

**NOTE:** There could be differences between this document and the official printed *Hansard*, Vol. 315

**WEDNESDAY, 6 JUNE 1990**

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) read prayers and took the chair at 2.30 p.m.

**QUEENSLAND DAY**

**Message from His Excellency the Governor**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have received the following message from His Excellency the Governor—

"Mr Speaker,

May I present to you and the people of Queensland the following message relating to the celebration of Queensland Day.

On the 6th June, 1859, the Colony of Queensland was created by Letters Patent signed by Her Majesty Queen Victoria. A proclamation was issued subsequently by Queensland's first Governor, Sir George Ferguson Bowen, in the following terms:

'Whereas Her Majesty has been graciously pleased, by Letters Patent under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, bearing date at Westminster, the Sixth day of June, in the twenty-second year of Her Majesty's Reign, to separate from the Colony of New South Wales, the Territory described in the said Letters Patent, and to erect the same into a separate Colony to be called the Colony of Queensland, and has further been pleased to constitute and appoint me, Sir George Ferguson Bowen, Knight, Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, to be Captain-General and Governor-in-chief in and over the said Colony of Queensland and its Dependencies. Now therefore, I, the Captain-General and Governor-in-chief aforesaid, do hereby proclaim and declare that I have this day taken the prescribed Oaths before His Honour Alfred James Peter Lutwyche, Esquire, Judge of the Supreme Court, and that I have accordingly assumed the said Office of Captain-General and Governor-in-chief.'

Mr Speaker,

The celebration of Queensland Day prompts reflection upon the courage, hardiness, perseverance and foresight of the pioneers who laid the foundations of the great pastoral, agricultural and mineral industries of the State of Queensland.

Despite often harsh seasonal conditions, great distances and debilitating fevers with which the pioneers were forced to contend, they settled large areas of this vast State. By steady application and hard work they overcame many hardships and built the basis of the industries which are the source of our prosperity today.

That same pioneering spirit of perseverance in spite of adversity was displayed in recent times by those Queenslanders who battled against the devastating floods which swept some regions of Western Queensland. Their courage and the resolve to rebuild their lives and communities have been a source of inspiration to all Australians.

The greatest tribute which Queenslanders can pay to our pioneers is for us to apply ourselves, each in our own field of endeavour, to ensuring that this State continues to grow in stature and in strength.

W. B. CAMPBELL,  
Government House,  
Brisbane.

6th June, 1990."

**Mr Lingard** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Fassifern! That was not appreciated.

#### PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

##### **Bundaberg Civic Centre**

From **Mr Campbell** (208 signatories) praying that no borrowings be allowed for the refurbishment of the Bundaberg City Council Civil Centre until boundaries of local authorities are reviewed.

##### **Relocation of LPG Tank, Edgar and Stanley Streets, East Brisbane**

From **Ms Warner** (67 signatories) praying that the LPG tank in the service station at Edgar and Stanley Streets, East Brisbane be relocated away from homes.

##### **The Avenue, Hermit Park; Purchase of Property by Corrective Services Commission**

From **Mr Smith** (104 signatories) praying that the Minister for Corrective Services not proceed to purchase a property in The Avenue, Hermit Park for the rehabilitation of prisoners.

##### **Traffic Lights, Main Street/Mumford Road/Mackie Road, Narangba**

From **Mr Hayward** (714 signatories) praying for the installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Main Street, Mumford and Mackie Roads, Narangba.

##### **Liability for Accidents Caused by Stock on Roadways**

From **Mr Connor** (322 signatories) praying for legislation to make owners of stock liable for accidents caused by animals straying onto roadways.

##### **Licensing of Firearms**

From **Mr Lingard** (324 signatories) praying that a licensing system for firearms be not introduced until public debate and alternative courses of action are investigated.

Similar petitions were received from **Mr Fitzgerald** (126 signatories), **Mr Pitt** (27 signatories), **Mr Heath** (17 signatories) and **Mr Stephan** (317 signatories).

Petitions received.

#### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Orders in Council under—

Rural Training Schools Act 1965-1984 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1989

University of Central Queensland Act 1989 and the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982-1989

Proclamation under the University of Southern Queensland Act 1989

Statutes under the University of Southern Queensland Act 1989

Reports—

Board of Senior Secondary School Studies for the year ended 31 December 1989

Ministerial Consultative Council on Curriculum.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

#### Queensland Industry Development Corporation

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development) (2.37 p.m.), by leave: Honourable members would be aware that in recent years there have been a number of allegations surrounding political interference in the allocation of financial assistance through the QIDC. Although I believed that many of these allegations were probably vexatious, they could not be ignored.

In January this year, I commissioned an independent review of the corporation by Mr John Polichronis, principal lecturer in banking and finance in the school of accountancy at the Queensland University of Technology.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Surfers Paradise will cease interjecting.

**Mr De LACY:** The aim of this independent review by Mr Polichronis was to clear up these allegations once and for all. I gave a firm assurance that, once I received the final report, it would be tabled in the House. I am now able to honour this undertaking.

I lay upon the table the report of the Inquiry into the Operations of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation, and I move that it be printed.

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

**Mr De LACY:** I recommend that honourable members take the time to read the report in its entirety.

Before I comment on certain key findings and recommendations of the Polichronis report, I first want to make a few general comments about the Goss Government's policy on the QIDC. The Government takes very seriously its responsibility to protect the Queensland taxpayers' significant equity investment in the QIDC. The corporation also plays an important role in administering Budget funds through schemes of financial assistance. Accordingly, the Government is committed to ensuring that the QIDC is a strong, efficient and reputable organisation. That is one of the key objectives which has guided the formulation of the Government's response to the Polichronis report.

However, in his report, Mr Polichronis has also made certain observations about the need for the Government to examine the very role of the QIDC and the potential benefits from rationalisation of provision of certain financial services. As honourable members would be aware, the Government has initiated an inquiry into the non-bank financial sector in Queensland. As part of its terms of reference, the inquiry will address these issues and make recommendations to the Government. In the meantime, the Government is strongly committed to the swift implementation of Mr Polichronis' recommendations in order to strengthen the QIDC and enhance its credibility.

As an example of its commitment and support, the Government has made a number of decisions to ensure that the QIDC functions as a wholly professional and commercial unit. We have already appointed a new board of directors for the QIDC. This new-look board has my every confidence, containing as it does high-profile and respected people from the business and rural sectors. Indeed, Mr Polichronis has noted that the new board has already initiated several changes in line with the recommendations in his report. Mr Polichronis has recommended that this excellent and well-functioning board could be made even stronger with the inclusion of a person with extensive high-level lending experience. The Government accepts this recommendation.

Many of the allegations about the QIDC surrounded the administration and allocation of assistance for the rural sector. Honourable members would recall that Rural Adjustment Scheme funds were frozen by the Federal Government following allegations

of financial mismanagement under the previous State Government. When the Goss Government came to power, I quickly moved to ensure that funding from the Federal Government for the Rural Adjustment Scheme was recommenced.

The funding recommenced after I gave assurances to the Federal Primary Industries Minister, Mr Kerin, on changes to administrative procedures and practices. The Goss Government moved quickly on this issue because it is firmly committed to the continuation of adequate and well-targeted financial assistance to Queensland's rural sector.

As a further sign of our commitment to the QIDC, I can announce today that the Government has approved that the Trusts Act be amended to provide that moneys invested with the QIDC are authorised trustee investments within the meaning of the Trusts Act. This will enable the QIDC to attract funds from a broader range of investors and should lower its borrowing costs.

I turn now to the findings of the Polichronis report. Honourable members will be able to examine these for themselves, but it is clear from several of the findings that the stewardship of the corporation by the previous Government and the previous board left much to be desired. In this regard, I would like to draw the attention of honourable members to a number of the key findings. I will quote directly from the report, which states—

"Political interference

There is evidence of political interference in the affairs of the QIDC under the previous Government, in particular in the Government Schemes Division . . .

Conflict of interest

There are several cases where directors and staff have been in a position of conflict of interest in transactions with the commercial side of QIDC, and the GSD.

Lending outside policy

There are many instances of abuse of Government schemes such as Natural Disaster Assistance Schemes and the Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme, as well as in concessional lending. These have persisted because of inadequate control procedures.

Lack of leadership and control

The previous board failed to provide effective leadership and direction to QIDC staff. Not enough emphasis has been placed on the commercial objective of the Corporation.

. . .

Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme"—  
better known as PIPES—

"The Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme has been poorly implemented (it appears to have been a pork-barrelling exercise). An amount of fifty million dollars was allocated for three years. Close to \$30 million had been lent in 14 months before the recent State election. At one stage the fund was overdrawn."

A close reading of Mr Polichronis' report leaves me to conclude that the QIDC was being used by certain members of the previous National Party administration to at times gain preferred treatment for a privileged minority of rural producers. That preferred treatment came at a large cost. It meant that funds were diverted from ordinary rural producers with more pressing funding needs but who lacked powerful and influential friends.

More fundamentally, it damaged the reputation and credibility of the QIDC—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** Opposition members do not like what I am saying.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Surfers Paradise!

**Mr De LACY:** As I was saying, it damaged the reputation and credibility of the QIDC in both the rural sector and in the broader community. It gives me no pleasure to have to say that the preferred treatment granted to certain QIDC clients appears to have been facilitated by certain elements of the previous board and certain senior QIDC executives. Clearly, the Goss Government's overhaul of the QIDC board was justified.

Mr Polichronis has made confidential recommendations in respect of the role and quality of certain QIDC staff. These recommendations have been referred to the new board for its consideration. Mr Polichronis has also provided confidential information in relation to a transaction which pointed to a conflict of interest involving the previous chairman and a member of the previous board. At Mr Polichronis' request, this matter has been referred to the Crown Solicitor for advice.

**Mr Katter** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Flinders will cease interjecting.

**Mr De LACY:** In case the members opposite missed it——

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Surfers Paradise, under Standing Order 123A, to cease interjecting. If he continues to interject, I will deal with him.

**Mr De LACY:** At Mr Polichronis' request, this matter has been referred to the Crown Solicitor for advice.

The Goss Government and the new board have acted decisively to enhance the integrity and credibility of the QIDC's operations. This Government sets the policy framework within which the QIDC operates. There has been, and will be, no political interference in the day-to-day business of the QIDC under this Government.

I now turn to the Government's response to the recommendations in the Polichronis report. As I have already mentioned, the new board has independently made a number of changes in line with the recommendations in the report. However, there are certain areas where the Government needs to give firm policy direction to the QIDC to enable the board to meet its responsibilities and to promote public confidence in the corporation.

The Government generally endorses the recommendations in the Polichronis report. It believes that a constructive response to the Polichronis report will ensure that the QIDC becomes more efficient and more accountable, which can only be a good thing for all Queenslanders.

The report contains 22 recommendations, and I do not propose to comment on each of them. I lay upon the table the full Government response to the recommendations in the Polichronis report.

*Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.*

**Mr De LACY:** However, I would like to comment on some recommendations. Recommendation 10 states——

"The board of the QIDC should move to review its corporate structure to provide greater autonomy to its GSD."

An important thrust of the Polichronis report is that Government assistance scheme activities should be maintained at arm's length at QIDC's commercial operations. Mr Polichronis sees this as being best achieved by establishing an independent board or committee to approve Government schemes of assistance and to report directly to the QIDC board. The Government supports this approach.

The alternative approach would be to establish a separate administrative board to administer Government assistance schemes. This would require the establishment of

new administrative infrastructure and the cost savings of sharing overheads with the QIDC would be lost. It is also likely that the logistics of the physical separation of QIDC and the Government Schemes Division would cause significant dislocation to both organisations.

There has been some criticism from the banking sector that the close relationship between the Government Schemes Division and the commercial activities of QIDC have meant that a level playing field did not exist in Queensland. The Government considers that this can be overcome by ensuring that the Government Schemes Division operates as an autonomous unit in regard to its assistance assessments. Further, the banking sector will be invited to participate more closely in the future delivery of Government assistance schemes.

Recommendation 12 states—

"An immediate review of Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme be carried out with a view to tightening up the eligibility criteria, avoiding overlaps with other schemes, ensuring that commercial viability is interpreted strictly as economic viability, and limiting subsidies to short term arrangements."

Recommendation 13 states—

"The QIDC should carry out a full review of all schemes"——

**Mr KATTER:** I rise to a point of order..

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! What is the honourable member's point of order?

**Mr KATTER:** Certain traditions in this House have been time-honoured. Constantly, Ministers of the previous Government were sat down when their ministerial statements went for more seven minutes. The Minister has now been going for 20 minutes.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There is no point of order, and I will not tolerate his abusing the Standing Orders on such a frivolous point of order.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr De LACY:** Fancy members of the National Party talking!

Recommendation 13 states—

"The QIDC should carry out a full review of all schemes in consultation"——

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** Some of these matters need to be drawn to the honourable member's attention.

Recommendation 13 continues—

". . . with the Government to determine whether they are effective and whether continuation is warranted."

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** Mr Speaker, the members of the Opposition do not like to hear the truth.

I would like to emphasise that the Goss Government is firmly committed to the continuation of the provision of adequate financial assistance to Queensland's rural sector. In particular, the Government believes that the Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme, properly implemented, has a very important role to play in the process of structural adjustment in the rural sector.

However, the Government is firmly of the view that assistance should be directed to those in need and not delivered with a scatter-gun approach or on the basis of who you know.

The Government believes that schemes of assistance should be efficiently targeted and that there is considerable scope for rationalisation of plethora of existing schemes. It has therefore decided that, as part of the ongoing round of strategic evaluations of selected programs and functions, which it initiated earlier this year, an evaluation of Queensland Government assistance schemes administered by the QIDC will be given a particular priority.

The evaluation will focus on—

- clarifying objectives for each scheme and associated eligibility criteria;
- assessing the effectiveness of each scheme in meeting industry needs and identifying mechanisms to improve effectiveness;
- identifying areas of overlap in existing schemes or where schemes could be broadened to meet particular assistance needs; and
- identifying mechanisms to improve administration and effective delivery of Government assistance schemes.

The evaluation team will comprise representatives of the Government Schemes Division of QIDC, the Treasury and the Department of Primary Industries. Industry representatives will be invited to make submissions.

A steering committee comprising myself, my colleague the Minister for Primary Industries and our respective chief executives will oversee the evaluation which is expected to be completed by the end of July.

While the evaluation is in progress, assistance will continue to be made available to deserving applicants under existing arrangements.

Recommendation 14 states—

"That all QIDC lending (excluding schemes) be placed on a commercial footing and that the concessional and special rural rates be phased out."

The board of the QIDC has already taken steps to phase out the special rural rate.

In regard to concessional rural rate lending—the QIDC has a significant portfolio of loans which have been advanced at a current interest rate of 13.5 per cent per annum, as against a prime rate currently of 18.5 per cent per annum. Until very recently, these loans were advanced on a needs basis which was not very rigorously assessed. To maintain this loan portfolio, this year, the Government will pay some \$14m in interest subsidy to the QIDC.

In response to Mr Polichronis' recommendation, the Government has made the following decisions to better target that interest subsidy—

- The administration of the existing concessional rural rate loans will, as soon as practicable, be transferred to the Government Schemes Division.
- All existing concessional rural rate loans will be reviewed and, where the financial circumstances of the client permit, the interest rate will be moved to a more commercial level.
- Where loans have a specified non-review period, this will be honoured.
- Only those primary producers who are assessed as clearly having the capacity to service a more commercial interest rate without threatening ongoing viability will be affected.
- In the interest of equity and to enable primary producers to make certain adjustments, any changes will take effect from the common date of 1 January 1991.
- No new concessional rural rate loans will be made available. However, primary producers seeking concessional interest finance will be considered for assistance under the current range of Government schemes.

In implementing these revised arrangements for concessional lending, the Government expects that rural producers experiencing difficulties associated with, for example, the

recent floods in western Queensland and the problems in the wool industry will receive particularly sensitive and sympathetic consideration by the QIDC.

The Government does not envisage that the implementation of the report will involve an overall reduction in assistance to the rural sector. Inefficiencies in, and better targeting of, current assistance measures will allow the Government to redirect scarce resources to higher priority programs of benefit to the rural sector.

In summary—the Government endorses the broad thrust of the Polichronis report. It thanks Mr Polichronis for a very comprehensive and constructive report. The Government has responded to the report in a decisive and positive manner which will enhance the standing of the QIDC in the Queensland community. The Government is firmly committed to the continuation of adequate financial assistance to Queensland enterprises but also takes very seriously its responsibility to the taxpayers of this State.

**Mr HARPER:** I rise to a point of order to challenge the Minister to move, "That the House take note of the statement" so that the matter may be debated in this Chamber.

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

### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

#### **Medical Board of Queensland; Dr I. Wilkey**

**Hon. K. V. McELLIGOTT** (Thuringowa—Minister for Health) (2.55 p.m.), by leave: Honourable members will be aware that I have previously advised this House that the Medical Board of Queensland and other boards associated with the Department of Health are currently under review. At present, I am considering proposals to change the structure and function of the boards, and honourable members will get their opportunity to comment when appropriate legislation is introduced into the House.

I have also made it clear that I believe it inappropriate for me to comment on individual cases before the Medical Board or other boards. Sadly, that view has not been adopted by the member for Callide, Mrs McCauley, who last evening used this House for an unprincipled attack on the President of the Medical Board, Dr Ian Wilkey. In the course of her remarks, the Opposition spokesman also made the extraordinary release of details from a hearing that was held in camera at the request of the parties involved. Dr Wilkey is a senior public servant and consequently unable to defend himself from the serious charge levelled at him by Mrs McCauley of not disclosing a personal interest in the case.

Dr Wilkey has provided the following information—

"The matter concerning Dr W Orford was heard by the Medical Board in May. Dr Orford was invited to have the matter heard in public but chose to have the matter heard in camera. The Board has made no public comment about this matter and it would have been improper for either party to do so.

Dr Wilkey denies that he had any personal interest in either matter referred to by Mrs McCauley. That Dr Wilkey knew Dr Orford was in fact discussed with the Board and the solicitor advising the Board before the hearing and Dr Wilkey concluded that there was no conflict. Several members of the Board knew Dr Orford who was a long standing general practitioner in Brisbane.

Dr Orford joined an established general practice in St Lucia probably in the mid 1950's. Prior to this, Dr Wilkey's parents attended this practice. Dr Wilkey, as a child and student, would have been seen by members of this practice. He has no specific recollection of having been seen by Dr Orford at that time but would not be surprised if he had done so. While senior members of that partnership may have been identified by Dr Wilkey's parents as their 'family doctor', Dr Orford would probably not have been so identified. It is doubtful that Dr Wilkey himself would have had any professional contact with members of that practice."

That ends Dr Wilkey's report to me.

The Goss Government's commitment to reform the professional boards is well documented. But intelligent and constructive public debate on these issues is not aided by this type of ill-informed and cowardly attack from the member for Callide.

I believe that the members of the National Party should be very concerned that a spokesperson for their party should attack the professional and personal integrity of the senior medical officer of this State—an officer appointed by the National Party Government and who, by virtue of legislation introduced by the National Party Government, is required to act as President of the Medical Board of Queensland. I urge the Leader of the Opposition to ask Mrs McCauley to apologise.

#### **LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE**

**Mr HARPER:** I seek leave to move a motion without notice relating to the statement made by the Treasurer.

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

AYES, 33

NOES, 52

#### **DIVISION**

Resolved in the negative.

#### **PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn) (3.06 p.m.), by leave: I refer to the report tabled in this House by the Treasurer and to that section dealing with the Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I wish to remind the honourable member for Auburn that I will be tolerant for a little while, but he must point out where he has been personally affected or misrepresented. He cannot debate any criticism that has been made by one side of the House of actions taken by members on the other side of the House when they were in Government. I remind the honourable member of that. I will be listening carefully.

**Mr HARPER:** I appreciate the wisdom of your ruling, Mr Speaker, and invite your attention to a paragraph on page 3 of the Treasurer's ministerial statement. Mr Speaker, you would be aware that I was the Minister responsible for introducing this scheme. I

refer to page 3 of the Treasurer's ministerial statement where he quotes from the report, and point out that my personal explanation relates to the fact that I was the Minister responsible, and proudly so, for introducing the PIPE Scheme. The paragraph from the report, which is on page 3 of the statement, reads—

"The Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme has been poorly implemented (it appears to have been a pork-barrelling exercise)."

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Auburn will resume his seat. Under Standing Orders, that is not a matter of personal explanation. Is there any other business?

**Hon. N. J. HARPER** (Auburn) (3.08 p.m.): I move—

"That the member for Auburn be further heard."

Motion agreed to.

**Mr Lingard** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Fassifern continues—

**Mr Lingard** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Fassifern under Standing Order 124.

**Mr W. K. Goss:** We wanted him to dig himself in deeper.

**Mr HARPER:** If the Honourable the Premier was serious in his comments, he would allow this side the opportunity to debate the whole report in the House. He has refused to do that. Donald Duck ran for cover. You know that, Mr Speaker, because the vote was put to the House.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I advise the member for Auburn to refer to the Treasurer by his proper title.

**Mr HARPER:** The Honourable the Treasurer was not prepared to debate a report that he tabled in the House.

If I may proceed with the personal explanation, I will refer again to that paragraph in the report to which I have referred. It amazes me that an independent commission would use such terminology as "it appears to have been a pork-barrelling exercise". That does not seem to me to be quite the terminology that one would expect from an independent commission.

In Parliament yesterday, the Honourable the Premier and the Honourable Minister for Primary Industries castigated the Criminal Justice Commission—and I emphasise "Criminal Justice Commission"—for not having discussed certain matters with the person whom it was investigating. Both the Honourable the Premier and the Minister for Primary Industries castigated the Criminal Justice Commission for not having that consultation. As part of my personal explanation, I put it to the House that this ad hoc committee that the Treasurer set up and plucked out of thin air did not have the courtesy to refer to the person who was responsible—and, as I say, proudly so—for introducing this Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme. There was no attempt to discuss any matters with that person, and to use terminology such as "it appears to have been a pork-barrelling exercise" demonstrates the political slant that obviously occurred right from establishment of the committee.

It is correct that in the 1988 Budget, an amount of \$50m was allocated by the Ahern Government for the Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme. The purpose of that was to help overcome financial difficulties being encountered by primary producers who were being held to ransom as a result of the maladministration of the Australian economy by Treasurer Keating, high interest rates and associated problems. That was part of the reason for the introduction of the PIPE Scheme.

As with another initiative, the financial counselling scheme, this scheme received acclaim from all sections of the community, including the environmental groups and

the former Opposition and present-day Government, all concerned with land care. I believe all those people were supportive of what the National Party Government was setting out to do, which was, as the member for Cunningham has said, to improve land care and productivity to the total benefit of the land management system. The scheme was also designed to arrest land degradation. Far from being a "pork-barrelling exercise", it was a very worth while and important contribution to overcoming and arresting land degradation in Queensland.

It is a great pity that representations made by the former National Party Government to the Federal Government for financial assistance were not heeded and in fact were not responded to.

It was because of the success of the scheme that \$30m was spent more quickly than had been anticipated. It was spent in 14 months and, as a Government, members of the National Party were proud of the fact that the scheme was so successful. The money was obviously needed. The former Finance Minister, the former Premier and Treasurer and I were well aware of the increasing need to provide further allocations of funds for land care.

I make this explanation particularly in the light of the paragraph to which I have referred. As the Leader of the House and the Premier have indicated that they are prepared to debate the issue, I again challenge the Government, as I attempted to do earlier, to debate the issue by moving that the Minister's statement to the House be noted so that a full debate can be entered into.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1.

#### Green Island, Freeholding

Mr COOMBER asked the Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts—

"With reference to an answer to a question he gave to this House on 10 May that he would soon receive a report on an application for the freeholding of the present lease on Green Island—

(1) Has he received this report?

(2) Will his Government allow this island, which is now under 100 percent foreign control, to be freeholded?

(3) Has the Government been advised whether or not the owners of the island, Daikyo, have yet secured a local joint venturer?"

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** (1) In response to the honourable member's question as to whether I have received the report—the answer is "Yes".

(2) With regard to the freeholding of the lease of Green Island— the Queensland Government will not allow the freeholding of this lease to either foreign or Australian interests. It has been the consistent position of the Government that any foreign interest in Green Island be limited to 50 per cent of the leases pertaining to the current tourism activities undertaken on the island.

I also wish to correct the inference in the honourable member's question that Daikyo has already secured title to the lease. This is not the case. In order for the transfer to take place, Daikyo requires the approval of the Queensland Government and the Foreign Investment Review Board. These approvals have not yet been given.

(3) This is still a matter of commercial negotiation.

2.

#### ALP Electoral Boundary Submission to EARC

Mr COOMBER asked the Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts—

"(1) Is there any evidence that his party's submission to EARC that recommends reducing the average number of constituents for each seat of Parliament to 18,000

resulting in the expansion of the Parliament by 10 seats, has the support of the people of Queensland?

(2) Did the Parliamentary Labor Party have any input into this recommendation and, if so, what was that input?

(3) How much does he estimate an extra 10 members of Parliament will cost the Queensland taxpayer?"

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** (1) The submission to EARC by the Queensland branch of the Australian Labor Party on voting and zonal systems makes the comment that a member of the Queensland House of Assembly should serve a workable number of electors and puts a figure of 18 000 as an "ideal". The report goes on to say that, under the present arrangement, each MLA would, by 1992, be serving 23 000 electors. I am unaware of any specific research on the views of Queenslanders in respect of the number of electors in each electorate. However, the results of the 1989 election indicated clearly an overwhelming mandate for electoral reform. This Government remains committed to that.

(2) The recommendation reflects the policy of the Queensland branch of the Australian Labor Party. While being aware of this particular recommendation, the parliamentary Labor Party does not normally have any formal input into submissions drawn up by the administrative wing of the Queensland branch. This was the case in respect of the submission to EARC.

(3) The question asks how much "will" an extra 10 members of Parliament cost. As there is no proposal to increase the size of the Queensland Parliament, a response is not warranted.

### 3. **Foreign Investment Review Board; Foreign-owned Land, Gold Coast**

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government—

"With reference to the fact that the Gold Coast City Council has written to the Federal Treasurer, Mr Keating, expressing its serious concern at the failure of Mr Keating's Foreign Investment Review Board to require the foreign owners of 17 vacant sites within Gold Coast City to meet development parameters laid down at the time these foreigners had their applications to purchase these properties approved by the FIRB—

(1) Will he publicly support the council in its attempt to have these foreigners comply with these previously agreed development parameters and write to Mr Keating to that effect?

(2) Is he concerned that this refusal by the FIRB to enforce these agreements is a gross and unwarranted interference in the legitimate planning powers of councils?

(3) Is he aware that the FIRB, in a letter to the Gold Coast City Council, said it did not see a need to consult with the council on each and every Gold Coast proposal received by the board and will he act immediately to persuade Mr Keating to require the board to so consult with every Queensland council?

(4) Does he believe that Queensland councils are being held in contempt by this existing policy of the FIRB?

(5) Does he see any justification in a policy which effectively gives foreign owners of development sites a special privileged status above Australian owners of similar sites who can be subjected to the full force of the law if they fail to comply with development agreements?"

**Mr BURNS:** Inquiries have been made in relation to the matters raised by the honourable member. I am aware of correspondence which exists between the Gold Coast City Council and the Foreign Investment Review Board in which the council initially claimed that 41 such sites exist in the Gold Coast City area. However, inquiries by the

board indicate that only 17 of those vacant sites are foreign-owned. There are presumably, therefore, 24 vacant sites owned by Australian interests. Of the 17 foreign-owned sites, 11 were acquired in 1988, four in 1987 and one in 1986, with a further site being repurchased in June 1989 from the original foreign owner, who acquired that site in 1988.

In respect of development commencement conditions imposed by the Foreign Investment Review Board, the board advises that—

- four were not subject to time constraints;
- five are within the time limits imposed by the board; and
- five have exceeded the time limits specified by the board for commencement of work.

Of those last five sites, construction has commenced on two and three have applied to the board for extension of conditions because of the current market down-turn. Construction is to commence on one site by September this year. Those would appear to be the facts of the matter. Having said that, I note that I share the council's concern at the failure to commence those projects.

Developers, whether local, interstate or overseas, must comply with a local authority's requirements. In that respect, it is a matter for the local authority itself to ensure that its conditions of approval have been complied with. In respect of that matter, I have been advised by the foreign investment secretariat within the Department of Treasury that it will be corresponding with the council on an ongoing basis so that the matters of concern can be kept under review.

Having regard to the foregoing, the answers to the questions are as follows—

(1) There is no demonstrated need for that to occur.

(2) There is no reason to believe that the actions taken by the board to date are improper. The powers of the board certainly do not interfere with a local authority's planning powers, and any foreign investment approvals do not exempt developers from the need to comply with local authority requirements.

(3) I am advised that the board informed the council that it did not see the need, nor did it have the resources to consult with the council on each and every foreign investment proposal. However, the board has offered to consult with the council on a continuing basis. I would interpret that offer as being open to any Queensland council.

(4) No.

(5) I am not aware of any privileged status provided to foreign developers by way of Foreign Investment Review Board policy.

#### 4. **Town-planning, Gold Coast Region**

Mr VEIVERS asked the Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government—

"With reference to an announcement made by the then Leader of the Opposition just prior to the 1988 South Coast By-election that a Labor Government would create a planning agency for the Gold Coast region and that this agency would 'be given sufficient staff and resources to effectively discharge its crucial planning role'—

(1) Will he now publicly announce that this bizarre idea has been abandoned in line with the Labor Party's own town planning policy which states, 'town planning is primarily the responsibility of Local Government'?

(2) Will he now indicate when appropriate Legislation will be introduced to establish this promised super planning quango to over-ride the proper town planning powers of Gold Coast City and Albert Shire?"

**Mr BURNS:** (1 and 2) The policies of the ALP were reviewed in the lead-up to the last election and, as the member for Southport stated, the current policy is that "town-planning will primarily be the responsibility of local government".

It is my intention to give effect to that policy later this week by introducing the Local Government (Planning and Environment) Bill, which rightly places the main responsibility for town-planning in Queensland with local authorities and which contains powers for a council to consider new types of applications to speed up the development process but at the same time protect the rights of local residents and ensure that environmental matters receive full consideration.

However, it is expected that, by the year 2001, Queensland's population will have grown by up to 854 000 people, with about 70 per cent of the increase living in the south-east of the State. Such an increase has important implications for local, State and Federal Governments, business and people in terms of such matters as physical infrastructure and community services. Town-planning does not stop at the border between two local authorities. Councils must plan ahead for their regions as well as their own shires or cities and have to consult more with one another. My Department of Housing and Local Government is looking at mechanisms to actively encourage such voluntary cooperative action by councils.

A new division is also being established in the department to foster the coordination of the plans of local authorities with the activities of State and Federal Government agencies in providing schools, child-care facilities, hospitals, transport services and so on.

In addition, the Government has established a Bureau of Regional Development in the Department of Treasury to assist in the process of regional development. The bureau currently has no legislative powers. It will achieve its aims of promoting regional, economic and social development by reasoned argument and persuasion.

#### **5. Multifunction Polis, Water Supply**

Mr NEAL asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

"With reference to the State Government's decision to support the Multi-Function Polis proposal for the Coomera region and its earlier decision to scrap the planned Wolffdene Dam and as the Hinze Dam water supply is fully committed and as Logan City already experiences water shortages—

Where will the water supply be drawn from for the MFP?"

**Mr CASEY:** Despite the implications contained in the question, there is no link or dependency between the site for the multifunction polis and the now abandoned Wolffdene dam proposal. The water needs envisaged as part of the multifunction polis project will be supplied as a normal part of the growth in water demand being experienced by local authorities in the region. The Government is already well ahead with that planning.

As I have already explained in the House and publicly on several occasions, immediately following the Government's decision not to proceed with the Wolffdene dam project, I instructed the Water Resources Commission to undertake a review of all the options available for consideration to meet the water needs of south-east Queensland.

That study is now well under way. A detailed examination is in train of all possible storages in the region.

**Mr Elliott** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** Of course, I know that the honourable member wants to go back and build Wolffdene. Under this Government, there is no chance of that occurring.

The study will examine in some detail the urban, industrial, power generation and agricultural growth trends in south-east Queensland to establish future water supply

demands. The projected water requirements of the multifunction polis are certainly included in this assessment. The study will also undertake a reappraisal of all the existing storages in the region to determine the extent to which their storage capacities are already committed.

A separate but closely linked study is also being made to assist in the future planning for major water supply distribution in the region. This will also encompass the proposed multifunction polis location. I can assure the House that water supply for the multifunction polis proposal is not being overlooked.

**6. Water Charges and Availability**

Mr BOOTH asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

"With reference to his statement that any further water allocations from the Water Resources Commission for irrigation or major water use would attract a capital charge—

(1) How does he propose to differentiate between farmers already receiving water without a capital charge and new farms attracting a capital charge?

(2) Does this mean that riparian landholders would be denied water from new projects unless they can provide the necessary capital?

(3) Does it mean that large companies could out-bid small family farm enterprises and corner all the water from a project?

(4) Could it be that the Government does not intend to bring on any new projects as regards water storage and intends to use lack of finance as a way of stopping all new projects, in regard to water storage?"

**Mr CASEY:** (1) Firstly, let me make it plain that charges apply only in those areas and projects in which assured supplies of water are made available as a result of Government investment. No capital charges apply to normal unregulated water flows.

Until recently the only capital payments for water allocation occurred when farms were developed by the Government and sold with a water allocation attached. In all other cases the allocation of water to existing farms at no cost resulted in a substantial windfall increase in the value of the property. I can see no reason why the taxpayers who foot the bill for those projects should not share in the increased value generated as a result.

There will be no difference between those land-holders who have obtained an allocation of water in the past free of charge and those who in future will have to make a capital payment. All land-holders will continue to meet the annual water charges which meet only the annual cost of operation, maintenance and administration, with a partial contribution in some cases to asset replacement.

Action will also be taken to ensure that all allocations obtained previously without charge are being beneficially used. Wherever there is an allocation with a long history of underuse, steps will be taken to recover that unused allocation.

At the same time, arrangements are already in place to enable transferability of allocations. This will ensure purchased allocations can be used flexibly by the purchaser.

(2) Riparian land-holders have always had rights to water for domestic and stock-watering purposes under the Water Resources Act 1989, and these rights will continue to apply.

Where a watercourse is supplemented as a result of a Government-funded scheme, a capital charge will apply to all future allocations. Arrangements can be made for that capital charge to be paid over a reasonable period.

Let me stress again that the capital charges proposed are to return to the community as part of the increased values generated by public investment in water facilities. Land-holders outside Government-funded schemes do not enjoy the benefits of public investment.

They have to bear all the cost of their on-farm water conservation development. I am certain that these costs far exceed the charges likely to be required for Government-funded schemes.

(3) The short answer is "No".

The auction of 3 000 megalitres of allocation by the Water Resources Commission in the St George area in November 1989 was structured to ensure that small enterprises were not disadvantaged. This was very successful. The results of the auction showed a good distribution of purchases ranging from 10 to 300 megalitres.

Strict controls will always apply to limit purchases to land-holders who can beneficially use the water. These can be established to ensure that large volumes are not concentrated in a few sets of hands.

(4) The sale of water allocations will enhance the viability of both existing and proposed schemes.

The Government has no intention of stopping development but is committed to putting all Government-funded schemes on a more equitable and economically sound basis.

The sale of allocation will ensure a fairer distribution of resources and a greater return on investment to the Government. This contrasts with previous windfall gains by a fortunate few from schemes that were propped up by the remainder of the community.

7.

### **Rural Road-funding**

Mr BOOTH asked the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development—

"With reference to the present lack of funding for rural roads in Queensland due to the fact that the Australian Government is returning very little to the States from fuel tax and excise duty—

(1) Has he made an approach to the Transport Minister to press for a greater allocation from the Commonwealth Government especially for rural roads?

(2) As the efficiency of primary production is linked very closely to an adequate road system, has he planning in progress to try and obtain greater rural road funding?"

**Mr HAMILL:** "No" to the premise.

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

### **QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

#### **Criticism by Premier and Ministers of Criminal Justice Commission— *Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations***

**Mr COOPER:** In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to criticism by the Premier and some of his Ministers of the CJC *Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations*, claiming that there was a lack of consultation with the Government by the CJC on the issue, and I ask: has the CJC Chairman, Sir Max Bingham, written to the Premier asking whether the Premier had received complaints about the Primary Industries Minister, Mr Casey, relating to matters impinging on the CJC report and, if so, did the Premier reply, and will he now table all of the correspondence involved?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I am not sure that I have got the question exactly right, but I understood the Leader of the Opposition to ask whether or not the Chairman of the

Criminal Justice Commission had written to me requesting information in relation to complaints about Mr Casey. The answer to that is "No".

I understand that the Leader of the Opposition made a complaint to the Criminal Justice Commission in respect of Mr Casey, alleging official misconduct, or misconduct of some kind. A letter from Sir Max Bingham was received by my office on Thursday or Friday of last week when I was in Sydney. That letter cleared Mr Casey of any official misconduct, either in respect of the events some 10 years ago or the events of this year, which I think were also the subject of the complaint by the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr COOPER:** Under Standing Order 68, I place on notice a question to the member for Brisbane Central in his capacity as Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice.

#### **Inquiry into Logging on Fraser Island**

**Mr PREST:** In directing a question to the Premier, I refer him to the inquiry into Fraser Island being conducted by Mr Fitzgerald. I understand that Mr Fitzgerald has been engaging in discussions with mainstream conservation groups, the Queensland Forest Service and the timber industry in relation to logging on Fraser Island during the course of the inquiry. I ask: can the Premier outline to the House the purpose of these discussions?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** This is an important issue. Such discussions have been taking place.

It is important for honourable members and the public to realise that the election commitment of this Government involved an inquiry into a long-term conservation and management strategy for Fraser Island. In January of this year the Minister for Environment and Heritage announced an inquiry. There was then some disputation in relation to the terms of reference of that inquiry and the way in which it would be conducted. In order to ensure that the inquiry would have public confidence and that it would be honest, I requested Mr Tony Fitzgerald to chair that commission of inquiry, and he agreed to do so on a voluntary basis.

At the time there was also a suggestion by some people in the environmental movement that there should be a cessation or a moratorium in respect of all logging on Fraser Island. That, of course, would have pre-empted the results of Mr Fitzgerald's inquiry and was not regarded as appropriate. Subsequently, some people associated with the timber industry sought a moratorium on other activities by tourists and environmentalists, including their mode of transport on Fraser Island because of the damage that that might cause. Once again, it was inappropriate to pre-empt the results of the inquiry.

At an initial public hearing held in April, the mainstream conservation groups, which style themselves under the title of the Joint Conservation Groups, submitted a compromise proposal, not to end logging but simply to restrict certain logging practices during the course of the inquiry. As I understand it, that related to what are known as old growth areas. It was decided that that would be inappropriate because, once again, it would have a pre-emptive effect in terms of the consequences that that would have for the timber industry.

However, it appears quite clear that the Joint Conservation Groups are aware, and have accepted, that the Government is unwilling to pre-empt the inquiry by imposing a moratorium on one side or the other while Mr Fitzgerald is continuing his inquiry. The latest discussions which were initiated as a consequence of the compromise proposal put forward by the Joint Conservation Groups relate to the possibility of a recommendation or some agreement on the suspension of the logging of trees that are more than one metre thick at breast height or, alternatively, 1.2 metres thick at breast height in old growth forests. Those discussions are continuing, and that is their basis.

Mr Fitzgerald and his commission requested that the Government direct the Queensland Forest Service to participate in discussions with the Joint Conservation Groups and the timber industry. Those discussions are continuing. The Joint Conservation Groups and the timber industry are to be congratulated for the manner in which they are cooperating with Mr Fitzgerald's inquiry. Some publicity has been given to one particular group known as the Rainforest Action Group. It should be noted that that group is not part of the Joint Conservation Groups, that is, the mainstream and responsible conservation groups. That organisation is not cooperating with Mr Fitzgerald. It is not supported by Dr Aila Keto, who is the spokesperson for the Joint Conservation Groups appearing before the inquiry.

A check was made with the inquiry this morning, and it should be noted also that the Rainforest Action Group has not even sought leave to appear before the inquiry, has not sought from the inquiry the initial information paper published and has not requested a copy of the discussion paper that was released this week. It is clear that that group is not genuine and is not part of the mainstream Joint Conservation Groups. The mainstream groups—not the Rainforest Action Group—have initiated the discussions that are under way at present and which will be pursued under the guidance of Mr Fitzgerald.

#### **Wheat Chip Industry**

**Mr PREST:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: is he aware of plans to establish a wheat chip industry? Does Queensland have any interest in its development?

**Mr CASEY:** I thank the honourable member for that very interesting question. I was very pleased to hear in today's news that a Brisbane-based company, A and B Holdings, is proposing to enter the highly competitive and crowded snack food market. I applaud the company for that. I understand that the industry will be based on wheat chips, which is a very interesting concept. It is a bold initiative that will be good for the local and export trades, which is great.

It is interesting to note that the chairman of that company was formerly a member of this House. On quite a number of occasions during his time as Industry Minister, he espoused ways in which Australia should be developing such types of industries. I am very pleased that he, as a Queenslanders, was espousing that interest.

Whilst he was the National Party Premier of this State, he espoused a project called Quality Queensland. In Queensland every week of the year, he wanted to hear the announcement of some new initiative that would be great for Queenslanders and for Queensland generally. That member believed that everything existed in Queensland and that when one reached the north bank of the Tweed River, that was the edge of the world.

Honourable members will be most interested to learn that the location of that factory will be right in the heart of "cockroach" land, at Inverell in New South Wales. That goes to show that some Queenslanders perform and others do not.

#### **Authorities to Prospect on Hummock Hill Island**

**Mr BEANLAND:** In directing a question to the Minister for Resource Industries, I refer to the issuing late last year of authorities to prospect on Hummock Hill Island south of Gladstone, and I ask: as sand-mining rights over the island are now held by Nissho Iwai, will the Government act to fulfil its election pledge, which was enunciated on 19 November last year by his leader, when he stated—

"Our magnificent coastline in particular must be protected by Labor's coastal protection strategy."?

Is the Government considering the cancellation of that authority to prospect to fulfil its election promise?

**Mr VAUGHAN:** Wild Cattle Island, Hummock Hill Island and Middle Island off the central Queensland coast are the subject of discussion between my department and the Department of Environment and Heritage in relation to the future of the area. Those discussions apply not only to that area but also to the whole of the coastal region of Queensland.

This Government is trying to reach a reasonable resolution of the issue of coastal management generally throughout the State, having regard to the natural resources of those areas, to ensure that the State receives the maximum benefit from the development of our natural resources while looking after the environment.

#### **Walsteam Pty Ltd; Development of Hummock Hill Island**

**Mr BEANLAND:** In directing a question to the Minister for Land Management, I refer to concern within the business community about a recent decision in *Walsteam Pty Ltd v. Queensland* in relation to section 205 of the Lands Act, and I ask: is the Minister aware that the company in this instance spent over \$2m on preparations for the development of Hummock Hill Island south of Gladstone based on undertakings given since 1981 by the Lands Administration Commission in relation to the issue of a special lease? In seeking to defend its action to issue authorities to prospect to the Japanese company Nissho Iwai, did the Government claim that section 205 only allowed leases to be granted by the Governor in Council and that the commission had no power to enter into agreements with Walsteam? Is it true that many lease-holders who relied on commission advice now have unenforceable interests against the Crown? Will the Government give an undertaking to reassure lease-holders throughout the State and financial institutions that advanced money on those securities that their interests will be protected?

**Mr EATON:** Let me say from the outset that this has been a very complex issue that has been ongoing for a number of years. An offer of a priority special lease was made to Bunny Industries Limited on 27 January 1984. However, before going into receivership that company failed to comply with all the conditions of the offer.

I will give a very brief summary of the facts of the matter. After *Walson Pty Limited* became the lessee of the holding, on a number of occasions it was requested to submit a development plan for consideration by the Government. However, it failed to do so. The company has never established its bona fides as a true developer and, in fact, on a number of occasions tried to sell the lease to another party. Quite clearly, the previous Government was not committed to the idea that Hummock Hill Island was to be developed for tourist purposes and it agreed to expressions of interest being called for exploration of minerals on the island.

This Goss Government is not against appropriate balanced development. However, it is opposed to Crown land being used for speculative gain by a privileged few. This particular case should not be seen as creating any sort of precedent, as all cases are judged on their individual merits.

#### **Employer Contributions to Superannuation Funds**

**Mr PALASZCZUK:** In directing a question to the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations, I refer to his statement that many industrial awards now provide for employers to make compulsory contributions into an approved occupational superannuation fund on behalf of their employees. I ask: will he advise the House what steps are being taken to ensure that relevant award provisions are observed?

**Mr WARBURTON:** I am pleased to be able to advise the honourable member that my department is taking very positive steps in this very important area of employer education. An education program for employers is being pursued at present. Brochures have been forwarded throughout the State to employers operating under State awards and agreements.

A second brochure is being produced. It is intended that, as from 1 July, when inspectors of my department enter into the second stage of their general inspections throughout the State, they will be able to hand these brochures to employers and have face-to-face discussions with them. The whole purpose of the exercise, of course, is to encourage employers to meet their obligations under awards and agreements.

In addition, and finally, I advise the honourable member that the department will be endeavouring to have a presence at the RNA Exhibition and at shows in country towns, where those brochures will be available. It is a part of the ongoing education process that I mentioned the Government would be involved in when I was questioned on this matter by the Opposition.

### **Education—Have Your Say**

**Mr PALASZCZUK:** I refer the Minister for Education to the Education Department's recent Education—Have Your Say campaign and I ask: will he inform the House of the results of this campaign and also the Government's future plans to improve education services in Queensland?

**Mr BRADDY:** I thank the honourable member for his question. Contrary to the criticism by the Opposition Education spokesman, the Education—Have Your Say campaign has been one of the most well received programs ever undertaken by the Department of Education. To date, over 1 700 responses have been received from teachers, community leaders, parents and students suggesting ways in which the delivery of education services to students in this State can be improved.

Therefore, a discussion paper will be prepared and presented to me in July by the policy unit, which has been put in place by this Government to monitor and suggest change in the education system. After that, a discussion paper will be prepared. In September or October of this year, a final report will be presented to me to set out the new directions for better delivery of educational services.

For too long too many teachers have held the opinion that in this State education services have not been prepared primarily for the benefit of the students but for the comfort of some of the people in central office. To some extent, that is not true; but to some extent, of course, it is true. This policy unit and the Education—Have Your Say campaign, far from being subjected to criticism, have been received with great enthusiasm and with great support by the teachers and the education community of this State. I am confident that this ambitious consultation program will lead to a delivery of services in Queensland Government schools that will be unparalleled anywhere else in Australia.

### **Member for Mackay; Findings by Criminal Justice Commission**

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I refer the Premier to the CJC finding that invoices sent to Ainsworth from the office of the member for Mackay were false and may have given that company the means to claim a fraudulent taxation benefit and to the clear qualification by the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission in his letter to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, which I will table, which says that the commission's finding on official misconduct relates only to the conduct of Mr Casey in the discharge of his functions as a member of the Legislative Assembly. I ask: in view of the fact that this finding indicates that criminal breaches may be involved, namely by the company of section 29B of the Commonwealth Crimes Act, and by the member for Mackay of a section of the same Act which is mirrored by section 7 of the Queensland Criminal Code, will the Premier request a full inquiry by the Commissioner for Taxation into the operations of the Caspalp fund? If such a breach has occurred, is this acceptable practice under the Premier's ministerial code of conduct?

*Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the document referred to.*

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** As I understood the situation, the Leader of the Opposition was going to ask the Australian Taxation Office to undertake an inquiry. I invite him to do

so. Let it be clearly understood that the Criminal Justice Commission report and, for that matter, the Opposition are not able to point to any law or any rule of conduct that has been broken.

The premise of the question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is quite contrived, and false as well. As for what the company concerned may have done—there has been no finding that the company concerned has done anything in breach of the law—the facts are there and the report is there for either the Criminal Justice Commission to take what steps it thinks are necessary or for the Taxation Department to take whatever steps it thinks are necessary. As far as I am concerned, the law can take its course.

If what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is saying is that the Criminal Justice Commission report, and in particular the Criminal Justice Commission investigation, is deficient in failing to pursue this matter through to some end which he would like to see, then let him say so clearly.

The members of the Opposition cannot have it both ways. The members of this House know that the outcome of the Criminal Justice Commission investigation is that there was no official misconduct on the part of Mr Casey, either in the 1980s or in the 1990s. The Opposition can adopt one of two positions. Either Opposition members have the guts to stand up and say that the Criminal Justice Commission investigation is deficient and is defective, or if they have not got the guts to say that, then they should have the honesty to say that the Criminal Justice Commission investigation and report is complete and that they are now in possession of the information to the effect that the Criminal Justice Commission has ruled that there was no misconduct.

Over a month ago, the Leader of the Opposition was caught out in this place because, when the National and Liberal Parties were in Government, they set the police on Casey to try to get him. Everybody knows of the bitter hatred between the then Premier and the then Leader of the Opposition. The previous Government referred all its evidence to the Solicitor-General, who gave an opinion—

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Surfers Paradise will cease interjecting.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:**—that Mr Casey had not broken any law. There was no impropriety. Furthermore, my Government tabled that report that the previous Government withheld from the Parliament and the public dishonestly and deceitfully. But, as this House found out yesterday, not only did the previous Government withhold that bit of information in dishonesty and deceit but, as the Minister for Police revealed, it also withheld the information that donations were made to members of the National Party and the Liberal Party. Where is the accounting? Let the members of the Opposition table the books and the records equivalent—

**Mr Borbidge:** They have no jurisdiction under Commonwealth tax law, and you know it.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I will come to that. I have not finished with the members opposite yet.

Let the members opposite table—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I have got all the time in the world.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier may, but I do not. Members will cease interjecting.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Mr Speaker, members opposite are both distracting and provoking.

I challenge members opposite to provide the same accounting as was provided yesterday in respect of the donations given to their respective parties.

In relation to the suggestion of a possible breach of the tax laws by the company concerned, I do not know whether the company concerned breached the tax laws. I trust that the Taxation Department will investigate that question if it thinks it is a matter of sufficient seriousness.

Unfortunately, as all honourable members know, the Criminal Justice Commission did not investigate the matter and this House is left without its conclusion.

#### **Ashgrove Police Station Site**

**Mrs EDMOND:** I direct a question to the Minister for Transport: is he aware of the diverse media reports that have caused some confusion and concern in the community about the future of the Ashgrove Police Station in relation to work on Route 20, and can the Minister inform the House if the Ashgrove Police Station site will be required for major road upgrading?

**Mr HAMILL:** I am aware of the reports to which the honourable member refers. I can advise this House that lengthy discussions took place between the former Department of Main Roads and the Police Department well before the last State election at the time when the Route 20 plan was first being canvassed.

As a part of that scheme, which involved major engineering works along that transport corridor, it was proposed that the Ashgrove Police Station site would be required for the establishment of a grade separation at Waterworks Road.

As all members of the House would be aware, this Government does not subscribe to the policies pursued by its predecessors with respect to Route 20. Consequently, no demand is being placed upon that site for roadworks in that area.

Whilst I understand that the Police Service may be desirous of better accommodation and a better presence in the western suburbs, it should not be construed that any demand is being placed upon that Ashgrove site because of present or future roadwork needs.

#### **Brooloo Road-funding, Report in *Gympie Times***

**Mrs EDMOND:** In directing a second question to the Minister for Transport, I refer him to comments made by the member for Gympie in the *Gympie Times* of Saturday, 26 May, that this Government has cut an allocation of \$600,000 made by the former administration for work on the Brooloo road. I ask: is that statement true? If not, can the Minister inform the House of the true situation?

**Mr HAMILL:** I have always had great respect for that worthy journal, the *Gympie Times*. However, some of its correspondents leave a lot to be desired.

I refer here to an article entitled "Len Stephan reports"—obviously one of the gun journalists employed by the *Gympie Times*. The report in the *Gympie Times* of 26 May stated—

"Last year the National Party Government allocated \$600,000 for the upgrading of the Gympie-Brooloo Road".

I am sorry to inform the member for Gympie that no such allocation was made. Although discussions took place in the week prior to the last election between the member for Gympie and the former Minister for Main Roads, the then member for Maryborough, and a statement was made that there would be an allocation of money for those roadworks, no allocation was ever made. Indeed, the correspondent in this article stated further that—

". . . funding has been withdrawn by the present Transport Minister David Hamill."

Again, nothing could be further from the truth. There was no funding to be withdrawn because no funding had been allocated. So important did the honourable member for

Gympie consider the Brooloo road upgrading that, when all members of the former National Party Government were asked to list road projects for funding under the supplementary road program in the run-up to the State election, the honourable member did not list the Brooloo road for that special allocation of funds.

**Mr STEPHAN:** I rise to a point of order. The Minister commented that I did not list that road. I did not list any road-funding or any priorities. I was not asked to list any road-funding. It might interest the Minister to know that that road-funding has been allocated and has been approved on the priority list by the Widgee Shire Council. I am not a Widgee Shire councillor and it was not my decision to list the road for funding.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I have been exceedingly tolerant. It was not a point of order but I thought I would give the honourable member a go.

**Mr HAMILL:** I apologise to the honourable member. When all other National Party Government members were getting their snouts into the trough for funds in the run-up to the election, it is obvious that the honourable member for Gympie was not worrying about his electorate.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Lockyer will cease interjecting. I warn him under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I have warned the honourable member for Surfers Paradise under Standing Order 123A. I ask him now to withdraw from the Chamber. I was on my feet and the honourable member kept interjecting.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Surfers Paradise withdrew from the Chamber.*

**Mr HAMILL:** As I have indicated to the House, no appropriation was made and no money was withdrawn.

The third point in the article suggested that Federal Government funds were being withdrawn and that that is why the Government is facing a road-funding shortfall in the new year. Again, there was nothing further from the truth. As I have pointed out in this House on a number of occasions, the funding shortfall was caused by the former Government flogging off income-bearing assets in a splurge which was designed to provide funds for the run-up to the election.

In response to the honourable member's question—on three counts the article by the honourable member for Gympie was wrong, wrong, wrong. Quite frankly, with reports such as this one, it is understandable that the electors of Gympie could well shoot the messenger.

#### **Donations to Ministers from Poker Machine Industry**

**Mr STONEMAN:** I ask the Premier: can he assure the House that he has sought from all his Ministers an assurance that none of them has ever been in receipt of financial donations from the Ainsworth group, other companies, or individuals associated with the poker machine industry since the Caspall donations?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I have not sought a declaration from Ministers as to whether or not they have received donations from poker machine companies. I require from my Ministers standards that were never required of National Party Ministers—

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** No, and they are going to hear it. I require my Ministers to make a declaration in respect of their pecuniary interests. There is a particular category whereby they are required to list any donation in excess of \$1,000. The purpose of that is to provide a capacity to identify potential conflicts of interest. It helps draw the

attention of the Minister to it and it helps draw my attention to it as well. I do not carry that list of pecuniary interests or donations in my head but I am very confident, from my recollection at the time I received it, that there were no donations to Ministers from any such source. That is something the National Party Ministers never did.

### **Caspalp Donations**

**Mr STONEMAN:** I refer the Minister for Primary Industries to his untruths in two media interviews in 1982 on questions relating to the existence of the Caspalp fund and to an untruth that he uttered in this House on 27 March, as recorded in *Hansard*, when, in an interjection during a speech by the Leader of the Opposition on the Caspalp affair during the Matters of Public Interest debate, he said—

"All moneys that were paid into any funds that were under my control were accounted for. The details of those moneys were tabled 10 years ago."

Given that the details of those moneys were not tabled 10 years ago—I repeat "not tabled 10 years ago"—I ask: will the Minister explain to the House why he continues to sit in this House after having misled it?

**Mr CASEY:** The points raised by the honourable member, along with several of the other points raised today regarding Caspalp and other matters, were fully canvassed yesterday both in this Chamber and publicly. They were also canvassed publicly a few days ago. I do not think there is anything further to add.

### **Conveyancing Fees**

**Mr HEATH:** I ask the Attorney-General: what action has been taken to soften the burden for home-buyers faced with exorbitant conveyancing costs?

**Mr WELLS:** I note the honourable member's interest in the question of high conveyancing costs. I also note his several representations to me on behalf of the young home-buyers in his electorate. I agree with the honourable member that conveyancing costs in this State have been too high for too long and that an unfair burden has been borne, particularly by those first home-buyers and home-owners whom the honourable member represents. A couple of months ago I initiated some conversations with the Queensland Law Society. I suggested that conveyancing fees could be safely lowered. The society was surprisingly willing to play a public-spirited role in this respect and, after a period of discussion and negotiation, it took the matter to its council and regional delegates and came back with the recommendation that conveyancing costs should be reduced by 20 per cent. As a result, Queensland no longer has the previous onerous levels of conveyancing costs; it no longer has the highest conveyancing costs in Australia. Young home-buyers and first home owners will be greatly advantaged by this public-spirited decision by the Queensland Law Society.

### **Ministerial Code of Conduct**

**Mr VEIVERS:** I have a question without notice for the Premier, bearing in mind his wild answer to the now defunct Deputy Leader of the Opposition who has disappeared—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Southport asks his question or he might also become defunct.

**Mr VEIVERS:** I refer the Premier to a statement he made in this House on 6 March this year in relation to the ministerial code of conduct in which he indicated that "the guidelines will continue to be finetuned as and when grey areas arise", and that they would be published at what he considered was the appropriate time, and I ask: in view of the CJC's findings on the actions and activities of the Minister for Primary Industries, including the misleading of this House—as we have just found out—is not now an appropriate time to publish the ministerial code of conduct guidelines?

and, if not, does the Premier intend to do some more finetuning of them to overcome the big grey area this report has cast over his Minister for Primary Industries?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I compliment the member on his ability to read the question that has been drafted for him. The question could best be characterised by the adjective "defunct" because of the false premises contained within it. His question assumes that the Criminal Justice Commission report found that the Minister for Primary Industries had breached some rule of conduct. It did not. The only people who allege this are the members of the Opposition, yet they cannot point to any law that has been broken, nor can they point to any rule of conduct that has been broken.

As I have already said in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition, it came to my attention that the Leader of the Opposition had complained to the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission in respect of two matters, as I understand it. The first was the conduct of the member for Mackay back in the early 1980s and the second was his conduct this year in Cabinet as a Minister. Both of those matters are the subject of a specific ruling in a letter to me from Sir Max Bingham that there was no official misconduct. In other words, there was no basis to the complaint made by the Leader of the Opposition.

#### **Criminal Justice Commission Report; Recommendations on Supply of Gaming Machines**

**Mr VEIVERS:** In directing a question to the Treasurer in his capacity as Minister responsible for the Casino Control Division, I refer to the Government's public criticism of the Criminal Justice Commission which reflects a marked about-turn from the attitude the Labor Party adopted towards Fitzgerald reforms when it was in Opposition, and I ask: in view of the clear recommendation in the CJC report that the firms Ainsworth Consolidated Industries and Olympic Video Gaming were not suitable companies to participate in the supply of gaming machines to licensed clubs and hotels, will the Treasurer assure this House that the Government will adhere to such recommendations and, if not, does this represent the start of the Government's selective indignation which could jeopardise the future work of both the EARC and the CJC?

**Mr De LACY:** In respect of the first part of the honourable member's question, I point out that the Government did not criticise the CJC; it criticised some aspects of the report. I will not pursue that criticism, but I could be provoked into it.

In respect of the second part of the honourable member's question—no, I cannot give him the assurance that he is seeking. However, I can give him an assurance that the legislation that the Government is drafting has in fact been given to the Criminal Justice Commission for its consideration. We will be meeting with the commission to ensure that all of its concerns are taken into account. We do not intend to proceed with the introduction of poker machine legislation in this State unless we can be certain that all of the commission's concerns, and the concerns of the people of Queensland, are taken into consideration. I cannot give the honourable member a specific "Yes" or "No" answer to his question, but I can give tell him that we will be taking those concerns into account.

#### **Toxic Waste, Kingston**

**Mr D'ARCY:** I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: has he seen the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government has taken the soft option on the Kingston toxic waste problem, and that—

**Mr Cooper:** Read it out—hurry up.

**Mr D'ARCY:** Yes, I will hurry up. I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition really wants me to hurry up on this question.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Woodridge will ask his question.

**Mr D'ARCY:** Compared with what the previous Government allocated to solving the problem, I ask: will the Minister explain the Government's plan, its details for the plan and how it will contain the toxic waste problem? It must be taken into consideration that the previous Government had been notified by me of the problem in March 1987 when I contacted the then Minister for Health, Mike Ahern. The current Leader of the Opposition handled the problem for some 12 months as the responsible Minister and did nothing to solve it.

**Mr Cooper** interjected.

**Mr D'ARCY:** The honourable member knows the problem.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** Yes, I heard the comments that the Government had taken the soft option. It is quite surprising——

**Mr Cooper:** You put a hard skin over the top.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** The Leader of the Opposition must hang on for a minute.

It is surprising that the Opposition Leader could accuse this Government of taking a soft option when in fact it will cost \$6.5m more than the option that he tried to bring in. Under the option outlined by the previous Government, it intended to take away some 5 000 cubic metres of sludge and contaminated soil.

**Mr Cooper:** Better than leaving it there.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** But the previous Government intended to leave 95 000 cubic metres of contaminated soil there and do absolutely nothing with it.

**Mr Cooper:** What about the rest of the people of Kingston? What are they going to do?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** They would have still been there with 95 per cent of the contaminated soil.

The previous Government was going to leave 95 per cent of the contaminated soil there and simply bring in a truck. It was then going to say to the people of Kingston, "There. We've taken your problem away." The previous Government would not have even told them about the cyanide in the dams. It would simply have told them that it had solved their problems.

**Mr Cooper:** You were feeding them on champagne.

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I did not feed them champagne at all. The proposal of the previous Government was driven by its desire to try to get a solution for media purposes. The difference between that course of action and the proposal of this Government is that, if the members of the previous Government had employed an independent scientific expert, he or she would have been able to tell them that the method that the present Government is adopting is the most modern method and is being used in Europe and America. I would have thought that an independent scientific investigator, who travelled overseas so much at the cost of Queensland's taxpayers, would have noticed some of those things while she was travelling overseas.

#### **Sugar Industry Working Party Report**

**Mr D'ARCY:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: has he received the report of the Sugar Industry Working Party into the future of the sugar industry? How does he assess it?

**Mr CASEY:** The answer to the honourable member's question is "Yes". Yesterday I received a copy of the Sugar Industry Working Party's report from the chairman, Mr Noel Fitzpatrick. The report was compiled by him and by members, Fred Soper and Don Watson, who are two very eminent people involved in Queensland's sugar industry.

I am currently reading that report. The interesting part is that the initial summary clearly shows that the report is excellent and that it will be well received by all sectors of the sugar industry throughout Queensland. Initially, I will have copies made available to the Premier and to Cabinet. On a confidential basis, copies will also be made available to some of the industry's leaders. I will be making arrangements—possibly next week—to have the report printed. When that is done I will make copies of it available to each and every member of this Parliament for perusal, study and objective comment. I welcome their views on what this Government should do for the sugar industry as it heads towards the end of this century and leads into the next century as Queensland's most important agricultural crop. Copies of the report will also be made available for general distribution throughout the community so that all people can read it.

When the report has been made available to industry representatives, I will be having discussions with them so that the industry will have a chance to assess the report and give its recommendations full consideration. As a result of all that and, hopefully, after honourable members are rested and relaxed after the forthcoming recess of Parliament, in the next session I will be able to present consolidating legislation that will lead the sugar industry into the twenty-first century.

### **Agricultural Chemical Spray Drift**

**Mr KING:** In directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to the serious concern and genuine fear of detriment to health felt by many Queenslanders—not just the residents of Emerald—who are worried about the agricultural chemical spray drift problem. I ask: does he acknowledge the seriousness of this difficult problem and the responsibility of the State Government to legislate to provide a Statewide, effective and balanced law to protect people from the wrongful or negligent use of chemicals by a minority of careless or untrained operators? If so, would he advise what has been done to date to address the problem? When can the Parliament expect appropriate legislation that is fair and just to all parties concerned to be introduced to this Parliament?

**Mr CASEY:** I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is a very sensitive issue for the Emerald area. The problem is also receiving attention from my colleague the Minister for Health. In fact, quite recently, a very senior officer of the Health Department visited the Emerald area and spoke to the various health and medical officers in that town. I feel quite sure that the honourable member for Peak Downs, who represents the area, would well know that, because both the Health Department and the Primary Industries Department have monitors permanently placed in the town, the problem of spray drift in Emerald is being checked by the Government on a day-to-day basis.

The problem is being very well handled. I believe that the Government is competently monitoring the situation and looking after the problem. I feel quite sure that the honourable member has no reason to be fearful, because I certainly know that the member for Peak Downs, in whose electorate the area is located, has no fears or problems about what the Government is doing.

**Mr HAYWARD:** I direct a question to the Minister for Education. In view of the time, Mr Speaker, can I put this question, which concerns the Deception Bay State School, on notice?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I will be consistent. The second question is out of order. The time allotted for questions has now expired.

### **PARLIAMENTARY MEMBERS' SALARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

#### **Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p. 1845).

**Mr STONEMAN** (Burdekin) (4.14 p.m.): I rise to comment briefly on this Bill. I agree with comments made by the Treasurer in his second-reading speech. The payments

outlined in the Bill are identical to those presently being made to members of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts and the Parliamentary Committee of Public Works and were put in place by the previous Government. I certainly consider the proposal contained in the Bill to be reasonable.

The Opposition will support the passage of this legislation through its remaining stages. I place on record my commendation of the chairmen of those two committees—Mr Beattie and Mr Foley—for the work that has been undertaken. I support the Bill.

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (4.15 p.m.): I rise briefly to indicate the Liberal Party's support for the Bill. I echo the comments of the previous speaker. In our opinion, the committees are working extremely well and, despite the pressure that is applied to them from various sections of the Parliament, both the chairmen of the respective committees appear to be performing an excellent task. The Liberal Party wishes them all the best and supports the Bill.

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier, Minister for Economic and Trade Development and Minister for the Arts) (4.16 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## RACING AND BETTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p.1851).

**Mr VEIVERS** (Southport) (4.18 p.m.): The Bill before the House pretends to be part of a Government attack on illegal betting in Queensland. Of course, anyone who believes that is probably big on other myths. No, this Bill is not about cleaning up illegal betting—although I believe that the Minister will get to that point one day—it is about cashing in on the well-known propensity of Queenslanders to have a bit of a flutter.

Opposition members believe that it is time that the Government got serious about its rhetoric. The Government was elected on a platform of clearing up corruption and illegal practices. It claims that this step is entirely consistent with its commitment to eliminate illegal betting practices. That is a commendable commitment. However, where is the action to clean out the starting price bookies—the blood-suckers who are bludging on the racing industry? What has the "great" reformer in the Government done? I believe that he seriously hoped to achieve improvements, but, in the first six months, the wheels fell off and he was brought back to taws.

Opposition members hope to see the gallops, the dogs and the trots receive a fair shake from the revenue that their promotions generate. At present, legitimate licensed book-makers are bleeding, and their numbers are decreasing. Because it is not worth the effort any more to take bets, some of the biggest book-makers have dropped out.

In the breeding industry, unless a yearling is of the best possible breeding, and there are only a few of those, it is hardly worth taking to the sales. It is a sad fact that only the big operators are making any money out of the breeding industry. Why? If the SP book-makers are receiving the betting dollar, less revenue is going back into the race clubs through taxes and less revenue is being offered in prize money. Less prize money

means smaller returns for owners and less money on offer to the yearling sale rings. SP book-makers are destroying racing. The Minister knows that and is hoping to do something about it. I hope that he does, and that he does not decide that it is all too hard.

Honourable members know that SP book-makers are still operating full steam ahead. Some of the people who ought to know say that at least three of the biggest SP book-makers named at the Fitzgerald inquiry are taking bets on a huge scale and showing no signs of fear of being caught. That is a despicable situation.

The Government has given no indication that it is serious about knocking off the lurk merchants—at least the three that we know about. It has had plenty of time to take action against them, even if it is only to tighten up the loopholes that it claims exist.

Government members want to distract us by talking about new ways to collect a bit of cash with new forms of gambling. Opposition members do not object to Footy TAB or to Tabanza as such. If the people want new forms of gambling, so be it. We do not object, either, to oncourse bookies being able to take bets on sporting results. I believe that is a good idea.

The Minister hopes that this legislation will help to bring the punters back on to the courses, and so do I. As I said earlier, at present the racing industry is suffering, and any boost is welcome.

**Mr Welford:** The Lone Ranger.

**Mr VEIVERS:** Yes. I wonder whether the honourable member owns any horses, as I do. I can tell him that he will never get rich through owning them.

That is especially true for country and provincial city clubs, which are bearing the brunt of some of the Minister's plans for redistributing assistance to the industry.

The Opposition does not object to the moves outlined in this Bill. However, it does object to things being dressed up as an attack on illegal gambling. The Minister has to get serious with these people.

**Mr Gibbs:** We are.

**Mr VEIVERS:** I know.

Many previous Ministers have endeavoured to attack the SP industry by the imposition of huge fines. I think that the Minister is aware that most Australians will bet on anything. They will bet on two flies running up a wall. There is always someone there to take the odds. Those people are called SP bookies. It is going to be very hard to get rid of these people to ensure that the funds go where they should, that is, back into racing and other sport, as I presume the Minister is endeavouring to do.

I hope that this is not just another way of raising a bit of cash. I believe the Minister has said that the Consolidated Revenue Fund will collect about \$400,000 a year from Footy TAB. I assume that that is a conservative figure, because I know of many people who would like to have a bet on the forthcoming State of Origin game. However, of course, it is no longer important because, as a result of the interference of referees, Queensland will not have a fair chance of winning that State of Origin game. I will not go into that now. I will stick to the Bill.

I would like to know how much money will pour in from Tabanza and the taxes levied on book-makers.

**Mr ELDER (Manly) (4.25 p.m.):** I will let the Minister, in his reply, comment on the contribution of the member for Southport.

The commitment of the Goss Labor Government to eliminate corruption and illegal practices in Queensland is further demonstrated by the introduction of this Bill, the Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill.

In footballing circles it has always been common knowledge that, if one wanted to get a bet on any football game, one only had to pick up the phone. That, in itself,

indicates that there has always been a considerable demand from the public for this form of betting. However, because this form of betting was available only through illegal operators, hundreds of thousands of dollars were lost to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I believe that the people of Queensland should benefit, not just those who are conducting those illegal operations. Furthermore, a legalised system of betting on Rugby League matches will ensure a fairer return for those who indulge in that form of betting.

**Mr Veivers:** What about referees?

**Mr ELDER:** I might get to them later.

Footy TAB was introduced in New South Wales in 1983. That Government receives 10 per cent of the investments on totalisator betting on Rugby League football matches. In its first six years of operation, a total of \$4.05m has been distributed to major sporting organisations as a means of fostering the development of sporting facilities. Since the inception of the scheme, the allocations have been as follows: 1983-84, \$520,000; 1984-85, \$725,000; 1985-86, \$400,000; 1986-87, \$410,000; 1987-88, \$1.2m; and 1988-89, \$700,000. I mention these individual amounts to demonstrate the continuing benefit and returns from Footy TAB to the sport in New South Wales. More importantly, it has been the continuity of those funds from Footy TAB that has enabled major sporting organisations such as New South Wales Rugby League, New South Wales Rugby Union, the NSW Soccer Federation, the baseball league and the Surf Life Saving Association to improve and, more importantly, to plan for the sporting facility needs in that State.

While the revenue initially generated by Footy TAB will be part of consolidated revenue in Queensland, it is my hope that in the future—similar to the position in the racing industry—money raised from Footy TAB will find its way back into community sporting facilities. As a person who has had some considerable involvement in Rugby League over a period of 20 years and who has travelled widely throughout the State with many representative football teams, I am acutely aware of the types of facilities available to Rugby League followers in country areas. In most cases, the local showground is the only sporting facility. The grounds are hard, the dressing rooms are spartan and the grandstands are basic, to say the least. Of course, if the local show is held on the same day, it makes things doubly difficult.

In Brisbane, football grounds—particularly in the Brisbane Rugby League competition—have similar problems, and major centres such as Lang Park leave a lot to be desired in terms of catering for supporter comfort. Lang Park was built back in the 1950s and, apart from the new corporate boxes, the seats are timber, aluminium or concrete. The public amenities are less than desirable, and should not be tolerated in this day and age. The stadium as a whole needs complete upgrading, particularly if our aim is to attract increasing patronage to the great game of Rugby League. The problem is not one that is confined only to the sport of Rugby League. Other sporting codes have similar difficulties. I hope that in the future some of the revenue from Footy TAB can be directed towards this area.

With the advent of the Brisbane Broncos playing in the Sydney Rugby League competition and the possibility of a second Queensland-based team also joining that competition, the interest of Queenslanders is obviously considerable. As the Minister foreshadowed, this Bill will also empower the Queensland TAB to amalgamate investments with the New South Wales TAB to accommodate the growing interest in Queensland.

While I am on the subject of Rugby League, I say in passing that, now we are in the midst of State of Origin fervour, Queenslanders would have appreciated the opportunity to be able to support their favourite team on Footy TAB. However, I must stress, as the member for Southport did, that impartial referees are vitally important to the game and, of course, to the result. Greg McCallum's performance in Melbourne was nothing short of appalling. One would hope that in the future a promise of a test match against New Zealand will not lead to such an "appropriate" penalty as was awarded on that Wednesday night. However, that is history, and I guess so is McCallum.

By amending the Racing and Betting Act to allow members of the public to bet on football matches, the Government is not introducing a new form of gambling but is legalising for the benefit of the general community something that is already common practice. I am sure that football supporters everywhere will welcome the introduction of Footy TAB because it will allow them the privilege—previously only available to followers of horse and dog racing—of being able to place a legal bet on the outcome of their favourite sport.

I commend the Minister on the introduction of the Bill. It is a great initiative. I urge honourable members to support it.

**Mr COOMBER** (Currumbin) (4.30 p.m.): With reservations, the Liberal Party supports the amendments to the Racing and Betting Act. It supports legislation to provide the mechanism for legal betting—and I emphasise the word "legal"—on the results of sporting fixtures. The Liberal Party supports also the initiatives of the Government to introduce Footy TAB and to provide the legal mechanisms for people to bet on the outcomes of football matches.

The Liberal Party supports the introduction of Tabanza, which will provide an increased interest in the harness racing industry in Queensland. That concept of betting allows a complex form of trifecta betting without any knowledge of racing form being needed by the punter. These amendments open the doors of the TAB and book-makers to members of the public, not only the racing fraternity as has been the situation in the past.

The Fitzgerald report brought to account areas of corruption and illegal practices in the racing industry. The presence of SP betting in Queensland and around the New South Wales border areas has received adequate attention by the media and very little initial attention by this Government and past National Party Governments. However, the Licensing Branch of the Police Service is trying. In fact, the Licensing Branch is very trying.

Because members of the Licensing Branch forcibly entered a luxury unit at Currumbin, wrecked the door, wrecked furniture and confronted—with weapons drawn—an elderly couple from New Guinea, they are a farce. Those residents of Currumbin are well respected by Governments in New Guinea. Listening devices were left in cupboards. Members of the Licensing Branch returned to the unit hours later to recover equipment that was supposedly forgotten by the police. Why is it so that, even after making a legitimate mistake in investigating SP book-making, an apology is not forthcoming and repairs to and replacement of property are not subject to legal action? I will refer that matter to the Minister for Police.

I am particularly happy to see the introduction of Footy TAB and particularly happy that it has happened exactly one week after the last State of Origin match, because many Queenslanders who would have had their first bet on Footy TAB would have lost their money.

**Mr Szczerbanik:** They would have got their fingers burnt.

**Mr COOMBER:** Yes, they would have.

The entry of Brisbane and the Gold Coast into the Winfield Cup has generated huge interest in Rugby League in Queensland. No doubt in time, additional teams will be formed in Queensland and people will support those teams through the TAB.

One concern of the Liberal Party is the use of revenue raised by Footy TAB or betting on sporting events. It would seem appropriate to return moneys to the sporting areas so that they can derive benefits from using those moneys. In that manner, centres of sporting excellence could be funded with very little need for Government assistance. It is noted that the Minister is anticipating revenue return of close to \$400,000 per annum from Footy TAB. Some of those funds could be directed to improving the football codes; in other words, through sporting subsidies, etc.

Queenslanders and Australians in general are renowned for their willingness to have a bet. Whether an event be football, cricket, soccer or yacht-racing, great interest is generated in it by the general public. Legalised betting on those events under section 147A is now possible.

The Liberal Party supports the racing industry and applauds the book-maker turn-over tax levels that are incorporated in this Bill. The marketplace that is available for book-makers to operate in has been enlarged through changes to the legislation. The continued viability of the book-maker has been assisted by the ability of people now to bet on sporting events.

Proposed section 191A of the principal will allow the Totalisator Administration Board to enter into an arrangement to amalgamate the net pools with other States. In his reply, perhaps the Minister will address the issue of whether or not there is any intention to amalgamate racing pools with those of other States, which this amendment would allow.

All in all, the Liberal Party supports the amendments.

**Dr CLARK** (Barron River) (4.35 p.m.): I am sure that honourable members would agree that gambling is generally recognised as a behavioural trait that is deeply embedded in the Australian psyche. It is an integral part of our national character, whether we like it or not. It goes back to colonial times.

In 1808, David Collins, the first judge advocate, was most distressed by the gambling excesses that he saw. He said—

". . . to such excesses was the pursuit of gambling carried on among the convicts that some have been known, after losing money, provisions, and all their cloathing, to have staked their cloaths upon their wretched backs, standing in the midst of their associates naked, and as indifferent about it as the unconscious natives of the country."

**Mr FitzGerald:** A sense of humour.

**Dr CLARK:** Yes.

Closer to home, in his book *Wowzers*, Keith Dunstan—

**Mr Prest:** How are the sandflies down there?

**Dr CLARK:** Pretty grim.

Keith Dunstan makes reference to a Cairns man who apparently claimed that if no proper gambling facilities existed, it would be impossible to populate the north. He claimed that Australians would just not go there. In view of the present thriving population in the north, gambling must have played a vital part in its development, of which I have been blissfully unaware.

**Mr McGrady:** That's due to good representation.

**Dr CLARK:** Yes.

In 1958, Kenneth Rudeen of *Sports Illustrated*, a leading sports journal, compared gambling in various countries throughout the world. He came up with some startling statistics. He found that Australians spent \$160 per head per year on gambling compared with \$90 spent by Americans, \$50 by New Zealanders and \$30 by Brittons. I am sure that, 30 years later, the statistics would not be much different. However, in terms of ranking, the amounts would have increased considerably.

I am not making any moral judgments; I am just making a statement about what I believe is the reality. Sociologists have suggested that the passion for gambling is rooted in the Australian character and value system which stresses mateship, egalitarianism and fatalism. I am not quite sure how gambling women fit into that, but that is what the

sociologists have to say. Whatever the cause, the reality is undeniable. Australians gamble heavily, and illegal gambling has flourished—as honourable members know all too well. The Fitzgerald report made recommendations in relation to gambling. To give some comfort to the honourable member for Southport, I point out that the CJC is looking into SP betting.

What has been proposed in this legislation—Footy TAB—is not a radical or new thing. In fact, I am led to believe that in 1984, Ken Murphy, the then general manager of the Queensland National Football League, looked with envy to New South Wales where Footy TAB had just been introduced. Sir Edward Lyons, the then TAB Chairman, promised to look into this. However, I could find no further reference to it. Perhaps some of the more long-standing members of the House may be able to educate me on that. I do not know what happened to the proposal.

This Government has resurrected that proposal because it can see the benefits of it. Footy TAB has continued to be a success in New South Wales, providing considerable revenue to the Government in that State. This Bill will also empower the TAB to introduce a new form of betting on evening harness racing known as Tabanza, which is a game of luck rather than skill.

Another concern raised by one of the previous speakers, the member for Southport, was the plight of the book-makers. Indeed, the Government has recognised that. The provisions of this Bill will enable book-makers who are members of the Queensland Bookmakers Association to accept bets on the outcome of approved sporting events. Again, this is not new. In Victoria, Tasmania and the Northern Territory, book-makers at race meetings can take bets on other sports. The New South Wales Government is currently considering a proposal by the New South Wales Bookmakers Co-operative Society that book-makers be allowed to take bets on sports such as all codes of football, cricket, tennis, golf, motor racing and yachting.

Betting on other sports is common in the United Kingdom and Europe, where operators such as Ladbrokes have been in existence for many years. There are clearly advantages in legalising this form of gambling, namely, the revenue which will be generated and returned for the benefit of sporting organisations which desperately need it. As has been pointed out, the possible revenue for a full year's operation of Footy TAB could be in the order of \$400,000.

As I am a person whose gambling behaviour is confined to investing merely a few dollars in a Melbourne Cup sweep every year, this legislation will obviously not change my behaviour. However, I am a realist and I recognise that the Government and I are simply no match for the obsession that is rooted and reflected in Australian history and character. Rather, I feel it is better to divert this Australian obsession with illegal gambling to productive and legal channels, and this is what will be achieved by the Bill, which I support.

**Mr RANDELL** (Mirani) (4.40 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to speak on this amendment Bill. My contribution will be relatively brief, because I understand that the Opposition Racing spokesman has covered most areas very ably. With his great knowledge of racing, he has certainly made a great contribution to this debate. As he said, he does not back a winner. I did not back too many at the Gold Coast last Wednesday, either.

By and large, as he has indicated, the Opposition will be supporting the thrust of the Bill, but it is concerned about some of the clauses, and the Minister will be asked to reply to some questions. To me, this Bill will give some relief, if only in a small way, to the hard-pressed book-makers in Queensland. As the Minister knows, their numbers are declining fairly rapidly. Book-making is a very hard game. I would not want to be involved in it myself. I think I would have a heart attack if someone placed with me bets the size of those placed with some book-makers.

It would be a sad day for Queensland racing if ever we saw the departure of book-makers from the racing scene. They are colourful characters who add something to the racetrack atmosphere. I would not like to go to a racetrack and not see book-makers.

In the past, there have been some flamboyant book-makers. At present, they are going through a very difficult economic period.

The country racing clubs that do not have on-course TAB will fold up if bookies depart from the scene. The members of the general public go to the races to have a bet as well as to look at the colourful racing. If there are no bookies and no TAB, the clubs will fold. If that happens, an amenity for country people and part of their society will be gone. I have been to many country racetracks, as no doubt the Minister has as he has travelled round Queensland. If he has not already done so, he will do so in the future. I hope that he has some regard for country racing. He has indicated in press reports that he will be very hard on country race clubs. I hope that that is not the case, because I think that country racing certainly has something to contribute to this State.

Some people may think that horses that race in country areas stay there, but many horses from the country have gone on to better things and have proved to be beneficial to city racing. Trainers and owners who have horses that are not good enough for racing in the city have a market for their horses in the country. Because of their love of racing, country people will buy those horses and race them in the country. That is something to which consideration should be given.

As I said, this Bill will provide some small relief to book-makers, because I do not believe that betting on sporting games will be in great demand by the average punter. The Minister might disagree with me; and I hope I am wrong. I could be mistaken, and in one way I hope I am, because from the reports that I have received from the United States, once betting on sports is introduced, highly organised crime creeps in. I know that the Minister will take every step that he possibly can to stop that from happening.

In particular, I think that the Minister and other members of this House would recall that several years ago scandals beset the game of basketball in the United States, where the rigging of games occurred. Only one player had to play dead in order for the result of a game to be altered. People who ran a book on the game could achieve the result that they wanted. Without going into details, at the inquiries, several prominent team members admitted receiving considerable amounts of money to throw games. That was reported widely in the media.

Once big money is introduced into sport, a highly different complexion is put on what we in the Opposition believe is a family sport, or a sport that for years has been enjoyed by everyone. Once money is brought into sport, organised crime can creep in, and that is to the detriment of sport.

I certainly believe that the actions of the Minister himself—and I do not blame him for this; I would probably do the same myself—will not help book-makers. I speak about the proposed extension of the TAB into hotels, which will allow people to bet in bars. I could be mistaken, but media reports indicate that the TAB will be allowed in hotels and will simplify betting for patrons. Once that happens, and possibly once poker machines are introduced—I do not want to go into this matter, because the question of poker machines will be debated at another time and in another place—I believe that book-makers will be hit hard. In our society there is only a certain amount of money to go around. If such facilities are introduced into hotels, it will be to the detriment of book-makers.

I have always said that the secret to racing, and indirectly to bookies, is to have people coming through the turnstiles. Clubs should be encouraged to do everything they can so that people attend the racetrack. Because of all the matters that I have mentioned, people will have no need to go to the track to have a bet, and probably that will not be for the betterment of the racing industry. I just hope that we do not see the day in Queensland when the gates are thrown open, the horses go round the tracks without a crowd being present, and all the revenue is obtained through the TAB outlets and returned for the betterment of racing. I think that people should be encouraged to attend racetracks, and I know that the Minister will do that.

Today, I take this opportunity to review some of the events in the racing industry during the period leading up to the last election. My comments might be a little bit antagonistic, but no doubt the Minister will answer me in the generous way that he usually does.

The Minister was quoted by a prominent journalist, Mr Peter Cameron—this was also freely touted in racing circles—in an article in the *Courier-Mail* of 14 February, which alleges that the Minister said—

"Labor would abolish bookmakers' turnover tax and introduce telephone betting with bookmakers if elected this year.

The turnover tax bombshell is part of the party policy package designed 'to make Queensland the racing and sports betting capital of Australia'."

The article continues—

"The principal club system of racing control would face major reform under a Labor Government."

I will have more to say about that later on. The article continues—

"The Labor Party also is preparing a breeders' incentive deal aimed at making the Darling Downs the heart of Australian breeding."

The article further discusses turn-over tax and quotes the Minister—

"Instead of turnover taxes, bookmakers' fees will be paid according to profits . . . We can dovetail with the Federal Government's checks and balances on betting turnover receipts to set up a fool-proof system against roting of turnover figures.

Bookmakers should have the incentive to improve turnover and profitability. A new system of fielding fees, plus a profits tax, will leave the old fielding fee and turnover tax system for dead. We also have no objection to betting on sports such as rugby league."

Today, I commend the Minister for doing that. However, Mr Cameron in the article purports to quote a source close to the Minister and states—

"Other Labor racing reforms include:

- Free racing for owners and trainers with the removal of all starting fees.
- Extended hours at training tracks and improved training facilities.
- Improved facilities at TAB outlets.
- Extension of TAB betting into all licensed outlets, such as hotels and clubs.
- Regular racing conferences—chaired by the Racing Minister"—

and I did that when I was the Racing Minister—

"involving administrators, owners, trainers, jockeys and bookmakers.

- Government support for night racing."

I might also comment on that aspect later.

When the Minister talks about getting together all the people concerned with racing and chairing the meeting, I cannot recommend too highly to the Minister that he follows that course. For far too long, many people in the racing industry have not been able to get together and talk over their problems. The Minister knows that it is a sectional industry and, for the betterment of racing in Queensland, those groups should be brought together.

I am concerned about the Minister's commitment to a racing commission in Queensland. I think that that would be a backward step for the whole racing fraternity.

I will quote from a speech by the Minister in a second-reading debate on 13 October 1988 at page 1360 of *Hansard* where he said—

"The fact is that the administration of the QTC leaves much to be desired. I have said it in this House before and I will say it again: it is time that Sir Edward

Williams was given a golden handshake in one form or another. That would be the best thing that could happen for racing in Queensland. He is an overauthoritarian force and the racing game needs to be opened up in a fairer fashion. The old-boy club that is virtually responsible for running racing in Queensland should be disbanded forthwith."

The Minister's comments may have some foundation somewhere but, overall, the principal club system in Queensland works well. The volunteer work carried out by many of the club members is commendable and benefits the racing industry. Those members work long and hard and their contribution to the racing fraternity in Queensland deserves recognition.

I am afraid that a racing commission—the Minister may have different views—has the potential to be a large bureaucratic quango that will cost a large sum of money. I recognise that the racing industry is a billion-dollar industry. The Minister might say that it will be better, but it may not. I think the Minister should look long and hard at the proposal before he establishes a racing commission in Queensland.

In that speech, the Minister also said that, immediately on election, he would introduce on-course telephone betting facilities.

When I was the Minister responsible for racing, the book-makers asked me to implement such a scheme. I was always afraid of it, but I did take the proposal to a conference that I chaired of Australian Racing Ministers. The unanimous decision of those Ministers was that telephone betting should not be introduced because it could have a domino effect in that if it was introduced into one State, it could flow on to another. If it was introduced into New South Wales, everyone in Queensland would be betting by telephone in New South Wales. That would not be for the betterment of Queensland's book-makers.

At the time I opposed that proposal. I ask the Minister: does he agree with my reasons? I have spoken to him frequently about it. Does he still intend to introduce on-course telephone betting in Queensland?

The one thing that will help legal book-makers in Queensland is the stamping out of SP bookies. The Fitzgerald report recommended that they should be stamped out. I can assure the Minister that the previous Government had planned to introduce strong penalties, including gaol sentences, to stamp out organised crime. At the time I called them bludgers and crooks—I know that the Minister totally agrees with me—and said that a determined effort has to be made to stamp out those SP bookies. I know that the Minister would agree with me that everything possible should be done to stamp out this blight on the Queensland racing industry.

On behalf of the Opposition spokesman, I advise the Minister that the Opposition will give him total support on any worthwhile amendments that he introduces into this House in relation to SP book-making.

**Mr Gibbs:** I am deeply touched. I am warmed by the honourable member's support.

**Mr RANDELL:** I thank the Minister. I am waiting to hear his response.

**Mr Gibbs** interjected.

**Mr RANDELL:** The Minister looks very benevolent.

Recently, the Minister made a statement about the debt that he inherited and about which he knew nothing. When I inherited that portfolio, I knew about the great debt owed by the industry. The loan will not be repaid until after year 2000, even at a rate of repayment of \$13m per year. However, I did not squeal about it. I got on with the job and did not make excuses. I did the best I could.

If the Minister wants me to go on, I can outline for him some of the steps that I took during my time as Racing Minister. The previous Government brought in a new era of accountability. I appointed Dr Bob Mason, of whom I can speak highly. He and

I discussed with industry representatives the problems of the industry. At this stage, I pay a tribute to Dr Mason and his staff for the wonderful job that they did. They received clear instructions from me as Racing Minister to introduce accountability. In this regard, I was reported as follows—

"Applications for financial assistance, other than those for emergency purposes, will need to be submitted by December 31 each year for consideration for funding during the subsequent financial year.

A copy must also go to the principal club or controlling body which will report to me."

At that time I was the Minister. It continues—

"The control bodies must consider the applications against the wider background of their area of industry responsibility."

And later—

". . . the new system for allocation of RDF funds would reward good management."

I insisted on good management and accountability. It continues—

"The responsibility of ensuring the allocated amount covered costs would remain with the race club.

Bad management will not be propped up by supplementary grants."

At the time, the racing industry accepted and supported that and congratulated me on it. If the Government stays with that, the racing industry will be better and stronger.

In the interests of time I shall conclude now and, if the Minister makes some remarks to which I feel I should respond, I will do so in Committee.

**Mr BRISKEY** (Redlands) (4.54 p.m.): As the honourable member for Barron River stated, gambling is part of the Australian psyche. It has often been said that Australians would bet on two flies crawling up the wall and, while this Bill will not make this type of bet legal, it will move towards changing the present situation in Queensland where punters have no legal means to place a bet on sporting events other than horse-racing, trotting and greyhound-racing.

One of the outcomes of the passage of this Bill will be that the public will be offered the ability to bet, legally, on the Sydney Rugby League competition and other events. By providing this facility, the Goss Government is moving further along the road to cleaning up illegal betting with SP operators. Not only will this initiative help to stop illegal betting, but also it will generate additional revenue. It is anticipated that, when Footy TAB starts, consolidated revenue will receive around \$400,000 per annum from a 10 per cent turn-over tax.

SP book-making flourished within Queensland while the previous Government was in power. As the Fitzgerald report states, the legislation enacted to curb SP book-making was a facade. Paragraph 6.5.2 (f) of the report reads—

"The apparently severe penalties prescribed, fines of not less than \$15,000 for the first offence, \$20,000 the second, and \$30,000 the third and following are of little terror to organized bookmakers who well know the order of profit to be made and, skillfully advised, have little difficulty in organizing their affairs so as to avoid the brunt of any such penalties."

Further, in paragraph 2.3.7, the report states—

"The few convictions for s.p. bookmaking which have resulted in recent years have had little impact. Most have been against minor offenders, including some without assets. Generally, fines have not been paid or compulsorily collected. For example, there were five convictions in 1986, but only one fine had been paid by the end of 1988."

The lack of real coercion with regard to obeying the law saw the SP book-making industry flourish and, with it, organised crime. It made huge profits and, with these, its

members were able to pay graft on a grand scale. Herbert alone named 32 SP book-makers who were paying protection through him.

This Bill will also help the legitimate on-course book-maker by enabling licensed book-makers operating at racing venues in accordance with existing provisions of the Act to also operate on approved sporting contingencies. As licensed book-maker numbers have fallen in recent years, this is an important initiative. Not only have their numbers fallen but also their turn-over has also been affected. Between 1984-85 and 1988-89, turn-over for licensed book-makers fell by \$10m. One might surmise that this fall was due to the previous Government's inability to curb SP book-making activity and the resultant massive growth of that industry during this period.

The TAB, in its submission to the Fitzgerald inquiry, estimated that SP book-making cost the public revenue a total of \$200m. SP book-making, on the surface, costs the State of Queensland large sums of money in public revenue but, of far greater importance, is its links with organised crime. Money has been gained through SP book-making and then used to fund other more sinister illegal activities, including the bribing of public officials.

One of the outcomes of this Bill will be that, as the revenues of licensed book-makers will increase as a result of fewer bets being placed with SP book-makers, more revenue will be returned to the clubs, where book-makers field. The money being outlaid with SP book-makers can be outlaid with the TAB, on-course totes and licensed book-makers. If it is, all Queenslanders will benefit. It is of paramount importance that everything possible be done to eliminate SP book-making.

Clause 6, which inserts new section 147A, will allow book-making on certain sporting contingencies. These, however, depend on approval from the Minister. Punters will be able to gamble on other sporting events at a racing venue only when a lawful meeting is being held at that venue. That new section will allow, with ministerial approval, the making of a book on sporting events which are of State, national or international interest. For example, in New South Wales, where similar provisions exist, the TAB took \$213,000 in sports TAB bets on special events in 1986-87. Those events included the Australian Grand Prix, Kangaroo tour games and the 1986 James Hardie 1000 motor race. Books have been made on these events in the past in Queensland. What new section 147A brings in is legalised betting on these events. Members opposite and their former colleagues did nothing to prevent illegal betting on such events.

This Bill assists licensed book-makers, provides for legal betting on sporting events and raises revenue. I recommend it to the House.

**Hon. R. C. KATTER** (Flinders) (5 p.m.): I wish to back up the words of Dr Clark and Mr Elder in this debate. Gambling is a very important part of Australia's way of life. There has been such a great interest in gambling because half of Australia's population who were in this country before the war came here during the gold rushes. Those people aspired towards making big money very quickly. Almost all of the other people who were already in Australia at the time—and perhaps I am being unkind to them—had a convict somewhere in their family tree. These people were after easy money as well. On the positive side, they aspired to something better for themselves and their families, which was the reason why they came to Australia and, to some degree, the same reason why they were drawn to gambling.

Unfortunately, my predecessors had an unenviable reputation in the field of gambling. On one occasion when my grandfather travelled by ship back to the Mediterranean, he said that he never moved outside the room where the gambling games were taking place. On another occasion, one night in Cloncurry he sat in on a game during which three station properties changed hands. Whilst he did exaggerate to some degree, there was a certain element of truth in it because these people were brought up at a time when their only form of recreation and interest was gambling.

**Mr McGrady:** Tell us about Uncle Bert.

**Mr KATTER:** I cannot help but take the interjection. I had a rather infamous Uncle Bert who participated in some of these gambling activities. Some unkind people said that he ran a lot of games, but I do not think that that was ever substantially true.

I might add with some degree of pride that members of my family have also participated in the great game of Rugby League ever since it started in Australia. Many members of my family have played Rugby League for the whole of their playing careers and have been officials involved in Rugby League for the remainder of their lives. My famous Uncle Bert was very prominent in the game of Rugby League. He bequeathed to me something that I consider to be one of the greatest things that I have ever been given by anyone. On his death, he left me his life membership of the North Queensland Rugby League, which I treasure and honour.

The reflections I am making here this afternoon are relevant to this Bill. Dr Clark quoted a person who said that no-one would go to north Queensland if he or she is unable to gamble.

I point out to the honourable member for Mount Isa the contribution that my family made towards helping people to come to north Queensland. If the stories I have been told are true, those people were pioneers in a very real sense and provided facilities which would not have otherwise existed.

I place on record a few names of the people who have devoted a substantial proportion of their entire lives to raising money to enable young people to play football. When I was a young man, I loved football very much and I sincerely thank those people for the contribution that they made. I urge the Minister most sincerely to try to help them. It is not right that they had to spend the amount of time that they did in raising the money they needed to enable the boys from out west and up north to participate in Rugby League throughout Queensland and Australia. A total of 23 north Queensland players have played in the Sydney Rugby League competition, and north Queenslanders are immensely proud of them. A huge amount of money was required to enable those young lads to play in that competition. The people in Mount Isa, such as Alex Biondi, and my own Uncle Bert, the Backhauses, the Telfords, the Lilleymans, the Eastaughffes, the Hearn and the Hoeyes, are all people who have devoted years and years of their lives towards raising money to help young men participate in that very important pastime. In addition, the Lewises, Richard Anthony and Ron Plant, and the Ormond in Charters Towers, made a contribution and enabled even a close town such as Charters Towers to participate in Rugby League. Their names should be recorded as a matter of public record and thanks should be given to them.

The sport of Rugby League has a very important social significance. In one north Queensland town, following a properly run assessment it was discovered that at the start of the Rugby League season the crime rate in that town was cut clean in half, but immediately after the season finished the crime rate doubled. If the people of north Queensland were to suddenly decide not to continue to raise money in support of Rugby League—and who could blame them for not wanting to spend half their lives raising that money—there would be a great increase in crime and violence. Whether we like it or not, young men have a lot of energy to burn off. It has been my experience that if they can burn it off playing Rugby League, they will not burn it off in other ways.

If my remarks appear to be a little class conscious, I do not apologise for that, but I make the very important point that the ballet, orchestras, theatres and other productions receive magnificent hand-outs. The sport of Rugby League in north Queensland and western north Queensland, where I come from, has not received one cent. Any money it has received is negligible. There appears to be a privileged group. The people who follow the theatre, the ballet and orchestras are very rich and well-educated and do not need the taxpayers and ordinary people to support their pleasures and pursuits. These people are looked after, yet the people in pursuit of the ordinary pleasures which are common to so many of us in north Queensland receive no help or support whatsoever. They are expected to spend virtually every afternoon of their lives running chook raffles to raise the money that is needed.

A couple of previous speakers mentioned refereeing, which is a very important aspect of this debate. If people are to be allowed to bet on football games such as a State of Origin match, which no-one could deny would carry a considerable amount of money, then Mr McCallum's decisions are very serious indeed. The recent refereeing was a lamentable performance, which indicates clearly that some problems exist.

**Mr Prest:** There would have been a few dollars on that match.

**Mr KATTER:** There might have been; I do not know.

However one defines "greatness", Wally Lewis is a truly great Queenslander. Quite frankly, to see him disgraced by the Australian Rugby League over remarks which, in the circumstances, could be described only as very, very restrained leaves me with the impression that that occasion was a most lamentable day for the greatest game of all. It was also a sad reflection—not upon Lewis, but upon ARL officials.

In conclusion, I point out that for the last 10 years or so, racing revenue went from the TAB to the Racing Development Fund. I support very strongly the remarks made by Mr Elder and reiterate that, if the Government proposes to set up Footy TAB, the revenue should be allocated to Rugby League because that is where the interest lies, and that is where the interest in Footy TAB will be focused. Revenue from racing is channelled into the Racing Development Fund—and I am not arguing against that. If the Government wants to be consistent, in the same way, Rugby League should receive its fair share of the revenue from Footy TAB. With all due respect to the Minister, it appears to me that that will not happen. It seems to me that that is extremely unfair to the code that plays a big part in the lives of the people of north Queensland. Whereas players have sometimes been able to make a bit of money—by being paid if they won but not being paid if they did not win—now it will also be possible for them to be paid when they lose. As a very necessary part of the legislation that is being discussed today, I think that the game will have to be scrutinised very carefully.

I hope that the game of Rugby League and the gambling that is part of this nation's activities and the character of Australians can be acknowledged through the fund to which I have referred and that some remuneration can be given to people who, in many cases—certainly in the case of my own uncle and in the case of many members of my own family—have devoted a significant proportion of their time to sport. In that way, they will receive some return for the huge input that they have contributed over the years.

**Mr WELFORD** (Stafford) (5.11 p.m.): I am pleased to rise and speak in support of this amending Bill, which is yet another example of a Labor Government's innovation. Certainly, by Queensland standards, this Bill is innovative because, as honourable members would know, for a number of years other States have had facilities similar to those for which this legislation now provides. Finally, a Labor Government has taken the initiative to bring Queensland up to date.

One of the features of the Bill that I have commented on in relation to other legislation is that it brings Queensland into line with other States. There are distinct advantages in having the laws of all States consistent. To the extent that this Bill achieves consistency in betting activities, the legislation deserves support. Consistency is a matter to which I will refer in much of the legislation that comes before the Parliament in the future.

Clause 4 provides for sports betting and a new definition of "sports totalisator", which extends betting to sports events, subject to certain conditions. The conditions basically are that the sporting event on which betting is proposed to be conducted must be approved by the Minister. Moreover, book-makers who run a book on an event must hold a current licence, and bets will be taken only on-course. When application is made for approval for bets to be taken in relation to a particular event, details of the event and the way in which the result is to be determined must also be provided to the Minister in the application.

Apart from the controls that I have just mentioned, other regulations are the same as those that apply to book-makers in respect of all other betting, except in relation to the levy. Clause 8 sets the turn-over tax on sports betting at 1 per cent, which is consistent with the Government's pre-election commitment. The Labor Party campaigned on the basis that the turn-over tax on betting should be set at 1 per cent. Of course, no club levy will apply in relation to sports betting. For the time being, the racing levy remains at 1.33 per cent on race betting, and the balance of 0.67 per cent will make up the total 2 per cent levy which currently is paid to the Racing Development Fund. I am pleased to note at this stage that in due course the Government will reduce the turn-over tax on race betting to 1 per cent.

The Bill also provides for Footy TAB and Tabanza, which will be operated by the TAB—an institution that, in the past, has come in for a good deal of criticism. I am pleased to note that the Minister is in the process of undertaking a major overhaul of the efficiency and operations of the TAB. In due course, I am sure that the Government will be proud of the work carried out by the TAB not only in providing betting facilities throughout the State but also in generating returns to the Government as a result of betting.

In spite of the fact that no provision has been made in the laws of Queensland to regulate sports betting, it has been a common activity in the past. Part of the process of regulating that form of betting is to ensure that illegal betting does not proliferate. The member for Southport made light of the fact that the provisions of the Bill fulfil, in part, the proposals that Commissioner Fitzgerald outlined in his report. It is the case that betting on sporting events is clearly a requirement, given that it already occurs in other States. However, there should be some regulation of betting activity in this State so that, at the very least, the people of Queensland will be able to benefit from the taxes that the Government is entitled to levy.

At page 195 of the Fitzgerald report, specific reference was made to gambling. It stated—

"Illegal gambling poses a particular problem, in that it is a major method of laundering money obtained from crime. Opportunities already exist for such laundering and it may be that the introduction of small, legal operations would not significantly affect this.

All gambling establishments, legal and illegal, need to be stringently controlled. This might be easier if they are legal and regulated rather than covert and illegal."

That is part of a long-planned process in which the past illegal gambling activities in this State will be regulated so that, at the very least, the State has some control over them.

I digress to mention the recent report of the Criminal Justice Commission on poker machines, which basically endorsed the very point that Commissioner Fitzgerald made. The Criminal Justice Commission report referred to various forms of illegal gambling that have occurred in the past in relation to online machines and poker machines. It also stated—the Labor Party has always acknowledged the point—that in any industry in which there is a heavy injection of cash, an increased risk of criminal activity exists. But it is the way in which the Government regulates that activity and the industry involved which is the crucial element. No-one denies for a moment that, as a result of the ability to legally bet on sporting events, social benefits will accrue to the community. No-one suggested that, because the racing industry is a cash-intensive industry, we should close it down. For those very reasons, no-one on this side of the House denies that the introduction of gambling in the form of poker machines will also increase the potential risk for criminal activity associated with cash-intensive industries. However, the fact remains that the social benefits are clearly desirable, and the Government will be able to provide those benefits from the additional taxes. They will be able to be redirected and distributed to highly beneficial sections of sporting activity and other areas, and clearly the provision of stringent regulations is the key point. Part of the regulation of sporting events about which we are talking is clearly consistent with that policy. The

Government is providing for the regulation of Tabanza in the racing industry, and the same will occur with other forms of gambling.

**Mr Veivers:** One question?

**Mr WELFORD:** I will allow the honourable member for Southport one question on the basis that he prefaces his remarks, as he did previously when he was speaking, with the statement that he is the only member on the other side of the House to take that view.

**Mr Veivers:** Don't you think you are here to represent the people rather than representing the Government taking money from the people? Just think about that.

**Mr WELFORD:** That is hardly a sustained attack.

**Mr Veivers:** It is not an attack. I am just asking a question.

**Mr WELFORD:** The point that I have been making is that the people of Queensland are clearly being extremely well represented by the moves that the Government is taking to regulate these forms of gambling; and they will be further represented at the conclusion of the inquiry into sports-funding, which I am currently chairing, by the allocation of additional funds to the many sporting organisations throughout the State. Perhaps, with a bit of luck, even the member for Flinders will appreciate that in terms of his plea for the provision of assistance to Rugby League in north Queensland.

At page 186, the Fitzgerald report makes a further comment—

"Laws should reflect social need, not moral repugnance. Unless there are pressing reasons to do so, it is futile to try and stop activities which are certain to continue and upon which the community is divided. To do so takes resources away from the policing of other activities which the community considers undoubtedly wrong, such as violence and fraud."

Clearly, as part of the consistent policy that this Government espouses and which I am pleased to support, the Bill will bring some consistency to the regulation of the betting practices that already exist in this State, which everyone acknowledges, and also provide for the social benefits that I have recommended.

I note that members of the Opposition, in their own terms, support the general thrust of the Bill. I am pleased to support the Bill.

**Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory) (5.21 p.m.): I am pleased that the Racing Development Fund is not the only aspect that is being canvassed in the debate on this Bill. In the past, money has been injected into that fund. I am pleased that the Government is addressing the needs of sports other than racing. However, racing is an important part of the Australian way of life. As other honourable members have said, so is football an Australian way of life. Because I have a great interest in country racing, I will address that aspect. I trust that the Government will remember the country race clubs when it considers the allocation of TAB funds. Country race meetings represent the one social event of the year for many country people. It is paramount that those racing clubs receive support so that they can continue to conduct race meetings.

I know that it costs money to conduct race meetings in country areas. As my colleague the member for Mirani stated earlier, many horses which are not competitive at metropolitan tracks, or at tracks in coastal areas or provincial cities, are taken to the country to race. That also benefits the blood horse industry in those areas. It is of paramount importance that this matter be addressed.

My honourable colleague the member for Mirani also addressed the issue of book-makers. Book-makers are part of Australian tradition in the country as well as in the city. As the member for Mirani said, some book-makers are very colourful characters. I trust that the Government will recognise the support that book-makers have received in the past and that it will continue to be support them. I was hoping that the book-makers'

turn-over tax could be lowered a little bit. Country book-makers are experiencing problems. I do not think that their job should be made even harder.

I turn to football. The honourable member for Flinders, the honourable member for Manly and several other speakers have addressed this subject. Country football is not what it should be. I have been a member of the Quilpie Rugby League and the Western Rugby League for some 25 years. I was on the board of directors of the Toowoomba and South-west Rugby League for seven years, and I was the western delegate to that league. At that time I was opposed to the Queensland side—the Brisbane Broncos—entering the Sydney competition because I felt it would result in the rape of the league in Queensland. Most honourable members would agree that that is exactly what has happened.

City football has always gained at the expense of country football. The good boys from the bush are always pinched by the wealthier city clubs. When the provincial boys show a bit of talent, they are pinched by the Brisbane clubs or the Sydney clubs. However, many of these players deserve a bit more credit than they have received in the past. I think that more emphasis should be placed on increasing the patronage at country football matches. I might add that the media coverage of country football and of Brisbane teams playing in the country has been detrimental to the game in Queensland in the last couple of years. Most interest has been centred on the State of Origin games and the Brisbane Broncos. I think that that is a sad and sorry state of affairs for the league in Queensland in general, and I trust that it is a problem that will be addressed. No doubt all honourable members would agree that what I have said is a true account of what is happening now. I know I am drifting away from the Bill a little bit, but this is an issue that must be addressed.

As honourable members would be aware, many great players came from the country. The honourable member for Flinders mentioned a few. There are the famous brothers from the north, Vern and Frank Daisey, who were great players. I mention also Artie Beetson from Roma and Chris Close from my electorate. Even though the honourable member for Southport, Mick Veivers, comes from the south coast, he was originally a country player. As I have said, many great players did come from the country, and there are many who are still playing in the country.

I trust that some of the funds that are raised through Footy TAB and Tabanza will be directed towards sports other than racing. Football is not the only sport that is played in the country. Tennis, cricket and other sports which are played in the bush and in the cities need help and support. I trust that the Minister will address the need for facilities for those sports. Tennis is a great social game, and one that people can play for most of their lives. I trust that its needs will be addressed.

In conclusion, I want to place emphasis on racing. It is a way of life. It is also a very contentious industry. Many people get irate when racing is mentioned. However, it is a growth industry, and, for many people, it is a very rewarding industry.

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

**Mr JOHNSON:** My colleague Mick Veivers just said that racing is the fourth largest industry in this State.

I think the member for Mirani might have mentioned the second-rate horses that one comes across in the bush. That is a problem that must be borne in mind.

I support the Bill. I simply ask that not all of the money that is raised from Footy TAB and Tabanza be directed back into racing and that other sports receive their fair share.

**Ms ROBSON** (Springwood) (5.28 p.m.): When perusing the list of speakers, one of my colleagues said that we start with a beast and finish with a beauty. I think he was alluding to the nature of this amendment Bill, but I could be mistaken.

I congratulate the Minister on his foresight in following through on yet another of the reforms recommended in the Fitzgerald report by moving to tidy up an area in which illegal practices have been flourishing for many years. Even better, the introduction of betting on sporting events other than horse and greyhound racing, through TAB agencies, lifts Queensland's sporting profile and brings us into line with some of the other States.

Obviously, an additional benefit will be the revenue collected via the levies imposed. Hopefully, some of this revenue will be fed back into supporting the sports from which it was generated. I would hope that that would be extended not only to the maintenance and promotion of football but also into the women's sporting area, which has been in a state of far worse neglect than probably any of the other sports that have been alluded to in this debate.

It is really shameful that so little of the revenue that has been accumulated in recent years has been fed back into supporting one of the favourite pastimes of most Queenslanders, namely, sport. Betting is well recognised as the favourite pursuit of many Queenslanders. Illegal book-makers have made fortunes by taking bets on anything that moves.

The introduction of Tabanza recognises the wishes of the betting public to find a creative and new game to play—a game in which no skill is required and everyone has a good chance of winning. People in Queensland invest substantially on games of chance—lotteries, scratch-its, the Casket. They love to gamble, and clearly indicate their desire to do so by their continued support of all those activities.

Because of Queensland's climate, a day at the races is one of the great pleasures of life in Queensland. By allowing book-makers at racing venues to accept bets on other sporting events, the Minister will be facilitating the regeneration of public interest and attendance at race meetings. I also believe that it will encourage the return of the family race meeting outing, which is very much a feature of country race meetings, when families actually use the venue of a racecourse to have a day out together.

As I said earlier, Queenslanders love to bet and will continue to do so regardless of the criticisms that come from some sectors of the community to the effect that gambling is an evil and that betting in itself is an encouragement of that evil. We must recognise that the nature of the Australian people is such that they do enjoy gambling. This Bill recognises that fact. It seeks to tighten up on illegal practices, offers variety to betters and introduces some new, innovative and creative ways of betting. I support the Bill.

**Hon. R. J. GIBBS** (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (5.32 p.m.), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contributions. I am greatly encouraged by the fact that, whilst some questions have been raised—which I will certainly answer—overall it appears that the Bill has the unanimous support of the House.

I thank the honourable member for Southport, who is the Opposition spokesperson on racing and betting, for his comments. I will answer some of his concerns. He expressed concern about this legislation simply legalising another form of betting and being a revenue-raising exercise.

Honourable members should be aware of the latest available figures on total per capita gaming expenditure for all States and Territories throughout Australia. It is interesting to note that the Queensland betting statistics are the second lowest of those of any State in Australia. Queenslanders bet \$30.91 per capita per year. The lowest betting statistics relate to Victoria, where people bet \$24.15 per capita per year. It would be an incorrect assumption that Queenslanders are basically over-the-moon punters.

The honourable member for Southport raised the matter of illegal betting and expressed concerns about the activities of SP book-makers in Queensland. I assure him that that matter is in hand. In fact, only weeks after coming to office and taking on the responsibilities of this portfolio, I sought a meeting with Sir Max Bingham and asked him to address with some urgency the matter of SP book-making activities in this State. As was rightfully pointed out by a previous speaker, that matter is now in the hands of

the Criminal Justice Commission. I am expecting a report and recommendations in the near future. Legislation will be introduced into this Parliament as a matter of urgency immediately that report is to hand.

The honourable member spoke about all codes of racing being given a fair go. He can rest assured that it is my policy and that of my Government to ensure that the harness racing industry, the gallopers and the greyhounds will all be treated with the utmost fairness. That will apply particularly in relation to the disbursement of funds from the Racing Development Fund.

The honourable member made a point about breeders and prices at auctions. I believe that he has based his assumptions primarily on his own personal experiences at sales such as the Magic Million. It is acknowledged that problems exist in relation to some of those special sales. It is recognised that the prices of horses at those sales are artificially inflated. Unfortunately, in many cases those horses are bought back by the people who offer them for auction.

The honourable member should be aware of the very excellent job that companies such as Queensland Bloodstock Breeder Sales and Sunstate Bloodstock Pty Ltd do in this State. They offer horses of very fine breeding at prices which the average person in the community can afford to pay for them. I recall attending a QBBS sale some months ago. Some of the bloodstock offered included a couple by Semipalatinsk, which sold for the very reasonable sum of \$15,000, and some by Prince Ruling which sold for around \$7,000. It is unfair to say that the average person in the community cannot get into the game.

Even though people such as Tommy Smith and Bart Cummings recently burnt their hands very badly, I believe that it was probably welcomed by all in the industry that the overinflated prices that applied at so many sales in the past suddenly fell overnight to much more reasonable floor prices.

The honourable member mentioned a concern about country race clubs. I have made statements in this House repeatedly in relation to the future of country clubs. I am aware of the sensitivity of that issue. However, I am aware also that this State is top heavy with race clubs. If I remember correctly, Queensland has something like 167 race clubs compared with 47 in New South Wales.

It is farcical to suggest that the Racing Development Fund or taxpayers' money via the TAB can be used constantly to prop up some of those clubs which, quite frankly, cannot pay their own way. If they were in a competitive business, they would have gone to the wall a long time ago. That is not to say that I intend putting the cleaners through country racing. I want to make that point emphatically. However, some changes will be made in the future in relation to country racing. I am determined to see that this Government will go ahead with that proposal.

At present, a consultative review is taking place. The consultants who have been engaged have already presented me with their first report, by which I am very much encouraged. They are now out in the field talking to the principal clubs in all codes of racing in Queensland.

It would be my fervent wish and desire to be in a position by, at the very latest, August this year to provide the industry and members of this House with a Green Paper in relation to some of the proposals for reform that I would like to see within the industry.

**Mr FitzGerald:** How about night racing in Toowoomba?

**Mr GIBBS:** I will come to that, if the honourable member would be patient.

The honourable member spoke about taxes and levies on book-makers and their income and he referred to Tabanza. Until Tabanza is tried, it is impossible to estimate the amount of taxation that will emanate from it. If I tried to make a prediction in relation to that, I would be shooting in the dark. However, as I said, at this stage we cannot determine the amount of money that will be derived from Tabanza.

In relation to the book-makers, I am taking the very first step to deliver the election promises I made, namely, to reduce their turn-over tax to a flat 1 per cent. That provision is contained within this Bill. At this stage, I have had a very preliminary discussion with the Treasurer. As I have said to the book-makers, patience is the order of the day. The State Budget will be introduced in August, and I believe that that issue will be more than adequately addressed at that time.

I thank the honourable member for Manly for his contribution. He is a fervent fan of the Brisbane Broncos—in fact, he is their manager. He made the point, correctly so, that he would like to see money from sports betting put back into sporting facilities and not into consolidated revenue, as this legislation provides. A number of other members made the same comment. It amuses me when I hear members of the Opposition carry on as they have in the past couple of days. I think it would be to the chagrin of most of them that their leader has conducted himself in such a despicably irresponsible manner in the debate on the poker machine industry.

The simple fact is that the way ahead for sporting clubs and codes of sporting organisations in this State will be assured by the introduction of poker machines. When one considers the wide diversification of the sports industry, the \$400,000, which will result from the betting on sport and which will be channelled into consolidated revenue, would not have a major impact on it. That money will be channelled into consolidated revenue in order that I can deliver the promise of the flat 1 per cent turn-over tax for book-makers involved in sports betting.

The honourable member for Manly referred to Lang Park and perhaps the need for a new stadium. I am very much aware of some of the problems at Lang Park. I simply say to him that I am not in any position to add further to it. The matter is in hand. Consideration is being given to whether Queensland needs a superstadium or whether repairs should be carried out to the existing stadium at Lang Park. However, I would point out to him that, since the Government has been in office, I have been inundated with requests such as a \$100m project to improve Lang Park; \$80m to upgrade and improve the Brisbane Cricket Ground; and proposals by the Broncos, as the honourable member well knows, to make their headquarters at the RNA; the Queensland Rugby Union, which would like things done; and the Brisbane Bullets, who want support. It is not a bottomless bin of money. These things have to be handled in a responsible and proper manner, and they will be handled and approached in that way.

I thank the honourable member for Currumbin for his support for the reduction of book-makers' turn-over tax to 1 per cent. He raised a very interesting question about net pools. At the recent Racing Ministers conference, which I attended in Melbourne with my departmental officers, the subject of net pools was discussed to some degree. Partly as a response to that, we are now able to go ahead. We are in the process of successful negotiation, I believe, with the New South Wales TAB for a net pool to operate on Footy TAB. Mention was also made of net pools covering the other codes of betting, for example, harness racing, greyhounds and thoroughbreds. Some complexity is involved in it.

**Mr Coomber:** Are you considering a universal TAB?

**Mr GIBBS:** Maybe at some time. That matter was not discussed. But I certainly do not dismiss it as a possibility at some time in the future. I am sure that the honourable member would appreciate and understand that, with the jealousy that exists between States and the political differences involved, it is something which would be very hard to implement.

I can say that, basically, the attitude of all Ministers at the conference was that most of us would at some time in the future like to see a national pool operating. It should be understood, though, that at such time as a national pool came into operation, in my opinion, it would have a fairly horrendous effect on those people whom we would all like to see remain on course, namely, the book-makers.

I thank the member for Barron River for her excellent contribution and her outline of some of the history of racing in this State and nation. She made reference to the fact that people have in the past been seen to lose their clothing at racecourses. My experience over the years is that the common saying is that there are those who go to the track and lose their shirt. But I have to say that I have yet to see a naked body leaving Eagle Farm or Doomben. The member for Barron River rightfully identified moves in other States which will dovetail into this legislation.

I am a great supporter of trying to adopt a universal approach, to use the member for Currumbin's words, to betting in this country, if it is at all possible to achieve. I can assure the member that I share his concern, deep desire and indeed commitment to the preservation of the role of book-makers oncourse throughout Queensland. I understand the very important role of book-makers at country race meetings, particularly those that do not have TAB facilities. The member can rest assured that this Government will do its utmost to assist the survival of the country book-makers.

The honourable member for Mirani voiced his concern about the future of country racing. I believe that I have covered those concerns. He also expressed a concern about the possible rigging of sporting events a la what happened to baseball in the United States.

**Mr Randell:** Basketball.

**Mr GIBBS:** It also happened significantly in baseball. I believe that as long as the Government provides the people of Queensland with the adequate sources for betting through the TAB, then that form of illegal betting will not occur. I can say that Pub TAB is an important part of future changes that the Government needs to look at, and I have that matter under consideration at the moment.

I believe that if the Government provides the public with adequate betting facilities, not simply betting outlets where they can go and have a bet, but outlets where they can enjoy betting and make it a social occasion, then that sort of illegal betting will not occur.

I have always found it difficult to accept that previous Governments and the TAB have allowed agencies to operate in a hotel, yet forced people in that hotel to walk from one area of the hotel, around a wall to go and have a bet. Those patrons must leave their beer and their food behind. It seems to me an absolutely ludicrous situation that those facilities cannot be located centrally in a hotel or in a club so that people can sit down, purchase a meal, enjoy a drink, watch the races on the television and have a social afternoon. For the life of me I cannot understand why previous Governments were not——

**Mr Lingard:** What about those people who do not like going to a hotel but want to bet on a TAB?

**Mr GIBBS:** That is fine. That facility would always be available.

I envisage that, in the future with the introduction of Pub TAB, facilities will be available for those people who wish to have a bet away from a hotel and for those who wish to go to a hotel and enjoy social conviviality.

The member for Mirani mentioned the role of the TAB. I think that he is fully aware of my criticisms of the TAB. I herald again my intention, as I have heralded it loud and clear for the last seven months, to make significant changes to the TAB in the not-too-distant future. I believe that in the past there has been some degree of failure on the part of the TAB to promote the racing industry. In my opinion, the role of the TAB is not to promote betting. The role of the TAB is to promote and market racing in a proper, professional and efficient manner. If it does that, it stands to reason that the benefits associated with betting will flow from that type of successful promotion in the marketplace.

I can state forthrightly that telephone betting will not be introduced into Queensland. I am aware of my statements prior to the election. I am also aware of my responsibilities now as Minister. I attended the Racing Ministers conference, as the member for Mirani did in the past, and as a result of that things were——

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr GIBBS:** The honourable member can laugh, but the simple fact is that if the previous Government had played a responsible role and made available to then Opposition members the sort of information that should have been in their possession, perhaps statements such as I made at that time would not have been necessary.

**Mr FitzGerald:** That is a good excuse.

**Mr GIBBS:** No, it is not a good excuse at all.

**Mr FitzGerald:** You are wrong and you admit it.

**Mr GIBBS:** I am admitting it. I have no problem with or hesitation in admitting it.

The simple fact is that since attending that ministerial conference, I am aware of a number of the security problems associated with telephone betting, some of the illegalities that could still take place and some of the stand-over tactics that could be used, and as a consequence the Government will not be proceeding with telephone betting.

It is my intention to hold industry conferences in the future.

In the past I have mentioned the night racing concept. I am keen to pursue that concept, but I am not about to rush into night racing until I have had the opportunity to look at what I believe is a very exciting future market for Queensland in both the tourism and the betting area. I refer to the market that is gradually starting to emerge in Queensland and in Taiwan. The ongoing excellence of Queensland's racing facilities and its ability perhaps in the future to use Skychannel or in some other way utilise a satellite communication link——

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr GIBBS:** The honourable member should be quiet and learn something. The members of this House know what an imbecile he is. The fact is that with the excitement about night racing in Hong Kong, the future of this game is untapped.

The member for Mirani referred to the principal club system. Only a week and a half ago I was more than heartened when the secretary of the Victorian Racing Club, Peter Armitage himself—who certainly would not be considered to be on my side of politics——made what I believe was a very progressive statement. He said that he believed that within the next 5 to 10 years, because of the size of this industry and its future potential, that Australia would face the distinct possibility of having not one principal club in Australia, but having one organisation that had the overall control of racing. I do not have a problem in coming to grips with that statement at all.

As I have said before, the principal club system in this State is outdated and outmoded. It is a relic of the colonial past. To put it bluntly to the member for Mirani, the role of some of the principal clubs in this State has left much to be desired in relation to their competency and their administration of the racing clubs under their control.

Like the honourable member, I congratulate my officers from Racing Services who, in view of their shocking working conditions in the past, with what I believe to be an appalling understaffing and considering their workload have done an outstanding job.

In relation to the Racing Development Fund, I am not going to indulge myself in a personality debate with the honourable member tonight, but at any time that he would like to debate the question of the Racing Development Fund and the so-called responsible

approach by previous racing Ministers, including himself, with me, I will be more than happy to do so. I say simply that, within the first couple of days of coming into the Ministry, I froze \$1.6m of Racing Development Corporation funds and allocations. I did that on the basis that, in the weeks before the election, the previous Minister, Mr Alison, had thrown money round like confetti. As I have said in the past, it was nothing more than a blatant attempt at pork-barrelling National Party electorates.

I thank the honourable member for Redlands for his contribution. He spoke on illegal betting, SP operators and the problems confronting book-makers. I believe that I have addressed those matters. The honourable member made some excellent comments on the benefits to the community of legal betting.

The honourable member for Flinders outlined his family tree. It was an incredible exercise. I am aware of his outstanding football ability. I was told today that he made his first-grade debut playing on the wing for Western Suburbs. He was so fleet of foot that, upon his first touching of the ball, he ran out of sight and nobody saw him the second time round.

I have mentioned the benefits to Queensland of the revenue from poker machines. I have referred to the very excellent job that my colleague the honourable member for Stafford is and will be doing in his overview of sporting grants and subsidies during the next couple of months. His report will be presented to Parliament.

I agree with the comments of the honourable member for Flinders on the connection between sport and crime. There is no doubt that, if we encourage sport in the community, it will have a beneficial effect on reducing crime.

The honourable member for Stafford spoke on the need for uniformity between the States. I agree with what he said. He rightfully made the point that one of the reasons for introducing on-course betting for only book-makers on sports events is twofold—it will increase patronage for book-makers and will have the beneficial side effect of attracting more people back to the racetrack.

As I have already mentioned, we are addressing the problem of the 1 per cent turn-over tax. We are also gaining an overview of the racing industry at present and we are directing our attention to some of the matters raised in the Fitzgerald report and to subsequent recommendations.

I believe it was appalling that, when we mentioned sport and poker machines, reference was made to the criminal element in that or any other industry. It would be disastrous for any Government to throw its hands up in the air and walk away from an issue saying, "Look, let us not tackle this problem because organised crime is involved." Adopting that attitude would be submitting to organised crime and admitting publicly that the Government cannot beat it, cannot handle it and was ill-equipped to get on top of it. I tell all honourable members now that this Government will be on top of it and will control it.

I thank the honourable member for Gregory for his contribution. I believe that I have addressed a number of his concerns about country race clubs. He made reference to the blood horse breeding industry. I do not agree with what he said about horses that do not perform well on the eastern seaboard going to the bush and being of great benefit to the blood horse breeding industry. They could be of benefit to station stock but, in many ways, those that fail at country tracks, as he would know, usually do not make much of a contribution to the breeding industry. Occasionally there is a freak, and Gunsynd was a classic example. By and large, most of them do not inject much excellence into the blood horse breeding industry.

He was concerned about Rugby League, the Broncos and the ongoing drama between the QRL and the BRL. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. A Broncos match attracts up to 35 000 spectators at Lang Park whereas a BRL match is flat out attracting 2 000. As to where the past responsibility for that lies, people can make up their own minds.

The honourable member for Springwood made a short but excellent contribution. She spoke about illegal betting, which I have already covered. She spoke about the need for a greater injection of funding into women's sport. She can rest assured that that will be done as part of the overview. She is doing an excellent job in establishing the Women's Sports Unit within my department. I believe that all of the matters she addressed are in hand.

I thank all honourable members for their contributions.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Hon. R. J. Gibbs (Wolston—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) in charge of the Bill.

Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.

Clauses 1 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—

**Mr VEIVERS** (7.30 p.m.): Clause 8 amends sections 163 and 164 to maintain the existing book-maker turn-over tax rate of 1.33 per cent on a horse race, trotting race or greyhound race and to impose a turn-over tax at a rate of 1 per cent for other sporting contingencies. I know that the Minister has spoken about reducing the turn-over tax for book-makers, which even he would have to admit will make their life easier and more trouble free. It may also do a bit more for racing, because the book-makers may offer better odds. I do not know whether that will be correct, because it is up to the book-makers.

The Minister has stated that due to the implementation of poker machines, over the next three years a sum of between \$30m and \$50m will be put into sport. I do not know if those are the exact figures. This is very commendable, but, if that sort of money will be raised through the installation of poker machines, perhaps it would be advantageous to racing in general if book-makers' turn-over tax was cut out altogether.

**Mr GIBBS:** That is a very generous proposal, one which in the past the former National Party Government would never be a party to. The simple fact is that, under the sports betting proposal contained in the legislation, the Government has reduced the tax to a flat rate of 1 per cent. I have given certain undertakings which I have discussed with the Treasurer and which are now under review for the August Budget.

**Mr RANDELL:** I commend the Minister on his proposition to alleviate turn-over tax on bookies. I am a former Minister and there is no doubt that the National Party Government would have relieved that tax previously except for the battle that I had with officers of the Treasury. I hope the Minister is not in the same position, because they are pretty powerful.

**Mr Gibbs:** We are much more civilised and intelligent.

**Mr RANDELL:** Yes, I know all about that, but, when the chips are down, Treasury is pretty hard to battle with. I ask the Minister to consider removing totally the turn-over tax on book-makers. I do not believe that they should pay any turn-over tax at all. It was my policy when I was Minister—and it is still my policy—that clubs should negotiate with the book-makers on what they pay to the clubs.

The other matter I would like the Minister to consider concerns the tax on back bets. Turn-over tax is levied on every bet, that is, every transaction. Naturally, a bet by a book-maker with another book-maker is a different bet to those he has had with his clients. Because it is viewed as being the same money, book-makers perceive this as double taxation. I think the Minister would agree with that. Money loses its identity once a transaction has taken place. One may as well say that only a punter's original funds should be taxed and not any reinvested winnings. However, in view of the fact

that back bets are made to reduce a book-maker's potential liability and the fact that they are made prior to the result of the race, it would be possible to exempt such bets. If some relief were to be offered, this would not have much effect on revenue. Book-makers are being double taxed, and I ask the Minister to earnestly consider this matter when he takes his submission to Cabinet.

**Mr GIBBS:** Any book-maker who cannot survive in the industry on a flat 1 per cent does not deserve to be in the industry. It is as simple and straightforward as that. I will not be considering any further concessions for book-makers other than the commitment that I have given to reduce the turn-over tax to 1 per cent. As a flow-on of this debate this evening, discussions are under way at the moment. That is as far as I am prepared to consider relief for book-makers at this stage.

**Mr RANDELL:** I have asked the Minister to do that and he has rejected my proposition. All I can say is that he will have to live with it.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 9 and 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

**Mr RANDELL** (7.34 p.m.): I did not get the opportunity during my speech in the second-reading debate to pay a tribute to Mr Ian Callinan of the TAB. I know what the Minister thinks, but when I was the Minister I always found him to be very fair and impartial. He had no hesitation in disagreeing with me, and, as a matter of fact, we had some violent differences of opinion. He stuck to his guns and I stuck to mine, and I respected his right to do so. He carried out his duties with a great deal of integrity and he can leave the TAB knowing that he acted very responsibly in the best interests not only of the TAB, but also of the people of Queensland. He did a good job and I commend him for that.

**Mr GIBBS:** I am sure the fact that the honourable member considers himself to have been a tough Minister is very reassuring to his own confidence and I congratulate him on it.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 12 and 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

**Mr VEIVERS** (7.36 p.m.): I have a question concerning the Racing Development Fund and the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Earlier this evening, when answering a previous speaker, the Minister said that he had certain ideas about racing and the clubs west of the Great Divide. Some of my parliamentary colleagues on this side of the House are a bit worried about what the Minister said. He said that he would not have taxpayers' money being used to fund race clubs out in those regions. As well as talking about the Consolidated Revenue Fund, I wish to make the point that, basically, it is not taxpayers' money that would be going into those areas; it would be punters' money from the TAB which would be recirculated. It would go out to the picnic race clubs, which rely heavily on funds to run that one race every year.

I ask the Minister: will the Racing Development Fund continue? My party did great things for racing through the former Minister Russ Hinze and the former Minister who sits behind me, Mr Randell. The amount in the Racing Development Fund increased to \$75m. The Minister said that money is being spent on things that are probably unnecessary, and I do not agree with that. However, I ask: will he put more of the money back into consolidated revenue, or will there be a continuation of the Racing Development Fund? I think it is most important for all race clubs to know that.

**Mr GIBBS:** In this Bill, the only reference to the Consolidated Revenue Fund is that concerning the \$400,000 that is estimated will be raised through sports betting, which will go into that fund. With the Racing Development Fund in debt to the tune

of \$72m, and bearing in mind the total incompetence of the previous Government and the squandering and pork-barrelling of the money in the Racing Development Fund, I absolutely assure the honourable member in the strongest possible terms that any suggestion that I should put a proposal or even think of entertaining a proposal that would have the effect of this Government wiping the \$72m debt away is certainly not on.

**Mr Veivers:** I did not say that.

**Mr GIBBS:** I say to the honourable member that I am working on this problem and looking at ways and means by which the debt might be paid. I am trying to eliminate the debt but, as far as I am concerned, when I have a Totalisator Administration Board that is up to date, modern and progressive, I will be making an approach to that board on the basis of eliminating the debt. However, I reiterate that the TAB is \$72m in debt and that \$10m is owed to State Treasury. Moreover, \$62m is owed to a consortium of five Japanese banks. Members of the National Party Opposition should not try to convince me of the competency of former Racing Ministers because, as have the great quiz champions of the world, they have pressed the buzzer and said, "Pass."

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 15 and 16, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## MINERAL RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p. 1854).

**Mr FITZGERALD** (Lockyer) (7.41 p.m.): At the outset, I wish to say that I do not think that there would be many pieces of legislation that have been fought over and mulled over more often than this legislation has been.

The Mining Act was passed in 1968. In May 1987, a Green Paper was issued, and it caused quite a deal of discussion to take place among land-holders' groups and the mining industry. On 7 September 1989, a Bill was introduced into this House and, after further discussion with land-owners and miners, it was replaced by a Bill that was introduced on 5 October 1989. Quite a number of amendments needed to be made to the first Bill, so the Minister decided to withdraw it and replace it with the Bill that was introduced on 5 October 1989. The second Bill received royal assent on 25 October 1989 but the Act was not proclaimed.

Because of election commitments that were made by Mr Goss, the present Government has decided not to proclaim the Act and has submitted it for further discussion. I understand that discussions took place with land-holders' groups and with the mining industry.

Many claims have been made by land-holders' groups. I understand that the Minister has attended meetings with the Minister for Primary Industries, although the Minister for Primary Industries did not wish to have very much to do with those meetings. Although he disappeared from the scene very quickly afterwards, he went along to put in a courtesy appearance so that at least he could say that he represented land-owners and primary producers, but did not wish to hang around. I understand that certain agreements were reached between the parties, but that not all the land-holders' requests were agreed to by the mining industry.

I believe that the Bill before the Parliament largely reflects the common ground among those groups. I understand that a number of changes were made to the legislation

that is presently before the Parliament, which will amend the Mineral Resources Act that has not yet been proclaimed. At the outset, I state that the legislation that was passed by this Parliament—the Mineral Resources Bill—and not proclaimed reflects National Party policy.

**Mr McGrady:** Rubbish!

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I say that the Mineral Resources Act that was not proclaimed, and which is being amended now, is National Party policy.

Members of the National Party Opposition will be supporting this amending legislation that the Minister has brought before the Parliament. Although I do not intend to move any amendments, during the course of the debate I will be discussing a number of topics.

The Minister has tried diligently to strike a compromise with the different land-owners' interest groups. In this respect, I commend him for the way in which he has carried out his duties. I do not intend to play politics with such an important industry as the mining industry or with such important legislation as the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill. As I said earlier, the Minister should be commended for the efforts he has made to satisfy as many people as possible. With regard to some requests that were made by some of the land-owners, the Minister has had to make some hard decisions. Although I can understand some of the views that were put forward to the Minister, I do not believe that the people presenting those views are right in all the issues they have pursued; furthermore, I believe they should be told that that is the position.

When this legislation is enacted, the Opposition will be watching to see how it works. Provided goodwill prevails on all sides, the legislation contains a number of checks and balances. In fact, they were inserted in the original legislation to ensure that it was reasonable. We will judge the legislation on how it works and how it is accepted rather than on shallow rhetoric that people throughout Queensland are using at present. However, I understand their concerns.

At the outset, I point out that the mining industry has always played a very important part in the prosperity of Australia. In the early gold rush days, Victoria, Western Australia, Queensland and, to a certain extent, New South Wales were all settled when the first wave of people came from all over the world to participate in Australia's mineral resources boom and to try to win their fortunes from the earth. Nothing has really changed; mining has merely become more sophisticated. Throughout history, we have seen waves of people moving into remote parts of Australia, particularly Queensland, to participate in mining development. Unlike many other industries, miners cannot choose where they wish to go; they must go where the mineral resources are.

The Director-General of the Department of Resource Industries announced his proposed retirement at the end of June. I place on record the previous Government's appreciation of Mr Kevin Wolff's service to the mining industry in Queensland. I believe I speak on behalf of the mining industry when I say that he was extremely well respected. Most people to whom I spoke mentioned that Kevin Wolff was an excellent public servant who served the previous Government and is serving the present Government very well. In the five years that he has been Director-General, he has witnessed many developments. He is a very enthusiastic man and is well respected in his position. On behalf of the previous Government, I thank him for his services to the people of Queensland and wish him well in his retirement. I am sure that those sentiments will be echoed by the present Government.

Returning to my earlier theme, I point out that, nowadays, mining plays an important role in the development of Queensland and the rest of Australia. A previous member of this House indicated in another debate that, since 1967, the mining industry has built 25 new towns, 12 new ports, 20 airfields, 2 000 kilometres of railway lines, 15 dams and thousands of kilometres of roads at little or no cost to the taxpayer. In many districts, other land-users have benefited enormously from the effects of the development of mines.

What is more, taxpayers do not appreciate that every man, woman and child benefits from the taxes paid by mining companies and mine workers. The living standards of all Australians depend to a large extent on the prosperity of a virile mining industry. When one witnesses the problem that Australia is facing at present with its balance of payments deficit, one realises that, if the export earnings of the mining industry were not included in those figures, Australia would be in extremely poor economic shape. Without the mining industry, Australia would not be as prosperous as it is today. The mining industry is export-oriented and plays a vitally important part in Australia's economy.

At the Committee stage, I will raise a number of issues. I foreshadow moving amendments which follow a simple theme. A number of clauses in the Bill relate to a single issue. For instance, in clauses 9, 10, 15, 16, 22, 23, 33 and 34, the word "recording" is proposed to be changed to "approval" and the word "record" is proposed to be changed to "approve".

Clauses 12 and 19 describe and clarify how a person may drive on a road. Everyone understands that under those clauses people have the right to drive on a road. However, because the point is common to a number of clauses, with your leave, Mr Speaker, I will refer to them. Clause 12, titled "Entitlements under exploration permit", states—

". . . the holder of an exploration permit is not required to obtain consent in respect of the entry or being upon land that is a reserve for public road where the entry of or being upon that land is solely as access in respect of land the subject of the exploration permit."

That provision is similar to the provisions for other permits that are required. Most people would accept that the holder of a permit has the right to be on a reserve for public road purposes. The clause clarifies the legislation on that aspect.

In clauses 13, 21 and 32, the term "codes of conduct" is mentioned. At present, the mining industry has a code of conduct. I ask the Minister to which code of conduct those clauses refer. I understand that amendments to the code of conduct are proposed. In 1982, a code of conduct was accepted by the industry. How can that code of conduct be changed? Surely it could only be changed by agreement of the mining industry and the other parties who wish to have an input into it. It would be wrong of the Parliament to give legislative backing to a code of conduct that was not spelt out clearly. I ask the Minister to ensure that that does not happen. If clauses 13, 21 and 32 stipulate a code of conduct, and it can be changed, it is like issuing a blank cheque. I do not believe that the industry would ever agree to that.

I would like some assurance from the Minister that that code of conduct will not be changed unless the industry is agrees with it. I believe that the industry is very responsible. It needs to be self-disciplining. There is a need for the warden. The Minister needs to take that into consideration with regard to the issuing of licences or permits, as the case may be. I do not believe that it is fair on the industry to have in legislation a code of conduct that can be changed without its agreement. I would like some clarification on that issue.

There are a number of other clauses in which the words "compensation for damage" have been altered by the addition of the words "injury suffered or loss incurred". I think that comes into another four clauses dealing with what is known as the authority to prospect, or the prospecting permit, the exploration licence and the mining lease.

In clauses 17 and 24 the word "initial" has been inserted before the words "entry to land". In other words, the first time a person goes onto the land, that person has to comply with those conditions. It does not apply every time a person enters the land. I think that is just a clarification. Obviously it was an oversight in the original legislation. It defines exactly when those conditions have to be met.

Clauses 18 and 25 are significant. They deal with the exploration permit and the mineral development licence. Clause 18 is rather extensive. In fact, it is quite a new

concept. It replaces section 5.39 in the original legislation. Section 5.39 was fairly short. It was entitled, "Report to mining registrar by owner of land." It states—

- "(1) Where a person purports to enter or be upon land under the authority of an exploration permit, the owner of the land who considers that that person is not authorized to enter or be upon that land or is not complying with any condition of the exploration permit or of any provision of this Act may report accordingly to the mining registrar of the mining district in which is situated the land.
- (2) The mining registrar shall have the report investigated and shall advise the owner of land who reports under subsection (1) of any action taken upon the report."

That is the wording of the original section 5.39. It is being replaced by a new section which is quite lengthy and spells it out step by step. The proposed new section 5.39 is entitled, "Reference by owner or holder to mining registrar". So, under this new section, the holder can go along to the mining registrar. It also involves what I consider to be a new concept. Subsection (3) of the proposed new section 5.39 states—

- "(a) The mining registrar shall cause the substance of any concern notified to him pursuant to subsection (1) or (2) to be investigated.
- (b) The mining registrar may convene and chair a conference with the owner and the holder at a date, time and place fixed by the mining registrar.
- (c) The owner of the land and the holder of the exploration permit shall attend the conference convened pursuant to paragraph (b) of which they have received notice."

The mining registrar has the right to call a conference, if he deems necessary, and the parties will have to attend. That is a very important provision.

Subsection (5) of the proposed new section 5.39 states—

"With the approval of the mining registrar a party may be assisted at a conference by another person."

I do not believe that that provision was contained in the original legislation. It also leads to a new concept in the mining industry, that is, consulting companies advising land-holders and mining companies on their rights under the mining legislation. These companies act as go-betweens and consultants. It is an industry that has developed because a lot of land-holders feel that they are not capable of understanding the legislation and that they require consultants to assist them.

I welcome this concept because I know that in other industries consultants are used quite widely. In the primary industries sector, consultants are employed to advise on which chemicals ought to be used and to offer financial advice. It has become popular to use consultants in a specific field. Experts are employed to assist in the running of businesses. The legislation provides for a party to be assisted at a conference by another person, so long as the approval of the mining registrar is obtained. Therefore, nobody should be disadvantaged in putting forward a case.

Provision is also made for costs to be awarded if a party makes a complaint and then fails to appear at a conference. I welcome that provision. It will stop people from using delaying tactics and making frivolous and vexatious complaints. People have every right to make a complaint. However, if a complaint is made and it has to be investigated, costs are involved. The other party has to incur costs in order to protect its interests. It is important that costs should be awarded against a person who fails to appear at a conference. That is just common sense. In all, I think clause 18 is fairly comprehensive. Clause 25 also deals with mineral development licences and so on.

I would like to speak briefly about the clauses to save taking up too much time at the Committee stage. Under clause 29, an environmental impact study may be ordered, if required. That is important. Quite often, the general public has an interest in the opening of a new mine or a proposed mine. This is probably a better way to go about it than what was previously contemplated. I stress that a study "may" be ordered; it is

not compulsory. If he believes a study is necessary, the Minister may direct that one be undertaken.

I can understand that a Minister might not always want an environmental impact study conducted. I cite the example of an environmental impact study that has already been conducted on a particular area that was not sensitive. If application is made to locate a similar operation or a mining lease on land that is very close to that area and if the Minister believes that all the important questions have been answered and no public agitation has been expressed at the application, it would be a waste of time if a company was put to the expense of conducting another environmental impact study. However, if a particular area is controversial and the general public has expressed an interest in that particular area, a properly conducted environmental impact study would be an advantage not only to the objectors but also to the mining company.

There is nothing worse than an accusation being made that, because an environmental impact study—an EIS—is paid for by the mining company, only a friendly consultant would be engaged to undertake it. Clause 29 (7) overcomes that problem. It states—

"After the Minister receives the copies of the study the Director-General shall forward a copy of the study to the mining registrar."

Clause 29 (8) states—

"Upon receipt of a copy of the study the mining registrar shall—

- (a) fix a date on or before which objections to the application may be lodged such date being not less than 2 months from the date of the posting of the notice pursuant to subparagraph (b)".

In other words, the results of the environmental impact study shall be posted so that the general public, the mining company and any objecting land-owners can peruse it. When the case is heard, those people can challenge its validity.

I am not casting any reflections on the environmental impact studies that have been undertaken in the past. However, in the future, those studies will come under much public scrutiny and will have to stand on the scientific bases on which judgments are made. They will have to stand up under the scrutiny of scientific inspections. Every scientific proposition that is put forward in an EIS, which will be on public display, can be scrutinised carefully. When the case is heard, the issues can be tested fully. I am sure that the general public will have more confidence in environmental impact studies than in something which the Minister has called for, has considered and on which he has made a judgment. This is a much fairer way to go.

Clause 30 covers the costs that can be awarded against an applicant who abandons an application in the Wardens Court.

Clause 31 relates to the warden's recommendation on hearing. Whereas some people might believe that a significant change has been proposed to this section, I believe that it is not as significant as they might think. According to subclause (l), when a warden is making a decision on whether to grant a licence, he must decide whether "taking into consideration the current and prospective uses of that land, the proposed mining operation is an appropriate land use."

Some people have expressed concern that the mining industry has first call on the use of land. People are concerned that a mining operation might be located on land that is potentially more valuable for recreational use, farming purposes or something else. I can understand that concern. When considering a mining operation, any Government would certainly consider competing land uses and make a decision as to whether a mine is really required in that area or whether the competing forces for land use should dominate. That decision will always have to be made.

Concerns have been expressed that, in the future, large mining operations might be located on the Darling Downs to obtain the underground coal. Although that is possible, I am sure that the farming interests on the downs would put forward very strong cases to the effect that plenty of supplies of coal exist in Queensland under land that has not

been developed as much as the Darling Downs area has been. It would be a major decision for any Government to allow open-cut mining on the downs. I am not sure of the depth at which coal is located under the downs, but I know that some of it could be mined by open-cut methods. I am sure that the honourable member for Condamine will mention this issue. He represents an electorate that has intensive farming operations located over coal deposits, and I know that he is concerned about the possibility of mining.

Concern has been expressed in the community about mining operations that fold up when companies go into liquidation and are unable to rehabilitate sites. That has occurred on a number of occasions in Queensland, and I know that the Minister has a few problems on his plate in relation to that.

In the light of past experience, I believe that the best way to overcome that problem is to ensure that reasonable bonds are imposed. The department and the Minister should ensure that, when a company applies to renew its mining licence, it must have an ongoing mining plan. If the department keeps a close eye on those operations, that will ensure that the bonds or bank guarantees are sufficient to clean up the mess if a particular company finds itself in financial trouble. It is a problem for the industry, for the Government and for the residents in the area. I know that I am saying this in the light of the Kingston toxic waste problem, but one never knows when this problem will arise. In the light of present technology, we know that we should be as careful as we can with regard to the rehabilitation of old mine sites.

In 1982, I went to the Comalco mine at Weipa and looked at the rehabilitation that that company had undertaken. I was absolutely staggered by the amount of money that the company had spent per hectare on rehabilitating land that could be best described as being extremely poor, open forest country that was on the bauxite deposits. That land had very little going for it, unless one enjoyed walking through sparse forest that had been leached over millions of years. The soil contained virtually no fertility whatever.

In an endeavour to establish an industry which would yield timber years later and provide a sustainable form of wealth, the company tried to grow mahogany trees. It also spent a lot of money growing pastures that could be used by the local Aboriginal community for the grazing of stock. Quite frankly, I thought the company was well and truly exceeding any demands that any reasonable Government could put on it to rehabilitate the land. I think that it might have been trying to establish its credentials with the general community by showing that it was very conscientious and that a mining operation could provide a long-term benefit as well as a short-term benefit.

I know that problems do occur when miners walk away and leave a site that is not fully reclaimed. I know that, because of the cyanide that is left on the site, some of the old goldmines have created a problem. They should be cleaned up. The department and, in particular, the Minister should ensure that, as mines are established, constant monitoring is carried out to ensure that no disasters are left behind for future generations to clean up. However, I know that that is a problem that will not always be overcome.

Another matter upon which I will touch later in my speech relates to the decision that is made as to when mines, particularly coalmines, should actually be opened. Quite recently, some discussion has taken place on this matter.

Recently, I received an invitation to attend the Queensland Chamber of Mines Ltd annual luncheon on 31 May. I noted that the guest speaker was to be the Premier. I was rather looking forward to that function, because it meant that I would see the Premier face the mining industry after the Ensham debacle that the Government got itself into. The function was to be held in the main ball room at the Hilton Hotel. I knew that the Premier would not be doing a waltz, but I thought that at least I would see him doing a quickstep. I want to report to the House that he did not do a quickstep. It was a very tense Premier who actually did——

**Mr McGrady:** They tell me he delivered a wonderful speech.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** Some people might say that.

**Mr McGrady:** Well accepted by the industry.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I am describing what some people in the industry said about it.

It was not a waltz and it was not a quickstep; it was an old twostep that he did. The old twostep was: first, blame the National Party; second, try to tell everyone that the deal was unique. The Premier had some very serious allegations to face up to. He spent most of his speech to the Chamber of Mines talking about Ensham. He knew he was under fire. The majority of his speech was on one issue—Ensham. I know that he had a number of prickles in his saddle and that he had been getting jabbed all over the place. As I said, the luncheon was held on 31 May.

In relation to the honourable member's interjection about how the industry received the Premier's speech—I will not mention names, but one of the guys whom I met after the function said, "That wasn't a speech; that was a lecture." Another person said to me that he told another person, "That was the biggest load of bullshit I have ever heard."

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mrs Woodgate): Order!

**Mr FITZGERALD:** Not only that, he said that he did not tell the whole story.

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that honourable members calm down. I ask the honourable member to continue.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** As I said, he said that he did not tell the whole story. I am only repeating what I have been told. I am an innocent person and I am not known to be so direct and so blunt. In fact, I am usually a placid person by nature. I know that the people to whom I refer did not see the speech in exactly the same light as the honourable member for Mount Isa did. A number of other people said exactly the same thing but in different words. I will not repeat the words they used because Madam Deputy Speaker may sit me down.

The paperwork had been building up for some time. I will go back over the issues later on. The Premier then explained in his speech that there were really only two issues: one was to blame the Nats; the second was that it was unique. He tried to blame the National Party by pulling out some letters that he had taken with him and also the minutes of a meeting that the Minister at that time, Mr Katter, had with the Ensham consortium. The Premier took those along to back up his case, because he was very nervous. He mentioned the fact that, on 19 April 1989, Mr Tenni had written to members of the Ensham consortium and asked them what they were going to do about the mining project. He also said that the Government was concerned that the mine would not get off the ground.

The Premier then went through the minutes of a meeting. I thought it rather extraordinary that he fished out minutes of a meeting held between the Minister, Katter and the Ensham consortium on 18 October 1989. The damning words that the Premier said Mr Katter used that locked the National Party into this Ensham decision were—

"Mr Katter said, 'I may have to make some unpleasant decisions, and clearly understand me that there may be some unpleasant decisions to be made.'"

That was the terrific threat that the Minister, Katter, made to the mining industry.

Therefore, the Premier has used those two statements by former National Party Ministers to say that the previous Government was going to filch the Ensham coal from the consortium and give it to a couple of the partners. I can tell the honourable member for Mount Isa, that Premier did not sell that one to the mining industry because the new Government was elected. It had to make those decisions. The previous

Government did not say that it would not call the partners together and ask them whether or not they were going to make a decision. I will tell this House what the Premier and the Minister for Resource Industries should have done in this case. They had every right to say that they believed that the mine should get off the ground and that they could understand how the previous consortium was put together.

Mr Goss told this House how this united nations of companies was put together. I accept that, under the previous Government, certain parties agreed to come together. I will be quite frank. I do not believe that it was the smartest thing to do to pull so many unwilling partners together when so many parties were interested in that authority to prospect when it was first offered. However, those parties had agreed to enter a consortium, and when they could not come to an agreement on when that mine should proceed, I think that the Premier and the Minister for Resource Industries had every right to question that consortium as to whether or not it was going to go ahead and to say that, if it was not, then the Government would not extend the authority to prospect. It still had the authority to do so under the old Act. It was not operating under the Act that was passed by this House last year.

If the parties to that consortium advised the Government that they could not agree amongst themselves, then the proper thing for the Government to do would have been to call for fresh expressions of interest. The Government could have kept the timetable short. It could have called for fresh expressions of interest. Then, Idemitsu and Bligh Coal could have advised the Government that they had formed a consortium and would make an offer for the authority to prospect.

**Mr McGrady:** Why didn't you do it?

**Mr FITZGERALD:** Because that consortium had an authority to prospect until February. This Government had to make the decision. The honourable member for Mount Isa cannot blame the previous Government for not doing the right thing. How does the honourable member know that Katter was not going to do it if he had still been the Minister for Mines?

That would have been the proper thing to do. If I had been the Minister for Mines, that is what I would have done. Tonight, I am telling the mining industry that that is the way I would have handled it. I would not have approved a number of consortiums. The Premier admitted as much in this House. On 29 May, the Leader of the Opposition put this question to the Premier—

"Given that the Government's handling of the Ensham coal-mining project has drawn a great deal of criticism from the mining industry, and given the backflip disguised awkwardly as a wayward bus, I ask: can he tell the House whether he met with representatives of the Idemitsu consortium before the decision to exclude the Australian partner from future participation in the project? If he did, was the appropriate, responsible Minister—the Minister for Resource Industries—present at that meeting? Was the Director-General of the Minister's department present or absent from that meeting, which was so central to all that followed?"

The Premier stood his ground and said, "Yes; yes; yes." In other words, he is now linked with that deal. He knew that he was talking to one partner in the consortium before the other two partners were informed that they were *persona non grata*—that they were not welcome. The Premier is linked with it. He understood it. He had the Minister and he had the Director-General of the Department of Resource Industries there to advise him.

A couple of days later, I asked the Minister whether any guarantee was given that that consortium had firm contracts for the sale of coal overseas, and he said that that question was not asked. In other words, the Government gave the authority to prospect to a couple of the partners.

The propriety of this action, when a couple of partners to a consortium can go around to the back door and talk to the Premier, the Minister and the Director-General of Resource Industries and, after certain conversations, those parties can walk away with

a guarantee that they have got the authority to prospect, as it is now called, is looked at aghast by the mining industry. In addition, the Premier appeared on television and said something about the other two having missed the bus. He stated that the three partners in the consortium were Idemitsu, Lucky Gold Star and Bligh Coal, which is wholly owned by Idemitsu. I appreciate that the members of that consortium had some difficulties. I understand that CRA took steps to buy out Bligh Coal, but in the end Idemitsu bought out Bligh Coal.

I believe that it is highly improper for the Government to talk to part of a consortium before it talks to the total consortium and asks for its final answer. The Government had every right then to readvertise and let it be known that it was interested in reissuing an authority to prospect. Queensland then was faced with the laughable situation, if it were not so serious, of the Premier suddenly realising—I do not know how he got himself into this bind—a couple of days later that under the old Act the Government could not do a damn thing for three months, anyway. There was a freeze on the authority to prospect and the Government could not reissue it.

The press then reported a new decision. I cite the AAP report of 21 May—

"Mr Goss revised his opinion expressed in Parliament last week that CRA had 'missed the bus.'"

He further told the news conference that CRA and Agip, which had not indicated they could proceed with the project, still had the chance to "run down to the next bus stop" because of the three months' moratorium. That bus leaves on 30 July.

What a simple way for the Premier to try to explain to the mining industry that he does not understand it, that he does not know the correct way to make an offer or that there was a three-month moratorium. Less than a week before that, he said that they had missed the bus.

I can imagine a cartoon depicting what I am saying. The three friendly parties are sitting on a bus. CRA and Agip are running like blazes beside the bus towards the next stop. The three on the bus are saying, "We don't want you two. We are on the bus." Do Government members think that is a reasonable way for negotiations to take place? Do they think it is reasonable for those two groups to be running along beside the bus trying to get their hands onto the rail while the three sitting on the bus keep the door closed and keep them out? That is not a proper way for business to be done. The business community and the coal-owners' association see the Government for what it is. It cannot deal with business. The people who believed that this Government would be reasonable in its handling of this matter now realise what a disaster it has been.

**Mr McGrady:** That is not true.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** According to one gentleman on the other side of the Chamber, the industry has said that.

I draw to the attention of Government members an article in the *Courier-Mail* of 17 May 1990 headed "Calls for fresh Ensham tenders" by financial writer Ron Watson, which reads—

"Pressure mounted on the State Government yesterday to call fresh tenders to mine the lucrative Ensham coal deposit after the favored Japanese-led consortium revealed it had no supply contracts."

It has been claimed that the industry did not say that what I am saying is correct. Later, the article reads—

"Queensland Coal Association executive director Mr Bob Macleod said yesterday: 'If they are going to cancel ATPs in this form, why weren't other sectors of the industry given the chance to bid for Ensham?'"

That accurately states the mining industry's stance.

**Mr McGRADY:** I rise to a point of order. I claimed that the mining industry had welcomed and respected the speech which the Premier gave. That is what we were discussing before.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Clark):** Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** That was a long while ago. I can understand the sensitivities of the member. Government members who try to support the Premier on this issue will be doubly damned because, when they come into it, they know they are wrong. The mining industry will judge the Government on this performance, no matter what happens to the honourable member for Mount Isa.

**Mr Stephan:** Do you think they are trying to prop the Premier up?

**Mr FITZGERALD:** I do not know whether they are trying to prop the Premier up; some of them are trying to pull him down. Many people in the mining industry did not see the funny side of the bus story. Why were those fresh ATPs not issued? I think it is very important that this issue be resolved.

The second point I wish to raise is that the Premier said this was a unique situation. It is unique, all right. The Government will never do this again. I guarantee that it will be unique. The Government has learnt its lesson. It is getting caned from one end of Queensland to the other. The Premier used the word "unique" because the previous National Party Government had held a meeting; Mr Katter had said that an unpleasant decision may be made; and Mr Tenni had written to the consortium on 19 April 1989. The Government actually had to go along with this. The Government has to make the decisions and, when it does, it must make the proper ones. I am afraid that what it has done has been a disaster.

I ask the Premier why this decision is unique. What is wrong with the decision? Is he proud of it? Of course, he is not proud of it; he knows that it is a disaster. The Premier will stand condemned on this issue. He will have to live with it. I will continue to remind him of the blunder made in this case. In fact, I think that the bus he has been talking about is a "blunder" bus. That is a good line! He will stand condemned.

The other issue I wish to discuss is very important. I can understand the Government's desire to have this mine opened. I admit that the previous Government also desired to have the mine open and operating. There has been no suggestion that the National Party has ever denied that, but it would have done things in a proper way. The decision on whether a mine should be opened should be made by the operators. They cannot be forced into it. They have to make the commercial judgment. I understand that it will cost \$400m to develop the mine. A responsible company would make sure that it has contracts for the coal or that firm offers have been made. Because mining is one of the most capital-intensive industries, it would also want to know the price. It is very expensive to open a new coal-mine, particularly when prices have been fairly low for some years and most companies have lost money on their coal operations. The price has picked up a little, lately.

I suggest that Japan has a vested interest in opening up mines throughout the world before they are actually needed so that corporate Japan can have a cheap raw product. I was interested to read a paper that came into my hands recently on the Southam Energy Group's ninth annual energy pricing conference in Toronto, Ontario, in October 1989.

**Mr Vaughan:** You know the Bill amends the Act in certain particulars. You are rambling away from it a bit.

**Mr FITZGERALD:** The Minister should not be too sensitive. It has been agreed that, in the second-reading debate, members have the right to speak on matters relating to the industry. That has been the tradition for some time. I resent any efforts by the Minister to curtail my speech.

The Southam Energy Group ninth annual energy pricing conference was held in Toronto, Ontario, in October 1989 and I will quote a couple of points from a paper delivered at that conference which was about coking coal. The paper was delivered by Jacob Mathew of Westar Mining Limited and part of it states—

"This remarkable accomplishment by the consumers was attained by paying enough price increases to keep the Australian industry barely alive and through strategic investment in new capacity to maintain a constant environment of over supply.

As an illustration, Japanese interests can bring five million tonnes of additional capacity into the market at a meagre investment of U.S.\$75 million. If that could accomplish a mere one dollar per tonne price reduction from what it would have been otherwise, the total investment will be paid off in one year."

In other words, if \$US75m was invested in mine development and coking coal, because the Japanese are buying in the vicinity of 75 million tonnes of coking coal per year, they would have to achieve only a \$1 per tonne reduction in price of the coal that they buy to pay for their investment in that year. The steel industry in Japan gets the benefit from corporate Japan's decision. That country is doing the same with regard to steaming or thermal coal. Another part of this paper states—

"The capital intensive nature of Australian and Canadian industries make them particularly vulnerable to price cuts. Since a large portion of the cost is capital cost, these producers, heavily debt financed, are forced to stay in production for the cash flow so as to service debt, instead of shutting down when prices cease to be profitable. Such assured supply without interruption, despite prices below what the economics dictate, have only whetted the appetite of consumers for further price cuts. This vicious circle must be broken to establish a healthy coal industry that can provide the world with a stable and competitively priced supply of coking coal."

I suggest that exactly that proposition is in place with steaming coal. I can understand why corporate Japan has decided that it wants to bring on a mine before its time. Because of the reduction in supply of thermal coal, there is great competition throughout the world. Queensland must look at its position with regard to the world trade and how demand is increasing.

The Government is probably very keen to establish a new mine. The coal industry is very fragmented. Coal comes from many countries with Anglo-Saxon backgrounds where people do not welcome or deal in cartels. They deal as individual suppliers, are fiercely independent and compete with each other. These countries are dealing with Japan, which has an enormous demand for the product and holds a large portion of the market.

According to page 7 of the annual report of the Queensland Department of Mines, in the year 1988-89 Queensland exported 40.1 million tonnes of coking coal and 18.9 million tonnes of steaming coal. That illustrates the ratio of production in Queensland. When one looks at the countries to which coal is exported, one sees that, out of that 59 million tonnes of coal, 28.73 million tonnes goes to Japan. Japan has an enormous share of Queensland's coal export market. Not too many members in this Chamber would realise which country was Queensland's second-biggest customer for coal in the year 1988-89; it was India. India has steel mills and developing industries and buys 4.259 million tonnes of coal, compared with the 28.73 million tonnes purchased by Japan. India comes a very poor second to Japan. Taiwan ranks third with 3.261 million tonnes, followed by Korea with 3.252 million tonnes. This gives an indication of the dominance of the Japanese market over Australian producers.

The decision on whether or not to open up mines should not be for Governments alone; commercial interests should be taken into consideration as well. If \$400m is to be spent on a project such as the Ensham mine, the people who are putting the money up should be the ones to determine whether they get a return on it. Whilst Governments

might be anxious, they should not dictate to companies that mines have to open within a certain time.

I wish to quote briefly from page 51 of the *Australian Journal of Mining* dated February 1989 which contains a report by Professor Donald Barnett, who is an Associate Professor of Mineral Economics at Macquarie University and Visiting Research Fellow from the Centre for Resource Studies, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. This article is taken from his paper which was presented at CoalTrans 88 which was held in Rotterdam in October 1988. His opening paragraph is quite interesting. It states—

"Australia recently assumed the mantle previously worn by the US as the world's largest coal exporter. Despite the concern of many about the cost burden imposed by the militant coal miners union and the size of government imposts, Australia is now the leading seaborne exporter of both steam and metallurgical coals."

Australia is now ranked as the largest exporter by sea of those two products. That does not take into consideration the large coal producers of Europe, Russia and the United States of America, which have large domestic markets for their coal. On page 54 of the same paper there is a list of total Australian coal exports by destination. In the year 1987-88, 47.6 per cent of Australia's total tonnage of coal was exported to Japan, that is, 48.7 million tonnes. The rest of Asia received 24.4 per cent; Europe, 21.9 per cent; and other areas, only 6 per cent. That is the present picture.

The coal industry really wants to know where this Government is going and what its policy is. The industry also wants to know what the Government's policy is on foreign investment because it has played a major role in the development of coal fields and the mining industry throughout Australia. Most people realise how important foreign investment is, and I think it is rather hypocritical of this Government to say that, although foreign investment is welcome in certain areas, it is not welcome in others. I believe that it is essential to have foreign investment involved in the mining industry.

When the Ensham deal was announced and three companies were riding on the bus at the early stage, two were kicked off and told that if they could run hard enough, they might be able to get back onto the bus later, and at that time I called on the Government to ensure that the consortium would accept conversion to Australian ownership within five years. I believe that the consortium should be Australian owned within that period because, within five years, production should reach full steam and returns would have started to flow. However, when the prices being paid for coal are taken into account and the fact that in Australian dollar values they have risen very little over a period of years, it must be realised that, for a number of years after the commencement of operations, the mining project will be in deficit. Compared to the increasing value of the Japanese yen, the price obtained by Australian producers for coal has continued to go down. The end result is that Japan has become a more powerful competitor on the world trade scene.

I realise that I have spoken for more than an hour on this Bill, and I will not delay the House any longer. I believe that people involved in the mining industry in Queensland should understand the Government's policy. As far as I am concerned, the Premier and his Cabinet Ministers have a long way to go to regain credibility. With regard to the Ensham deal, they have destroyed all credibility and they stand condemned for that. Although I will not condemn them, I know that people involved in the mining industry will, and that members of the public will see this Government for what it really is.

**Mr McGRADY** (Mount Isa) (8.39 p.m.): As a relatively new member of this Parliament, I sat back and listened to what I considered to be the very sensible remarks that were being made by the member for Lockyer. After a short period, suddenly everything changed. Although I had been thinking to myself that at long last honourable members would hear some common sense from the Opposition, alas, I was wrong.

As I represent an area that I believe to be the premier mining community in Australia, it is with a great deal of pride that I address this House on the Mineral

Resources Act Amendment Bill. Let me say at the outset that I was appalled, to say the least, at the way in which the previous Government and, indeed, the Minister, the honourable member for Flinders, Mr Bob Katter, handled this very important piece of legislation.

Honourable members will recall that for the first time in its history the Queensland Chamber of Mines carried unanimously a vote of no confidence in a mining Minister, Mr Katter. I have no doubt at all that the members of that organisation gave the matter a great deal of thought and, in many cases, underwent a good deal of soul-searching, before they arrived at the decision to move a vote of no confidence in the National Party Minister. At that time, they were certainly well aware of the implications of such a move.

From time to time, I hear criticisms of the mining industry and, I suppose, sometimes some of those criticisms are indeed well founded. However, this Parliament, this Government and the public of Queensland must realise that the mining industry plays a major role in the development and economic welfare of this State and of this nation. I make no apologies at all to anybody for being an advocate for an industry that serves this nation and this State so well.

The history of the Mineral Resources Act certainly is interesting, to say the least. The previous Government and this Government consulted with rural producers in five major organisations, namely, the Queensland Graingrowers Association, the United Graziers Association of Queensland, the Cattlemen's Union, the Queensland Cane Growers Council and the Queensland Producers Federation. As far as the mining industry was concerned, consultation was engaged in with the miners through the Queensland Chamber of Mines Ltd, the Queensland Coal Association and Small Mine Associations, which represents the gemfields and the tinminers in far-north Queensland.

The initial moves to rewrite the Mining Act were put forward by the former Mines Minister, Ivan Gibbs, back in 1986 and the Green Paper was produced by Mines Minister, Brian Austin, in May 1987. The White Paper, outlining the draft of the Act, was produced by Mines Minister, Martin Tenni, in July 1989. The Mineral Resources Bill was introduced into the Parliament on 7 September 1989. The Cattlemen's Union attended every meeting with the rural producers from 1977 through to the introduction of the Bill into the House in September 1989. After the Bill was introduced into the House by Mines Minister Tenni, a change in the Ministry resulted in Bob Katter becoming Mines Minister on 25 September.

The Queensland Producers Federation stood firm in its support for the Act. However, in the final days before the second-reading debate was resumed, the Queensland Chamber of Mines was asked to negotiate additional amendments to clarify the compensation provisions and introduce stockyards into the exclusion zone. When that was agreed, all parties acknowledged they would accept the passage of the new minerals Bill. Minister Katter accepted the agreement between the rural and mining industries and ordered the Bill to be drafted accordingly. Cabinet approved the Bill on the following Monday.

Two days later, without the knowledge or consent of the Chamber of Mines, former Mines Minister Katter attempted to introduce six further amendments. On the morning of 4 October, he succeeded in getting Cabinet to approve the amendments. An urgent meeting with the former Premier was called by the Queensland Chamber of Mines and attended by the Queensland Producers Federation. Those two organisations were successful in reaching an agreement with the Premier that the Bill should proceed without Mr Katter's amendments. This was the final form in which the Bill was passed by the Parliament on 6 October.

On Friday, 17 November, a special meeting of the Queensland Chamber of Mines Limited's executive committee resolved to call a special general meeting of its members to brief them on the rapid developments of those past few days and, in particular, to consider the statement of the Minister from the meeting of the Cattlemen's Union on 15 November. It was also resolved that the meeting should consider a motion of no confidence in the former Minister for Mines, Mr Bob Katter. This followed a stream of

conflicting statements in public, lack of support for the Mineral Resources Act and commitments that changes would be made to the Act without consultation of, or agreement with, the mining industry.

That brief history of the events leading up to today should in fact show this Parliament and this State how inefficient the former Minister Katter was and what little regard he had for the due process of consultation and negotiation. It is no wonder that that former Minister today stands, and will be remembered in history, as the only Minister for Mines in whom the mining industry moved a vote of no confidence. Because his actions were taken only days before the State election, they were all the more surprising.

I believe that the new Act will provide benefits to the mining industry and also benefits to the land-owners. In all the discussions I have had with both the land-owners and the mining industry, there appears to be widespread praise and support for the way in which the present Minister has met with and consulted with them and carried out all the promises which he made on behalf of the Goss Labor Government prior to the recent State election.

Some weeks ago, the Premier of Queensland, the Honourable Wayne Goss, attended the official opening of the Hilton mine, just north of Mount Isa. Very few people realise the length of time and the amount of money it takes to in set up and establish a new mine. Work started on the Hilton mine 20 years ago, yet the official opening took place only a few weeks ago.

Many people who are involved in the mining industry realise the important contribution it makes to the economy of this State. Many people have no knowledge whatsoever of the industry. Therefore, from time to time it does not hurt to explain the contribution that it is making to Queensland.

For over 100 years, over 80 per cent of this nation's annual export revenue has come from primary industries, either mining or agriculture. Throughout the years, the contribution of those two great industries may have changed, but in total they have at all times equalled or exceeded 80 per cent of Australia's export revenue and, since the mid-60s, over 40 per cent of Australia's export revenue has come from the mining industry. That situation exists today and will continue into the foreseeable future. I think we can all claim with a great deal of pride that the mining industry has the runs on the board and certainly has a proven track record.

In the 1960s, Bob Dylan recorded a song which became a huge hit throughout the world titled *The Times they are a Changing*. Of course, the times have changed. When that song was written, there was a mood throughout the world for radical change. But one thing that did not change was the contribution of the mining industry and the nation's dependence on that industry for its development and provision of a good standard of living for its people.

Currently the industry contributes to the Federal Government almost 19 per cent of total tax revenue raised from industry, accounting for some 45 per cent of total export revenue, and directly and indirectly employs over 200 000 people.

In 1987-88, processed and unprocessed minerals contributed \$16.6 billion to Australia's export earnings. This year that figure is expected to reach some \$20 billion.

The mining industry's contribution to Queensland's economy is even more pronounced. In 1987-88, coal and non-ferrous metals accounted for almost 65 per cent of the State's export revenue and almost 25 per cent of all Government moneys raised in the State. As the member for Lockyer stated, within the last 20 years throughout Australia, the mining industry has built 25 new towns, 12 new ports, 20 airfields, 2 000 kilometres of rail line, 15 dams and thousands of kilometres of roads.

Every tonne of ore which is brought out of the ground represents new and additional wealth to the State and to the nation. In many industries we see people simply moving money from one area to the other. We see people making millions of dollars on the

stock markets of the world. Yet people who live and work in the mining communities are the real wealth-creators—the real wealth-generators of this State. I believe that due consideration and acknowledgment should be given to those people who toil to create the wealth of this State.

When one looks at the map of Queensland and sees dotted around the State the small mining communities and sometimes large mining communities, one can see how decentralised the State is. One can also see the major contribution that those mining towns are making to the goals and ideals of decentralisation in Queensland today.

In most mining areas we witness excellent industrial relations. In the main, unions and employers sit down around a table and thrash out their problems in a spirit of cooperation. Today, I place on record the major contribution which the Mount Isa work force and Mount Isa Mines Limited have made in the field of industrial relations.

After much blood, sweat and tears in the early 1960s, owing to the efforts of a number of people, a system has evolved which has basically kept our city free from industrial strife and, at the same time, been able to ensure that the living standards of our people are indeed compatible with those in other parts of the State.

People should never forget the fact that so many people come to the small mining communities and learn their trade or their profession and then go back into the big cities to continue their learning. It is a great teaching ground for so many people. Let nobody forget the hidden benefits which mining communities provide. Again, I mention my own city of Mount Isa in which not only does the industry provide direct employment for over 4 000 people, as well as 5 000 jobs indirectly, but it also provides work on the railway system from Mount Isa to Townsville and ensures the jobs and the livelihood of so many people living in the City of Townsville through the copper refineries, the Townsville Port Authority and the transport system. As a direct result of the operation in the Mount Isa mineral field, many jobs have been created.

I have great admiration for those pioneers who came before me and helped to develop this nation and this State. When we discuss the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill, it would be wrong if we did not pay special tribute to those men and women who today may be small in number but still have the great pioneering spirit, who want to go out themselves as fossickers and gougers, and hope and pray and work for that find of metal, whether it be gold, silver, lead or zinc. That is still the great Australian dream. That was the spirit on which this country was built. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that, in a number of places in Queensland today, that spirit is still alive and well.

The Goss Labor Government has developed a three-part strategy to improve service to the mining industry, to improve miner/land-holder relationships and to encourage multiple land use and provide an acceptable climate for the acceleration of mine development, whilst ensuring adequate protection for land-owners' rights and the environment. The three-part strategy as it appears in this Bill is—

- (1) A number of strategically located district offices with mining registrars, field officers and other support staff under the control of the Department of Resource Industries.
- (2) A Statewide computerised mining tenure database, including both graphical and non-graphical data.
- (3) A complete review of the mining legislation and associated procedures.

Each of these three parts is integral to the success of this Act.

This Act has been drafted so that, as much as possible, it details the requirements which normally apply in a given situation. However, provisions are included to allow discretion to be exercised in some other circumstances.

I have no doubt at all that all members of this Parliament would be familiar with the provisions of the legislation which is now being debated in this Parliament. As I said in my opening remarks, I believe that I can speak with some authority on this Bill, coming as I do from the premier mining city of Australia, or, as the Irish President described it on a recent visit to Mount Isa, "The core of a great nation."

I arrived in Mount Isa in 1964. It was the first experience I had ever had of a mining community and mining men and women, and over this long period I have been convinced of the necessity of this industry to our way of life—not only the way of life in Queensland but also right throughout this nation. It also provides much wealth to the whole world.

When people discuss the pioneers of this nation, they usually refer to the men. The pioneers also brought with them their wives. We must never forget the role that the women played. They put up with the heat, the flies, the loneliness, the floods, the droughts and every other inconvenience. In fact, Slim Dusty wrote a song called *The Women of the West*. He certainly summed up his true feelings for those women.

Recently in the City of Mount Isa one of the local ladies wrote and directed a play called *The Presence of Women*. Marge Henderson detailed in that play the trials and tribulations of the women of the west. The play has certainly been a great success in our city. If ever it reaches the City of Brisbane, I advise honourable members to go along and see it.

From time to time, I hear people criticise and decry the industry with which I am involved but, as I said in my opening remarks, there have been instances when mining companies have not done the right thing by the community. However, I think that in the main those days have gone, and there is still a general realisation by people on both sides that far greater care and attention has to be given to revegetation of those areas in which mining has occurred than has happened in the past. I again instance the situation in my home city in which the company has spent large sums of money on a revegetation program which I believe, and it is generally accepted, to be a great success.

Mining communities today are not places where people come and work for six or 12 months, earn big money and move away. Mining communities in the main are places to which young people come, and in which they raise and educate their families. More and more people are retiring in these communities, which indicates to me, and no doubt should indicate to this Parliament, the great turn-around which has evolved in the way that people act and think.

I would again claim that legislation cannot right all the wrongs, or certainly it cannot solve all the problems, and in this legislation there is a clause that provides that some of the points can be reviewed in 12 months' time. In fact, a committee will be set up to supervise this review. I certainly hope that when the Minister is setting up this committee, he places on it people who have a genuine interest in the development of the mining industry and are not there simply to attempt to score points at the expense of individuals, companies or, indeed, the industry of which I am part.

Queensland has been blessed with an abundance of resources and, as I have tried to explain in this speech tonight, the greatest resource we have is our people. Given the opportunities, those people—both men and women—who live and work in the mining communities will continue to produce wealth for this State. I hope that, as a result of this debate today, there is a far greater understanding by members of this House and, indeed, members of the community of the significant role which the mining industry plays in the everyday life of Queenslanders. I ask honourable members to consider the situation if the Treasurer of this State or, indeed, the Federal Treasurer, had to try to compile a Budget without the revenue which is gained from the mining industry.

in conclusion, I hope that, whilst the mining industry will and should continue to pay its way through legitimate taxes and charges, the Government does not embark on a policy of milking the industry dry, because in the long run that will never ever be to the benefit of the State, the nation or, indeed, the Government.

I place on record my gratitude to those pioneers who left the relative comforts of city life and made the track to the inland to discover and to develop the industry as we know it today. I know no greater example of the saying, "From small acorns grow large trees", than the mining industry of Queensland.

I know that the Director-General, Mr Kevin Wolff, is in the lobby. Mr Wolff has certainly been a servant of this industry. Everyone who has worked in the industry holds him in very high regard. On behalf of the premier mining community in Queensland, I wish him well in his retirement. I think all honourable members could say, "Well done, dear servant."

I support the Bill and trust that all members will give it their full support.

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (9.00 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to join in this debate. I intend to begin where the previous speaker left off, by offering my best wishes and those of my party to Mr Kevin Wolff. For quite a number of years Mr Wolff has been a major player in the mining industry. Although he intends to retire at the end of this financial year, I am sure that he will find that, in retirement, his services are in demand just as much as they were in his previous full-time employment.

**Mr Sullivan:** Do you get McGrady to write your speeches?

**Dr WATSON:** No, I have not stooped to that.

It is obvious that this Bill is exceptionally important, because the mining industry is exceptionally important within this State and country. As previous speakers have indicated, some feeling for that can be gained from the fact that mining and agricultural industries contribute a vast amount to Australia's export earnings—something like 80 per cent.

In the past 40 years, the relative positions of mining and agriculture have changed. In the past, mining contributed a very small percentage to our export earnings. Today, it contributes slightly more to our export earnings than does agriculture.

Because the mining industry is important to this State and nation, this is an important debate. The members of the Liberal Party intend to support the legislation. We recognise that this Bill makes some marginal changes to legislation that has already been passed by this House, although it has not been proclaimed. The Mineral Resources Act, which was passed last year, makes some significant improvements to the lot of certain land-owners, particularly leasehold-owners. This Bill actually extends that process a little further.

The Liberal Party accepts that mineral rights belong to the State and have remained so since early this century. We accept and understand that the Crown must be given reasonable access to those mineral rights. That access certainly will be made available through the allocation of mining permits to companies. In essence, the Crown has the rights to the minerals, and reasonable access certainly must be given to the Crown.

The Liberal Party understands that competing land uses exist and that no Bill will at any particular time resolve once and for all every competing use. In this case we are considering mining, which from time to time competes with agricultural for the use of prime land. That issue is of concern to land-holders. At other times, mining competes with tourism, environmental concerns and other land uses of the community.

Towns are another potential use of land. In that case, mining competes with housing and accommodation. There is no doubt that, at any one time, various land uses receive various degrees of prominence. It is up to the Government of the day to make the necessary decisions in the best interests of the State and the country. The Liberal Party does not believe that, just because competing interests exist, one particular interest deserves any absolute right of veto. It is up to the Government of the day to make the decisions that it feels are best in the interests of the whole State.

The Liberal Party understands that what this legislation says and how it is to be implemented are critical. Because we take our role in this Parliament and in opposition seriously, we intend to monitor closely the implementation of this legislation.

There is no doubt that some concern will be expressed about the compensation that will be paid over time to land-holders for the dislocation that they endure and the

costs that they incur. As to what the member for Lockyer said earlier—the Liberal Party understands that, during the next few weeks, codes of conduct will be negotiated between the mining industry and primary industries. It will be interesting to see whether the outcome is balanced for both parties.

The Liberal Party understands that the mining industry needs timely and reasonable access to resources. We intend to monitor closely the implementation of this legislation to ensure that the mining industry obtains timely and reasonable access to resources.

The Liberal Party is interested in how this legislation will be implemented in the long term. As I said, we shall monitor that very closely. It gives me great pleasure to support this Bill.

**Mr SCHWARTEN** (Rockhampton North) (9.07 p.m.): It gives me great pleasure to enter the debate at this juncture. As I do not want to be the odd man out, I, too, wish the retiring gentleman all the very best that the rest of his life holds for him.

In supporting this Bill, I guess we must ponder the reason why it is before us. It is before us because of the acrimonious debate that took place about it and which I guess was politically motivated in that it tended to occur around or at least before 2 December last year. I guess that that reinforced the political process to the extent that something had to be done.

Wild allegations were made on both sides. Both the mining community and the land-owning community were at odds. It is hardly surprising that that was the case. Whenever those two groups of people came together, there were major problems. For a start, whether we like it or not, mineral resources are found in places that are beyond the control of all of us. We cannot even blame the National Party for that. Minerals occur naturally in the ground.

When people profess to either leasing or owning land on which a company wants to establish a mine, problems will arise. We have seen that that is so. The resources must be mined where they are. I guess that is the bottom line of disagreements.

However, the Government recognises that there is a need to develop the mining industry in this State. That brings the Government into the whole game of cards, because it is obvious to all concerned that there is some economic need for the development of the industry. With Australia's balance of payments in the state that it is, I do not think anybody needs reminding of that. I guess that the responsibility with which all Governments are charged, be it our Government or the previous Government, is to ensure that both sides in the game get a fair go. One will recall vividly the debate that ensued up to 2 December last year in which both parties said that they were not receiving a fair go.

Consequently, a solution had to be found. That solution is before us tonight. Quite frankly, I believe that this solution was borne out of the Honourable Minister's industrial background, because when problems arise they will be dealt with in exactly the same way as an industrial dispute is dealt with. When disputes arise in which people are obviously at odds with one another, poles apart and there does not seem to be any happy compromise to be reached between them, it is then up to an independent body to bring them together. I commend the Minister for doing just that. Prior to the election, he promised to do that, and he has done so.

Let us look at the balance that has been derived from the process of negotiation. I will speak very briefly about some aspects of the Bill. Unlike other speakers tonight, I will confine myself to the Bill that is before us. Under proposed new section 3.16 of the Act, the holder of the prospecting permit is required to give to the land-holder at least seven days' notice of his intention to enter onto his land. In other words, land-holders will not have to continually worry about somebody barging in their front gate with a bulldozer at a moment's notice. Seven days' clear notice now has to be given to the land-holder before entry is gained to his property. I think that is fair and reasonable.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Unless the property-owner is in agreement. Unless there is an agreement.

**Mr SCHWARTEN:** Yes, unless there is an agreement to the contrary. I am indebted to the honourable member for Lockyer for his wisdom.

**Mr Prest:** About the only sensible thing he said all night.

**Mr SCHWARTEN:** I would have to concur with the member for Port Curtis.

**Mr Gunn:** Five bob each way.

**Mr SCHWARTEN:** That is enough of the honourable member.

**Mr Prest:** You wouldn't get a sensible comment out of Mr Gunn.

**Mr SCHWARTEN:** No. He is past it.

The amendment to section 5.15 will regulate activities to ensure compliance with the industry codes of conduct. That is very important for the people working in the industry.

Proposed new section 6.33 will allow the land-owner to have the mining registrar investigate proposed exploration programs and, if he considers it necessary, the mining registrar may call a compulsory conference between the parties. One of the interesting things about that is that a breach does not have to occur before that action is taken. Under the present legislation, the provisions have to be breached before the parties can be called together, which is really a case of shutting the gate after the horse has bolted. I think it is sensible and reasonable to go along the path proposed in this Bill. Where the land-holder perceives there will be a problem, he can report it to the registrar and accordingly some action can be taken by way of a compulsory conference which brings the parties together.

The present section 11.12 of the Act was an issue that was raised by the land-holders. This section refers to people who are injured on the site. The land-holder was of the view—and quite understandably, obviously—that should an accident occur on his site, he would somehow be responsible for the damage incurred to the person; in other words, that he would be responsible for any damages in law that may be awarded as a result of the accident.

Proposed new section 11.12 will clarify that issue. Basically, it states that where there is no involvement whatsoever by the land-holder, or where there is a lack of involvement, the issue is clearly at the feet of the miner or the mining company.

The existing section 7.21 relates to the environmental protection that made headlines prior to the election. Under the proposed new section 7.21, the Minister may require an EIS to be carried out. It specifies a two-month period so that the public can view the report that is before the Minister and obviously make comments on it. In the lead-up to a hearing, a two-month period has to expire in which the public can have access to the report and comment on it. If there is some problem with members of the public responding within that period, there is provision for leniency for an extension of that period. I think that is fairly reasonable.

The Bill provides for flexibility in that in the next 12 months this legislation will be reviewed by a bipartisan group of people. That group will include two representatives from the land-holders, two representatives from the mining industry and a representative from the department. If any wrinkles need to be ironed out of this legislation over the next 12 months, that will be done by that group when it reviews the legislation, and I believe that is a sensible approach.

It is with pleasure that I recommend this Bill to the House.

**Mr LITTLEPROUD** (Condamine) (9.16 p.m.): In rising to speak to this Bill, I am reminded by the comments of the previous speaker that the legislation which this Bill amends was debated at the end of the last Parliament. Therefore, this legislation is fresh

in the minds of many members in this House. It represents a refinement of that legislation.

I congratulate the Minister on his second-reading speech. It is easy to read. It sets out step by step what this legislation will achieve. It may also reflect on the director-general of the department, Kevin Wolff, who has always adopted a very pragmatic approach. For some time, I served on the committee of the Minister for Mines and Energy, and I very much enjoyed that experience.

The member for Lockyer has already indicated that the Opposition supports this legislation. His speech comprehensively covered this Bill and other issues concerning the mining industry, and I do not intend to cover the same ground. If I could speak in farming terminology, it would be minimum till to mention some relevant facts.

Although coal resources have been discovered in my particular part of the world, mining operations have not commenced. In other parts of Queensland, agricultural interests have clashed with mining interests. I am aware of the survey that was carried out on the grid patterns by the people doing seismic work for the oil industry and, through my association with the Queensland Graingrowers Association, I perceived the issues that had to be resolved. I pay tribute to the people in the mining industry, the Graingrowers Association, the United Graziers Association and the Cattlemen's Union who, over a protracted period, have gradually worked their way through the various problems. Each party enters a new situation with a fair bit of knowledge about his own particular interests and expertise, but with insufficient knowledge about the point of view and the interests of the other parties. It has taken a long time for those parties and the members of this House, as legislators, to get this legislation right. I believe that this Bill is on the right track.

I was going to spend a few minutes going through the points that the Minister laid out so clearly in his second-reading speech, but I will not do that because the member for Lockyer has already canvassed them and they are recorded in *Hansard*. However, I will comment on the coal reserves that exist in the Condamine electorate. Fortunately, those coal reserves have been discovered beneath the solidic soils, and one could say that those areas contain the least fertile land on the Darling Downs. That being the case, there should be minimum dispute between the farming interests and the mining interests. There is a saying that even the wallabies carry a cut lunch when they go across the solidic soils. Therefore, the people of my electorate do not hold those areas in high regard. It is interesting to note that the use to which those farmlands are put is changing. With the Redland Bay area being built out and the Lockyer Valley becoming overcrowded, people are moving to my electorate and using small areas containing solidic soil for intensive farming.

I note that the Bill provides that the mining warden, when making determinations, will have to take into account current and prospective uses of the land. One can look back with hindsight and say that a certain type of land has been used in a certain way for a hundred years. Sheep are run or cattle are bred on the land. That use will never change. Farmers on the black soil plains believed that they would always grow wheat or coarse grains. Now, farmers in my area are changing to more intensive forms of agriculture. They are moving from a production cost of less than \$100 an acre up to \$300 an acre for dryland and \$500 to \$600 an acre for irrigated land. That puts a whole new emphasis on the style of negotiation that will take place. I commend the Minister for the way the Bill is structured. The prospective uses of the land will have to be taken into account in the future.

I now ask the Minister to give consideration to the development of those coal resources. The agricultural part of the Darling Downs has had a proud record of being one of the most progressive parts of this State. Until the middle 1980s, that area was very prosperous, but over the last four or five years, with the economies of scale and the costs of production in the agricultural field, the position has changed the situation and the Darling Downs is now one of the most depressed parts of this State.

When I was a Minister and moved around Queensland, I noted the quality of life in the provincial areas of Queensland. Those observations confirmed indelibly in my mind the view that the Darling Downs had suffered badly in recent years. The down-turn in the markets, the variation in the seasons and the impact of high interest rates have combined to make farming enterprises less and less viable. Farmers have tried to accumulate larger aggregations of land. That has resulted in fewer people living in those areas, and that impacts on the commercial centres of the towns. If the resource on the Darling Downs can be developed, it will bring a new dimension to the communities in the area.

The work force in the area has plenty of skills in the use of machinery, and it could easily adapt to the demands of the mining industry. In fact, a few years ago, it was hoped that the coal reserves at Macalister would be developed. They are of excellent quality and lie only 30 feet or 40 feet below the surface. Certain feasibility studies were carried out by the Mines Department. However, one problem was finding a market. Then, it was thought there was a market. Secondly, an export port was needed. It was suggested that a brand new railway line could be built across the South Burnett to Red Rocks near Bundaberg. The feasibility costs of that proposal were horrific, because the line would have passed through the intensively used farming lands of the South Burnett and that would have caused many problems. Consideration was then given to using the main western line from Toowoomba. However, the gradients on that line would have created problems, and the Minister would be aware of them, because at the time he was the Opposition spokesman. At that time it was suggested that a tunnel should be built through the Toowoomba range to reduce those gradients.

The next problem was the port of Brisbane. Even though the port of Brisbane has been developed and services the grain industry and other industries, it has only limited capacity for the transshipment of coal. Something like a couple of million tonnes a year can be handled. The Minister would know better than I the tonnage handled. Some of the capacity is taken up by the West Moreton fields. We are hopeful that we can take up the remainder of that capacity. We hope that the people of Brisbane will be a little more tolerant and allow an increased tonnage of coal to make its way through Brisbane. Another problem was that we did not think that a transport corridor through the southern suburbs of Brisbane handling a few million tonnes of coal would be accepted.

**Mr Ardill:** It wasn't, I can assure you.

**Mr LITTLEPROUD:** I know, but people must think about where the wealth comes from as well. We have argued that ad nauseam.

Another proposal was to take a rail line north of Brisbane and have an elevator across the Bribie Passage to a loading terminal on the ocean side of Bribie Island. We ran into trouble with the environmentalists. One miner said it was interesting that many people who had made big money out of the mining industry had retired to Bribie Island and did not want their environment upset by other people transshipping coal through it.

We have a resource in the west and we need to give our local economy a broader dimension. We now have legislation that will allow us to have competing land-users come to terms with what it is all about. I hope that the Government will give favourable consideration to making use of that coal.

I canvassed with Mr Ivan Gibbs another use for this coal, which was power generation. The big limiting factor was water. I canvassed with him the use of the technology developed in South Africa of dry cooling towers which use much less water to cool the furnaces.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Only about one-tenth of the water.

**Mr LITTLEPROUD:** Yes. I hope the Minister will consider that.

Whilst I was waiting for the debate to resume, I watched on the *7.30 Report* a story about a clash of land-users in the Wimmera in Victoria. That area was regarded as some of the best farming land in Australia. Some of it has been farmed by the same families

for about a hundred years. Lo and behold, heavy metal has been found under some of it and the people there are going through the same sort of problems we have worked our way through. If the Minister attends some of the national ministerial conferences, he may be able to lend some of his expertise to other State Ministers.

I am pleased to support the Bill and to support the honourable member for Lockyer.

**Mr DOLLIN** (Maryborough) (9.25 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill because it makes a great contribution to a solution to the vexed issue of land use, to which the community is rightly giving more and more attention. The Government's role in this issue is to provide a framework that allows the different land uses—mining, farming, conservation or housing—to be balanced. The right sort of framework is the one that gives everybody a fair go and should help take a good deal of the conflict out of this issue.

That is something that the Government has tried to achieve across the board through consultation and negotiation. This Government is not about riding roughshod over the interests of Queenslanders, be they miners or farmers. We have always been prepared to listen, as we did before the election. We heard the call of the people of Queensland on 2 December and, since then, we have continued to listen to the people who put us here.

Our Minister listened as well to the groups that were concerned about the National Party's original legislation, and that is why we are tonight debating this Bill, which does so much to resolve that concern. It has not been an easy task. They were worried about compensation, their land and their rights. This Bill widens the scope for compensation, requires miners and explorers to be more responsible and, more importantly, gives the land-holder somewhere to go if he feels that he has a problem.

**Mr Stephan:** Where are they going to go?

**Mr DOLLIN:** The honourable member is being hard on me the first time round. He need not worry. There will be somebody to go to. I have all the faith in the world in my Minister and he will have handled that point.

The right to compensation applies across the board. The Government is being even-handed in this issue, as it strives to be in all matters. The miners and explorers have access to conflict-resolution procedures through the mining registrar.

The purpose of the Bill is to amend the Mineral Resources Act 1989 before it is proclaimed. The mineral resources of this State belong to everyone and it is the Government's role to ensure that the mineral resources are developed responsibly in the interests of this State, not in the interests of one group, be it miners or farmers. The land-use debate requires balance and a carefully planned framework via which that balance can be achieved. I believe that the value of our minerals last year was in the vicinity of \$300m, so we have to be careful not to lock them away.

I strongly believe that, once this legislation is in place, the Government will be able to strike a balance between the needs of the exploration and mining industries and the needs of other land-holders, especially rural industry.

The Bill provides a new objective to encourage responsible land-care management by prospectors, explorers and miners. This will highlight to the exploration and mining industries that, as well as primary producers and other land-users, they, too, must adopt acceptable land-use methods that are environmentally sound.

The compensation provisions relating to prospecting permits, exploration permits and mineral development licences have also been extended to allow the land-holder to obtain fair compensation for injury or loss as well as for damage to his land or any improvements on that land. The Act as it stands allows compensation only for damage. Prospectors will be required to give land-holders at least seven days' notice prior to their initial entry onto land-holders' properties. The legislation as it exists requires notice, but does not specify any period. Another amendment seeks to save miners and land-holders' time and money. If a land-holder attends a court hearing only to find an applicant for

a mining claim and mining lease has abandoned or withdrawn the application, this Bill allows the mining warden—the fellow who will fix it all up—to award costs against that applicant. Similarly, to discourage frivolous or vexatious objections, an objector who does not pursue his objection may have costs awarded against him.

I will briefly outline to the House some of the benefits to both sides, that is the mining industry and land-owners. When drafting the legislation, some hard work had to be done to ensure that it was satisfactory to both sides. The benefits to mining are as follows—

- There will be no restriction on mining on certain improved freehold land, subject to the restrictions in relation to protection of structures, etc., and compensation.
- Reserves can be entered with the consent of trustees.
- There is no requirement for two authorities to enter one parcel of land, which means both coal and gold could be mined if both minerals happen to be there.
- They can apply for a mining claim on freehold land and reserves.
- They can obtain development/retention licences.
- There will be speedier processing of applications.
- No rental will be paid on mining lease applications.
- Amounts of security need not be deposited or paid until immediately prior to commencement of mining.
- There are no statutory labour or expenditure conditions and work commitment is based on the plan of operations.
- There is no requirement to obtain exemption from labour conditions, thereby saving fees.
- There is no statutory limit on the term of mining leases.
- There is no statutory limit on the shape or area of mining leases.
- Transfer of security deposit can occur between tenements.
- There is provision for the recording of dealings on exploration and development tenures.
- Entitlements will continue on application for subsequent tenement.

The benefits to land-owners are as follows—

- Prior notification will be given of any entry to land for prospecting.
- Explorers are to advise all land-owners at least seven days in advance of an intended entry and must specify the program of work proposed and the times when such work is to be carried out. This notification must be renewed every three months.
- Security deposits are required in respect of all prospecting or exploration activities to ensure rectification of any damage to land or improvements, and the amount of security is not limited.
- No prospecting, exploration or mining can be carried out on the surface of Crown or freehold land within 100 metres laterally of dwellings, places of business, etc. and within 50 metres laterally of a principal stockyard or an artificial storage of water.
- The provisions which allow the Minister for Mines to prevent freeholding of Crown leasehold land in areas of mineral potential and resume freehold land for mining purposes have been removed.
- Prior to the Warden's Court hearing of mining leases or mining claims, the land-owners can demand a potential miner to attend a no-prejudice conference to resolve concerns.
- Compensation is payable on mining leases and mining claims specifically for loss of profits to the owner.

- Compensation value capable of having a premium is applied where evidence is produced to the court that the status and use of the land warrants it.
- Compensation assessed on the criteria detail must be increased by a minimum of 10 per cent to reflect the compulsory nature of the actions taken.
- Compensation for damage to the surface of lands where there is no surface area in the mining lease can be negotiated or claimed.
- The terms of the compensation agreement are to form part of the conditions of a lease or claim and non-adherence to terms or non-payment of amounts will lead to the cancellation of the mining title.
- There is provision for non-performers and poor performers to be banned from obtaining further titles.
- There is provision for appointment of local resident field officers to investigate any land-holder complaints and provide liaison between miners and land-holders.

During my life-time, my involvement in mining has been very small indeed. I have had a bit to do with coalmines, but mostly in regard to building houses.

**Mr FitzGerald:** The only time you were a minor was when you were under 21.

**Mr DOLLIN:** I am still a minor, almost.

I congratulate the Minister for the excellent work he has done. It was a very difficult job. Members on this side of the House really appreciate how difficult his job was because——

**Mr Booth:** You are on this side.

**Mr DOLLIN:** Members of the Opposition will have to do better, otherwise members of the Labor Party will be sitting all the way along the benches on the Opposition side of the House.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DOLLIN:** Do Opposition members think they can convert me? That is the only way they will get me on their side.

In addition, the committee did a good job in assisting the Minister. I am pleased with the Bill, because it covers a lot of issues very carefully. Some people might not be completely happy with certain matters that crop up; it is pretty hard to please everyone. If farmers and graziers are satisfied, then the Government has done pretty well, because from my experience in life they are not easy people to keep happy. I am proud to recommend this Bill to the House.

**Hon. R. C. KATTER** (Flinders) (9.37 p.m.): It could be said that the 500 people who attended the farmers' and cattlemen's conference at Rockhampton—if one could call it that—were a bunch of idiots. It could also be said that the 300 people who attended the meeting at the gemfields were also a bunch of idiots. The honourable member for Mount Isa denigrated me in this Chamber in very great detail because a vote of no confidence in me was passed by the Queensland Chamber of Mines Limited. I would like to see him go out to the gemfields and take a vote among the 300 people who turned up at the meeting to which I have referred and ask them what they think, or ask the 500 people who turned up at Rockhampton to take a vote on what they think. Perhaps, as an alternative to all that, honourable members should listen to the seven or eight captains of industry—those people who have numerous calluses on their hands from the hard work they have done underground in the mines. I have met Mr Graham Tucker and I would have to say that I would be surprised if he has ever worked on a boomed jumbo in any of the mines in Queensland; but perhaps I am wrong, and perhaps he is a very experienced miner.

When Mr McGrady comes into this Chamber and laudably commends these people for their great experience in the mining fields, one must ask whom the member represents.

He most certainly is not representing the 500 people who literally travelled thousands of miles to attend the meeting in Rockhampton and he most certainly is not representing the 350 battlers in the gemfields who trooped into the local hall to express the most extreme disgust about the mining legislation that was about to be introduced into Parliament. Numerous flags and placards were hung all around the walls of the hall on the gemfields. The member who represents the area will verify that many of the flags bore the Eureka Stockade's insignia.

All I can say is that when I read certain aspects of the legislation, I was very troubled because I thought that the criticism that had been expressed to me was enormously, unfortunately and sadly very valid. It would not have necessitated a great deal of change to have overcome some of the problems that the people had with that legislation, so I made certain changes—all of which were agreed to by all parties. In spite of the statements contained in the brief that was given to Mr McGrady, all parties agreed to the changes with the exception of the freeholding clause. That is very interesting because, for the benefit of those honourable members who are not aware of the significance of it, I point out that up until the time that legislation was introduced into the Parliament, the laws of Queensland stated that if a person owned a piece of freehold land, it was sacred and the rights of the individual were unassailable. Those laws were adhered to and agreed to, and some of us would be prepared to make very great sacrifices to safeguard them. Simply stated, the laws meant that if a person owned a piece of land, it was his absolutely.

Ever since the Venetians invented money, there has been one sure way that a piece of freehold land could be obtained from a person. Those of us who have a commitment to the idea that the marketplace should decide such matters felt that it was not unreasonable for a miner to pay an economic rent for that land. I point out that economists refer to "economic rent" as an amount of money that would provide the land-owner with a fair return for the land. If a farmer wished to stay on the land—unlike the honourable member for Southport who is a famous football player—because he believed that it was not worth \$1m and that the land was worth more to him if he retained it, then he would sit on it and not sell. Surely in a free market system, that is the way such matters are decided. I would like to think that the people of Queensland enjoy the rights of a free-market society.

Under the circumstances I have outlined, market forces decided those transactions. Surely, that was fair to all parties concerned. However, the proposal put forward in the Act when I inherited responsibility for it ensured that that right was to be struck out completely and that the farmer would be left only with a right to compensation that would be determined by the courts. In other words, his land could be taken from him.

The really terrible aspect of that legislation was that there were literally thousands of people in the State of Queensland who had paid a great deal of money to obtain freehold title. Many people came to see me and I can remember at least one example quite graphically. A man had paid \$500,000 to hold on to his property—his station or farm—so that the miners could not take it from him. He paid \$500,000 to obtain freehold title for the very purpose of keeping the miners out, but the Government came along and changed all the rules. Thousands of people who had obtained freehold title were suddenly left out in the cold.

**Mr Dollin:** You did it.

**Mr KATTER:** No, I did not. I own only pastoral leases. Mining companies can walk in and take over the MHPLs. The interjection is interesting because many people live on properties that are the subject of a miner's homestead perpetual lease. When I heard that a former Minister for Mines intended to change the legislation, I was concerned. Throughout my life I have paid great tribute to the legislators who assembled in this Chamber and put together laws that have served this State well for almost a century. Many of them were Labor Party members, so the Government members can enjoy the kudos associated with that important legislation. Very great Labor legislators sat in this Chamber and gave Queenslanders the decent and fair laws that they have enjoyed in

the past. If any Minister thought he could come into this Parliament and decided to radically alter that legislation and those arrangements without causing earthquakes, he was kidding himself.

In this instance, the earthquakes have not occurred because Mr Vaughan has simply given the mining companies everything they want. The big companies have been able to get from Mr Vaughan every single thing that they wanted. They can say "Thank you" to Mr Vaughan for being a great representative for big companies.

In contrast to that, I felt that some type of fairness should be part of the arrangement. At the first of a number of meetings I had with mining companies—contrary to the rubbish stated by the member for Mount Isa—I put forward what I considered to be a desirable outcome. If the Honourable Minister's departmental officers tell him a different story, I hasten to point out that I did not tell them everything that was happening. I knew that the mining companies had a fairly efficient pipeline into the department and I felt it was fairly undesirable to tell those officers everything. I will not whistle or point, but I advise the Minister to be careful of what he says because there are a lot of open doors in the department. If they gave a bad brief to the Minister who passed it on to Mr McGrady so that he would come into this Chamber and make a fool of himself, the Minister would be well advised not to run off any more departmental briefs. I notice that the Minister has not been doing that, and he would be well advised not to start.

Having said all that, let me now remove any doubt from the mind of anyone who might have thought that this is good legislation. At the first meeting I had with the big companies, I said, "Fair go, fellows. The land-holders now own land that has a value of \$1,000m, but this Act will take the \$1,000m value of the land away from them and assign it to you. At present values, to get those station properties and the land that people call their home, you now have to pay \$1,000m whereas, if this legislation is passed, you will get away with having to pay only \$300,000." I researched the figures in relation to those transactions and obtained prices for comparable sales. The difference between the price that would have to be paid by the mining companies under the terms of this legislation and the price that would be paid under a valid compensation claim was approximately \$300,000 as against \$500,000 or \$1m in the three or four cases I examined.

I said, "Fair go, fellows. You are taking \$1,000m off one group of people and handing it to another group of people." They asked, "Well, what are you going to do?" I said, "Well, I don't know. Perhaps you could offer compensation with 10 per cent, 50 per cent or 100 per cent added to it—I don't know." They went out and made a telephone call, returned and said, "We will accept that." I do not have my notes of the conversation, but I think 10 per cent was the figure that was accepted. Anyway, that was included in the changes that the former Government made to the legislation.

In one five minute session dealing with this supposedly perfect Act, we were able to obtain a concession that was worth approximately \$100m. I thought that my negotiations had been successful and that I had done a good turn for some people who were allegedly suffering.

The old Act said: let the marketplace decide. When Governments start mucking around with price mechanisms and not letting the marketplace decide, unfairness becomes the order of the day. Depending on who has the muscle at the time, Governments can be got at.

In addition, a number of small concessions were made. I regret that the Minister has not included a reasonable provision in the legislation that the former Government undertook to include. I did not speak, as honourable members have alleged, to the mining giants in the State; I spoke to the mine managers—the men out wearing khaki and getting their hands dirty and faces sunburnt every day. They were the ones who were responsible for bringing hundreds of millions of dollars of production into the State. They knew what it was all about. Daily, they had fights and arguments with farmers and station-owners. I asked their advice. I do not say for one moment that they would not have liked to abolish the freehold clause—of course they would have; and I

would have, too, if I was a miner. They maintained that, when an exploration application is made, surely the land-owner must have a right to at least put his case to the person who determines whether or not the exploration tenure is granted. In other words, if I was a miner who was about to set foot on someone's land, surely that land-owner would have a right to at least have a say in the terms and conditions of the exploration tenure.

In many cases, the terms and conditions sought by land-owners are ludicrous and outrageous. No mining company could ever meet some terms and conditions that are sought to be imposed on them. I am not saying that a land-owner should be able to hold up every application by a mining company. I am not being disparaging of the Chamber of Mines; I do not hesitate to say that some excellent people work for it. The men who are actually at the coalface carrying out those negotiations every day said that they could live with certain terms and conditions, but they said, "For goodness' sake, do not allow the land-owner to hold us up. If the matter has to go through long court hearings and appeals, it will go on forever." Provision could be made for the land-owner to be notified by certified mail of a hearing before the mining warden. If he did not appear at the hearing, that would be his problem. However, upon being given notice, he should be entitled to put his case before the mining warden, or whoever else determines the application.

If this problem was rectified, the savings to the State of Queensland, the mining companies and the land-owners would be considerable. Time and time again, problems have arisen. I will refer to a classic case that affected three separate farms. A farmer had constructed contour banks to hold water to enable him to double his grass production and to double the number of cattle that he could stock. Contour banks are expensive to construct. However, after rain, when the grass grows, one cannot see them. At a time when the soil was moist, an employee of an exploration company drove a vehicle straight down the contour banks, causing a hole to form in each of them. The best part of the land-owner's farm was washed down the hill into the creek below. Not only did it ruin the creek, but it decreased the value of the farm.

In cases such as that, the farmer should be able to request the mining warden to endorse on the exploration permit that the exploration company cannot drive down the contour banks. That would save the mining company a huge fortune in compensation, it is not an unreasonable request and it would save the farmer's property. I will not bore the House by referring to other similar cases. The people in the field who are negotiating these deals have informed me that that would be a sensible move and should have been included in this legislation. I have brought it to the attention of the Minister. I hope that he was paying attention.

In the gemfields, the major difficulty is that the new legislation abolishes a number of the old tenures that existed which permitted people to have in the gemfields houses worth up to \$50,000. All of a sudden, when the exploration permit is granted, those people have no right to have the house there and literally lose their homes. Under the new legislation, they lose any rights to their homes. I am deeply disappointed that the legislation does not cater for that difficulty. It would entail only a minor change to the legislation, but it is a very real problem to the people in the gemfields.

I am concerned about a number of minor matters such as distance from watering points. The issues raised by John White—although his language might have been intemperate at times—were not unreasonable. Although the detail may have been unreasonable, the principle involved was not. The initiatives that he requested could be delivered without having them included in the legislation. I do not criticise the Minister for not including them in the Bill. They could be included in the regulations or be provided by administrative fiat. I urge the Minister in the strongest terms to take those matters into consideration.

On the other side, some considerable problems were created in Mount Isa, and most certainly in Charters Towers, where the houses are protected. A large amount of the valuable ore bodies are, of course, underneath houses. In actual fact, the Bill is a very good thing for the citizens of Charters Towers. I was very enthusiastic about the

protection that it afforded the houses. Although I am very pleased that the houses have been protected, there has to be access to the ore body. This legislation clearly restricts very much the ability of the mining companies to be able to access that ore body.

**Mr Smyth:** How do you do it?

**Mr KATTER:** I think that there are ways of going about it, but I do not want to take up the time of the House with details. I merely state the principle.

**Mr Smyth:** I would like to know how you are going to do it.

**Mr KATTER:** If the honourable member would like to speak to me later outside the Chamber, I could explain to him some of the ways in which I believe it could be done.

I publicly thank very much the mine managers in my own area and in other places who have helped to formulate the amendments proposed by the Opposition. They are very reasonable people, who have taken a very strong stand on some issues.

A number of land-holders outside Rockhampton were adversely affected by a technicality in the legislation. I do not want to bore the House with the details. However, it seems to me that they were correct—they most certainly had legal opinion that they were correct—in their belief that, whilst the House was protected to within 100 metres, if a different mining tenure came within 20 metres of the house, mining could occur well within that 100 or 50-metre range of protection. So there was a little quirk in the legislation that led to a serious problem at Rockhampton. I might add that some of the people involved were very unreasonable and very unfair to a mining company that was trying desperately to do the right thing.

I think that Mr Smyth and myself are the only members of this Parliament who have ever worked in a mine. It is not a very happy position to be in.

**Mr Schwarten:** And Mr Pearce.

**Mr KATTER:** I am pleased to hear that a third member of this Parliament has worked in a mine.

**Mr Vaughan:** The Treasurer.

**Mr KATTER:** I do not think he has ever worked in his life.

**Mr Veivers:** It has affected his mind.

**Mr KATTER:** Yes, it has affected his mind.

I have two great difficulties with the administration of the present legislation and with the new legislation. I refer to the extreme unfairness of asking for these huge deposits. The small miners of Queensland made numerous representations to the Opposition. They simply cannot afford to go out mining because of the huge deposits that are required of them. It is not an easy problem to overcome because some people will not play the game.

The small gouger and the small prospector are the people who have found 80 per cent of the wealth that mining produces at present in this State—with the exception of coal-mining. When I hear big mining companies making disparaging remarks about these people and saying, "There is no future for them", I try to resist the temptation of embarrassing them by pointing out that the very mine from which their company derives its wealth was in fact found by a prospector—a person who is supposedly unskilled and untutored in the field of geology. That is the case not only in Australia but also throughout the world.

The other thing that adversely affects the small miner—and about which something most certainly can be done—is the bending of the knee by the department to the environmental lobby, which demands that holes in the ground be filled in. I have had cattle for some considerable period of time. I am a fourth generation mining person in

the sense that, arguably, my family has lived on minefields for six generations. It can be argued that the most valuable resource in Charters Towers is the huge shafts that are still there—those huge holes in the ground—because they contain water. Most of the local farmers utilise that water for farming purposes.

Many of the stations in the Cloncurry area simply would not exist if it were not for the old mine shafts that yield the water supply which is the watering point for the stock. As a land-holder, I must say that one of the most valuable assets one can have is an understanding of one's soil at depth. One can climb down that hole in the ground and find out how the land is composed. That is very important when it comes to the building of dams, detecting poisons in the water supply and actually securing a water supply. As a land-holder, I do not like the idea of every hole in the ground being filled in.

I cannot help but reflect upon the adverse comments that were made about me by the honourable member for Mount Isa and the Chamber of Mines. The Chamber of Mines is chaired by a gentleman called Mr Tucker. Whilst I could say some nice things about Mr Tucker, suffice it to say that his attitude towards running the QIDC was not the attitude of the Government at the time. The Government felt that it should expand and become bigger. Mr Tucker expressed sentiments different from those of the Government of the day. The Government made a policy decision.

I admire Mr Tucker for sticking to his guns. However, he later resigned, and he resigned in such a way that there was a fair degree of tension between him and the Government. He was interviewed by Mr Quentin Dempster, who is most certainly no friend of the former National Party Government of this State. The interview concluded with Mr Dempster saying, "Mr Tucker, you would not be influenced at all in your judgment by the fact that the National Party Government sacked you?" That was the end of the interview.

So I will not say anything about the vote of no confidence by the Chamber of Mines and its illustrious leader, Mr Tucker. In fairness to the man, I could say a lot of nice things about him, too. As I have said on many occasions, whilst I am a person from whom the milk of human kindness flows freely on all occasions—and those honourable members who know me would be aware of that—sometimes I get provoked. As the honourable member on my right—the famous footballer—would say, when people keep punching you in the nose, there is only one thing that you can do, that is, punch back.

The honourable member for Mount Isa denigrated me. In 1964, Mr McGrady was a worker at Mount Isa. In 1966, I was a labourer at Mount Isa. That means that I have a fairly good knowledge of Mount Isa and the people who worked there.

One strike in Mount Isa lasted from 23 August 1964 to 7 April 1965. Although that strike resulted in some excellent benefits, such as the terrible hiding that Cloncurry meted out to Mount Isa in football matches during that year, that strike was a terrible thing. At that time it was the worst strike in Australian history.

Mr McGrady lauded the wonderful relationship between workers and the mining companies and said how wonderful the big companies were. However, he was regarded and honoured as one of the revered leaders of that strike which lasted from 23 August to 7 April. In today's monetary terms, that strike cost the State of Queensland \$410m in export earnings.

I am referring to the person who is touting himself as a successor to Mr Vaughan, and I do not believe that he intends to wait until Mr Vaughan retires. Perhaps Mr Vaughan can use this information to protect himself against Mr McGrady. That strike also cost the Government of Queensland \$30m in lost royalties. If such a wonderful relationship exists between the workers and the mining companies, it is not because of the likes of that man.

The honourable member spoke about the people who developed and built this country. However, he was not one of the people who worked hard to produce the sort

of wealth that has made this a great State. He was most certainly on the side of the niggers in the woodpile and the knockers.

I pay very great tribute to Mr Kevin Wolff. I hope that I am not giving him the kiss of death. I would not be doing this, except that he is retiring. I would not be game to, because of the hallmark of this new Government, which is vindictiveness. It gives me no great joy to say that.

Mr Wolff has always been pleasant to deal with. He has always tried to help, always had an intelligent viewpoint and always tried to be fair to the various parties concerned.

**Mr D'Arcy:** Are you trying to get rid of him?

**Mr KATTER:** No. I just said that I would not give him the kiss of death. Mr Wolff has already announced his retirement. That is why I am game enough to give him the praise which he so richly deserves. In the highest possible terms, I praise Mr Wolff.

The rent on miners' homestead perpetual leases that miners are unjustly charged are a disgrace. They are the only land-holders in this State who have to pay such a tax. It is about time that that injustice stopped, and it should stop right now.

**Mr LIVINGSTONE** (Ipswich West) (10.04 p.m.): I am pleased to support this legislation. In the last days of the former National Party Government, it used its numbers to railroad through a Bill that caused widespread concern throughout the community. Local councils throughout Queensland were very rightly horrified at the implications of that Bill, which the former Premier, the member for Roma, proposed. The National Party even put its own former supporters off side. In the run-up to the last State election, largely because of the Mineral Resources Act, the Cattlemen's Union spoke out publicly against the National Party.

This Bill rightly seeks to strike a balance between the competing needs of land-holders and mining interests. The Bill rightly allows for wider compensation to land-holders and tougher requirements for those who are involved in mineral exploration and mining.

The Goss Labor Government is not anti-mining—far from it. Because of the jobs that mining provides for Queensland families and the wider benefits that it provides for the State and all Queenslanders, the Government welcomes responsible mining companies to Queensland. The approach of the Labor Government to mining is not, and never will be, the redneck approach for which the former National Party Government built a reputation over 32 years.

One of the important parts of this legislation relates to the rehabilitation of areas that have been mined. It was with great interest that I listened to the contributions of the members for Flinders and Lockyer. The member for Flinders spoke about the supposed benefits to people in country areas of some of those holes in the ground.

I live in the Ipswich district, which contains approximately 150 000 people. Unfortunately, coal skyscrapers are scattered throughout my electorate. They are a monument to the previous National Party Government, which did not force mining companies to undertake rehabilitation of the sites that they mined.

The holes in the ground, which honourable members have been told are so good, have created all sorts of problems. There is no doubt that, unless mining companies are forced to undertake rehabilitation of mining sites, tragedies will occur.

Many social problems arise because of dust from coal skyscrapers. Because people are unable to keep their properties clean, they cannot invite visitors around. I have spoken to doctors in the area and they have told me that the incidence of asthma and allergy problems in the Ipswich area is a lot higher than elsewhere in the State. There is no doubt that the large skyscrapers make these problems worse. Had this legislation been in place years ago, such skyscrapers and holes in the ground would not be all over the place as monuments to the previous National Party Government. I certainly look forward to the rectification of some of these problems in the future.

The wider community will welcome the fact that, under this legislation, environmental impact statements must be available to the public two months before any hearing in the Mining Wardens Court. In this way, local communities throughout Queensland will be able to examine local environmental concerns before large-scale mining projects are developed, and there will be a chance for debate about these projects.

Under these amendments, we will see a community that is better informed about what is happening in relation to mining developments in its area. Rightly, the amending legislation allows the Mining Wardens Court to award costs against an applicant who does not pursue an application or against an objector who does not follow through with an objection. In the past, a few mining companies in Queensland used the Mining Wardens Court as though it was their local club.

In some cases, land-holders had little chance of getting justice from the Mining Wardens Court, because so much was stacked against them, and the big mining companies, with their armies of legal advisers, certainly knew the rules. Clearly, legal manoeuvres were used in the past to put land-holders to great expense to attend a legal hearing only to find that the application had been abandoned or withdrawn. However, on the other hand, the legislation will discourage frivolous or vexatious objections. This legislation will help to end a lot of subtle intimidation that was occurring in relation to the Mining Wardens Court.

The Mining Wardens Court will have the power to award costs against an applicant who does not pursue an application or against an objector who does not follow through with an objection. So, many of the games that were played in the Mining Wardens Court in the past will soon end once this amending legislation becomes law.

I welcome the power laid down in this legislation whereby prospectors have to give property-owners at least seven days' notice before their initial entry onto land-holders' properties. Clearly, it makes sense that a set period of notification be provided for entry onto a person's property.

Also, I welcome the power in this legislation for a land-holder who has concerns about exploration work on his property to refer them to the mining registrar, who is required to investigate and, if necessary, make a recommendation to the Minister. As the person on the spot, the mining registrar will also have a range of powers to resolve conflicts as they arise. We have all heard about mining exploration teams knocking down fences and cattlemen who have lost stock because of the actions of some cowboy operator in the exploration business. Under this legislation, those people will be quickly brought to account for their actions and, without doubt, they will become more responsible.

These amendments do not seek to make things difficult for those associated with the mining and exploration industries. They are about giving everyone a fair go. They are about providing avenues for conflict resolution between property-owners and those associated with the mining industry. They are amendments which will make things easier for all concerned.

These amendments are the result of extensive negotiations between land-holders and the mining industry and are clearly illustrations of the way in which things should be done in the future. I support the Bill.

**Mr RANDELL** (Mirani) (10.12 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to speak on this legislation. The Bill has been covered quite fully by members on this side of the House, particularly the Opposition spokesman who spoke for an hour and who covered very competently every aspect of the legislation. As a matter of fact, I think he made mincemeat of the members opposite. They could not rebut him.

**Mr Beattie:** What are you bothering to talk about it for?

**Mr RANDELL:** The last time I saw the honourable member, he was asleep.

I want to refer to the comments made by the member for Mount Isa, who was quite complimentary of the Minister for Resource Industries. He claimed that it was the

Minister who in fact was responsible for this legislation and that it was in fact the Minister who had conducted wide-ranging consultation with those parties to be affected by this legislation. I would like to ask but one question: when did he do it?

I ask that because members of the Opposition are more used to seeing in this House a vacant seat than the Minister for Resource Industries. We believe that, in the past six months, he has been overseas more than he has been at home. He has seen more of the inside of an aeroplane than the inside of this Chamber. I do not blame him for that, because that is his job. I realise that he is actually the most efficient, most hard-working and most competent Minister in the Government. I have been a member of this House for 10 years and I have always been very impressed by him. Even in Opposition he was a man whom we came to respect. He is a hard-hitting and fair person. I compliment him on that.

Members of the Opposition ask the question: when did he get the time to conduct the wide-ranging debate referred to by the member for Mount Isa? No doubt the Premier sent him overseas to deal with certain matters. He had to go. Things were left in a mess when he went away. There was no-one here to take his place.

Nevertheless, the Opposition is pleased that the Minister will accept the accolades for this Bill because he is in fact accepting the accolades on behalf of the National Party. The great bulk of the mineral resources legislation was put in place by successive National Party Ministers who have presided over the expansion of the industry in Queensland. If honourable members opposite are fair about it, they will admit that.

Members of the Government have passed some comments in respect of previous National Party Mines Ministers. I point out again that the National Party was responsible for the successful mining industry inherited by the Goss Government. Some members opposite may not know, although Mr Casey would, that the Minister responsible for getting mining going in Queensland was Mr Ron Camm, who was a Minister for Mines. He was recognised by the mining industry as being the architect of mining in Queensland.

**Mr D'Arcy:** He sold the place out.

**Mr RANDELL:** As a matter of fact, the honourable member is saying exactly what the ALP said at that time, that the National Party Government was selling the heritage of Australians to overseas interests. The ALP opposed the setting-up of a mining industry in central Queensland.

I was in Sarina on the night when people packed the hall to hear Mr Camm debate the Labor candidate for that electorate on the commencement of mining in central Queensland and the building of a railway line. At the time, the Labor Party opposed that proposal, but Ron Camm went ahead.

The National Party Government was responsible for those new towns, the new railway lines, the thousands of jobs and the prosperity that was created for this State and this nation. Honourable members opposite should recognise that. If Mr Beattie would care to visit towns like Coppabella, Dysart, Middlemount, Glenden and Blackwater, he would see what the National Party Government achieved. It established those towns, opened up the hinterland, and built new schools and police stations. That was all because of the policies of previous National Party Governments.

Despite the comments of the member for Mount Isa, the Opposition is concerned about this Goss Government's performance in the area of resource industries. Firstly, there was the Ensham fiasco, which really highlighted to the mining industry the intentions of the Goss Government. At a time when the industry was looking for some direction from the Government—I point out that Mr Vaughan was overseas and the Government was in a real mess—what did it receive from the Premier and the Treasurer? The Treasurer of this State has a record of compounding problems rather than solving them. What did the mining industry get from this Government? Absolutely nothing! Mr Vaughan had to return from overseas and sort those problems out. The Goss Government

played its first card in respect of the mining industry and the responsible Minister was not around to sort that problem out.

The Opposition appreciates that the Minister may have been drumming up business overseas and it does not criticise him for doing that from time to time. However, in this case, his timing was astray. The Government was in disarray and certainly could have done with his expertise. There is no doubt that the Government has made a real mess of this. As the days went by, the Government dug itself into an ever-deepening hole. The Opposition had a line of questioning in place that was stalled because it had no-one to direct its questions to.

The Treasurer, who was confronted with a foreign investment question, ducked and weaved. The Opposition never received an answer from him. When it did hear from the Treasurer, he insisted that Ensham was a development issue, not a foreign investment issue and that his foreign investment review secretariat was not even consulted on it. I point out to Government members that foreign investment is an issue in the mining industry. I urge them to take that into account in their future dealings with the industry. I know that the Minister is listening and will do what I am asking.

As stated by the member for Lockyer, the Opposition supports this Bill. However, I would like to address specifically clause 31, which deals with the warden's recommendation on hearing and, in particular, the idea of appropriate land usage. This is an important amendment and one that I would stress because it takes into account an economic variable, that is, what exactly is the best use of the land. If, on the recommendation of the warden, the best use of the land in question is for farming, that must be the case. If, on the other hand, the best economic use of the land is for mining, that, too, must be the case. The Opposition accepts that.

**Mr Beattie:** Before the election, the farmers weren't impressed with what you were doing.

**Mr RANDELL:** I think one has to have an umpire and in this case one has the warden. He makes a decision which has to be accepted—and the honourable member for Brisbane Central will have to accept it, too. I wholeheartedly support that amendment.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr Kevin Wolff on his long involvement in the mining industry. From speaking with members on both sides of the House and with the mining industry in general, I know how highly respected he is for his integrity. He goes out with the warmest wishes from all parties, and I personally wish him and his family all the best for the future.

In summary, the Opposition supports the Bill, which covers much of the ground of the previous Government.

**Mr SMYTH** (Bowen) (10.20 p.m.): I support this Bill. Firstly, I congratulate the Minister and his departmental officers for bringing before this House this very important issue. Both the mining industry and the farming communities within this State were very concerned about the introduction of this Bill. However, the Minister and his department managed to bring those parties together and I believe this will be very successful legislation.

Land use within this State is the responsibility of the Government. Clause 2 of the Bill inserts an additional objective of the legislation, that is, to encourage responsible land-care management by prospectors, explorers and miners. This clause is to highlight to the exploration and mining industries that, as land-users, they, as well as primary producers and other land-users, must adopt acceptable land-care methods.

People through the State are generally becoming more aware that our valuable land can be washed or blown away. In the past, there have been many cases of land abuse from a wide cross-section of interests of this State. Governments need to introduce legislation to encourage land-users to adopt policies that are acceptable to the people of Queensland.

Land-holders are responding to the legislation introduced by the Federal Labor Government in 1983, which catered for contour ploughing and drainage programs. However, on a State Government level, over the past decade mining industries have destroyed good grazing and farming land. This legislation will ensure that mining industries restore Queensland's rural land to an acceptable standard. Land-holders can be assured that this clause of the Bill is workable.

An important provision in the Bill is that holders of prospecting permits are to give land-holders at least seven clear days' notice prior to the prospector's initial entry onto the land-holder's property, whereas the Mineral Resources Act 1989, which was introduced by the National Party, does not specify a clear number of days.

We know that, last year, when the Bill was introduced by Mr Tenni and then withdrawn by Mr Katter and reintroduced by him, land-holders were very concerned with this aspect of the legislation. It meant that any mining developer could move onto a property overnight, giving only 24 hours' notice, without payment of any compensation.

Land-holders have a right to know, within a given time, who is going to encroach on their property. To allow responsible development in this State, the Bill includes provisions in relation to mining claims and mining leases under which the Wardens Court may award costs against an applicant who does not pursue his objection. This is to discourage applicants from putting land-holders to the expense of attending a court hearing only to find that the application has been abandoned or withdrawn. Similarly, it should discourage frivolous or vexatious objections.

The Mineral Resources Act 1989 does not distinguish between land held by an owner under lease from the Crown, freehold land or a reserve. Consequently, all tenures are treated in the same way for compensation purposes. However, the compensation payable will obviously have a relationship to the type of land involved. Earlier, it was pointed out by Mr Katter that this clause needs to be in the legislation because land that has been developed as good grazing and farming land is worth more to the land-holder than a rocky crest. So that is an important part of the Bill.

The compensation provisions of the legislation applying to the prospecting and exploration permits, the mineral development licences and the mining claims and mining leases, vary. The details of the provisions as they relate to these tenures are set out in the clauses of the Bill dealing with prospecting permits and exploration permits. Under the provisions of the legislation, compensation is not payable in advance prior to the grant of these tenures.

Provision is made that, notwithstanding that a security deposit is taken to be used to rectify any damage caused to the land or any improvements thereon, an owner of land may apply from time to time to the Wardens Court to determine compensation for damage caused by a person acting or purporting to act under the authority of a prospecting permit or exploration permit. The court must take into account any security already utilised in relation to that damage.

The difficulty with the previous legislation arose because of the incompetence at that time of Mr Katter in not being able to bring the land-holders together. He may claim that it is very difficult to talk to 300 miners or mine-owners. It is clear that the National Party, particularly Mr Katter, has been very arrogant. This Bill is a very responsible one and is something that the National Party could not have achieved, and I recommend it to honourable members.

**Hon. K. H. VAUGHAN** (Nudgee—Minister for Resource Industries) (10.24 p.m.), in reply: I begin by thanking all honourable members for their comments on the Bill and on matters relating to the mining industry. As they would be aware, this legislation has had a pretty rough passage through the House. It was introduced on 7 September last year and was passed, with some amendments, in October last year. It has not yet been proclaimed.

In the lead-up to the last election, a good deal of controversy was raised, mostly by land-holders. As a result of that controversy, certain propositions were put to all

parties. During the election campaign, I gave an undertaking to land-holders and to the mining industry generally that I would endeavour to overcome the problems that had been raised with me. The result is the Bill being discussed tonight.

Subsequent to my appointment as Minister, I convened a conference of land-holders and other people in the mining industry throughout Queensland. My aim was to get the parties round the table and involve them in negotiation, conciliation and consultation. The success of my efforts is borne out by the support given to the Bill by the Opposition and the Liberal Party.

This legislation will replace the old Mining Act. All of the problems raised by land-holders about mining on their properties occurred under the old Mining Act. It is my firm conviction—and judging by the speeches tonight, it is the opinion of the Opposition—that the Mineral Resources Act will go a long way towards overcoming the problems that developed over the years.

As indicated by some Government members—and I confirm it—once this legislation has been proclaimed, an ongoing consultative committee will be established to monitor its progress for 12 months. The committee will be representative of both land-holders and the mining industry. If, at the end of 12 months, there are any problems, we will address them.

Because of the lateness of the hour, I shall keep my comments brief. The Opposition spokesman, the honourable member for Lockyer, indicated that the Opposition supported the Bill. I am very appreciative of that.

He referred to the provisions in the Bill relating to entry on roads. That provision is necessary to clarify that local authorities own the roads. The provision is designed to clarify the ownership of roads.

The honourable member also referred to the code of conduct contained in the Bill. As he and other honourable members would be aware, over the years, the mining industry and the land-holders have negotiated a code of conduct. That code has been adhered to in the main by genuine and sincere mining people. As far as I am concerned, it is only on very rare occasions that some of the less responsible mining people have seen fit not to comply with that code of conduct. The code is presently being renegotiated between the rural groups and the mining industry. This is an industry code and must be drafted by the industry. The Government does not have a hand in it.

The Opposition spokesman referred to clauses 18 and 25 and the fact that the land-holder can report to the mining registrar in his locality if he is concerned about the whole or part of an exploration permit over his property. The amendment extends the provisions to allow examination of a proposed exploration permit if the land-holder feels that the holder of the permit over his property may be breaching the terms and conditions of the exploration permit. It must be remembered that exploration permits will replace authorities to prospect. The land-holder can then go to the mining registrar and make a complaint. The mining registrar then has the power to convene a compulsory conference between the holder of the exploration permit and the land-holder in order to try to resolve the differences that may exist. This improves the consultation process. It is my aim to ensure that consultation does take place.

The Opposition spokesman made reference to the environmental impact statements being published. As the amendments indicate, in cases when I as Minister require an environmental impact statement to be produced—and in the past these statements have not been readily available—the legislation will make those environmental impact statements available two months before objections are heard so that the parties can study the environmental impact statement and prepare their case when they go before the Mining Wardens Court.

The Opposition spokesman referred to public concerns about rehabilitation and that there should be a reasonable bond. The Government and I certainly agree with that. The member for Flinders raised the point that the amount of bond could be prohibitive for certain miners. I am aware of the possible problems that might occur

and the Government will give due consideration to them. I have spoken to small miners around the State and have taken their concerns on board. The Government will see what it can do in relation to that matter. I will refer to the other matters raised by the honourable member for Flinders later on in my reply.

The Opposition spokesman raised the Ensham question, which has been canvassed in the House. It is unfortunate that I was overseas at the time, but on the Friday prior to my leaving for overseas on Wednesday, 16 May, I made a statement about the Government's decision concerning the Ensham project. However, I wish to make a brief comment. All of the parties to that joint venture were written to well before the authority to prospect expired. Two subsequent letters had to be written to some of the parties in order to obtain a response, and a decision was made on the basis of that response. It would be an idea if the Opposition spokesman studied the provisions of the current Mining Act, particularly in relation to authorities to prospect and their standing. I also suggest that he has a good look at the provisions in the Mineral Resources Act relating to exploration permits, and in particular to section 5.14.

The Opposition spokesman claimed that the Japanese were interested in opening up mines to provide a surplus capacity. I do not think that is the case. The Japanese are very astute businesspeople. Tomorrow I will be making a statement in this House concerning my overseas trip.

**Mr FitzGerald:** I thought the Premier was going to talk about it earlier at one stage.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** No. I had already received information in this regard because of my previous discussions with JCDC of Japan concerning the structure of the Japanese power industry. My assessment of the power industry in Japan is that it will be substantially converting its generating capacity in order to use more coal. It is possible that, by 1993, Japan might need another 10 million tonnes of steaming coal and by 1998 it might need an additional 18 million tonnes on top of that figure.

I turn now to deal quickly with some of the matters raised by other speakers in this debate. The member for Condamine raised the question of land use on the Darling Downs. One of the purposes of this legislation is to deal with land use and, as the honourable member for Mirani stated, the provisions in the legislation will provide that, on hearing an application for a mining lease, a warden will take the appropriate use of the land in question into consideration. He will be given the responsibility to weigh up the pros and cons, that is, whether the land is more suited mining or whether it would be better used for agricultural or other purposes. The question of rehabilitation is addressed significantly in the Mineral Resources Act and the Government will be paying close attention to that, particularly in areas such as the Darling Downs, in the event that coal mining proceeds in that region.

Finally, I turn to the comments made by the member for Flinders. He raised the question of the freeholding clause. As I understand it, freeholding did not prohibit exploration and, in fact, land-holders do admit that in many instances they have demanded three to four times the value of their land. The minerals under the land do not belong to the land-holder, they belong to the people of the State. The grant of freehold always reserves the minerals and access thereto to the Crown. In relation to the other matters mentioned by the former Minister, I point out that the Minister will grant the exploration permit and that the permit can include hundreds of parcels of land. He suggested that land-holders have the right to veto or to have a say.

**Mr Katter:** Not veto, have a say.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** The matter concerns up-front agreements, and the former Minister was suggesting that land-holders should be consulted before an exploration permit is granted. As the former Minister would be aware, there are thousands of authorities to prospect; similarly, there will be thousands of exploration permits granted over areas throughout the State. Those exploration permits or authorities to prospect include hundreds of different parcels of land and might involve hundreds of land-holders. It

would be absolutely impossible to undertake consultation of that magnitude, as suggested by the member for Flinders.

The honourable member also mentioned speculation concerning houses on the gemfields. Under the original legislation, houses situated on land that is the subject of a mining claim are required to be removed when mining has ceased. However, arrangements have been made with the Lands Department to allow title to be granted to householders under the provisions of the Lands Act.

I also thank the member for Moggill for his contribution to the debate. I note that he supports the legislation. I thank also the speakers on the Government side of the Chamber for their contributions. I am very pleased that there is no opposition to this legislation. I sincerely trust that when the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill is proclaimed and becomes operative, any problems that may arise will be able to be resolved by the consultative committee that will be set up. I certainly intend to honour the undertaking I have given to review the legislation after 12 months to see whether improvements can be made to it.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Hon. K. H. Vaughan (Nudgee—Minister for Resource Industries) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—

**Mr FITZGERALD** (10.41 p.m.): I seek clarification from the Minister. At approximately nine different places, an amendment is proposed to be made substituting the word "approval" for the word "recording" and also substituting the word "approve" for the word "record". Because the amendment will affect many of the clauses, I ask the Minister to explain the impact of the amendments and their meaning.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** Subclauses (a) and (b) clarify that the lodgment of a caveat in respect of a mining claim prevents the approval of subsequent assignments or mortgages, and not merely their recording on the register. The member refers to the proposed amendment whereby the word "recording" will be omitted and will be substituted by the word "approval". Fundamentally, it means that the issue of a caveat has to be approved. If it is not approved, it affects registration. That is the reason for the change of words.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13—

**Mr FITZGERALD** (10.44 p.m.): The Minister responded to some comments I made with regard to the code of conduct that is referred to in clause 13. The Minister said that negotiations are taking place presently between representatives of the mining industry and land-owners. My information is that in 1982 a code of conduct was agreed to and that, at this stage, agreement has been reached between land-owners and mining companies.

If that is not the case, can the Minister give an assurance that no code of conduct will be used unless the mining industry and land-holders agree to it? The Minister has indicated that he will not move in and set a code of conduct and that any code of conduct would have to be agreed to by representatives of the mining industry and land-owners. I seek an assurance from the Minister that, if there is not an agreed code of conduct, he will not interfere.

I seek the assurance because the code of conduct is now written into legislation and, if the legislation is breached, heavy penalties apply. In those circumstances, the

mining companies will be placed in a very awkward position, and I think they should be given the assurance that no code of conduct will be imposed upon them unless it is an agreed code of conduct.

I believe that a code of conduct should be in place. It is difficult to cover all the details and domestic matters in legislation. However, if a miner is disciplined, the mining warden can take note of breaches of a code of conduct. I ask the Minister to assure the Chamber that no code of conduct will be imposed upon the miners without consultation.

**Mr VAUGHAN:** The whole thrust of the discussions that have taken place this year related to consultation. The code of conduct has been inserted into the legislation. It is not a voluntary provision; it is mandatory. That code of conduct is to be achieved by a consultative process.

My departmental officers have been successful in arranging discussions and achieving a consultative process between the land-holders and the mining industry. As I said in my reply, the parties will be required to reach agreement on any modifications to the code of conduct. The Government will not interfere with the framing of the code of conduct; it is for the industry. If the Government attempts to interfere, to force a code of conduct upon the parties, it will not work. My aim is to improve relationships between land-holders and the mining industry. If that is not achieved, not only will the mining industry be adversely affected but also the livelihood of the land-holders will be adversely affected.

The Government wishes to get away from the confrontation that has existed over the years and to improve the relationship that it has established. When the legislation is proclaimed, an ongoing consultative committee will monitor its operation. I believe that a reasonably good relationship has been established between both parties. I hope that it continues.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 14 to 46, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## MINING (FOSSICKING) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p. 1855).

**Mr FITZGERALD** (Lockyer) (10.50 p.m.): I assure the House that the debate on this Bill will not take as long as the debate on the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill. The Opposition supports the legislation. It notes that a fair proportion of the legislation is consequential to the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill. The other major part in this legislation deals with miners' commons. I welcome the control of the miners' commons being passed over to local authorities and possibly other interested bodies in the areas of the gemfields. The Minister has brought reasonable amending legislation before the House. The Opposition supports the Bill.

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.51 p.m.): The Liberal Party supports the Bill. As the member for Lockyer said, this Bill is consequential to the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill.

**Hon. K. H. VAUGHAN** (Nudgee—Minister for Resource Industries) (10.51 p.m.), in reply: I thank the Opposition spokesman on Resource Industries for his support for the legislation. As he indicated, it follows on from the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill. It amends the Mining (Fossicking) Act to bring it into line with provisions that are contained in the Mineral Resources Act Amendment Bill.

I also thank the member for Moggill for his contribution and his support.  
Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Clauses 1 to 44, as read, agreed to.  
Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## GOLD COAST WATERWAYS AUTHORITY ACT REPEAL BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 5 June (see p.2207 ).

**Mr VEIVERS** (Southport) (10.53 p.m.): Once again, the Goss Government has failed to recognise the Gold Coast as a city and a region in its own right.

This House has already debated the Fire Services Bill. I do not intend to go over ground that has already been covered. However, I think it is important that I highlight the continuing erosion of local communities of interest that has occurred under the Goss administration.

The Fire Services Bill achieved exactly what this Bill aims to achieve, that is, it took the decision-making process away from the local community and centralised it in the bureaucracy. Decisions in respect of fire services are now being made by a body that is not representative of Gold Coast interests. That legislation, introduced by the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, was not well received on the Gold Coast, and I venture to suggest that come tomorrow the Minister for Transport will be in the same boat—metaphorically speaking.

This Bill provides for the scrapping of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority and allows its functions to be taken over by the Harbours and Marine Corporation—

**Mr Hamill:** Harbours Corporation.

**Mr VEIVERS:** Yes, the Harbours Corporation; I stand corrected.

What this Bill actually provides for is the scrapping of an efficient body and its replacement by a body which, by its very size, will be less efficient. It is a case of replacing efficiency with inefficiency—the hidden agenda of the Goss Labor Government.

The big losers in this decision are once again the people of the Gold Coast, who are beginning to wonder whether they are going to win any concessions at all from this Goss Government. Once again, in respect of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, they have lost. They have lost because the functions of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority will be taken over by the faceless bureaucrats in Brisbane. Bureaucrats will be installed in the mega Transport Department—a department which has administrative centres dotted all over the City of Brisbane, a department that is clearly proving to be unworkable, even for the very young, able and well-educated Minister.

The Gold Coast Waterways Authority was created to overcome the very difficulties associated with a centralised bureaucracy. It was created to maximise community input into both the ongoing operations of the authority and, indeed, into the decision-making process. It was the principle of a community managing its own affairs and not being treated along with the remainder of Queensland. And that is not being elitist in any way. Those Government members who consider it to be elitist should consider carefully the waterways system of the Gold Coast, in particular, the abundance of canal estates and the Broadwater. It is a unique waterways system—a waterways system that is the gateway for tourists.

The natural resources of the Gold Coast, the demand for those natural resources and the need for them to be governed locally were the driving forces behind the establishment of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. That authority has not been without its critics. That was inevitable.

**Mr D'Arcy** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Perrett): Order!

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

However, I want to outline to the House just some of the achievements of the authority. Its crowning achievement, of course, was the construction and management of the Gold Coast Seaway, which put some stability into that very dangerous waterway.

**Mr D'Arcy**: This is the worst speech you've ever made.

**Mr VEIVERS**: The honourable member would not know, because he has not listened to it.

I must say that the construction of the Gold Coast Seaway was largely the result of a lot of work by my predecessor, the late Doug Jennings. He did a marvellous job.

**Mr D'Arcy**: He wanted them sacked, too.

**Mr VEIVERS**: I will take that interjection. Doug Jennings quite often had spats with the man who owned Sea World at the time, Mr Keith Williams. Mr Jennings did a very good job for the constituents of Southport. He helped to ensure that the Gold Coast Seaway was built.

I wonder whether this could have been achieved, or even considered, under the present mega Department of Transport? Of course not. There was a community-based organisation reacting to community concerns. The authority tapped this concern and got the project off the ground. It achieved its task, and it did so very efficiently.

Under the administration of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, the people of the Gold Coast always received efficient and speedy service. One of the functions of the authority was to consider applications for pontoons and jetties. It was able to process these within seven days, that is, seven days from lodging the application to receiving the okay, or otherwise. That is a record to be proud of.

Let us consider the record of the then Department of Harbours and Marine in approving applications for jetties and pontoons. It must be remembered that there were not as many of them in those days, either. It generally took the Department of Harbours and Marine between 6 and 12 weeks to approve an application, or reject it. That is one week as compared to 12 weeks. In no way do I condemn the many officers of the former Department of Harbours and Marine. The simple fact is that their workload was increased. They did not have the local knowledge and the specialities of the Gold Coast authority.

As to costs—for the privilege of having to wait an extra 11 weeks, the people outside the Gold Coast had to pay about twice as much. The Gold Coast Waterways Authority charged \$190, whereas a similar application lodged with the Department of Harbours and Marine cost up to \$400. The people of the Gold Coast were well treated by the authority, and generally support its continuation.

The Minister for Transport has justified the axing of the authority on the basis of efficiency and sound public administration. I ask the Minister: how does he reconcile this with the figures and achievements that I have just outlined to the House? This Bill is designed simply to appease the Minister's vanity and to control the operations of his department, which is clearly too big and unwieldy.

This Bill does not have its basis in sound public administration and does not create increased efficiencies. This Bill has been introduced because the Minister wants to deal only with the Director-General of the Department of Transport, not the head of the authority. The Bill is designed also to cut down the ministerial workload because the

likes of Coaldrake and Davis have given him an unworkable department. They are the Minister's experts. The public administration gurus who looked for efficiency found inefficiency. They searched for gold and found rock. The Gold Coast is now being made to suffer for that. Once again, the bureaucratic law of the jungle will be the order of the day.

The Minister for Transport should take a long-overdue lesson in public administration and protocol. When the Government announced the axing of the authority, it did so in the traditional way. It announced it in the *Courier-Mail* before—I repeat "before"—it had advised the board members. That is the same way as it acted yesterday in regard to the board of the Small Business Development Corporation.

**Mr Hamill:** Not so.

**Mr VEIVERS:** That certainly is so.

People who had provided invaluable service to the authority and the local community definitely deserved better. After the announcement was made in the *Courier-Mail*, a dear John letter was sent to the board members. That letter was supposed to go to the Mayor of the Gold Coast. However, it was not addressed to the mayor or even the aldermen. In fact, it was not even addressed correctly. That is the sort of shambles that occurred.

The Mayor of the Gold Coast is held in very high esteem and he does a very good job. However, the Minister, who is a Rhodes scholar, did not even know who was the Mayor of the Gold Coast.

**Mr Stephan:** Did the drover's dog deliver it?

**Mr VEIVERS:** He is in Yarralumla, I believe.

If the simple administrative matter of correctly addressing a letter is beyond the capacity of the Minister, one may well wonder how he carries out his other ministerial duties. The people of the Gold Coast know not to expect much from the new arrangements. They know that this is just another Bill in a long line of anti-Gold Coast Bills. I will tell honourable members why the people of the Gold Coast know that.

The people of the Gold Coast hear what is said about them in this place. They heard about the comments of the Minister for Administrative Services, who refers to my electorate as the white-shoe brigade electorate. I do not mind that. They know that the Premier constantly ridicules my electorate and that of the honourable member for Surfers Paradise. Quite often, the Premier tips a bucket on Mr Borbidge. Unfortunately, Mr Borbidge cannot be present in this Chamber because he has other pressing duties that were forced upon him this morning by the Speaker.

The Emergency Services Minister said that the fire services of the Gold Coast could be administered from anywhere. The people of the Gold Coast are used to such statements. I am used to it, and so are my constituents. They have no voice in Government, apart from the member for Albert, who operates from Beenleigh. That is "Little John". I notice that he is not interjecting now. The people of the Gold Coast know what to expect from this Government.

I pay tribute to the former chairman of the authority, Bill Laver, and the other members of his committee. Bill Laver has been a marvellous person for the Gold Coast.

**Mr Hamill:** A mate?

**Mr VEIVERS:** He is certainly a mate of mine, and I am proud to say so. He did great work as the Chairman of the Albert Shire Council. He was a member of the South East Queensland Electricity Board. Because he was born and bred on the Gold Coast, he knows the local area well. His family was one of the pioneer families of the district. Mr Laver had a great feeling for the Gold Coast, but he was sacked.

Some of those letters were hand delivered by chauffer-driven cars. Am I wrong in saying that?

**Mr Hamill:** A departmental officer, was it?

**Mr VEIVERS:** They were specially delivered by a chauffeur. He also went around and went "bang, bang" to some of them.

**Mr Hamill:** We didn't want to leave them waiting for the mail.

**Mr VEIVERS:** The Minister can be assured that he did not let them know, but the mail got through.

**Mr Hamill:** I respect the decision of Executive Council.

**Mr VEIVERS:** I see. The Minister did not think that it was worth while ringing them up and saying, "Expect a letter in the mail"—not "The cheque is in the mail."

**Mr Hamill:** Sir Walter gets distressed if you take him for granted.

**Mr VEIVERS:** I am glad to hear that the Minister is still so callous. It is terrible.

**Mr Hamill:** It is called respect.

**Mr VEIVERS:** Lack of it.

I have spoken about the Gold Coast Mayor. Other members of the board, including Pat Gay, put a lot of work into the authority.

**Mr Szczerbanik:** What about Burchill?

**Mr VEIVERS:** Mr Burchill, who is respected in that area, puts a lot of work into it. The members were not paid a lot of money to do the job that they did. They were paid a meagre pittance. I feel that they have been treated very shabbily indeed. The people of the Gold Coast will not forget it; nor will I.

**Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (11.08 p.m.):** I was very disappointed with the schizophrenic speech of the member for Southport. I was not sure whether it was——

**Mr VEIVERS:** I rise to a point of order. I find the honourable member's remarks that I am schizophrenic most unpleasant, and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Perrett):** Order! The honourable member will withdraw the remarks.

**Mr ARDILL:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I want to assure you that I was not speaking about the member, I was speaking about his speech. I was not sure whether I was hearing the words of the honest farmer or the words of the white-shoe brigade member for Surfers Paradise. It seemed to be a mixture of both.

**Mr Stephan:** We can understand that you wouldn't be sure.

**Mr ARDILL:** The member for Gympie is never sure of anything at all.

I was also very disappointed to hear the member for Southport defending the board of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority, which he has so trenchantly criticised in the past. It is disappointing that he was not willing to take up the cudgels on behalf of the people of the Gold Coast, but he was willing to support the board, whereas his predecessor was willing to defend with his fists the people of the Gold Coast against this board that was imposed upon them. Obviously, I know a little bit more about this matter than some of the National Party members who have told me that I do not know anything about the Gold Coast Waterways Authority.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Campbell):** Order! The honourable member will return to the subject matter of the debate.

**Mr ARDILL:** Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Tonight, in line with published Labor Party policy, the Minister has brought about an amalgamation of all the transport arrangements of Queensland under one separate

authority. That is Labor's policy, and I believe it is in the interests of this State. It will be a part of the streamlining of the harbour activities throughout the State under a Harbours Corporation and will standardise management and development requirements throughout Queensland.

In addition, this Bill will reduce delays in processing applications, which will no longer be subject to disputes between the local authority on the Gold Coast, that is, the elected council, and the appointed board, which have both had jurisdiction over the same area and have had contradictory goals, attitudes and regulations.

Certainly, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority has continually been the subject of public controversy and has caused considerable public ill-feeling in its heavy-handed approach to the environment of the Gold Coast and to the elected council. This is the crux of the matter: in line with National Party thinking, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority was established to ride roughshod over the interests of the environment on the Gold Coast. As Mike Gore said, "They should apologise to God for what they have done to the Gold Coast."

**Mr Veivers:** Oh, what a load of rubbish!

**Mr ARDILL:** Mike Gore said that.

**Mr Veivers:** Mike Gore—you stood up in this House and ripped him apart.

**Mr ARDILL:** No, I have never done that. Mike Gore was a very charming person. At times, he was inclined to hyperbole, but not in that statement; he never spoke a truer word.

The Gold Coast Waterways Authority had under its stewardship some very important and beautiful areas ranging from the southern end of Moreton Bay to Currumbin Creek. Perhaps I know a little more about the latter than the former. The Gold Coast Waterways Authority had control of all the waterways north of Southport in the Nerang River estuary, all the canal estates from Surfers Paradise to Burleigh, which are all linked together by Little Tallebudgera and Boobegan Creeks, which become Mudgeeraba and Reedy Creeks. All of those waterways are linked together as part of the Nerang River system. The Gold Coast Waterways Authority had control of those waterways, not that that is to its credit.

It also had control of two of Queensland's loveliest waterways, the estuaries of Tallebudgera and Currumbin Creeks. For the interest of National Party members, I point out that my memory of Currumbin Creek goes back to my childhood when we could swim safely in the estuary in clear, clean, unpolluted water. Millions of soldier crabs would run over the sand at low tide. We enjoyed the free oysters from the rocks. I certainly do not thank the Gold Coast Waterways Authority for what it has done in that area. Currumbin Creek was also the set-out point for people in small boats with outboard motors who went out fishing in winter-time when the swell was fairly low. It was rather more difficult when a high swell was coming into Currumbin Creek.

The only thing that can be said to be to the credit of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority is the Gold Coast Seaway. That is another matter of controversy, as I believe about \$57m is still owing on that seaway, which was constructed by the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. It is the one exception that, in some way, is to the credit of the authority. The Harbours Corporation will be quite capable of managing that and probably will do a better job of dredging the area than the waterways authority has done. I am quite sure that this Bill will reduce duplication and reduce delays in processing development applications. It will certainly enable greater control over environmental issues in the Gold Coast area.

I support the Bill before the House.

**Mr CONNOR** (Nerang) (11.15 p.m.): Tonight, I intend to explain my personal opposition to this Bill, why it has such significance for my electorate, how it will affect the people of my electorate and the Gold Coast, exactly how the revenues are earned

and what the likely outcome of the legislation will be. The Gold Coast is losing the waterways authority, which is good, but it is getting something much worse. At least the waterways authority had local involvement.

This Bill is about the Nerang River and the Broadwater and who controls them. It is not just about who receives the money, but what occurs in my electorate and who decides that. Do honourable members believe that Brisbane people care as much about the Gold Coast as Gold Coasters do? That is what this is all about. Decisions about Gold Coast backyards will be made in Brisbane. Brisbane people will not care about the Gold Coast environment—they do not have to live there. The people making those decisions are faceless public servants. They do not have to go to the polls each term and justify their decisions.

I am not interested in this issue just because I am a Gold Coast member. My interest is there because a great deal of the foreshores of the Broadwater cover much of my electorate. Almost the whole of the western side of the Broadwater, from Southport to Biggera Waters is my electorate—right out to the Gold Coast Seaway, including Wave Break Island.

Regularly, I drive along Brisbane Road looking out onto the Broadwater. It certainly is a beautiful sight—the blue water, the sailing boats and the sand dunes. That is what the tourists come to the Gold Coast for, not the high rise, the glitz and the glamour. Tourists can go anywhere for that. Tokyo has much more of that to offer, yet the Japanese spend a fortune to travel thousands of miles to enjoy what Queenslanders take so much for granted.

I return to this Bill and what it is all about—money, control and power. The money that these seabed leases bring in will be syphoned off to Brisbane and into consolidated revenue—money that rightfully belongs on the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast people already pay huge taxes.

**Mr Hamill:** You're not going to lose any money.

**Mr CONNOR:** The money the Gold Coast environment creates should be returned to the Gold Coast.

What guarantees do Gold Coasters have? Honourable members have been talking about these seabed leases, but I feel that it is most important that people realise what these seabed leases are. To make a seabed lease, firstly the company brings in a huge dredge and puts pipes up to the shore where the mudflats and the Broadwater beaches are. Much of those areas close to the shore are quite shallow, and they are popular places for young families to take their children. They can wade and learn to swim in safety without the waves breaking over them.

Much of the eastern side of the Broadwater has already been lost. That area is known as the Spit. Places like Marina Mirage have extended out onto the Broadwater with eateries, shops and boating facilities. At the moment, the Fisherman's Wharf complex is extending out into the Broadwater. The dredge is already pumping continuously out of the channels and up onto the shallows in front of the complex. That is happening right now on the eastern side.

What they are effectively doing is making new land to build on and converting once shallow Broadwater foreshores into multimillion-dollar real estate. Whoever controls those seabed leases has a licence to print money. A quarter of a million dollars a year is what is paid for a medium-sized lease. That is the sort of money I am talking about, and it will increase as the Gold Coast develops.

However, I believe that the major issue is not money; it is the control of the most important and unique asset of the Gold Coast. The local people must retain control of what creates their livelihood. Tourism is the Gold Coast's main income-earner. Everything else feeds off it. Take tourism away from the Gold Coast and one takes away its livelihood and its future. Gold Coasters should control their own destiny.

State Governments do not control the town-planning of normal land. Why should they control the town-planning of land just because it was once covered by water. Just like the Harbourtown dispute, this was a local government responsibility, as the waterways should be. This Government has already set the precedent with its Harbourtown decision. It overruled the previous Government's interference in Gold Coast town-planning, and quite rightly so. Why have a local council with the job of town-planning and take it away? Why have a council at all?

This Government has set the precedent, set its own standards, but this is a blatant exception. Where is the Government's consistency on this issue? The Government is putting the responsibility in the hands of the Transport Department in Brisbane which has a section that deals exclusively with boat movements. This is not about boat movements; it is about property development and who controls it. Property development is where the money comes from, and that is why this Government wants it.

The Gold Coast is unique. Its future, unlike that of many other cities in this State, depends entirely on the maintenance of its coastal environment. Under these circumstances, it is ridiculous to suggest that control over the development of this environment should be placed in the hands of unelected officials living outside the Gold Coast.

Decisions taken on developments at the Gold Coast have a direct impact on the economic future of every Gold Coast resident. Such decisions should be left in the hands of those very same residents. There is absolutely no need to create another bureaucratic decision-making layer above existing local authorities.

I shall give a perfect example of where the difference in attitudes lies. The locals know that, if anyone were to develop the western side of the Broadwater, he would very quickly be voted out of office. The western side of the Broadwater is where the tourist drives along and looks through the window of his car as the Gold Coast puts on its show. That is what makes the tourist stay. No-one—not even the most callous of Gold Coasters—would want us to lose that.

But what about the non-Gold Coasters and the non-elected decision-makers? Will they care about what the local Gold Coasters think when a developer comes along with his fist full of dollars wanting to develop along the Broadwater? We could have the granddaddy of all seabed leases and the largest marina and tourist complex anywhere. It would be another San Francisco Fisherman's Wharf. It could be 5 kilometres long. How much money would a developer be prepared to pay for that?

Could this Government resist it? Does anyone think the Government would really care if the Gold Coast people were up in arms? The Government could use that money to do some pork-barrelling in marginal seats. The Labor Government would say, "Just imagine 5 kilometres of luxury development where all we have now is a lot of shallow Broadwater. Look at all the development dollars coming into the Gold Coast. We have to let the Gold Coast develop." That is what the Government would say. How will it resist the developer when the Treasury coffers are almost empty?

Does the Government not realise that it would be killing the Gold Coast's golden goose because it is the Broadwater that gets most of the tourist dollars there in the first place? No Broadwater, no tourists! We would have to rename the Broadwater as the "Narrow-water" because, when the western side of the Broadwater is developed, that is all that will be left—just a channel for the boats to get in and out.

What about the views of the water? They will still be there—some of them, anyway—but people will have to pay for them. They will have to pay for a meal in a restaurant in one of the marina developments to be able to see the Broadwater. They will have to do that to enjoy what is now theirs for free.

I notice that the honourable member for Albert is the last member listed to speak on this Bill. It was a rather belated decision of his to speak on this Bill.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Campbell): Order! It is out of order to refer to what another member may say in a debate. It is out of order to speak about him.

**Mr CONNOR:** Well, I challenge the member for Albert—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! It is out of order to challenge another member of Parliament.

**Mr CONNOR:** Right. What do members representing the Gold Coast put first—the Labor Party or the people living on the Gold Coast? If I cannot mention the honourable member for Albert, I will have to speak about this in general, won't I?

I want to go on the record now as saying that, if it is proposed that the western side of the Broadwater be developed, there will be total opposition not just from me but from the whole of the Gold Coast. We will not stand for it.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK** (Albert) (11.24 p.m.): Because it was so good, I considered getting a copy of the speech of the honourable member for Nerang and rereading it.

I am honoured to speak to this Bill to repeal the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. I represent the seat of Albert, which contains a large number of waterways that come under the control of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. This area still contains large areas of untouched and unspoiled expanses of water and has to be properly managed for the benefit of future generations, a task which many within my electorate felt could not have been done properly by the authority. It was like putting Dracula in charge of the blood bank.

I would like to remind the members of the Liberal Party of a statement made by their previous leader, Angus Innes. He said that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority would be replaced by a port authority, which is what the Government is doing now.

I should like to give the House some of the history associated with the authority. The authority was set up in 1979 by the National Party on the understanding that it basically would look after the waterways of the Gold Coast. I believe that this was only a smokescreen for its true agenda, which was to cater for developer friends of the National Party.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to continue with his speech.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** It would appear that some members of the board received more than just the \$82 for attending meetings. One of the board members has already been mentioned in that famous publication, the Fitzgerald report, for his long association with the former Racing Minister, Mr Russell Hinze.

**Mr Veivers:** Who is that?

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** Does the honourable member want me to name him?

**An Opposition member:** Yes.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I do not care.

One must look at those involved in the Sovereign Island issue. I refer to Lewiac Pty Ltd and its long association with the previous member for the area, Mr Ivan Gibbs. Look where Mr Gibbs is now. That is one leg of a quinella and I am waiting for the other leg to come home.

The people of Runaway Bay, Paradise Point and other areas can rest assured that there will be no more secret deals behind closed doors. These people fought long and hard against the previous Government. No longer will they be told, "I know what's best for you and that's that." I have been in contact with the local government representative, Alderman Alan Rickard, and he knows my personal view of the authority and he knows the feelings of the people. I support the Bill.

**Mr D'ARCY** (Woodridge) (11.30 p.m.): The last two speeches made by members of the Opposition have caused me to rise to speak in this debate tonight, particularly

the speech made by the member for Southport. He has been quoted many times in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* as calling for the sacking of the board of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority. He followed the late Mr Jennings into this Parliament. Mr Jennings was very vocal in this House, and, as the honourable member for Salisbury stated, Doug Jennings once defended himself by using his fists against one of the members of that authority.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Campbell): Order! That is a personal reflection on a former member of this House. The honourable member will confine his comments to the Bill.

**Mr D'ARCY**: He was a great defender of his point of view against the actions of that waterway authority.

The member for Nerang, who spoke tonight in this debate, really does not understand what in fact the authority was all about, nor does he understand that the people on the Gold Coast actually hated the authority. It was never an elected authority. Tonight, the Government is attempting to give the people of Queensland an overall view of coastal development and, if that is to be done, the authority must go. When one looks at the total destruction of the Gold Coast which has been overseen by that authority and at the things that some of the Opposition members have been quoted as saying, one can understand why the people on the Gold Coast feel that way. Opposition members asked the member for Albert to quote some developers' names and the destruction that they had caused to the Broadwater at the behest of that authority. I can name them. They were the Williamses, the Hansfords, the Gores, the Lewises and the others involved with that authority which oversaw those developers. It was Mike Gore who cut off the river at Coomera and it was the Gold Coast Waterways Authority that caused crowding in the boat harbours, allowed mooring to take place in the rivers and caused destruction of the banks, thereby narrowing the waterways and the Broadwater. This Government has a kind disposition towards coastal development in this State and wants an overall view.

Previous members, such as the former member for Southport, the late Doug Jennings, had some real feeling for the Spit, Southport and the Broadwater, not the rubbish that this House heard tonight from the member for Nerang and the hypocritical speech from the member for Southport, who went against every principle he has espoused——

**Mr VEIVERS**: I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the word "hypocritical" and I would like it withdrawn.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member was referring to the honourable member's speech and not to him personally. It is a frivolous point of order and I warn the honourable member for Southport under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr Hamill**: It wasn't his speech. It was Mr Borbidge's speech.

**Mr D'ARCY**: I realise that it was Mr Borbidge's speech, which is a bit of a worry. I know that the honourable member for Southport did not have his heart in it because he would not take an interjection during his speech. The whole time he delivered his speech he looked down like an errant schoolboy. He was the same when he got into trouble at school.

It is disappointing that this authority which this legislation will dispose of tonight oversaw the greatest destruction in our history of the Gold Coast waterways. I am pleased that the authority will be disbanded, as any sensible member would be, because then there can be some kind of overall planning for the Gold Coast area. I have named some of the disgraceful things that the authority did.

I issue one word of warning—the Gold Coast waterways are overcrowded and overall planning is needed. The Gold Coast does not need the money-grabbing policies of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority in order to build——

**Mr Veivers**: This bloke wanted the Indy race.

**Mr D'ARCY:** How many free lunches did the honourable member for Southport attend at the waterway authority's magnificent building down there? They were after free lunches.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I believe that the honourable member for Woodridge has finished his speech, and I call the Minister.

**Hon. D. J. HAMILL** (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (11.35 p.m.), in reply: The debate yesterday evening and tonight has been remarkable only for the ignorance which has been displayed by a number of speakers in it.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr HAMILL:** I am pleased to hear the "Hear, hears" coming from the Opposition benches because that is where most of the ignorance emanated from.

If I pick up some of the themes that were continually addressed by honourable members opposite and respond to them, we will have done the debate and the public a great service this evening. The first theme was that somehow this Bill is taking away local autonomy from the Gold Coast area. That was the only comment on the Bill made by the Opposition spokesperson. I make the point very clearly that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority was never elected. It is a fact that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority board was known to have been appointed from a pool of friends of the previous Government, and it operated according to its own agenda, without regard for the aspirations of the people of the Gold Coast, and as expressed from time to time during elections to the Gold Coast City Council. This quite clearly indicates that the Opposition is merely weeping crocodile tears at the impending passage of this authority that is unwanted and not needed.

The talk of the rapid turn-around in approvals further demonstrates this fact. If the Gold Coast Waterways Authority was able to turn around approvals in seven days, this demonstrates that these decisions which were being made about the very fabric of the environment of the Gold Coast and the very life-style which the people on the Gold Coast hold so dear were being made totally separate from the decisions that were being made by the Gold Coast City Council and the Albert Shire Council. That was the crux of the tensions which bedevilled the history of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority during its decade of existence.

The financial aspect was another recurrent theme. The honourable member for Nerang spoke about the killing of the Gold Coast goose that laid the golden egg. The only goose that I could identify in the debate this evening was the honourable member.

**Mr CONNOR:** I rise to a point of order. I find the Minister's remarks offensive. I ask him to withdraw them.

**Mr HAMILL:** I withdraw the word "goose".

The honourable member is obviously not well versed in the financial arrangements that will flow from passage of this Bill through the Parliament; nor, indeed, are other members of the opposition parties. Comments to the effect that this legislation is in some way a revenue-raising exercise to enrich the Consolidated Revenue Fund are so far from the mark that a member who is as experienced as the honourable member for Southport should have demonstrated a better understanding than that of the accounting procedures that pertain to the accounts of the Harbours Corporation of Queensland. The Harbours Corporation does not operate from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

**Mr Connor:** Where's the money going?

**Mr HAMILL:** As the honourable member refers to it, the goose that laid the golden egg—and I will restrain myself from making further comments along those lines, Mr Deputy Speaker—operates separate accounts. In other words, the Harbours Corporation operates separate accounts for the harbours that come under its responsibility.

**Mr Connor:** For the whole of Queensland?

**Mr HAMILL:** I take the interjection because, obviously, the honourable member is on a learning curve. He is presently at the bottom of the curve, and he has a long way to go.

The Harbours Corporation operates separate accounts for the various port operations that are its responsibility. I can tell the honourable member for Nerang that those ports operate under commercial arrangements. Moneys paid for port operations are paid for that purpose only, and there can be no cross-subsidisation among accounts in the Harbours Corporation fund.

It is intriguing that all the talk engaged in by members opposite is on the subject of revenue. Not one speaker from the opposition parties has mentioned the very significant debt structure that was generated by the major capital works that had been undertaken. The debt structure will not go away; it must be met through the Harbours Corporation fund.

The Gold Coast is not the loser in this administrative change. Indeed, ever since construction of the seaway, the operations of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority have actually been subsidised by the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Rather than it being a case of people living on the Gold Coast missing out or, as honourable members opposite would assert, that the Gold Coast is self-funding, the people of Queensland as a whole are subsidising the operations of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority.

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

**Mr HAMILL:** Consequently, recognition that capital works are a public responsibility is well founded in this Bill.

I believe that honourable members on the Government side of the Chamber developed very well the points they wanted to make during this debate.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Campbell): Order!

**Mr Veivers:** No! He's telling lies.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Veivers:** Where's all that stamp duty gone? Where has the stamp duty gone?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am on my feet.

**Mr Veivers:** Into consolidated revenue!

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have warned the honourable member once. I am on my feet. I now ask the member to withdraw from the Chamber.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Southport withdrew from the Chamber.*

**Mr HAMILL:** I wish to acknowledge remarks made by a former member for Albert who is the present member for Woodridge. Mr D'Arcy has played a considerable role in drafting coastal protection policies for this State. Let me say that removal of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority will mean that approvals in relation to waterfront matters on the Gold Coast will operate on the same basis as approvals granted in relation to all other areas of the State. They will have to be approved by the Department of Environment and Heritage, which will be a boon for all the people who have been concerned about the despoilment of the environment on the Gold Coast.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 49

NOES, 29

DIVISION

Resolved in the affirmative.

**Committee**

Hon. D. J. Hamill (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

**Mr COOMBER** (11.50 p.m.): This clause concerns members representing Gold Coast electorates. Subclause (2) states—

"Money in any such fund must, as soon as is practicable after the appointed day, be transferred to the corresponding fund maintained by the Harbours Corporation under the Harbours Act 1955-1989."

At present, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority holds \$1.5m to \$2m that has been collected from sand royalties and other fund-raising activities of that authority. More importantly, the existing seabed leases that have been issued to places such as Marina Mirage and Fishermans Wharf Pty Ltd generate funds of about \$1m a year. As increases in the CPI are built into those leases, each year those amounts will increase.

By being transferred to a corresponding fund in the Harbours Corporation, the moneys presently being generated by the Gold Coast Waterways Authority will be lost to the Gold Coast. The funds will not be returned to the Gold Coast to provide harbour and channel maintenance or improvements. A political decision will be made as to where the funds are applied, and they will be lost into general revenue.

Will the Minister explain how those funds will be applied?

**Mr HAMILL:** As I endeavoured to clarify in my reply to the second-reading debate, the honourable member needs to understand that the Harbours Corporation of Queensland operates a series of separate funds for the various harbours which are under its authority. As required under the Harbours Act and Regulations, the Harbours Corporation operates as a corporation sole under the authority of the Minister, and separate accounts must be maintained. Under the definition of the Harbours Act, the area which is currently defined as the Gold Coast Waterways Authority becomes a harbour. The revenue generated from that harbour must go into the fund dedicated only to the service of the

needs of that particular harbour. Consequently, there can be no cross-subsidisation or syphoning off of funds which are generated from the Gold Coast. Therefore, the honourable member can be assured that the revenue which the area is generating will be going to service the debts that are currently the responsibility of the Gold Coast Waterways Authority.

**Mr COOMBER:** Is the Minister saying that the funds that are currently being generated are to be used to offset the \$6m or \$7m Budget entry against the \$50m needed to build the Gold Coast Seaway? Is the Minister indicating that all of the funds that are currently in trust and those that will be generated annually will have to be used for future works and maintenance in the Broadwater?

**Mr HAMILL:** In each of those accounts that are held by the Harbours Corporation, funds that accrue to a particular harbour are used for the maintenance of that particular operation. So in the case of the Gold Coast Seaway, which has a debt structure, those funds would be used to service the debt that currently exists.

The situation in relation to the Gold Coast Seaway is no different to that of ports such as Karumba, those on the Sunshine Coast and elsewhere in the State. The funds that are generated go towards the general maintenance and the continuation of the fabric of that operation and to service the debts that that operation has in terms of borrowings and so on.

I repeat that there will be no leakage of funds away from the Gold Coast area. Indeed, I reiterate that funds have been appropriated from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to supplement moneys that the Gold Coast Waterways Authority has generated to service the needs of that authority in the past.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 11, as read, agreed to.

Clause 12—

**Mr HAMILL (11.56 p.m.):** I move the following amendment—

"At page 3, line 43, omit—

'approved'

and substitute—

'sanctioned'."

This is a very minor amendment. It is simply a matter of ensuring the appropriate terminology, in keeping with other similar legislation.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 13 to 25, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1—

**Mr HAMILL (11.57 p.m.):** I move the following amendment—

"At page 7, line 24, insert—

'Harbours Act and Other Acts Amendment Act 1982 Part IV of the Act

Harbours Act and Other Acts Amendment Act Part III of the Act'."

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

### Third Reading

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

**LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL**  
**Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p. 1846).

**Mr STONEMAN** (Burdekin) (11.59 p.m.): My comments in relation to the Land Tax Act Amendment Bill will be brief. The Opposition supports the amendments. In fact, they are a part of the commitment given by the Opposition when it delivered the last Budget. I want to draw to the attention of the community the Opposition's concern for the escalation of land tax problems resulting from increased valuations throughout the State.

I am particularly concerned about, and mindful of, the fact that the increase in bankruptcies could be due in no small way to the blow-out in land tax revenue and land tax imposts on the community. Through no fault of their own and, in many ways, through no fault of the Government, people are being swept into the land tax gathering arena.

Last year, land tax generated \$75.825m. The Estimates for this year allow for a windfall of \$99m. However, a good deal of reliable information seems to indicate that this year's estimate would be in excess of that sum by as much as 50 per cent. The figure could increase from \$75m last year to \$150m for this year. Although that would be a windfall for the Government, it would create a major problem for many people.

Although the Premier has promised that land tax increases will not go beyond the movement in the CPI, the fact is that when valuations are added to that component, the increases in land tax could be huge. I refer particularly to areas such as the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast and the Brisbane area, which would be particularly hard hit.

The anomalous situation arises in which people are being swept up into the land tax bracket through no fault of their own. I am aware of some of the problems that were raised by my colleague the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He cited one instance in which a land tax assessment increased in one year from \$11,985 to \$20,241. In another case, a small-business operator experienced a land tax increase from \$5,351 to over \$10,000. The Government will have to come to grips with this problem and consider a reform package. It is something that any Government has to consider if it is genuinely concerned about the pressures that increased land tax imposes on the community at large.

Most small businesses pay land tax as part of their outgoings. In our current economic climate, that is an additional burden that they, quite frankly, cannot accommodate. It is emerging as probably the single most significant threat to the viability of businesses in this State. That is one issue that the Opposition will be watching very carefully. The Opposition will be developing policies that will accommodate it.

In the meantime, the person who has the responsibility of gathering land tax should apply the process in such a way as not to impact unfairly upon the community. It must be very carefully monitored so as not to gather up those people who would not usually be gathered up.

The Opposition supports the Bill.

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.04 a.m.): The Liberal Party will be supporting the Bill before the House. However, in this instance the Liberal Party is supporting the Bill not because it agrees with the concept of land tax but because the Bill excludes a further group of people from this particularly inequitable tax.

Land tax was introduced in 1915 by the Labor Party. Although there may have been some good social reasons and revenue reasons for doing so at that time——

**Mr Beattie:** I thought you were an economist, not a historian.

**Dr WATSON:** I said that there may have been. I was not around in 1915. The honourable member thinks that he was around then.

As I said, when land tax was introduced in 1915 it may have had some social and revenue benefits. However, slowly but surely, a great amount of land has been excluded from the purview of land tax. All agricultural land and the majority of land associated with residences has been excluded. This legislation will further that process. All Government leasehold land has also been excluded.

Land tax is falling on a smaller and smaller group in our society. In particular, it has been falling on elderly people. After this Bill is passed, it will fall principally on small businesses. In the first instance, land tax falls on large retail shopping centres. Through the rental system, that is passed on to small-businessmen in those shopping centres. Much of it falls on manufacturers and people such as that.

The issue that bothers the Liberal Party is that the number of individuals in our society who are paying land tax is becoming smaller and smaller. As one honourable member said, it falls on a very productive sector of our society. As another member said, land tax affects the ability of small businesses to survive at any time, but particularly during a period of great downturn.

The people who pay land tax are concentrated in a relatively small area of Queensland. I am sure that the Treasurer would be aware that land tax is now paid by many people in his electorate of Cairns, as well as in Townsville, in the south-east corner of the State—particularly Brisbane—and on the north and south coasts.

**A Government member:** Moggill?

**Dr WATSON:** This Bill probably helped the people of Moggill, which is another reason why it should be supported.

**Mr Beattie:** Always looking after your constituents.

**Dr WATSON:** I am always looking after my constituents. I am a good member.

Obviously, the burden of land tax is falling not only on a small group but also on a very small area of our State. Over the last few years, these areas have also been subject to large population inflows and they look like being the areas which will continue to have large population inflows. They are the areas in which there will be an increasing demand for land and therefore there will be a major increase in the value of land on which the land tax is based.

There are a number of reasons why the Liberal Party has taken its position in relation to the abolition of land tax. It is expected that, when it comes to Government, that will be done. In the meantime, given that this Bill, as I said before, excludes a number of other people who are presently paying land tax—they will not be paying land tax after this amendment goes through—the Liberal Party supports the Bill.

**Mr CONNOR (Nerang) (12.09 a.m.):** As the member for Moggill said, the Liberal Party supports this Bill because it is moving in the right direction. Again, it is really only small business—

**Mr Comben:** Who are you talking to?

**Mr CONNOR:** To the Bill.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will not interject from other than his correct seat.

**Mr CONNOR:** I want to bring to the attention of the House some of the problems that have been discovered in north Queensland in the Cairns area. I have only just received a facsimile copy of a document from the Australian Taxpayers Associations, which is related to the Trinity Beach Ratepayers Association. That association is bringing the Liberal Party's attention to spiralling land tax assessments and also comparing land tax in Queensland with land tax in Victoria.

The association said that, because of the dramatic increases in values of properties in the Trinity Beach area, the land tax is causing many businesses to go—

**Mr Hayward:** Are you talking about reservoirs? What are you talking about, the Trinity Beach ratepayers?

**Mr CONNOR:** The Trinity Beach Ratepayers Association.

**Mr Hayward:** What are they?

**Mr CONNOR:** That is the ratepayers' association.

**Mr Hayward:** They are residents there?

**Mr CONNOR:** Whatever.

As that association said, the effect is disastrous for those who are trying to run businesses. I will quote from the document that I received.

**Mr De Lacy:** If you keep threatening me to introduce the Victorian system, I will.

**Mr CONNOR:** I am not suggesting that the Minister introduce the Victorian system. If he will bear with me, I will make a comparison of the rates; that is all.

**An honourable member:** You were suggesting that you abolish it.

**Mr CONNOR:** I will take that interjection. The Liberal Party's suggestion is that the tax be abolished altogether.

The document that I received states—

"There is a provision which limits the effect of increased valuations—from 1st July, 1988, the taxable value of a parcel of land is the lesser of—

- the Valuer-General's value for the year, and
- 150% of that value the preceding year."

The document continues—

"Serious flaw cancels long-term effect:

Nothing limits huge increases in the taxable values because the 150% limit doesn't apply to the preceding year's taxable value.

All that so-called concession means is that there is a one-year delay in applying the full force of the preceding year's higher value.

Tax up sometimes 1000% to 1400%.

With the minimum exemption unchanged at \$120,000 for Australian residents, even minor adjustments to valuations can have drastic effects on the Land tax charged.

Quite apart from being left low and dry by the airline dispute, with valuations this year having gone up by from 40% to 140%, the plight of business people must be recognised.

Some moteliers faced Land tax increases of 1000% within two or three years. One has been charged 1400% more over two years, as at 30th June 1987—over a period when valuations have risen considerably due to purchases by non-residents.

...

Land tax rates on the taxable value were cut by varying degrees—with the top rate kept at a flat 2.1% although applying in 1987 from \$750,000 instead of the earlier \$400,000.

But since that time, Land tax rates have remained the same over a period when the valuations have risen considerably due to purchases by wealthy, non-resident companies corporations.

If locals own land through a company running the business: Importantly (except for principal residence land held by a home-unit company, or a unit plan) the Queensland Land tax charged to a non-resident company or trust is exactly the same as to struggling local land-holders.

That isn't a racist comment, but we point it out because it highlights the plight faced by many trying to make ends meet following the collapse of the tourist industry in the aftermath of the contrived airline dispute."

The document goes on to mention that—

"A good argument can be mounted for that 1.05 hectares to be increased where the land is outside town areas."

The association is saying that the direction in which this Bill is moving is the correct direction.

I will now compare the Queensland land tax rates with those in Victoria. I will compare the land tax paid by an Australian individual in Queensland with that paid by an individual or company in Victoria. In both States, the tax payable on land that is valued at \$120,000 is nil. When the land value is increased to \$200,000, the tax in Queensland is \$928, compared with \$160 in Victoria, which is quite a big difference. If one takes a land value of \$300,000, the land tax for an individual Australian in Queensland is \$3,248, whereas the amount paid in Victoria is \$750.

**Mr De Lacy:** Do they have exemptions on personal residences?

**Mr CONNOR:** That is comparing apples to apples. That is a direct comparison.

I suggest that the Minister looks at those figures, because that is quite a dramatic difference. I also point out that it is the same for companies.

Many people arrange their affairs in companies or trusts. Many retired people put their property in family trusts and those people should be considered—

**Mr Hayward:** There is still an exemption level on them.

**Mr CONNOR:** Not according to this information.

**Mr Hayward:** It is \$30,000.

**Mr CONNOR:** Victoria puts individuals and companies together.

The Liberal Party's position is to abolish the tax altogether, and certainly this Bill is moving in the right direction. I support the Bill.

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development) (12.16 a.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate. I note that they all supported it, which is very pleasing.

The Opposition spokesman did point out that these are initiatives that were announced in the last Budget, which was brought down by his party. It is a pity that those initiatives were not introduced sooner and that they were left to this Government to introduce. However, most of those initiatives have been introduced at an administrative level and they just needed to be ratified by way of legislation.

I do agree that land tax receipts for this financial year are coming in a long way ahead of estimates. The estimates were revised up to \$99m, as the honourable member said. The Government expects that those receipts will come in fairly close to \$150m, as he said—somewhere between \$140 and \$150m.

As Treasurer, I point out, however, that just because one revenue area comes in above budget, that does not mean that one can go in and cut that one out because there are other revenue areas that are coming in below budget. What one wins on the swing, one loses on the roundabout.

I do recognise the problems that the very rapid increases in land values have created for certain groups of people who have been paying land tax, not least of all in my electorate around Cairns, on the Gold Coast and, to a lesser extent, in some other areas.

I thank the member for Moggill for his support. I am well aware of the fact that the Liberal Party's policy is to abolish land tax, but as is often said, the further one gets away from Government, the more one can promise anything at all. Back in the old days, the members of the Labor Party used to do that, too.

The honourable member stated that when the Liberal Party gets into Government it will abolish land tax. I will give the honourable member some gratuitous advice. The Liberal Party will not get into Government unless it has the courage to stand up and say that it is going to abolish land tax but that it is going to increase another tax to the same amount or else it is going to cut spending in certain areas. There will be fewer police or less money spent on education and other services. The easiest thing in the world to do is to stand up and say that land tax will be abolished.

I have no doubt that tomorrow, when this House debates the payroll tax legislation, the members of the Liberal Party will say that they will abolish that tax, and then, when this House debates the stamp duty legislation, they will say that they will also abolish that tax. Why not? From where the honourable member is sitting, that sounds like a good idea.

I thank the member for Nerang for looking after my area of Cairns and reading out at great length from a submission that comes from the Trinity Beach Ratepayers Association. That document has obviously been sent to me and I have had a look at it. I can understand the concern of that association. I also know that Alan Scanlan, the author of that article, was a Liberal member of the Victorian Parliament for some time. I do not know why he is living in Queensland if he looks back on the tax regime in Victoria with such rose-coloured spectacles. However, I must say that it is the first time in recorded history that a member has stood up in this Parliament, particularly a member of the Liberal Party or the other conservative party, and agitated that the Government should adopt Victoria's tax system.

**Mr Connor** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** As I said by way of interjection, if the honourable member keeps threatening me with the Victorian system, I may just introduce it.

**Mr Connor:** We are not suggesting that.

**Mr De LACY:** The honourable member wasted a lot of time tonight saying how good it was.

**Mr Connor:** I was comparing the rates.

**Mr De LACY:** I know from looking at the last Commonwealth Grants Commission report that the Victorian Government receives exactly twice as much per capita from land tax as does the Queensland Government. If the honourable member says that that is the best way to do it, as I have said, I would be prepared to have a look at it because this Government is always looking at new ways to raise revenue.

**Mr Katter** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I would appreciate it if members do not interject from other than their correct seats.

**Mr De LACY:** Mr Speaker, while you are at it, I suggest that you address the quality of the interjections as well, because they are not very good.

I will raise some of the other issues mentioned by honourable members. People talk about increased valuations and complain that the Government should not be levying land tax on valuations, or rapidly increasing valuations.

I do not care what the member for Nerang said, the system of phasing in that was introduced does overcome those rapid increases.

**Mr Connor:** It does not.

**Mr De LACY:** Certainly the value of the land, for tax purposes, can only increase by 50 per cent.

**Mr Connor:** Why don't you put a 50 per cent cap on the tax, not the valuation. Put it on the tax, not on the valuation. Then it will work. This is an increase of 50 per cent in the tax.

**Mr De LACY:** Because of the way in which this tax is levied, one cannot put a cap on it.

**Mr Connor:** Why not?

**Mr De LACY:** The Government has struck that tax at a certain rate. In fact, this Government did not strike that rate, it was struck by the previous Government.

The honourable member for Nerang said also that the exemption level has not been increased. We have not introduced a Budget yet so we have not had an opportunity to increase the exemption level. It remains what it was in the last Budget, so the criticism that has been directed at us is ill founded. We are living with the system set in place in the last Budget, and that was not by the Labor Party.

I give the guarantee that we will be looking at the exemption levels and at the tax. I appreciate that there are some negatives in this tax, but I must say that there are also some positives.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members will stop talking to each other. I am having trouble hearing the Minister.

**Mr De LACY:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. What I might do is to say, in conclusion, that I thank all members for their contributions and give them the commitment that we will be looking at the threshold and at the whole tax during the Budget session.

Motion agreed to.

#### Committee

Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### Third Reading

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

### SUPERANNUATION (STATE PUBLIC SECTOR) BILL

#### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p. 1847).

**Mr STONEMAN** (Burdekin) (12.25 a.m.): I intend to be brief in my comments—

**Mr Foley** interjected.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I could be goaded into action. The honourable member should not test me.

I acknowledge the intent and the importance of the Bill and certainly the purposes outlined in the Minister's second-reading speech. There is no point in my going over them again.

I wish to comment briefly on the structure and management of the superannuation schemes in Queensland and particularly on their relativity to those in other States. It must be said that the management and the actuarial position of the public sector superannuation funds in this State are models for every other State and something for which previous administrations can be justifiably proud.

When we look at the situation in other States, particularly those such as Victoria that have had Labor administrations for many years, we must wonder how the public servants in those States feel. The Minister is inheriting a public sector superannuation structure that is second to none in this nation. That is a very healthy position. In fact, it was always the proud claim of the previous Government that, if all public servants resigned at any stage, they could be given their cheques as they walked out the door. If that had happened in States such as Victoria there would have been a huge problem and the schemes would have been bankrupted.

Because of the Labor Party's propensity to spend in areas that are not quite as sound as might be the case under a more conservative Government, there will always be the temptation to put the hand up the hollow log and pull money out. May I point out, to use the old country vernacular that, if a person puts his hand up a hollow log, there is a big chance there will be a snake there.

This has happened in other States and it has created a problem. The superannuation funds have been the hollow log that has allowed the John Cairns and the Neville Wrans to be gung ho. I certainly express the hope that the many members of the Queensland public sector continue to be supported by the management and the actuarial position that have been the basis of what is now being amended.

I note that, under the Bill, the Treasury Corporation is to play a continuing hand. Again, that is supported by the Opposition because, in fact, it was set up by the National Party Government.

There is no point in my saying very much more except to make the point that anything that can be done to improve the lot and the security of the public sector in this State must assist in its better management and in the way in which it serves the taxpayers of this State.

I support the Bill. The freezing of the State Service Superannuation Scheme and the establishment of a new process is commendable. The Opposition sees no problem in supporting the Bill.

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.30 a.m.): I rise to support the Superannuation (State Public Sector) Bill, which is the second of such Bills to come before the House.

The Liberal Party believes that if there is to be efficient government and public administration and an apolitical and competent public service, there needs to be competent individuals in that service. In order to attract and retain such individuals, there needs to be a competent remuneration package. These days part of such a remuneration package is a funded superannuation scheme.

The Bill before the House creates a new scheme, although, to all intents and purposes, it will mirror the existing scheme. The Liberal Party supports the introduction of the new scheme. I echo the comments made by the previous speaker, who indicated that one of the achievements of this State has been that superannuation schemes have been fully funded, which I am sure will continue in the future. This has been a hallmark of our State and one that the Liberal Party has always supported.

The Liberal Party supports the Bill.

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development) (12.32 a.m.), in reply: I thank the two speakers in this debate for their contributions and support for this legislation. Basically, this is enabling legislation to establish a new superannuation scheme in the modern way by means of a trust deed. The trust deed will be introduced into Parliament as subordinate legislation and, therefore, will be

subject to the approval or disapproval of the Parliament. I wish to report that negotiations with trade unions have proceeded very well. The trust deed itself has now been drawn up and details of the new scheme will shortly be available for publication.

In response to the comments made by both speakers, in particular the Opposition spokesman, about the actuarial soundness of the superannuation schemes in Queensland—whilst the Labor Party is in Government and I am Treasurer, these schemes will always be actuarially sound. This Government adopts the very strongly held and often enunciated principle that today it will fund all future liabilities and will not build up liabilities for future generations. That is my policy and that of the Government, and it is one that we will stick with.

I thank both honourable members for their contributions. This is good legislation which will lead to the establishment of a very good superannuation scheme; one that is approved by this Government and the employees who will be the beneficiaries under the scheme.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Clauses 1.1 to 4.16, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## **SUPERANNUATION ACTS (MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS) BILL**

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 29 May (see p. 1849).

**Mr STONEMAN** (Burdekin) (12.36 a.m.): Again, I intend to speak only very briefly to this legislation. I make the point that on some occasions the members of the Opposition and their Liberal colleagues have been castigated for speaking at length in the House. When the members of the Opposition are satisfied that the amendments to Acts which are brought before the House are in line with the commonsense approach that we believe should be adopted and do not flout common decency or become too political, they will have no problem in supporting those reasonable amendments. This is one such amendment.

On the other hand, it is the duty and right of every member to speak as often and for as long as he or she wishes on such occasions when there are concerns, particularly with the principles of any Bill. The other day, in a debate on another Bill, it disturbed me that there was a tendency to heap scorn on the Opposition and on the members of the Liberal Party because they wished to speak at length. I do not wish to speak at length on this Bill or on any future Bills, unless there is a concern.

I acknowledge that the primary reason for the change that this Bill is making is to bring this superannuation scheme into line with the Commonwealth Occupational Superannuation Standards Act and Regulations which extend to public sector superannuation schemes from 1 July 1990. In addition, it is a requirement of the Government—and the Opposition supports it—that the legislation brings some proposals into line, particularly those relating to the Police Superannuation Scheme following the recommendations made by Commissioner Fitzgerald.

All matters considered, I believe that the proposals contained in the Minister's second-reading speech—and, therefore, in the Bill—are commendable and reasonable. I see no reason to expand further on those matters. On behalf of the Opposition, I support the Bill.

**Dr WATSON** (Moggill—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.38 a.m.): I also rise to indicate support for the Bill, which is presented as a consequence of changes at the Commonwealth level that take effect from 1 July this year. Under those circumstances, the Liberal Party supports the Bill.

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer and Minister for Regional Development) (12.39 a.m.), in reply: I thank the two previous speakers for their support for this Bill. I also applaud the principle enunciated by the Opposition spokesman who said that, if members of the Opposition agreed with the Bill, they would not speak at length. Let me also say that I will not be introducing legislation that flouts common decency or becomes too political, which means that there will probably be no occasions when the honourable member for Burdekin will speak at great length in this House.

As honourable members have said, these amendments to the superannuation schemes have been precipitated by the need to comply with Commonwealth regulations that will apply from 1 July this year. It is worth while drawing to the attention of honourable members that some changes are being made to the parliamentary superannuation scheme. In spite of the fact that many honourable members are concerned about their future, I am pleased to say that there is nothing in this legislation that will precipitate their departure from this Parliament, members opposite merely face the prospect of an extended stay on the opposition benches.

Motion agreed to.

### **Committee**

Clauses 1.1 to 6.8, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### **Third Reading**

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

The House adjourned at 12.42 a.m. (Thursday).