

NOTE: There could be differences between this document and the official printed *Hansard*, Vol. 317

TUESDAY, 12 MARCH 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

ABSENCE OF MR SPEAKER

The Clerk informed the House that Mr Speaker was attending the Fortieth Seminar on Westminster Parliamentary Practice and Procedure in London.

The Chairman of Committees (Mr C. B. Campbell, Bundaberg) read prayers and took the chair as Acting Speaker.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Acting Speaker--

Animals Protection Act Amendment Bill;
Adoption Legislation Amendment Bill;
Residential Tenancies Act Amendment Bill;
Registration of Births, Deaths and Marriages Act Amendment Bill;
Racing and Betting Act Amendment Bill;
Legal Aid Act Amendment and Public Defence Act Repeal Bill.

ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Nomination of Mr R. K. Hollis

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Honourable members, I inform the House that I nominate Mr Raymond Keith Hollis, Temporary Chairman, to act in the office of Chairman of Committees during the absence of Mr Speaker.

PANEL OF TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN

Resignation of Mr T. J. Perrett;

Nomination of Mr L. W. Stephan

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Honourable members, I inform the House that I have received the resignation of Mr T. J. Perrett, MLA, from the panel of Temporary Chairmen. Pursuant to the requirements of Standing Order No. 13, I nominate Leonard William Stephan, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Gympie, to fill the vacancy on the panel of Temporary Chairmen caused by the resignation of Mr T. J. Perrett, MLA.

REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, pursuant to the resolution of the House dated 27 November 1990, I lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Register of Members' Interests

REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

Report

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: I table a copy of the first report on the Register of Members' Interests, January 1991.

Ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions--

Adoption Law Amendment

From **Mrs Edmond** (29 signatories) praying for significant changes to the Adoption of Children Act Amendment Act 1990.

Tobacco Levy Increase

From **Mr Santoro** (54 signatories) praying that the tobacco levy be increased and that the proceeds be channelled into an independent foundation for health promotion, research and sponsorship of sports and the arts.

Religious Education

From **Mr Sullivan** (99 signatories) praying for the Education Department to be directed to abandon all work on the P-10 religious education curriculum and allocate resources to the existing religious education system.

Speed-limit near Schools

From **Mr Beattie** (29 signatories) praying for the urgent implementation of a speed restriction to 40 kilometres per hour in the vicinity of all schools.

A similar petition was received from **Mrs Edmond** (669 signatories).

Bank Hours, Holidays Act Amendment

From **Mr Prest** (100 signatories) praying that the Holidays Act be not amended to allow banks to open for business on Saturdays and certain public holidays.

Ambulance Service, Injune

From **Mr Cooper** (173 signatories) praying that all funds raised within the existing Injune ambulance area be retained for use in that area.

Moura Court House

From **Mr Harper** (926 signatories) praying that the operation of the Moura Court House be continued.

Petitions received.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table--

Regulations under--

Police Service Administration Act 1990

Tobacco Products (Licensing) Act 1988-1990

Workplace Health and Safety Act 1989-1990

Building Societies Act 1985-1990

Co-operative Housing Societies Act 1958-1990

Co-operative and Other Societies Act 1967-1990

Orders in Council under--

Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act 1990

Retirement Villages Act 1988
Referendums Act 1989-1990
Rules under the Casino Control Act 1982
Proclamation under the Corrective Services (Administration) Act 1988-1990.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Report: *Timeliness in the Tabling of the Annual Reports of Statutory Bodies*

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns--Treasurer) (10.05 a.m.): I lay upon the table of the House the report upon action taken or proposed with respect to recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts in regard to *Timeliness in the Tabling of the Annual Reports of Statutory Bodies*.

Ordered to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO AMBULANCE SERVICES

Appointment of Mr V. G. Johnson

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth--Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.06 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move--

"That Mr Vaughan Gregory Johnson be appointed to the Parliamentary Select Committee of Inquiry into Ambulance Services to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr Thomas John George Gilmore from the committee."

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Recommendations of Parliamentary Select Committee of Inquiry into Ambulance Services

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth--Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.07 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday, State Cabinet considered some of the major recommendations of the Parliamentary Select Committee of Inquiry into Ambulance Services. In considering those recommendations, Cabinet acknowledged the findings of the parliamentary committee, the matters raised in the debate in the Parliament and the submissions that have been made to me by ambulance committees and individuals since the report was published last year.

Cabinet has agreed with recommendations 8.2 and 8.3 of the select committee's report to establish a Statewide ambulance service to be known as the Queensland Ambulance Service. Cabinet has decided to amend other recommendations, specifically those related to local ambulance committees. The role of committees has been a concern of communities around the State since this inquiry began early last year. Under the new structure QATB committees will be called local ambulance committees. The role of these committees will be appropriately enhanced in terms of administering a formal service auditing function. Committees will be able to measure the quality and quantity of the services within their area of jurisdiction in a very precise manner.

In essence, local ambulance committees will be responsible for the following--

managing the trust fund for funds raised locally, bequests and donations and responsibility for allocation of these funds for service enhancement;

providing advice on planning for the operation of ambulance services in their area;

planning and promoting community participation in the ambulance service; and

managing fund-raising in areas of responsibility.

There will be little change to the system that exists in relation to committee-owned property and assets. A central trust fund for retention of assets for a committee will remain with the Minister as the trustee. At present this trust fund operates for local committees with the Queensland Ambulance Services Board as the trustee. This decision should allay the fear of local committees that the Government will take their assets. I would also like to place on record that the Government has no intention of closing any ambulance centres throughout the State. Nor will it take away from local committees any equipment or assets which have been paid for with funds raised locally.

Cabinet also recognises the role played by honorary ambulance officers and has changed recommendation 48.1 to read as follows--

"No honorary ambulance centres will be closed nor will honorary ambulance officer positions be abolished.

It is intended that honorary ambulance officer positions and honorary centres will only be phased out if or when it can be established that there is a need to employ full or part-time officers at a centre and when funds become available."

I will table in the Parliament a list of the recommendations considered by Cabinet outlining the position taken by Cabinet on each recommendation.

Further recommendations will be considered by the Government at the appropriate time. However, I should point out to the Parliament that many of the recommendations are long term and will be subject to the normal budgetary constraints. However, at this time the most important decisions have been made and they will ensure we will have a structure which will see ambulance services into the next century. It is planned for this new structure to be in place by the middle of this year.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Queensland Casino Supervision

Hon. K. E. De LACY (Cairns--Treasurer) (10.13 a.m.), by leave: Recent media reports have commented on the alleged activities of Japanese organised crime figures in Queensland. These reports have also suggested a link between these figures and Jupiter's Casino on the Gold Coast.

It is important that the nature and purpose of the State Government's controls on casino operations are clarified to prevent any misconceptions on this matter. Critically, the State Government's role as a licensing authority is to ensure that Queensland's casinos are the cleanest in the world and that there is no corruption or illegality in the operations of the casinos. Fair rules must apply and be enforced. In this, I have no doubt that here in Queensland we have succeeded. However, I must make the point that it is important to achieve the right balance between the rights of individuals on the one hand and the need to enforce strict controls in order to obviate corruption on the other. In this context I draw attention to those who in one breath criticise us for paying insufficient attention to civil liberties in the drafting of our gaming machine legislation, and in the next breath urge us to all sorts of arbitrary action against people suspected--I repeat "suspected"--of having connections with organised crime overseas.

I remind all honourable members that the life-blood of a casino operation is gambling. It is inevitable, therefore, that any casino management will encourage potential patrons, particularly those known to be keen gamblers. In this context, I understand that Jupiter's staff visit a number of overseas countries each year, including Japan, seeking to interest high rollers in coming to Queensland. This is a normal casino marketing practice, and in this regard it should be noted that Jupiter's staff are competing with other Australian casinos and with Asian and Pacific rim casinos for such custom. It is also normal casino marketing practice to provide incentives to those valued customers to continue to patronise the casino, for example, by way of free or discounted meals

and/or accommodation. These arrangements are purely commercial in nature and, by and large, are a matter for Jupiter's management. However, they are monitored by both Jupiter's management and by the Casino Control Division to ensure that they do not go beyond industry levels.

There has been some comment on what are known in the casino industry as junkets. Junkets are visits by a group of high rollers promoted and organised by an operator who receives a payment from the casino by way of commission based on the value of chips purchased by members of the party. The Government does not currently prohibit such visits. However, it does prohibit the payment of commission to anyone organising such visits. To date, Jupiter's has never paid such a commission, nor has any application for a junket ever been made by Jupiter's. The Casino Control Division could not--nor could it be expected to--be aware of each and every high roller who visits the casino. However, there are other more pertinent checks. For example, all Japanese visitors are subject to normal visa scrutiny arrangements by the Commonwealth immigration authorities prior to entry into this country. Both the Federal and State police have a major role to play in this regard. The leaked police report, apart from providing some good copy for the newspapers, at least demonstrates that the police are mindful of these responsibilities. Further, these law enforcement agencies, with access to the police criminal intelligence network, also are provided with access to the surveillance systems that operate at the casino. If known criminals are identified, and this is clearly established, steps can be taken to exclude them from the casino. Of course, if any person is detected cheating at the casino and convicted, that person is automatically excluded.

I have also noted that some honourable members have sought to make an issue of Japanese involvement in the poker machine industry. It is a fact that there are certain gaming machine manufacturers and/or suppliers that have connections with Japanese business. In all cases, as is the normal procedure, the Machine Gaming Division, in conjunction with the Queensland Police Department, has conducted investigations into these companies. No connections with Japanese organised crime have been detected and full clearances from the Japanese police have been obtained for all Japanese citizens concerned.

In conclusion, I assure honourable members that all information and allegations will be taken seriously. The comprehensive system of checks and balances built into the State's casino and gaming machine operations will be continually reviewed and enhanced to the extent necessary to protect the public interest.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

***Courier-Mail* Article on Queensland Railways Restructuring**

Hon. D. J. HAMILL (Ipswich--Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (10.18 a.m.), by leave: Mr Acting Speaker----

Mr Stephan: How many of them are going to lose their jobs?

Mr HAMILL: I knew that Goofy would lead for the Opposition.

The lead story in today's *Courier-Mail* shows just how low a newspaper can go as it plays into the hands of those scaremongering, loose cannons on the other side of the House. The newspaper has now joined the member for Flinders and the member for Peak Downs in spreading untruths and causing unnecessary worry for rail workers. To have a screaming headline promoting a number of railways job reductions----

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order. I find it most offensive that I have been accused of spreading a mistruth. I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Did the Minister actually name the member for Peak Downs?

Mr HAMILL: Mr Acting Speaker, I stated that the newspaper has joined the member for Flinders and the member for Peak Downs in spreading untruths and causing unnecessary worry for rail workers. To have a screaming headline promoting a number of railways job reductions, when that number is not condoned by the Minister or by the Commissioner for Railways, is quite irresponsible.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I will have to ask the Minister to withdraw that comment.

Mr HAMILL: Mr Acting Speaker, I withdraw any inference that the member for Peak Downs may have initiated these untruths.

Opposition members: Withdraw!

Mr HAMILL: Mr Acting Speaker, the truth is that we have not arrived at any target figure----

Mr LESTER: I rise to a point of order. I seek an unequivocal withdrawal.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the Minister please withdraw that statement.

Mr HAMILL: I give an unequivocal withdrawal, Mr Acting Speaker.

As I was saying, the truth is that we have not arrived at any target figure and it really is impossible to quote a number. There is no number. In the past, there have been many wild claims mentioning figures such as 6 000 or 8 000, and even 14 000 jobs to go. It really depends on the day of the week. Today is Tuesday, so the figure mentioned is 6 000. The figure of 6 000 quoted in the newspaper could have come from one place only--Disneyland. It is unreal and unrealistic.

However, the main point about Queensland Railways restructuring, which was so sadly overlooked by the *Courier-Mail*, is that I have repeatedly given my assurance that no Queensland Railways worker needs to fear the sack. Nobody will be sacked. Nobody will be forced out. Queensland Railways is undergoing a restructuring process, which includes a reduction in positions, as Queensland Railways does what must be done to slash a \$480m freight deficit. We are endeavouring to put Queensland Railways on a better footing because it was certainly on shaky ground when we inherited responsibility for it from the previous Government.

Queensland Railways is now doing the right thing by the taxpayers, rail-users and staff--despite what Mr Katter, Mr Lester and the *Courier-Mail* might say. We are not--I repeat "not"--sacking people. We are rebuilding Queensland Railways so that it will be stronger as an employer and as a provider of efficient service to the public.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Effluent Contamination, Rainbow Beach, Tin Can Bay

Hon. P. COMBEN (Windsor--Minister for Environment and Heritage) (10.21 a.m.), by leave: On 28 February 1991, in answer to a question asked in this House, I expressed my concerns about the Rainbow Beach sewerage treatment plant, which is the responsibility of the Widgee Shire Council. At that time, I stated that my department was yet to receive from the council an application for a licence to discharge waste water under the Clean Waters Act. My department had sent application forms to the council on 17 January.

My department has since advised me that it had received the application by 28 February. Departmental officers received the licence application, recorded it and forwarded it to the field officer who was to deal with the matter, without notifying senior officers, staff in my office or me. I have apologised to the Widgee Shire Council for criticising it for not responding to the licence application. However, I do not apologise for expressing my concerns about the treatment plant. I trust that the council's application

for a licence under the Clean Waters Act will facilitate improved management of the plant. Such is my concern that I have arranged with the Widgee Shire Council Chairman for me to visit the plant soon. If my statement has led to confusion in this place, or if the Widgee Shire Council has been embarrassed unnecessarily, then I regret that.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Report of Commissioner of the Police Service

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (10.30): I lay upon the table of the House, pursuant to section 4.7 of the Police Service Administration Act 1990, a report of the Commissioner of the Police Service, which is a certified copy of the register of all reports and recommendations made to the Minister for Police, the Honourable Terry Mackenroth, MLA, under section 4.6 (1) (a) and all directions given in writing to the commission under section 4.6 (2) of the said Act, along with a report of the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission.

The committee is of the view that the format of the report should be approved. I advise that the report was handed to me by the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission, Sir Max Bingham, QC, on Friday 1 March 1991. It is therefore tabled within the period of 14 days, as specified by section 4.7 (4) of the Act. I also table with the document a letter from the Police Commissioner to Sir Max Bingham and a letter from Sir Max Bingham to me as chairman of the committee.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

Mr COOPER having given notice of a question--

Mr COOPER: I table documents relevant to the question.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Former Superintendent J. Huey

Mr COOPER: I ask the Attorney-General: why has he failed to act on serious allegations brought to his attention on 12 February 1990 relating to former Superintendent John Huey?

Mr WELLS: There was no failure to act. I point out that 12 February was some time ago. If the Leader of the Opposition would put the question on the notice paper, I will give him a detailed answer.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I direct that the question be put on notice.

Pornography

Mr PREST: I ask the Premier: is he aware of the community concern about the possibility of explicit pornography being available in Queensland? What can he say in response to those concerns?

Mr W. K. GOSS: As all honourable members would be aware, there is some concern in the community as to what is the appropriate response in a modern and progressive society to the availability of material which can be described under the general heading of pornographic. There are two competing concerns, both of which are legitimate. The first concern is the right of adult Queenslanders to have access to the material that they want to read and on a similar basis to that which operates in other parts of Australia--Queensland now being part of Australia. The second and competing consideration is the concern of some people, particularly families, about the impact that that might have on impressionable young people, particularly if it is readily accessible, for example, in the family newsagency.

Yesterday, this matter was considered in a very general or tentative way by Cabinet. In the near future, it will be the subject of further deliberation. I can signal to the community that Cabinet and the Government are concerned about the basis on which such material might be made available, particularly if it was readily accessible to young people in the general community. We are all aware that, under the previous Government, anybody who really wanted that material was always able to secure it by mail order from Canberra. As Opposition members know from their time in Government, that has occurred in the past and, presumably, it will occur in the future.

The question of how accessible that material should be in general retail outlets has to be considered. Although the Government supports national standards, there is a loophole in or a problem with national standards in the sense that Commonwealth standards on literature involve a voluntary process of classification. We are quite happy to abide by the national or Commonwealth standards, but we feel that there is a need to consider the enforcement of those standards so that some 80 per cent of the material does not come through unclassified, which is what the potential is if the Commonwealth standards are adopted but not enforced by the Commonwealth or the State.

I suspect that before too long the Commonwealth will have to consider or move towards actual enforcement of its standards as opposed to the current voluntary system. In the meantime it is appropriate that Queensland consider a response to ensure that not only do we have national standards--not only are Queenslanders treated the same as other Australians--but also that those standards are enforced so that we balance those competing concerns of the right of adult Queenslanders to see and read what they want to and at the same time minimise the detrimental consequences for young people, the way in which much of the material is degrading to women and the impact on families in general.

Rating System

Mr PREST: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier, Minister for Housing and Local Government. Yesterday, during an interview on ABC radio, the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Alderman Atkinson, attempted to blame the State Government for criticism that her Liberal administration is facing on the issue of rates. I ask: will the Deputy Premier inform the House of the facts of the matter?

Mr BURNS: In the past 12 months, I have spent considerable time suggesting to the Lord Mayor and others in the local government community that they should carry their own can for decisions that they make on rating, not try to hide behind the State Government and not try to blame the valuation system for their problem. On a number of occasions in this place, I have told the local authorities throughout the State that I believe in their autonomy and their right to make decisions and that I will implement recommendations that are brought here and that will help them to run the finances of their cities, towns and shires in the best possible way for their local ratepayers. Honourable members will know that in the past few days we recommended to the councils that they examine the South Australian system, which allows them the possibility of using not only the Valuer-General for valuations purposes but also a private valuer. We have said that they can consider using unimproved valuations or improved capital valuations of land.

I have researched this matter. Last year, the Lord Mayor forwarded to me proposals to amend the financial provisions of the City of Brisbane Act. They were forwarded to my department for consideration, as any changes would affect all Queensland local authorities, not just Brisbane. Included amongst those proposals was one to allow the council to grant a rebate on rates where they had increased above a certain predetermined percentage when compared with the previous year. On face value, that proposal is not without merit, and serious consideration will be given to introducing such an amendment in time for councils to allow relief to ratepayers in their next budget. I point out, however, that I am advised by my department that the package to which the Lord Mayor refers also contains other proposals which could advantage the council and not

the ratepayer. For example, I am advised that the Lord Mayor proposes that the council be empowered to alter its budget at any time during the year and also to alter the rates and charges founded on that budget. Clearly, that would enable the council to increase rates at any time it wished during the year--hardly in the ratepayers' interest.

At present, if the council uses differential general rates, the Valuer-General must assign each parcel of land in the city to the appropriate rating category fixed by the council. Under the proposals submitted by the council, it wants to clothe itself with that power; that is, it would be batting to its own bowling.

As I stated in answer to a question from Mr Schwarten on 29 November last year in the House, I am all in favour of introducing amendments that will enable the council to reduce the level of rates charged on any property. In the case of the current proposals put forward by the Brisbane City Council, there is provision not only for relief but also to increase rates at any time during the year. Honourable members can rest assured that, before the latter type of amendment is considered, I will need to be convinced that the increase in the power is warranted. A complete review of the Local Government Act is being carried out. It was started by Mr Gunn when he was the Minister for Local Government and it is being carried on by my department. A major part of that review is to examine the whole rating and valuation system in regard to charges. That review is a continuing review. I have asked councils throughout the State to forward their proposals to me. The Local Government Association and others have said to me, "Do not react to Sallyanne and others who are trying to blame someone else for their trouble. We want a system. We will carry the responsibility for it ourselves. We will do it properly and we will do it well."

I suggest that Sallyanne Atkinson accept the responsibility for the mess that she has made of Brisbane City Council rating with a differential rating system--a minimum rating system. She should accept that she is forcing people out of their homes at Spring Hill, Manly and other places all over the city and that some of her proposals are designed more to help the rich than the poor. The system is designed to help the rich land-owner and disadvantage the poor land-owner, and the State Government cannot allow that to happen.

Job Reductions in Queensland Railways

Mr BEANLAND: I direct a question to the Minister for Transport. To end the uncertainty and fear now gripping Queensland Railways, particularly following the Minister's statement this morning in this Chamber, can he inform this House of the Government's job reduction targets in Queensland Railways? What is the timetable for these job reductions? How much money has the Government set aside for redundancy payments?

Mr HAMILL: Obviously the honourable member was not paying attention when I made a ministerial statement earlier today---

Mr Beanland: I was; that's why I'm asking the question.

Mr HAMILL: In order to assist the honourable member to comprehend it, I will try to speak slowly. There is no job reduction target and there is no figure that can be pulled out of the hat to satisfy the honourable member. As I have stated repeatedly--and I am speaking slowly for the benefit of the member for Toowong--despite the scaremongering that is going on, no railway worker will be forced to leave Queensland Railways and no railway worker need fear the sack. No doubt that scaremongering has been sponsored by the sort of nonsense that was peddled this morning in the House by the member for Peak Downs, the nonsense that the member for Flinders has been carrying on with and, indeed, the nonsense that the member for Toowong now wants to be a part of.

If there is one aspect of Queensland Railways that does cause concern, it is the Liberal Party policy with

respect to Queensland Railways. The Liberal Party policy with respect to Queensland Railways--as honourable members have oft heard it in this House from none other than the member for Toowong--is to privatise Queensland Railways. If Queensland Railways was to be privatised, it would mean a sell-off of Queensland Railways. I ask all honourable members: which parts of Queensland Railways would private industry like to buy? I suggest that there would be only one part of Queensland Railways that industry would like to buy, and that would be the coal and mineral traffic. In those circumstances, under the Liberal Party policy for railways, what we would see is a total reduction of Queensland Railways to a coal and minerals railway, with no concern whatsoever for urban passengers, with no concern whatsoever for country rail services and certainly no small freight business whatsoever. If Mr Beanland had his way, that would be the future for Queensland Railways. Let me assure the House and the people of Queensland that, despite what Mr Beanland considers is the appropriate course of action, this Government is committed to maintaining the services of Queensland Railways throughout the State.

Safe City; Statements by Mr Soorley

Mr BEANLAND: I refer the Minister for Police and Emergency Services to the ALP document *Safe City* prepared by former management consultant Mr Soorley, which states--

"Women live in fear, even in their own homes. Old people are bashed. The mall has become a battle ground. The police claim they have lost control of the situation."

For the information of honourable members, I table the document. Does the Minister share the views of Mr Soorley in relation to crime in Brisbane? As Mr Soorley says--

"The citizens of Brisbane have a right to feel safe and to be assured of security at all times."

When will he provide the police with the resources to ensure that that is the case?

Mr MACKENROTH: In answer to the honourable member's question--I think that over the last year in this Chamber I have explained the actions that this Government has taken in relation to the Queen Street Mall. One of the problems being faced by this Government--and I am sure that the former National Party Government had the same problem--is that councils such as the Brisbane City Council go ahead and build malls without even talking to the Government about the resultant problems that are going to be faced in relation to policing. I cite the example of the latest mall that has been built down the Valley. The Brisbane City Council went ahead and built that mall without making any approaches to me as the Minister for Police. That council had absolutely no concern about the security within that particular establishment. That is the present situation. Councils want to build these establishments and then throw the problems onto the State Government. That is the problem that exists. The Government is aware of problems in the Queen Street Mall and, indeed, in malls right throughout Queensland and is taking the appropriate action.

Commonwealth Grants Commission Report

Mr PALASZCZUK: Will the Treasurer inform the House of the implications for Queensland of the report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission on interstate distribution of general purpose grants for local government?

Mr De LACY: I thank the honourable member for the question. The Grants Commission report on the distribution by the Commonwealth among the States of local government funding was commissioned by the 1989 Premiers Conference. A number of States felt that they were being disadvantaged by the per capita distribution of funds currently in force. Honourable members would be aware that general revenue grants to the States--formerly called FAGs--are distributed not on a per capita basis but on the fairer basis of fiscal equalisation. The Grants Commission found that when the

distribution of local government funds was equalised for factors such as the different capacities to raise revenue, then States such as Queensland would receive a substantially greater share of funding--perhaps as much as \$140m more. Most significantly, the commission found that it is not appropriate to continue using indefinitely a distribution based on per capita shares that departs so markedly from fiscal equalisation.

While I recognise that it would be difficult to implement overnight the commission's findings on a distribution based on fiscal equalisation, involving, as it does, a very large distribution away from a couple of States, Queensland will be arguing for at least a partial implementation of the relativities. Options could include a phasing of the new relativities or adoption in the first instance of the distribution formula used for State grants. Local authorities in Queensland have been clearly disadvantaged for long enough compared with those in New South Wales and Victoria. This morning's *Sun* notes that the New South Wales Premier, Mr Greiner, has already started to squeal about the implications of this new report. At the forthcoming Premiers Conference, the Queensland Government will be arguing strongly for a better deal for its local authorities.

Queensland Teachers Union, Proposed Work Stoppage

Mr PALASZCZUK: In directing a question to the Minister for Education, I refer him to the call by the Queensland Teachers Union for a work stoppage next week on the issue of advanced skills teacher positions, and I ask: what is his view on this matter, and what steps is he taking in response to the actions by the Queensland Teachers Union?

Mr BRADDY: I thank the honourable member for his question. The classification of advanced skills teachers is a new classification in all the Australian States and Territories. We are trying to achieve a system of master teachers, or teachers of excellence, whereby encouragement is given to those teachers who do not wish to proceed to senior administrative positions in order to receive better pay and who clearly would prefer to stay in the teaching role. It is a decision that the Queensland Government supports strongly. It is our intention to ensure that that classification is introduced in Queensland. However, the union has taken the position that it believes that the department has broken an agreement between it and the department. That position is not correct. Last year, a progress report was put to the Industrial Commission spelling out some of the areas of agreement that so far seem to have been reached and some areas that required further discussion. The matter of quotas was not mentioned at all in that progress report, and certainly no union can say that it has an agreement with the Government and the Department of Education until the Minister or the director-general has signed such an agreement, particularly over a matter of this importance involving millions of dollars of public money per year.

The classification of advanced skills teachers involves, amongst other things, the question of how many teachers can hope to become advanced skills teachers. The union has also been saying that quotas have not been introduced in any other State. That is a half-truth. For the time being, the question of quotas in the other States has been adjourned because when that matter was referred to arbitration, the judges involved pointed out that large numbers of teachers are unlikely to achieve this position immediately, and that the question of quotas or how the position can be ultimately limited is one that could be determined in about 12 months' time. Nowhere in Australia has this question of how many teachers can become advanced skills teachers been determined finally. It is still under review. Similarly, nor is it a matter of urgency in Queensland. The urgency is to determine how the classification of advanced skills teacher can be commenced, how it can be categorised and how it can start. It is therefore a great pity for the union to call for its members to strike over an issue that is not urgent and has not been determined anywhere else in this country. Therefore, I referred the matter to the Industrial Commission and this afternoon at 2.15 p.m. in the commission a conference will be held. I certainly hope that, as a result of this conference and perhaps some discussions that will flow from it, the strike can be averted and that the union and the

department can continue to talk about what is a complex and important matter, which is only being complicated by what the Government regards as a rash and unnecessary strike.

Former Superintendent J. W. Huey

Mr BORBIDGE: I ask the Attorney-General: did he receive legal advice to support his decision, in the light of new evidence presented to him last year, not to proceed with action against former Superintendent Huey? If so, will he now table that advice or, alternatively, will he make that advice available on a confidential basis to the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr WELLS: The honourable member's question was in two parts. The answer to the first part is, "Yes". The answer to the second part is that I have already indicated to his leader, to whom the honourable member owes unquestioning loyalty, that I will provide an answer on notice tomorrow, as my recollection of exactly what I did on 4 February last year is slightly hazy, and I would like to provide the honourable member with accurate information.

Former Superintendent J. W. Huey

Mr BORBIDGE: I ask the Attorney-General: did he, or any of his officers, discuss with the Premier, or any of the Premier's staff, the new evidence in his possession relating to Superintendent Huey prior to the Government's decision not to proceed with charges last year?

Mr WELLS: The honourable member's question is based on a false premise and the false premise is that there was in fact new evidence. The answer, nevertheless---

Mr Borbidge: Then read what was tabled.

Mr WELLS: What was tabled when? To the Government now?

The answer, nevertheless, to the honourable member's question is, "No".

Policing in Salisbury Electorate

Mr ARDILL: I direct a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Owing to inadequate and fragmented police resources for the past decade, lawlessness and vandalism, including personal attacks and damage to schools, have become progressively worse in the Salisbury electorate and surrounding areas. I ask: can the Minister outline what steps he has taken to improve police organisation in the region?

Mr MACKENROTH: The Government is concerned about the number of break-ins in schools, not just in the Salisbury electorate but in other areas of the State. That is why it has started a program of building up the numbers of police in Queensland. In the last calendar year, the number of police in Queensland increased by 400, and that number will continue to be increased. At the end of the term of this Government, there will be an additional 1 200 operational police over the number that existed when the Government came to office.

Two measures have been or are being taken in relation to police operations in the Salisbury electorate. Firstly, the Upper Mount Gravatt Police Station has become the operational headquarters for policing in the Metropolitan South district. Secondly, as some police district boundaries which cross through the honourable member's electorate are not appropriate--they are the old boundaries--it is intended to change those boundaries so that the policing of that area will be the responsibility of the Mount Gravatt area. I think that will help to provide for better policing in the Salisbury electorate.

Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders in Correctional Institutions

Mr ARDILL: I direct a question to the Minister for Justice and Corrective Services. One of the stated principal objectives of the Queensland Corrective Services Commission is "to contribute to the percentage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander inmates being reduced from 20 per cent to 10 per cent of the total prison population". Can the Minister inform the House what progress has been made in this area?

Mr MILLINER: I thank the honourable member for Salisbury for the question, because it is very important. It has been well recognised by Mr Kennedy and others that the Aboriginal population was overrepresented in our correctional institutions. Although people of Aboriginal or Islander descent comprised less than 3 per cent of the population, they comprised about 20 per cent of the inmates in our correctional institutions. It is quite obvious that they were overrepresented. Also, very few employees of the Queensland Corrective Services Commission were of Aboriginal or Islander descent. Over the past two years, the Queensland Corrective Services Commission has tried to actively address this problem. In addition, no community-based facilities were available for Aboriginals or Islanders. Last year, the Queensland Corrective Services Commission, in cooperation with the Brisbane tribal council, opened at West End a facility called Gwandalan, which is working very well. Recently, the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Tickner, visited Queensland and looked at the programs that we have in place. He was very impressed with what was being done in relation to Aboriginal and Islander inmates.

There has been a steady reduction in the number of Aboriginal and Islander inmates in correctional institutions. Recently, I was informed that there has been a reduction of 15 per cent in the number of Aboriginal and Islander inmates in the correctional centres at Lotus Glen and Townsville. It is those two institutions that contain most of the Aboriginal and Islander inmates. In addition, there has been a significant increase in the number of people of Aboriginal and Islander descent who have been employed with the Queensland Corrective Services Commission. As at January 1991, a total of 100 officers of Aboriginal or Islander descent were employed with the commission. They are spread across the spectrum of corrective services, from correctional officers to community corrections officers to councillors. As well, there are nine official visitors, five chaplains, one board commissioner and seven representatives on community corrections boards, all of whom are either Aboriginals or Torres Strait Islanders. That represents a total of 122 people of Aboriginal or Islander descent who are now employed in the Queensland Corrective Services Commission.

The problem to which the honourable member referred still exists. We are not running away from it; we are addressing it. We are quite confident that, in the foreseeable future, we will achieve our goals in relation to the number of Aboriginals and Islanders in custody.

Instigation of Legal Action by Attorney-General

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I refer the Attorney-General to his advice to this House on 29 August 1990, when he advised that it was inappropriate to instigate legal action on matters that remained dormant for several years. He based this advice on the Jago case in the New South Wales District Court. I ask: should such precedents be observed when new evidence emerges?

Mr WELLS: There is a variety of questions which the Director of Prosecutions and subsequently an Attorney-General take into account in making a decision to prosecute. Not every case is prosecuted, and a number of factors relate to that. One of the factors which the Director of Prosecutions takes into account is the age of a particular offence. Another factor which may be taken into account is whether the person whom it is proposed to charge is already in gaol and if prosecuting that person would merely lead to having the person continue to serve a concurrent sentence with the sentence that he is already serving. Another factor which the Director of Prosecutions takes into account

is the likelihood of achieving a conviction. The Director of Prosecutions never recommends a prosecution unless he thinks there are reasonable grounds on which he will be able to achieve a conviction. So there is a variety of factors which the Director of Prosecutions always takes into account prior to making a recommendation whether or not to prosecute.

In exercising a discretion not to prosecute, of course, the Director of Prosecutions, or subsequently the Attorney-General, can enter a nolle prosequi, that is, drop the case. This is sometimes done on legal grounds because of some development which might occur in the context of the case. It can also be done on social grounds--discretionary grounds. Those discretionary grounds----

Mr Borbidge: You are in trouble and you know it.

Mr WELLS: No. Those discretionary grounds include such things as the age of the person concerned and the culpability of the person concerned. So the answer to the honourable member's question is: yes, certainly the length of time which has elapsed since the commission of an offence is one factor which is taken into account in the context of a recommendation that the Director of Prosecutions might make concerning whether or not to bring a prosecution.

Instigation of Legal Action by Attorney-General

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I think the Attorney-General was avoiding my---- **M r A C T I N G
SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will ask his second question.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: My second question is relevant to the same matter as the first. I ask: why does the Attorney-General deem it appropriate to take action on some longstanding legal matters yet rule out action on other legal matters of even longer standing by invoking the precedent of the Jago case in the New South Wales District Court?

Mr WELLS: The honourable member for Condamine does not seem to understand that the Attorney-General does not initiate prosecutions. Prosecutions are brought by the Director of Prosecutions. There are circumstances in which the Attorney-General can exercise a nolle prosequi.

Mr Harper: Accept your responsibility.

Mr WELLS: The honourable member for Auburn does not understand this, either. The Attorney-General receives recommendations for prosecutions from the Director of Prosecutions, and sometimes from the Special Prosecutor.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Surfers Paradise has already asked two questions. He will not ask any more.

Mr WELLS: The Attorney-General does not play an initiating role. Officers of the Director of Prosecutions and the Special Prosecutor initiate prosecutions. That is a matter for strict legal advice. The Attorney-General plays a jurisprudential role, not a prosecutorial role. The Attorney-General can exercise a nolle prosequi, grant fiats and make determinations as to whether or not to act on a recommendation for an appeal. However, he does not decide to initiate a prosecution. It would be a serious abuse of his position if any Attorney-General were to say to his Director of Prosecutions, "I think this person ought to be prosecuted." That does not and should not occur.

By asking me why I did not prosecute this person or that person, the honourable member is betraying his total ignorance of his shadow portfolio. The answer to this question is always: "Because I did not receive legal advice to do so."

Business Regulation Review Unit

Mr PITT: I direct a question to the Minister for Business, Industry and Regional Development. Business in my electorate and, indeed, throughout the State is being crushed beneath the weight of unnecessary regulations. Members would be aware that, over a number of years, representatives of industry associations such as the Queensland Confederation of Industry have persistently expressed dissatisfaction regarding the regulatory burden on business.

I ask: can the Minister explain to the House how he expects the new business regulation review unit to address the problem?

Mr SMITH: I thank the member for his interest in this matter. The issue of business regulation review has existed for a number of years. In fact, it was a proposal of the previous National Party Government, but it was never actually funded. The unit was never established. This Government was left to fund that unit, which it did in the last Budget. The unit was established in January this year and officially opened yesterday.

There is a pressing need for a review of business regulations. Over the period of administration of the previous Government, this State built up something like 900 regulations that affect business. That figure compares with 450 to 500 regulations in other States. The business regulation review unit will have not only the task of reducing the number of regulations that cause problems to business but also the responsibility of ensuring that new legislation that comes on stream does not replace regulations that have been removed. It is clearly the object of this Government to free up business in Queensland. The business regulation review unit will be a very important element in achieving that objective.

Public Transport System, Far-north Queensland

Mr PITT: In directing a question to the Minister for Transport, I refer to my representations relating to the inadequacy of the public transport system in far-north Queensland, particularly along the Innisfail-Cairns corridor, which passes through the electorate of Mulgrave. I ask: can the Minister detail to the House what steps are being taken to ascertain present and future demands? Will he give an assurance that the needs of that rapidly growing area will be addressed?

Mr HAMILL: The honourable members for Mulgrave and Barron River and the Treasurer have been very concerned about the transport impacts of the very substantial population growth that is occurring in the Cairns area. Department of Transport officers have been in touch with local authorities and those honourable members regarding the strategies that are to be put in place to accommodate that growth. A number of options are being examined in the process of putting together a transport strategy for the region. An announcement on that will be made in the very near future. I should add that one major innovation that is under way in the area is the new transit mall in Cairns, which will provide greater coordination for local bus services as well as substantial benefits not only for bus companies operating in the Cairns district but also the travelling public and the tourist public, which are the mainstays of the regional economy.

I thank the honourable member for his continuing interest in this matter. I am sure that, over the months ahead, substantial improvements will be made to passenger transport in the area.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CONNOR (Nerang) (11 a.m.): I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. It is now time for the Matters of Public Interest debate. The honourable member will make his personal explanation after that.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST**Alleged Fraud by Mr M. Ready and Manual Body Works**

Hon. R. C. KATTER (Flinders) (11.01 a.m.): Last night, on a Channel 7 program, an issue was raised about the Mat Ready case, which is not unknown to members of this House. The issue has been canvassed in this House by none other than the present Minister Mr Bob Gibbs, who has made statements about the investigator, Mr Huey. Today, I believe that I should outline the facts of the Mat Ready case, because it is of serious gravity as far as this House is concerned. The case concerns a tow truck control company called Ready Towing. I point out to honourable members that this information has been given to me by very reliable people whom I trust, but I am not quoting directly from documents.

In this case, an accident occurred involving a person called Mr Augusteyn. A tow truck, which operates from the control company Ready Towing, picked up Augusteyn's truck and took it back to Manual Body Works, a panel-beating company. Later on, the owner of the truck said, "It is an unhappy and unfortunate event that I have smashed up my Toyota Dyna truck. I do not have any money to have it repaired and I do not have any insurance. It would be beaut if the event occurred next week instead of today, because I would take out insurance and be able to collect on it." Amongst the people who were having a few quiet beers together was a police officer by the name of Sharp. Being a good drinking companion of the people concerned, he said, "What the hell. Let's say that the accident occurred next Thursday." The other people in the group agreed. I do not know whether the day that they chose was a Thursday, but it was in the future and Mr Augusteyn was able to take out an insurance policy. That accident was said to have occurred a week later when he had insurance cover. The panel-beating works, Manual Body Works, received its money. The tow truck operator received his money. It was never alleged that the policeman received any other money; it was just a good-old-boy favour that he was doing for a few drinking buddies of his. The only loser was the insurance company.

That is all very interesting, but it does not have much to do with the grave issues that I am about to put before the House and the people of Queensland. After those events, Mr Huey and/or Mr Farrah, who were the two investigating officers of the fraud that they had heard about on the grapevine, naturally assumed that Mat Ready was a party to the fraud. Mat Ready was in control of owner-operated taxis that work for the Black & White Cab Co. Ltd. Not the slightest shred of evidence has been put forward that Ready at any stage knew anything about the accident. Ready had no knowledge whatsoever of the accident. If one reads the transcript of the evidence that was put forward at the trial by Huey and Farrah against Ready, one reads a substantial statement. I will quote from the transcript of the trial of Mat Ready. This is the alleged statement by Mr Huey of an interview that he conducted with Ready. The "R" stands for Ready and the "F" stands for Farrah. The transcript states--

"R Yeah, hello, Cal.

F I suppose you know John Huey.

R Yes hello John. What's the trouble.

F We're investigating a traffic accident which occurred on Nudgee Rd Hendra on the nite of 4th March 1981 . . . "

Note that Farrah does not say "an alleged accident". He said "an accident". Ready does not know what the hell Farrah is talking about. He presumably gave an honest answer to the question. The transcript continues--

" . . . A Toyota Dyna truck collided with a post. Driver was Rudolf Augusteyn."

Now this is the important point. This is what John Huey said that Ready said in the interview--

"R Yes I remember it. He's a mate of Manual's--Manual Body Works. I went down--just down the road past Hedley Ave (pointed north--Dorames St runs

parallel to and just west of Nudgee Rd). I didn't do the tow. Charley Wilson brought it in. He drives Manual's truck, or he did then. I'm not too sure when they had the blue, but he and Manual had a blue. Can never get him on the radio. Bloody good man if you can get him. He works for me now and earns \$1,000/week. Can sign up tows better than anyone I know."

That is what Mat Ready was alleged to have said.

Unfortunately for Mr Huey and Mr Farrah, Mat Ready, being an ex-policeman, had underneath the table during the interview a tape-recorder. The statement is on the tape-recorder. Not only is the tape-recorder the strongest possible evidence in itself but also a telephone call came in and was registered on the tape-recorder. So the tape-recorded evidence is corroborated. Last night on Channel 7, it was reported that diaries and other notes will be produced. I do not know anything about those, but presumably we will watch with great interest what occurs on the television tonight. I cannot read out all 29 pages of the transcript. However, this I do know: Ready said in his interview that he knows nothing about any accident involving a Toyota Dyna. He said--

"The only Dyna I've towed since last December is from Newmarket."

I repeat--

"The only Dyna I've towed since last December is from Newmarket."

Every single statement in the 29 pages of the transcript of the tape-recording is similar to that. He knows absolutely nothing about it. Yet the submissions put to the court were as follows--

"Yes I remember it. He's a mate of Manual's--Manual Body Works."

They did not just tell a story; they created a whole theatrical drama centring around the statements that were allegedly made.

So the case is brought against Huey and, presumably, Farrah. Because the case was not heard by a court, it is still open to a court to hear a case against Huey. Some honourable members will ask why the hell are we going back to a case that occurred in 1982 or 1983. Why are we doing that? I do not know. I ask myself: Why did we go back in the Neal Freier case, which occurred in 1976? I ask myself why are we not going back in this case and why Mr Wells has removed this case from the House. I want to emphasise to honourable members the seriousness of this matter. A justice of the High Court of Australia, Lionel Murphy, was charged with interfering with the course of justice following a case that was brought against a magistrate in New South Wales. The then Premier of New South Wales, Neville Wran, also was tried over alleged interference with the course of justice concerning a case brought against another magistrate.

The case to which I was referring has been withdrawn from the courts. As Mr Harper said in answer to the statement made by Mr Wells, by definition the Attorney-General makes the decision on whether a case proceeds. By definition that decision was made by Mr Wells and a case has been removed from the courts. Minister Gibbs stated in this House that Mr Huey's evidence should never be accepted. He is a Minister of the Crown--a Minister of this Queensland Government. Mr Schwarten made the clear and unequivocal statement that this case should be proceeded with. Over the years other members such as Mr Gately and Mr Menzel--and I could name many others--have made similar statements in this House. I have not. The police union unanimously called for the dismissal of Mr Huey.

Time expired.

Alleged Corruption in Redland Shire Council

Mr ELDER (Manly) (11.11 a.m.): I wish to draw to the attention of this House and to the attention of members the blatant misuse of public office and the corruption that has existed for many years in the Redland Shire Council.

As far back as 1985 the present Police Minister, Terry Mackenroth, who was then a member of the Opposition, detailed the financial dealings of the Redland Shire

chairman, Merv Genrich. I will briefly reiterate those matters for the benefit of members who were not present at that time. In November 1979 Councillor Genrich's family trust bought a block of land at Bunker Road, Victoria Point for \$80,000 from ASL Developments Limited. Just over 12 months later, in February 1981, the Redland Shire Council, of which Councillor Genrich was a member, approved the subdivision of this land into two blocks and permitted the realignment of Bunker Road to pass between the two blocks. Less than one week later a company called Berlino Pty Limited was appointed trustee of the Genrich family trust and became the registered proprietor of the Bunker Road land. One of the directors of Berlino was, of course, Councillor Genrich. The following day Berlino Pty Limited sold the land to a company registered in Victoria called Fifth Amendment Pty Ltd.

A fact that was not public knowledge at that time was that one of the conditions of sale was that the seller, Berlino Pty Limited, had an option to purchase back the same land from the buyer, Fifth Amendment Pty Ltd, after subdivision for the same price it was sold for plus the costs of the subdivision. Berlino Pty Limited was then dissolved only three days--I must admit, three very busy days--after its appointment as trustee of the Genrich family trust. However, before it was dissolved it passed on the option to repurchase the Bunker Road land to a company called Pierce Holdings Pty Ltd, and one of the directors of Pierce Holdings was Councillor Merv Genrich. In the two years that Fifth Amendment Pty Ltd held what was by that time two blocks of land, lot 1 was rezoned for local business and lot 2 was divided into 112 building blocks by the Redland Shire Council. In May 1983 Pierce Holdings Pty Ltd exercised its option to buy back the land and, once again, Merv became the proud owner of the Bunker Road blocks, which were worth considerably more after their travels by courtesy of some clever accountants and Merv's obliging colleagues on the Redland Shire Council.

This is the man who, when Local Government Minister Tom Burns called for councillors to voluntarily declare their pecuniary interests, said--

"I have only a half share in two houses. I am not a real estate agent or developer. I only grow flowers."

I suggest that what Chairman Genrich has managed to grow in the Redland Shire is not flowers, but the proverbial money tree which has borne some very nice fruit for him and his colleagues. Members may wonder how such a man has managed to keep the majority support out of 12 independently elected councillors over the last nine years. The answer is simple. Over the years a select band of Genrich supporters has been promoted and included in this little club of self interest, and the financial rewards have been plentiful for those prepared to observe the club rules. These rules were quite simple--"You support my land rezonings and I'll support yours."

Over the years the Redland Shire Council has been a great breeding place for trainee developers learning their skills. Regardless of their previous occupations, it is surprising how many of the councillors have branched out into land development after their election to the council. For instance, Councillor Betty Goleby, whose occupation on the nomination form was stated as poultry-breeder, now declares a pecuniary interest in two major Selpam projects, that is the Wellington Heights estate and Stradbroke Island's first high-rise development. Councillor Bengston, whose occupation is shown as farmer, is now a partner in Landmark Developments, whose projects include the major housing estate, Maridale Park, at Capalaba. Councillor Bonney, whose occupation is shown as fish technologist, is now a real estate agent.

Mr Schwarten interjected.

Mr ELDER: Or scales them. Councillor Bonney is credited with a number of shady practices, including harassing property-owners to sell their land to him, rezoning it, developing it himself and selling it at a large profit. In fact, in one of his own paid advertisements, Councillor Bonney said--

"I would like to point out that local government in the Redland Shire is no longer a job to be taken on by lay people. In fact, it is big business. I am a businessman and I have always been involved in business."

Mr Nunn interjected.

Mr ELDER: That is quite true. It is little wonder that Councillor Bonney refers to himself as the fox in the henhouse. It has certainly been big business for a favoured few and, indeed, it might be said of the Redland Shire Council that never have so few profited so much at the expense of so many.

Ms Power: Especially those mangroves.

Mr ELDER: Actually, one only has to look at the developments in that area to see the connection. The honourable member is quite correct.

The list goes on; the system has propagated itself. Councillor Judy Holt, who on election was a shop-keeper and strong Genrich supporter, retired after two terms in the council, having had numerous blocks of land pass through her hands which were rezoned for townhouses and a controversial rezoning for a caravan park. The Genrich and Holt anointed successor for Judy Holt's division on her retirement was another shop-keeper, Councillor Paul Field, who also happened to be the son of one of Genrich's other prominent supporters, Councillor Ron Field. The appointee for Councillor Woodgate's council position was his son. Also, the appointee for Councillor Skinner's seat was Councillor Fowler, one of chairman Genrich's closest business colleagues. It has always been important to ensure, as is the case in all good clubs, that membership passes on through sons and family friends who understand the system and know how it works.

Of course, I do not suggest that honest councillors have not been elected during this nine-year period. However, finding themselves powerless against the numbers lined up against them, they have been ineffectual and apathetic. By their very silence, they have condoned the actions of a greedy few. One honest man, Councillor Charlie Mackay, fought a desperate, losing battle to band together a strong opposition against the abuses of the system. Charlie Mackay, a brother-in-law of chairman Genrich, was elected to the council in 1982 and was initially one of Genrich's greatest supporters. In 1985, after serving only one term, Charlie Mackay decided not to seek re-election because he was deeply angered by, amongst other things, the rezoning of land for a caravan park that was owned by Genrich supporter, Judy Holt. Councillor Mackay handed a letter at that time to the shire clerk, Bob Mackie, placing on notice a motion of no confidence in the chairman. The motion was never heard because writs for defamation, based on the contents of that letter, were taken out against Mackay by Genrich and Holt. Charlie Mackay retired from that council a bitter and broken man.

This is how the system works in Redland. A person either joins in and enjoys the fruits and profits, or just shuts up. Anyone who has dared to speak up has had writs taken out to silence him. This practice has not changed--not even to this day. As recently as a couple of weeks ago, when Sir Vernon Christie, the former Liberal Speaker of the Victorian Parliament, spoke out against the use of a ratepayer-funded advertisement to attack one of Genrich's opponents for the chair, Len Keogh, chairman Genrich immediately took out writs against both Sir Vernon Christie and the *Redland Times/Bayside Bulletin*. This happened because, in Redland, even the freedom of the press is shackled in the interests of protecting the vested interests of the ruling few. It is a corruption that has spread as though it were a cancer, not only throughout the elected representatives of the shire but also, according to serious allegations, to senior public servants of the council have interests in companies that have been awarded council contracts. It has long been known that companies owned by councillors have been awarded contracts. However, this is a far more serious development. More sinister is the fact that it is common knowledge among businesspeople who deal with the council and with councillors that there are certain councillors who find ways to fast track the system involving unlisted financial outlays. This situation can best be summed up by a little story told in my office by a prominent Redland businessman who said, "While attending a businessman group's breakfast, a man was joined by a Redland Shire councillor. When the conversation got around to difficulties the businessman was having in getting a project off the ground in the shire, the councillor winked, drew a dollar sign

on the table and patted his back pocket, saying, 'It's easy to get fixed up, if you know how.' " On other occasions, he has passed across lists showing the costs, and there is always a figure at the end to cover out-of-pocket expenses. Suffice it to say that that figure includes a number of zeroes.

By the very nature of its dealings, local government, of all the levels of government, is the type of government most open to corruption. It will only be by imposing the most stringent controls-- whereby councillors are forced to list their pecuniary interests in personal, financial and company holdings--that the abuses by those who seek to advance self-interest above those of the community they represent will be stopped.

Time expired.

Albert Community Alliance Candidate, Mr F. James

Mr QUINN (South Coast) (11.21 a.m.): Today, I rise to bring to the attention of this House one of the greatest charades being played out in the forthcoming local government elections. I am referring to the campaign being waged by the Labor Party and the so-called independence of Fred James and the Albert Community Alliance. The Albert Shire Council is the fastest-growing local authority in Australia. For such a dishonest and shadowy figure as James to attempt to con the people living in that shire is an absolute disgrace. Bearing in mind the background and history of Mr James, one can understand why people should not believe a single word that the man utters. On numerous occasions, he has claimed to be an independent and have the support of the Liberal Party. Let me tell this House and the voters of the Albert Shire that this fraud and his running mates do not have one shred of Liberal Party support. In fact, the Liberal Party recommends that when voters mark their ballot-papers on 23 March, they give no consideration to Fred James and the other candidates of the alliance.

The reason for this recommendation is quite simple. Fred James is nothing but a Labor hack who is taking his orders from the Labor Party's campaign director, Wayne Swan. This is the same Fred James who led several ALP-organised marches on Parliament in 1989 under the guise of concerned, non-partisan citizens who were protesting against the gerrymander and corruption. This is the same man who, at a public rally in the Roma Street Forum, introduced Wayne Goss as "our hope--our saviour". If Wayne Goss is our saviour, there is no hope--no hope whatsoever. This is the same man who distributed Labor how-to-vote cards at the Merthyr by-election and enthusiastically told people to vote Labor. This is the same man who is always entertained by his Labor Party mates whenever he visits Parliament House. This is the same man who was part of the Wolffdene dam protest. Then, as now, he was in constant contact with the ALP's campaign director and took orders on how to attack the Liberal Party. Not once throughout that entire period did Fred James criticise the Labor Party. In fact, he has had nothing but lavish praise for Labor, despite claiming to be non-political throughout the whole issue.

For his past loyal efforts on behalf of the Labor Party, Fred James was rewarded by being honoured with a front row seat at the official ALP's campaign launch at the last State election. "Front Row" Fred was on Statewide television for everyone to see; yet, he now has the audacity to appeal to conservative voters to support him and his group. This person is guilty of consorting with Labor, speaking like Labor, acting like Labor, and is openly supported by Labor. However, he does not have the decency and honesty to declare that his political affiliations are with Labor so that the people can judge him on his merits. For too long, this political chameleon has deceived the people of Beenleigh and the Albert Shire. Over the past three years, Fred James has had a lengthy and undeniable association with the ALP. To describe as independents himself and his alliance friends--some of whom are straight out of the ALP school of political candidates--is to treat the public with contempt. Whenever the ALP wanted a mouthpiece for one of its front organisations, Fred James was to the fore. This is now the case in the Albert Shire elections. His campaign for the chairmanship of the Albert Shire Council is being secretly directed and funded by the Labor Party in the same way as all his

previous campaigns have been. Prominent Labor politicians, including Government Ministers Comben and Wells, are actively supporting and promoting James and the Alliance at every opportunity. This political stooge owns no property within the Albert Shire itself and therefore has contributed nothing to the overall development of the area, but he brazenly promotes himself as a person who knows what is best for the ratepayers.

During the Wolffdene dam debate, James admitted that he was actively involved in real estate speculation in the Beenleigh area. To have a self-confessed property speculator with little integrity privy to sensitive town-planning matters would be like letting a child loose in a chocolate shop. Under him, corruption and conflicts of interest would rise to new heights. His ill-founded public comments on the council's current debt level demonstrate an absence of understanding of how local authorities operate and are designed to alarm ratepayers. The truth is that even the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission has found that the council's finances are among the most soundly based in the State. That is just one example of how that person ignores the truth or cynically twists it to capture a media headline for his own political advantage.

To be eligible to stand as a candidate in local government elections in this State, a person must reside within the local authority that he or she wishes to represent. James has dishonestly stated that he lives at Quarrian Street, Beenleigh, for the purpose of enrolment on the Albert Shire roll when in fact at all times he has been living on property he owns at Curtis Road, Cedar Creek, in the Beaudesert Shire. Voters have been invited to meet him at any time at that address and he even lists his Cedar Creek home telephone number as his after-hours contact on his campaign literature. He contemptuously disregards the State electoral laws for his own political advantage.

Apart from his superficial environmental stance, he has no policies on roads, rates, libraries and many other matters that affect all the people living in the whole shire. The favoured campaign tactic has been to attack the character and reputation of the present councillors. Accusations of corruption have proven to be baseless and James has shown himself as a person bereft of credibility, integrity and character. Without any previous experience as a shire councillor, Fred James is totally lacking in the necessary knowledge and experience at local government level. Yet that man seeks to run a council with an annual budget of about \$120m a year based on his past experience as a take-away food and laundromat operator. Electing him to the shire chairmanship would be about as logical as appointing a wharfie to be captain of a cruise liner. Under his guidance the ship would prove to be the Titanic and all would be lost.

Whenever Labor has taken charge of Government, ordinary people have felt the cruel blow of its incompetence. It is no wonder that this political puppet and his team are reluctant to wear their Labor hats. These Alliance candidates do not have the political courage to tell the people of Albert that they are being funded and promoted by the Labor Party. If they cannot be honest with the people before the election, they do not deserve the support of Albert voters on election day. I am confident that on 23 March, when the ballots are counted, that indeed will be the case.

Speed-limits near Schools

Mrs EDMOND (Mount Coot-tha) (11.28 a.m.): Today, I presented to Parliament a petition signed by a number of parents and teachers of children living or attending schools in my electorate calling for this Government to implement, as a matter of urgency, a speed restriction of 40 kilometres an hour in the vicinity of all schools. Included in submissions to my office was a petition from the Rosalie Sacred Heart Parish School, which stated--

"Dear Ms Wendy Edmonds,

The children of Rosalie Sacred Heart school would like a forty kilometre speed limit in and around the area of our school. We think we have the right to feel safe when crossing the road.

eg: if someone was driving, 40 kilometres an hour they would have a better chance of stopping while a child was crossing, before it was too late!!!

We hope you will consider the forty kilometre speed limit favourably."

The letter is signed by the children of the school.

Because of my strongly held commitment to the safe passage of children to school, I am speaking today to endorse those petitions. It is because of that belief that I am in this Chamber as the member for Mount Coot-tha. In 1985, as secretary of the Ithaca p. and c. association, I wrote to the present Lord Mayor to request 40 kilometre an hour speed zones around that school. The reply we received was offhand to the point of rudeness--"If people are speeding, tell the police, don't tell madam." We were told that it was not council policy to reduce speed-limits on suburban streets. When Aspley school environs suddenly achieved special zones and 40 kilometre an hour speed-limits, it became obvious that those decisions were based on voting patterns and not on children's safety considerations. After years of arrogant dismissal, the proposal has now been rushed into this year's election promises by our Lord Mayor. I find this a flattering, if not somewhat expedient, measure.

Over the last six years, I have continued to pursue this aim with the wholehearted support of my family, friends and community. At last, as a member of the transport committee, I believe we have the ear of a sympathetic Transport Minister and I am hopeful that we will achieve those measures this year. My letters to the editors of local and State media promoting 40 kilometre an hour zones drew supportive responses from across the State and north to Townsville. The QCPCA now has this proposal as part of its school safety policy statement for 1990. Over my years of debating this issue I have heard a wonderful variety of reasons not to introduce reduced speed limits--all purportedly showing scientific and irrefutable evidence that the proposal will not work and that it is not worth trying. I am sure that I have heard them all. Today, I intend to answer some of those arguments. In arguing these points I have drawn very heavily on detailed studies performed, reviewing 10 years of speed reduction in the United States and New Zealand following the 1973 oil crisis, and also the Federal Office of Road Safety's report titled *Children and Road Accidents*.

The most common argument is that motorists are already exceeding the set speed of 60 kilometres an hour, therefore reducing the speed is useless. Not true! I agree that motorists speed, but long-term studies here and abroad show that generally people obey the law, or close to it, in the case of speed. So that, although they may fly past at 70 kilometres an hour in a 60 kilometre an hour zone, they tend to reduce it to 45 kilometre an hour in a 40 kilometre an hour zone. That is a welcome reduction in speed, yet speed inhibitors, such as speed tables, would be even better. But let us make a start.

Mr Harper: What about the normal traffic flow?

Mrs EDMOND: The honourable member can speak any time he likes. If he is not interested in the safety of schoolchildren, I am. The businessmen cry, "It will add time to my trip." Over and over again, I have been told that this proposal will add 5 or 10 minutes to some high-flyer's trip to the airport. This is not even necessarily true. Studies have shown that trip-times may be extended, but only by a very small amount--far less than expected. What does happen is that travelling speed is more constant, with less acceleration and deceleration. This has led to documented significant savings in terms of fuel consumption, engine wear, pollution and driver stress. In fact, speed "smoothing" is actually promoted as a dramatic force of motoring efficiency. I invite honourable members to recall how many times they have drawn up at the lights next to the hoon who has accelerated and weaved in and out of traffic in his search of increased speed, thereby putting everyone else at risk. He typically thinks that he is a more positive and better driver. In reality, other drivers are constantly having to make allowances for him. If none of that convinces people to "smooth" their driving and slow down, I say, "Tough!" They should leave for the airport five minutes earlier and not risk the lives of our kids. Trip-times might indeed be improved because of reduced traffic. If honourable members cast their minds to school holiday traffic conditions, they will understand what I mean. When we were first fighting for these measures, Ithaca Creek school conducted

a survey. Eighty per cent of parents had actually bought houses with the intention of encouraging children to walk to school. They saw this as being beneficial for social and educational reasons and yet they drove their children to school because of concern in regard to traffic. Four hundred trips per day were being generated by one very small suburban school.

A corollary to the trip-time argument is the line that the more times a motorist is on the road, the more he is exposed to traffic dangers. This is also used as a reason for speeding through pedestrian crossings and red lights. There are excellent ways of reducing this exposure. They are called buses and trains. Public transport in Queensland has an excellent safety record for those who are concerned about their exposure. They should catch it! Another excuse is that children should learn the road rules. I agree 100 per cent. So should adults! However, the *Children and Road Accident Report* raised some very real problems with this. Children's perceptions are different from those of adults. Their concept of danger is more audio-visual than considered. Thus, they will judge the danger of a motor vehicle by its noise and size, with little heed of its speed. Therefore, a slowly moving but large, colourful and noisy milk float, for example, is perceived as being much more dangerous than a low, speeding sports car, at the child's obvious peril. Ritualising safety measures means that children can parrot them off without thinking. We all know, "Look to the right. Look to the left. Look to the right again", "Watch how you go", "Don't be slow", and, "Use the pedestrian crossing." Unfortunately, I have watched my own children run through this litany at an early age and then proceed to walk out in front of cars, in the belief that rattling it off somehow made them blessed and safe. Sure, teach children road rules, but try to protect them while doing so.

As an extension of that argument, I am told that children already have pedestrian and school crossings with lollipop persons to assist them cross the road. I am very grateful to these lollipop people. Every morning they take their lives into their hands. It was a lollipop lady who first drew my attention to the problems on Arthur Terrace near Ithaca Creek school. The crossing is situated on a hump, and cars regularly take off as they go across it. As residents predicted, the speed of motorists has increased noticeably since the building of that downhill racetrack on Jubilee Terrace. This lollipop lady asked the school for more insurance cover against her possibly inflicting injury to the offending motorists who raced through the crossing as she monitored children across. She had become frustrated and desperate at motorists' selfish disregard for the children and had taken to threatening them with her lollipop. Yet we say that children need to be educated in the rules of the road!

The *Children and Road Accident Report* confirmed these subjective findings. The survey of motorists that was conducted showed that motorists were less likely to stop for pedestrians who were perceived as being slow, that is, the frail, the elderly, the young--especially the very young--or mums with children and prams. Great, isn't it! The very people who most need safe pedestrian crossings are the least likely to get this from motorists. Motorists are less likely to stop if they are travelling at 60 kilometres per hour or more. Surely no comment is needed. In addition--wait for it--motorists are more likely to stop for young attractive females than for children. We all suspected as much. The Road Safety Office proved it! Many of Queensland's schools are built on main roads. While this may be a very good argument for drastically improving the school designs and planning to take them off main roads, I do not accept it as an argument for not reducing speed in the immediate area. I believe that it increases the need for speed reduction, as well as engineering solutions.

The last argument is usually that motorists have rights. This seems to mean that only motorists have rights, and has something to do with the concept of roads being for cars. I point out that roads have been around for a bit longer than cars--in fact, quite a few thousand years before cars. We have to stop thinking of roads as belonging to and being for cars. Roads are for people--big people and little people, people on foot, people with prams, people on bikes and sometimes people in cars. They must all share this space and show respect for the rights of all roads-users, not just one variety.

I am pleased that this Government has given road safety a high priority. I urge the Minister to consider these petitions and thank the parents and teachers of Milton, Petrie Terrace, Ashgrove, Rainworth, Payne Road, Bardonia and Ithaca Creek schools----

Time expired.

Legal Advice Given to Bailey and Bailey by Attorney-General

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (11.39 a.m.): The Attorney-General needs to explain two things to this House in relation to an article in the *Courier-Mail* of 29 August 1990 headed, "Report says no charges for Huey", which states--

"A report from the Director of Prosecutions, Mr Royce Miller, has recommended that no charges be laid against Superintendent John Huey. The Attorney-General, Mr Wells, yesterday told Parliament an investigation by officers of the Director of Prosecutions concluded that no charges were warranted."

As I say, there are two matters that need to be explained. Firstly, the Attorney-General needs to explain an apparent inconsistency in the source of legal advice given to the legal firm Bailey and Bailey. Secondly, the Attorney-General needs to provide to this House evidence to prove that he investigated new evidence drawn to his attention by Bailey and Bailey in February 1990 and in summonses served in July 1990.

I will go through the order of events that led up to this. On 12 February 1990, a letter was sent to the Attorney-General, copies of which were sent to the Premier and the Minister for Police. With those letters was evidence, which was backed by a barrister's opinion, that new evidence had been brought forward in relation to charges laid in 1981. On 28 February, the Attorney-General responded to that letter from Bailey and Bailey.

The Attorney-General responded--

"Re: John William HUEY

Thank you for your letter of 12 February 1990 to myself in relation to the abovenamed.

I have received the advice of the Acting Director of Prosecutions in relation to the material supplied by yourselves on behalf of your client, Mr William John Rapp.

It is not my intention at the present time to present an ex-officio indictment in relation to the allegations obtained and the material presented by you on behalf of your client."

That is the first part of the answer. The second part states--

"In relation to other matters raised by yourselves on your client's behalf, I am of the view that the correct body to investigate any claims of misconduct on behalf of Mr Huey or any other officer is the Criminal Justice Commission. Neither I, nor my Department, have the power or the facilities to conduct any such investigation."

The proposition put by Bailey and Bailey was that old charges should be reopened because of new evidence being brought forward and, secondly, that there was evidence that the same types of offences had been committed since that date. They were requesting that an investigation take place. In July 1990, two police officers served five summonses on Mr Huey because the Attorney-General had refused to take any action on the request made to them by Bailey and Bailey. On 29 August 1990, the Attorney-General made a statement in this House, which is recorded in *Hansard*, and that statement was referred to during question-time today. The Attorney-General's answer mentioned two matters. First of all, he gave as an excuse for not reopening the 1981 charges against Huey the precedent of the Jago case in the District Court of New South Wales. I quote from *Hansard* on 29 August 1990 at page 3250--

"It is the advice of the Director of Prosecutions that it would be a shameful exercise of the Crown's discretion if, in 1990, a decision was made to lay charges which might have been laid in 1983. In the case of Jago in the District Court of New South Wales, Mr Justice Deane held that such a delay in laying charges that could have been brought many years before may constitute an abuse of process."

In that same letter, he went on to state that the proper body to investigate any allegation of misconduct was the CJC.

The next interesting aspect of the matter is that, in November 1990, Bailey and Bailey referred the matter to the Criminal Justice Commission. In November 1990, the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Commission wrote to Detective Sergeant J. P. Reynolds. The letter states--

"Dear Sir,

Both you and Constable G L Harris have made a complaint to this Commission concerning the conduct of former Superintendent J W Huey.

For the purposes of this letter, there is no need to traverse the complaint or the background to it.

In addition to your complaint against Mr Huey, he has complained to the Commission concerning your conduct--and that of Constable Harris--in taking out the five complaints and summonses against him earlier this year."

The important part states--

"Amongst other things, the Commission has received and considered certain advices given to the Attorney General by the Director of Prosecutions, Mr R N Miller Q.C. Suffice to say that in the circumstances, the Commission will take no action against you (or Constable Harris) regarding the complaint made by Mr Huey nor, in the circumstances, will it take any action against Mr Huey relative to your complaint (and that of Constable Harris).

In both matters the Commission has had due regard to the advice and recommendations given and made to the Attorney General by the Director of Prosecutions."

The inconsistency is that in the letter dated February, the Attorney-General had advised that it was improper for him to give any advice with regard to the improper conduct of a police officer and that the matter had to be referred to the CJC, and yet in 1990 the CJC wrote giving a ruling on the accusations made and quoting the advice that it received from the Attorney-General. I find that most inconsistent and I believe that the Attorney-General owes this House an explanation.

Mr Borbidge: The Attorney-General has a bad memory.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise is quite correct. He states that the Attorney-General was asked about this matter this morning and had a lapse of memory, but the Attorney-General will be able to comment tomorrow because he asked that the question be placed on notice.

The other matter that I ask the Attorney-General to explain to this House relates to a *Courier-Mail* article that states that investigations had been made by the Director of Prosecutions. I remind the House that I have already stated that the new evidence brought forward was backed by the opinion of a barrister that it was new evidence that was worthy of consideration. I ask that the Attorney-General provide to this House evidence of a proper and exhaustive investigation carried out to check the new evidence presented to him in February 1990, which was also presented to the Premier's office and to the Minister for Police, and which was presented again in July 1990 in relation to the five summonses served on Mr Huey.

Mr Katter interjected.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Flinders wants to interject, he must do so from his own place.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* letters from Bailey and Bailey, the Attorney-General and the Chairman of the CJC, and the *Courier-Mail* article of 29 August 1990. I also cite the statement, which I quoted from *Hansard*, made by the Attorney-General on 29 August 1990, which is at page 3250.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: I will allow all those papers to be tabled, except the one concerning *Hansard* because it is already on public record. I call the honourable member for Albert.

Villa World

Mr SZCZERBANIK: Before I commence the main body of my speech in this debate on Matters of Public Interest, I wish to comment on the attack by the member for South Coast on Fred James and the ACA. It seems that members of the Liberal Party at the Gold Coast are again lying down with dogs and being infested with fleas. The honourable member must have a very short memory.

Mrs Sheldon: Are you talking about Mr James like that?

Mr SZCZERBANIK: No. I am talking about the National Party-led---

Mr FITZGERALD: I rise to a point of order. I do not believe that question that those papers be tabled was put, but the question was for the House.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no need to ask for letters to be tabled.

Mr FitzGerald: Incorporated.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: I will not allow them to be incorporated at this stage until I have had a look at them.

Mr Littleproud: I asked that they be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! What I understood was that the honourable member asked for them to be tabled.

Mr FitzGerald: No.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: I will not allow papers to be incorporated unless they have been first shown to the Speaker. They were not shown to the Speaker. That is the usual practice if they are to be incorporated. I call the honourable member for Albert.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Acting Speaker, I move that the documents referred to by the member for Condamine be incorporated in *Hansard*.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have already called the member for Albert. He can make his speech and the honourable member can raise that matter later on.

Mr SZCZERBANIK: I wish to refer to the member for South Coast's blatant attack on the ACA. The members of the Liberal Party should remember that if they lie down with dogs, they will be infested with fleas. At the fiftieth meeting of the Albert Shire Council, Mr Hinze made the comment, "I taught them all they know."

I draw the attention of the House to the most despicable activities of a Gold Coast developer, Villa World. Numerous examples of blatant misrepresentations by salesmen from this company have been brought to my attention and to the notice of the Consumer Affairs Bureau and the Office of the Registrar of Auctioneers and Agents. These salesmen, with their high-powered selling techniques, have taken and are taking advantage of people's ignorance of the law. They are blatantly misrepresenting contracts to prospective buyers and, as a result, those people are finding themselves caught over a financial barrel.

In all of the cases brought to my attention so far, as a result of a salesman's assurance that the deposits are returnable, prospective clients have been persuaded to pay a holding deposit on a house and land package. Unfortunately, this is not the case. I have no doubt that the salesmen involved are well aware of this. The problem arises because of a deliberately confusing legal contract. Unfortunately, many of the people who visit Villa World, which is located near the Gold Coast highway, make the fatal mistake of trusting Villa World salesmen. The contract has a number of inherent problems and represents financial suicide, but I believe that, as a result of not having

sought legal advice, quite a few people now find themselves in a substantial contract with Villa World and are being forced to pay interest rates on finance which is being made available to them by Villa World. Under the terms of the contract, the maximum rate is 21 per cent and the minimum is 18.5 per cent. That is not all. There is also in the contract a subsection which provides for Villa World to demand a lump-sum payment at the end of a 12-month period. If that is not forthcoming, it is basically up to Villa World to determine what happens either to the house or the terms under which the financial arrangement is to continue.

The conditions set out in Annexure B of Villa World's contract are untenable. It appears to me to be a deliberate attempt to pressure people into signing a contract which has financial gains for Villa World at the expense of the unfortunate, although trusting, consumer. For example, the contract places extremely unrealistic expectations on the potential purchaser gaining financial approval from a bank of his or her choice. The contract states that, if the purchaser has not notified Villa World in writing within 16 days of signing the contract, the vendor is deemed to have received approval for finance. That obviously fails to acknowledge that financial institutions do not necessarily deal with such applications within that time-frame. In the event of the prospective purchaser failing to notify Villa World, the contract becomes unconditional. In other words, Villa World can do what it likes with the person who was silly enough to believe in the promises of the Villa World salesman that, in the event of finance not being made available, the deposit is returnable and the contract breakable.

The contract also states that, in the event of the prospective purchaser being unable to arrange personal finance, Villa World shall have the option to lend or arrange to lend the money to buy the house and land package. One might see this as being a particularly generous offer from the caring chaps at Villa World to help average Australians achieve their dream of owning their own home. I hate to shatter anyone's illusions, but all this means is that the consumer is then forced, under the terms of the contract, into agreeing to a loan arrangement with Villa World at the exorbitant interest rate of 21 per cent. I have calculated that, at the minimum interest rate of 18.5 per cent on the average price of a house, the interest component alone would be approximately \$18,000 annually. This is obviously a deplorable and inexcusable attempt to put unsuspecting members of the public in a position in which they cannot realistically repay the moneys borrowed and so default on the loan, leaving Villa World with the house and land package in question. In layman's terms, section G basically says that, if a person cannot get the finance, he will have to put up with what Villa World has arranged for him. People should be warned. They had better get the finance. Unsuspecting first home buyers as well as others are being talked into purchasing Villa World home and land packages by fast-talking salesmen. A minimum holding deposit is paid in the heat of the moment with, I might add, an assurance from the salesman that, in the event of finance falling through, the money is returnable. But when that first-home loan is not approved, or if it is approved but people cannot meet the other stiff requirements, they have no choice other than to take what is offered to them--and take it at 21 per cent. At this stage, the score is obviously Villa World: 2--trusting public: 0.

There are other aspects of Villa World's contract which disturb me somewhat, namely, that Villa World actually mentions in its contract that it cannot guarantee that the improvements "purporting to be on the land are or will be at the date of settlement wholly on the land or that buildings of adjoining owners do not or will not at the date of settlement encroach on the land". In other words, Villa World is not prepared to give a guarantee that its house and land package promised to the purchaser will necessarily be the one he ends up with.

Another aspect of the contract appears to be a total denial of natural justice, that is in relation to the handing-over of the purchaser's power of attorney to Villa World. It appears to me that, once a contract is signed, thus enacting this transfer of power, the purchaser is in effect without a legal voice. It is sad to note that apparently the only way to escape this ridiculous clause is to seek the assistance of the mortgagee, whose

vote overrides that of the proprietor. A later clause makes it even more probable that the mortgagee will be the vendor, anyway.

I would also like to point out that the heavy-handedness of Villa World salesmen does not end with the initial inspection of the Villa World package. Unfortunately, I have had personal experience of this. My wife had the recent misfortune of having a Villa World salesman lob onto our doorstep with a contract. Later she was abused because she did not at the time want to sign the contract. Villa World salesmen were quite rude to her when she said she wanted to go and get legal advice on the document. Obviously, basic human rights are not an overriding principle with these salesmen, either. The obvious question that needs to be answered here is: well, if these contracts are so bad, how do people get themselves into the situation of signing them? The answer is a simple one and one which unluckily has been borne out time and time again. Just about all of the complaints to me in relation to Villa World and, I might add, in relation to matters currently being investigated by the Justice Department's Registrar of Auctioneers and Agents expose shonky practices by Villa World salesmen. These salesmen, whether it be deliberate or not, are telling people that the contracts are subject to finance, when the contracts state explicitly that they are not.

Obviously, one cannot stop people from entering into contracts. That is their basic legal right. However, the Villa World saga highlights in a tragic way the fundamentally important need for people not to sign on the dotted line unless they understand the contract. Time and time again, the advice from the Justice Minister and the Consumer Affairs Bureau has been, "Do not believe fast-talking salesmen. If you are not sure, seek legal advice; because otherwise, unfortunately, you will pay the price." Quite a few people have paid the price.

The people selling Villa World's product are not licensed real estate agents. Although their offices may look like real estate agencies, they are merely agents for a developer. As a result, those people who have been ripped off cannot seek compensation from the Auctioneers and Agents Fidelity Guarantee Fund. My advice, and that of the Justice Minister and his department, is to steer clear of Villa World. Unless that company smartens up its act considerably, it appears that it is only out to make money by fleecing those members of the public who are trusting enough to take the word of salesmen and developers as a gentlemen's agreement.

INCORPORATION OF DOCUMENTS IN HANSARD

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (11.55 a.m.): I seek leave of the House to incorporate in *Hansard* letters from the Attorney-General, the Chairman of the CJC and Bailey and Bailey.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have looked at those letters. I allow the following letters to be incorporated in *Hansard*: a letter from the Attorney-General to Bailey and Bailey dated 28 February 1990; a letter from Bailey and Bailey to the Director of Prosecutions; a letter from the Attorney-General to Bailey and Bailey; and another letter from the Criminal Justice Commission to Detective Sergeant Reynolds.

Leave granted.

Bailey & Bailey

Solicitors

GPO Box 2376

BRISBANE Q 4001

Dear Sirs,

Re: John William HUEY

Thank you for your letter of 12 February 1990 to myself in relation to the abovenamed.

I have received the advice of the Acting Director of Prosecutions in relation to the material supplied by yourselves on behalf of your client, Mr William John Rapp.

It is not my intention at the present time to present an ex-officio indictment in relation to the allegations obtained in the material presented by you on behalf of your client.

In relation to other matters raised by yourselves on your client's behalf, I am of the view that the correct body to investigate any claims of misconduct on behalf of Mr Huey or any other officer is the Criminal Justice Commission. Neither I, nor my Department, have the power or the facilities to conduct any such investigation.

Yours sincerely,

DEAN WELLS

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

28 February 1990

7th March, 1990

The Director of Prosecutions,

State Law Building,

50 Ann Street,

BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Sir,

Re: JOHN WILLIAM HUEY

Further to previous correspondence with the Attorney-General's Department, we enclose further material which may be of some assistance to your consideration of our submission.

1. Transcript of taped conversation commencing in the afternoon of the 29th June, 1981.
2. Photocopies of notes composed by John William HUEY.
3. Transcripts of conversations involving Christine Jayne PAGE.
4. An Index to the brief re committal of Matthew John READY & Ors.
5. Some notes re references in the transcripts.

We are instructed to advise that Mr Huey has applied for three (3) months leave commencing later this month. We are instructed that he has indicated an intention to travel to England with a view to purchasing a hotel. We are further instructed that Mr Huey is eligible for early retirement as early as July 1990.

Yours faithfully,

BAILEY & BAILEY

06036601

Messrs Bailey and Bailey

Solicitors

GPO Box 2376

BRISBANE QLD 4001

Gentlemen,

Re: John William HUEY

Further to my letter of 28 February 1990 I wish to advise that your material in this matter is held in my Ministerial Office if you wish to arrange for its return.

I have not forwarded it to the Criminal Justice Commission as I consider that to be a matter for your client.

Yours sincerely,

DEAN WELLS

ATTORNEY-GENERAL

13 November, 1990

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Det Sgt J P Reynolds

C/- City Police Station

Police Headquarters

100 Roma Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

Dear Sir

Both you and Constable G L Harris have made a complaint to this Commission concerning the conduct of former Superintendent J W Huey.

For the purposes of this letter, there is no need to traverse the complaint or the background to it.

In addition to your complaint against Mr Huey, he has complained to the Commission concerning your conduct and that of Constable Harris in taking out the five complaints and summonses against him earlier this year.

Amongst other things, the Commission has received and considered certain advices given to the Attorney General by the Director of Prosecutions, Mr R N Miller Q.C. Suffice to say that in the circumstances, the Commission will take no action against you (or Constable Harris) regarding the complaint made by Mr Huey nor, in the circumstances, will it take any action against Mr Huey relative to your complaint (and that of Constable Harris).

In both matters the Commission has had due regard to the advice and recommendations given and made to the Attorney General by the Director of Prosecutions. The Commission also had regard to the age of the matters and the fact that Mr Huey is no longer a member of the Queensland Police Service.

As mentioned, no action will be taken by the Commission against yourself, Constable Harris or Mr Huey.

Yours faithfully

SIR MAX BINGHAM, Q.C.

Chairman

Mr CONNOR (Nerang) (11.56 a.m.): I wish to make a personal explanation. Last Wednesday, 6 March----

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I will allow the member to make his personal explanation after the Matters of Public Interest debate has concluded.

Former Superintendent J. W. Huey

Hon. N. J. TURNER (Nicklin) (11.57 a.m.): I rise today to bring to the attention of this Parliament the very serious allegations that have been made in recent days through the media concerning former CIB chief, John William Huey. At the outset, let me make it perfectly clear that, in October 1989, Mr Huey was appointed by the former Cooper National Party Government as second in charge of the CIB. He was appointed on a 12-month probationary basis on the understanding that one is innocent until proven guilty. However, new evidence was brought forward indicating conclusively that Mr Huey was corrupt and a fabricator of evidence. On 12 February 1990, that new evidence was sent from solicitors Bailey and Bailey to the Premier, Mr Goss; the Attorney-General, Mr Wells; and the Police Minister, Mr Mackenroth. On 19 February 1990, Mr Mackenroth's private secretary, Gary Kenning, acknowledged receipt of Bailey and Bailey's letter and said that the Minister would advise again as soon as possible. That was more than 12 months ago, and no further response has been received. Mr Goss never replied, and Mr Wells did nothing. The question that must be answered by this Labor Government is: on what basis did the ALP Cabinet confirm or ratify Mr Huey to head the CIB in Queensland when, on 12 February 1990, it had evidence before it which must have cast serious doubts on Mr Huey's credentials to carry out that job?

The next question that must be answered is: if Mr Huey's position had been confirmed before the evidence of 12 February 1990 was presented, what action did this Government take to reverse the appointment or to have the matter thoroughly investigated so that innocent police were not being victimised as a result of Mr Huey's appointment? Another question that must be asked is: what role did the Tourism Minister, Mr Gibbs, play in Cabinet in relation to Mr Huey's appointment? In 1982, during a *Nationwide* program, in relation to the Ready case, Mr Gibbs said of Huey and Farrar--

"I believe that there should be an immediate inquiry and prosecution of both of those police officers. I believe that every case that they have been involved in since this evidence was brought to light should be re-investigated because it disturbs me greatly to think that there is the possibility-- a very distinct possibility--that if perjury has been committed in one case that it may have been committed in others and that there could be people who are behind bars at the present time who perhaps shouldn't be in that particular position."

Mr Gibbs stated further--

"I've called for a judicial inquiry and I believe a judicial inquiry or a royal commission is most certainly warranted."

I wonder what role Mr Gibbs played in Cabinet in relation to that ratification or appointment, given that he expressed his concerns in 1982.

Bailey and Bailey presented a 16-page document which clearly outlines the doubts about Huey's credibility. In light of the "new justice" that is being implemented in Queensland, the Opposition has very serious doubts about the appointments process of the Goss Government in Queensland. Why was Huey kept in that influential position when all the indicators from the legal profession showed that he was not worthy of such an appointment? The Opposition agrees with the Police Union's stance in a vote of no confidence in its Police Minister, Mr Mackenroth. His actions in this instance further justify that stance.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CONNOR (Nerang) (12.01 p.m.), by leave: Last Wednesday, 6 March, Miss Roslyn Atkinson, counsel representing the Corrective Services Commission at the CJC public hearing into corrective services, asserted before the public hearing that I had misled witnesses giving evidence at the hearing.

Mr MILLINER: I rise to a point of order. Mr Acting Speaker, I seek your ruling. The matter that the member for Nerang is raising is before the CJC. I believe that the matter is sub judice.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CONNOR: It is on the public record.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Before I allow the honourable member to continue, I will have a look at the material that he intends to present to the House.

GAMING MACHINE BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 26 February (see p. 6419).

Mr VEIVERS (Southport) (12.02 p.m.): The Opposition totally rejects this legislation which the Minister has presented to impose poker machines on Queensland. No Queenslanders need them, and few Queenslanders want them. Poker machines will benefit only a handful of the biggest and richest clubs and provide a bonanza only for the favoured few manufacturers and, of course, the campaign funds of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I will come to that. Poker machines will destroy the lives of thousands of Queensland families. They will destroy the viability of hundreds of restaurants and cinemas. They will catch people at their most vulnerable--when they are drinking. People who would not normally gamble will take a chance. Most will lose--although I know a few wowsers who will not even do that. Most clubs and hotels will lose because, after the machines pay out the punters, the Government will take most of what is left.

Some honourable members will recall my support for poker machines as a means of giving vitality to the sporting clubs of Queensland. I have been on record as favouring

the introduction of poker machines in tourist areas, particularly Gold Coast City and the Albert Shire. In common with many people, I thought that I saw the benefits for sport and tourism. I knew at first-hand what wealth poker machines had brought to Rugby League clubs in Sydney and the big clubs just over the border. But, in common with most people, I had never had a good look at the dark side of these matters. As a member of Parliament, and particularly as a shadow Minister, I must do that. I do not like what I have seen. What I have seen leads me to one inescapable conclusion: poker machines will bring Queensland and Queenslanders nothing but misery and trouble. There will be no bonanza for sport or for the community. I can see no advantages for Queensland; I can see only disadvantages.

There are only two reasons why the Government is so keen to introduce poker machines in this State. Firstly, it must deliver on an old promise to a benefactor--and, if the legislation is passed, a continuing benefactor. Secondly, the Government needs to suck up more taxes to help the lame-duck Treasurer to balance his books. Neither reason is good enough. The first reason why the Labor Party wants poker machines can be summed up in one word--Caspalp. Honourable members will remember that name. Last year in this House, the Premier admitted that Caspalp probably meant Casey, ALP and pokies. Caspalp was a Labor slush fund established in 1979 by the member for Mackay and others. Its funds were boosted by \$30,000 in payments from a poker machine manufacturer, Ainsworth Nominees, after a deal was done with a middleman, Mr Ted Vibert. For years, the Premier and Labor politicians paraded about the State throwing corruption tags at everyone, particularly members on this side of the House when we were on the Government side. What could be more corrupt than to impose poker machines on a State for a miserable \$30,000 bribe? That is what it was--a bribe. This squeaky clean so-called Labor Party does not really like that word, so let us find words with which it can live--how about "a financial inducement to push hard for poker machines", or maybe "a pay-off for services to be rendered in the future"?

Well, the future is now. The money was offered and taken; the same Labor Party is now in Government; and poker machines are on the way. The families of Queensland, the clubs, the pubs and the hospitality industry are about to pay the return on Mr Len Ainsworth's \$30,000 investment. Ainsworth is about to slide down Labor's rainbow into the pot of gold. He is all set to collect the lion's share of the \$100m that the Government plans to spend buying machines. Anyone who would deny that must either believe in the little people at the bottom of the garden or be very much Irish. Ainsworth has built his factory in Brisbane. His lobbyist, Mr Colin Lamont, spent plenty of time hanging around this House while the legislation was being prepared. I find it amazing that Ainsworth is still on the list of organisations that are able to tender for the supply contract. Last year, the CJC reported very unfavourably on Ainsworth. Page 32 of the report summarised the commission's view of Ainsworth as follows--

"This Commission recommends that the Ainsworth group of companies not be permitted to participate in the gaming machine industry in Queensland."

That comment followed several pages that were devoted to a study carried out over many years of Ainsworth and his associates. Considering the adverse comment on that group by other commissions, the seemingly endless conflicts with police and licensing authorities and the attempt to influence political decisions, it is not difficult to understand why the CJC is wary of Ainsworth.

Mr Ainsworth objected strongly--and why would he not--to what the commission said about him and made a submission to the parliamentary committee. However, I must note here that Mr Ainsworth and his associates have still not appeared before either the parliamentary committee or the CJC itself. The CJC made some strong judgments about Mr Ainsworth and some of his associates. I would like to think that I am a pretty fair man and I would like to see Mr Ainsworth and his friends given a chance to answer the allegations against them. Quite frankly I believe that, by debating the legislation, honourable members are pre-empting matters. Three weeks ago, the Speaker of this House ruled that the alleged rotting undertaken by people who are now

Government Ministers was covered by the sub judice rule. The ruling of the Speaker on that occasion was based on his view that the CJC is a judicial body. Consistency demands that honourable members not debate this legislation. After all, we cannot debate poker machines without referring to Mr Ainsworth and his associates and, of course, Mr Lamont. They are an essential part of the debate. The CJC has devoted a great deal of its report on poker machines to activities of theirs that can be described only as alarming. These are very serious allegations relating to bribery and corruption; they are central to any moves to introduce poker machines in this State. I cannot believe that the commission has forgotten about anything so important. I, for one, want to hear Mr Ainsworth and others answer these serious charges, and the place for that is before Sir Max Bingham and the CJC. I ask you to stop this debate, Mr Deputy Speaker, until the Criminal Justice Commission conducts a full inquiry into the matters raised in its report.

Mr Gibbs: That's frivolous.

Mr VEIVERS: It is not frivolous. I believe that this Government should enforce the ruling made on the first day of this session.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: The Minister is kidding. The CJC is still investigating these people on charges of corruption. The Minister should read the first page of the CJC report. In regard to these machines--the CJC said that it is conducting an ongoing investigation into poker machines and in his ruling on 19 February the Speaker, who is not here today, said that any matter before the CJC was sub judice. What is the difference with this legislation? There is no difference. This House should not be debating this legislation because, according to the Speaker's ruling made on 19 February, the matter is sub judice.

Mr Borbidge: The Speaker set the precedent.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, the Speaker did set the precedent that day.

Mr Beattie: There is a mile of difference.

Mr VEIVERS: There is not a mile of difference. The Chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee is waxing lyrical on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr Beattie: We always do.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, and the honourable member does it so well. I notice he has dyed his hair again this week. If the Speaker's ruling in this Parliament is to be upheld, we should not be debating this legislation. However, that will not be the case, so I will continue with my speech.

I have studied the CJC report and the written submissions to the parliamentary committee and I see no reason why the original report should be significantly altered. I turn now to look at a few of the allegations against Mr Ainsworth and the replies that have been supplied by his lawyers in his submission. The CJC report detailed a concealed proprietary interest taken by Mr Ainsworth in a competitor, that is, the Murray River Poker Machine Company. The share capital of that company was divided between the original owners, with the McCookes retaining 25 per cent, Ainsworth 50 per cent and his mate--that famous man Mr Ted Vibert--retaining the other 25 per cent. However, the books showed a different story. In the books the original owners were shown as holding 50 per cent of the company and the famous Mr Vibert was shown as holding the other 50 per cent. However, there was another agreement that the original owners did not know about. Under that deal, the famous Mr Vibert held his interest in trust for Ainsworth. Effectively, Ainsworth then had a 75 per cent controlling interest in Murray River which was in business to sell his competitor's products. The Minister is smiling and shaking his head, but this is what the CJC should be looking at. In his submission to the committee, Mr Ainsworth said that shares were transferred back to the McCookes when they asked for that to be done for taxation reasons. Perhaps by

that time he had no further use for the company. Ainsworth also makes the following point about the Murray River deal--

"... contrary to the implications of the Commission's Report, there was nothing illegal or illicit in the trustee's shareholding on behalf of Ainsworth Nominees Pty Limited."

There may have been nothing illegal or illicit, but it certainly points to Ainsworth's willingness to disguise a holding in a company that he is not supposed to be involved with under the rules of the game. The Minister has made great play of the fact that suspect people will be kept out of the industry in Queensland, but how will he prevent occurring deals such as the one Ainsworth pulled in the Murray River job? How can we be sure that Ainsworth will not be involved, even if another company gets the contract?

The Victorian inquiry into poker machines considered the same question, and this is what it had to say--

"Mr. Ainsworth has demonstrated, by his conduct in respect of the Murray River company, a willingness to disguise his involvement in an enterprise if he regards such disguise as being beneficial."

Page 51 of the CJC report canvasses the possibility that Ainsworth and the Leisure and Allied Industries Group have both incurred tax and penalty liabilities in the range of \$10m to \$20m. It quotes from the 1984-1985 annual report of the New South Wales Licensing Investigation Section, which says it identified criminal aspects as follows--

- "3. Utilisation of local trust, and offshore banking and trust facilities to hide the origin of monies received or obtained.
4. Links with major drug distributors.
5. Planted or subverted employees with access to commercial and financial knowledge and technological know how.
7. Large scale income, customs and sales tax evasion/avoidance.
9. Falsification of financial documents."

Ainsworth's submission to the committee replies to the allegations recorded by the CJC and he devotes two and a half pages to it. I am worried about the following passage--

"Both Mr. Hammond SM and the Full Bench on the first occasion found that it could not be established that Ainsworths had sought to evade or avoid tax as had been alleged against it . . ."

That simply says that there was insufficient admissible evidence. It is like the Scottish verdict of not proven, and the honourable member would know about that. We are entitled to wonder about someone who got off because of insufficient evidence. Substantial allegations were made against Ainsworth by the New South Wales Licensing Authority, but when they were tested in court they could not be proved.

This Government rode into power on unsubstantiated allegations made in the Fitzgerald inquiry against scores of people. The Labor Party happily accepted standards of proof that fell far short of those required in a court. The people who are now in the Ministry were happy to stand in this House and brand just about every member of the National Party as corrupt. They made the wildest allegations that were based on nothing more than a mention at the Fitzgerald inquiry. However, where were they when one after another these people were cleared? There are members on this side of the House who are still waiting for the Premier and others to do the decent, manly thing, but I reckon that they will wait a long time. This Government cannot afford to admit that it came into power on the unfounded allegations that it peddled in this House from day one of the Fitzgerald inquiry. This is a Government of hypocrites who are demanding the highest.

Mr Beattie interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member can ask Mr Turner and some of the previous Ministers such as Mr Lester.

Mr Beattie: How many are in gaol? Come on!

Mr VEIVERS: They are not. Ask Mr Littleproud. They were cleared, but no-one ever apologised to them.

Mr Beattie: Tell us about Austin. Tell us about Leisha Harvey.

Mr VEIVERS: They are where they are at the moment, but I am talking about the people whose names were cleared. The Labor Party did not apologise, but just let the wet blanket cover everybody.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! Honourable members will cease having a conversation across the Chamber.

Mr VEIVERS: This Government of hypocrites now demands the highest standards of proof when it comes to its mates who want their pay-back. However, only a couple of years ago, it accepted far less. I could stand here for weeks and debate the individual claims made against Ainsworth and his responses, but that would not be very productive. It must be accepted that the sheer volume of these allegations is overwhelming. A man who is the subject of so many allegations made by reputable police officers, tribunals and commissions of inquiry cannot be a suitable person for the Government to deal with in relation to poker machines. The risks are just too great. As members of Parliament, we have to worry about whether some of those allegations might be right.

Let me repeat my suggestion that this debate should really be stopped to allow Mr Ainsworth to appear before Sir Max Bingham and the CJC just to get this matter off the books and clear the air. After that has been done, this legislation could go ahead. Of course, that will not happen. Members of the National Party Opposition do not want to be unfair to Mr Ainsworth and to the people with whom he has allegedly had dealings, or even gave money to, but the allegations cannot be ignored. As I said earlier, serious allegations have been made concerning a man with whom Labor has had dealings. At least one senior Labor man is involved. Ainsworth is the very man from whom Labor is happy to take a financial inducement. This is the very man that the Labor Government is still prepared to allow to submit a tender for the supply of poker machines worth \$100m. This is the very man who had the confidence to build a poker machine factory in Queensland and advertise for 200 staff. I believe he had good reason to have all that confidence.

In a written submission to the parliamentary committee, Ainsworth gives the following version of the reason for his confidence. He stated that Ainsworth is one of the three largest manufacturers of poker machines in Australia and currently holds approximately 70 per cent of the New South Wales market. This is what Ainsworth has stated. The decision to locate plant and offices in Queensland was made in reasonable anticipation--and what a good word "reasonable" is--of being able to obtain a reasonable proportion of the sales; that is, on the basis of proven quality and popularity of the Ainsworth range of poker machines. Of course he held "reasonable anticipation". He had paid \$30,000 for the right to hold that expectation and he paid it to Caspalp in 1980. The way in which he paid it would make any reasonable man suspicious. He should therefore be allowed to front the CJC and present a case to show that it was not a bribe. For a start, there was not anything as up-front as a cheque made out to the Labor Party. Nobody could object to that, because plenty of people donate funds to all political parties. This is just part of the democratic political process that ensures that all parties have access to funds with which to undertake election campaigns. However, this situation was different.

The lobbyist--the famous Mr Ted Vibert--described the arrangement in his written submission to the Criminal Justice Commission as money paid to Caspalp because he and the former ALP Leader, Mr Casey, did not want the donation caught up in a Labor

Party faction fight. He made it very clear that the money was a "donation", and not disguised as an advertising fee, as stated by the former Leader of the Labor Party in Queensland, the member for Mackay. Part of what Mr Vibert outlined in his submission is--

"There was no way I could get payments made to the Queensland Labor Party through Caspalp unless I could specifically show to Ainsworth's auditors that this was a donation to the Queensland Labor Party."

He went on to state--

"It should be clearly understood that a cheque from Ainsworths made out to the Queensland Labor Party was the correct and proper way that this matter should have been dealt with."

A few paragraphs further on, he stated--

"Both Mr. Casey and I wanted the Ainsworth donation kept between ourselves and the less people who knew about it, the better.

I decided that the best way for the money to be paid which would enable me to satisfy the auditors at Ainsworth was for Ainsworth to be invoiced for advertising in Labor Party publications. In this way, I would simply approve the invoices when they came in and send them to Ainsworth where they would be paid to Caspalp.

It should be pointed out that this was a transaction involving two parties, both of whom were quite happy about the way in which it was conducted."

Vibert made some pretty important statements when he said those things, and he said some pretty damning things as well. He kept saying "donation" and that is exactly what it was--a donation, but one that was disguised. Vibert admits that there was an intention to deceive both the Labor Party and the auditors. He admits that he knew the correct way to do things, but had done them totally otherwise. They covered up a bribe offered to the former Leader of the Labor Party. Vibert also admits that both parties were happy about the way in which the matter was conducted. The arrangement was as shifty as a bag of marbles. Presumably, he meant that Ainsworth and the member for Mackay were happy about the way it was conducted.

I have to inform this House that the way it was done was corrupt, underhanded, unscrupulous, illegal and nothing short of scandalous. Of course, the Premier says that it was really nothing. Last year, Mr "Seventy-seven Per Cent" Goss told the House that it was really nothing. He is a lawyer and one would think that he would know right from wrong. This transaction was conducted in such a way that Ainsworth could have claimed as advertising expenses a false tax deduction for \$30,000. Because there was no advertising and there were no ALP publications, it would have to be a false deduction. In other words, the Australian taxpayer was the real donor to the Labor Party's slush fund and to the financial state of Ainsworth. Again I say that the CJC should be asked to take another look at this matter because, after all, that is why it was set up.

If the facts I have outlined indicate what has happened--and there is no reason to think otherwise--Ainsworth has committed an offence under Federal law and so did anyone who helped him do it, including the member for Mackay who, at the relevant time, was Leader of the Labor Party and Leader of the Opposition. He is now a member of the Labor Cabinet which will make the decision on poker machines. He has not been removed yet by Mr "Seventy-seven Per Cent" Goss and I doubt whether he will be. The public of Queensland must know why.

We have all seen the letters between the member for Mackay and Ainsworth's man, Vibert, setting up the shonky invoice scam and talking about looking at Ainsworth's machines in action in the United States. The letters make very interesting reading, but they are very disturbing, too. They are disturbing because they reveal that the leader of a major political party in Australia--it was in Opposition at the time in Queensland--was arranging how to disguise a payment, to obscure it even from his own party. We have a political leader enthusiastically working with a company on a deal to give that company a bonanza--a future income, as well as tax relief at the time. We have an

ALP political leader, Mr Casey, being party to an arrangement which might have given the same company a very questionable tax deduction. Might have? It did! It is very disturbing to think that, a decade on, the same parties to those arrangements are still around. One of them, the member for Mackay, is sitting in Cabinet--I say this at the risk of repeating myself--making decisions on poker machines. The other is in the box seat to reap the harvest that he sewed in 1980. Caspalp may be gone, but this House is about to give Queensland its legacy.

Ainsworth will get a big share of the poker machines sales in Queensland. Even if his name is not on the contract, he will be in there somewhere--maybe with a disguised holding, but he will be there. I have nothing personal against Mr Ainsworth, but if we believe even some of those allegations against him, we cannot justify the risk of letting him anywhere near a State poker-machine industry. I still say that there should be a full CJC inquiry, conducted in the open, with Mr Ainsworth on hand to present any evidence which might clear him.

I said earlier that there were two main reasons why this Labor Government wants to impose poker machines on the State. The first reason is to pay off the poker machine industry for the support that it has given Labor's coffers over the years. The second is to milk the people of this State of enough money to pay for Labor's grand schemes. Mr Keating's disciple, Mr De Lacy, recently reported to the House very proudly on the state of the Queensland economy. He had the cheek to do that after the farce that we saw when he first took over as Treasurer and tried to cook the books to show how bad things were. Even at the height of Labor's honeymoon, no-one bought that one. However, the other day he was able to say everything was going along quite nicely. He forgot to mention that that was because we left things in such great shape. The "Undertaker's" apprentice has such a bad memory.

Mr De Lacy made one mistake. He presented a Treasury Department publication giving the figures which show this big-spending Government's need for lots of cash. In its first 12 months in office, this Labor Government increased social expenditure by a staggering \$345m a quarter--that is, 13 weeks. The do-gooders are soaking up money just about as fast as Keating can print it. Of course, the money has to come from somewhere. Land tax is a good money-earner for Labor Governments which hate private ownership of land. My party does not think about land tax the same way in which the Government does. We have pledged to abolish it as soon as Queenslanders get rid of this lame-duck Treasurer and his Government and we get back into power. The Labor Government is soaking the land-owners of this State of an extra \$21.4m a quarter--that is, 13 weeks. It has increased land tax by almost \$2m a week. An extra \$103m a quarter has been gained in licences and permits from a Government that claims it has not raised taxes and charges much. Not much it hasn't! However, that is still not enough to make up the shortfall. Where does the Government go for more money? To Mr Gibbs and the pokies and the poor old gamblers!

Queensland does not need another outlet for gambling. Too much of dwindling family income is already going into gambling. Queensland families, in common with those all over Australia, are hurting. They are suffering under the economic-suicide policies of Labor Governments. More and more people do not have jobs. Those who do are seeing the real value of their wages eroded at an accelerating rate. We should not be encouraging more gambling. The Government already makes enough out of preying on this Australian weakness. Let us face it, gambling is a national weakness. We all joke about Australians being prepared to bet on almost anything, including two flies crawling up a wall, but we never stop to think about the real extent of the effects of gambling.

I refer honourable members to an issues paper prepared by the Australian Institute of Criminology and published in July last year. One of the authors was Dr Paul Wilson. Government members believe in Dr Paul Wilson, so they must believe what is contained in that issues paper. It claims that on a single Saturday gamblers in Australia spend at least \$80m to satisfy their craving. That is \$80m which is no longer available to their families. It is a lot of money from only 16 million people, a figure including many wives

and children who do not gamble. A large proportion of the \$80m goes straight to the Government in taxes--swallowed up to feed a hungry bureaucracy. In the six months to last December, this Labor State Government made more than \$110m out of taxes it imposed on legal forms of gambling. The Government took in totalisator and betting tax alone more than \$16m for the quarter to the end of December. There is that 13 weeks again. It is a goldmine. No wonder the Minister wants to dig a bit deeper. There might even be a bit more down there. We can expect that figure to go a lot higher since the House passed legislation letting the Minister take more out of TAB exotic gambling such as the doubles, trebles and trifectas which so many punters favour. The Government took almost \$8m in casino tax, \$13m from the Golden Casket and \$18m from Gold Lotto. The total pool of money available from gambling has not been growing very quickly. If Government figures are accurate, there is a bit of movement between the different forms of gambling. We are likely to see the same pie being cut into more slices. Unless this "caring" Labor Government can find a way to make people part with even more of their scarce money, it will have to create more gamblers and encourage the present gamblers to spend more.

The Australian Institute of Criminology issues paper has a few things to say about compulsive gambling. It quotes research findings that the costs of compulsive gambling can be severe--not just to the individual but to the community in general. It says that there is a positive relationship between participation rates and the number of gambling outlets. It also quotes one researcher in the following terms--

"He . . . has argued that it is logical to assume that as opportunities to gamble are expanded and become more accessible, the more likely it is that people will indulge. He has further argued that a logical extension of this is that the higher the proportion of the community that gambles, the more likely it is that problems will develop."

That is pretty frightening. Honourable members are debating legislation that will bring gambling opportunities to many thousands of people who are not tempted by what is presently on offer. Honourable members should remember that not very many people actually go to racecourses. Many people will not go to a TAB agency for a bet. If they do, they have a limited number of opportunities to bet. There are only so many days of the week on which there are races, and there are only so many races on the card at each track. There are breaks between races. The system militates against constant wagers. However, this does not apply to poker machines. The gambler can bet and lose, bet and lose, as fast as he or she can push the coins into the slot. The machines can be, and are, hypnotic. They play on the same senses as a stage hypnotist--repetition and movement. They have pretty coloured lights to hold the attention of the people. More importantly, they are right where people drink--or they are going to be--that is, in clubs and pubs. They are going to be situated where there is a very good chance that people's judgment is going to be impaired. That must be remembered.

The Government wants to bludge on human weaknesses to raise a few more dollars. That is basically what it amounts to. Of course, the Minister will piously tell us that he will be funding a scheme so that the Family Services Minister can salvage the victims of excessive gambling. If the reports of the blow-out of her Seniors Card budget are correct, she will need it. Why create the victims in the first place? Why put people into this danger? Why create the conditions guaranteed to make victims out of ordinary, decent Queenslanders? They have enough problems in the worst recession for decades. The Treasurer keeps demanding more money to contain the Budget blow-out. Because the receipts coming from real economic activity are falling, the Government wants to rely on gambling taxes. It has budgeted for about \$213m this year from gambling. Even so, the Treasurer wants more. The Minister responsible for pokies--that is Mr Gibbs--has promised him \$100m more. That is all very well, but we do not know where it will all come from. I ask the Minister to remember the recession. He should talk to the publicans about how many people can even afford to go out for a drink these days. Things are tough. It is hard to see that there will be enough left in the family budget to

enable people to gamble on pokies to the extent that the tax take will get as high as the Minister reckons it will.

The Labor Party has raised the destruction of family budgets to an art form. Each week, thousands of jobs are being lost. Inflation is still out of control and is wrecking what pay-packets are left. A tank of petrol, a beer and cigarettes all go up automatically now and the weekly trip to the supermarket to buy imported food costs more and more. What Keating does not get in indirect taxes he tries to get in income tax, and his mate the Queensland Labor Treasurer gets in for his chop, with a whole bookful of increased taxes and charges. Now this Government wants to install a lot of brand-new tax machines in every suburb and town in Queensland! When one thinks about it carefully, that is really what the pokies are. They are tax machines. That is not what we have been hearing from the Minister, of course, or from Colin Lamont, who is the Ainsworth lobbyist. To listen to them, one would think that there is something in it for everyone. For sporting clubs there will be unimaginable largess, new clubhouses and new playing fields. They will have so much money that they will not know what to do with it. The club members will have clubs like palaces with a constant flow of top entertainers between trips to the upmarket restaurants for their almost-free gourmet meals. For the hand-out crowd, there will be another fistful of dollars.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: I am too thrifty for that. In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that \$54m a year extra would be provided for sport.

Mr Gibbs: No, I did not.

Mr VEIVERS: I will correct that. The Minister promised \$30m to \$50m.

Mr Gibbs: No.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes, the Minister did. He promised \$30m to \$50m for sport in his first two years of Government, and he said that it would come from poker machines. They are not even in yet, and they will not be in for another four or five months. When they come in, the Minister is going to be well short of that figure that he promised. The Minister did make that promise. Where is he going to get that \$30m to \$50m for sport?

Mr Gibbs: I did not.

Mr VEIVERS: The Minister did.

Mr Gibbs: You're making this up.

Mr VEIVERS: No, I am not. It is true. I will find the Minister's remarks in *Hansard* and hit him with it when the clauses are dealt with.

Mr Gibbs: You're making it on the run.

Mr VEIVERS: No, I am not. I have had a lot of time lying in my sick-bed to work this out. There is supposed to be a prize for every player. They are starting to sound like sideshow barkers. \$54m will go to welfare groups!

Just a few weeks after the Labor Government was elected, Mr Lamont found that he could contain his joy no longer. He raced off to the *Sunday Mail* and told Ken Blanch all about how life would be in the new pokie-funded paradise. In about the time it takes to drop a week's wages on the pokies, we heard the following list of pipedreams: 20 000 machines in 700 clubs; 500 new jobs in the clubs; 500 new jobs in the catering industry; another 500 contract cleaners; \$100m in new building work--and that is just in the first year--and new life for country towns. Mr Lamont even told us that some clubs would have 90 per cent of the adult population as members. It sounds great, does it not? Everyone is a winner. Why did we not get onto it years ago? Why are we not all lying around under coconut trees being taken care of by the pokies? I will tell the

Minister and Mr Lamont why--because life is not like that. Someone has to pay. For every winner, there have to be a lot of losers. If the Government can hand out \$54m----

Mr Gibbs: What about the money you took out of them when you played for Manly?

Mr VEIVERS: I am not too sure whether that is where it came from. As I was saying, if the Government can hand out \$54m, it must be planning to grab about \$60m from its turn-over tax and the fees payable by clubs and pubs.

Mr Gibbs: You didn't mind it when you played for Manly.

Mr VEIVERS: Things were so bad down there that I was actually paid out of the proceeds of chook raffles. The pokies were not going very well. The Minister should ask Arthurson, the president of Australian Rugby League, about the troubles that are being experienced with poker machines in Rugby League clubs throughout New South Wales. Most of the clubs in that State are in more trouble than Flash Gordon. Clubs will pay 4 per cent of turn-over to the Government and pubs will pay 10 per cent. The Minister must be expecting the machines to turn over hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Pay-outs will be 85 per cent of turn-over. Therefore, Queensland communities and families will be dropping a bundle--that is if they are sucked in.

A respected firm of consultants to the hospitality industry has compiled some figures and arrived at a forecast of the profits to pubs from pokies. The short answer is: just about nothing. Pubs will pay out 85 per cent of turn-over to gamblers and another 10 per cent to the Government in tax. From the remaining 5 per cent, clubs will have to pay for many things--a gaming licence, the rent of the machines, machine servicing, extra staff costs, servicing of the extra cash floats the machines will require and so on. Those clubs will also have to spend a lot of money on extra buildings and maintaining gaming areas to the standard required by this Government.

The consultants estimated that even a pub with a customer base to qualify for 10 poker machines could still lose. For the machines to turn a profit for that hotel, they would have to be played 2.8 times a minute, 12 hours a day, seven days a week, and that is just not on. Not too many hotels could boast enough bar patrons to manage that level of custom, even on a Saturday. Of course, on Saturdays, the competition would be pretty intense from those SP bookies whom the Minister shows no inclination to clean up. He was going to do something about them but he still has not. People have started to call him the "gonna" Minister--"I'm gonna do this and I'm gonna do that". He has done nothing. The impost on Queensland is horrendous legislation--it makes Mr Lamont's \$100m extra building work in a year look a bit sick.

In some ways clubs will be under even more pressure than pubs. People such as the Minister and Mr Lamont have built up expectations about lavish clubs with the best of everything and members will start demanding just that. There will be serious problems as clubs attempt standards that they think they can maintain and then cannot. Some will borrow heavily to finance the move into this poker machine era and will default when the pot of gold fails to materialise--when it turns to lead. Clubs could do worse than take some sober advice from the big Sydney leagues club, North Sydney. In a recent circular, it stated--

"While the earning power of a poker machine is considerable, clubs should not be distracted from their current position by the 'potential' lure of 'big' poker machine earnings. I believe in the short term that your earnings from poker machines should be utilised to consolidate your club's future, and to act in a conservative manner initially would not be a mistake."

That is in an area where poker machines are already established and operating. I assure members opposite that it is not going to be the bonanza that they think it is. It is going to be a nightmare, a nightmare that members opposite have brought into this House.

The Queensland Hotels Association has expressed grave reservations about the overselling of the advantages of poker machines to hotels and clubs and the club industry in general. In its magazine, *QHA Review*, it has even gone so far as to say that smaller clubs and pubs could actually suffer or fail. Last year's May edition states--

"This could lead to the community not receiving the anticipated services and facilities it has been led to believe will flow from the introduction of poker machines and the tax payer having to bail out those clubs that run into further financial difficulties."

I know that at the moment this Labor Government cannot stand the Criminal Justice Commission, but its report into poker machines makes a very valid point about the problems that some clubs will face. The report states--

"Poker machines will give many if not most clubs in Queensland a several hundredfold increase in cash turnover. This will be combined with inexperience, ambitious expansion programs, a grave shortage of qualified staff and an influx of itinerant labour. Club directors often elected as a matter of formality and managers of whom some are little more than bartenders will be elevated to being the directors and executives of mini-casinos. In all but a very few of the larger and more professional clubs in Queensland accountability is more a matter of trust than design."

I am quoting the CJC report; they are not my words. The report sees grave problems of fraud and theft within a club industry which suddenly has a vastly increased cash flow. It criticises what it calls the blind optimism of the President of the Registered and Licensed Clubs Association, Colin Lamont, and states that this degree of naivety is alarming.

Mr Wilcox, QC, who conducted the Victorian inquiry into poker machines, reported evidence of dishonesty in about 50 per cent of New South Wales clubs. That is terrible! The CJC report quotes him in this way--

"But even if the level of criminal activity is only one half of that, twenty-five per cent of all clubs, it is at a level unmatched, so far as I am aware, by any other lawful industry in Australia."

The Minister has told honourable members not to worry about all that. It will be all right. He is going to make it hard for the crooks. He is going to have a special Machine Gaming Division in the Treasury to make sure everything is hunky-dory. The only problem with that is the Casino Control Division's total failure to keep the Japanese Yakuza out of the Gold Coast casino.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: It is not garbage; it is the truth. The police report states that the Japanese equivalent of the Mafia have been walking in and out of the casino right under the nose of the Minister and the Government watchdogs. I do not know if the report is totally accurate, but if it is the Minister has a big problem. The Minister for Police has to tackle this problem and this Minister will be depending on him. At present, he is not coming up with the goods, and that will affect this Minister because he needs those gaming machines to be absolutely squeaky clean. It just will not happen. It is fallacy. If the Minister believes that, he believes in the fairies.

If the Casino Control Division is there to help casinos, it is supposed to keep undesirables out. It has failed. It has let the casinos and the people of Queensland down. We can expect no better from the new Treasury watchdog. It will be totally unable to look after the 700 or so locations in which the Minister is proposing to put pokies. By the Minister's own admission, the task that the gaming commission faces is huge. As the Minister said, there could be up to 2 000 applications for gaming machine licences from clubs and hotels and more than 6 000 applications for a machine manager's, repairer's or service contractor's licence. Even with help from the police, it could never be hoped to carry out all the necessary initial checks as well as those on replacements

who come into the industry. That is just another burden for the police who, because of a shortage of numbers, are already battling. The Government has police processing thousands of applications for firearm licences. Now it wants them to take on many thousands of investigations to get the pokies under way. The Minister recognises that there will be long delays in checking licence applications. That is why the legislation has one particularly outrageous provision. It allows the commission to grant provisional licences. In other words, anybody can get in. Any crook in the world can be involved for as long as it takes the new commission to get around to checking on him. It means that a person will be able to have a provisional licence until a check is made on him to determine how much of a crook he is. However, the commission is not too sure how long it will take for that check to be made.

Mr McGrady: That's not true.

Mr VEIVERS: It is so. There is already in place one commission--the Criminal Justice Commission. It has not yet been able to get to Ainsworth and his mates. I pointed that out today.

Mr Beattie: We will.

Mr VEIVERS: The member for Brisbane Central says, "We will." What a pathetic thing. He is supposed to be the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee.

Mr Beattie: You are pathetic.

Mr VEIVERS: It is not pathetic.

Mr Beattie: The only thing that is pathetic is your speech.

Mr VEIVERS: It is not pathetic. The honourable member has not got to them. He should have. Even though this legislation is being brought in, the honourable member has not even got to them--not to the committee; let alone to the Criminal Justice Commission.

Mr Gibbs: You are not being critical of the CJC, are you?

Mr VEIVERS: I am being critical of the member for Brisbane Central. He is a dill.

Mr Gibbs: Surely you wouldn't be critical of the CJC.

Mr VEIVERS: The Minister should just sit there and listen. He will have his turn later. I do not think he will come up with any answers for this. If he does have any answers, they will all be figments of his imagination. The whole system will be full of criminals. I assure the Minister that the system will be impossible to oversee and police. I make the point again: this debate should not be allowed to continue until the air has been cleared about some of those people.

Mr Beattie interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member admitted it before. Comme ci comme ca. Is that how the honourable member is handling the Criminal Justice Committee? No wonder there is a backlog. It is pathetic that the committee cannot deal with what it is supposed to deal with.

Mr Beattie: That isn't true, either. You'll get one fact right eventually.

Mr VEIVERS: I have got them all right, and that is what is worrying the honourable member. Another fact I have is that the honourable member should change his bottle of peroxide. It is not working as well as it should.

Mr Prest: Have you been in one scrum too many?

Mr VEIVERS: No, I have not. I have been in plenty. What is the honourable member's excuse? He has a face on him like a busted papaw.

If what I have outlined is the best the Government can do, it should withdraw this legislation now and, as I said, go back to the CJC for advice on how to do it properly. When we go to the CJC, the answer we get is that Peter Beattie, the chairman of the committee, says, "I don't know."

Mr Beattie: That's not true, and you know it.

Mr VEIVERS: It is true. The honourable member just did it. He should read *Hansard* tomorrow. It is true.

This Labor Government, its leading spokesmen and the poker machine lobby, fronted in Queensland by Mr Lamont, have mounted a sustained effort to do over the CJC. The honourable member is allowing that to happen. What a weak member to have! Fancy having a chairman who cannot even come up with the goods. I am absolutely disappointed in the honourable member. I thought he had more craw in him than that. I thought he had more ticker than that. Members opposite have tried to do over Sir Max Bingham and one of his staff, former *Courier-Mail* journalist, Phil Dickie. Do members opposite remember him? Their friend, Phil Dickie. They point a very accusing finger at Dickie for the contribution they say he made to the CJC report on poker machines that Mr Beattie brought in. They point the same finger at Sir Max Bingham for allowing the report to come forward to this Parliament. That occurred through Mr Beattie, too. The honourable member should not have opened his mouth, should he?

Let us consider these two people for a moment. Two years ago, Labor must have wished that it still supported Imperial honours. Labor would have recommended Phil Dickie for a knighthood. He was Labor's hero. He was gold plated. Labor lived and breathed his allegations about corruption. Labor members competed in waving his corruption stories around at media conferences. When I was sitting opposite, I saw in this Chamber Labor members waving bits of paper--not that they had anything on them. They really went into it. It was like *Macbeth*. Fair dinkum, it was like watching a good movie. Now Phil Dickie cannot do a thing right. Now Phil Dickie is copping it for exposing the probability of corruption in the poker machine industry. Sir Max Bingham, too, is right up there on Labor's hit-list. One has only to read what the member for Rockhampton North, Mr Schwarten, says about Sir Max.

Sir Max came to the Criminal Justice Commission with impeccable credentials. He was a Rhodes scholar--like the man opposite in charge of transport.

Mr Johnson: Railways.

Mr VEIVERS: And railways. They are running right off the rails.

Sir Max was also a Bachelor of Civil Laws from Oxford. He became a Crown prosecutor, a magistrate and a university lecturer in criminal law. In 1974, he was appointed Queen's Counsel, and he was chairman of the National Crime Authority. He was also Attorney-General, Opposition Leader and Deputy Premier of Tasmania. Right now, he is probably the best qualified criminal lawyer in Queensland. I cannot think of anyone better qualified than he to report on a subject such as poker machines. I do not think the Premier could, either, until the report came out against poker machines. That certainly put the cat among the pigeons. The Premier and his Government fulfilled a Fitzgerald prophecy then--the prophecy that political or bureaucratic opposition would try to derail Fitzgerald reform.

Sir Max was not just a National Party appointment to head the CJC; the present Premier and the former Leader of the Liberal Party, Angus Innes, also had a hand in it. The Premier is being hypocritical now in his attacks on Sir Max Bingham and the CJC. That means he is attacking Mr Beattie, too. They are after him. The Premier sees Mr Beattie as a big danger. Perhaps Sir Max would have been better off with a Labor background than a Liberal one. Then he would fit the Premier's rather strange idea of what makes a non-political appointment. They are only political appointments if the appointees have been associated with the conservative parties. It is a different story if they have had Labor associations. What about the non-political appointment to the

Legal Aid Commission of the prominent Labor lawyer Stephen Keim, or the non-political appointment of that other Labor lawyer Maurice Swan to that very same commission? Better still--what about the non-political appointment of Maurice Swan's wife, Deirdre, a prominent trade union official, as an industrial commissioner?

Mr Ardill: What has this got to do with it?

Mr VEIVERS: This is what it is about. At least all three political leaders at the time agreed that Sir Max Bingham was the right man for the job at the commission. I remember the honourable member for Salisbury jumping up and down talking about corruption and saying, "The CJC will fix it. You have to stick with Fitzgerald reforms right to the letter--lock, stock and barrel." Now the member is showing signs of dogging it.

In those days, Labor had an election to fight. There was no way that it was going to get into the sort of bucket job that it is doing on the CJC now that it has won office. I have been pleasantly surprised by the degree of support given to Sir Max and the commission by the Premier's successor, the member for Brisbane Central. As chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice, Mr Beattie has had a lot to do with Sir Max. Obviously, he agrees with the way that he is doing his job. Is that right?

Mr Beattie: You will get no response. I am quite happy with him. I make no bones about it.

Mr VEIVERS: That is almost a "Yes".

Mr Beattie: I have no problems with him. I am on public record.

Mr VEIVERS: Is Mr Beattie on record as saying that Sir Max is doing a good job?

Mr Beattie: I am on public record. I have a good relationship with him. I have said it on the public record. I have faith and confidence in him.

Mr VEIVERS: Honourable members would remember that the Premier and the Leader of the House had no hesitation in kneecapping Mr Beattie over his role in releasing that poker machine report. Does Mr Beattie remember when he went white as a sheet and had perspiration coming from his nose and moustache? The pressure was on him then, and it still is. The Premier and the Leader of the House are watching Mr Beattie like a hawk. That member is not very popular with at least one poker machine lobbyist, and a newspaper columnist who seems to regard himself as the industry's apologist. It is outrageous for those people to sneak around saying that the committee and its chairman had sat on information which would exonerate certain people who were criticised in the CJC report. That is a gross insult to the integrity of every member of that committee. It was good to see the committee chairman make that very same point in a letter to the *Sunday Mail*. However, Mr Beattie is still hated. If he feels a chink, it will be a knife; so he had better wear thicker armour.

Too many people are running around trying to discredit the *Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations*. I notice that the Minister is smiling--the smiling executioner! Those people who are trying to discredit the report believe that their actions will help them sell the line that the report is full of holes. They criticise the amount of original research and the partial reliance on material from other agencies and inquiries. They conveniently ignore the fact that, early last year, the Labor Government was hell-bent on getting pokies up and running quickly. There was simply no time for the CJC to do any more. Even if it had done more, the resulting report would not have been any different. The Minister must agree that the CJC came up with the same conclusion as did every other major study on poker machines. The plain, hard truth is that poker machines go hand in hand with corruption. The Government can heap scorn on the CJC and Mr Beattie, but it cannot escape the collective judgment of every study: if one lets in the pokies, one lets in the crooks.

In the early eighties, the Victorian Government had a proposal before it to introduce poker machines to that State. That Labor State is now \$34 billion in debt. It would

have been worse if it had let in poker machines. An inquiry headed by that eminent Queen's Counsel, Murray Wilcox, gave the machines and the industry a pretty emphatic thumbs down. He gave it a bucketing such as honourable members would not believe. In his report, Wilcox said that there was a "certainty"--I like to bet on certainties, and so does the Minister--of increased criminal activity as a direct result of the introduction of poker machines. He went on to say that the extent of the likely increase depends directly upon two factors, namely, the number of premises in which machines are permitted and the stringency of the controls imposed. He said also that, depending on those factors, crime will increase to a degree ranging from significant to serious. He stated that there is not merely a risk of increased crime, but that crime will increase under any scenario. Wilcox stated specifically that crime will increase.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

Mr VEIVERS: Prior to the luncheon recess, I said that Mr Wilcox said that crime will increase, not that it might increase. The CJC records its own fears in that respect. It talks about links between manufacturers of gaming machines and organised crime. It talks about patterns of criminal or suspect activity by companies or their principals. It talks about disguised ownership by criminal identities. That concerns the Opposition. How can we ever be sure that people that the Government could never accept publicly do not lurk in the backgrounds of companies that seem legitimate? The real control of a company is not very difficult to hide. Just ask the people who tried to move against white collar crime in the past several years. This Government can publicly ban people from the industry, but it will probably do so as a public relations exercise. However, the crooks will remain. Too much money is at stake for them to stay out.

The subject of money leads to another concern of the CJC. On page 9 of its report, the CJC stated--

"In addition there is the possibility of organised criminal activity on the periphery of the industry including involvement in entertainment, security, prostitution and money laundering."

Two aspects, entertainment and security, are a worry. Members of the Opposition think that the CJC is right.

Mr Schwarten: None of them were substantiated.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member is on the Criminal Justice Committee. He should listen.

Mr Schwarten: I've read it.

Mr VEIVERS: The committee has not yet got it up to the commission and we are debating it in this House, which I feel it is totally wrong.

Mr Schwarten: You make sure you are in the House when I speak.

Mr VEIVERS: Yes. I will be waiting for the honourable member. When plenty of money is around, the grubs--and I am not referring to the honourable member for Rockhampton North--will get in on the act. Queensland does not need the pimps, the pros, the touts and the stand-over artists that this grubby industry will bring. Nobody has ever accused me of being a wowser, but I do not want to share a club bar with that crowd, nor I do not want my wife and children to do so.

The CJC report raises also the possibility that public officials, management or elected officials of clubs might be corrupted or compromised. I will quote again from the report, even if Government members do not like what it says. The report states--

"The use of gaming machines will produce a several hundred fold increase in the flow of cash through both small and large scale organisations"--

whether that will happen, I do not know--

"many of which currently have inadequate provisions to protect against fraud or theft by directors, management, staff, members or customers. The greater wealth

of such establishments combined with relative naivety on the part of many of their managements will inevitably lead to an increase in fraud and theft.

Historically, whatever the level of control, the clearing and maintenance of gaming machines poses perennial problems."

That is not a pretty picture. It is painted well by the Las Vegas police department, which was quoted in the CJC report as follows--

"The open-city status of Las Vegas has attracted at least eighteen Mafia families to Southern Nevada. Today organised crime has reached into almost every segment of our community. The traditional Mafia plays a dominant role in Las Vegas and often aligns itself with other non-traditional syndicates that are also rising in prominence.

These criminal activities include arson, illegal bookmaking, escort services, pornography, loan sharking, narcotics trafficking, gaming, unions, street crime, and legitimate business."

Let us consider some of those problems that Las Vegas has as a result of its gambling culture. Queensland already has illegal book-making. It is called SP and has been with us for a long time. The way in which the Minister is acting, it will be with us for a long time to come. SP bookies take a free ride on the Australian racing industry. They give nothing back to racing and they give nothing to the Government in the way of taxes. If the Labor Government is so desperate to increase its gambling take, it should get serious about stamping out SP book-making, thus boosting legitimate betting. Much has been said lately about prostitution, a problem that the Government is determined not to confront. If the subject is raised, the Police Minister hides behind the CJC and the Police Commissioner. The commissioner says that it is a problem for the Government. The Government then goes back to the CJC. It is not only confusing but also an abrogation of the Government's duties. But the prostitutes and the pimps are not confused. They are going flat out and making plenty while the police are told to look the other way. The Government will have to confront prostitution, especially if poker machines happen to bring in big cash flows at the bigger clubs.

Loan sharking will be a huge problem. People will be only too willing to pray on compulsive gamblers or even the once-a-week punter who gets drunk and loses the lot. The Wilcox royal commission reported evidence of organised loan sharking around Sydney clubs. That happened when I was in Sydney playing for Manly/Warringah, and it still happens. They were doing business at an interest rate of well over 100 per cent. That is not a bad return. It beats even Paul Keating. Even the "Undertaker" was never that game, although he is working on it.

What about the other things that the Las Vegas police talked about? What about union rackets, for instance? We have heard a bit about unions lately, courtesy of the Cooke inquiry.

Mr Schwarten: Don't miss the unions.

Mr VEIVERS: The Government does not like Mr Cooke any more than it likes Sir Max Bingham. Once again, that is the member for Rockhampton North. He must have a craven hatred for Sir Max, and he has to work with him, which is quite frightening.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I rise to a point of order. I have been misquoted by the honourable member. I demand a retraction. There is nothing on record to indicate that I have a hatred for Sir Max Bingham. I ask the honourable member to retract his comments.

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

Mr VEIVERS: The trouble with Mr Cooke is that he keeps hearing evidence that too many union officials like to look after themselves first and their members second. We are talking about some good mates of the Government here. We are speaking about

blokes such as Elton and Hardy. They had their picture taken with the Minister. He remembers that. However, I will not go on about that.

Imagine what would happen if employment did grow in the club industry? Imagine the fun that they could have with all those extra membership subscriptions. That is what Lamont reckons will happen--it will all grow. The union will grow with it. It is all good stuff for the Government, but it is no good for the clubs that it is supposed to service. Now that there is compulsory unionism, honourable members can just imagine the rackets that union bosses will be able to pull. Could we trust people like Elton and Hardy to organise the staff in the pokie clubs? Not a chance! I bet that it could not and would not be done.

What about drugs and street crime? This Government cannot even keep on top of the kids in the Queen Street Mall in Brisbane or the Cavill Street Mall on the Gold Coast, and they are only a few hundred metres long.

Mr Beattie: What has this got to do with poker machines?

Mr VEIVERS: It has to do with keeping the criminal element out of poker machine operations. What about the Casino Control Board? The honourable member is the Chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee, but he is over there bleating whilst the Yakuza is marching into the casinos down on the Gold Coast and in northern Queensland. They do not have merely pockets full of money--they have bags full of money. They are laundering millions of dollars, yet the Casino Control Division has not done a thing about it and does not seem to want to. The Police Minister is not too interested, either. This Minister says that pokies will be protected, but he is kidding. He has two chances--his and Buckley's. If, as the Minister claims, the clubs will be places for families, the Government had better give the police--that is Mr Mackenroth--the means to make them safe. As I have just said, he is not doing the job in the casinos, so how can he do it in the clubs and hotels? He has no chance. The Government should learn from Las Vegas and New South Wales.

This Gaming Machine Bill should be a comprehensive piece of legislation which warrants very careful consideration by every member of this House. Unfortunately, it starts off badly with the assumption that pokies can be a clean industry that will benefit the people of this State. The Bill will have far-reaching implications for most families and every community in Queensland. It is so important that I appeal to all members to have their say in this debate before the Government uses its numbers in the House to ram the legislation through. We in the Opposition believe that there is still time for the Government to walk away from this evil. Once it has been set up, this legislation can never be dismantled. The pokies will be addictive to many Queenslanders and they will not allow any future Government to ban them. The National Party is the Government of the future.

In fairness to the Minister, he does seem to have worked hard on provisions designed to minimise the involvement of crooks in the industry, but even he admitted in his speech when introducing this Bill that it will be no easy task. In his second-reading speech the Minister stated--

"The evidence recently submitted to the Fitzgerald inquiry and the allegations of large amounts of graft being passed to several persons at all levels and the allegations and criticisms raised by various Australian commissions of inquiries into the machine industry are frightening to say the least."

These are the actual words of the Minister who is responsible for introducing this legislation, yet he says that there will be no worries. He is worried himself and if he had any guts he would get out of this legislation in a flash. He does not want to introduce poker machines because they will be an embarrassment to him. He will not be able to fund them. It will cost \$100m to bring them in and \$18m to look after all the drop-outs that result. What about the \$30m to \$50m that will be put into sport? Before lunch the Minister said that he did not say that, but it is here in black and white. On 6 June

1990, at page 2265 of *Hansard*, during the debate on the Racing and Betting Act Amendment Act I stated--

"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."

Mr Gibbs agreed at that time, yet before lunch today he said that he did not say that.

Mr Gibbs: You said it.

Mr VEIVERS: At that time I stated that the Minister said it.

Mr Gibbs: You said it.

Mr VEIVERS: The Minister said that he did not say it. He said that \$30m to \$50m would be put into sport over the next three years. The Minister nodded and it is there in *Hansard* in black and white. The Minister should turn it up. He is lying about this because he is dead set scared of introducing poker machines and because he knows that he has no chance whatsoever of controlling the criminal activities that will occur as a result.

The Casino Control Division sits there doing nothing, yet the members of the Yakuza with all their fingers missing and tattoos all over them are laundering money from drugs and prostitution. The Minister for "Coppers", Mr Mackenroth, is doing nothing about it, yet Minister Gibbs is going to depend on him. He has no chance! Don't start that rot! Minister Gibbs has no chance of controlling poker machines and, whether he likes it or not, there will be criminal activities. I know that most members in the House do not want this sort of criminal activity, but they will be unable to control it. The Minister has already told a lie about the \$30m to \$50m, and I wonder how many more lies he will tell in an attempt to get out of it. I know that the Minister has some blokes sitting in the lobby who will help him when we debate the clauses of this Bill. He will need all the help he can get because deep down he knows that he has a bucket full of trouble coming. He thought it would be terrific, but he is like me.

Mr Beattie interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: The honourable member must hang on. Both the Minister and I have looked at it. I was in favour of poker machines on the coast and in the Albert Shire area until I had a close look at it, but then my hair stood on end. All the inquiries and commissions into the introduction of poker machines have told us that there is no way the criminal element can be kept out. If this Government thinks it can do so, it is living in the land of the fairies. The honourable member for Brisbane Central need not talk because he is the chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice and when I asked him what he was going to do about it, he simply shrugged. What a beauty! Fancy relying on him as someone responsible who might look after it! The member for Rockhampton North, who sits behind the member for Brisbane Central, is laughing and joking about it. It will be no laughing matter when the criminal activity gets totally out of control. The Minister is depending on the Minister for Police, who does not have a chance. The Minister for Police does not even have enough police officers. He promised us the world but has given us nothing.

The Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing admitted in his second-reading speech that it will be no easy task. He stated--

"The evidence recently submitted to the Fitzgerald inquiry and the allegations of large amounts of graft being passed to several persons at all levels and the allegations and criticisms" ---

Mr Heath interjected.

Mr VEIVERS: No, it is not. It is the Minister sitting opposite me. The member is a raving twit. He wants to read *Hansard*, but he cannot think. I will repeat what I was saying, which is as follows--

"The evidence recently submitted to the Fitzgerald inquiry and the allegations of large amounts of graft being passed to several persons at all levels and the

allegations and criticisms raised by various Australian commissions of inquiry into the machine industry are frightening to say the least."

This statement has to be considered on top of what he said earlier. He also referred to the "dishonourable history of poker machines in other jurisdictions"--they are nice words--and talked about the "inherent, difficult problems that attach to machine gaming". He knows that he has a bucketful of snakes and he knows that a day of reckoning is coming, but he is being forced by his Treasurer and other people to get this legislation through. He has been told, "We need all the money we can get." The Minister is giving all the reasons why poker machines should never even be considered for Queensland. The Minister gave all members of the Opposition an assurance that we find totally inadequate. I wish to cite that assurance again. The Minister stated--

"The community can be assured that the potential for undesirable practices is limited."

Mr Deputy Speaker, that is all he said.

Mr Beattie: "Acting Speaker"; get it right.

Mr VEIVERS: I am sorry--Mr Acting Speaker. In spite of what the Minister says about this legislation being second to none in its field, he can promise "limited" criminal activity only. It will be about as limited as having the Japanese wandering through the casinos, and that is just not good enough. The halo on this Premier and his Government is getting a bit wonky. In 15 months, the Labor Government has changed this State forever. The Government has wrecked the economy and has made a pretty good start on the very foundation of our society--family life. The members of this Government rushed in with new forms of betting and they legalised homosexuality.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with this legislation.

Mr VEIVERS: Mr Acting Speaker, I am just explaining what they have done in 15 months, and all of it is not too good.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The debate concerns the Gaming Machine Bill.

Mr VEIVERS: I will get on to that. They have stopped prosecuting prostitutes and have given people hard-core pornography on newsagents' shelves. Members of this Government now want to impose on the people of Queensland an addictive, unnecessary form of gambling in spite of the fact that they admit that they cannot keep the crooks away. That is what I was getting at, Mr Acting Speaker.

Mr D'Arcy: They tell me you were sick last week.

Mr VEIVERS: I still am.

Mr D'Arcy: I hope you improve.

Mr VEIVERS: The member for Woodridge is bringing on a relapse. The Government should take steps to keep the pokies where they belong--on the other side of the border--and forget about Ainsworth and the \$30,000. I notice that the Minister is using the hot line. He is probably trying to find out how he can get out of this legislation. Backbench members of the Labor Government should tell the Minister that they have had a fit of conscience and that poker machines come at too high a price for Queenslanders to pay. They should tell him that, because this legislation is ill-considered, impractical and unnecessary. He should also be told because for a long time he would not be seen dead without the Fitzgerald report. The Labor backbenchers should remind the Minister of that, and they should forget about Ainsworth's \$30,000. After all, Ainsworth has given it to poor old Ed and we have never seen it. No-one can find it.

Mr Gilmore: The director does not think much of it, either.

Mr VEIVERS: That is true.

I do not think many backbench members of this Labor Government have read the Fitzgerald report. Mr Beattie has read it and probably Mr Schwarten has, but I do not think that many others have. Mr Schwarten is in the public gallery looking after his visitors at the moment, so I cannot say very much. In my opinion, not many members of the Labor Government have read right through the Fitzgerald report.

Mr Beattie: But they did a report.

Mr VEIVERS: Members of the Labor Government should read it. Page 195 states--

"Until a comprehensive review is undertaken"--

which I asked for, but the Speaker is now overseas--

"narrowly focussed piecemeal action including expanding the legal means of gambling, is inadvisable."

Mr Foley interjected.

Mr Beattie: You spent half the day quoting the report they did.

Mr VEIVERS: That appears on page 195. Did the member for Brisbane Central not read that part? When Labor was in Opposition and when the member for Brisbane Central was not even a member of this Parliament, it preached that it would ask the CJC and the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice to conduct the comprehensive review referred to by Mr Fitzgerald. I wonder whether the member for Brisbane Central knows what that is? I do not think he knows what a "comprehensive review" is. As far as he is concerned, it means stacking up papers and not passing them on to Sir Max Bingham. Even in this afternoon's edition of the *Sun*, the member for Brisbane Central admitted that the CJC is hopelessly clogged and that it is useless.

Mr Beattie: That's not what I said.

Mr VEIVERS: What does that mean?

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member will come back to the Bill.

Mr VEIVERS: Mr Acting Speaker, it will be my pleasure to do so. As members of the Labor Party seemed so upset after lunch, I will conclude by saying that, in common with the majority of Queenslanders, the Opposition opposes this Bill in its entirety.

Debate interrupted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CONNOR (Nerang) (2.52 p.m.), by leave: Last Wednesday, 6 March, Ms Roslyn Atkinson, counsel representing the Corrective Services Commission at the CJC public hearings into corrective services, asserted at the hearing that I had misled witnesses giving evidence at those hearings. While questioning a witness who had made video tapes available to the CJC, Miss Atkinson asked the following questions--

"Mr Connor told you, did he, that you were covered by whistle blowers legislation?---Correct.

And that was in October?---Yes.

You see, the so-called whistle blowers legislation is the Whistle Blowers Interim Protection and Miscellaneous Amendments Act 1990. I expect that's what Mr Connor was referring to?---I presume.

And that was assented to on 2 November 1990. That was after you'd been to see Mr Connor?---Yes.

So you were sold another pup, were you?---If that's correct."

Miss Atkinson should have read the legislation to find out that, amongst other things, it amended existing whistle-blowers' protection contained within the Criminal Justice Act 1989.

Section 6.6 of the Criminal Justice Act states--

"A person who does or threatens to do injury, or causes or threatens to cause detriment of any kind to another person on account of--

...

(b) any evidence given, or to be given, by that, or any other, person before the Commission . . ."

Because that legislation was in place at the time and has been since 1989----

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has made his personal explanation.

Mr CONNOR: I have not.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will sit down. He has made his personal explanation. I call the honourable member for Manly.

GAMING MACHINE BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr ELDER (Manly) (2.54 p.m.): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I think the honourable member bought a couple of mongrel pups.

I was almost pounded into submission by the member for Southport. The only laughing matter today that I have seen has been his contribution to this debate. I admit that he is an entertainer, but he has been all over the place like a dog's breakfast. Coming from a sporting background, the honourable member for Southport would know the old saying, which I will tone down for you, Mr Acting Speaker, "He is all full of wind and water."

A Government member: I've heard it called something else, too.

Mr ELDER: I have heard it called something else, also.

Legal poker machines were first permitted in registered clubs in New South Wales in 1956. It has been reported that illegal machines have operated in Australia since the 1900s. Poker machines were legalised in the Australian Capital Territory in the 1970s and, of course, in the Northern Territory poker machines are permitted only in licensed casinos. With the passage of this legislation, Queensland will be the next State to legalise machines.

As the Minister said in his second-reading speech, there are many identifiable reasons in support of gaming machine introduction. One reason is that it will provide direct funding for sport, recreation and welfare programs. In fact, from a paltry \$6m a year allocated for sport under the previous Government, over the next few years sport can expect from poker machines an increased allocation of some \$30m. That is what the Minister was saying and the member for Southport missed. The simple fact is that over a number of years funding for sport will build to \$30m yearly, while charities and welfare groups will receive \$20m a year.

Mr Stephan: You were not talking about \$100m though, were you?

Mr ELDER: I cannot recall that figure ever being mentioned. In common with everything that comes from the member for Gympie, that statement is a figment of his imagination. As well, machine gaming will provide an avenue by which participating clubs and hotels can increase their income base and, in turn, improve recreational facilities and services for their members and patrons. When one witnesses how the clubs in southern States have improved facilities and services for their patrons, one realises

that, in time, those facilities will be available in Queensland. The identifiable reasons in support of machine gaming are--

- to provide direct funding for sport, recreation and welfare programs;
- to provide an avenue by which participating clubs and hotels can increase their financial support and, in turn, improve recreational facilities and services for members and patrons;
- to encourage the growth of tourism by the improvement of club and hotel facilities, services and entertainment;
- to provide additional employment opportunities in the State, because as the clubs grow they will require additional staff;
- to create extra revenue for the State; and
- to meet the legitimate wishes of many people in the State who have long been attracted to playing gaming machines but have had to travel across the border to do so.

One only has to compare many New South Wales clubs, which provide for their members from poker-machining revenue a wide range of sporting and recreational activities, and subsidised food, liquor and entertainment, with Queensland clubs, many of which are experiencing serious financial problems and lack of services resulting in a reduction in patronage and, consequently, a lack of resources overall to improve those facilities, thus self-perpetuating an ever-alarming cycle. For many years in Queensland, the deteriorating financial position of clubs has been a major concern of all of us. At present, in Queensland there are some 800 registered and licensed clubs and more than 1 100 hotels. Over the next 12 months or so, some 20 000 machines will be introduced into the marketplace. In time, they will create a substantial financial stimulus for those clubs and hotels directly involved and have considerable spin-off effects for service industries and commerce generally. In time, the impact on business in this State will be immense. We keep saying that it will take time. However, all clubs realise that the introduction of these machines will not solve their financial woes overnight.

Under the legislation, the number of machines will be limited according to liquor turn-over. That will prevent many clubs from overcommitting themselves and will be one of the protective measures. Clubs will be able to start with an acceptable number of machines and, when the club demonstrates it can support more, consideration will be given to increasing that number. In time, as turn-over increases and revenue returns to clubs expand, benefits will accrue and jobs will be created directly in the clubs, many in the hospitality area. In particular, the revenue will benefit many young people who are presently unemployed and looking for work in this State.

As well, an improved club industry will boost local economies across-the-board; more particularly those in rural and country areas. As the financial positions of those clubs improve, they will spend money in their own communities and help to stimulate local businesses. They will also provide for those communities improved facilities and services--they do not have them at present--which the residents in those areas have longed to enjoy. It is also relevant to note that, under our legislation, poker-machine returns to players in winnings will be more generous than machines in New South Wales. Each individual machine in Queensland will produce an 85 per cent pay-out to players. In New South Wales, the machine pay-out is calculated on an average of machine income for each club. Some machines therefore, as the Minister outlined, pay out large jackpots while many others pay out precious little, which probably explains why I have spent many hours feeding machines at the Tweed Heads RSL with very little return for my endeavours. Honourable members can rest assured that there will be a better return to players under the Queensland model.

Mr Santoro: Are you admitting they don't work?

Mr ELDER: I have not admitted that. The honourable member has made a broad assumption. He is obviously not listening.

The fact that Queenslanders have had to travel to New South Wales to play poker machines has always amazed me. Over the years, busload after busload has travelled daily to the big clubs in northern New South Wales and, as a result, we have seen significant improvements in the sporting, recreational and family facilities in that area.

Mr Santoro: What a load of rubbish!

Mr ELDER: The honourable member has obviously not travelled across the border on a regular basis to see it. The expansion in those areas in the clubs in northern New South Wales has been enormous. Do honourable members know how they are funded? I will tell them. They are funded by the Queensland taxpayers, who are allowed to go across the border to spend the money----

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport had 90 minutes in which to make his contribution. I ask him to cease interjecting.

Mr ELDER: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. The Opposition cries foul at the moment, but what did the National Party do about the problem when it was in Government? The fact is that Queensland clubs folded while the New South Wales clubs prospered. The previous Government did absolutely nothing. The Liberals are equally responsible because they were part of a coalition Government at the time. The previous Government stood by and watched the daily procession continue. Unfortunately for Queensland clubs, former Premier Bjelke-Petersen was implacably opposed to pokies. However, his Government for years ignored and condoned, by that action, the expansion of in-line machines in Queensland clubs, to the point at which income from this illegal source was, in many cases, the clubs' only saviour. That Government did nothing to assist the clubs by addressing the problems with in-line machines, by regulating policing or even legitimising the process. It was too hard for that Government to deal with and, in the end, it was left to the Fitzgerald commission. It was left to Fitzgerald to inform the previous Government of what it had known for years, that is, that the in-line industry was racked with corruption, payments, secret commissions, stand-overs, tax evasion and falsification of records. As members of the Opposition well know, many in the industry were prominent in, or well connected with, organised crime.

The Opposition Leader has the nerve to tell this Government to withdraw this legislation because he describes poker machines as the heroin of the gambling industry, which will open the door to corruption. Members of the Opposition actually opened the veins and pumped it straight in, because the system of the previous Government is corrupt, and it has been corrupt for years. The nerve of them, making sanctimonious statements to this Government! They should take a look at what the previous Government did to the clubs. Many of those involved in the club industry have long memories. The National Party Government was responsible for the proliferation of in-line machines. It condoned the illegal activity; it did nothing about it. This was to the long-term financial detriment of the club industry. Many did not survive the previous Government's head-in-the-sand approach, and members of the Opposition ought to be ashamed of it. Over the years, this appalling state of affairs was allowed to continue. It is something that the previous Government condoned, and now the Opposition is trying to take it out on this Government.

Surprisingly, the former National Party Government allowed video gaming machines into the State's two casinos but not poker machines. Queenslanders are able to bet legally on electronic card games and Keno machines, which the former Government argued required patrons to engage in a game of skill. It argued that one had to be skilled to engage in a game. What hypocrisy! There is no difference between many of the poker machines available on the market today and the types of machines that are available in the casino. In fact, all of them require very little skill to master. After a one-week crash course, the Opposition front bench could no doubt manage it. It would take anyone else 60 seconds to do it. The argument that has been used over the years by the Opposition--and the argument that is being used by it today--is mischievous and dishonest.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr ELDER: It is mischievous and dishonest. The member for Southport has done backflips over this issue. I know that in the club industry the honourable member is about as popular as a renal burp in a crowded elevator.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that he clearly recognised that there was a danger that criminal elements could be attracted to the industry. Studies overseas and in New South Wales, as well as the Queensland in-line machine debacle, along with allegations and evidence before the Fitzgerald inquiry, develop the fear that corruption is an inherent component of this form of gambling. Thus there is the need for strict, tough, uncompromising legislation. The Minister went on to say that the Government was also mindful of the potential impact on other forms of gambling and of undesirable social effects. However, he said that those matters could be resolved, and it was decided that the positive effects of gaming machines far outweighed the possible negatives. Under the legislation, all gaming machine sites, repairers, service contractors and people involved in controlling gaming operations would be licensed. Machine manufacturers and suppliers would be investigated. To avoid corruption associated with kickbacks in the industry, the Government would buy gaming machines and allocate them to clubs and hotels.

Because of the history of gaming industries in other States and other jurisdictions, the Queensland Government is determined that the introduction of gaming machines will be controlled by strong and uncompromising legislation. In line with this most stringent legislation, the penalty provisions are comparable with the offence committed. With the current penalty unit set at \$60, the maximum penalty for the most serious offences would be \$60,000, or 1 000 units, or imprisonment for five years, or both. I will mention some of the clauses that deal with those major penalty provisions. Clause 3.27 provides that gaming machines may not be played unless a licence is in force. If machines are being played and a licence has not been issued, the persons concerned are open to the maximum fine. All of these are maximum fines of \$60,000 or imprisonment for five years. Clause 6.6 prohibits the possession, operation and sale of gaming machines or restricted components by persons who are not licensed under the Act. It provides major penalty provisions for these offences. The same applies in regard to the provision dealing with unlisted machines. Clause 6.22 prohibits gaming on unprotected devices. That clause prohibits gaming on a machine which has not been protected with a seal placed by an inspector or other approved person under the Act. Clause 6.23 deals with unlawful interference with gaming equipment. Clause 6.24 provides that only an inspector or other approved person may break a seal or seal the computer cabinet, or game microchip or remove or replace any component or security seal. The Government has included major provisions to cover the enforcement of this legislation. Clause 6.24 deals with protection of sensitive areas of gaming equipment. Clause 6.26 deals with the use of gaming machines not provided to licensees. Clause 10.11 deals with cheating. There are also lesser offences. I will not go through them. They are outlined in the Bill. There are a considerable number of offences, as well as general penalty clauses that apply where there is not a specific penalty that can be stated.

All these penalty provisions--all the major penalty provisions--are unsurpassed in Australian legislation. Under the legislation, the Government will require the clubs to display prominently the list of gaming rules that are applicable to these penalties. It is incumbent upon those clubs to fully inform the patrons of their obligations. As I have said, the Government ownership of the machines will ensure strict security through security checks on manufacture and licensing and, ultimately, computerised monitoring of machines.

In short, with this legislation this Government will enforce the world's tightest poker machine controls--I repeat "the world's tightest poker machine controls"--a far cry from the pathetic endeavours that members opposite undertook when they were in Government when dealing with illegal gambling and with illegal activity. If they had done something about it in the years when the in-line machines were proliferating in clubs, maybe honourable members would not be in this position today. I commend the Minister for this legislation.

Mr SANTORO (Merthyr) (3.09 p.m.): The Liberal Party will oppose this Bill in total and will not seek to make any amendments. Because of the shortness of the time available to me and because opportunities will be available at the Committee stage, I will refrain from making detailed comment about many of the specific provisions within this Bill.

The Bill represents one of the most traumatic reforms that this Government has sought to introduce within this place, and its impact on the social, economic and moral fibre of Queensland will be felt dramatically for many years to come. This impact cannot in any way be described as positive or of long-term benefit to Queensland and its people. The Liberal Party will oppose this Bill for the following reasons--

- (1) the Bill leaves the door open for corrupt influences to infiltrate the gaming industry;
- (2) it fails to implement anti-corruption standards essential to prevent corruption, for example, the establishment of an independent gaming commission;
- (3) it establishes structures that are authoritarian and extreme in their application and set the Minister up, irrespective of who it is--I do not want to be seen throughout this speech as having a go just at the Minister who is in charge of this legislation in this case--as the suprema capable of abusing and being abused; and
- (4) the introduction of poker machines is not the panacea for the problems being experienced by the sporting and social clubs of Queensland.

If I have enough time to quote a few examples, I will be able to inform Mr Elder of some facts which will disprove some of the claims that he made recently in this House.

- (5) The Minister and the Government have failed, in my view, to assess the adverse social consequences of the introduction of poker machines; and
- (6) the Bill overrides many of the legitimate powers of local government authorities.

It is on the first three objections that I wish to dedicate the bulk of my remarks today, and my Liberal Party colleagues who will follow me will, in turn, amplify on those and the other objections that I have listed. This Bill leaves Queensland wide open to the spectre of corruption. In view of the Minister's and the Government's performance within and outside of this place, the Liberal Party can form no conclusion other than that the Government is keen to see this happen.

To fully explain this point, I wish to go back to what the CJC concluded on page 8 of its *Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations*. It stated--

"The introduction of gaming machines concerns this Commission in two respects. Firstly there are long established and well documented links between the legal and illegal gaming machine industry and organised criminal interests. Secondly the establishment of a gaming machine industry dealing in high cash turnovers in numerous locations can be expected to contribute to an increase in general criminal activity.

The best possible regulatory system can be expected to 'moderate rather than eliminate increased criminal activity'."

The Commission went on to say in its report--

"From the viewpoint of this Commission the most striking feature of previous inquiries is the common conclusion that, if gaming is to be introduced at all, it be under the control of a regulatory authority and that those involved in gaming be subject to some procedure of licensing."

The Commission concluded, and honourable members opposite should pay attention to this--

"This Commission is of the view that any gaming regulatory authority should be accountable to parliament rather than to a Minister or Department. After establishment, the authority could, and should, be funded by levies or fees upon the gaming machine industry."

The Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee considered the views of the CJC and, in its report tabled in this place on 1 September 1990, the majority of the Committee--I stress that that majority is made up of Labor members--recommended--

" . . . that an independent Commission which has responsibility for all gaming in Queensland be established expeditiously, and as far as possible in tandem with the introduction of gaming machines, to establish a system of accountability at all decision making levels."

I stress that that recommendation was in fact put forward by the majority of the committee, comprising Labor members. I am sorry that they are not present in the House because a committee meeting is in progress at this point. Otherwise, I would ask them to confirm exactly where they stand in relation to the recommendation that they made. The non-Labor members on the committee went further and recommended in a joint minority report that--

" . . . an independent Gaming Commission which has responsibility for all gaming in Queensland be established prior to the introduction of gaming machines in Queensland in order to ensure maximum accountability and integrity at all decision making levels."

The recommendations were put forward by both the CJC and members of the parliamentary committee after exhaustive investigation and public hearings during which expert witnesses tendered evidence that an independent gaming commission, reporting directly to Parliament and not to the Minister, was essential if corruption within a gaming industry in Queensland is to be kept out. One of those expert witnesses was in fact none other than Mr Noel Hall, the current head of the Casino Control Division and the person who will be the director of the Queensland Machine Gaming Commission. I acknowledge Mr Hall's presence in the lobby. Yet the Minister has chosen to ignore his advice and has, at the same time, ignored long-standing Labor Party policy--those long-serving and suffering grassroots ignored yet again!

Mr Swarten: Fancy you worrying about it!

Mr SANTORO: The honourable member for Rockhampton North certainly does not worry about it because he allows his Ministers and his Government, as honourable members will see when the EARC legislation is introduced into this House shortly, to prostitute long-standing Labor principles and policies.

Mr Swarten: What a hypocrite! You've never worked in your life.

Mr SANTORO: I will help look after the interests of the honourable member's constituents. If they are legitimate, I will help look after them because the honourable member is obviously incapable of doing so. So what has the Minister given to Queensland within this Bill? He has given Queensland a Bill which is the antithesis of what the commissioner, the parliamentary committee, expert witnesses and pre-election ALP policy recommended, demanded and expected from this Government.

The Minister has set up a Queensland Machine Gaming Division which is totally subservient to the whims of the current Minister, future Ministers and those who influence them. Under the provisions of the Bill before the House, the Minister--and I urge all the civil libertarians and those members opposite who are concerned with the rights of individuals to listen carefully--has the power to hire and fire members of the commission. He has the power to order the commission to do absolutely whatever he desires. He has no obligation--and this should concern all members of this Parliament--to report promptly, if at all, to Parliament every year, given that the Act requires the commission to furnish to the Minister "as soon as may be convenient after 30th June in each year a report on the Commission and its operations under this Act during the year ended on that day". The Minister may rescind any decision or determination of the commission. He has the absolute and exclusive right to hear appeals from decisions of the commission, and presides over legislation which allows a determination of the Minister to "be final and is not to be appealed against, reviewed, quashed or in any way called into question in any court or tribunal on any account".

I see the Minister smiling. I know what he will say either when he replies or at the Committee stage. He will say that there is an EARC initiative which will basically impose judicial review on all Government decisions. The Minister will move an amendment. My challenge to him is to make sure that it encompasses all operations of the gaming commission, which is being set up under this Bill, and that it encompasses all decisions----

Mr Gibbs: Read the Bill. If you had read the Bill and were totally cognisant of it, that's already guaranteed in it.

Mr SANTORO: That is not what the clause in the Bill----

Mr Gibbs: Read that page of the Bill.

Mr SANTORO: I am happy to be corrected. If what the Minister is claiming is in the Bill is in fact to be given effect, the paragraph to which I refer will have to be rescinded and amended considerably.

The provisions to which I have referred represent one of the greatest concentrations of power in the hands of one man since the abolition of absolute monarchy. All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. I think the honourable member for Southport was right when he suggested that, under this Bill, the Minister has absolute power and that therefore the emergence of corruption on the part of a Minister is a matter of when, not if.

Let me recap. The Minister has power to hire and fire commissioners. He is not bound by their decisions. Appeals from decisions of the commission are to the Minister. I suggest that the provision for an appeal from Caesar to Caesar is a complete sham. The Minister is obviously frightened of public and independent scrutiny and of having to justify his decisions. Hence the exclusion of effective judicial review of commission decisions. As far as I am concerned, the Minister has set up a kangaroo court with himself as Chief Justice for the Supreme Court of Queensland. The public voted for and wanted openness and accountability from this Government and unbiased decisions from an independent umpire who owes no-one favours. Obviously, the members of the public are again bitterly disappointed with what they are getting in this Bill. The system of ministerial appeal is dangerous, unfair and undesirable and this will be proven many times over as this legislation comes into affect. If anyone has been instructed to prepare legislation guaranteed to provide an obstacle-free fast track to the introduction of poker machines, then value for money has been given.

So who is going to take care of the crooks--and I use that word advisedly, as the honourable member for Southport did--who will undoubtedly by now be rubbing their hands in glee. None other than the Queensland Machine Gaming Division which, as I have just pointed out, is a toothless tiger which can and progressively will become subjugated to the whims of the Minister and those who do and will influence him. So let us take a closer look at this Government body which the Minister confidently claims will keep criminal and corruptive influences out of the gaming industry in Queensland. The Minister bases this confidence on the fact that the new body will be very much based on the current Casino Control Division and that it will be headed by Mr Hall, the current head of the Casino Control Division. At this point, I stress that any comments I make should not be misconstrued by anyone within this place or outside it as an attack on Mr Hall or the Minister's other senior adviser, Mr Allan Pettigrew, who I notice is sitting in the ministerial advisory box. The Liberal Party believes these two people to be competent and honest public servants who advise the Minister accordingly but whose advice often and, as I have shown here today, unfortunately falls on deaf ears.

As I said previously in this speech, it was Mr Hall who, at the public hearings of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice in relation to the CJC report on gaming machines, said that he thought that an independent gaming commission was essential in the overseeing of the gaming industry in Queensland and that such a

commission would take not much more than 12 months to set up. This is what the senior adviser of the Government and the Minister advised. Yet the Minister and the Cabinet ignored the advice and proceeded to set up a ministerial junta that will, in the view of the Liberal Party, eventually bring much discredit on the gaming industry of Queensland.

Last week, given what seemed to us to be the existence of prima facie evidence that the Casino Control Division had failed to keep corrupt elements out of the Gold Coast casino, the Liberal Party and I asked this Government to postpone the debate on the Bill before us today. This morning, the Honourable the Treasurer sought to hose down the impact and the reality of the leaked report by saying--

" . . . the Casino Control Division could not--nor could it be expected to--be aware of each and every high roller who visits the casino".

The Treasurer then went on to say that really it was the responsibility of other authorities, including Commonwealth immigration authorities, to sift out and stop the entry into Australia and the casino of organised crime elements. I ask the Minister: what sort of buck-passing is this? Although the Treasurer is not in the Chamber, I ask him: what excuse is he tendering? Is he talking about the same Casino Control Division as that about which Minister Gibbs said in the *Australian* on Tuesday, 9 January 1990, "I have full confidence in their honesty and professionalism."? Or is it the same commission about which the Premier said on the Henshaw program on the 3 June 1990--and I am happy to tender the audio tape and the transcript--

" . . . we believe that we can keep the shonky operators out and to give you an example, Rod, look at the Casino down at the Coast and the Casino in Townsville, they are controlled with some of the most strict regulations in the world by the Casino Control Division and there has never been a hint or a whiff of corruption about either of our two casinos".

I point out to the Premier and the Minister that we have just experienced more than a whiff of corruption around at least one casino, and it is not simply the words of an Opposition spokesman saying so. The leaked police report alleged that Japanese crime bosses have frequented Jupiters Casino. They have been flown into Queensland at the expense of the casino, carrying in excess of \$1m in their suitcases. The Treasurer casually concluded his statement this morning by saying that he assured all members of this place "that all information and allegations will be taken seriously and that the comprehensive system of checks and balances built into the State's casino and gaming machine operations will be reviewed and enhanced to the extent necessary to protect the public interest". The Treasurer was already admitting that it will be necessary to patch up legislation that, at the time when he made that statement, had not yet even gone through this place and totally failed to explain to the satisfaction of at least the Liberal Party and me the obvious lapse of the Casino Control Division and the casino management as detailed in the leaked police report.

If the Treasurer and the Minister responsible for this legislation stick to their commitment of investigating the allegations contained in the police report, and if the allegations contained in the police report are found to have any validity, then serious doubts will hang over the effectiveness of the Casino Control Division to monitor and control the movements of organised crime elements within Queensland's gaming industry. The questions that must be asked are: why was it up to the police to detect the alleged movements of the Yakuza rather than the Casino Control Division, whose responsibility it is to keep the gaming industry in Queensland clean? Was the Casino Control Division aware that Japanese crime bosses were visiting Jupiters Casino? I acknowledge that these are clearly only allegations. According to the report, members of the Yakuza did not visit the casino on a sporadic or once-only basis; they visited it on several occasions. It would not have been beyond the ability or the bludgeoning determination of this Government--if it indeed had the will--to pass through this House legislation that would have beefed up the powers and ability of the Casino Control Division to stop those people from frequenting that casino and other gaming establishments in Queensland.

One must ask: is there any evidence that the Yakuza has been using casinos for money-laundering? If so, why have there been no prosecutions? What has the Casino Control Division done to keep the Yakuza out of casinos? In asking these questions, I stress that I am not questioning the integrity of people who are running that division, including members of this Chamber. If members of the Yakuza really were coming to Queensland and patronising our establishments, if the Government and the State were earning revenue from the patronage of Queensland gaming resorts by organised crime elements, and if this Government did nothing to stop the gaining of revenue from that patronage by alleged crime bosses, this Government should hang its head in shame for more reasons than those I have just mentioned.

Depending on the answers to these and other questions which could be asked, serious doubts may be raised about the ability of the Casino Control Division to monitor and control the movements of organised crime elements within the two Queensland casinos. I remind members that the Minister tells this House that the new Machine Gaming Commission established by this Bill is based on the successful Casino Control Division. Clearly, before proceeding with this legislation the Government had the obligation to sort out the allegations contained in the police report. If it is found that the Casino Control Division cannot monitor and control two geographically well-confined gambling establishments--irrespective of the reasons--what chance does a new body have if it has to control 21 000 poker machines distributed throughout approximately 2 000 pubs and clubs in this greatly decentralised State of Queensland? I suggest to the House that it would have very little chance.

Why has the Government taken such enormous risks by setting up a gaming industry framework that is so patently faulty and open to the insidious influence of corrupt outside bodies? In answering this question, I find it difficult to disagree with many of the general and specific reasons tendered by my honourable and learned colleague the member for Southport. One cannot dismiss lightly the easily drawn conclusion that someone somewhere in Government owes someone else something, and that the best way to pay back what is owed is to have one's sticky hands in the till and over the day-to-day control of the Queensland gaming industry. It is a shame that it has come to this, because far too much is at stake, not just for today's Queenslanders but for those who will follow us. It would have been a relatively simple task to set up an independent gaming commission. As I have said, it could have been set up quickly and efficiently. It could have been funded by some of the huge amounts of money which the Government will get its hands on once the poker machine industry is properly set up. Initially, it could have covered only the operations of the poker machine industry--which, after all, is the major area of concern--and, at later stages, it could have gone on to take over the control of other forms of gambling, such as racing, Gold Lotto, etc. As well, it could have been established within 12 months, as was clearly stated by Mr Hall and other expert and independent witnesses at the parliamentary committee's public hearings.

Queensland clubs have waited for over 30 years for the introduction of poker machines. I fail to see how waiting a maximum of an extra twelve months could have made much difference. If the Minister and the Government had been serious from the start about introducing an independent gaming commission, that commission could have been established by now and introduced in tandem with this legislation, which was what members of the Labor Party strongly recommended.

Unfortunately, I have insufficient time to mention other disadvantages of this legislation. However, at the Committee stage I will elaborate further on the impositions--the gross travesties--that this legislation places on the autonomy of local authorities, and the social impact that it will have on Queensland families. Despite what Mr Elder said, other colleagues of mine will give very detailed examples of how clubs in New South Wales which have allegedly benefited from poker machines are going broke. Members of the Liberal Party will rebut many of the points made by Mr Elder and which undoubtedly will be made by other members. I do not intend to be blunt and crass by making outlandish statements about the motives of the Minister and his

Government. The Liberal Party does not believe that the Minister is genuinely committed to fighting corruption, and will continue to remind him of the negative effects of this legislation.

Time expired.

Mr SCHWARTEN (Rockhampton North) (3.29 p.m.): It is perhaps fortuitous that I follow the honourable member for Merthyr, who has just read a speech that was written for him. Obviously, he was able to give that speech fairly eloquently.

Mr SANTORO: I rise to a point of order. I do not feel that there is a great necessity for me to take this point of order. However, if the honourable member for Rockhampton North cares to speak to the secretary on the eleventh floor of the Parliamentary Annexe, he will be able to confirm----

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

Mr SANTORO: I rise to a further point of order. I find offensive the remarks made by the honourable member for Rockhampton North about my speech-writing. I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I withdraw my comments about the honourable member's speech. I thought that I was paying the member for Merthyr a compliment by saying that somebody else had written his speech for him. He had the same opportunity as I had to travel around Australia and inspect various gambling casinos. He toured New South Wales and familiarised himself with poker machines in that State. He was also privy to various submissions on poker machines. Because he shared the same experiences as I did, I would not have thought that he would hold those views.

Mr Santoro: Where do you stand?

Mr SCHWARTEN: I take the interjection. Either the honourable member has another agenda or he is remarkably stupid. I will let honourable members decide which inference they will draw. I wish to make a number of points in order to put some reasonable tenor into the debate. I do not speak as a member of the CJC, but the CJC had the opportunity to consider the matter. We travelled around Australia and familiarised ourselves with the issues. A large question mark lies over some of the items that were referred to by the honourable member for Southport. Many matters to which he referred in the report that came to the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice were, to my mind, very inaccurate and certainly not backed up by some officers of the New South Wales police force with whom we spoke. The honourable member for Merthyr was present on that occasion and he may have drawn a different conclusion. However, having visited the casinos that I did, I do not believe that the statements made by the member for Southport and the member for Merthyr have any substantial basis. It is unfortunate that many of the concerns that were raised do not have any durability or sustainability.

When we were in New South Wales, we were treated very kindly by the Illawarra Catholic Club. I assure honourable members that I did not notice any shysters, pimps or prostitutes lurking around the entrance to that club. However, I did see the books of the club, which clearly indicate that the club has a very admirable social conscience. The club hosts free days for pensioners. It has chiropodists and doctors on staff. It runs free buses and organises meals for pensioners who live in the area. It has a community watch system. All of those activities are funded by the club from money received from poker machines. No honourable member could say that the group involved with the Illawarra Catholic Club consists of shysters, thieves, robbers and crooks, as honourable members opposite have indicated. From what I saw, that is far from the truth.

The honourable member for Southport referred to my husbanding of my guests in the gallery. It is entirely fortuitous that he mentioned my good friends, Harry and Colleen Wood, who have just returned from New South Wales. They are locals of Rockhampton, and they just spent a few days after their son's wedding touring RSL clubs and other

places in New South Wales. They tell an entirely different story to that which has been expounded in the House today. They illustrate that there are not only groups of people who make a yearly pilgrimage into New South Wales and enjoy the facilities that clubs there have to offer but also people who weekly, or perhaps even daily, enjoy that privilege. I am astounded that the honourable member for Southport would say that all of those people who pursue their gambling passions across the Tweed on a daily or weekly basis do so to be ripped off or to become destitute or do so because there is something wrong with them. I do not believe that that is the case, but therein lies another point.

I do not know how to arrive at an exact figure, but I have heard figures of between \$2m and \$5m bandied about that weekly goes over the border in the form of buses, for example, that take people to gamble. I do not know what the figure is. I do not think anyone can state it accurately, but I am willing to bet that it is above \$2m. Every week, that occurs in Queensland. I cite the example of compulsive gamblers who throw their pay-packets down the drain and throw themselves on the mercy of the welfare system of this State. They chuck their pay-packets over the border, come back into Queensland and throw themselves upon the mercy of the Queensland taxpayers. I do not know how members of the Opposition feel about that but, for my money, I would rather those compulsive gamblers spend the money in Queensland so that Queensland has the return that the honourable member for Southport talked about, which can then go towards the welfare system so that from our own taxpayers' dollars we can help those compulsive gamblers, those people who cannot help themselves. For the life of me, I cannot see what is wrong with that notion.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I am pleased that that struck a raw nerve with members opposite. We have heard them talk about the outbreak of crime. If we were to follow their argument to its logical conclusion, we would ban scratch caskets, because they generate money into newsagencies. For people such as my mate, Greg Belz, who ran a newsagency in Rockhampton and who was broken into on five occasions, the generation of money then generated crime. We would close down banks in Queensland because they generate crime. The fact is that, wherever there is cash, somebody is out there with a sawn-off double-barrelled shotgun who wants to poke it across the counter and take the money. This will not be any exception. I defy any honourable member to say so. The fact is that a group of hypocrites lurk on the opposite side of the House. They did not oppose casinos in this State, because casinos generate cash flow. Members opposite sit piously in the House and rabbit on about casinos and how much crime they have generated, but who introduced casinos in this State? None other than the National Party!

The National Party introduced casinos into this State but now it is saying that the Labor Government should bear the cross of poker machines. That is not the case at all and I have a lot of faith in the way in which casinos are run in this State. I have seen casinos in other States and the intricacies of their security systems. They are the best of their type in the world, and members opposite know that. The honourable blurter from Merthyr knows that that is the case and that he is on very shaky ground.

Mr SANTORO: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Now he is going to buck about being called a blurter.

Mr SANTORO: I have heard members on the Government side of the House take points of order on far less insulting comments. I find the honourable member's comment offensive and I ask him to withdraw it. I ask that you, Mr Deputy Speaker, so direct.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I am deeply wounded that I have offended the honourable member's pride, and I withdraw the comment.

Mr Veivers: Mr Schwarten----

Mr SCHWARTEN: I will get to the honourable member for Southport, if I have time. The fact of the matter is that members of this House have a golden opportunity

to give the public of Queensland what they want. Believe me, where I come from the clubs are screaming for poker machines and they would have installed them three months ago if they could have done so. I receive phone calls on a weekly basis from clubs and pubs in my electorate asking me, "When are they going to arrive? When is the Labor Party going to live up to its promise of putting these into place?" The reason members opposite do not like it is that they are the last fleas on the last dogs in this State in terms of bringing Queensland up to date and realising that that is what the public wants. That is why members of the National Party are sitting on the other side of the House; they lost touch with what the people of Queensland wanted. By and large, Queenslanders want this form of gambling, and I am sure that once poker machines are installed, no Opposition member will wander down to his or her RSL club, football club or any other club, stand up on a soap box and knock poker machines .

Mr Elder: That is if they are invited.

Mr SCHWARTEN: Of course they would not be invited. These machines are not the same as the ones made in the early 1960s or 1970s. These are very, very sophisticated machines. One only has to visit New South Wales to see the sophisticated mechanisms in place there. I again refer to the Illawarra Catholic Club.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise is obviously interjecting and saying that they are crooks and rort merchants down there. The Illawarra Catholic Club has the runs on the board. There are no shady characters lurking around there, trying to knock money off people and push prostitutes on to other groups. The fact is, as the honourable member for Manly indicated, that 85 per cent will be returned to the player, which is different from the system operating in New South Wales where it is taken on the basis of turn-over. As far as I am concerned, the reality is that all of the safeguards that are currently available are put in place through this legislation. They are there. I am satisfied, having looked at the legislation, that it will prevent criminality as far as that is possible. This is on just the same basis as banks, credit unions, newsagencies and corner stores guarantee that their place will not be broken into, their safes will not be tampered with and that the money that they put in the banks will not be taken away. That is the fact of the matter. There is no such thing as a 100 per cent foolproof system. If we had a 100 per cent foolproof system, banks would not be robbed and petty criminals would not flourish anywhere in the world.

The old rorts and mischief of putting buckles down poker machine handles, mucking around with screwdrivers and tinkering around in the dark are in the dim, dark ages. They are not applicable to a modern-day debate on poker machines. Poker machines have been brought almost into the twenty-first century and the technology is there to detect people wanting to do the wrong thing to poker machines. They can be picked up very quickly, and the honourable member for Merthyr knows that is the case.

Mr Santoro: What about the independent gaming commission that you recommended? Where do you stand on that?

Mr SCHWARTEN: I ask the honourable member to give it away. He is obsessed with that. He has a bit of a problem. He is simply saying the same thing over and over again. The honourable member knows----

Mr Santoro: That's not what I said. It's what you said.

Mr SCHWARTEN: The honourable member is either illiterate or deaf.

Mr Santoro: It is what you said.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I just said that before. The honourable member should go and get his hearing tested. Previously, I said that I was satisfied that all the safeguards are contained in the legislation and that they adequately cover the matter raised by the honourable member. I do not intend to indulge the honourable member any further.

The other area to which reference has been made concerns the distribution of the machines. I do not expect the ignoramus from Merthyr to understand this proposition, because he seems to be unable to grasp the other proposition. Therefore, I will say this very slowly: the place where the rorts mainly exist is in the operations of the middleman, and that is something----

Mr SANTORO: I remind the honourable member for Rockhampton North that schoolchildren are in the gallery, and my point of order is that I find his remarks----

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! Is this a point of order?

Mr SANTORO: It is a point of order. I find his remark about me offensive, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr SCHWARTEN: I withdraw the word in deference to the schoolchildren who are here and who have to listen to the member for Merthyr displaying his sensitive ego in front of them. I urge those schoolchildren to turn a deaf ear to what he has to say.

The rorts occur with the middleman. That fact has been exposed and referred to in the report made to the committee. This has been adequately dealt with under this legislation. There will be no shysters wandering around offering free kegs of beer or whatever else in return for using this or that machine. I turn to my other point, and I will not make any derogatory remarks about the sensitive member for Merthyr because I know that it upsets him. The member for Merthyr would not accept the assurance given by the Treasurer of this State this morning. I understand the political game he is playing, but he is not playing it very well. If he keeps up this type of conduct, he will be destined never to beat Mr Beanland's leadership of the Liberal Party. Anyway, who would want to lead that group of motherless kittens huddled in the corner of this Chamber? They cannot even find their way to the correct side of the House in the middle of a division, which is why the honourable member got the sack as Liberal Whip. He should not keep interrupting me because he could not get his colleagues to vote at the right time or to stand up and be counted properly. This morning, the Treasurer of this State made some very pertinent comments about the manner in which casinos in this State are being run. He also referred to the statement that had been made in the weekend press.

Mr Dunworth: Did you prepare this?

Mr SCHWARTEN: Better than the honourable gunslinger could. I am yet to hear him fire in this Chamber. He has made about one speech in this Parliament and he spends his time going down to the Crest to bash people. He would be a great asset to a casino as a standover man. He could get a job as a bouncer.

I do not want to prolong any further the agony being suffered by members of the Opposition while they are being told the truth. Let me simply say that I am very confident that the majority of Queenslanders who gave this Government a mandate on 2 December 1989 did so with the firm knowledge that poker machines would be introduced into this State. They will be satisfied with the steps taken by the Honourable Minister to ensure that corruption will be kept out of the industry in this State. It is my great delight to support the Bill before the House.

Mr JOHNSON (Gregory) (3.49 p.m.): After the garbage that fell from the mouth of the member for Rockhampton North, I hope honourable members can hear me. I doubt whether even the honourable member knows what he said. However, at the outset, I point out that I am one who feels that, in Queensland, sufficient and adequate gambling opportunities are available presently and that the introduction of poker machines to this State is totally unwarranted. To my mind, this Bill has been introduced not to meet gamblers' needs but to meet the Government's taxation coffers' necessities. I believe that that is the main reason for the introduction of this Bill. This Government's policies and its grab bag of electoral promises, which it is now finding difficult, if not impossible, to implement, are the real driving forces behind this Bill.

I do not believe that the vast majority of Queenslanders want gaming machines or poker machines or one-armed bandits--whatever one wishes to call them--because people are satisfied with the gambling facilities that are available in this State. People are more than satisfied to attend casinos, to bet on racing or football, attend the TAB and play Gold Lotto. I think those forms of gambling are sufficient. Despite the general thinking in the community at large, thankfully, I do not believe that this Bill will result in poker machines being available in every town. However, it is true to say that for the same income-raising purposes as those being pursued by this Government, certain sections of the business community are very keen to have this form of gambling legalised. They, too, do not understand the long-term ramifications; they, too, do not seem to care very much where the money comes from, or whether people can afford another gambling habit; they, too, do not care very much about the predicted damage and hurt this legislation will cause to family budgets. They simply adopt the attitude that if people are stupid enough to play the machines, they are only too willing to put into their pockets as much of that money as possible, which is where the "don't care" attitude comes in.

For years, manufacturers of machines have been aided and abetted by certain representatives of licensed clubs and hotels who wanted to get poker machines introduced into the community in this State. I understand that some years ago a manufacturer lobbied at least one senior member of the present Cabinet very strongly. I have no doubt that the Minister for Primary Industries will attest to that fact. For years, these licensed clubs and hotel lobbyists have been looking with envy across the border at the plush poker machine palaces and their seemingly unlimited cash flows. The previous National Party Government steadfastly refused the entry of poker machines into this State and kept the sticky fingers of poker machine operators out of the affairs of this State and out of family wage packets that are so important to family members. It clearly held the interests of the family unit above the financial interests of clubs and hotels. I am sorry to say that this present Government obviously does not have the same high ideals and values as those that were upheld by the previous National Party Government.

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: That is good. In common with the licensed clubs and hotel lobby groups, the present Government obviously wishes to get its hands on the proverbial pot of gold--the pokie font of wealth. Perhaps, after all, the people who live in rural areas really do not have much to worry about. I say that because, judging by the way that rural areas are going presently, there will be nobody left to put money into poker machines. Bearing in mind the type of representation offered by this Government and the ability of its members to carry out their responsibilities, together with the obligations of this Government that have just fallen by the wayside, it is apparent that the responsibilities of this elected Government do not loom large any more. Moreover, the Federal Government has lost sight of the real issues.

Mr Dollin: What about the Federal Opposition? They are cracking up.

Mr JOHNSON: No, they are not. People have been led to believe that these new money-generators will become available in all clubs and hotels, regardless of the size of the supporting population. They have also been led to believe that, as a direct result of this availability, the standards and facilities offered by local clubs and hotels will improve substantially and become somewhat akin to those luxury clubs across the border. I feel that if people believe that poker machines will do well in this State, they have had a very dangerous drug administered to them. I have had a fair bit to do with New South Wales and I have seen the way in which poker machines operate in that State. I have seen what that has done to the values and life-styles of many people who live in New South Wales. However, I have been advised that, due to the high operating costs proposed by this Government--the big Government rental, tax and levy slugs--basic economics will dictate that each machine will require a very substantial minimum gambling population to make it viable. I understand that this is true.

I have been told that, because of the cost structure involved in rent and so on, the introduction of poker machines in a town with a population of 8 000 or less is unlikely to be a viable proposition. The honourable member for Southport has already made the point that the return to players is to be 85 per cent of turn-over. It is no doubt a reasonable gambling ratio in the minds of many who will be suckered into it; however, not everyone wins. In real terms, the majority of gamblers are losers. Instead of 85 per cent being returned to the people, it might be more like 5 per cent.

Hotels will pay the Government a gross turn-over levy of 10 per cent and clubs will pay 4 per cent. The monthly rental charges for a machine will be a minimum of \$100 for a club and \$300 for a hotel. In a town such as Barcaldine with six hotels and a population of 1 100 or 1 200, for the life of me I cannot see how poker machines can be a viable proposition. At present, the hotels in those towns are suffering because they do not have sufficient patrons.

Mr McGrady: They are not being forced.

Mr JOHNSON: I am merely telling Government members what the facts are; however, they do not want to hear them. At present in those country towns, there is not enough money going around to keep businesses viable.

Mr Dollin interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: The honourable member would not be worried. He is not worried about anything. That is the problem with him. I guarantee that in two years, when the people of Maryborough make a decision on his future, he will be worried.

Mr Lingard: Is it true they are closing at Mount Isa?

Mr JOHNSON: That is exactly right. As the honourable member for Fassifern has reminded me---

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Bill.

Mr JOHNSON: I will, Mr Deputy Speaker.

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: It is a bit like everything else. We try to tell Government members the real facts, but they do not want to hear them. On top of these rental and levy charges--sport and recreation levy and a charitable and rehabilitation levy--operators will reportedly have to pay a gaming licence fee of \$1,500 every two years. They will also have to employ additional staff and provide special gaming room facilities. Huge expense will be involved in providing those facilities and struggling clubs will not be able to afford them.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister predicted that the sport and recreation and charitable and rehabilitation levies will allow the Government to distribute an additional \$54m a year to those bodies. I suggest that at the same time the Minister should increase the number of Family Court judges to process the increased number of family break-downs as a result of the introduction of gaming machines.

Mr Elder: Rubbish!

Mr JOHNSON: It is not rubbish.

Mr Elder: There have been no substantial reports. You can't validate it with any reports. Give me the reports that validate your statement.

Mr JOHNSON: It can be seen in New South Wales.

Mr Elder: Give me one.

Mr JOHNSON: I have seen it in New South Wales.

Mr Elder: Give me a report.

Mr JOHNSON: The honourable member has carried out a study on this and knows the position as well as I do.

I would like the Minister to inform the House of the proposed Government tax take as a result of the collection of those levies. To put it simply: if a country hotel installed one 10c machine, the licensee would be permitted to retain 5c in every \$1 played. Taking all rentals, levies and anticipated extra costs into account, it is estimated that a particular machine would have to be played 2.8 times per minute per 12-hour day, seven days a week, just to meet operating costs. At that rate, any small-town operating profit would be meagre indeed. In his summing up, perhaps the Minister could tell us just what the viability and, therefore, availability factors of those machines really are. Will they be viable only along the coastal strip and in major inland centres such as Mount Isa and Toowoomba?

Even at this late stage, owing to the history of these one-armed bandits strewn, as it is, with tales of corruption and family suffering--I stress "family suffering" because, with the implementation of this Bill, it will increase in this State--I personally believe the Bill should be defeated here on the floor of the House. If Government members had any credibility at all or any conscience, they would oppose it.

Mr Elder: I bet you can't.

Mr JOHNSON: No, because Government members do not have the guts to oppose it. Of course, thanks to Government numbers, the Bill will not be defeated unless a few of them find the intestinal fortitude to vote with their conscience rather than abide by party policy. I sincerely urge them to put the well-being of families and the welfare of this State first and this blatant tax-grab second. Tragically, we in Opposition can only watch this so-called people's Labor Government sell not the family farm on this occasion, but force many family units themselves into financial insecurity.

Mr Elder: Are you suggesting that they are all compulsive gamblers in the bush?

Mr JOHNSON: The honourable member is saying that.

Mr Elder: No, you are suggesting that. You are suggesting that they are all going broke.

Mr JOHNSON: They will be. At present, they do not have enough to go around in the bush. There are people out of work right throughout the State.

Mr Elder: You are suggesting they are all compulsive gamblers.

Mr JOHNSON: I am not saying they are compulsive gamblers. By introducing the legislation, you are making them compulsive gamblers.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr Pearce interjected.

Mr JOHNSON: We are worried about the workers. In the 14 or 15 months that Government members have been here, they have forgotten about them. If the legislation does go ahead, there is one particular point I would like to raise which appears to preserve and protect what I consider is a lousy--in every sense of the term--attitude by over-the-border pokie palaces. This is the often-reported claim by those running gaming areas that machines into which players have in all good faith inserted their money and won substantial prizes have suddenly malfunctioned. Going through the clauses of this Bill, I thought that, if we were going to have these one-armed bandits forced down our throats, at least the Government would block that obnoxious practice. But, no, it appears to be having two bob each way on the Bill at this stage.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister said that the legislation provides a mechanism by which complaints related to the non-payment of wages and improper

practices can be dealt with. He stated further that no-one other than Government inspectors and licensed repairers would have access to the computer cabinet and be permitted to service the microprocessor and the all important game EPROM. He went on to say that this EPROM holds the game program, including the random number generator, and may be termed the brains or controlling influence of the gaming machine. The Minister also said that it is vital that access to this area is restricted to prevent tampering. I am sure that all honourable members would agree that the electronics in an electronic machine must be protected to ensure that the machine operates satisfactorily. Later in his second-reading speech, the Minister made the direct statement that Part 5 of the legislation requires, among other things, that play must only be allowed on a properly functioning machine. So any logical thinker could believe that the Minister is saying that the machines must be functioning correctly and the operating mechanism sealed correctly against interference, so that if switched on they will work correctly and, by inference, pay out correctly. It is no surprise to read that provision is made in clauses 5.10 to 5.13 to ensure that players are paid their entitlement. That is not necessarily so. One has to admire bureaucratic hogwash. Although the Bill ensures that players are paid their entitlement, it also makes provision for the machine manager to refuse payment of a bet where the machine has malfunctioned. In my opinion, this is akin to cheating a player out of his rightful spoils. If a machine is capable of accepting money, then it is similarly capable of paying out.

Mr Smyth: Have you played poker machines?

Mr JOHNSON: Yes, many times. I have never won a brass razoo. According to the bureaucratic hogwash, protection for the player is provided by either the licensee or the director being empowered to reverse the refusal to pay out. That is exactly right. I have read complaints in the media regarding the interstate incidents in which jackpot pay-outs have been refused on the grounds of machine malfunction. Pigs might fly, too! The Government should stand up for the public in this instance and give the people a fair crack of the whip, if it is capable of doing so. It is not too late. If a machine is left operating to legally swallow a player's money, then at the press of the button, whatever the nominated win, it should be a legally enforceable pay-out. Who among the public knows how many of these one-armed bandits simply sit and swallow coins without making a pay-out? Where is the protection in this legislation for the public? I cannot find it. If the Minister can, I ask him to point it out to me in his reply. This Bill goes to considerable lengths to ensure honesty and security in the operation of these machines. If Queensland is to have gambling machines, I urge honourable members to support me in my call for protection of players and an assurance that pay-outs will be enforceable. The only exception should be in the case of deliberate cheating. After all, if there is a possible machine malfunction, the operators have the right to turn off the machine. If the operator allows a malfunctioning machine to operate, he should be forced to honour any winning amount, jackpot or otherwise.

Finally, the whole exercise will obviously require a small army of security-cleared people, from licensees right down to repairers. One can only hope that the scrutiny procedures adopted are a little better than those that are apparently used for taxi-drivers by the Transport Department. I mention also the major inroads into society that organised crime has made over the years to legitimise its money-laundering operations and so on. Apparently just such an infiltration of property and tourism developments in Queensland has been quietly achieved by Japan's best-organised crime groups. The Yakuza or the Japanese Mafia--call them whatever you like--are criminal elements and they are operating on the coast of this State today. One would have to be blind not to recognise the opportunities that the introduction of poker machines to Queensland would present to this one group alone. As I said at the outset, I firmly believe that for the overall betterment of Queenslanders, in many and varied ways, this Bill should be scrapped here and now. I honestly believe that the Minister is not happy with the introduction of this Bill. I can tell by the look that the Minister has had on his face all day that he wishes that it would go away. I can assure the Minister that if he were to scrap this Bill now, his credibility would rise one thousand fold.

Mr Gibbs: I am deeply touched.

Mr JOHNSON: I thought the Minister would be. However, he will not be deeply touched about 12 months or 18 months after the passage of this Bill when he sees just what a disastrous effect it has had on the people of Queensland. The Minister will wish to hell that he had never mentioned poker machines in this Chamber.

Mr BRISKEY (Redlands) (4.07 p.m.): I eagerly await the test of the predictions of the honourable member for Gregory in regard to criminal activity in relation to poker machines. I can just see these criminals putting \$100,000 worth of 20c pieces through the machines! It is going to make an interesting spectacle in the clubs and hotels throughout Queensland.

Mr Gibbs: Particularly with that little finger on the right hand chopped off.

Mr BRISKEY: That would be interesting.

The Gaming Machine Bill has only come about after many months of consideration to ensure that it addresses the concerns raised with respect to keeping the criminal element out of the gaming machine industry. This Bill will ensure that no criminal activity is involved in the introduction of poker machines in Queensland. This State has the benefit of learning from the New South Wales experience. Poker machines have been operating legally in licensed clubs in that State since 1956. Over the years, there have been reports of many illegal activities with respect to poker machines and many examples of cheating by players, theft by club management and staff and theft by externally employed poker machine mechanics.

In the report of the Board of Inquiry into Poker Machines, Mr Wilcox found that secret commissions or kickbacks to club directors or management by poker machine manufacturers or agents were being made in consideration for the installation of particular machines. As a result of this Bill before the House today, those sorts of illegal activities will not occur when gaming machines are introduced into Queensland. For a start, kickbacks will not occur in Queensland as this Bill will allow the Government to purchase all gaming machines through public tender. The machines will then be rented to clubs and hotels, which will ensure that the opportunity for this type of kickback does not exist.

Another important facet of this Bill is the licensing requirement, which will ensure that those involved with the industry are honest and that the operations will be secure. For a start, a five-member Machine Gaming Commission will be established. The functions of that commission are to grant and cancel or suspend licences to clubs or hotels. All members of the commission will be thoroughly investigated to ensure that they are persons of the highest integrity. When the Machine Gaming Commission looks at the granting of a licence, only incorporated clubs or hotels and taverns that hold liquor licences under the Liquor Act will be eligible to apply for a licence. All applicants for a gaming machine licence will also be thoroughly investigated to ensure the highest standards of integrity, honesty and financial stability.

The director of the Machine Gaming Division within the Treasury Department will be responsible for the issuing of the gaming machine licence. The licence remains in force for two years and is renewable. If, in the public interest, there is shown to be a need to vary the licence in any way, the commission is empowered to vary the terms, conditions and restrictions imposed on the licence. Such gaming machine licences are not transferable. Once a gaming machine licence has been issued, the director has the power to supply gaming machines to such licence-holders. If, at any time, the licensee wishes to increase or decrease the number of gaming machines that are on the premises, the licensee may make an application in that regard.

The strictest controls will be implemented over all gaming machine operations. The Bill enables the investigation of all interested parties in the business operations of an applicant. All interested parties must be declared when the applicant applies for a licence, and the director may, if he deems fit, investigate the licensee or any associate to ensure

that he continues to be a person of the highest integrity. If, at any time, the liquor licence of the premises where a gaming machine licence is held is cancelled or suspended, the gaming machine licence will also be suspended for the same period. The director has the power to recommend to the commission that the gaming licence of a particular licensee be cancelled or suspended if the director considers that the integrity of gaming may be jeopardised or the public interest affected. If a licence is not in force due to cancellation, then the gaming machines on those premises are not to be played.

The Bill also provides further controls that will ensure that the criminal element will be kept out of the industry. One of those provides that the supervision of gaming machines will be the responsibility of a machine-manager on the premises. The background of all machine-managers will be thoroughly checked, once again to ensure that all involved with the industry are people with only the highest degree of integrity and honesty. The applicants for the positions of machine-managers will also be required to have their fingerprints and palmprints taken so that the Machine Gaming Division can thoroughly check them out. Those licences will also remain in force for two years and are renewable after that time. They, like the gaming machine licence, cannot be transferred. A machine-manager must be on the premises and available whenever the gaming machines are being operated.

Gaming machine repairers will also be required to be licensed and the same checks and conditions which apply to machine managers will apply also to repairers. They will have to make application to the division and their background will be investigated and fingerprints and palmprints will be taken also. All repairers of machines will be required to wear identification when they are undertaking their duties. The Bill makes provision for a licensed repairer to be in possession of gaming machines and restricted components. All licensed personnel and executive officers of licensed premises are not permitted to play gaming machines on the premises in which they are involved. They are further not permitted to extend credit in any form to enable a person to play a gaming machine. The comprehensive licensing procedures that I have outlined will ensure that all who are involved in the gaming machine industry will be people whose character, honesty and integrity is beyond reproach.

The other controls that will ensure that the New South Wales experience will not be repeated will be a computerised monitoring control system which will ensure full accountability so that the Machine Gaming Division will be cognisant of all coins which go through the machines and therefore the net return of each machine in a club or hotel. Financial records will be also thoroughly checked to ensure that the prescribed accounting procedures are followed, and the machines will have limited access as only authorised people will have access to sensitive areas of the machine.

Honourable members can rest assured that the Bill before this House is second to none with regard to ensuring that the criminal element is kept out of the gaming machine industry in Queensland. Many people enjoy playing these machines and their introduction in Queensland will ensure that the needs of that group of people are met and that the viability of clubs and the hotel industry is ensured. It will also provide much-needed funding for sport, recreation and welfare groups, as well as being a boost to the revenue of the State of Queensland. This Bill is extremely tough, and this Government makes no apologies for that. The safeguards within it will ensure that any attempt by the criminal element to get involved in the gaming machine industry in Queensland will be stopped. I commend the Minister for the extensive consultation that has endured which has ensured that this Bill addresses the concerns of the community as a whole. I support the Bill.

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise--Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.16 p.m.): In joining my colleagues on this side of the House in opposing the Gaming Machine Bill, I want to make the point that the naivety of members opposite never ceases to amaze me. I say to the Government back bench that every inquiry that has been held into the operations of the poker machine industry in Australia has said that poker machines equal organised crime. If ever there was a more monumental pay-off in

Queensland political history, then surely it is the Gaming Machine Bill before the House this afternoon. We are witnessing the Labor Party paying back outstanding debts, protecting its income trail and looking after its mates, some of whom are rather dubious. This Bill pays back debts on behalf of the Minister for Primary Industries.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! That matter was addressed very clearly by the member for Southport. It has also been addressed very clearly in this House previously. I draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Order 141, which deals with repetition.

Mr BORBIDGE: What I am saying is that this legislation is also a pay-back to the Labor Party power-brokers at South Brisbane. This is classic Queensland Labor. I contend that, in the post-Fitzgerald era, it is most inappropriate that this legislation is being submitted to the House when hearings are still to take place before the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. Mr Deputy Speaker, you are quite correct when you say that the ALP's connection with the poker machine lobby goes back to the early 1980s and it does involve a trail of intrigue a mile long. I wish to bring to your attention some matters and some correspondence of which you may not be aware.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I did not make that statement. The Chair did not make that statement.

Mr BORBIDGE: I am sorry. I accept your assurance, Mr Deputy Speaker. That was the perception that I had from here. That trail leads fairly and squarely into the lap of this Government.

Mr Elder interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: It is quite okay. There is in office a Government elected on the grounds of accountability and propriety in government. We have sitting around the Cabinet table and deliberating on all aspects of the introduction of poker machines in the State of Queensland a Minister with \$30,000 hanging out of his pocket.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have already mentioned the fact that, under Standing Order 141, repetition is not permitted. I now ask the member to desist from mentioning those matters again. If he does not do so, I will execute the authority I have under that Standing Order and ask him to cease speaking.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek your ruling. I wish to read out to the House certain correspondence that has not been referred to by my colleagues. I seek your permission to do so.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have already ruled that the matter of Caspalp was canvassed sufficiently in the House at an earlier time this afternoon, so I will not give the honourable member that permission.

Mr BORBIDGE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I wish to refer to a number of matters of correspondence that have not been detailed in this debate today, and I seek your permission to do so.

Mr Prest: You haven't got to seek his permission.

Mr BORBIDGE: Well, I will go ahead. There is one letter from the Minister for Primary Industries to Mr Ted Vibert from the Australian Club Development Association. That letter stated--

"Many thanks for your letter of 19 May re my Mount Isa visit.

The comments that you have made relate most exclusively to the key points I will make in my release relating to the trip.

Bertoni is certainly stirred up and the Premier has gone very quiet on the matter as can be seen by the attached photocopy of his answer to a question which I asked of him in State Parliament last Thursday."

The letter concluded, "Kindest regards, Ed."

Then there was a letter from Mr Len Ainsworth, a man whose company, Ainsworth Consolidated Industries, is now one of the key tenderers for this \$100m-plus Government contract. The Ainsworth letter to Mr Casey reads--

"Dear Ed

We appreciated the opportunity to give you a glimpse of our undertaking at the end of things, and we were delighted to receive on Friday a copy of the statement released by you in Mount Isa.

In the writer's view the statement can only be described as 'magnificent' and will most certainly be well received by the great majority of Queenslanders.

Congratulations and regards, Len Ainsworth."

Those letters set out the 1980 relationship between people who are now senior Ministers in the Government and a company director who, by his own admission, expects to provide the bulk of the Government's poker machines. It appears as if the relationship between the then Labor Party Leader and the poker machine lobby was so close that the present Minister for Primary Industries had his press releases written by Ted Vibert and vetted by Len Ainsworth. In return, Opposition Leader Casey was asked by Vibert on 28 January 1980 to prepare a letter of introduction outlining "the help, etc, we gave the party in Queensland". We have an incredible situation which, in my view, goes to the heart of this Government's alleged commitment to accountability.

Mr PREST: I move--

"That the letters that the member has quoted from be tabled."

Mr BORBIDGE: As I understand it, they were tabled at some previous time.

Mr Gibbs: But you said that this is the first time they have ever been here.

Mr BORBIDGE: This is the first time they have been read into the record.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member table them?

Mr BORBIDGE: I do not have them with me. I will table my speech----

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr BORBIDGE: In my speech, I am referring to extracts from letters.

Mr Gibbs: You said you were going to read from letters.

Mr BORBIDGE: The Minister can read my speech. I will table my speech.

Mr PREST: I want those letters tabled, Mr Deputy Speaker.

An Opposition member: You have to move that whether you want them or not.

Mr PREST: I have moved that those letters, as quoted from by the member, be tabled.

Mr BORBIDGE: I am more than happy to table all the documentation that I have with me. I can understand the sensitivity of honourable members opposite when a senior Minister is so close to one of the principals behind the poker machine industry. We in the Opposition believe that this relationship is too close for comfort.

But in this place early last year, the now Minister said that neither individual--that is, Mr Ainsworth or Mr Vibert--had had any input into ALP policy and had no influence on his attitude to poker machines. In the view of the Opposition, on that occasion the Minister misled the Parliament, as he has done many times. I regret that, as has occurred on many occasions, the Government used its numbers in this place to refuse to refer the entire matter to the parliamentary Privileges Committee, including the four letters from which I read extracts a few minutes ago.

Because the Opposition contends that this legislation is the subject of ongoing hearings of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice, it should not be debated at the present time. Those hearings are all about determining the suitability of particular poker machine manufacturers such as Ainsworth and Olympic. I remind the House that, in November 1989, Mr Ainsworth advertised for 200 new jobs because his company was "expanding into Queensland, and as part of this initiative we invite applications for certain positions". Ainsworth said, "Rarely has there been such an opportunity." Those were Mr Ainsworth's words prior to this Government enacting legislation and having a CJC hearing into the operations of poker machines, and prior to the tender process being put in place. Yet today, this poker machine legislation is being debated before the findings of the Criminal Justice Committee are known to members of this Parliament and before that committee can fully examine the Ainsworth matter.

It is okay for Ministers to selectively hide behind the CJC and the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. I submit that this legislation should never have been introduced before the findings of that body are known. That would have been the proper way for this Government, which talks long and hard about Fitzgerald reform, to have acted. However, we have become used to this Government and its selective acceptance of committees of review. I understand the sensitivity of the member for Port Curtis, the Government Whip, who demanded that I table the letters to which I referred. I table those letters and invite Government members, including the member for Port Curtis, to read them.

The CJC *Report on Gaming Machine Concerns and Regulations* was quickly branded the "Dickie" report. The Minister said that it was deficient, not properly researched and lacked substance. I agree with that to a certain extent. It was deficient, because the CJC did not investigate and recommend whether poker machines should be introduced at all. It was not allowed to. It was prevented from doing so by this Government. The CJC accepted that the Government was hell-bent on introducing poker machines, and set out some of the problems associated with their introduction. I contend that the CJC should have investigated the whole issue of the introduction of poker machines, and been permitted to make recommendations as to whether or not poker machines should be introduced. The CJC compiled a 105-page damning indictment of poker machines. Page 8 of the report states--

"... there are long established and well documented links between the legal and illegal gaming industry and organised criminal interests."

It states further--

"... the establishment of a gaming machine industry dealing in high cash turnovers in numerous locations can be expected to contribute to an increase in general criminal activity."

In my view, during the course of this poker machine debate, it is important to examine the role of the chairman of the CJC parliamentary committee, the member for Brisbane Central. I hope that that honourable gentleman has not been compromised. I invite the honourable member to comment on where he was when the Opposition was saying that the passage of this legislation should have been held up until his committee reported on that issue. The honourable member has been notably silent. I hope that undue pressure has not been brought to bear on the honourable gentleman in his capacity as chairman of the CJC parliamentary committee, that he has not been made to toe the party line and had to submit to what is in the best financial interests of the Labor Party. Perhaps I should remind honourable members that the member for Brisbane Central knows very well how the Labor Party works. He is a former State Secretary of the ALP.

The Opposition contends that Queensland does not need poker machines, that they are the creation of a by-gone era, that they are indisputably linked to corruption, and will lead to the ruin of many of the groups that the Minister claims they will assist. They are so much on the nose that the former Premier of Victoria, John Cain, resisted

any attempt to introduce poker machines to prop up his economic tail-spin. Of poker machines, Mr Cain said--

"They are a bit like sex--they seem to excite people regardless of their merits."

Queensland has a Minister who has been well and truly excited. Former Victorian Premier Cain said further--

"I remain unconvinced by supporters of the one-armed bandits that the situation has changed since the 1983 Wilcox inquiry which found poker machines encouraged organised crime."

The Government's desire to introduce poker machines comes not from any concern for the struggling club and pub industry, it comes from a commitment to the poker machine lobby. It is a pay-back. There will be no change to the status quo of the club industry. Poker machine profits will be distributed in a similar way to how they are distributed now. This legislation is all about money for the Government. It is about money and ongoing financial donations for the Labor Party. It is about money and profits for poker machine manufacturers. Most definitely it is not about money for clubs and hotels.

Last year, on the *7.30 Report*, I had the opportunity to participate with the Minister for Tourism in a debate which focused on the introduction of poker machines in Queensland. On that occasion, the *7.30 Report* conducted a phone-in poll during which viewers were asked to vote "Yes" or "No" on whether they supported the introduction of poker machines. The "No" vote was 68 per cent and the "Yes" vote was 32 per cent. Almost seven out of 10 people opposed the introduction of poker machines.

Mr Bredhauer: How many times did you ring?

Mr BORBIDGE: I voted only once. I do not know how many times the Minister voted. The Minister claims that his poker machines will be tamper-proof, that the advent of a new microchip will secure the machines and that the Casino Control Division can control the show--that is notwithstanding the Minister's extraordinary and subsequently withdrawn outburst a couple of years ago in this place against the Casino Control Division. Poker machines will not be tamper-proof. With advancements in technology, microchip machines are as accessible as any other machines. The Minister seems to assume that, because technology has advanced, so has security. That assumption is valid only if forms of criminal endeavour have not increased at a similar rate. I suggest that that is less than a valid assumption. The Minister somehow assumes that the criminal community has been sitting on its hands for the past 10 years or so, that its technology cannot match the technology of those people who manufacture poker machines. The bottom line is that poker machines will not be tamper-proof and they most certainly will not be free of corruption.

I am glad that the honourable member for Port Curtis has returned to the Chamber. My office has delivered to me those letters about which he was so concerned. They have been tabled. I invite honourable members opposite and the press gallery to read through those letters and find the long association that exists between the poker machine industry and the Labor Party in this State.

In the time available, I will make one more comment on this Government's commitment to accountability. This morning, by way of ministerial statement, the Treasurer as Minister responsible for the Casino Control Division hopped up in regard to certain allegations about Yakuza involvement in Queensland's casinos and, true to form, said, "It is none of my business. It has nothing to do with me. I am only the responsible Minister. I do not know anything about it."

Mr Santoro: A pretty weak effort.

Mr BORBIDGE: As the honourable member said, that was a pretty weak effort. If major Yakuza identities can gamble at Queensland's casinos--casinos that I consider to be amongst the best-run casinos in the world--without the Casino Control Division of the Treasury Department knowing, how does the Minister think he can monitor the operations of poker machines in hundreds, if not thousands--

Mr Santoro: Two thousand.

Mr BORBIDGE: Two thousand outlets throughout Queensland? Anyone who has visited the casinos knows the incredible security and surveillance methods that are operational. Yet the same people who tell us that we do not need to worry about organised crime in the poker machine industry are unable to detect major Yakuza figures--if we are to believe the leaked intelligence report that appeared in the *Courier-Mail*--being frequent patrons of Queensland's casinos. It certainly demonstrates that the Government will be found wanting.

Mr Elder: You threw your hands up and walked away from them.

Mr BORBIDGE: I would like to know the honourable member's associations with the poker machine industry. Plenty of people are saying that this will be the downfall of Goss; this will be the downfall of Labor. I say to the Minister and to each and every honourable member in the Labor caucus that they will wear it. Sooner or later, this will come back to bite them. The clubs will not be better off. The hotels will not be better off. The Labor Party, the poker machine manufacturers and the Government will be better off, but that is where the benefits for the people of Queensland start and finish.

Mr BEATTIE (Brisbane Central) (4.36 p.m.): I begin by saying that I find a bit offensive the suggestions that I may in some way have been compromised. I make it absolutely clear that, as far as the parliamentary committee is concerned, there has been no compromising of either myself or that committee. At no time have I been asked to toe the line and at no time would I toe the line which would in any way affect either the responsibilities that I have as chairman of that parliamentary committee or the responsibilities of any other members. I want to make that very clear and I want to set it very clearly on the record.

I will deal with a few of the issues involved. One of the difficulties that concerns me about this debate--and I am talking about the debate since it began--is that there has been some confusion about exactly what is happening with the CJC report and the report of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. Some honourable members may have noticed that, as a result of some confusion that existed in the *Sunday Mail*, I wrote a letter that was published on Sunday in which I tried to clarify the position on the role of the committee. I will briefly go through that, because it is relevant to the legislation. The Criminal Justice Commission brought down its report in May 1990. That report, of course, started the public discussion that has taken place since that time. In that report, a number of people were named adversely. Questions were raised about natural justice and about procedural fairness. When that report was released by the Criminal Justice Commission and released publicly with the assistance of myself as chairman of the parliamentary committee, we called for public submissions. As a result of the receipt of public submissions, public hearings were held. We invited a number of people who were named adversely to appear before the public hearings of the parliamentary committee to deal with issues such as natural justice. In other words, we sought to give those people who had been named adversely the opportunity to respond under privilege to what had been said about them in the report of the Criminal Justice Commission.

At page 11 of its report, which was tabled in this House on 1 September 1990, the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee lists five people who appeared before it at the public hearings. They were Vincent Hage; John Vicary, who is the chief executive officer of the Seagulls Rugby League Club; Keith Kelly; Ronald McConnell; and Wayne McInerney. A number of other people who were adversely named indicated initially that they were going to appear but decided that they would not do so. The difficulty in which the committee found itself was that Ainsworth Industries and Mr L. H. Ainsworth, in his private capacity as well as in his company capacity, had initiated proceedings in the Full Court alleging that there had been a denial of natural justice. That put the parliamentary committee in the position that it could deal with the poker machine issue per se, but, because there were matters that were properly before the Full Court and a date for hearing had been set--which follows the procedures of this House--at that time the committee felt it inappropriate to deal with the question of natural justice involving

Mr Ainsworth and Ainsworth Industries. However, the committee did deal with the other five people to whom I referred, who did not initiate those proceedings. I refer honourable members to page 26 of the committee's report, which states--

"The CJC Report makes public a wide range of matters, some of which were not canvassed by the CCD"--

that is the Casino Control Division--

"in its reports to the Government. Within its terms of reference, it deals with matters relating to criminal justice issues--organised and general crime, corruption and accountability.

The Report makes public criminal intelligence on named individuals and organisations."

This is the crucial part--

"Mr. L. H. Ainsworth and the Ainsworth Group of Companies instituted proceedings in the Supreme Court of Queensland against the Criminal Justice Commission to have the Report quashed on the grounds of breach of natural justice. The Full Court of the Supreme Court has not yet delivered its judgment."

That was at the time of this report. It continues--

"This Committee does not propose to canvass the issues raised by the proceedings before the Court, or to deal with individuals or organisations named in the CJC Report at this time. The Committee does not have the resources to undertake an investigation of that kind."

I stress that, and I hope that honourable members on the other side of the House who have participated in this debate will go back and read the relevant page, which is page 26. I repeat what the report states--

"The Committee does not have the resources to undertake an investigation of that kind."

It goes on to state--

"Those persons who were adversely named who responded to the Committee's invitation to make a statement at the public hearings have had an opportunity to place on the record an answer to the CJC's allegations. The Committee will review its position once the Full Court has published its judgment."

Today, a great deal has been said about what the committee intends to do. That was the central point. Since the tabling of this report in the House, the Full Court has indeed come down with its judgment, which favoured the CJC, but subsequent to that--and it happened only in the last week of the sittings of this House--I tabled in this House all the submissions received by the parliamentary committee. So that everyone will understand, I make it abundantly clear that the committee is giving those people adversely named, but who did not appear before it when the hearings were held in July last year, an opportunity to be heard under privilege. That is what the committee is doing. It is giving that opportunity to Len Ainsworth, Olympic and other people who did not appear.

Mr Borbidge: When?

Mr BEATTIE: I will come to that.

Mr Veivers: Well, when?

Mr BEATTIE: In May. The members for Southport and Surfers Paradise created a number of misconceptions about what the committee is doing. I would be grateful if they would give me an opportunity to clearly set on the record what is happening. I do not want the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee to be used as a political football by anyone. That is what I fear is starting to take place as a result of this debate. As chairman of that committee, I am prepared to defend the independence of the committee

and the role it has to play, and will resist its being used as a political football by honourable members opposite or anyone else.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: I have done that quite happily, but I will get on with my point.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: Does the honourable member want to hear it or not? Does he want to be an empty beanbag going up and down, or does he want to hear what is going on? I know why there is no understanding on the other side of the House of what is going on. Honourable members opposite talk and do not listen. I state clearly that when this document was tabled in the House, the committee dealt with the issue of poker machines per se. It dealt with the issue of security and procedural security measures. They were all dealt with and the only issues left to be dealt with are matters relating to natural justice and procedural fairness. That is not a convenient argument, and honourable members opposite can read what the committee said.

Mr Borbidge: You've been compromised, and you know it.

Mr BEATTIE: The honourable member for Surfers Paradise wants to attack people on this side of the House because we use the Fitzgerald process.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr BEATTIE: It is all very well when it favours the honourable member, but when I hold my ground objectively and it does not favour him, he does not like it. The facts are very clear. I will not tolerate the committee being used as a political football by the honourable member or anyone else. That is what he is trying to do. Honourable members opposite need not come in here wearing pious white coats, trying to pretend that they are not attempting to use the committee as a political football. I will clarify the matter again. This report was tabled in the House last year and any idiot who reads it--including some of the geese on the other side--will understand that the committee finalised the issue of poker machines and their introduction. The only issues that were left to be dealt with were those of natural justice and procedural fairness. The committee accepted the position put to it by the Casino Control Division, that is, that it could be guaranteed that the manufacturers--regardless of who they are--will not be involved in the process in Queensland because in essence--and honourable members know what will happen--the Government will be buying the machines and the machines will be leased. It will not matter whether Len Ainsworth is involved. It will not matter who is involved because they will not be on the playing field in this State, which is the key security measure in this legislation. The recommendation was put forward by the whole committee. Members of the Opposition should not sit in this Chamber and talk pious nonsense to me because members of the National Party and other members supported the position of the committee. I am not prepared to sit quietly while the committee--

Mr Borbidge: You're very touchy.

Mr BEATTIE: Of course I am touchy. I am tired of the committee being misrepresented and I am tired of that misrepresentation being done in this House. I am simply saying that, come May, the committee will have Len Ainsworth before it. The honourable gentleman on the Opposition side of the House is correct in relation to this matter. If Mr Ainsworth is prepared to come, we will have him before the committee and we will also have Olympic before us if its representatives are prepared to come.

Mr Borbidge: But the legislation will be already in place.

Mr BEATTIE: Yes, but the honourable member should listen to the point I am making. They will be before the committee to deal with the issues of natural justice and procedural fairness. The checks and balances were recommended in the Criminal Justice Commission's report and the checks and balances that have been incorporated in the

legislation will deal with those issues. I am delighted to say that, by and large, members of the Government have accepted the recommendations made by the committee. By and large, that is what has happened. The remaining matters simply provide an opportunity for natural justice to be done to Ainsworth, Olympic and those other people who did not appear before the committee.

I digress to refer to the reason for tabling the documents. Ken Blanch reported in the *Sunday Mail* that it was inexplicable that the documents had not been tabled earlier, and that was referred to by the honourable member for Southport. Quite frankly, I am stunned that Mr Blanch did not take the trouble to attend the committee's public hearings or raise the issue with committee members. The reality is that it would have been quite inappropriate and quite improper for the committee to have tabled those documents while serious and weighty issues were before the Full Court. When the matter before the Full Court was resolved, the committee was in a position to table those documents, and that is exactly what has been done. Of course, the matter has been the subject of an appeal to the High Court. In granting leave to appeal, the High Court raised queries in terms of the procedure adopted in Queensland. The committee's tabling of the documents is not inconsistent with the decision made by the High Court granting Ainsworth leave to appeal because the High Court was interested in the future procedural steps that would be taken by the committee. In other words, to comply with the arrangements, the committee has done what had to be done. I hope that I have successfully put to bed that issue in terms of the *Sunday Mail's* article. I am disappointed that the article suggested that the delay in tabling was inexplicable. I suggest that the only person who thought it was inexplicable was Ken Blanch, because it certainly was not inexplicable to me.

It is entirely a matter for the representatives of the groups to whom I have referred whether they appear before the committee in May. The committee has communicated with them. Indeed, a letter has been received from Mr Ainsworth's solicitors inquiring about the terms of the appearance. As I previously reported to the House, the committee has indicated that legal representatives of Ainsworth will not be allowed to appear. However, the committee will allow legal representatives to appear with Ainsworth's representatives, but not in an advocacy role. The committee has provided Ainsworth with an opportunity to forward additional written submissions on the issues of natural justice and procedural fairness, and Ainsworth's lawyers will be able to prepare that document. The decision is consistent with the practice adopted by the House of Representatives, the practice advocated in *Ersine May* and the practice adopted by most parliamentary systems.

During this debate, I noticed that a suggestion was made in relation to the Labor Party's position on Sir Max Bingham. I noticed also that that issue has been raised by the member for Surfers Paradise, so I will make the issue absolutely clear. I do not want anybody in the House to misunderstand the position. As Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice, I enjoy a sound, healthy working relationship with Sir Max Bingham. I have no hesitation in putting on the public record today that we communicate regularly. As recently as this morning, we communicated on various matters. I had a meeting with him last Friday and we communicated with other CJC officials yesterday. As I said, we communicate regularly and a good relationship of trust exists between the parliamentary committee and the Criminal Justice Commission--in particular, Sir Max Bingham. If the committee is to perform the role of monitoring and reviewing the commission, which is required by the legislation, it is necessary to maintain that type of relationship. In that regard, I feel it is important to refer to a matter of some significance. In this House, the member for Tablelands asked me, as chairman of the parliamentary committee, a question about Ed Casey. I think it is important for me to reiterate part of the answer that I gave in the House on that day. I draw the attention of honourable members to page 96 of the commission's report. In doing so, I do not intend to comment further except to read the relevant two paragraphs. The commission reached a conclusion in relation to Mr Casey to which I will refer. Because this matter

is on the record of this Parliament, to some extent that ensures that all the facts are before the Parliament. At page 96, the report states--

"The complaint in relation to the Caspalp donations and Mr. Casey's involvement in the March 1990 cabinet decision on poker machines was furnished to the Complaints Section of the Official Misconduct Division pursuant to Section 2.27 of the Criminal Justice Act. The Complaints Section has assessed the substance of the complaint in the light of the available material pursuant to Section 2.29."

This is a statement made by the Criminal Justice Commission, not by my committee, and not by me. The commission went on to state--

"The Commission is of the view that the complaint does not involve official misconduct within the meaning of Section 2.33 on the part of Mr. Casey either in respect of his alleged activities in 1980 or his involvement in the deliberations of Cabinet in March 1990."

I turn now to the issue of Yakuza and the casinos. Obviously, this is a matter that has been the subject of discussion between the committee and the commission, and it will continue to be the subject of discussion. As honourable members would appreciate, it is difficult for any casino to monitor and review people who go to casinos to gamble. I inform the House that this is a matter that the committee will continue to pursue with the commission.

In terms of the checks and balances, I refer people to the nine recommendations in the parliamentary committee's report and I again set on record the fact that the Government has accepted most of those recommendations that were put forward by the committee. I congratulate the Government and unhesitatingly congratulate the Minister on taking up the recommendations of the parliamentary committee.

Mr Santoro: What about the independent gaming commission?

Mr BEATTIE: I did not say that it took up all the recommendations; I said "most"--the vast majority. I refer to the matters on page 2 of the Minister's prepared second-reading speech. Therein lie most of the points that the committee was making. It deals with the fact that this Bill caters for the issues of gaming machine site licences, the licensing of repairers, service contractors and all club and hotel persons who are involved in the control of gaming operations, and a thorough check of the antecedents of the people who repair or manage the machine operations involving fingerprinting, photographing, disclosure of family history and so on. It deals with the need to avoid kickbacks in the industry. The legislation allows for the Government to purchase gaming machines through public tender, a matter to which I referred earlier. The allocation of machines to clubs and hotels will be without any consideration for their preference. What the Government has successfully done in dealing with that issue is to minimise, or exclude, the opportunity for corruption and criminal activity. That is central to the success of the legislation.

Of course there will be hiccups and difficulties along the way. We dealt with that in the report. However, the key is to have mechanisms in place that make sure that, if something goes wrong, it is picked up quickly. That is exactly what is incorporated in the legislation before the House. It was the spirit and the major point in the committee's recommendations. That is why I believe that the committee has, by and large, had its recommendations accepted.

Because my time is running out, I will conclude on this matter. The question of education which we recommended has been picked up by the Government. It is central to the success of the introduction of poker machines.

Time expired.

Mr CONNOR (Nerang) (4.56 p.m.): I rise to speak on the gaming machine legislation. Having lived in Sydney for my first 20-odd years, I have a reasonable understanding of the implications of the introduction of poker machines. One area that I wish to cover

is the effect of poker machines on the business community, especially small business. When I say "small business", I mean the restaurants, caterers and other small operations that provide entertainment such as mobile discos, dances, bistros, pool halls, squash and tennis courts and so on. All those types of small business will be affected in a detrimental way by the introduction of poker machines into Queensland's pubs and clubs. The reason why they will be affected is that, as the clubs become monolithic giants like those in New South Wales, to get more people in to play their poker machines, which is where their real profit lies, they will start supplying subsidised services such as those I mentioned earlier at a price with which small businesses will not be able to compete. They will not be able to compete with them because they will not be competing on a level playing field.

The Government has prided itself, quite wrongfully, on having a policy on business that will allow different groups within the business sector to be able to compete fairly, yet it is supplying poker machines only to pubs and clubs. Will it supply them to picture theatres, small restaurants and all the other small businesses I mentioned earlier so that they have a chance to compete on a fair and level playing field, as the Government's stated philosophy would dictate? No, it will not. That facility will be available for licensed hotels and clubs only. We only have to consider the example in New South Wales to see how those hotels and clubs will operate in practice. We will see large edifices--monuments to gambling such as the leagues clubs and service clubs in New South Wales--which will be businesses with multimillion-dollar turn-overs. We only have to look at the lack of small business of the type I mentioned around those monuments to realise that they must be having some effect on small businesses.

When we look inside the clubs in New South Wales, we find that they are supplying facilities that they were not originally intended to supply. In Sydney, we see leagues clubs but quite often we see no oval. We do not see a bar full of people dressed in football gear who have just come off the football field. The clubs have lost their direction and their original purpose. Most of the patrons have no interest in the sport; the establishments have become merely pokie palaces. To get the people in to play the poker machines, the clubs offer all sorts of alternative distractions such as pool tables, subsidised meals in bistros and restaurants, dances and movies, not to mention a host of sporting facilities from basketball to bowls, tennis, squash, badminton and so on. In most cases, those facilities can be used for free--the ultimate in subsidisation. Yet the small businesses outside do not have the income from poker machines to supply those services to the community for no charge. They have to compete with each other on a level playing field. That is not so with the subsidised clubs. The introduction of poker machines will severely cut the foundations from under a major sector of the Queensland economy--small business. Is that what the Government intended to do?

In my electorate on the Gold Coast there are 400 restaurants. I firmly believe that, when this legislation goes through, there will be many fewer restaurants on the Gold Coast.

Mr Elder: This is self-flagellation.

Mr CONNOR: I find the remark by the honourable member quite offensive. I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark. I think everyone heard it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! What was the remark?

Mr CONNOR: He said that it was an example of self-flagellation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hollis): Order! That is unparliamentary. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that comment.

Mr ELDER: I withdraw it.

Mr CONNOR: The restaurants have competed with each other on a level playing field but they have not competed with these subsidised club restaurants. In and around my electorate on the Gold Coast there are more than 400 restaurants. I believe that,

once this legislation is passed, there will be far fewer restaurants on the coast. I suggest that the number of restaurants will be halved. The same number of people will be dining but they will not be dining in the small restaurants. They will be dining in the club restaurants on subsidised meals paid for by the poor pensioner who throws his pension cheque through the poker machines every second week. It must be remembered that small businesses create jobs and pay taxes. Half of them will disappear because of the clubs. Initially, at least, the Government may gain a reasonable quantity of revenue from these poker machine palaces. However, it will receive much less than it used to from the small-business sector. We may also see an increase in the number of people on the dole because generally these poker machine palaces are all automated and the food and other facilities are self-serve. That will limit the number of job opportunities, hence throwing more people onto the dole queues.

Another aspect will be the growth in liquidation firms. We have already seen the growth in this area brought on by the "world's greatest Treasurer" in Canberra. The only thing that the small-businessman wants from a Government is for it to get out of his way--not to do things for him, and certainly not to do things to hinder him. That is exactly what this Government is going to do with this legislation. It is more than hindering small-businessmen; it is crucifying them. It is crucifying the hardest-working sector of the community, and one of the areas that has been hit the hardest by the Federal Government. One does not have to think back far to remember the fringe benefits tax, which also decimated restaurants and similar types of small business.

My position is: if the Government wants to have a casino, that is fine. One goes to a casino to gamble. If one wishes to gamble, that is fine. I see no reason why the Government should stop people from doing that. However, the problem I have with this legislation is that the Government is effectively making it compulsory, because the machines will eventually be everywhere. Eventually, people will have to go to these pokie places because all the other small businesses which used to supply them with entertainment and dinners will have closed down. How many of them will have the willpower not to play the machines? I can tell honourable members that very few people have that willpower. The practice in New South Wales is for one to go out for a Friday or Saturday night or afternoon, use some of the sporting or entertainment facilities, go to the restaurant in the club and play the poker machines for an hour or two until one runs through one's money. That is what this legislation is all about--taxes! During the debate on gaming legislation introduced in New South Wales in 1956 by the Labor Government, the following statement was made--

"Without any doubt the Government is in a desperate financial position, largely of its own making.

...

In a desperate search for money the Government has turned its attention to poker machines. The only difference between these machines and the Government is that the former has only one arm."

It goes on--

"... we contemplate giving an official blessing and legal recognition to a gambling device. This is to be done not because we are convinced that gambling does not do much harm, but with the intention of making money because the Government cannot administer the State's affairs efficiently under a proper system of taxation."

Labor Governments do not change very much. It further states--

"The introduction of this bill heralds an all-time low in legislation brought down in the House by a Labor government.

...

The only way the Government can bolster its toppling financial structure is by introducing measures such as this. It has no initiative or business enterprise to devise other means of financing hospitals or other State works. The bill only

emphasises the barren outlook of the Government. From the remarks of Government supporters, it appears that any bill is justified that brings in more revenue."

It continues--

"The Government has apparently decided, now that it cannot tax the people directly any more, the limit of taxation having been reached and the people having exhausted their patience, that it will tax them by back-door methods."

That is what the introduction of these poker machines is all about--taxation! It further states--

"But the financial barrel was empty! The finances of the State were so bad that every post must be made a winner. So the Government decided that here was a method by which it could get an additional £1,000,000--perhaps more. The suggestion that the bill emanates from the Government's wish to help clubs is all baloney and humbug. This measure is no different from other bills in the offing, such as those to impose land tax and, probably, to legalise starting price betting. They are all designed to save New South Wales from bankruptcy.

The Government's argument that the measure will save clubs from ruin is extraordinary. There are no poker machines in clubs throughout Queensland, a State which has been controlled by Labor for many years. There are no machines in South Australia, a blue-ribbon Liberal State. Victoria, where clubs flourish, has no poker machines; and Western Australia, another Labor State, will have wiped them out by the end of the year."

Mr Smyth: What year was this?

Mr CONNOR: It was 1956. It continues--

"The suggestion that poker machines are essential to the survival of clubs is not borne out by the experience of other States. The Government has offered no evidence whatever to show that in other States clubs are dying out. Evidence has not been produced that poker machines are necessary for the survival of clubs in New South Wales. Clubs in other States can get along without them. This measure is concerned not with the survival of clubs, but only with obtaining more revenue by taxation for a bankrupt Treasury. The Government has no scruples about extending facilities for gambling. This bill will promote gambling, and the Government will be happy when it does."

Mr Smyth: What year?

Mr CONNOR: 1956. It further states--

". . . I am concerned about those who lose their week's or fortnight's income in poker machines and who must return home with empty pockets to face their wives. What does the Government say about them? It says, 'Let them; that is their responsibility.' As the hon. member for Concord said, 'Each man has his own responsibilities.' Of course he has, but some members of the community are irresponsible. A gambler may be compared with an alcoholic: just as the alcoholic cannot refuse a drink--his psychological make-up causes him to drink to excess--so the gambler cannot refrain from gambling. However, the Government says, 'We shall provide these men with the means to enable them to gamble.' "

It then goes on to talk about corruption back in 1956. It states--

"Any policeman entering a club and finding these machines in use knows full well that he cannot take any action. The law is thus brought into disrepute."

It reminds one of the position in Queensland--

"This measure will at least re-establish in the police, who have been required to hold their hands, respect for the law."

Mr Elder interjected.

Mr CONNOR: Labor Governments never change.

Mr Elder: Are you calling us?

Mr CONNOR: Labor Governments never change.

Mr Elder: You did read Fitzgerald?

Mr CONNOR: Labor Governments never change.

Mr PITT (Mulgrave) (5.09 p.m.): It has been estimated that some 90 per cent of Australians gamble and that gambling may take the form of a once-a-year bet on the Melbourne Cup, as is my usual practice, or more regularly placing a wager on a horse or a dog at the track through a registered book-maker or over the counter at the TAB. There would be very few members of our community who have not at some stage purchased a raffle ticket, invested in Gold Lotto, tried to scratch a fortune or taken out a casket ticket as a substitute for a more tangible gift for someone's birthday. Australians are indeed renowned the world over as a nation of gamblers. This reputation has been with us since the first colonial settlement, and it would be fair to say that a sizeable proportion of the population would take some pride in that actual tag. Thus, gambling holds a distinctive place in our culture and the saying that Australians would bet on two flies climbing the wall has an element of truth to it.

The legislative history of this country is littered with the remains of unsuccessful attempts to wipe out our passion for gambling. In fact, the various forms of gambling--legal or otherwise--have proliferated. Governments of all persuasions have no doubt come to the conclusion that gambling, as a human activity, cannot be eliminated by legislation. Most thinking people would know also that the lessons of history indicate clearly the prohibition of human activity in most circumstances has an effect in direct contrast to that which was intended. The attempt by the Government of the United States earlier this century to make that nation dry spawned one of the most organised and successful criminal networks in the world.

On the issue of gambling, the question is not whether it is good or bad for those who participate--it is not even a question as to whether or not innocents may suffer because of the actions of others--the real dilemma for Government is its acceptance or otherwise of the fact that the majority of people want and enjoy various forms of gambling. They also accept the need for Government regulation. Later, I wish to address the real concerns that I have for those who become addicted to gambling and, more particularly, the plight of those who suffer as a by-product of that addiction--the families.

Meanwhile, I assert that, having accepted the inevitability of gambling, Governments in this country have presided over the proliferation of ways and means, all legal and all adding to the public purse by way of taxes. The Bill under debate today relates only to one form of gambling, that is, the introduction of poker machines to clubs and hotels in this State. Poker machines are nothing new in Australia. They have been with us, albeit illegally, since the turn of the century. It was not until 1956, though, that they were permitted as a legal operation in registered clubs in New South Wales. By 1970, poker machines were also accepted in the Australian Capital Territory. In the Northern Territory, their introduction was limited to licensed casinos only. There is compelling evidence to indicate that the ACT in particular and also the Northern Territory have been able to operate machines virtually free of organised crime.

This, though, was not the case in New South Wales, where an inquiry in 1983 found--

"There is significant criminal activity associated with poker machines. The inquiry heard evidence which revealed the existence of loan organisations in Sydney which customarily made loans to gamblers at rates of interest well above 100 per cent. It also revealed that serious problems existed among some clubs with respect to tax evasion, player cheating, theft by management or staff and possible kickbacks or illegal commissions paid by poker machine manufacturers for placement of their machines."

Since that report and others like it, the position in New South Wales has improved considerably. Here in Queensland we are in the fortunate position of being able to draw upon hindsight. The mistakes of certain jurisdictions and the successful operation in others enables this Government to introduce into the House today legislation which is the most comprehensive in Australia, and some would say anywhere in the world.

It is the clear intention of the Government that we create, as far as is humanly possible, a crime-free industry. To this end, the Bill provides for each gaming machine establishment to be licensed. Repairers and service contractors are required to be licensed, as will be each and every individual who is involved in the control of gaming operations. There is no room for error in this process. Any hint of illegality in the conduct of the industry can have serious repercussions. To this end, the legislation is quite specific about the need to make detailed checks on persons who have access to machines on a technical basis or who are involved in the managerial side. Any individual who wishes to be associated closely with machines has to be prepared to divulge details of their finances, their employment record and their status before the law. This is not, though, an intrusion on the personal rights of the individual. It is merely an acceptance of the right of society to be protected against the unscrupulous. Fingerprinting and photographing, along with other matters previously mentioned, are necessary control measures. The stakes are too high for this or any Government not to put in place the most stringent controls yet contemplated in this country.

In the *Sunday Mail* of 10 March, I read with great interest the concerns expressed by the Council for Civil Liberties as to the extent of investigations to be carried out. However, a spokesman for the Registered Clubs Association of Queensland, in my view, hit the nail on the head when he asserted in the same article--

"The legislation shows that pokies will be a privilege--not a right."

No-one is forcing clubs or hotels to install poker machines. The truth of the matter is that the registered clubs in this State have battled for years to obtain access to poker machines. Likewise, hotels have lobbied to be included so as not to suffer a commercial disadvantage.

There is no room in the industry for those of dubious character or for individuals whose financial track record is not beyond reproach. All of this begs the question: does Queensland really need poker machines? As one who takes no great interest in gambling of any form, I have no compelling desire on a personal level to see pokies introduced. However, to take such a narrow and individualistic view would be to ignore the evidence before us. For years, patrons from the south-east corner of this State have flocked across the border to registered clubs in northern New South Wales. In the process, they have managed to boost the tax revenue of that State to the tune of several million dollars each and every year. This is revenue on which Queensland has been missing out. It is also revenue which could have been put to good use to improve the quality of life in this State.

As the brochure titled *Introduction of Gaming Machines to Clubs and Hotels in Queensland*, which has been widely distributed, points out--

"Over a number of years vast numbers of Queenslanders have visited New South Wales clubs to play gaming machines and enjoy club facilities. The New South Wales clubs have benefited greatly from this large contribution from Queenslanders. This has occurred to such an extent that the New South Wales Liquor Administration Board's annual report of 1989-1990, indicated that 2 of the top 5 registered clubs (based on poker machine turnover) are located just over the border from Queensland."

This State can no longer afford to miss out on the revenue on offer.

Part 8 of the legislation makes provision for the State to place a tax on the gross monthly turn-over of poker machines. Additionally, provision is made to direct a portion of moneys so raised to provide direct funding of sport and recreation activities as well as welfare programs. The targeting of revenue to these worthwhile purposes will greatly

benefit all Queenslanders. To be able to acquire funds for these community programs from the pockets of individuals willing to part with their money is appropriate because sport, recreation and welfare causes should be freely supported.

One could easily claim that, because of unfair competition from poker machine palaces in northern New South Wales, registered clubs in the south-east corner of Queensland have been seriously hampered in a financial sense. Their economic woes are more widespread than one would at first realise. Indeed, throughout Queensland—not just the south-east corner—registered clubs and hotels have, since the clampdown on in-line machines, been in an ever-deteriorating financial position. The necessary clampdown on drink-drivers has further added to their worries. Of course, it would be just as easy to ignore the plight of our registered clubs, but that would be to fail to understand the valuable role they play within our society. Clubs provide social interaction. They make available quality entertainment that would otherwise be denied ordinary citizens. Clubs build and maintain a range of sporting facilities whose funding requirements would normally be out of the range of groups unable to draw upon a large revenue base. Above all, clubs are renowned for their good works amongst the elderly and the disadvantaged.

Clubs in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory do all of these things and more, whilst their Queensland counterparts still rely, by and large, on the fund-raising practices of the era which was characterised by the chook raffle. Poker machines and financial viability appear to go hand in hand under the right stewardship. However, there is always the danger that some clubs will overextend themselves. Some clubs see the installation of pokies as a panacea for all of their financial woes. Had the legislation not been so stringent and so demanding, I am sure that a whole host of clubs managed by well-meaning amateurs would have had their fingers badly burnt. I have counselled clubs within my electorate to proceed with caution in relation to poker machines. Although I am convinced of their beneficial effect, I am equally aware of the need for excellent managerial skills in clubs which have them. Quite frankly, in many cases it will be some time before many clubs reach that level of expertise. Having flagged this note of caution, it would be remiss of me not to provide some positive facts to support the overall benefit of the introduction of gaming machines.

The 1 573 registered clubs in New South Wales have an annual turn-over in the order of \$7,000m. They employ some 47 500 people, the payroll for that employment being in the order of \$500m. Last financial year, the clubs committed \$185.4m to new buildings or refurbishment and spent \$900m on bar and catering purposes. The club industry provides and maintains superb golf courses, football, cricket and soccer pitches and bowls greens. New South Wales clubs spend \$131m a year on sporting facilities and provide \$52.4m in direct charity support.

As a far-north Queenslander, I indicate that there is no impact felt in my area as a result of the proximity of New South Wales clubs. However, there is another factor to be considered, and it relates directly to tourism. The far north has much to offer the tourist by way of its natural beauty and places of interest. Unfortunately, in this highly competitive market the raw product, so to speak, is quite often not enough. Tourists demand the very best in club and hotel facilities in services and entertainment. Poker machine revenue helps provide these inducements. Should tourist areas continue to rely solely on present arrangements to fund infrastructure and services, they will be missing out on another valuable source. In short, there are no negatives for tourism with the introduction of poker machines. There is, though, the undeniable fact that their advent in this State will further encourage tourists to take advantage of our wonderful natural beauty.

A point that I have already mentioned in passing is that of the employment opportunities which will become available in clubs and hotels as well as through servicing these establishments and the machines themselves. With unemployment being a continuing problem throughout Australia, Queensland would be foolish not to take advantage of this timely shot in the arm. A New South Wales university study last year, drawing on

statistics compiled in that State, predicted that, when poker machines are introduced, some 14 000 new jobs would be created on a decentralised basis throughout Queensland. I have no reason to doubt those figures, yet even if they were double the real situation, they represent a mammoth boost to employment.

The decentralisation of employment opportunities deserves careful scrutiny when considering this whole question. Experience in New South Wales points to the beneficial effect a viable club industry has on combating the urban drift. That is a matter of great interest to me. Every country Queenslander must view the movement of workers, especially young people, to urban centres as damaging to the continued viability of rural communities. Additional employment opportunities in country towns enable young people to obtain a job without having to leave family and friends to go to Brisbane. The other benefit, of course, lies in the fact that when dollars are invested at the local RSL or sporting club, that money basically stays in the town itself. This is in direct contrast to the TAB and other forms of legal gambling where there is no guarantee that the invested dollar will ever return to the point of investment.

All thinking members of this House would be aware of and concerned about the social damage which can result from compulsive gambling. Pathological gambling is a recognised illness. We must face up to the reality that access to poker machines will result in an increased number of sufferers. Although I do not subscribe to the view, as suggested by some quarters, that the numbers of pathological gamblers will reach epidemic proportions, it is obvious that it is a problem which must be addressed. By definition, pathological gambling would incorporate descriptions such as "neurotic", "compulsive", "addictive" and "excessive". Six criteria have been established to provide a useful description of the condition: the gambler habitually takes chances; the game precludes all other interests; the gambler is full of optimism and never learns from defeat; the gambler never stops when winning; despite initial caution, the gambler eventually risks too much; and a pleasure/pain tension is experienced during the game.

The problems associated with pathological gambling are severe and costly. They are costly not only to the individual, but they are also costly to family and friends as well as to society as a whole. I am encouraged by the fact that the Minister has faced this issue squarely. Some gambling revenues are to be used to fund welfare and community initiatives to deal with the social effects of compulsive gambling. Provision exists to place an onus on licensees to prohibit gaming by a person who is obviously a pathological gambler. This legislation specifically bans betting on credit, and makes it possible to obtain a court order against those individuals whose addiction is detrimental to the welfare of those who are dependent upon them. To ensure that licensees take this responsibility seriously, the Bill provides avenues whereby a licensee who ignores that situation runs the obvious risk of not having his licence renewed when it expires. The work of voluntary organisations such as Gamblers Anonymous cannot be overestimated. They currently give great service to the community, and it behoves the Government to support their good work.

As I said earlier, I am not an avid gambler, but I do support the rights of those who enjoy the opportunity to do so. This legislation will provide those people with legal access to a form of gambling that has widespread popularity. Gamblers in this State can look forward to a well-controlled industry bringing pleasure to themselves and benefits to a large number of other Queenslanders. Therefore, I support the Bill.

Mrs McCAULEY (Callide) (5.26 p.m.): I find it extremely ironic that the Goss Labor Government which, for the past 15 months, has consistently introduced no industry initiatives and consistently knocked all outside initiatives on the head, should now introduce its first industry initiative, which happens to be the poker machine industry. That is very unfortunate.

In this House, the Minister for Family Services said--

"As honourable members would be aware, considerable problems caused by addictive gambling already exist within the community."

She acknowledged that, and went on to say--

"Those social problems already exist and they will not be exacerbated by the introduction of poker machines."

I am not quite sure how Ms Warner could claim to be an expert on poker machines and what they will and will not do. I find that particular assurance as foolish as her recent utterance that Ministers are merely extraneous when it comes to departmental submissions. I am quite sure that the Minister in charge of this Bill would not agree with that. That was a fairly foolish point of view for Ms Warner to express. My opposition to this legislation is not just conservative wowseryism.

Mr Bredhauer: Not just, but it is partly.

Mrs McCAULEY: No, it is not at all conservative wowseryism. Recently, Labor Governments in South Australia and Victoria rejected the introduction of poker machines into those respective States for precisely the concerns that were expressed by the CJC committee in its report. This legislation crosses party lines. The arguments against the introduction of poker machines can rest on a few major issues that I would like to mention.

There is no doubt that there is associated criminal activity with the introduction of poker machines. The Wilcox report, the *Report of the Board of Inquiry into Poker Machines*, which was conducted in Victoria in November 1983, stated quite categorically--

"There is not merely the risk of increased crime. Under any scenario crime will increase."

The board was in no doubt about that. Its concerns lay in four major sectors: the infiltration by organised crime; the abuse of the system by employees; compulsive gamblers who turn to crime to feed their habit; and, finally, corruption.

The CJC report stated categorically that with the introduction of poker machines there will be an increase in general criminal activity. It identifies a number of activities of organised crime, such as skimming operations; money-laundering; linking some of the manufacturers of gaming machines to syndicated or organised crime; peripheral crime, such as in prostitution and the security and entertainment industries; compromise and/or corruption of public officials; and the development of parallel illegal industry. The illegal industry in Australia is closely connected with organised crime, tax evasion, falsification of records, violence and intimidation. It is interesting to note that what we have been led to believe is fiction in the American television stories that we have been watching over many years is really based on fact.

The question must be asked: will the commission be able continually to monitor and move to close loopholes? Will it be able to--as Ms McMillan suggested in the CJC report--"think like criminals and look for loopholes before they occur"? To a large degree, that depends on who comprises the commission. There is no doubt that intrabusiness criminal activity is stepped up with the introduction of poker machines. That was shown in the Wilcox report, which documented cheating from machines by customers; theft from machines by mechanics and staff; theft of profits by club management; and secret commissions. The record of the New South Wales poker machine industry in that regard is deplorable. The exact nature of criminal activities in that State is not known because no effort has been made to find out what it is. That is very poor, indeed. The New South Wales Department of Finance noted--

"The revenue from clubs' poker machine operations is many millions of dollars below the level that ought to be obtained."

Although that revenue can be significantly increased with new, rigorous legislation, industry licensing and a system of computer monitoring, there will always be significant criminal activity.

The question and answer booklet on poker machines, which was distributed by the Minister's department, stated--

"Applicants (for everything) will be thoroughly checked to ensure a high standard of integrity, honesty and financial stability is maintained."

I must ask: how can we test for greed? Of course, we cannot.

It may be that compulsive gamblers turn to crime to feed their habit. It is certainly a point worth thinking about, because gambling is an addiction. In common with other addicts, for example, drug addicts, eventually some gamblers will turn to petty or more serious crimes to keep their habit going--whether it be stealing the housekeeping money, white collar crime or armed hold-ups. That is a real possibility. The Reverend Dr Ian Mavor of Kings College, who is involved with Gamblers Anonymous, said--

"A compulsive gambler becomes highly irrational in relation to money. Members of Gamblers Anonymous have sold their family home, have gone through all their savings, and have embezzled from their place of work and it has all been in their search for money to gamble."

He said also--

"Gambling increases the potential to end up as compulsive gamblers."

I will talk more about that later.

Increased criminal activity extends to corruption, which is the buzz word at the moment. The CJC report states that corruption can permeate all levels of involvement--politicians, regulators, inspectors, clubs, hotel and casino officials, management and staff, servicers and associated industry employees. Not too many people were left out. It can result in kickbacks, price undercutting, tampering with machines, false accounting, purchasing of contracts and payment of bribes. The inescapable conclusion is that even the most careful legislation and regulations cannot overcome the highly unpredictable human element.

Social costs are also extremely high for an industry such as the poker machine industry. A Salvation Army estimate, which is based on US comparisons, suggests that 19 000 Queenslanders will be affected by compulsive gamblers. Of course, it is not only the gamblers themselves but also their families and the people for and with whom they work who will be affected. The Wilcox report shows that compulsive gamblers tend to have several problems. Financial problems cause family hardships and increase the possibility of criminal activity. Available evidence indicated to Wilcox that 150 000 Victorians would be likely to play machines to a degree causing financial concerns, about 40 000 of whom would be addicted. That is a fair number. In terms of the financial impact on the community, for every big winner, there must be a group of losers. Winnings always come out of other people's pockets.

Compulsive gamblers have distorted life priorities, because they lose a great deal of money and seek always to win more in order to pay it back. That leads to family disunity, with possible increased abuse, emotional deprivation to family members and increased stress. Dr Mavor observed that self-destructive behaviour usually destroys the family assets and sometimes the husband may be sent to gaol for a crime that he has committed in order to feed his compulsive gambling habit, leaving the wife to struggle on with an extreme lack of resources. Although there is much talk of compulsive gamblers, that type of problem could still result from the occasional flutters in households in which finances are already extremely tight. For example, the gambling of just one pay-packet could be enough to create stresses that will take a long time to overcome. That is especially applicable to poker machines that are installed in hotels where the danger of alcohol plus the good old Aussie mateship could exacerbate the situation and cause a worker to lose all of his pay-packet before he takes it home to his wife. Compulsive gamblers are extremely affected by stress, which can lead to health problems such as ulcers, insomnia and other stress-related illnesses which then result in decreased

work productivity and increased use of health facilities, with the resultant flow-on of costs, more sickies---

Mr Elder: Cardiac arrest.

Mrs McCAULEY: Indeed, cardiac arrest. It results in family disunity and causes stress on family relationships. I am not sure whether the Minister will provide in the legislation for the banning of compulsive gamblers or whether he will waive that. He copped a lot of flak about that, and it was a patently unworkable idea. Can anyone imagine a family reporting its spouse, father, mother or anyone?

Mr Gibbs: Yes.

Mrs McCAULEY: I could not. A certain stigma is attached to admitting that a problem exists. Certainly, that is the case with drug and alcohol addiction, physical abuse and incest. People think that it is better to keep quiet than to let the neighbours or the average man know. Also, we have the Australian ethos of "Don't dob in your mates". I do not think that the Minister's idea will work. We should note that banning does not treat the addiction. Gamblers Anonymous will work only when the addict admits that he or she has a problem. The observation of gamblers by employees in clubs, etc., to help pick out compulsive gamblers may work when those employees are vigilant and responsible--although that has not been very successful in relation to alcoholics and under-age drinkers--but what happens in a city that has multiple gambling outlets? Hotel A sees Joe Bloggs only once a week. However, Joe gambles large amounts each night of the week, simply travelling from one club to another to do so. In that way, the large number of outlets with poker machines will facilitate the crafty gambler to lose his money.

Poker machines are seen as an acceptable form of gambling. I guess that that stems from the practice of pensioner clubs and other clubs in a large area taking their members to Seagulls or to somewhere else across the border for a day's excitement. It is quite acceptable. It is a bit like drinking white wine and thinking that one is not an alcoholic because an alcoholic is a person who drinks hard spirits. It is not exactly right.

Mr Gibbs: Are you saying that none of us should drink white wine?

Mrs McCAULEY: No, I am not saying that at all. If one says, "I drink only white wine therefore I am not an alcoholic, no matter how much white wine I drink", one is really on the wrong track. Someone who says, "I feed only the 5c or 10c poker machines, therefore I am not a poker machine addict" is also barking up the wrong tree. It is similar to having a credit card. All of the small amounts quickly add up. The 5c, 10c and 20c machines are seen to be within reach of all, but it remains to be seen how much money is put into them.

The easy availability of the machines encourages people to gamble for fun. The nature of the exercise is that it is a relatively fast-moving activity with a rapid succession of stake and play interspersed with relatively frequently pay-offs--not that I have ever found that to be the case. The environment in which the activity is conducted--that is in clubs with food, drink, friends, etc.--encourages impulsive gambling and is certainly not stigmatised as yet. It is seen as fun and is much more acceptable than going to a newsagent to buy \$100 worth of Scratch-Its. Some people do win on Scratch-Its, as I found out yesterday from an honourable member on the Government side of the House. I am certainly not in that category, but he is.

The income and employment generated by the poker machine industry will be counterbalanced by losses in other sectors, such as small business. The Wilcox report observed that there would be adverse effects on many existing businesses, especially hotels and some types of restaurants. The larger clubs in New South Wales have become public houses which are aggressively marketing food, liquor and entertainment at prices that are subsidised by poker machine revenue.

Mr Palaszczuk: That's not right.

Mrs McCAULEY: That is quite true. I used to live in New South Wales and I know. The result is beneficial to those people who avail themselves of these facilities.

Mr Gibbs: You're just an old clubbie.

Mrs McCAULEY: Yes, that is me. However, the benefits are obtained at the expense of those who play the machines and those organisations that do not have poker machine revenue. There is no doubt that the hotel industry will be adversely affected and the Wilcox report documents that it will lose up to 30 per cent of its beer trade and up to a quarter of its total trade.

Charitable organisations will also suffer greatly and the CJC detailed some concerns over the possible impact on other forms of gambling, and therefore on charitable institutions that are using such activities as bingo and lucky envelope machines.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mrs McCAULEY: Yes, and country clubs. These organisations use these activities to generate income. The CJC stated that it was possible that Government-sponsored gaming will compete with charitable fund-raising initiatives. Ms McMillan stated--

"Small charity gambling will be unable to match the coordinated resources of governments and large commercial interests, and thus will be forced to rely on handouts from central government agencies."

One query that has been raised in my electorate concerns clause 10.4. I hope that the Minister can answer it. The clause refers to restrictions on certain agreements. I ask: does this mean that there will be a banning of chook raffles for such organisations as junior Rugby League clubs or the Little Nippers? That would create a lot of problems in my area. My electorate office is situated next door to a hotel and every Saturday morning the high school runs a chook raffle in the hotel. If that raffle was to be cut out because the hotel has poker machines, that organisation's income would suffer accordingly.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mrs McCAULEY: As I am just about to detail, the poor old publican will already have problems keeping his head above water.

Mr Randell interjected.

Mrs McCAULEY: That is right. The proposed \$90m profit from pokies will be inroaded as Governments need to subsidise charities and the social ramifications of having poker machines in this State will be great.

I wish to give the House some figures based on a hotel having the maximum number of poker machines, that is, up to 10. If these figures are wrong or if the Minister disagrees with them, I would like to hear from him later. A hotel with 10 poker machines would need to make over \$60,000 a month just to pay the rent. The rent on each machine in a hotel is \$300 per month. Therefore, total monthly rental costs would be \$3,000. The hotel has access to only 5c in every dollar played through its machines and the player return is 85c in the dollar. The Government takes 10c in the dollar. This means that \$60,000 must go through the machines before the hotel has \$3,000 in its pocket to pay the rent and after that it can make some profit. In a small town such as Biloela, the sum of \$60,000 going through poker machines would be a huge amount of money. After the hotel has paid the extra staff, met the costs of renovations to install these machines, the increased power bills, etc., then it can look at making some profit. That is not a very appealing set of figures.

For my own part I find poker machines a tedious and boring recreational pursuit. They will not add to the quality of life. They will cause hardship and suffering and increased social problems. They will foster criminal activity and I strongly believe that they are not needed in Queensland.

Mr FOLEY (Yeronga) (5.44 p.m.): This Bill has been long awaited by the citizens of my electorate. I am well aware of the concern that the Yeronga Services Club has had in relation to the introduction of gaming machines.

The clubs of the electorate of Yeronga serve the community well. I am mindful of how important it is that the club industry and the club volunteer workers be supported by appropriate legislative measures. In an electorate such as my own where there are large numbers of elderly citizens, I am very mindful of the work done by the bowls clubs at Yeronga, Moorooka, Tarragindi, Annerley and Chelmer. Those clubs are entitled to know what their source of revenue may be in the future, for we are approaching a future in which it will be vital to maintain a sense of community in order that citizens in our community can be properly serviced. This legislation, by way of introducing gaming machines subject to very strict regulations, is an attempt to ensure that there is a relevant source of funding for those clubs which perform such a vital community role for our citizens.

Before dealing with the social welfare issues and the issues of civil liberties which arise out of this Bill, I want to deal with the heresy that has been attempted in this Chamber by the honourable member for Southport, who repeated the earlier frivolous remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. In short, the argument was put upon the grounds that this House should not proceed to debate legislation because the matter is sub judice and because certain matters of investigation are before the Criminal Justice Commission, making it inappropriate for members of this Parliament to debate this legislation in this House. Not only is that view frivolous, but also it trivialises the role of elected representatives in debating matters of legislative importance in Parliament. It purports to use the sub judice rule to deal with legislative matters, but I remind honourable members that a fundamental distinction is to be drawn under the doctrine of the separation of powers between the judiciary and the Legislature; that is, between judicial functions, or quasi-judicial functions, and legislative functions. It is true that in respect of certain specific matters of investigation before the Criminal Justice Commission, the Speaker made a ruling which falls under the broad heading of sub judice. It is also true that there is authority for the proposition that a commission of that kind should attract the exercise of that rule under certain circumstances in a manner analogous to the application of the sub judice rule. However, it would be an extraordinary state of affairs if the elected representatives of the people assembled in Parliament were to be prevented from exercising their law-making function because of a silly misconception about the quasi-judicial function of a commission which is empowered to investigate. Let us hope that in this place one does not hear further attempts at frivolous objections being taken to the proper use of this Chamber as an arena for debating legislation.

I turn now to the two issues that must be taken into account when considering the worth of introducing gaming machines to Queensland. The first concerns social welfare, and the second concerns the civil liberties of citizens attaching to the very strict controls that are necessary to prevent criminal elements from becoming involved with the poker machine industry. As a former social worker, over the years I have had first-hand contact with families in crisis. I am mindful of the fact that some people have a weakness for gambling and that they can dissipate the family pay-packet. In this regard, I note the provisions of clause 5.24 of the Bill which make it a requirement of licensees to prohibit certain people from gaming. The requirement arises in circumstances in which reasonable grounds exist for a licensee to believe that, due to excessive playing of gaming machines by that person, the peace and happiness of a person's family are endangered.

The first point to be made is that the provision relates to family welfare and not to the situation of the individual himself. One might say that it proceeds upon the assumption that one has a right to go to hell in one's own way, but that one does not have a right to take one's family along. The clause places an onus or a burden upon the licensee. If a benefit is to be created by the licence, then it is appropriate that a burden attaches to it to ensure that gaming machines are not used in circumstances in which a person's family is likely to be severely prejudiced. The prohibition is reasonable in the circumstances, and I welcome the absence of any prohibition enforceable through

the courts or involving criminal sanctions, such as those contemplated at an earlier stage in the evolution of the legislation that is now before the House. However, more important in relation to the social welfare characteristics of this legislation is a very novel provision which is not to be found in other legislation relating to gambling and which gives back to the community through the social welfare arena something out of the gaming machine industry. In this regard, I refer to clause 8.5, which provides for the establishment of a Charities and Rehabilitation and Benefit Fund. I am informed that this fund is expected to raise \$18m. I am very pleased to note that provision because, when considering these matters, it is appropriate that something of a positive nature is given back to the community to ensure that assistance is being provided by way of rehabilitation and by way of charitable assistance wherever it is necessary.

I turn now to the civil liberties issues that are relevant to this legislation. It is elementary that if one has gaming machines, one has to have strict controls. One of the fundamental questions that one must ask in relation to whether any society should have gaming machines is whether or not the restrictions they bring can be tolerated. The report of the Criminal Justice Commission and the subsequent report by the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice illustrate the great need for safeguards and for close regulation. If gaming machines are to be introduced, no-one in this House would dispute the need for such severe regulation. The question is, however, whether or not that is too high a price to pay by virtue of our civil liberties heritage. The answer to that question is to be found by careful study of a number of important safeguards built into this Bill to ensure that the civil liberties of citizens are respected, notwithstanding the Bill's very stringent powers.

Nothing could be more important than to ensure that confidentiality is maintained. In this regard, the provisions of clause 2.26 are of singular importance. That provides that a commissioner or a person appointed as an officer must preserve and assist in preserving secrecy with regard to all information that comes to the person's knowledge in the exercise of his or her functions or duties under the Act. That is very important, because the legislation requires the commission to make very careful investigation into applicants, repairers and their associates. It does cast the net broadly to associates, and that is a matter of legitimate concern to civil libertarians. But in the real world one has to accept that it is necessary to inquire into the affairs and circumstances of associates, because organised crime does not work in a vacuum; it works through intermediaries and through a network of associates, and it must be possible for a responsible commission to make those inquiries. That is why it is important that confidentiality of the strictest kind be protected, and that is protected by virtue of clause 2.26 of the Bill.

Similarly, when one sees the very considerable powers that are provided for the commission to gain information, it is important to have a provision that enshrines the ancient privilege against self-incrimination, hence clause 9.3 (11), which provides--

"A person is not required, in respect of any matter within the application of this Act, to answer any question or give any information tending to incriminate him or her."

That, of course, is an important provision because it restates the ancient provision which is all too readily ignored in modern times in the haste to confer extraordinary powers.

With regard to the retention of the fingerprints of a person who is charged with offences under the Act, it is pleasing to see the provisions of clause 10.17 (3), which provides that, where a person is found not guilty of certain offences, fingerprints and other records must, on written request by the person, be destroyed in the person's presence or in the presence of a person nominated by the person--again, this Bill's inner safeguard to ensure that we do not confer such extensive police powers or powers on the gaming commission so as to deprive citizens of their legitimate entitlements to civil liberties. Equally, it is important that at the end of the day the Minister and the commission be subject to the normal rule of law. No-one is above the law. Recently, we have seen in the report of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission a powerful statement arguing against shutting away certain bodies from judicial review by

the courts. In this regard, the provisions of clauses 2.15 (1) and 2.16 (3) do give cause for concern. In that regard, I respectfully urge the Minister to consider carefully those provisions which purport to oust the jurisdiction of the courts to review those decisions. Having had the benefit of some discussions with the Minister, I am aware that he is able to give sympathetic consideration to that matter. I urge him to look carefully at those provisions at the Committee stage, for it is most important that there be a reassertion of the fundamental principle that we are all subject to the rule of law and that judicial review be available in appropriate circumstances.

The provisions of this Bill do put together a package of civil libertarian safeguards which result in protections for our heritage of freedom, notwithstanding the very severe and very protective provisions which confer wide powers on the gaming commission, those being necessary, of course, to ensure that organised crime and corruption are not permitted to get a foothold here in Queensland. I support the Bill before the House.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr ROWELL (Hinchinbrook) (7.30 p.m.): When considering legislation such as this, our main responsibility is to consider the direction in which it will take Queensland. Honourable members must consider not only the short-term future of this State but also its long-term future. It is absolutely imperative that we do not make decisions that will have serious ramifications for the future. Australians generally are notorious gamblers. They have a reputation with respect to two-up, racing thoroughbreds and racing cars. Australians are prepared to bet on flies crawling up a wall and on all manner of other things.

I voice my strong disapproval of this gaming machine legislation. There is a cloud of controversy over the introduction of poker machines and matters concerning gaming machines before the CJC. This has been raised on numerous occasions during this debate, and it is an area that needed further consideration prior to the introduction of the legislation. However, that did not occur, so honourable members now have to debate this legislation without its having gone through the full process, which, if carried out, probably would have meant an alteration of some aspects of the legislation. It introduces an element of gambling that is not necessary within Queensland society today. I do not believe that this type of legislation and the gaming machines that it legalises are needed.

Mr Schwarten: Do all of the people of Ingham agree with you on that matter?

Mr ROWELL: I do not know. I do not think that all the people in Rockhampton would agree with the honourable member.

Mr Schwarten: I'd say 80 per cent do.

Mr ROWELL: That is fine. That is great. I believe that what the Minister had to say in his second-reading speech reveals that he has some grave doubts. He recognises that there are dangers that persons of bad repute and influence could be attracted to the industry. He raised a number of matters and concluded by saying--

" . . . the allegations and criticisms raised by various Australian commissions of inquiry into the machine industry are frightening, to say the least."

Honourable members should take careful note of that. I believe that the Minister has some grave doubts in his mind as to just where Queensland is headed with poker machines. For whatever reason, legislation that provides for the introduction of poker machines in Queensland has been introduced. The introduction of gaming machines is really like playing with fire. There are numerous ways in which funds can be generated without looking for trouble, which is what the Government is doing by introducing this legislation, which promotes that type of gambling. Even if this legislation is the best of its type in Australia, or even if it is the best in the world, as a consequence of this particular form of gambling, with its rapid turn-over, there will be peripheral effects of nurturing money-lenders, prostitutes and prostitution and opportunists, who will be preying on the fortunes and misfortunes of poker machine players.

Mr McGrady: What rubbish!

Mr ROWELL: That is a well documented fact. Very little benefit will accrue from adding another dimension to gambling within Queensland society, but there is considerable potential for hardship. Considerable trauma has occurred in families in which either or both bread-winners are addicted to the machines. Sometimes this has resulted in children going hungry. It has happened in other States such as New South Wales. I am absolutely certain that it will occur in Queensland. As times get hard, people who are experiencing financial difficulties tend to look for instant remedies. Poker machines can provide such opportunities.

The other matter that has to be taken into consideration is the role of the police. In his second-reading speech, the Minister referred to the role of the police. It is quite apparent that an additional police presence will be required as a result of the installation of poker machines. I do not think anybody doubts that. It is a fact of life. What degree of consultation has been entered into with the police force? Has the police force been consulted on this issue? Is it aware of the ramifications as a result of the introduction of poker machines? Where are the additional police going to come from to counteract the inevitable problems that will arise with the introduction of poker machines? Honourable members have heard of the increases in police numbers, but they have not heard of any increases that will occur as a consequence of the introduction of poker machines. I think that that has to be addressed. Currently the morale of the police force is in tatters. The number of police officers considering resignation is at an unprecedented level. If one goes out and talks with police officers, one finds that that is what is happening. The police are not happy with their lot. They are considering resignation; they are looking at their superannuation funds; and they are giving thought to where their future lies. That is an irrefutable fact. What provision has been made for the additional police--perhaps hundreds of additional police--who will be required to service the disreputable industry that this legislation will create in Queensland? The police will be forced to take on another unnecessary burden.

We have seen the introduction of gun laws. Now we are seeing the introduction of poker machines. The police have had to increase their responsibilities to society in a number of areas. Honourable members can be assured that when the police are required, the demands on them will be tremendous. There will be an absolute necessity for them to provide a service that is not commensurate with the number of problems that are occurring now in society. Homosexuals are just another one. The Minister has given assurances that the potential for undesirable practices is limited. The Government is going to try to limit undesirable practices. The fact is that the Government can limit them only so much. This legislation is just creating another problem. The Minister might claim that these undesirable practices will be limited, but they will not be wiped out; they will not be totally overcome. As he said in his second-reading speech, the Minister is quite aware of the problems associated with poker machines, but the Government is going to go ahead, anyway. The Minister spoke about all those matters in his second-reading speech.

I would like now to refer to an article from the Australian Institute of Criminology in January 1990 which states the following about poker machines--

"The Board of Inquiry into Poker Machines (Victoria 1983b) found there is significant criminal activity associated with poker machines. The Inquiry heard evidence which revealed the existence of loan organisations in Sydney which customarily made loans to gamblers at rates of interest well above 100 per cent. It also revealed that serious problems existed among some clubs with respect to tax evasion"--

Of course, Queensland will not have that problem--

"player cheating, theft by management or staff and possible kickbacks or illegal commissions paid by poker machine manufacturers"--

People have not heard about that in Queensland--

"for placement of their machines."

The Minister stated that the tourism industry will benefit. The only benefit that the introduction of poker machines will have on the tourism industry is to attract a bunch of undesirables who live off the misery and hardship of others. The Minister described those people as having a legitimate wish to play gaming machines. I accept that some people want to play gaming machines. They believe it is their God-given right, but does the Government have to introduce legislation to enable them to do that!

In the past, for its population size Queensland's reputation for tourism has been way out in front of other Australian States. Of the \$23 billion that is gained by Australia from export income through tourism, Queensland has earned about \$5.6 billion. If members consider the multiplier effect, the end figure is probably somewhere around \$11 billion. Concentrating and building on that industry would generate more wealth and job opportunities than the poker machine proposal.

There is little doubt of the fact that the clubs that install poker machines will have the ability to provide entertainment, food and beverages at reasonable prices. There is a great deal of evidence from the New South Wales clubs that that is exactly what happened. However, when somebody gains, somebody else loses. There is no doubt that small establishments will pay a cost. They do not have the same ability to generate income or to attract people by offering low-cost food and off-setting that cost with the revenue from poker machines to which they hope to attract people.

Thankfully, small centres will be largely insulated against poker machines. I do not believe it is feasible to introduce poker machines into some of the smaller country towns, and I am extremely pleased about that. Those country towns will preserve the way of life for which they have been noted. The cost involved will be far too prohibitive for the majority of towns throughout the State. The larger towns will be able to afford to introduce poker machines. They will get the throughput and, if there are to be the benefits as enunciated by the Government, it will accrue in those larger centres. This menacing element to Queensland society will congregate within the cities and large provincial towns.

One question that I would like to ask the Minister is whether a business plan has been devised for the funding of poker machines? Honourable members have not seen a costing on how poker machines will be funded. A lot has been mooted about what might be done. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spoken about but, in the end, how will Queensland come out of it? What about the cost of purchasing machines, the inspection fees, the audits, the running costs and the costs associated with the commission and the law enforcement? All those factors must be added into any consideration that this House gives to the introduction of poker machines. I ask the Minister to explain to the House the cost projections by this Government in relation to its commitment to the introduction of poker machines? The Government must have some idea!

Mr Gibbs: You couldn't win anything. This has been addressed in numerous papers.

Mr ROWELL: I am not speaking about just one aspect of the matter. I am talking about the total aspect of the issue.

Mr Gibbs: There have been numerous papers.

Mr ROWELL: What will police control cost? How many police officers will be involved in the policing of the machines themselves and crime-related factors that will result from the introduction of poker machines? I am asking the Minister: have all those issues been evaluated?

As far as I can see, the main object of the introduction of poker machines is for the Government to gather tax revenue. I am very unhappy that the Government is using this method to collect tax from people. It is a revenue gatherer from the Queensland economy.

Ms ROBSON (Springwood) (7.45 p.m.): It has been very difficult to sit here and listen to the rubbish that has been spoken by Opposition members who have carried on

with their concerns about this legislation. It is a pity that they did not apply some of those principles to the legislation that they introduced into the House when they were in Government. I recognise the concerns held by members opposite. However, they have not adequately studied the provisions of this Bill which very thoroughly address in detail issues such as the awarding of contracts for the supply of machines, the appointments of officers to the control body in terms of inspections----

Mr Veivers: It does not.

Ms ROBSON: It does so. The honourable member should read the legislation properly. Earlier this afternoon, he stood in this place and spoke a whole lot of rubbish. It would have been better if he had spent his time in his sick bed actually reading the Bill in detail, without his rose-coloured glasses on.

This Bill deals also with provisions addressing the issuing of licences to approved hotels and clubs and to repair and service personnel; the investigation of the credentials and viability of potential machine suppliers and manufacturers; security and monitoring of the computer chip which controls the function programs of the machine; the accounting procedures, and reporting on a regular basis to the controlling body. But, most importantly, the Bill recognises the potential social ramifications and seeks to address these problems created by the so-called compulsive gambler. I want to know how we stop adult human beings from entertaining themselves by placing a bet on either the horses or the dogs, or by going to bingo or to any of the many things that Australians are well known for and about which many members today have spoken. I think adults have to take responsibility for their own decisions. I see the introduction of poker machines as simply being another form of gambling. It is another way of using the dollars that are currently being used for gambling. It is just giving people an additional choice. It has other benefits, which I will talk about as I continue.

Mr Veivers: What are they?

Ms ROBSON: It might well be true that some family problems will follow from the introduction of gaming machines into clubs and hotels. But none of the literature that I have read actually makes a clear distinction between the cause and the consequence of this. In other words, it is very often the case--and literature shows this--that people who already have social problems turn to gambling. It is not necessarily the case that gambling causes a social problem. So again the honourable member needs to do his reading a little bit more broadly.

There are other aspects of people's habits or preferences to which I would allude as being a lot more dangerous than gambling. I cite as examples alcoholism and the hazards that have been proven--and I stress the word "proven"--to be attributed to the smoking habits of some people. I will not point any fingers in any particular direction. As the situation stands now in Queensland, people travel across the border into New South Wales to gamble. That fact cannot be ignored. Of the top five clubs in New South Wales, two are in Tweed Heads. Those two are patronised by thousands of Queenslanders every year. That cannot be denied; it is a proven fact.

Mr Johnson: Is that why you came to Queensland, to get away from it down there?

Ms ROBSON: Certainly not, no. I quite supported and enjoyed the poker machines in New South Wales. Also, I took full responsibility for my activities in that direction.

Millions of Queensland dollars are lost from this Government's coffers into the New South Wales Government's coffers. The honourable member might approve of that, but I think it is rather bad management of the economy. That money will now be used to support the development of sport and leisure activities and provide much-needed welfare dollars for our general community. Clearly, the introduction of poker machines will support the clubs and hotels which participate. In fact, most establishments in New South Wales that have poker machines provide food, liquor and entertainment at prices subsidised by poker machine revenue. In my view, poker machines will have the additional

facility--and the honourable member for Southport may not approve of this--of actually affording to low and fixed income earners an affordable night out.

I can instance many cases of my own experience in which people who otherwise could not afford to go out for the occasional meal--it might be once a month, depending on their income--can now afford to go out for a cheap meal and a bit of entertainment. The effect of that is that they are not sitting in front of their television set, they are out socialising and meeting other people. It cannot be denied that there is some benefit in that. Maybe the honourable member would like to keep them as isolated as he is. Even my own parents, who are pensioners now, constantly write and tell me how much they enjoy their occasional affordable night out. My mother is rather tinny. On a \$5 investment on a poker machine, she will win enough to pay for the whole meal. So it is possible that, if people are intelligent about it, they will not send themselves broke.

Mr Veivers: You're not that old.

Ms ROBSON: I was living in New South Wales when poker machines were introduced in 1956. I can remember their initial impact. I actually remember----

Mr Veivers: How old are you?

Ms ROBSON: If the honourable member wants to know, he should look in the green book. As I was saying, I actually remember that the response to the introduction of poker machines in New South Wales nearly 40 years ago was the same as that coming forward in this House today.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms ROBSON: Honourable members opposite do not read anything. If they really want to know, they should go and look it up in the green book. That is why it is issued to them. It is my birthday in a couple of weeks, so they can celebrate appropriately. It is on the same day as that of the member for Mount Isa.

I think members of the Opposition have grossly overreacted to the introduction of poker machines. They have not examined the situation that exists now. They have not accepted the fact that those dollars are already being spent.

Mr Veivers: How are you going to put them in poker machines if they are already spent?

Ms ROBSON: They are being spent in poker machines in New South Wales--at Tweed Heads. The honourable member cannot deny that as a fact. I think one of the honourable member's major problems is that he is a little bit frightened that the clubs and hotels will now be able to compete with the more expensive restaurants, which many people cannot afford to attend and of which his mates are probably patrons. This legislation is actually changing the marketplace, and the word "change" seems to induce a great deal of fear into members opposite.

I also find extremely outrageous the assumption that people cannot control their own spending or gambling habits. It is rather an insult to the people of Queensland that members opposite think they do not have enough mature judgment as adults to at least determine how much they can spend. I do not really see the introduction of gaming machines into Queensland as the end of civilisation as we know it. That is the message of doom and gloom that has been coming from the other side of the Chamber today. Gamblers will always find an avenue in which to gamble. Honourable members opposite know that as well as I do. I cannot be convinced that this legislation will make any substantial difference to that particular trend. Honourable members can say what they like, but there is no statistical evidence in real terms to support that. There is no real, determining evidence that suggests that one particular habit causes another.

In summary, I have absolutely no problem in supporting this Bill. I stand on my record as a community advocate. If I had found any convincing evidence against this legislation, I would have opposed the Bill in its early stages and argued against it. I

found no such evidence. I would like to see in writing some of the so-called evidence that has been mentioned, particularly in relation to the allegations that the introduction of poker machines will cause the social decay of society in Queensland.

Mr COOMBER (Currumbin) (7.55 p.m.): As my Liberal colleagues have said, the Liberal Party does not support this legislation in any form. In 1989, Queenslanders elected the Goss Labor Government on one issue, and one issue alone, namely, accountability. Queenslanders will not forget the reasons why they elected Labor in 1989. In 1992, Queenslanders will realise that they have been misled and betrayed by the real accuser in Queensland, namely, the Goss Labor Government. The need to illustrate accountability is paramount. This Government is removing accountability--the checks and balances--from legislation that will affect Queenslanders for years to come. For example, Premier Goss appointed commissioners to the CJC and EARC. Surely the correct procedure would have been for the parliamentary committee to decide who those commissioners should be. Minister Gibbs is doing the very same thing today. Accountability in Queensland is out the window, the checks and balances are missing, and the Minister answers to no-one.

The Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee's report on poker machine gambling is a Claytons report--a report that you have when you are not having a report. In the report of 1 September 1990, the Chairman of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, Mr Beattie, stated--

"This has been necessitated by the fact that the State Government has already announced its decision to introduce gaming machines in Queensland."

The chairman stated further--

"The Committee was concerned not to delay the Government decision to introduce gaming machines but rather to examine possible problems arising in relation to their introduction."

This is a prime example of a passive revolution. We know that there will be problems, but let us try to reduce the inherent problems. Why not try to be a lateral-thinking, positive-thinking Government of change?

Victoria and South Australia considered the gaming machine industry and threw the idea out the window. Most States in the United States have done the same thing. Consequently, in my opinion the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee has not fulfilled its function to this Parliament. Its chairman, Mr Beattie, stated--

"This process (of haste) has unavoidably placed pressure and demands on the Committee and its limited resources."

Honourable members have before them legislation to introduce change--negative change to the people of Queensland. It is not enough to enforce change in moral behaviour, with a relaxation of the type of pornographic material that will soon be available from newsagencies. It is not enough to enforce change in social behaviour, with the decriminalisation of homosexuality and, in the near future, prostitution and marijuana. There will now be a change to people's gambling behaviour. This represents poor thinking by a Government that regards change as giving to the community something that was denied it by a previous Government.

As I said, two States of Australia have undertaken long, detailed inquiries into gaming machines. The Queensland Government has not even been prepared to undertake an economic impact study, let alone a study into the criminal aspects of gaming machines. Many inquiries and royal commissions have been held into legal and illegal gambling. All those commissions, including the Moffit, Woodward, Costigan, Wilcox and Stewart royal commissions, found that it is not only illegal gambling that is associated with crime but that some forms of legal gambling are also associated with alarming levels of criminal activity. It is my opinion that, no matter how watertight legislation is in the beginning, crime will not be deterred.

This legislation is similar to taxation law in that one loophole is being closed and another one opened. There is a widely held view that the introduction of gaming

machines will assist struggling clubs. In the main, this legislation will create bigger problems. The electorate of Currumbin borders New South Wales. The major clubs across the border, namely, Twin Towns Services Club, Seagulls Rugby League Football Club, the Tweed Heads and South Tweed Heads Bowls Clubs and the Coolangatta and Tweed Heads Golf Club, provide enormous venues in which to play poker machines. Their facilities are palatial, and the perceived public benefit is to the forefront for everybody to see. The associated facilities are world class. However, the social impacts of gambling are well disguised and even discounted when evaluating benefits from gaming. The Gold Coast is well serviced with gambling alternatives. Jupiters Casino, the service clubs just across the border and the Gold Coast Turf Club provide basically 24-hours-a-day, 365-days-a-year gambling options. Gold Coast business have adjusted to the huge drain of revenue to New South Wales. There is no doubt that gambling has a major effect on the fabric of society. I will enlarge on that aspect later.

This legislation is no panacea to the livelihood of the clubs. In fact, during his evidence to the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee, Mr Lavers said--

"Don't think that poker machines are the be-all and end-all, because they are not. Certainly we believe that if poker machines go into hotels you will see a very big downturn of the club industry."

In fact, New South Wales clubs do not reflect the rose-coloured financial image promoted by the industry. One good example, which was provided to me by the member for Merthyr, is the Revesby Workers Club in New South Wales. Last year, that club cleared \$4.37m from poker machine revenue. After all costs, the net operating profit was only \$356,000. My information is that, even after expanding and spending \$5.7m on improvements, the gross income and turn-over have not increased. As a result, the club now trades at a loss and receivership is not far away. Despite net income from poker machines of some \$4.7m, the club is extremely overcapitalised and badly financed. The Revesby Workers Club is not alone. The Penrith Rugby League Club is in a similar position, with borrowings of almost \$23m.

What we will see in the long run was aptly summed up by the Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice, Mr Beattie, when he said--

"We have a lot of clubs in this State. Some of the things we have to be concerned about is what will happen to some of them. If we find that, as a result of poker machines, some of them will go to the wall--we want to anticipate that is what is in fact done."

The real agenda is revealed. The small club can expect to be swallowed up in the marketing that is undertaken by larger service and licensed clubs. This Government does not give a damn. That eventuality was detailed in evidence to the Parliamentary Committee for Criminal Justice. The club industry comprises non-profit-making organisations and all moneys made by the clubs are turned back to the benefit of the clubs, not to the community.

For many years, the Gold Coast small business and service industry has had to compete with the gaming industry in New South Wales. With subsidised meals and subsidised entertainment and liquor, it has been the survival of the smartest. The same does not apply to the rest of Queensland, and I predict that the introduction of gaming machines into mainstream Queensland will see the demise of small business, restaurants and the charities, which will supposedly be supported by moneys from gaming.

In years to come, Queenslanders will reflect on today as the day when another monetary Bill was introduced into this State. As an instrument of taxation, we are seeing Queensland move towards New South Wales principles--using gambling to collect revenue through gaming machines. In New South Wales, each year, each person over 18 years of age spends \$2,355 on all forms of gaming and \$1,065 on racing. That is almost three times the expenditure on gaming of people over 18 years of age in Queensland. Once again, the only winner is the Yakuza of Queensland--the Goss Labor Government. This action today is perhaps the best example of a Government that is

out of touch with the people of Queensland. Let us consider the hotel scene. In 12 months' time, hotels in this State will be sending machines back to the Government. The hotel industry has been sold a pup, a myth--the magic of money promised prior to the 1989 election and withdrawn just as mischievously as the book-maker turn-over tax was withdrawn from the racing clubs of Queensland. Perhaps the hidden agenda is also to see a rationalisation of the hotel industry as well as the club industry.

In July 1989, Mr Tony Fitzgerald provided his advice to this State in respect of poker machines when he said--

"Law reform in respect of gambling needs to be approached in a comprehensive, considered way. It is inherently difficult. Until a comprehensive review is undertaken, narrowly focussed, piecemeal action including expanding the legal means of gambling, is inadvisable."

Fitzgerald went as close as possible to making a recommendation against poker machines. If that recommendation had been made by the commissioner, it would have been interesting to see whether the ALP would have followed it. The Minister himself refers to the Fitzgerald inquiry and the allegations of large payments being passed to several persons at all levels. The whole field of gaming machines is obviously highly controversial, as indicated by the Minister. In these post-Fitzgerald days and given those circumstances, it is surprising that the Bill effectively provides maximum scope for abuse by the Government in favour of its friends.

The Queensland Machine Gaming Commission is to consist of five commissioners. All are to be appointed by the Cabinet on the recommendation of the Minister. Clause 2.4 (3) purports to propose guidelines as to the people whom the Minister shall recommend as commissioners. However, it is apparent from reading the relevant clause that, in reality, no real constraints are placed on the Minister. He will appoint commissioners who will toe the party line. It will be seen as more jobs for the boys. It is unfortunate that, although the commissioners will make highly sensitive and controversial decisions, under the scheme of this Bill, no inquiry will be made into their character. The commissioners will be far more powerful and therefore open to corruption than will the director, deputy director or officers of the division, who will have been investigated. Likewise, when an application for the grant of a gaming machine licence is made, the director is required under clause 3.3 to carry out an involved and comprehensive investigation of the applicant.

Thus it can be seen that there is enormous scope for the Government to manipulate the make-up of the commission, and the commission itself is given enormous latitude and power in the decision-making process. Neither of those aspects would be so disquieting if it were not for the fact that the Bill expressly precludes any form of appeal from a decision of the commission except by way of appeal to the Minister himself, who is the person who appointed the commissioners to administer the Act on his behalf. In effect, the Bill provides an appeal from Caesar to Caesar. A party who is aggrieved by a decision of the commissioners can go only to the Minister, who has effectively appointed those commissioners. To exclude effectively any independent scrutiny of decisions made in this highly sensitive area will allow cronyism and corruption to infiltrate and flourish in a very short time. Even if, by some miracle, that does not occur, the mechanism proposed by the Bill is tailor made to invite allegations of just that kind. Justice--and the ALP is big on justice--must not only be done but also be seen to be done. There is no justification for excluding judicial review of the decisions of the commission.

Today, we are witnessing the start of Queensland Incorporated, because this legislation also represents the very high risk investment of public funds. The public is entitled to know just how much public money will be spent on buying poker machines and about the feasibility studies that show the wisdom or stupidity of such expenditure. It is entitled to know if the recession that we had to have has been allowed for in these feasibility studies. It is entitled to know what safeguards are in place to protect public investment if the machines run at a loss and have to be sold. It is entitled to know if there will be a market for the anticipated number of machines if they are to be sold and if Queensland

clubs will be liquidated if they are unable to meet their tax charges. It is also entitled to know what the Minister plans to do next if the poker machines fail. Does he plan to buy a string of racehorses out of public funds and endeavour to recoup the loss?

The Bill before the House today threatens not only the moral fabric of Queensland, as I have just described, but also it blatantly undermines the legitimate powers of local authorities. Clause 3.1 ensures that the rights of private citizens and local authorities to plan their own environment has been lost to the influential and cashed-up poker machine lobby. The gaming commission is specifically empowered to ignore any law that stands in the way of poker machines. If poker machines are a prohibited use under a town-planning scheme or a consent use, then that counts for nothing. The operations of poker machines under the legislation are an as-of-right use anywhere in Queensland and local authorities can either like it or lump it. This represents the biggest ministerial rezoning in history. One can but ponder the size of the paper bag involved. This conduct by the Minister is all the more glaring and suspicious when one recognises that citizens' rights to enforce town plans are about to be substantially widened by the powers of the Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act Amendment Bill that will be proclaimed in April. Citizens' rights to object to poker machines are not merely being limited; they are being dumped all together. Centuries of law have been erased to give protection to the poker machine lobby. The abolition of the common law right to sue for public or private nuisance pertaining to poker machines is scandalous and disgraceful. Private citizens will have no avenue of objection or appeal under this legislation. The rights of citizens and the community's right to preserve its social environment have been sold out to the poker machine lobby.

In conclusion, it is clear that the poker machine lobby has already exercised an extraordinary level of influence in the preparation of this legislation.

Dr CLARK (Barron River) (8.10 p.m.): Gambling has a crucial and distinctive place in Australian culture. Since the first colonial settlement gambling has been widespread throughout the country and many Australians are proud of their reputation as a nation of people who--as it has been said--will bet on two flies on a wall. Almost 90 per cent of Australians gamble on anything from a sweep on the Melbourne Cup to cock-fighting or frog-jumping in remote parts of Australia. Toad races are held in my part of the world. Despite restrictive legislation and strong opposition from those who were determined to eradicate the evils of gambling, the Australian passion for gambling has survived. So, too, has the belief that gambling is evil and members have heard that belief repeated here today by members of the Opposition.

I personally do not gamble and doubt that I will ever be a regular player of poker machines. However, I am prepared to support the introduction of gaming machines, subject, of course, to the very strict conditions enshrined in this Bill, because, on balance, I believe that the benefits will outweigh the costs--costs that have been exaggerated by speakers on the opposite side of the House. I will recap--because they need recapping--on some of the benefits and reasons for the introduction of poker machines. This is worth restating because of the negativity that has come from speaker after speaker in this debate. The introduction of poker machines will in fact provide direct funding for sport, recreation and welfare programs. When I was involved in the preparation of the report on sports funding I discovered first hand just how desperately more funds are needed in that area and how much more could be achieved with more funds. I am aware that the figure will be in excess of \$30m when poker machines are up and running. Poker machines will provide an avenue by which participating clubs and hotels can increase their financial support in order to improve recreational facilities and services for members and patrons. Today, this House has heard just what dire straits Queensland clubs are experiencing. By comparison, we have heard exactly what clubs in New South Wales are able to offer by way of sporting and recreational facilities and services. Poker machines will also encourage the growth of tourism by the improvement of club and hotel facilities, services and entertainment. Given the importance of tourism to this State's economy and its current state in far-north Queensland, it needs all the help it

can get. Furthermore, poker machines will provide additional employment opportunities in the State. Earlier this evening, the member for Mulgrave clearly indicated the boost to employment that has occurred in New South Wales and no doubt a similar picture will emerge here in Queensland. Poker machines will provide extra revenue for the State and thereby provide the additional police, teachers and nurses that everyone wants. Finally, poker machines will meet the legitimate wish of those who are attracted--unlike me--to playing gaming machines.

Poker machines were first introduced into registered clubs in New South Wales in 1956 and since then communities in that State have had plenty of time to decide on the benefits or otherwise of poker machines. There are many testimonials from local authorities in New South Wales that clearly document the support for the facilities that have been provided, the employment that has been generated and the positive benefits it created for their communities. However, the Government recognises that there can be problems. The Government will not step away from that fact. There can be problems in the operation of poker machines, and no-one doubts that. The evidence is very compelling, and I recognise it. In New South Wales, the experience prior to the introduction of the regulation of the industry was that there were problems, but Queensland has the opportunity to benefit from the lessons learned elsewhere.

The CJC report on poker machines contained very detailed recommendations regarding the means of regulating the industry to avoid the criminal activities that have been associated with the industry elsewhere. Those recommendations have been taken on board by this Government point by point, and are enshrined in the legislation that is being debated in the House today. Those recommendations regarding licensing, Government purchasing and enforcement have all been included and are in the legislation for everyone to see. It is interesting that the Opposition has not recognised that, but has preferred instead to engage in debate of a much more emotional type and in scaremongering tactics.

I turn now to the likely social impact of the introduction of poker machines. The Government is well aware of the potential that exists for some individuals and families to be affected adversely. However, I do not accept the wild claims that have been made during this debate, including those made by the member for Southport. What is known about the prevalence and impact of compulsive gambling in relation to poker machines in Australia? The answer to that question is that precious little is known because the research that needs to be done has not been done. Mossenson compiled a report titled *Gaming in Western Australia* and stated that pathological gamblers were excluded from consideration because "it proved difficult to obtain any reliable information on the subject." The report went on to state--

"When called to do so, those persons most strongly opposed to liberalising the gaming laws were unable to produce objective evidence of the damage caused by gaming in particular and gambling in general."

This is not to say that compulsive or pathological gambling does not exist. Quite clearly, it does exist and it is generally accepted that it is an illness which is suffered by a very small group only in the community. It is listed in Spitzer's handbook of psychiatric disorders under the category of a disorder in impulse control. Compulsive gambling must be recognised for what it is, that is, an illness that affects a very small group in society. It is simply not true--although it was suggested by some participants in this debate--that in some way, as soon as a person comes into contact with one of these dreadful poker machines, he or she instantly becomes a compulsive gambler who loses control and gambles away the family pay packet, which results in dire consequences. As I have said, attempts to put some accurate figure on the incidence or prevalence of pathological gambling have revealed that no accurate data exists. In 1986, Allcock undertook a review of pathological gambling and his report is contained in the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*. He estimated that the incidence could be between 0.5 per cent and 1 per cent of the population. Concern has rightly been expressed that, even if there is only a small number of people who will be affected adversely, the

Government nevertheless has a responsibility to recognise that and address the problem, which is what this Government is doing.

Alex Blaszczyński delivered an address to the second national conference of the National Association for Gambling Studies and was very critical of the New South Wales Government for creating compulsive gamblers. He stated--

"Exactly how many we do not know"--

that is, how many compulsive gamblers have been created--

"but it is high time for the government to find out. In creating a problem, the government must accept responsibility for alleviating it, at least by providing funds for rehabilitation.

In America, recognition and acceptance of their social responsibility has led federal and state governments to initiate funded treatment centres for pathological gamblers . . . it is hoped the New South Wales government will follow their lead."

The Queensland Government will not follow the lead of any other Government. Right from the beginning, it is going to do the right thing because it recognises its responsibilities.

Clause 8.5 of the Bill refers specifically to a charities and rehabilitation levy that will be collected each month from poker machine operators. This money will be deposited in a Charities and Rehabilitation Benefit Fund. It is proposed that approximately \$18m will be available from this source which will be used to assist existing organisations, such as Gamblers Anonymous, and, hopefully, in setting up new treatment centres. Treatment for this illness exists, but not a great deal of study of compulsive or pathological gambling has been carried out. However, the small amount of research that is available suggests that gamblers respond well to Gamblers Anonymous, which encourages the gambler to express the hopelessness of his or her situation and give himself or herself over to a power greater than he or she. Gamblers are able to contact nominated members for mutual support when the urge to gamble is being felt. While some people respond to Gamblers Anonymous, other people respond to a psychoanalytic model. However, research suggests that the most effective treatment is the behaviour therapy model. It is a cost-effective model of short duration and out of all the various treatments that are available, it is considered to be the most appropriate and effective.

Allcock cited a research study carried out in Sydney hospitals. As a psychologist, I wish to share with other members some facts relating to some of the interesting treatments that are available. I doubt that other honourable members would have had behaviour therapy described to them before, so an explanation of the treatment may be of interest to them. The study referred to by Allcock concentrated on 20 pathological gamblers who were randomly allocated. Ten were to receive imaginal desensitisation and 10 were to receive aversive therapy treatment. In the imaginal desensitisation procedure, patients visualised cues that precipitated the urge to gamble, such as walking past a TAB, but maintained a state of relaxation while visualising the scene. In the aversive-relief therapy, patients received mild electric shocks to their fingers as they read out 10 phrases that were written separately on index cards relating to aspects of their gambling behaviour. However, no shock was given in relation to the last card which described an activity incompatible with gambling, for example, "Going home to my wife". All those cards were used four times in each session. Both groups received fourteen 20-minute treatment sessions over a period of just one week as inpatients. One might ask, "What on earth would that do? What result could that possibly produce?" Honourable members should listen because the patients were assessed at one-month and one-year follow-up periods by an interviewer who was blind as to the treatment received and the psychological scales administered at pretreatment. The results showed that the desensitisation process was significantly better than aversive therapy. The researchers found that 70 per cent of the former reported markedly reduced or absent gambling behaviour compared to 20 per cent of the latter group, which was the group who had received the electric shocks. I wonder whether the result might have been different if the electric shocks had been given at the time the handle on the poker machines was pulled.

Further, there is a need for more research to be carried out. It is interesting that in its report the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee focused on additional research that was needed. I can only commend those recommendations and hope that the charities and rehabilitation levy will in fact be used for that purpose. It was suggested that, with the introduction of gaming in Queensland, research needed to be carried out into the personal and broader social effects of gambling so that resources can be allocated and services can be developed where needed; research into the actual transfer and distribution of gaming moneys can be undertaken; research into the criminal justice system's approach to gambling-related crime can be conducted, particularly for offenders who are compulsive gamblers; the advertising and promotion of gambling can be researched; and, finally--I am not sure whether it is in the Bill and I would like the Minister to comment on it in his reply--all establishments which have gaming machines can be required to display a sign advertising services for compulsive gamblers. I believe that is very important and I hope that we will adopt that recommendation.

However, there are matters in the Bill which must be recognised as being designed specifically to reduce the social problems associated with poker machines. As I said, the Government takes its responsibility very seriously. So we have in clause 5.9 a provision that licensees are not to extend credit. It is well known that compulsive gamblers will go to enormous lengths to get the money that they need to gamble and they will run up credit wherever and from whomever they can get it. The licensee must not make a loan or extend credit in any form to any person to enable that person or any other person to play a gaming machine on the premises.

Additionally, we have recognised that minors must not play gaming machines. The age of 18 years has been chosen, and that can be thoroughly policed to avoid minors being caught up in gambling habits. Research shows that those habits are developed when people are adolescents. In fact, many of the gamblers who have been studied in the research that I have examined revealed that their parents were gamblers, that they had been learning those habits from a very early age and that it was ingrained. We must not encourage our young people to gamble.

Under the provisions of clause 5.24, licensees should prohibit certain persons from gaming. This is the controversial provision. If there are reasonable grounds on which a licensee believes that the peace and happiness of a person's family are endangered due to excessive playing of gaming machines by the person, the licensee must prohibit that person from playing gaming machines on those premises. That has been provided in order that, if the licensee becomes aware that a problem exists with a regular patron who is using the family budget for gambling purposes, he has a responsibility to do something about it. If the licensee does not do so, when his licence comes up for renewal in two years, he might find himself without that licence. We want the licensees to take that responsibility, and we will make sure that they do.

I will conclude by restating my belief that on balance the benefits of introducing poker machines do outweigh the costs. We have before the House a Bill that is the best that can possibly be drafted in this country to control this industry. I support the Bill before the House.

Mr SPRINGBORG (Carnarvon) (8.27 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I rise to participate in this debate. I want to talk primarily about how the legislation affects pubs and clubs in my electorate and some of the furphies that have been perpetrated in this House by Government members. Today, we have learned that as soon as Government members find themselves backed into a corner and they cannot intellectually fight their way out of an argument, they turn to making personal abuse, and they do it so very well.

I will quote from a newspaper article which alarmed me when it appeared in the *Sunday Mail* a few months ago. The journalist, on his way to a particular venue, stopped to interview me and stated that he was spending a certain period in my area in an attempt to obtain some stories from the western part of my electorate. A journalist by the name of Guy Ker wrote the article.

Mr Pearce: He's a great representative, that fellow. He doesn't even know how to tell a true story.

Mr SPRINGBORG: If the honourable member would listen for a moment and not go indulge in making personal abuse, he would learn something. This article should hit home as to what we will face as a result of this poker machine legislation passing through this House--amended or otherwise--during this parliamentary session. The article stated--

"It was scarcely noon on dole cheque day in Bogabilla, on the Queensland-NSW border"--
that is only 10 kilometres away from the southern side of my electorate--

"and already the weekly pension money was disappearing fast into the Town and Country Club's poker machines.

A trio of Aboriginal women sat at the garish \$75,000 jackpot pokies, feeding dollar coins into slots as if there was no tomorrow.

One of the club directors looked on approvingly. 'Today's pension day,' he remarked gleefully." They were like vultures sitting around waiting for a carcass, or like Dracula overlooking the blood bank. The article continued--

" 'It would be a quiet day but the blacks love the machines--they'd put their money in it all day if they could.'

Turning his attention to females of the other race paying earnest homage to the deities of the silver coin, he continued: 'See that other lady over there? She won \$600,000 in a third share Lotto win and now she's giving us the money.'

As Queensland approaches the introduction of poker machines with mixed feelings . . ."
Later, the article continued--

"For many local people, starved of entertainment, it has proved a Godsend.

'I love them,' said Tipperary-born Mrs Anastasia Lawless, 72, of Goondiwindi.

The sentiment was echoed by 24 year-old Brenda Murphy, who had driven down from Dalby for a flutter and a meal with some workmates.

'I love the excitement. When Queensland gets them I'll be there every night. And I'll be broke.'

Is that not a sad indictment on what we are embarking upon tonight? We can sit down and say that we are going to overcome all the corruption problems and all the social problems related to the legislation--Government members can be as idealistic as they want to be--but it will not happen. The Government's most up-to-date, anti-corruption and anti-interference devices on these machines may be as good as human ingenuity can provide today; however, whilst we have human ingenuity we can and will run into problems.

I want to talk about the difference between the one State and the one Territory that have poker machines and the amount of money that is spent on gambling in Queensland. Figures released on adult gambling show that in New South Wales and the ACT--the only State and Territory that have poker machines--each person spends more than twice the national average. Last financial year, Queenslanders legally gambled \$1,303 a head.

Dr Flynn: That is because Queenslanders and Victorians are spending their money in New South Wales.

Mr SPRINGBORG: That will not be necessary after the passage of this legislation. Only Victoria, with an average of \$1,191, was lower. In New South Wales, the average person gambled \$3,646, of which poker machines accounted for \$2,391. In the ACT, the

total per capita was \$3,093, with poker machines accounting for \$2,327. I take issue with the statement that all this money will come back to Queensland. If it did go over the border--and undoubtedly a large amount of it did--then the boom for poker machines may very well be over. Today I spoke with the proprietor of a very large New South Wales club. I think that the club is in Wollongong. The turn-over of that club was \$2m or \$3m--it might have been even more. He said, "This is by no means a godsend. It is by no means the be-all and end-all." In fact, many New South Wales clubs are in great strife because they thought that they would capitalise on the poker machine boom and that it would continue. They went out and borrowed money to expand and now they are having difficulty meeting interest payments. The clubs that seem to have done the best are those on the Victoria/New South Wales border and the Queensland/New South Wales border.

Earlier this evening, a press release given to Australian Associated Press was drawn to my attention. It is headed "Victoria to get poker machines". How many members on the Government side were aware of that?

Mr Smyth: They are getting machines?

Mr SPRINGBORG: They are getting poker machines. The press release is dated 12 March--today's date--and it states--

"Melbourne, March 12th, AAP.

Ten thousand poker machines are to be installed in clubs and hotels across Victoria, Premier Joan Kirner announced today.

Ms Kirner said Tattersalls and the TAB would each have the right to operate 5,000 machines under the government's new gambling policy."

Is that not a strange twist of fate? Is that press release wrong? I certainly hope not. Tonight, the Queensland Parliament is debating gaming machine legislation, and Victoria is going along a similar line. The reasons for the introduction of such legislation in Victoria may be very similar to the reasons for its introduction in Queensland. Because of the way in which ALP Governments traditionally mishandle economies, those Governments are going to need all the money that they can rip off the people. That is basically the way it is.

Today, I rang all of the hotels and a large number of the clubs in my electorate. I would have been able to contact most of them if I did not have my duties to perform as Acting Whip and if it were not for the problems that are sometimes experienced with the telephones in this building. The proprietors of 11 pubs with whom I spoke were concerned about the introduction of poker machines. I think that there would be 16 or 17 pubs in my electorate--there could be a few more. Some of those pubs did not necessarily want poker machines. Many of them were going to get them. In fact, they are all going to have to get them. They feel an obligation to do so because the clubs and the pubs down the road would be getting them. That is the point that has been missed today. The honourable member for Mount Coot-tha said that the clubs and pubs do not have to get the poker machines. If they do not want to lose their patronage and they want to be able to offer the same facilities to their patrons as the club or the pub down the road, then it is essential to have the machines. Their hands are being forced. That is the point that is being missed.

For the sake of these pubs, I hope that this will be the great panacea that the Minister is saying it will be. Many of the pubs that I contacted felt that it was unfair that the clubs would be getting 20 cent machines and that the pubs would be getting only 10 cent machines. I spoke to only five clubs. Two of the clubs did not necessarily want the machines. Two of the clubs wanted the machines because they feel that they are struggling economically and that this will be their saviour. I hope that those people do not hold the mistaken belief that this is going to extricate them completely from the mire, because I do not believe that it will. I do not believe that Queensland can necessarily get back the money that is going over the border into New South Wales because those clubs have

a very vast infrastructure that it would take our clubs a long time to develop. The Queensland clubs would have to rely on a lot of the resources that have gone over the border. A lot of the money that has gone over the border is lost to Queensland. I suppose it could have been used to build up our clubs. However, I do not agree at all with the introduction of poker machines. If they are going to be introduced, I think that they should be introduced in a way that will minimise their impact on small pubs and clubs. I give the Minister some credit where it is due. He realises that there can be a problem with crime in regard to poker machines and he has made endeavours to overcome any problems.

Mr Nunn interjected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: Yes, but it may not work. Earlier in the debate, the member for Callide said that charities may very well suffer as a result of the introduction of this particular piece of legislation. I know that there is a fund to get money out of the poker machines and give it back to charities. I know of one hotel in Stanthorpe that has four ticket machines. Those machines clear something like \$2,000 a year for four charities. One charity is the Leukaemia Foundation. Another one is the Lions Club. The other two are sporting clubs--the local swimming club and the local soccer club. I hope that local charities are not going to be disadvantaged by poker machines. People may be mesmerised by a poker machine. It may be a bit more exhilarating to play a poker machine than to put 20 cents into the slot of a ticket machine. I say again that Queensland will have great difficulty in getting back this revenue from New South Wales. I know that every time members of the Opposition say that they have principles, members of the Government hark back to Fitzgerald. I remind the Government that it is not the party that is corrupt; it is individuals. The same has happened in the Labor Party. It has happened right across Australia. It will happen in the Labor Party in the future in Queensland.

Mr Bredhauer: Who has been gaoled in other States?

Mr SPRINGBORG: Rex Jackson. The honourable member will have to wait and see the results of the Western Australian royal commission. It is going to make what happened in Queensland look like a teddy bear's picnic. They will be talking about billions of dollars there, not just thousands.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SPRINGBORG: I am returning to the debate. I was provoked. I had no choice but to answer that interjection.

The simple fact is that Queensland money is going to New South Wales. Its clubs have the infrastructure. They sometimes put on a free bus to transport people to northern New South Wales. They can offer international entertainment, which the Queensland clubs cannot offer, regardless of whether they get poker machines or not. They can also offer cheap counter meals, something which Queensland clubs cannot offer. I noticed that in a recent press statement Mr Colin Lamont said that in time those good things would come to Queensland. I hope that is not going to be another case of being away with the fairies. Earlier tonight, I was reading through some press statements about compulsive gambling that alarmed me. One gentleman in New South Wales was banned by the local club management because they knew that he was a compulsive gambler. He went through two properties. However, he convinced two friends to go into the club and put the money into the slot machines for him while he sat back and watched. This seems to me to be a deficiency in the policing procedures in New South Wales. In the future, that may be the sort of area that will be a challenge for the Minister, if compulsive gamblers are to be precluded from clubs. Their gambling affects their families and in fact detrimentally affects them personally.

Mr Gibbs: You will even knock the idea. He said they should not be protected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: But I am talking about gaol terms and all those sorts of things.

Mr Gibbs: That is not in there.

Mr SPRINGBORG: The Minister spoke about the previous Government's famous deviants legislation. In a way, this Minister has far excelled that legislation and yet members opposite are supposed to be the bastion of civil liberties. They have abrogated their responsibilities in that area. This is not an easy problem to solve. The Minister knows that as well as I do. I ask him to recognise that there may be grave problems with this legislation and that he will be constantly amending it.

The pub-owners in Queensland are concerned that they are going to go broke or find themselves in a difficult financial position in which they have to actually order and have in place various poker machines to basically beat the Joneses down the road. This is a very real concern of theirs. I did not pre-empt any of those answers. I did not ask any other questions this afternoon. I just said, "What are your concerns? Are you exhilarated by the possibility of poker machines coming in or are you concerned?" Most of them stated that they had concerns. Some of them said that they are hoping that it is going to work in Queensland because they felt this legislation had some particular promise, but they felt that with the way it was being introduced there may be problems.

The gentleman who I spoke to today in New South Wales, who is the proprietor of a club, said that he was most amused at the way Queensland was going about introducing poker machines. Perhaps the Minister knows more about this than I do. Queensland is embarking on a turn-over tax. The system in New South Wales varies from 88 per cent to 96 per cent of the takings from machines being returned to the punters and the results are subsequently taxed. Up to \$100,000, the tax on net profit returned to the Government is something like \$1 in every \$100; over \$100,000, it is \$22 in every \$100. He felt it most amusing that Queensland was going this way. He suggested that this might in fact mean that Queensland has to stay in line with the so-called slow machines or the tight machines and that they do not return as much money as the \$1 and \$2 machines in New South Wales, which may in fact have the effect of coaxing more people over the border into northern New South Wales.

Mr Gibbs interjected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I am saying that this is a concern that was raised.

Mr Gibbs: Is he a club manager?

Mr SPRINGBORG: He is a club manager.

Mr Gibbs: If that is the sort of information, it is no wonder his club is going broke.

Mr SPRINGBORG: No. Actually, his club is going quite well. It seems to be managed pretty well. His is one that is not suffering. He said that over the border they have the \$1 and \$2 machines, the faster machines. I ask the Minister whether those machines will be introduced into Queensland at some time in the future. The Minister might find that he will have to introduce those machines to keep the punters in Queensland because those machines pay up a lot quicker and patrons can play many more games on them. That is another problem that may be inherent in this legislation.

I will leave the debate at that point. I hope that I have articulated some of the concerns of the club and hotel owners in my electorate. I have been sensible enough to suggest that some club people are in favour of the legislation and that some pub-owners are hoping that it will work. Most of them are genuinely concerned because they feel that the clubs have a headstart because they are going to get 10 per cent or 11 per cent back and they are going to have the 20c machines. Those concerns have to be addressed by the Government.

Mr Gibbs: Do you know that the 10c machine is more popular than the 20c machine?

Mr SPRINGBORG: It is funny that those people do not view it that way. They feel that patrons will be more inclined to take a bigger risk and go up the street to the 20c machines. They feel that the club-owners will be at a distinct advantage because

they are going to get a 10 per cent return whereas the pub-owners are going to get a 5 per cent return.

Anyway, I will leave the debate at that point. I look forward to the Minister's response in his summing-up. I hope that he can answer many of the concerns that I have raised because the people in my electorate are worried about this legislation. I have not hyped up the argument. Until today, I had not spoken with those people. I have not made any press statements.

Mr BREDHAUER (Cook) (8.45 p.m.): At times, I have found the debate from the other side of the House confusing. That is epitomised by some of the statements from the previous speaker, the honourable member for Carnarvon. I thought he was going to speak against the legislation. At one stage, he spoke about all the wonderful services that the clubs over the border are able to provide people in Queensland in terms of putting on free buses, enticing them over the border, feeding them up with cheap food and providing good entertainment. Those are the types of facilities that clubs are able to provide because New South Wales has the poker machine legislation. He then went on to speak about one fellow who convinced two mates of his to go in and feed the poker machines while he sat back and watched, and he asked whether the Government could legislate to stop that type of activity occurring. Then he rang a mate of his who was the manager of a club in New South Wales and talked to him about how efficient or effective the Queensland legislation might be. I really think from the point of view of statistical analysis or proper evaluation of the legislation that he fails himself, this House and his constituents.

The issue of the introduction of gaming machines in Queensland has a long history. It has generated a great deal of debate and discussion and has time and time again come under the microscope of public scrutiny. That the Labor Party in Queensland has long supported the introduction of gaming machines is a matter of public record. That this Government made a clear commitment to the introduction of gaming machines prior to the last election is equally indisputable. Given that this Government can claim, therefore, a mandate to proceed, what criteria must a prudent, responsible Government apply to the machinery of determining to proceed, when drafting the appropriate legislation? In my mind these criteria are twofold. Firstly, can we demonstrate public interest? Secondly, can we satisfy our own stringent requirements and the public demand for a clean industry?

I would like to make some evaluation of this legislation based on those two criteria. The Bill provides for applications for the grant of a gaming machine licence to be made by, among others, a club, the holder of a licensed victualler's licence or tavern licence or such other licence or class of licence as may be prescribed by Order in Council under the Liquor Act. For a number of years, even prior to the current economic downturn, many licensed clubs in Queensland were suffering declining membership and difficult financial times. This effectively placed clubs in a downward spiral. Without the resources emanating from the membership and patronage of a club's supporters, it is virtually impossible to expand the range and quality of services and benefits designed to attract members. Without these enhanced services and additional members, the club's financial position progressively worsens. Queensland's club industry clearly perceived the need for some initiative to break that spiral. The clubs undoubtedly saw gaming machines as having the potential to provide a boost to their flagging coffers which would enable them to embark on a program of winning back lost custom through service delivery. Numerous approaches to previous Governments on behalf of the club industry were spurned. Those Governments were quite prepared to sit back and watch the ongoing slide of such clubs, apparently oblivious to or uncaring of the loss of community recreation and social facility.

No-one will argue that gaming machines are the panacea for all club ills. Time and time again, we have listened to members opposite claim that there are clubs in New South Wales that are suffering difficulties. Even though they have poker machines, some clubs are not doing well. No-one on this side of the House says that the introduction

of machine gaming will be some sort of magic wand that will pull all clubs in Queensland out of any financial difficulties they may have. No-one is arguing that gaming machines are a panacea for all club ills. Indeed, it is my belief that, especially in smaller towns, the days of successfully running as independent commercially viable units a Rugby League club, a soccer club, a cricket club, a golf club and so on are over. This point has been made before. What will happen to some of the other clubs? For the last 20 years, I have lived in small towns throughout Queensland. I can tell the House that small towns can no longer support, as commercially viable units, a soccer club, a golf club, three Rugby League clubs and four or five other clubs, because every particular interest group wants to have its own club to serve its own client group. The communities just are not big enough and they do not have the resources to support them.

Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that since the introduction of gaming machines in New South Wales clubs have significantly expanded their membership and the services they provide to the community. Many New South Wales clubs provide a range of recreational and social activities to patrons at a cost subsidised by gaming machines. This is the point about which the member for Carnarvon and others were talking. As the Minister reported to the House during his second-reading speech, the New South Wales Liquor Administration Board's annual report for 1989-90 shows two out of the top five New South Wales clubs to be on the Queensland/NSW border. They are the Twin Towns Services Club and Seagulls.

I am surprised by the pals of the small-businesspeople who sit opposite with the Liberal and National Parties. They do not seem to care about the thousands of people who every week troop through their backyards and their frontyards across the border to New South Wales to spend millions of dollars. They go by the bus load. They go from Brisbane. They even go from the electorate of the member for Carnarvon. They go from Toowoomba. They go from all over the State. They go in bus loads straight past the electorates of the members for Southport, Surfers Paradise, Nerang and Currumbin across the border and pour millions of dollars into the coffers of businesses in New South Wales. Yet those members have the hide to stand in this House and say that the introduction of machine gaming in Queensland will have a deleterious effect on small businesses. What sort of an effect is it having now when people with all of those millions of dollars are walking straight past their front door interstate. In part, this legislation tries to redress that flow of resources across the border.

Machine gaming may not be a panacea but it will enable clubs and hotels to supplement their incomes and improve facilities. It will provide greater public amenity, not just through the availability of machine gaming--in itself a legitimate leisure-time and pastime pursuit--but also through the enhanced facilities and services provided to patrons and subsidised by gaming machines.

To this point, I have not said a great deal about the provision for hotels to apply for gaming machine licences. The decision to make provision for hotels to be able to apply for licences is to give them some opportunity to compete with clubs for customers' patronage. I will deal with the point raised by the member for Carnarvon. Many of the hoteliers in my electorate have also conveyed to me that they have done their sums and they do not think it will be worth while for them to put poker machines in their hotels. But they do not have to do that. If they provide a range of services to the members of the public, they will continue to attract the custom which they presently do. It may not be financially viable for every hotelier to get into the poker machine industry. But that is the right, the entitlement of hoteliers. Some may make astute business judgments, others may not. But it has to be remembered that hotels operate for the profit of the publican, the company that owns the hotel or the brewery that owns the hotel. Therefore, they must be treated differently from the clubs which in essence are there to provide a community service.

The member for Currumbin quoted figures relating to the level of profit of a particular club in New South Wales that started with gross takings of \$4m-odd and made a gross profit of approximately \$360,000. The fact is that the gross profit generated

by that club goes back into facilities, benefits and services for the members of the club. The club is not strictly a profit-making organisation. It turns over its profit so that it can improve facilities for its members. That is the intention of the clubs. That is why there must be a difference between the profit margins of hotels and clubs. The profit margins of hotels go into the pockets of the owners of hotels.

The member for Carnarvon claimed that people who owned hotels thought that they would have to install poker machines in their hotels in order to compete for the patronage of people in a pub down the road which might also be installing poker machines. The honourable member does not realise that, by saying that, he is admitting that the services provided by the hotel or establishment that will have gaming machines will be better than it is at present, so that they will have to consider installing gaming machines so that they can compete with the improved facilities which patrons of an establishment down the road will receive.

Mr Springborg: That is twisted logic.

Mr BREDHAUER: It is not twisted logic. It is very simple logic. If those hotels are trying to compete with establishments down the road, it is because those establishments are attracting people because they have better services and facilities.

There are other significant benefits to be derived by the people of Queensland from this Bill. Part 8 of the legislation details the appropriate taxes, levies and fees to be incurred by licensed operators. Monthly assessment of the gross turn-over of each licensed premise will be made. A monthly rental fee payable to the director will cover the cost of interest and redemption of purchase cost, repairs, maintenance and other factors. Gaming machine tax, prescribed by regulation, will be paid monthly and based on the gross monthly turn-over according to the category of licensed premise to which the licence belongs. The sport and recreation levy and the charities and rehabilitation levy will be paid monthly into the Sport and Recreation Benefit Fund and the Charities and Rehabilitation Benefit Fund respectively under Treasury. Those levies alone are anticipated to allow the Government to distribute some \$54m to sporting and welfare groups and the funds will be administered by the relevant Minister.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister also outlined numerous other benefits, which I will not go into in detail. However, I will mention the positive spin-offs of the legislation for growth in the tourist industry. Clearly, one of the features of the growth in the Australian tourist industry over recent years has been the range and diversity of services and facilities that it offers for international and domestic tourists alike. Those services range from backpacker hostels to five-star hotels, tourist walks to theme parks, and a range of cultural pursuits from Aboriginal art to Expos. Gaming machines will further enhance the range of options available in themselves and through the growth of services and entertainment at clubs and hotels.

Much comment has been made about the down side of poker machines and problems suffered by Gamblers Anonymous. The member for Callide--a self-confessed conservative and wowser--gave a long litany of all the problems faced by gambling addicts. She implied that gambling addicts do not exist now, but that they will exist after the introduction of this legislation. That is a nonsense.

Mr Springborg: Aren't you concerned that there will be more after this legislation goes through the House?

Mr BREDHAUER: There is no question that that is a concern. However, focusing on that to the exclusion of all else is not dealing with the real essence of the Bill.

I turn now to the second of the criteria that I mentioned previously, namely, the need for a clean industry. Not surprisingly, given the absolute and resolute commitment of this Minister and this Government, this Bill provides a legislative framework that is second to none in terms of ensuring the highest integrity in the conduct and operation of the gaming machine industry in this State. The Bill draws on the experience of others, a comparative analysis of similar legislation in other jurisdictions throughout the world

and the not inconsiderable abilities and expertise of our own Machine Gaming Division. The Bill will lead to the creation of the Queensland Machine Gaming Commission, consisting of five commissioners appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister. The skills and aptitudes possessed by those commissioners will include experience or knowledge of the gaming industry, educational qualification or extensive experience in accountancy, extensive experience or knowledge of public administration or law enforcement, religious and/or social welfare experience, and all must be of good repute. That body will exercise functions such as are necessary for the administration of gaming machine control in accordance with the Act.

I wish to comment on a statement made by the member for Currumbin. It epitomised to me the fact that many members on the other side of the House either have failed to read the Bill or failed to read it in its entirety. The member for Currumbin made an assertion that, in the appointments to the commission, there would be no scrutiny of the background of the people whom the Minister had to appoint. The member referred to clause 2.4 (3), which relates to qualifications required of those appointees. However, the member for Currumbin failed to read the rest of that clause. For example, clause 2.4 (6) states--

"The Minister is to cause"--

not "may" cause or "can" cause--

"due inquiry to be made before a person is appointed under this section to be, or appointed under section 2.10 to act as, a commissioner in order to be satisfied that the person is of good repute."

Clause 2.7, which relates to the register and disclosure of interests, states--

". . . a register of the pecuniary interests of each commissioner had by him or her at the time of his or her appointment as a commissioner or acquired by him or her during his or her term of appointment as a commissioner."

Clause 2.7 (b) states--

". . . a record of personal or political associations had by each commissioner that might influence him or her in the performance of his or her functions or duties as a commissioner."

The legislation states quite clearly that there will be scrutiny of the backgrounds of the people who will be appointed.

Mr Quinn: What does it all mean?

Mr BREDHAUER: If the honourable member had read the legislation, he would know what it means. The unfortunate people whom he represents deserve better than to have him reading only half of the legislation and making half-baked speeches about it. The legislation establishes the criteria for determining those bodies which can apply for gaming machine licences and the information that they will be required to produce to support the application. The Bill provides for thorough investigation of all applications to ensure the integrity of each applicant and a detailed examination of the suitability of each proposed licensed premise. The director is charged with the responsibility of providing the gaming machines of the type and denomination as appropriately determined.

Part 4 of the Bill relates to the licensing of repairers, service contractors and machine managers. This part ensures that all functions related to the operation and maintenance of licensed gaming machines are carried out strictly only by those accredited to do so. It stipulates which personnel are required to be on hand at all times during the operation of licensed gaming machines and the personal details that are required of licence applicants. It details procedures for the granting or refusal of licences, their issuance, terms and conditions and revocation. The Bill covers the supervision and management of gaming on the licensed premises and provides information on those categories of persons who may have access to machines to check or remove or place gaming tokens in the cabinet or drop-box. A gaming machine entry log in respect of each gaming

machine held within its cabinet records details of all entries to the machine by appropriate persons and their reason for accessing the machine.

Part 6 of the Bill relates to the control of gaming machines and provides for the director to maintain a roll of recognised manufacturers and suppliers of gaming machines and that the director is empowered to conduct any necessary investigation to satisfy the commission of a person's suitability to be listed on the roll. This part of the Bill further provides for the director to authorise the calling of expressions of interest from persons interested in supplying gaming machines. The director is authorised to cause tenders to be called for the supply of gaming machines and to purchase such machines in accordance with the Act and to purchase, lease, rent or obtain restricted components, gaming equipment and related items. That provision is one of the most fundamental in terms of ensuring the integrity of the operation of gaming machines in Queensland. By having gaming machines purchased by the Government, their ownership maintained by the Government and then leased to appropriately licensed premises, a significant area of potential concern will be eliminated. Through that process, no collusion or kickbacks between potential suppliers of machines and potential licensed operators can occur.

At the outset of this speech, I referred to the two criteria that a responsible Minister and a responsible Government would be required to satisfy in introducing machine gaming in Queensland. Over the past 16 months and over the years prior to the election of this Government, I have followed closely the debate.

Mr Santoro interjected.

Mr BREDHAUER: I have read the Bill and explanatory notes, which is more than I can say for the member for Merthyr and some of his Liberal comrades. In assessing the two criteria, I can conclude only that there can be no doubt about the public benefit to be derived by Queenslanders through this legislation. Clubs and hotels will be given an opportunity to supplement their incomes. Services, facilities and social and recreational activities for their patrons will be enhanced. Government revenue will be boosted through tax receipts, and sporting and welfare organisations will benefit from the levy benefit funds. Tourism will be encouraged and the wishes of people to play gaming machines will be recognised.

The fundamental feature of the legislation, however, is the scrupulous manner in which the Minister has acted to ensure that every effort is made to provide for the proper conduct of machine gaming and to ensure the honesty, integrity and good repute of those associated with machine gaming. The Minister and his department and the director and staff of the Machine Gaming Division can be justifiably proud of the comprehensive legislation that they have delivered to this House. I commend the Minister and I support the Bill.

Hon. V. P. LESTER (Peak Downs) (9.05 p.m.): I am very pleased to take part in the debate. I have considerable reservations about poker machines. Recently, I undertook a short trip to northern New South Wales to experiment with poker machines so that I could speak with first-hand experience of my attempt to beat the pokies.

Mr Prest: Thirty-five years to have a go.

Mr LESTER: Well, at least I tried to make myself familiar.

Mr Palaszczuk: Did you lose any dough?

Mr LESTER: I certainly did lose some dough. I want to make it very clear that both as a member of Parliament and personally I am not a gambler. To be able to speak with some experience, I thought that I should see what happens when people play poker machines. I placed a total of \$50 in various machines that were set in various locations. To make maximum use of the machines, I used only 5c pieces rather than 10c and 20c pieces. By doing that, I was able to play those machines at least 1 000 times. During that time, I had a couple of drops of fifty 5c pieces, which each amounted to \$2.50. I

had three drops of twenty 5c pieces, which each amounted to \$1. I had several other minor drops of ten 5c pieces, five 5c pieces and two 5c pieces.

Ms Power: Did you enjoy it?

Mr LESTER: I did enjoy it, but it was work. Furthermore, as we are talking about these things, I did not make any claim for expenses. I would have been quite entitled to do so.

Mr Prest: Fact-finding.

Mr LESTER: It was fact-finding. I was quite entitled to do so. However, I chose to save the taxpayer the expense, but I do not want any bouquets for it.

Mr Prest: If you put 5c in a poker machine, when you go to church, how much do you put in the plate?

Mr LESTER: I put a lot more in the plate. I will make a bet with the honourable member that I put more cents in the plate last Sunday at mass than he did.

Mr Prest: I don't want publicity.

Mr LESTER: The honourable member did not even go to church. I am not condemning him for that, but he should not make allegations when he is not in a position to prove them. It is fair enough if he went to church and put money in the plate. I did not intend to say that I went to church, but the honourable member provoked me into doing so.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr LESTER: That is nasty. He is a nice priest and his name is Father Milliner. He is a very decent man indeed. Some Government members are trying to distract me from this very important task of relating this report to the Parliament.

With the additional pulls of the machine paid for by the occasional drops, I had a total of 1 400 goes on the machine. The experiment was conducted by using \$10 a time on separate machines in separate clubs. The longest I lasted before the \$10 was blown was one hour 37 minutes and the shortest was 46 minutes. I also noted that many people were betting 20c a time and, in order to maximise their chances of winning the jackpot, sometimes they bet three lines at 60c a throw and sometimes five lines, which meant \$1 a throw. Almost inevitably these people blew their money within 20 minutes. I was there to witness it and see the looks on their faces.

Mr Heath: Don't you wish all that money was staying in Queensland instead of in New South Wales?

Mr LESTER: I do not like to see these people going broke. That is all that worries me.

I also took the opportunity to talk to people and I asked them if they ever won. They hardly ever win. Almost inevitably, as a result of their investment in poker machines, everyone is a long way behind. During the whole time I was there I saw only one person walking away after having won--and that was \$20 on a 20c machine. That does not mean to say that that person did not win at any other time, but it is most likely that he lost. Quite frankly, the odds are absolutely hopeless. I believe the machines are a milking cow that will contribute to many family problems. I certainly have no intention of donating another \$50, but it was money well spent on an exercise to enable me to speak here tonight in an informed manner on the subject. I wonder whether Government members have ever done the same thing in jest and are able to use actual experience when they enter in this debate.

Mr Prest: I put my money in the plate.

Mr LESTER: The honourable member does not put his money in the plate. He has explained all that. I will not moralise, because what the honourable member does is his own business.

Under this legislation hotels will find it impossible to make a profit. Under the tax structure a hotel will have to pay a rent of \$6,000 a month for 10 machines. As a result, for the hotel to make a profit after paying out rent, Government charges and returns to players, the machines will have to operate almost three times a minute every hour of every day of every month. I do not believe that they can make a profit.

Mr Prest: They will if people lose \$50 a time.

Mr LESTER: If the honourable member had been listening, he would know it was not \$50 a time, that it was spread over a number of locations.

One club that I have been told about has operating costs of approximately \$50,000 per annum. These funds are raised through chook raffles and other means. In order to raise the same amount of money with poker machines, after taxes are paid the club would need a turn-over from poker machines of \$1.6m. Such clubs might prefer to remain little clubs, but in order to get into a position from which they can attract this sort of money, they will have to open their doors wide, and the whole structure of the club will change.

There are other problems with this legislation. During my short trip to New South Wales I also noticed that, generally speaking, one club in each town was the main club. For example, the RSL club at Byron Bay dominates and most of the other clubs do not do very well at all. Another example is at Ballina, where the RSL club is the main club and the other clubs do not do terribly well. The same applies in Mullumbimby. Because the smaller clubs such as golf clubs cannot afford decent jackpots or to look after the people in the same way as the big clubs they cannot compete. Obviously, they are struggling; they have installed poker machines because they had to. The hotels in New South Wales have a different sort of a system. Poker machines will discriminate against smaller operations, whether they be hotels or clubs. The big clubs will get bigger and the small clubs will struggle all the more.

My ideas against poker machines are not fixed. I understand that people travel from Queensland to have a flutter at the bigger clubs which are doing very well over the New South Wales border. All in all, I do not know what Queensland will gain from the introduction of poker machines. As a result, many families will be very badly affected. The expression on the faces of people who are losing their money at poker machine venues makes one's hair stand on end. At one of the clubs I visited when I was trying out these machines, I came across a couple beside me who were celebrating their fortieth wedding anniversary. In no more than an hour and a half, the wife had blown \$50. It was rather obvious that they were pensioners and that they were not very well off. Their day was certainly spoilt because they had lost money that they could ill-afford to lose.

Mr Prest: Just got married, did you say?

Mr LESTER: For goodness' sake, a fortieth wedding anniversary does not indicate that they had just been married. In any event, this Government has to decide the course of action it will take. I am happy that at least I have been able to participate in this debate and make a speech based on what I have seen of the industry. What I saw, I did not like. However, I wish the Minister good luck in his endeavours.

Mr McGRADY (Mount Isa) (9.17 p.m.): I am pleased to participate in this historic debate--and it is quite historic--because, despite the many and varied obstacles put in the way of the introduction of this legislation by many people for reasons best known to themselves, honourable members now welcome into this Parliament a Bill which, when passed, will go a long way towards assisting the hospitality industry and, in particular, the club industry of this State. Let us look at what the club industry is. It is the many thousands of men and women scattered across the length and breadth of Queensland who join together in pursuit of common interests. For many years, licensed

clubs have made a major contribution to the social life and fabric of Queensland society. Many men and women have given their time and their labour in building up—in many cases, from nothing—clubs that are presently a credit to their members and their communities. This is the Queensland's club industry and it is all too easy for people to forget the positive role played by the bowling clubs, the RSL clubs, the Buffalo clubs, the ethnic clubs, the church clubs and, of course, the sporting clubs in the development of communities. In many cases, local clubs were developed on new housing estates, which helped to start the community. In so many cases, those clubs have helped financially and physically the many cultural, charitable and sporting groups in their areas and assisted them in achieving their goals.

I get very angry and annoyed when I hear members opposite implying that the introduction of poker machines into clubs will mean that a criminal element will move into these premises. Are they saying that the presidents, the secretaries, the committee men and women and the managers of the Roma RSL or the Toowong RSL are susceptible to the criminal element? This is what members of the Opposition mean. Are they saying that these people, who in most cases are well-known and respected members of the community, will allow their clubs to be taken over? I certainly have a greater faith in these men and women than the Opposition obviously has. To suggest that this possibility exists is to illustrate that it exists in relation to every transaction on this earth. Some clubs in Queensland may very well spend thousands of dollars in additions and renovations to their premises in order to accommodate poker machines. Surely, honourable members can see that much greater scope for kickbacks and corruption exists in the everyday duties of these people, if they were so inclined. Should we perhaps check out from whom they bought their dishwashers and from whom they bought their new furniture? Who made the choice? What inducements might have been offered and accepted?

With the greatest respect, I suggest that, given that the backgrounds of various committee members are more diverse than those of people who might exist at the commission or other authority level, there is less likelihood of corrupt activities taking place at the local club level. The Fitzgerald inquiry revealed that no section of the community is immune to the temptations of bribery and corruption. The collapse of the Vatican Bank a few years ago and the scandals that occurred in the aftermath attests to the fact that this is a worldwide problem that extends into the most august bodies. Of course, the Government must ensure that legislation reflects the concerns that all people feel about this new industry being subjected to these vile pressures, but let me misquote and say, "Let us not fear to legislate, but let us not legislate out of fear." If this Government were to restrict the decision-making responsibilities of elected representatives of club members or if it were to usurp the committees' legitimate authority to make all the necessary decisions in the conduct of their respective businesses, it would amount to this Government claiming a status of superior moral virtue and to the conferring of such a status on all future Governments. This is what the pathetic members of the Opposition are all about. This is what they are trying to do. With every respect, I suggest that the track records of Governments and other bodies to date indicate that that status has not been earned and that such trust might be misplaced. I know of no other field of human endeavour or business engagement that has considered such an intrusion by potential Governments, yet this is what members of the Opposition are suggesting should be done.

While the captains of industry daily make decisions worth billions of dollars and while the gnomes of Melbourne and Sydney hold the commerce of this nation in the palms of their hands, it is timely that we got into perspective this threat to Queensland's new gaming machine industry. The day has not yet arrived in Queensland when the integrity of the average club committee member in doing his or her duty with honour cannot be relied upon. Furthermore, it is not even to be seen on the horizon. There may be the odd individual who might well fall prey to the temptation of a kickback or a bribe, but we would have to convert his fellow committee members while placing a lid on his own personal interest. Given the diversity of club committee members and

the requirement for annual re-election by their peers, it would indeed be a difficult exercise. In any event, this legislation should ensure that adequate deterrents are in place for both individuals and companies who are engaging in these activities. The penalties for these activities are so personally and commercially severe that they render contemplation of such activities obsolete.

The general response from the club industry to the proposed poker machine legislation has been favourable. Certainly, there is the statement made by Mr Gibbs, which appears in his speech notes on the Gaming Machine Bill and which has been made on various other occasions, which reads as follows-

"That one can never claim that later amendments will not be necessary in the light of operational circumstances".

It is perhaps fair to assume that persons in the industry are prepared to accept the legislation and the various charges being made by the Government. The industry sees the Minister, the Premier and the other members of the Government being besieged by the Opposition and many other self-interest groups on the issue of poker machines.

It sees the Government standing for and supporting the club industry in the face of this sustained campaign of criticism. It sees this Government as its only chance of ever achieving poker machines and appreciates the long, hard battle that has been fought by this Government and, in particular, Minister Bob Gibbs to get the poker-machine policy through to this stage. The industry appreciates that the Government has honoured its pre-election pledge to introduce these machines when quite obviously the easier path would have been to use one of the many negative issues raised as a pretext for dumping the whole proposal. Quite often legislation that appears practical and constructive on paper is proven fundamentally flawed in practice. There will no doubt be several such examples in this poker machine legislation and no difficulties of any great extent will be experienced in allowing these faults to be exposed and remedied by operational experience.

The Bill is a lengthy and thorough document and I am concerned about only one or two areas. I have always been opposed to the concept of a turn-over tax, but that is a personal view and one which I have held for many years. Although poker machines are, arguably, the best thing to happen to the club industry ever, it must be recognised that it may mean that some clubs just stay in existence--no more, no less. Although Oppositions have a duty to oppose, I do not believe that they should be negative all the time. Poker machines will offer more support for sport and welfare in Queensland. Without a doubt, the local economies will be stimulated and, in many cases, jobs will be created in much of the community. But the main winners out of the poker-machine legislation will be the country towns, because at present the gambling dollar which is spent in country areas comes straight to the Brisbane area. Nothing is left in the country areas except, of course, any winnings that some of the punters may gain. At least with poker machines some of the proceeds stay in the local community.

Today, we have been listening to the Opposition complain about the dangers of gambling. Will it stop horseracing, dogracing, the trots, Gold Lotto, the Pools, the Scratch-Its--need I go on! The Opposition's policy on this matter is hypocritical. In the dying days of its being in Government, it tried to introduce a Claytons poker-machine policy because it knew that the public of Queensland was in favour of the introduction of poker machines. That subject played a major part in the 1989 election campaign when the Nationals and the Liberals were decimated by Queenslanders.

In conclusion--I make no apologies to anybody in this State for supporting the legislation. I place on record my appreciation of the Minister, Bob Gibbs, for the way in which he has steered the legislation through so many uncharted waters. I have great faith in the decent men and women who administer the clubs of Queensland. I believe that the legislation will assist the hospitality industry and, in particular, the country towns of this State. I reject the utter verbal garbage which has come from the Opposition in this Parliament today. I believe that once again Queensland has come of age. No

longer will our people have to rush across the border to use poker machines in New South Wales. Our people can now exercise choice, something which Opposition members talk about but obviously are not prepared to allow Queenslanders to have. They stand condemned by so many Queenslanders. Country people are entitled to good conditions in their hotels and their clubs. They are entitled to the same standard of entertainment as city people receive. The introduction of poker machines into this State will go a long way towards ensuring that country Queenslanders receive far better entertainment, to which I believe they are duly entitled. I support the Bill and again congratulate the Minister for all the work and effort he has put into the legislation.

Mr LITTLEPROUD (Condamine) (9.28 p.m.): In rising to speak on the Gaming Machine Bill, I am very much aware that it addresses an issue that has long divided our community and will continue to do so. Regardless of what is contained in the legislation, there will still be division in the community between people who are in favour of poker machines and those who are very much against them. Tonight, many of the issues have been canvassed widely. Whilst I have been in the Chamber, and also in my office, I have listened to some well-presented cases. I wish to address five matters.

The introduction of poker machines has been on the political agenda in Queensland for a long time. In June last year, a series of events took place in this House, including questions, ministerial statements and speeches in the Matters of Public Interest debate, which soiled the image of poker machines as they are attached to the present Government. I refer to *Hansard* of 5 June, which contains a ministerial statement by Mr Casey and speeches in the Matters of Public Interest debate by Mr Cooper and Mr Borbidge on the point that Mr Casey had misled the press, used false accounts and probably misled the Parliament. If a proper course of action had taken place and had it not been for the political thuggery of the Government, Mr Casey would have been----

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! It is inappropriate to use the word "thuggery" when talking of the Government.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: Mr Speaker, it was common terminology last year and the year before that. However, I have finished on that point. The Government protected Mr Casey from being referred to the Privileges Committee. Nevertheless, that matter created a taint on an issue that is now before us in the form of legislation.

The next matter to which I wish to refer relates to the statement from the CJC that there was every likelihood, no matter what was done, that we would have corruption. The accuracy of that has been borne out recently by reports in newspapers of the Japanese Mafia coming to the Gold Coast. I was alarmed to discover that representatives of Jupiters Casino, as a promotion, have been visiting Japan to encourage people to visit the Gold Coast casino and the other casino in Queensland. We find that the advice given by the CJC was correct.

Other honourable members have mentioned that the matters before the CJC are still being investigated. However, I want to add some comments. It is most unfortunate that although the complete findings of the CJC inquiry have still to be determined, the Government has pressed on. It must be borne in mind that the CJC advised that, regardless of what sort of controls Governments impose, organised crime will become associated with poker machines. The Opposition spokesman, Mr Veivers, made that point very strongly. I support what he had to say in that regard. Nevertheless, the Government has decided to press on. I was also interested to hear the member for Brisbane Central say that the manufacturers of machines will not be on the playing field. I do not agree with that. I say that they will be. The manufacturers have to supply machines. I am concerned that there are no real safeguards to ensure that there is no favoured treatment, that there are no kickbacks. The member for Mount Isa talked about human nature. We are all aware of human nature. The Minister has assured honourable members that all the necessary protections are contained in the Bill. However, those protections seem to concentrate on the machines once they are in place. I am concerned about a deficiency in the legislation with regard to who is going to look over the shoulder

of the people who tender and who is going to look over the shoulder of the Government when it accepts tenders.

Mr Gibbs: There are five processes.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: The Minister says that there are five processes?

Mr Gibbs: Yes.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: If that is true, I will stand corrected.

Mr Gibbs: Including the Governor in Council.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: All right. I do not want to talk about the individual clauses. However, as shadow Attorney-General, I have some concern about rights of appeal against the Queensland Machine Gaming Commission, which are contained in clause 2.14. I understand that the shadow spokesman, Mr Veivers, will move some amendments at the Committee stage----

Mr Gibbs: I will move to amend that clause.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I am pleased to hear that. It has been suggested to me that perhaps the Government should consider the model of----

Mr Gibbs: EARC.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: No, the Licensing Commission.

Mr Gibbs: The EARC one is now the role model, and we will move on that.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: All right. It was suggested to me that perhaps the Government should consider the Licensing Commission, so that appeals can be made against the Queensland Machine Gaming Commission to the Licensing Court but that points of law could be dealt with in the Supreme Court. I believe that, as it stands, the clause contains a deficiency. I am pleased that the Minister has recognised that that is the case.

I want to make a few parochial comments with regard to how I see this legislation affecting my electorate. I have contacted the clubs in my electorate and spoken to some of the publicans. I am the first to admit that some clubs are keen to have poker machines. They have already made preparations, similar to the preparations that have been made in the electorate of the member for Peak Downs--perhaps not to the same extent. They have certainly been gathering information. There are a couple of excellent clubs in my electorate--the RSL club that opened recently in Chinchilla and the club in Dalby. I am sure that those clubs will make use of this legislation, bearing in mind the differences that exist in the community. The prosperity of those clubs will probably be enhanced. However, I am concerned about some of the hotels. I am talking about four-hotel towns and two-hotel towns.

There seems to be some sort of similarity between the introduction of poker machines and the decision to put TABs in pubs. When the National Party was in Government, it moved to put TABs in pubs. If it was a three-pub town, I opposed it because one pub would have an advantage over the others. That has been borne out recently in my own town of Chinchilla, where one hotel is doing extremely well. In fact, the other day I heard a comment that the facilities provided in the TAB in the Club Hotel in Chinchilla are equal to the best in Queensland. A survey was conducted. I did not follow it to any great extent. However, I did hear that comment. To the credit of that hotel, it is running the TAB extremely well, and patronage has picked up. However, I am also aware that the licensees of the other hotels are doing it tough. In fact, the proprietors change quite often. I think that the RSL clubs in those two towns will do fairly well. The bowling clubs and golf clubs operate on only a part-time basis. I doubt whether they will see any profit in it for themselves. Rather than hang around and support their own club, people may finish play for the day and say, "Let's slip down to the RSL and play the pokies for a little while."

I have to disagree with the member for Cook, who said that if people are going to race down to the hotel that has poker machines because they recognise that it is a better service, that is a recognition that poker machines are the way to go. I am afraid that some hotels that are pressed for survival will make a decision to go into poker machines but they will not be very well based financially. They may find that the machines become a stone around their neck. I may be wrong, but I am concerned. Some of the hotel-owners and licensees with whom I have spoken have told me that they have looked at the figures supplied by the Government and those appearing in the newspapers. They have said, "We cannot be in it. There is only 5 per cent in it for us. No thanks. We will stick to our beer", or whatever else they make a better percentage on. No doubt the Minister thinks that it will go the other way. I still have concerns.

Mr De Lacy: They don't have to have poker machines.

Mr LITTLEPROUD: I know that they do not have to have them, but I think that they will say, "Crikey, if I am going to survive, I have to meet the marketplace. I have to try these machines." The Treasurer has had a couple of businesses that have gone down the gurgler. He ought to listen to what I am saying. These people are pretty keen to survive, and they have expressed their concern to me. The Government has made the decision to introduce poker machines, which is its right. It has certainly introduced a complex piece of legislation. I congratulate the Government on its intention to amend the clause in regard to appeals. I am still concerned that members of the Government have been tainted by past actions. That has not helped. The Opposition spokesman mentioned the fact that if the CJC finds that some manufacturer of machines is an unfit company, that could result in some embarrassment not only to the Government but also to the many clubs that have those machines. No doubt the Minister will address those matters in his reply.

Mr PEARCE (Broadsound) (9.37 p.m.): It is a pleasure for me to rise in this House tonight in support of the Gaming Machine Bill. It does give me a great deal of pleasure because, unlike some members on the other side of the House, I do have some experience in the industry. In my days in New South Wales, I spent about 20 years working in the club industry, unlike the member for Nerang, who also came from New South Wales, and who said that he had two years' experience in the industry. I believe that the only experience of the member for Nerang would be playing pinball machines at the local pinball parlour.

The member for Southport is a gentleman who spent some time in New South Wales playing Rugby League at Manly. I know that he gained a great reputation as a player in that sport. He would have also spent enough time in those clubs to appreciate the benefits that flow to members from poker machines. Some of the comments from members on the other side of the House indicated that many of them did not take the time or were not interested to find out what poker machines are all about. The comments about forcing people to play poker machines and people becoming addicted to gambling just do not hold water.

During the time that I spent in New South Wales, I never saw any club manager or any board director walking around a club with somebody's hand held behind his back telling him to play the poker machines. It is the same as when one walks into a TAB or onto a racetrack. People will gamble. They are prepared to gamble and they like different forms of gambling. I do not see the poker machine industry causing any extra problems in this State. I am not naive enough to say that there are not people who will be affected by the introduction of poker machines, but I am sure that, given the care with which this legislation has been put in place, that care will be directed to those people.

The member for Callide stated that she had also lived in New South Wales. The member for Peak Downs ventured into New South Wales and spent \$50 on 5c pieces and immediately became an expert on poker machines. I have to give the honourable member some credit. At least he did travel across the border and make an attempt to understand the issue and at least he now has some idea of how the system works.

As I stated before, I do have some experience as an employee and an administrator in the poker machine industry in registered clubs in New South Wales. As an employee, I started behind the bar and worked to the door situation. I was then put in a position of trust where I was allowed to become involved in the operation of poker machines. I went from the position of being in the change box to out on the floor where minor maintenance took place, which concentrated on the unjamming of the poker machines, refilling of the machines and paying out of jackpots. When one is on the floor doing the work, one sees what happens. One understands the type of person who plays poker machines.

As I stated before, I am not silly enough to say that there are not some people who will be affected, but most people who play poker machines do it solely for the enjoyment of playing. I know that on Friday and Saturday nights, for example, in clubs in New South Wales, a group of workers will come in and stand at the end of the bar, have a few drinks, put in \$5 or \$10 and spend a couple of hours playing the poker machines. I have no doubt that the member for Southport probably participated in that type of entertainment himself. The honourable member is giving a nod of approval. I know that many people use that method when they play the machines.

I left the club industry as an employee to work in the coal industry. After a period of 12 months, because I had a great deal of interest in the club industry, I was nominated and stood for the position of director at the Campbelltown RSL. Being a worker in the club and getting to know many people, I was elected and, as a board member, I was responsible for the supervision of and gave assistance in clearing poker machines, which involved the clearing of cash boxes from the bottom of poker machines. I do not know how many members really understand how a poker machine works. I will go into that a little bit later on.

The cash box contents were emptied into calico bags that were marked to correspond with the machine being cleared. After clearing, the contents of the bags were tipped into a counter which counted out coins into containers automatically. For example, there were \$4 lots of 10c coins, \$4 lots of 20c coins and \$2 lots of 5c pieces. All clubs kept a float so that they could handle the coin-flow through the poker machine system. Coins in excess of the required float were wrapped and deposited at the bank.

Having worked on the floor and as a director, I came into contact with people who were involved in maintaining poker machines. I am referring to the repairmen, club directors and management staff of clubs. When one is in that position and visiting a large number of clubs in south-west Sydney, as I did, one speaks with many people. Many people came forward with stories about the corruption and the rorts that were in the system in the early days of the poker machine industry. I want members on the other side of the House to understand what I am saying about the rorts and the corruption that was in the system in the early days of the poker machine industry.

Anyone who knows anything about poker machines knows that the older mechanical machines accumulated large numbers of coins in the workings of the machines and the tops of the cash boxes. This was an open invitation for repairmen to dip their fingers and make themselves a little bit better off by gathering coins, because they were not accountable. They did not have anybody standing behind them and supervising them. In many cases, they made themselves well off by helping themselves to the spoils of what was lying in and around the back of poker machines. Repairmen and servicemen were known to have false bottoms in tool boxes and in WD40 cans. Quite a few of them were known to have long pockets. Being aware of those characters and what they got up to in the industry, I was very pleased to read Part 4 of the Bill, Licensing of Repairers, Service Contractors and Machine Managers. The Minister and the people who put this legislation together have realised that there was a problem in New South Wales. They have ensured that such a problem will not occur in Queensland. I commend them for taking that into consideration. Because of the poor recording procedures in years past, floor workers or poker machine attendants were able to dip their fingers into the pay-out trays.

An honourable member: You wouldn't do that, would you?

Mr PEARCE: I certainly would not. Manual manipulation of machines made the fixing of pay-outs possible. This was done to impress mates. With some of his mates hanging around, a poker machine attendant would approach a machine and open it. Because there was no record of how many times he opened the machine and no record of pay-outs, to impress his mates the attendant would line up a pay-out, which could mean anything up to 50 or 100 coins.

On the management side, there were no checks or balances when directors were doing machine clearances. A steady income was available to dishonest directors who daily would help themselves to small amounts to help cover the cost of their drinking habits and other personal needs. There is no doubt that there were crooks within the industry, especially in the early days. This became public knowledge and unfortunately the stigma still exists. It is unfortunate that people on the other side of the House who do not understand what the poker machine industry is all about are trying to put into the minds of people in Queensland that the introduction of poker machines means the introduction of corruption. Over the last decade, security and improved accounting systems have slowly but surely sorted out the crooks and cheats. Improved technology means that new machines coming on line record every function of the machine during operation and servicing. Recently, I visited the Grafton District Services Club. The manager of that club, Mr Arthur Lysaght, was very helpful. He showed me the whole system and how it worked.

Mr Palaszczuk: Was Vince there?

Mr PEARCE: No, Vince was not there. He was at Ballina and Byron Bay.

I was impressed with the changes that had occurred in the industry in only the last six or seven years. The latest technology and methods of accounting have ensured that the cheats and the thieves who were in the industry are finding it very, very difficult to operate. Poker machines are now fitted with manual and electronic counters which register the movement of all coins through them. When coins are dropped into the machine, they are recorded. Honourable members opposite should be listening to this, because it is important. This process ensures that there is no opportunity available for the thieves and other corrupt people to take advantage of poker machines. As I said, when coins are dropped into a poker machine, they are registered on mechanical and electronic meters. Coins that are returned from the machine to the player are also recorded in the same manner--on electronic and mechanical meters. The coins that go into the cash box are those that overflow from the hopper. They are also recorded on electronic and mechanical counters. Jackpots and pay-outs are recorded by recording the serial number of the machine, the time and date, the player's name, his signature, the supervisor's signature and a witness to all the signatures.

By continually monitoring the cash-flow performance of every machine under a club's control, faults and malpractices are detected early and appropriate action is taken. We are fortunate that the rorts that existed in the past have been eradicated from the system that will be introduced in Queensland. This State will reap the benefits of the introduction of poker machines and a system of accountability seen nowhere else in the world. Substantial benefits will flow back to the people of Queensland by means of extra funds for sport, charity and welfare. At a local level, poker machines will mean improved club facilities, increased membership for clubs, more money for local sporting bodies and better entertainment. Most importantly, the introduction of the poker machine industry in Queensland will mean jobs--for maintenance, administration and catering staff, and increased numbers of bar staff and door attendants.

People on the Capricorn Coast and in the coal-mining towns are looking for job opportunities. I have made it very clear where I stand on the introduction of poker machines into Queensland. I support the Minister and the introduction of poker machines. I commend the Minister and the people who have put the legislation together for doing an excellent job. I support the Bill.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Gympie.

Mr Prest: Oh!

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (9.52 p.m.): I thought it would please members opposite to hear where they have been going wrong and to be pointed in the right direction. I was led to believe that the thrust of the Fitzgerald inquiry reforms was that the investigations of both the EARC and the CJC should be subject to review by the respective parliamentary committees before their consideration by this House. With the introduction of this legislation, we find that this method of implementation of the Fitzgerald reforms is not being adhered to.

Mr Schwarten: That is not true.

Mr STEPHAN: It is true.

From time to time, it is very convenient for the Government to ignore Fitzgerald, yet at other times it wants to hold him up as some sort of a king and saviour. I have noted some of the comments made by Government members. The member for Redlands, Mr Briskey, said that the gaming machine legislation is tough and that it will control the criminal element. How naive can he be if he thinks the criminal element can be controlled? Last year, when appearing on television, the Minister held up a silicon chip and said, "This is foolproof." I have never seen a piece of equipment that is foolproof and unable to be manipulated by the people who are handling it. In the very same way, because people are able to manipulate it and see through it, this legislation is not foolproof. The member for Cook, Mr Bredhauer, stated that the Minister "shall" cause an inquiry to be made to determine if a person is fit and proper to be appointed as a commissioner. However, the member quoted selectively from the Bill. Clause 6.4, which refers to investigations of the suitability of listed persons, states--

"At any time the Director may cause to be undertaken such investigations as the Director considers are necessary in order to satisfy the Commission that a listed person or any associate of the listed person is a suitable person . . ."

As I said, the member for Cook quoted selectively from the Bill.

After the introduction of poker machines in Sydney, a review was undertaken on behalf of the fruit and vegetable industry in that city. It is interesting to note that fruit and vegetable stores near establishments that installed gaming machines suffered a great decline in the amount of money that they received from the sale of fruit and vegetables. The introduction of poker machines does not generate more money, it simply spreads it from one sector to another. In Sydney, that money was directed into the pokies rather than being spent on healthy food.

Mr Gilmore: Taking food out of the mouths of children.

Mr STEPHAN: As the honourable member says, it is taking food out of the mouths of families. I believe that that will happen in Queensland. Charities rely to a very large extent on raffles that are held on Friday nights at various hotels and other establishments. Is the Government trying to tell honourable members that those charities will not suffer when they no longer obtain the benefits of those activities?

Mr Schwarten: They reckon you get around town in Gympie with only a dinar in your pocket.

Mr STEPHAN: The member for Rockhampton North gets very anxious under any circumstances, especially when one points out a few facts to him. This Bill provides a method for gathering taxes. It has been stated that although \$100m was to be made available for sports and sporting subsidies, with the introduction of poker machines that figure will dwindle to only \$20m or \$30m.

I turn now to the rental charges on poker machines. A club with up to 10 machines will pay monthly rental charges of \$100 a machine. A club with up to 20 machines will pay \$200 a month for each machine, and a club that has over 20 machines will pay

\$300 monthly for each machine. Hotels will pay monthly rental charges of \$300 for each machine. A club with more than 20 poker machines must have at least \$60,000 go through its machines each month just to pay the rental charges. Because the monthly rental on each machine in a hotel is \$300, the monthly rental cost for 10 machines is \$3,000. A hotel has access to only 5c in every dollar played through its machines. The player return is 85c in the dollar. Mr Lester stated that only a lucky player would receive 85c in the dollar. The Government takes 10c in the dollar for itself. That means that \$60,000 must go through the machines before a hotel has \$3,000 in its pocket. As well, the hotel must pay extra staff and meet the costs of renovations, increased power bills, etc. Because the Government is looking for that 10 per cent, it is placing a lot of emphasis on the introduction of poker machines.

According to the Explanatory Notes, the legislation provides for the payment of gaming machine tax, a sports and recreation levy and a charities and rehabilitation levy. Clause 8.6 refers to the amount of the monthly rental fee, gaming tax, sport and recreation levy and charities and rehabilitation levy payable and any previously owing fees. I have no doubt that this is the major reason for the introduction of this legislation, irrespective of its effect on the community.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister stated--

"The Bill ensures that excessive or compulsive machine players are prohibited from gaming for one month if it becomes evident to the holder of a gaming machine licence that the peace and happiness of a person's family are endangered."

That is an indication of how inappropriate and stupid this legislation is. That provision cannot be implemented because it is not practical to do so. Why that provision has been included in the legislation is beyond my comprehension and that of other Opposition members. I emphasise that the Opposition opposes this legislation.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mackenroth, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH (Chatsworth--Leader of the House) (10 p.m.): I move--

"That the House do now adjourn."

Outpatient Clinic, Toowoomba Base Hospital

Mrs McCAULEY (Callide) (10.01 p.m.): I wish to draw the attention of the House to the possible closure of the outpatient clinic at the Toowoomba Base Hospital. Similar problems are occurring throughout Queensland. The Goss Government should come clean on its policy in this regard, because it is creating a lot of concern for many people in various parts of the State. If the outpatient service is no longer provided at the hospital, one can rest assured that the Health Minister will soon be saying that there is no need for the number of doctors or nursing staff at the hospital, and the flow-on will drastically cut the services provided by the Toowoomba Base Hospital.

The Health Minister seems to be searching high and low for areas in the provision of health services in which to cut costs. Before we know it, no outpatient service means no dispensary staff, the loss of medical and nursing expertise and the loss of back-up staff such as domestics and catering staff. Already, I understand that the Cairns Base Hospital has closed its outpatients clinic to all but accident and emergency cases. There have been calls for the Rockhampton Base Hospital to follow suit. That may well happen following the inquiry into the Rockhampton Base Hospital. But then again, we must wait to see what that inquiry comes up with.

The policy of the Labor Government is obviously to discourage people from presenting at hospitals with problems that could be handled by their local GP. Last Monday, in Biloela I addressed the Queensland Pensioners League annual conference. One of the women present said that she had presented to the outpatients clinic at the

Biloela Hospital on the Sunday with a broken arm. She was told that she would not be considered an outpatient; she was to be termed a day patient and, as such, would be charged. That was of great concern to the pensioners. It is of great concern to many people, because it seems that that could well be the first step in the abolition of the free hospital system, which is unique to Queensland and which the former National Party Government managed to hang on to for many, many years. It is part of the health policy of the Goss Government to maintain the free hospital system in Queensland, but that may well go by the board in the Minister's search for areas in which he can cut funds.

I understand that dental services are suffering greatly. Certainly, in my electorate there seems to be a freeze on any transfers of people working in that area. Gladstone has only one dentist, and people must make appointments with him three months in advance. A visiting dentist comes to Biloela to handle the schoolchildren and cannot cope with the work that he has, yet, in its last Budget, the Government said that it would extend the dental health services in schools to include Year 8. That is just not possible. A sufficient number of dentists are not being employed by the Health Department and the services are not being provided. Dental technicians cannot work without a dentist being present. There are not enough dentists to go around, and the service is falling into a great big hole. That is most unfortunate. The latest episode of which I have heard is the closure of maternal and child welfare centres throughout Queensland. The centres are saying that they cannot get the staff, so they are closing down until they can get qualified staff. To me, that is the thin end of the wedge. They may never get qualified staff or they may say that they have not had access to qualified staff and those centres will therefore not be able to provide services.

Starting from the outpatients clinic at the Toowoomba General Hospital, all of those matters are of great concern to people in country areas. Last week, I visited the Moura and Theodore Hospitals. In the last financial year, the Moura Hospital had more than 14 000 outpatient visits. If that outpatients clinic were closed, imagine the problems that the people of Moura would suffer. Unfortunately, that is a problem. We who live in country areas are aware of it. We will fight like hell to retain the services that we need. We do not take those services lightly and we are not prepared to put up with any cut-back in those areas. That is why I have raised the problem of the closure of outpatients clinics.

Beerburrum Radioactive Waste Storage

Mr SULLIVAN (Glass House) (10.06 p.m.): Beerwah, Coonowrin, Ngungun, Tibrogargan, Beerburrum, Coochin, Miketeebumulgrai, The Saddleback, Tibberoowuccum, Tunbubudla and Wild Horse—they are the names of individual elements of the Glass House Mountains, the feature after which my electorate takes its name and for which my constituents have a great affection. The Glass House Mountains are one of the nation's most readily recognisable features. The first four that I named are already protected by national park status. They are a national treasure. I understand that some suggestion has been made that they be afforded even greater protection.

Only two days after announcing the decision of the Government to accelerate the construction of the Caboolture Hospital, for which we are all very grateful, the Health Minister, Ken McElligott, made a less welcome announcement concerning my electorate. I refer, of course, to the announcement that an area of State forest plantation in the Glass House Mountains precinct was to be one of two sites selected for further investigation in relation to the siting of a radioactive waste storage facility. At the time of the announcement, I commented that the decision was idiotic. I do not resile from that sentiment. My constituents ask: who would believe that the siting of such a controversial facility in the midst of the Glass House Mountains is appropriate? Who, they ask, would recommend such an action? They say that surely the criteria that allows such a selection not to be rejected out of hand immediately must be vague. I understand that there are two criteria. The first is proximity to Brisbane, where the greatest majority

of the material requiring storage is currently in use. That is seen as desirable because an officer from the Department of Health accompanies any material that is placed in storage to ensure that it is stored correctly. The second criterion is the ability to prevent encroaching development.

In the circumstances, the safe nature or otherwise of the waste matter is immaterial. The fact is that people fear radioactive waste. This Government is more responsible than any person or group of people for creating the perception that the material is not safe. That was done, firstly, through the commitment to the people of Redbank not to store waste in the facility established there and, secondly, through the criterion that any new storage facility be cocooned from further development. In the circumstances, who would be surprised by the clearly stated opposition of the people in the area? The facility is not wanted; it is not welcome; and it will not be contemplated. Public meetings that I have attended have carried resolutions to that effect.

This decision is a LULU--a locally unacceptable land use. A protest group called Communities Against Radioactive Dumps, or CARD, has been established and has linked up with another group opposing a similar investigation of a site near Esk. CARD has the support not only of the people of the area, but also of the Caloundra City Council, the Caboolture Shire Council and me. There is no suggestion that the people of the area through CARD, the two local authorities and me as local member will not take part in phase two of the selection process, that is, the consultation stage. Rather, those people find it incredulous that it should be necessary for phase two to be invoked in respect of this site.

As I said at the outset, the area to be investigated is in the precinct of one of Australia's national treasures. No matter where one tries to hide a radioactive waste storage area, it will adversely affect the amenity of that area. Property values in nearby settlements will most certainly fall, and fall dramatically, simply because of people's fears. The economy of the Sunshine Coast region is heavily reliant on tourism. Given people's perception, there can be no doubt that the presence of a radioactive waste storage facility anywhere in the hinterland will impact unfavourably on that important sector of the economy. No longer would ordinary people view the Sunshine Coast as an appropriate destination for themselves and their families, with consequential difficulties for businesses in the area.

Members of the rural sector of the community, many of whom have properties bordering the State forest in question, have similar concerns. Again, given people's perceptions, produce from the area will be suspect. As the beleaguered pineapple-growers are the major producers of the area, it seems incredible that they could be asked to carry this particular burden. Again, considering nothing more than people's perceptions, the crops from Elimbah could be rejected as unsafe by the Golden Circle Cannery. Alternatively, the product from the cannery may find itself rejected by the consumer simply because in that consumer's mind it could include radioactive material. There are many similar examples.

Suffice for me to say that this proposition will be vigorously opposed. I can see no way that the Beerburum site could ever be selected after the social and environmental impact assessment processes have been undertaken. The real tragedy is that it has come this far.

Time expired.

Mental Health Services

Mrs SHELDON (Landsborough) (10.11 p.m.): I rise tonight to speak of the perilous situation of this State's mental health services. I draw the attention of the Minister to the more urgent examples, although the list is by no means exhaustive.

From Mackay north to Cardwell there are 10 psychiatrists for a population of half a million. The desired ratio is one to 10 000; what we are seeing is more like one to 50 000. Cairns has no occupational therapist, social worker or psychologist; in an area

where the total staff numbers should be 12, the total currently is seven. There is no facility for medium or long-term inpatient psychiatric care in all of far-north Queensland, stretching from Tully to the Torres Strait Islands. Mosman Hall in Charters Towers has 100 long-term psychiatric patients and no resident psychiatrist, medical staff or ancillary staff. It has only nursing staff. Of particular concern is that, contrary to the Mental Health Act, patients in Mosman Hall are detained without being seen by a psychiatrist.

In late 1990 the State Government spent \$95,000 on a day centre in Rockhampton, but, due to chronic staff shortages, the centre operates only one day a week. This is yet another example of Labor's gross mismanagement of public funds. In Gladstone, which has a population of approximately 23 000, the public health system has no mental health professional. This puts an even greater strain on Rockhampton's services. The Sunshine Coast's general hospital at Nambour, which is situated in Queensland's most rapidly growing area that stretches from Landsborough through to Gympie, has no permanent psychiatrist. Medical coverage is only 10 per cent of what it should be and, due to staff shortages, only 11 out of a total of 23 beds can be utilised. There are no new admittances and anyone seeking psychiatric inpatient care is now transferred to the Winston Noble Unit at Prince Charles Hospital, which has been forced to open up disused lower storage areas to provide these extra beds. At Nambour Hospital drug addicts, alcoholics and the psychiatrically ill are all mixed together in one ward. At the Winston Noble Unit patients have complained about a number of disconcerting issues. The patients are often seen only once a week by psychiatric staff, whereas in the medical and surgical wards of the Prince Charles Hospital acutely ill people are seen more than once a day. Patients are not normally advised of their rights and responsibilities and the right of appeal form, form 12, is rarely if ever used. The patients do not know of its existence or of their avenues of appeal.

Toowoomba's Baillie Henderson Hospital is in desperate straits. In February, due to a critical budget overrun, 10 temporary nursing staff were given one week's notice. The Health Department will not assist with a budget shortfall. Therefore, a guard fence has been built around the perimeter of the grounds of Gowrie Hall to enable the reduced staff numbers to cope with the number of patients. Gowrie Hall, which is now a locked ward, is also on the agenda to house head-injured patients with the threatened closure of Penrose Hall. The association, Headway, is currently fighting this closure.

The Princess Alexandra unit needs at least three times the level of beds and staff that are currently provided. There is an acute lack of beds and due to this shortage at least one patient a day is transferred to another hospital. This is occurring in a fast-growth area covering southern Brisbane suburbs down to the Gold Coast. The Rosemount Psychiatric Unit at the Royal Brisbane Hospital dates back to the 1940s, despite broken promises from the current and previous Governments that it would be replaced. There has been a half a million dollar cut-back on recurrent expenditure at Rosemount and current levels of drugs and ward space have reached a stage when a dangerous situation could arise in case of an emergency. There is an overcrowding of patients in the wards, resulting in lack of privacy for patients and certainly no private personal space is possible. It would seem that the day centre, which currently handles 130 patients, is to become an assessment centre for long-stay patients. The number of patients expected to be able to be assessed is 35.

At the Wolston Park Hospital there are 30 nursing staff vacancies which cannot be filled due to lack of funds. The hospital is chronically understaffed and services need upgrading. The nursing staff at McConnell House B Ward has been reduced to two from three before Christmas; a staff of four is required to give adequate care. At the Valley Community Psychiatric Clinic there are six cars for 43 staff, which is a ratio of one car to seven staff. This should be compared to the ratio of one car for every two staff at community health centres.

Time expired.

Emergency Medical Dispatch System

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (10.16 p.m.): Since returning from overseas, I have continued to push the case for establishment of what could be called an emergency medical dispatch system in Queensland. This is a fairly important matter.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: I am afraid that this is not a laughing matter, and it is not regarded as a laughing matter by the Government. What happens when people ring the emergency number 000?

Mr Dunworth: No-one answers.

Mr D'ARCY: That is a fact of life. On 10 March, an article appeared in the *Sunday Sun* titled "From emergencies to reminders". Obviously, there is a very competent young lady working for Telecom. The article states--

"Tracy, who works in Telecom's operator services section, took the hysterical call asking for an ambulance to help the children.

'It took a little while to find out where they were and that they needed an ambulance.' "

The article further states--

"Manning the emergency 000 number is just one of Tracy's tasks each working day.

She is also one of the helpful voices that supply telephone numbers through Telecom's free 013 and 0175 services; an operator who connects trunk calls; one of the ever-cheerful wake-up and reminder call crew; and is responsible for intercept calls which occur when numbers change."

Apparently, she has a break of 10 minutes before going on to a new service.

Upon my return from overseas, I reported on the emergency medical dispatch system. In real terms, it means that the call is passed through to a dispatcher. For goodness' sake, this system has been operating in most advanced countries for approximately two decades and, in Queensland, people are totally and utterly frustrated because it does not exist here. The system operates on a priority card system that covers most emergency and medical services. The card contains predetermined information. Queensland has reached the stage at which bureaucrats want to reinvent the wheel. Because an emergency medical dispatch system will assist in preventing deaths and permanent injuries that would otherwise occur in the short time it takes to summon assistance, it will not only save lives at the scene of emergencies but also an enormous amount of money. The Queensland Government should begin to look at the way in which the system operates.

Let me provide honourable members with some of the background relating to the system that operates right throughout the United States. The system began operating in 1971. Right from the start, it was worked out in the United States that it was not feasible to have paramedics as medical dispatchers, who are the people who actually talk to the caller and dispatch the ambulance or the fire brigade to the scene of the accident, because it was neither economical nor occupationally appropriate. A report on the system states--

"In order to upgrade the emergency medical expertise of the dispatcher, the concept of the Emergency Medical Dispatch Priority Card system was developed. This reference system became the core of a 25-hour training course."

That was important because the trainee was taught how to assist and coordinate the emergency medical trainee or paramedic en route and arrange a rendezvous by relying on information that was shared between agencies and units lacking common radio frequencies.

Currently, Queensland is in a position to change from VHF to UHF frequency and this would be a perfect time to implement this type of emergency system. The advantages

of such a system are that it obviates the need for red-light emergencies, the incidence of wrong telephone numbers and most of the problems complained of by ambulance bearers and people who provide assistance at the scenes of accidents and who are frustrated by the inefficiency of the system that operates presently. It is time that greater emphasis was placed on saving lives, limiting injury and keeping fast emergency vehicles off the roads when alternatives are available. The system I have described would also save a great deal of money.

I emphasise that the emergency medical dispatch system is a proven system and not one that seeks to reinvent the wheel. I have the greatest confidence that the responsible Minister, with whom I have had lengthy discussions, will give the introduction of this system a high priority so that an emergency medical dispatch system will operate at every level of the provision of emergency medical services in Queensland.

Importation of Vegetable Products

Mr FITZGERALD (Lockyer) (10.20 p.m.): I wish to raise a matter that I have raised a number of times in this House, which is the effect that the importation of vegetables has on the Australian farmer. Today, the Prime Minister delivered an economic statement. People are asking why Australia imports vegetables when this country has a balance of payments problem, when imports presently exceed exports, when Australia has fertile soil, a work force that is able to grow vegetables, adequate water resources, machinery, factories and everything else that is necessary to produce frozen and processed vegetable products. In spite of all that, this country still imports vegetable products that are displacing Australian products in the domestic market.

I will give some examples of what is happening in the vegetable-growing industry. Because of the changes in consumption patterns of processed vegetables in Australia, the industry is presently in absolute turmoil. I understand that Edgell usually processes approximately 205 000 tonnes of potatoes to make frozen French fries. This year, it is estimated that 40 000 tonnes of potatoes will be left in the ground out of the total of 205 000 tonnes. Basically, the potato crop is grown in Tasmania, Victoria, and Western Australia and is indicative of the plight that vegetable-growers find themselves in. The imports are coming mostly from Canada and are imported by McCain and other companies that have access to supermarket and distribution chains throughout Australia. Those companies quite happily import products that are displacing Australian products.

I can give a first-hand indication of the effects of importation of vegetables on the pea-growing industry because peas are grown in the Lockyer Valley, which is an area of my electorate, and in the Fassifern Valley. Some producers forecast that there will be no crop this year. Queensland usually produces 5 000 tonnes of shelled peas a year for processing which ultimately become the product that is available in a packet at supermarkets. The fact that no peas will be grown this year will have a considerable impact on the farming areas I have mentioned. Queensland also produces approximately 5 000 tonnes of beans a year for processing. Producers have estimated that crop production may be cut by up to 50 per cent or slightly more. That means that 2 500 tonnes of beans will not be produced this year.

I will indicate what is occurring in other parts of Australia. The sweet corn crop for processing is grown mainly in the Cowra area of New South Wales, but some of it is grown in Queensland. In the season that has just finished, in the Cowra area the Edgell company cut its production dramatically after the crop had been grown. Instead of harvesting the crop on a seven-day production cycle, that company harvested only every five days out of seven and left the produce for the last two days of every week in the ground because it did not wish to run the factories. Of course, that has created an oversupply of canned kernel corn and creamed corn, which has led to a discount of 25 per cent on the price of a can of corn kernels in order to clear stock. What is the future for the Queensland production when Golden Circle produces Queensland corn in cans?

The beetroot industry is another processing industry in which Queensland dominates the Australian market. Approximately 30 000 tonnes of beetroot a year are grown in

Australia. The break-up of production is: 18 000 tonnes to Golden Circle, 9 000 tonnes to Edgell and 3 000 tonnes to the Cowra area in New South Wales. There will be an overall cut in production of about 10 per cent. In addition to that, there has been no increase in the price to the growers this year and the processors are manoeuvring themselves into position to ask for a cut in the price paid to growers.

The effect is that Australians will not be eating as much Australian product as they should be. I believe that the imports are allowed to enter Australia by the Federal Labor Government so that it can keep the CPI figures down. It wants to keep food costs as cheap as possible. It is absolutely ludicrous that subsidised products from Holland, Canada, the United States and Eastern Europe come into Australia and displace Australian products when our growers can produce the goods as cheaply as those produced anywhere else in the world.

Overseas Adoption

Dr FLYNN (Toowoomba North) (10.25 p.m.): I draw the House's attention to a new anomaly in Queensland. In my relatively short time as an elected representative, I have found that nothing irritates people more than anomalies--the situation in which one group in a society has access to a right or a service and an apparently equivalent group does not. This new anomaly was brought to my attention by members of a group called IAFQ--the International Adoptive Families of Queensland. I acknowledge that I am a member of this group and have a personal interest.

The anomaly relates to the adoption of Romanian children. Queensland residents, who are also Australian citizens--which is most of us--are unable to adopt children from Romanian orphanages because there is no agreement with the Federal Government, through the Immigration Department, recognising the legality of such adoptions. Consequently, Romanian children are not eligible to immigrate to Australia with prospective adoptive parents. However, it has recently come to light that Queensland residents, who are citizens of New Zealand, are able to adopt from Romania. They are able to arrange adoptions through the New Zealand Government, and then bring their children to Queensland to live as New Zealand citizens. This situation was publicised recently in the *Northside Chronicle*, which described the recent adoption of two Romanian babies by a Clayfield Kiwi couple. My private advice from members of the IAFQ is that there are two more Queensland Kiwi couples currently in Romania finalising adoption arrangements, and another couple are getting organised to go.

There are many complex issues involved in overseas adoption. I do not have time to fully canvas the issues tonight. Suffice to say that the paramount concern is the needs of the child. I am not fully aware of the current position in Romania, but in January last year we read of the plight of thousands of children in Romanian orphanages. After the fall of the Ceausescu regime in December 1989, the world learned of the unusual legacy of that dictator. As well as the usual mass graves of an estimated 60 000 victims, it was also discovered that there were orphanages full of abandoned children--2 800 in Bucharest alone. They were deprived physically in terms of food and clothing, but also emotionally, with minimum contact from adult care-givers. Most showed signs of sensory and emotional deprivation. This revelation led to a worldwide interest in the children's plight and newspaper articles at the time with titles such as "Children the whole world wants to adopt".

I have no personal knowledge of the current situation in Romania. I do not know what is best at the moment for children still in Romanian orphanages. But the new Romanian Government has had a year to consider its policy on overseas adoption and there has been a year for foreign aid to help alleviate the situation. Adoptions are still occurring at a rapid rate to at least 24 countries. My information from the Clayfield family is that the adoptions in Romania are proceeding in a correct fashion. Children not visited by their parents for over three years are now classified as abandoned and are available for adoption. Otherwise, parents of children in orphanages must be found prior to adoption. Those parents must go before a notary public and declare their

intentions to put their children up for adoption. They must also appear in court at the time of the adoption, and there is an appeal period of two weeks. Those procedures satisfy most of the world as legally valid, including most of the major players in the recent gulf alliance.

Some insight into the Federal Government's current attitude to the situation can be gleaned from a recent letter to the *Northside Chronicle* by Gary Johns, Federal member for Petrie. Mr Johns was addressing this anomaly and explained that Australians are not prevented by Federal legislation from adopting Romanian children. Quite true. He went on to say that the Australian Government had never been asked by Romania to be accredited as a country offering children for adoption and also suggested that the New Zealand Government was sidestepping a legal minefield because of legal deficiencies in the Romanian adoption process. The information I have been given by the Clayfield family seems to contradict that. We do seem to be out of step with the rest of the world.

Members of AICAN, the Australiawide body representing overseas adoptive families, feel aggrieved by this new anomaly in Queensland and, no doubt, in other States as well. I reiterate that the paramount issue in overseas adoption is the need of the child. I do not believe that it is the role of the Immigration Department or the Queensland Family Services Department to seek children overseas for prospective Queensland adoptive parents, but I do believe that the relevant Government departments should cooperate with prospective adoptive parents to help legitimate overseas adoptees.

Time expired.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.