

**WEDNESDAY, 12 MAY 1993**

---

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

**STANDING RULES AND ORDERS****Amendment of Rule of Practice No. 10**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I have to advise the House that His Excellency the Administrator this day approved the amendment to Rule of Practice No. 10 that was adopted by the House on Tuesday, 11 May.

**PETITIONS**

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

**Penalties for Offences Committed at Schools**

From **Mr Campbell** (32 signatories) praying that a review be carried out on penalties handed down to convicted offenders of break and enters and theft particularly at schools and that the penalties include restitution for damages.

**Pashen Street, Morningside**

From **Mr Purcell** (119 signatories) praying that no further public housing accommodation be built in Pashen Street, Morningside after completion of the proposed projects.

**Pedestrian Crossing, Aspley Court/Compton Gardens Retirement Villages**

From **Mr J. N. Goss** (185 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland ensures that the Queensland Transport Department provides a traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing between the Aspley Court and Compton Gardens Retirement Villages at Aspley.

**Transport, Bald Hills**

From **Mr J. N. Goss** (363 signatories) praying for the introduction of a mini bus feeder system to service Bald Hills residential areas connecting the railway station, schools and shopping centre.

**Department of Transport Customer Service Centre, Sherwood**

From **Mr Beanland** (701 signatories) praying that the Department of Transport Customer Service Centre at 686 Sherwood Road, Sherwood be retained in its present location.

**High School, Victoria Point**

From **Mr Budd** (354 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will provide for a high school at Victoria Point.

### **Turbot, Edward and Ann Streets, Park**

From **Mr J. N. Goss** (129 signatories) praying that action be taken to create a park in the inner city of Brisbane on vacant land bounded by Turbot, Edward and Ann Streets.

### **Bardon Professional Development Centre**

From **Mr Comben** (748 signatories) praying that the proposed sale of the Bardon Professional Development Centre and adjoining Crown land be reconsidered to enable it to be retained for educational purposes in its bushland setting.

### **Child Molesters**

From **Mr Gibbs** (732 signatories) praying that the parole period be removed when sentencing child molesters, that offenders are given and serve maximum sentences and that their names be released for publication.

A similar petition was received from **Mr Bennett** (344 signatories).

Petitions received.

## **STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS**

In accordance with the schedule circulated by the Clerk to members in the Chamber, the following documents were tabled—

Anzac Day Act—

Anzac Day Regulation 1993, No. 116

Audit Legislation Amendment Act—

Proclamation—remaining provisions of the Act not in force commence 1 May 1993, No. 125

Bread Industry Authority Repeal Act—

Proclamation—remaining provisions of the Act not in force commence 16 April 1993, No. 109

Brisbane Casino Agreement Act—

Brisbane Casino Agreement Regulation 1993, No. 135

City of Brisbane Act—

Proclamation—30 April 1993 as the date for the purposes of section 14M (3) of the Act, No. 122

Co-operative Housing Societies Act—

Cooperative Housing Societies General Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 95

Cooperative Housing Societies Model Rules Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 96

Cooperative Housing Societies Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 94

Commonwealth Aluminium Corporation Pty. Limited Agreement Act—

Commonwealth Aluminium Corporation Pty. Limited Agreement Regulation 1993, No. 105

Dairy Industry Act—

Dairy Industry Pasteurisation Plant (Gold Coast City and Albert Shire) Amendment Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 110

Financial Administration and Audit Act—

- Financial Administration and Audit Repeal Regulation 1993, No. 124
- Fishing Industry Organisation and Marketing Act—
  - Fishing Industry Organisation and Marketing Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1993, No. 128
- Foreign Judgments Act (Commonwealth )—
  - Supreme Court (Foreign Judgments) Rules Order 1993, No. 91
- Forestry Act—
  - Forestry Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 101
- Gaming Machine Act—
  - Gaming Machine Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 121
- Grain Industry (Restructuring) Act—
  - Grain Industry (Hail Compensation Scheme) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 100
- Grammar Schools Act—
  - Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements (Brisbane Girls' Grammar School) Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 111
- Harbours Act—
  - Harbours (Abbot Point) Amendment By-law (No. 2) 1993, No. 126
- Health Act—
  - Health (Scientific Research and Studies) Regulation 1993, No. 133
  - Poisons (Adoption of Standard) Notice (No. 2) 1993, No. 120
  - Poisons Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1993, No. 104
  - Refuse Management Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 115
- Industrial Development Act—
  - Industrial Development Regulation 1993, No. 92
- James Cook University of North Queensland Act—
  - James Cook University of North Queensland (Investment) Statute 1993, No. 90
- Local Government Act—
  - Local Government (Correction of Errors) Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 102
- Mineral Resources Act—
  - Mineral Resources Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 1993, No. 108
  - Mineral Resources Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 1993, No. 107
- National Parks and Wildlife Act—
  - National Park 2 County of Wongalee (Extension) Order 1993, No. 117
  - National Park 41 County of Cheviot and Wolseley (Declaration) Order 1993, No. 134
  - National Park 880 County of Nares (Extension) Order 1993, No. 118
  - National Park 1353 County of Nares (Extension) Order 1993, No. 119
- Petroleum Act—
  - Petroleum Amendment Regulation 1993, No. 123
  - Petroleum Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 106
- Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act—

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing (Rice Marketing Board) Regulation (No. 2) 1993, No. 127

Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act—

Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Regulation 1993, No. 103

Queensland Law Society Act—

Queensland Law Society (Approval of Indemnity Rule) Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 113

Queensland Marine Act—

Queensland Marine (Ports Traffic Control) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 1993, No. 99

State Housing Act—

State Housing Interest Rate Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 131

State Housing (Freeholding of Land) Act—

State Housing (Freeholding of Land) Interest Rate Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 130

State Service Superannuation Act—

State Service Superannuation (Approval of Officers) Order 1993, No. 98

Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act—

Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements (Brisbane Girls' Grammar School) Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 111

Statutory Instruments Act—

Statutory Instruments Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 1993, No. 89

Stock Act—

Stock (South Queensland Cattle Tick Protected Area) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 1993, No. 136

Superannuation (State Public Sector) Act—

Superannuation (State Public Sector Membership) Amendment Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 97

Supreme Court Act—

Criminal Practice Rules Amendment Order (No. 1) 1993, No. 114

Supreme Court (Foreign Judgments) Rules Order 1993, No. 91

Supreme Court Rules Amendment Order (No. 3) 1993, No. 132

University of Central Queensland Act—

University of Central Queensland (Admission and Enrolment) Statute 1993, No. 112

University of Southern Queensland Act—

University of Southern Queensland (Investment) Statute 1993, No. 129

Workplace Health and Safety Act—

Workplace Health and Safety (Officers) Amendment Notice (No. 1) 1993, No. 93.

## PAPERS

The following papers were laid upon the table of the House—

(a) Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Casey)—

- (A) A Proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as State Forest under the Forestry Act 1959 of—
  - (a) All that part of State Forest 531 described as Lot 1 on Crown Plan 855162 and containing an area of 3.366 hectares,
  - (b) All that part of State Forest 194 described as Lot 307 on plan NR 6057 and containing an area of about 5.13 hectares,
  - (c) The whole of State Forest 917 containing an area of about 650 hectares,
  - (d) All those parts of State Forest 589 described as Areas A and B and shown hachured on plan FTY 1657 prepared under the authority of the Primary Industries Corporation and containing areas totalling about 25.1 hectares,
  - (e) All those parts of State Forest 432 described as Lots 2 and 319 on Crown Plan 847516 and containing areas totalling about 508.8 hectares; and
- (B) A brief explanation of the Proposal.
- (b) Minister for Environment and Heritage (Ms Robson)—  
Draft Great Sandy Region Management Plan.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation

**Hon. R. J. GIBBS** (Bundamba—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (2.31 p.m.), by leave: The performance of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation continues to make it the envy of its counterparts and my ministerial counterparts around Australia. Consistently through the recession, and now during the recovery phase, the QTTC has achieved sales record after record. Tourism is a significant component of Australia's strongest State economy. With results such as these, if the QTTC was a private company, it would be the darling of the stock market. Let us take a look at the holiday sales figures for the first four months of this year.

**Mr Borbidge:** Has Peter Laurance paid the money back?

**Mr GIBBS:** If the honourable member would listen, very shortly he will find out that his recent statements about the QTTC could best be described as "Yo! Not the way to go". For the first four months of this year, the Queensland Government travel centres around Australia recorded a 48 per cent increase on the previous year, up from \$6.9m to \$9.7m. Sunlover sales increased 40 per cent, up from \$10m to \$14m. The agency reservation centre for the QTTC recorded a 40 per cent rise, up from \$6.9m to \$9.7m. Tourism is undergoing sustained, strong growth, which surely must convince lending institutions to support the industry.

Although ordinary Australians are investing in their own country by holidaying here in unprecedented numbers, developers are being forced offshore to find venture capital necessary for the provision of infrastructure. The financial institutions' lack of support for this State's fastest-growing industry borders on being un-Australian. The brightest note in the current batch of figures is the 43 per cent turnaround in interstate visitors experienced in western Queensland. The Matilda Highway, which runs 1 600 kilometres from Cunnamulla to Karumba, has the potential to become one of the State's premier attractions, offering access to places such as Lawn Hill National Park, Longreach's Stockman's Hall of Fame and the Barcaldine Heritage Centre. I am not suggesting tourism is the answer to all the economic woes of the bush, but the more diversification in the rural economy, the better it can deal with natural disasters.

There is tremendous potential for expansion in both domestic and international markets. QTTC research shows that the Japanese, Europeans and Americans all want to get off the beaten track, and Australians are showing more of an inclination to explore their own backyard than ever before. The Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation will continue to foster and encourage tourism in western Queensland, a move which I believe will be of lasting benefit to our State and to our rural communities.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Public Accounts Committee Report on Department of Primary Industries

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (2.39 p.m.), by leave: I refer to the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts report on the Department of Primary Industries. I would like to thank the committee for its report and recommendations on improving the financial management of my department. I welcome these recommendations. The PAC was established as an important public sector reform and has fulfilled its role by making a range of positive recommendations to correct financial management problems in my department.

With regard to the specific recommendations, I am able to advise that I have informed Mr Hollis that I have already acted to implement recommendations 1, 2 and 3, which are the major ones—

1. That a clear reporting line be established between the Minister for Primary Industries, the Director-General, Department of Primary Industries, and the senior management of the department.
2. That the Minister for Primary Industries approach the Treasury Department and the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development to make available the appropriate resources to enable a review of the department's corporate services area conducted jointly by the Treasury Department, the Public Sector Management Commission and the Information Policy Board—referred to as the Joint Advisory Team—under a common charter negotiated with the Minister for Primary Industries independent of the department.
3. That the Minister for Primary Industries engage the Joint Advisory Team to conduct a review of the current situation in order to improve management's accountability, efficiency and effectiveness. Specific areas to be addressed include financial management and information systems and human resource management.

I have written to the Under Treasurer and Under Secretary of the Treasury Department and the Director-General of the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development, and their representatives will be part of the Joint Advisory Team that will report confidentially to me. I look forward to my department cooperating fully with this team of advisers on improvements to my department's accountability, efficiency and effectiveness.

I am encouraged by the Public Accounts Committee's acknowledgment of the positive steps taken by my department to improve its financial management systems. The committee identified the following steps—

- Corporate Plan;
- Corporate Services Business Group—Strategic Plan;
- Corporate Management and Support Program Strategic Plan 1992-1996;
- Information Strategic Plan 1992-1997;
- Information Technology Operational Plan 1992-1997;
- Performance Planning and Review Program; and

Performance agreements with regions for the delivery of corporate services.

In addition, my department has established an independent Audit Steering Committee and a Financial Management Improvement Group to oversee and monitor the department's financial accountability requirements. Stabilisation of the current financial management system, a planned and ordered approach to the development of an improved financial system, including the prerequisite systems testing, staff training and the development of a financial management practice manual are proceeding in accordance with the department's strategic planning process. An updated Risk Assessment Report in December 1992 reveals that substantial progress has been made in addressing critical risk areas facing the department.

Bank reconciliations for the year ended 30 June 1992 were completed on 31 March 1993. This information has been conveyed to the department's Audit Steering Committee, the Auditor-General and the PAC. Although problems existed within my department's financial systems, I would like to emphasise that there was never any suggestion of any fraudulent activities, nor did that have any effect on the services delivered by my department to the primary producers of Queensland.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! There is too much noise in the Chamber.

**Mr CASEY:** My department is continuing to strengthen internal controls, and I am advised by my Director-General that a recommendation will be made to implement a new financial management system with assistance from Treasury Department specialists. This will introduce both stabilisation and consolidation of a number of training initiatives already in progress to improve internal controls. In order to ensure that this project is undertaken with appropriate experience, the Director-General has seconded the General Manager (Finance) to project manage the implementation for 1993-94 on a full-time basis. This, together with training programs on internal controls, new systems development and job redesign, will place the DPI at the forefront of efficient and effective financial management in the 1990s. Our problems of the past will be translated into opportunities for the future and the adoption of best management practice in financial management.

As I have indicated previously, I will not be entirely satisfied on this matter until all the issues have been resolved and both the Auditor-General and the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee have indicated their full satisfaction with the financial statements of the QDPI.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Vocational Education and Training (Industry Placement) Act

**Hon. M. J. FOLEY** (Yeronga—Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations) (2.44 p.m.), by leave: I am pleased to be able to report to honourable members the progress in implementing the Vocational Education and Training (Industry Placement) Act, which passed through this House with all-party support late last year. This legislation, which is the first of its kind in Australia, allows students, including those at Queensland TAFE and senior colleges, rural training schools and approved training organisations to undertake on-the-job training where their vocational courses require practical experience.

Until the passage of this legislation, the Education (Student Work Experience) Act was the only Act allowing for any kind of workplace experience for secondary school and TAFE students. This legislation allowed for little more than observation and the chance to experience the "feel" of the working environment. It also did not allow at all for students at rural training schools or with private training organisations, nor for participants in approved Commonwealth and State labour market programs. The Vocational Education and Training (Industry Placement) Act has changed this entirely, not only by providing a legal basis for these previously excluded people to gain on-the-

job experience but also by changing the focus from work experience to a focus on genuine skills development.

The Vocational Education, Training and Employment Commission has been active in promoting the new legislative provisions, and since the Act began operation the State Training Council has approved the practical training and experience components in 55 courses. Each of those components is an integral, structured component of the course. That 55 includes 28 courses from TAFE, four courses from rural training schools and 23 courses from approved training organisations. The 23 private courses cover the full range of employment opportunities from pharmacy assistants to sugar industry workers. Examples include—

Bundaberg Skillshare's cane haulout and farms skills course. Students on this course are given industry placement on cane farms within the Bundaberg district. This enables them to gain valuable real-life experience in one of Queensland's important industries.

Students undertaking recently developed pharmacy assistant courses run by the Pharmacy Guild of Australia.

The Australian Institute of Management mature age manager reskilling course which commenced in January 1993.

Courses conducted by the Mount Gravatt Training Centre Inc. in home care, hospitality, tea and tidy, and hardware, all of which have been in operation for approximately 12 months.

Discussions are continuing with other training providers on the use of the industry placement system. A handbook will be available by midyear setting out the legislation and the process of incorporating genuine on-the job experience into courses.

I must add that employers and unions, recognising the need for training to provide students with immediately useable skills, have supported the concept of industry placement. With their ongoing support, and the continuing cooperative efforts of the public and private training sector, vocational education and training in Queensland will become a more relevant and valuable commodity not only to participants and job seekers but also to business and industry.

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

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (2.47 p.m.): In view of comments made by the Premier, I seek leave to move a motion that this House supports the continued existence of the Senate.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition knows very well the procedure. Does he seek leave to move a motion without notice?

**Mr BORBIDGE:** Yes.

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

AYES, 35

|             |                 |
|-------------|-----------------|
| Beanland    | Simpson         |
| Borbridge   | Slack           |
| Connor      | Stephan         |
| Cooper      | Stoneman        |
| Davidson    | Turner          |
| Elliott     | Veivers         |
| FitzGerald  | Watson          |
| Gamin       |                 |
| Gilmore     |                 |
| Goss J. N.  |                 |
| Grice       |                 |
| Healy       |                 |
| Hobbs       |                 |
| Horan       |                 |
| Johnson     |                 |
| Lester      |                 |
| Lingard     |                 |
| Littleproud |                 |
| McCauley    |                 |
| Mitchell    |                 |
| Perrett     |                 |
| Quinn       |                 |
| Randell     |                 |
| Rowell      | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| Santoro     | Springborg      |
| Sheldon     | Laming          |

NOES, 49

|            |                 |
|------------|-----------------|
| Ardill     | McGrady         |
| Barton     | Milliner        |
| Beattie    | Nunn            |
| Bennett    | Nuttall         |
| Bird       | Pearce          |
| Braddy     | Power           |
| Bredhauer  | Purcell         |
| Briskey    | Pyke            |
| Budd       | Robertson       |
| Burns      | Robson          |
| Casey      | Rose            |
| Comben     | Smith           |
| D'Arcy     | Spence          |
| Davies     | Sullivan J. H.  |
| De Lacy    | Sullivan T. B.  |
| Dollin     | Szczerbanik     |
| Edmond     | Vaughan         |
| Elder      | Warner          |
| Fenlon     | Welford         |
| Foley      | Wells           |
| Gibbs      | Woodgate        |
| Goss W. K. |                 |
| Hayward    |                 |
| Hollis     | <i>Tellers:</i> |
| Mackenroth | Pitt            |
| McElligott | Livingstone     |

Resolved in the negative.

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE

### Interim Report

**Mr DAVIES** (Mundingburra) (2.50 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I present an interim report of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee entitled *Review of the Criminal Justice Commission's Use of its Powers Under Section 3.1 of the Criminal Justice Act 1989*. This interim report forms Part A of the committee's twentieth report to Parliament, which consists of submissions received by the committee on the powers under review and the minutes of evidence taken at the committee's public hearing held on Friday, 30 April 1993. The committee issued some 120 invitations to make submissions to various persons and organisations who may be interested in the subject matter under review, and received 24 submissions in response. The report of the committee reviewing the Criminal Justice Commission's use of the subject powers will constitute Part B of report No. 20. I move that the report be printed.

Ordered to be printed.

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE

### Report

**Mr DAVIES** (Mundingburra) (2.55 p.m.): Mr Speaker, I table a report of the Parliamentary Criminal Justice Committee on its study tour of Canberra and inquiries relating to organised crime.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**Mr COOPER** (Crows Nest) (2.56 p.m.), by leave: Yesterday, in this House, the member for Everton indulged on a trip down memory lane with a rather curious attack on the former Government's actions in purchasing a Brisbane construction site known as Queensland Place. As the Premier of the State at that time, I found his misleading comments maligned my position, and I seek your indulgence, Mr Speaker, to counter his shabby mischief-making.

The facts about the purchase of that property are clear. Some members would do anything for publicity. In late 1989, my Government approved its purchase for \$52.5m, with the intention to use the 1.55 hectare site for Government office buildings. In February 1989, the site changed hands when Hooker Projects sold it to Seymour Developments for \$30m, and a 55-storey tower was planned as part of a major inner-city development. The new owners, for their own reasons, subsequently decided against that project and announced, in July 1989, that the land would be sold in separate lots, which were then expected to fetch between \$3,500 per square metre and \$7,000 per square metre. At that time, which was months before my Government approved the purchase of the site, the *Courier-Mail*—which did not bother to contact me yesterday—quoting from *Property Sources*, reported that the site would sell for about \$70m, as against the purchase price of \$52m.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I have been very tolerant. I suggest that the honourable member come to the point.

**Mr COOPER:** The Government's purchase of the site later that year was arranged by the respected company Richard Ellis and Jones Lang Wootton, whose chairman, Mr Brian White, was quoted as saying that other interested parties had offered the owners more than \$6,000 per square metre for certain parts of the site but the owners preferred to sell the site in its entirety. The purchase price paid by my Government equated to a significantly lower amount of \$3,380 per square metre. I do not know what the member for Everton was attempting to imply or allege, except that he was trying to climb the ladder and do a fair bit of promotion for himself.

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

#### 1. Cairns City Council

Mr LINGARD asked the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning—

“With reference to an audit report prepared by Hall Chadwick into expenditure irregularities at the Cairns City Council—

What action has he taken to ensure irregularities of this nature do not occur again?”

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

The Auditor-General in his second report to Parliament on audits performed for the financial year ended 30 June 1992 referred to a number of matters relating to the results of the audit of the Cairns City Council.

My department has informed me that since these matters were identified in the audit, the council has taken remedial action and adopted policies and instigated internal administrative and accounting procedures which are aimed at preventing a recurrence of the problems.

#### 2. Mr K. E. Winters

Mr LINGARD asked the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning—

“With reference to an accredited builder, Mr Kenneth Edwin Winters of Gladstone who has recently filed a debtors petition with the Registrar in

Bankruptcy leaving debts of approximately \$5000,000 to small businesses throughout Queensland—

- (1) When was Mr Winters given accreditation to tender for Government contracts?
- (2) How was it that Mr Winters was given accreditation when he was technically bankrupt?
- (3) Why did his department continue to grant contracts to Mr Winters after October 1992 when his department was informed that Mr Winters was having difficulty paying his accounts?
- (4) (a) How many contracts are outstanding and (b) what action has been taken to have them completed and granted to other builders?
- (5) Given that Mr Winters was an accredited builder for the Queensland Government and was contracting for the Queensland Government at the time of his bankruptcy, what action will the Government take to redeem the debts that Mr Winters has accumulated at the expense of small businesses, since being improperly accredited?"

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I seek leave to have the answer incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

1) Kenneth Edwin Winters was granted approved construction contractor status by the department on 15 October 1987.

2) In 1987 the departmental procedures for granting approved contractor status required that references be obtained from the relevant contractor's major suppliers and a bank opinion obtained from the contractor's bank through the Reserve Bank of Australia. These procedures were followed and the information obtained indicated that Mr Winters was in a profitable trading situation.

A further financial report from an independent mercantile agent was sought in November 1991. This report did not disclose any adverse information on Mr Winters' financial standing.

3) In October 1992, as a result of investigations carried out by the department regarding claims that sub-contractors were allegedly not being paid, it was ascertained that there were no sub-contractors' charges laid against Mr Winters.

The department's investigations produced no evidence that Mr Winters' financial viability had changed.

- 4) (a) nine contracts are outstanding. Five had only minor variations to complete.  
(b) four contracts involving seven houses are currently outstanding.

A contract has been awarded to complete six houses within the original contract price. The department has instructed that existing sub-contractors be used to the extent possible.

Tenders are to be called shortly for the remaining house on which only minor site works had been carried out.

5) The agreement to pay a sub-contractor for work undertaken on departmental construction projects is between the principal contractor and his sub-contractors. The department is not a party to these agreements.

The independent action available to a sub-contractor for payment of monies outstanding is through lodging a claim against the contractor under the Sub-contractor's Charges Act.

Once a trustee in bankruptcy is appointed, or a liquidator is appointed, the matter of outstanding monies due to creditors is a matter for the trustee or liquidator to determine.

It is not true that the department continued to give work to Mr Winters after his financial difficulties became known to the department.

As soon as the department became aware of Winters' situation the department commenced action to take the contracts out of his hands.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Ipswich City Council

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning who has been feeling neglected, I refer to claims of large scale corruption, union standover tactics and blackmail made by the Mayor of Ipswich, and the particular allegation that the former town clerk was paid \$184,000 in hush money to cover up expense rorting. I ask: why has he failed to order an inquiry into the Ipswich City Council so that these and other abuses can be investigated?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** I point out, firstly, that the claims have been made through the media. If the Mayor of Ipswich believes that anything has been done wrongfully in relation to finances in the council, he has an obligation under the Criminal Justice Act to advise the Criminal Justice Commission. I understand that a private individual has already done that, so the matter should be with the Criminal Justice Commission, which will make a decision on whether or not there will be an investigation.

In relation to council matters generally throughout this State, I inform the House that during the six or seven months that I have been the Minister for Local Government, I have had representations to sack probably 30 per cent or 40 per cent of the councils in this State. If I listened to everyone who came to me, including members of Parliament, about sacking——

**Mr Borbidge:** How many mayors have made them?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** The Leader of the Opposition asked the question and I will give the answer. I have had complaints made to me about sacking councils. If I were to do that, I would have to run the lot of them. Perhaps that might be the best thing to do; but, if I did, I am sure that all the members of the Opposition would once again be whingeing about the heavy hand of Mackenroth. I understand that last week the Labor caucus of the Ipswich City Council decided to expel the mayor from caucus, which is not a matter for me as Local Government Minister. In relation to what now goes on within the Ipswich City Council, let me say that I understand that the members have had one meeting since then. We will monitor the situation.

The Government has a number of powers available in relation to that council, and I will explain them to the Leader of the Opposition, if he wants to know. If the situation is sufficiently grave to warrant the step, there is power under section 4.9 for the Governor in Council to dissolve the council. That means that all the elected members, including the mayor, would go out of office, and the Government would appoint an administrator who would take over the responsibilities of the council. If a majority of the council were passing resolutions which seemed entirely inappropriate—and this stage has not been reached—there is also power under section 4.5 of the Local Government Act for the Governor in Council to rescind such resolutions. Section 4A of the Act also contains powers which enable the Director of Local Government, either in his own right or when directed by me as Minister, to carry out inspections, investigations and inquiries in relation to any matter relating to the administration of the Act.

I am well aware of the claims and counterclaims that are being made at Ipswich. When I believe that the administration of the council or the governing of that city has reached a stage at which it cannot be managed effectively, I will take the necessary steps. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition and all members of the Ipswich City Council that if they get out of line, I will sack them.

### Department of Primary Industries

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to the massive financial irregularities in his department that were uncovered by both the Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee, and to a report which is probably the most damning by an Auditor-General in Queensland in respect of the maladministration of a Government department. I ask: notwithstanding what he is doing

now and notwithstanding what he has done over the last few weeks, what action has he, as Minister, taken to ensure that taxpayers' money was administered in an efficient and accountable manner?

**Mr CASEY:** I thank the honourable Leader of the Opposition for his question. In so far as most of the parts of it are concerned, I refer him to the ministerial statement I made in this House earlier today. Also, as a further response to the member's question, I refer to the fact that the main thing that I had to guide me were the recommendations made in the Public Sector Management Commission's report, which found more than 160 problems in existence that were left behind by the previous Government. These consisted of a lack of decision-making on key issues because of the way in which the department operated under the previous Government, and poor organisational structure within the department. There were also excessive levels of middle management within the department.

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Gregory!

**Mr CASEY:** A system of centralised control existed in the department whereby all the decisions had to be made in Brisbane and not out in the bush or out in country areas where they ought to be made by people who are operating within the department. As a consequence, this Government has moved to restructure the department so that instead of almost 50 per cent of the department's agricultural production work being carried on in Brisbane, it has been decentralised. There is not very much agricultural production practised in Brisbane, yet under the previous Government 50 per cent of the Agricultural Production Group, including scientists, were located in Brisbane. That proportion has now been reduced to 35 per cent.

Of all the departments of the Queensland Government that were in a great mess as a result of the previous Government's administration, it was the Department of Primary Industries that was worst off. This occurred for the simple reason that people were not being trained to look at how they had to qualify matters relating to financial management. When they overran expenditure limits, members of the previous Government would simply go to the Treasury and Treasury would throw out another bucketful of money. Under the previous Government, they did not have to worry about financial management because that was the system that operated. Most of the reports of the Auditor-General relate to the period of the very early days of my administration. We have the situation now where the department will become one of the best financially managed departments that this State has ever seen.

### Economy

**Mr PITT:** I ask the Premier: is he aware of any recent comparisons between the performance of the Queensland economy and that of any other growth State of Australia? Further, is he aware of any comparison between the economies of Western Australia and Queensland?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I note that members opposite moan at this question. It is not my fault that I have to organise these questions. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition moaned that he had been waiting for six weeks to come into this Chamber in order to ask questions about Mr Blizzard, the drought, and a host of other things. Yet here we are, it is question time, and it is the same as the last session. On 9 days out of 10, the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy do not have the guts to ask me a question. I am now stuck with taking the desperate measure of begging the Whip to ask me a question.

Fortunately, Mr Speaker, I can inform the Government Whip that I am aware of a recent comparison of the performance of the Queensland Government with that of other States. I would like to quote briefly from a publication titled *Reform and Recovery*. It is

subtitled "An Agenda for the New Western Australian Government". On page 63, in a section headed "Queensland is the benchmark", it says—

"The most salient feature of the Australian State sector is the excellent performance and prospects of the Queensland economy. Over the three years to 1991—92—a period of deep recession—Queensland outperformed all States according to most indicators, and it is expected to continue to do so over the term of the Government."

Who produced this report? It was none other than the IPA, and it was edited by Mike Nahan and another gentleman. Who is Mike Nahan? He was the author of the costings of the National Party policies at the last State election; in other words, one of the people whom the Leader of the Opposition—

**Mr Borbidge:** You said he was no good.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** No. I said that the information that was given to him was no good because, at the time of the last election, in relation to the Leader of the Opposition's costings—and I am glad he has had the guts to interject because I will nail him on that lie also—Mr Nahan said, "Based on the information given to me by the Opposition in Queensland, I say as follows". We well know what the quality of the information provided by the Luke Shaw of public debate—that is, Mr Borbidge—is worth. On page 64, this report from the IPA goes on to say—

"The Queensland public sector has, by a substantial margin, the lowest level of debt and debt-servicing cost of all the States."

It goes on to say—and there are many passages that I could quote, but I will finish with this one—

"During the 1990-92 period, Western Australia and all States other than Queensland were, in response to the recession, forced to cut capital works, lay off public servants and pay out more in interest. During the same period, the Queensland Government was able to increase capital spending by 38 per cent, to employ over 4 000 more public servants, cut interest payments by \$100 million, and at the same time achieve a balanced budget, retire debt and fully fund all liabilities, without increasing taxes."

The Leader of the Opposition complains that we do not do anything. Here is an author from an organisation that he touts as being reliable saying that Queensland is doing the best of any of the States and is also outperforming all of those States governed by Liberal/National Party Governments.

### Proposed Corporatisation Legislation

**Mr PITT:** In directing my next question to the Treasurer, I refer him to claims by Opposition members that the proposed corporatisation legislation is nothing more than a smokescreen for a revenue grab which they say will fail, in any case, because the process does not involve radical labour market changes. I ask: can the Treasurer advise the House of the real objectives of corporatisation?

**Mr De LACY:** In response to the question, I would firstly like to make the observation that every time an efficiency measure is introduced in this place by this Government there is criticism from the Opposition. I think that members opposite are starting to find out that we are a Government which is committed to efficiency and committed to making progress. If honourable members wanted a better example than that, I could just about rest my case on the point made by the Premier in relation to the IPA report. If corporatisation is a smokescreen for a revenue grab, I have to say that it has the longest gestation period of any revenue grab in history. It was in October 1990 that we first issued a Green Paper on corporatisation. Since then there has been a White Paper. Since then there has been consultation with everybody, and I mean everybody—the GOEs, the unions, business, industry and what-have-you. As a

consequence of all the consultation that has gone on, the Bill that will be introduced into Parliament tonight, hopefully, is version No. 36.

I turn now to this business about a revenue grab. Let me say this: what this Government would do is what the Liberal/National Party Governments are doing throughout the rest of Australia, that is, flogging off assets. What we would be doing is what Mr Borbidge was advocating at the last election, that is, getting out there and selling off all of our Government-owned enterprises like the ports, Suncorp, QIDC and what-have-you. That is what we would be doing if we wanted the money. We would be doing what the other States that want the money would be doing. If we did not want to sell them off, what we would do——

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** What we would do is what the New South Wales Liberal/National Party Government is doing.

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

**Mr De LACY:** The *Australian Financial Review* of 17 March stated——

“The New South Wales Government is continuing to search through its Government trading enterprises for cash to help it bring down its deficit and it expects the Prospect County Council to come up with about \$130 million by the end of the month.”

On the next day, 18 March, the *Australian* stated that the New South Wales Government had taken an \$18m dividend from the Sydney County Council as part of its Budget strategy designed to take advantage of the repository of profits of Government trading enterprises. It went on to state that that was on top of a \$75m dividend from Prospect County Council and an estimated \$500m in dividend and tax equivalents from Pacific Power. That is what the Liberal/National Party Government in New South Wales is doing.

The fact is that we are not involved in a revenue grab; we are involved in a considered program that is going to make our Government enterprises efficient so that we can keep that advantage that we have in Queensland, so that we can keep Queensland at the forefront of Australia, and so that the next time IPA publishes a bulletin it will also say that Queensland is the benchmark.

#### **Department of Primary Industries**

**Mrs SHELDON:** In directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to the *Cabinet Handbook* which states that “It is the policy of the Queensland Government to enhance ministerial responsibility and accountability”——

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I would like to hear the question.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lockyer!

**Mrs SHELDON:** For the benefit of the Premier, I will repeat the question. I refer to the *Cabinet Handbook* which states that “It is the policy of the Queensland Government to enhance ministerial responsibility and accountability consistent with its collective commitments”, and I ask: what responsibility does the Minister take for the massive irregularities uncovered by both the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor-General?

**Mr CASEY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I can assure the other members of this House that Bali really was not the appropriate place to ask it. However, I say quite clearly that I accept total responsibility for my department, as is the case with all other members of the Goss Ministry. But in accepting that responsibility, I

must also accept total responsibility for fixing up the massive mess that was left in Primary Industries by the previous Government. I must accept total responsibility for the faults and failures of the past under that Government. Under the National Party Government, Ministers would not talk to people within industry because they would take their counsels from some local National Party branch officials, people within the department in rural areas of Queensland were treated with great disdain, and all of the management decisions had to be made down here in Brisbane.

I accept total responsibility for the restructuring of the Department of Primary Industries in Queensland, the regionalisation of the Department of Primary Industries in Queensland, and the reorganisation of legislation in Queensland that has made our major industries in this State better able to capitalise on the situations in which they now find themselves. I am very proud of the achievements of this Government in the primary sector of Queensland. I am very proud of the way in which these matters are now being administered. I am very grateful to people such as Bob Gibbs for the work that they have done in the Department of Primary Industries during my recent absence. As a result, yesterday during the enforced stay in Bali, I was able to reciprocate a little bit for him in relation to tourism.

### Department of Primary Industries

**Mrs SHELDON:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: will he now admit that the specific decisions of his Government to cut the budget of the Department of Primary Industries, enforce voluntary retrenchments and departmental transfers of nearly 1 000 staff, and amalgamate three separate departments have contributed to the massive financial irregularities highlighted by Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor-General?

**Mr CASEY:** I actually thought that the Deputy Leader of the Coalition had learned quite clearly in some of the countries that we visited that just to put more men on the job does not mean efficiency of operations. That was the case in many of the industries that we saw during the trade delegation's visit to South East Asia, from which all members who participated benefited greatly. We now have in Queensland a Department of Primary Industries that is a more efficient and more effective department in the delivery of services.

**Mr Johnson:** What a joke!

**Mr CASEY:** "What a joke!", the honourable member says. Under the National Party Government, 50 per cent of the Agricultural Production Group were located here in Brisbane, where they did not grow anything and they did not produce anything. They did not help the primary producers of this State one little bit. That figure is now down to 35 per cent and the decisions are being made out in the regional areas of this State. The one thing for which this Goss Government will be remembered——

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Gregory under Standing Order 123A. It is his final warning.

**Mr CASEY:** The one great thing for which this Goss Government will be remembered by Queensland's rural communities and rural industries is that it took the Department of Primary Industries back to the bush, where it belongs.

### Queensland Film Industry

**Mr LIVINGSTONE:** I ask the Premier: is it true that the Government has provided direct financial assistance to the film industry in Queensland? Is it appropriate for the Government to directly involve itself in such an industry? Is there any evidence that suggests that this is producing results?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Once again, I am reduced to begging for questions from my own back bench because I cannot get them out of the leadership of the coalition. I cannot get a question out of the leadership of the coalition. I have not got a question this year from these people.

**Mr Borbidge:** Give us more question time, you big sook.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The Leader of the Opposition has not got a decent question. He has not got the guts to ask me a question. It is appropriate that he should squawk on this question because he has been typically two-faced about this issue.

**Mr Stephan** interjected.

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

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** When the Leader of the Opposition is at Surfers Paradise in his board shorts, he says that we should be supporting the film industry. Then he hops around the bush or sends the other deputy around the bush saying, "They have money for the film industry and money for the Indy car race, but no money for the drought." Of course, that is another lie, but what is more objectionable and what is more deceitful to the people of Surfers Paradise is the two-faced approach.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** I rise to a point of order. I cannot use the word "lie". I suggest that the Premier should not be allowed to use it, either.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** I withdraw and substitute "deliberate mistruth".

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** No point of order was taken on that, so I assumed that it was accepted. The Government provides support through two vehicles—the Queensland Film Development Office and the Pacific Film and Television Commission. It will continue to do so, because not only has the Government's policy been very successful in respect of the film industry and the arts but it has also been very successful in terms of the economic benefits that increased film and television production brings to this State.

To cite one example—tonight, I will launch the corporate sponsorship appeal for the second Brisbane international film festival. That festival was initiated last year, and it was a great success. It is important that that festival continue, not just for its artistic benefit but also for its drawing the attention of national and overseas producers to the fact that, increasingly, Queensland is seen as an attractive location for film and television production. I wish to cite briefly the figures that reflect the success of this policy.

**Mr Connor:** Why don't you table them instead of wasting question time? You said it was a Dorothy Dix; table it.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The member for Nerang comes from the Gold Coast, yet he is showing by his complaint that he does not value the film industry and he does not value the massive economic benefits that it has brought to his electorate and to the Gold Coast in general. Let me provide him with the figures.

**Mr Connor** interjected.

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

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** Clearly, the member for Nerang is ignorant of the benefits of the film industry. Today, I hope to enlighten him. In the past five years—

**Mr CONNOR:** I rise to a point of order. The Premier is referring to a document that he has in his hand. Under the Standing Orders, I ask him to table that document.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** As I am entitled to do, I am referring to material provided to me by my office. For the benefit of the member for Nerang, I will read it all out, because he is keen to hear. His ignorance will be removed if he just listens for a minute and puts his tongue into neutral. If he makes this one of those rare occasions on which he lapses into silence, he will learn that, over the past five years under this Government, film and television production has increased from \$10m a year in 1988 to \$100m a year this year.

Studies show that a significant proportion of that—close to 60 per cent—is staying in the local economy. That is occurring because of the strategic support and investment by this Government.

Through the Queensland Film Development Office, this Government is sponsoring and supporting the local industry. Through the Pacific Film and Television Commission, it is seeking to attract overseas production. It is interesting to note that, when the Pacific Film and Television Commission was formed, its business plan projected achieving \$100m per annum film and television production by 1995. We have achieved that two years ahead of schedule.

In conclusion, I want to cite some examples of how successful we have been in not only attracting overseas production but also stimulating the local industry through the Queensland Film Development Office. Recent outstanding successes in that regard include the films *Redheads*, *Bedevil* and *Broken Highway*, a film by a local director, Laurie McInnes, which will be screened next week in Cannes after being selected as one of the best 20 feature-length films from around the world. That film was crucially assisted by \$100,000 from the State Government.

### Drought Assistance

**Mr LIVINGSTONE:** I ask the Treasurer: what impact is the drought having on the State's finances, and what is the extent of the Government's financial commitment to alleviating the impact of the drought?

**Mr De LACY:** Yesterday, I listened with bated breath to the assertion by the Leader of the Opposition. He has finally made a trip to western Queensland, over the other side of the Great Divide, and he has found the drought. The next thing we know, he will don a pair of elastic-sided boots and pretend that he grew up in the bush! I listened also to the notices of motion moved this afternoon, and let me say that, when it comes to the drought, the National Party is missing the boat. This afternoon, Mr Hobbs, the member for Warrego, started to tell the House what is being done about drought assistance by New South Wales. I challenge him to compare the monetary assistance provided by the New South Wales Government with the monetary assistance provided—

**Mrs Sheldon:** Why don't you stand on your own two feet for a change and talk about Queensland instead of New South Wales?

**Mr De LACY:** I am talking about Queensland—believe you me. Rather than selecting a very minor item and trying to score a point out of it, I challenge the member for Warrego to compare both the quantum and the type of assistance provided in Queensland with that provided in New South Wales. For instance, the new exceptional circumstances drought assistance and wool assistance in Queensland—the Government is subsidising that up to 100 per cent interest subsidy. For the benefit of all honourable members, I point out that the RAS funds which come from the Commonwealth Government—

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** If the honourable member listens, I will explain. The first 50 per cent is funded 90 per cent Commonwealth, 10 per cent State. The next 50 per cent is half/half Commonwealth and State, dollar for dollar. The New South Wales Government would not go to 100 per cent; it went only to 80 per cent. The Queensland Government went to 100 per cent. I noticed that the honourable member for Warrego did not talk about that! Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition spoke about Queensland's contribution being \$3.5m. I have news for him: when one adds up the Queensland Government's contribution, it will amount to \$19.5m.

**Mr Borbidge:** I quoted from your Minister.

**Mr De LACY:** In future, the honourable member should quote me, because I am telling him what it will cost. The Government's contribution to RAS, the restocking and crop replanting scheme—and I notice that the Leader of the Opposition—

**Mrs Sheldon:** What was your contribution to Indy? It was a bit more than \$19m.

**Mr De LACY:** I will come to that. This year, the Government's contribution to Indy was \$10m. The contribution to drought is \$20m, which is twice as much. As to the Indy race—the Premier referred to the double standards of the Leader of the Opposition. The last time I was on the Gold Coast, I spoke to a mob of Indy supporters. They told me that they were disturbed by the fact that the Leader of the Opposition was badmouthing the Indy. They said that they had met with him, and that he had given a guarantee not to say anything more about the Indy.

**Mr Borbidge:** Who said that?

**Mr De LACY:** Max Christmas, who is a mate of the Leader of the Opposition, and Greg Rix, who is another mate of his.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** The Leader of the Opposition should have it out with them. They said that the only commitment that the Leader of the Opposition would give was that he would let the deputy leader do all the talking about the Indy race so that he would not appear to be two-faced when he went out bush and spoke about the Indy race.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr De LACY:** The Leader of the Opposition will have to sort it out with his mates on the Gold Coast.

In conclusion, this year, the cost of the drought to the Queensland Budget and the Rural Adjustment Scheme—the drought funds that have been offered by the Commonwealth Government—will be \$19.5 m. If one goes out and talks to rural producers, they will admit that the Queensland Government is playing its part in addressing this very difficult problem.

#### **Department of Primary Industries**

**Mr LINGARD:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: in the light of what he has just said, that putting more people on does not make it more efficient, how does he justify having 19 people on his own personal staff when almost 1 000 positions have been cut from operational areas in the Department of Primary Industries since 1989?

**Mr CASEY:** When I came in this morning, I did not count the number of staff members. It was during the early hours of the morning when I arrived back in Brisbane, and I would not know whether the figure of 19 is correct or not. However, I do know that since I have been the Minister for Primary Industries, I am called upon constantly and continuously by members opposite. They say that the job is an horrendous job; that the Minister for Primary Industries is handling too many things; that he should not have under his control the Water Resources Commission, the Queensland Forest Service, the Division of Fisheries and Wetlands and the other branches that the department is now handling quite capably. There is no question that my office has been built up to be a very effective, efficient and capable office. Despite the bleatings of the Opposition, it is providing a service to the Government and the people of Queensland.

Officers of my department have been available to answer the inquiries of those members of the Opposition who have enough sense to come to my office if they want clear and proper information. Of course, the problem with members of the Opposition is that they like to pick up little pieces here and there, such as my comment a few moments ago, and change them around. My comment was not about putting more people in the job, but adding to the number of people doing a particular job. Quite clearly, my ministerial office is working efficiently; it is working effectively and it will continue to do so.

**Mrs P. Jaenke**

**Mr LINGARD:** In directing my second question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I note that the Minister has an electorate research officer, Pam Jaenke, and I ask: who pays for the position? Does it come out of departmental funds? What does the occupant of this position do?

**Mr CASEY:** Many years ago, when I was the Leader of the Opposition and a member representing a provincial seat in Queensland, I found it very efficient to have integration between my Mackay office and my major Brisbane office. Of course, over the years, the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition, or the Deputy Leader of the National Party—whatever he is; I am not quite sure—has not been accustomed to that type of arrangement because he lives, works and operates in urban Brisbane. The fact of the matter is that Mrs Jaenke is part of my Brisbane office extension staff, and is a very capable and efficient person who does most of my north Queensland work for me. One important point about being Minister for Primary Industries that is not recognised very clearly by members of the National Party is that I must spend as much of my time as possible in the regional areas of this State, and I do so. I have no doubt that members will scrutinise ministerial travel arrangements when they come before the House, and they will find that I, as Minister for Primary Industries, probably spend more on travel than anybody else in the Ministry, and rightly so. It is the responsibility of this Government, and accepted by this Government, that in regard to Primary Industries matters, both the Minister and the Minister's staff must, on a regular basis, appear in regional areas and be available to people who live in those regional areas. I do not wander around from time to time in Gucci shoes at showgrounds, as does the Leader of the Opposition.

**Vocational Education and Training for Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders**

**Mr BREDHAUER:** I direct a question to the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations. Recognising that access to vocational education and training opportunities is a vital factor in improving employment prospects, and that this is the International Year of Indigenous People, I ask: what has the Goss Government done to improve vocational education and training opportunities for Queensland's Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders?

**Mr FOLEY:** The honourable member's commitment to the rights and welfare of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people is well known, as is his commitment to the International Year of Indigenous People. I can inform the House that the number of student contact hours provided to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students through TAFE facilities has increased from around one million in 1990 to 1.75 million in 1992. What that means in plain terms is that there has been an increase equivalent to 1 400 full-time students up to 2 400 full-time students since 1990. This represents an increase in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students taking advantage of the vocational education and training system in a way which I hope would be welcomed by all members of this House. This has been made possible through funding over the past three years of some \$28.8m of State Government funds for vocational education and training programs. This has included the establishment of centres in TAFE colleges for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, in particular the Centre for ATSI Studies opened at the Cairns TAFE and the School for ATSI Studies created at Kangaroo Point.

In addition to that, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander unit within TAFETE in my department continues to work on various curricula that are designed to meet the specific needs of Aboriginal and Islander communities. They include courses such as the Associate Diploma of Business for community council clerks and the Certificate of Tertiary Preparation (Justice Studies), which is designed to assist students preparing for entry into the Queensland Police Service. In addition to the provision of those services, there has been a significant commitment on the part of the Government to

capital works for the assistance of Aboriginal and Islander students in vocational education and training. That includes some \$500,000 annually for the operation of a TAFE centre on Thursday Island to service the Torres Strait. That centre was opened in April 1992 by my illustrious predecessor the honourable member for Nudgee, Mr Vaughan. Furthermore, some \$660,000 has been committed for three townhouses for TAFE teachers on Thursday Island.

Just the other day, I was very pleased and very honoured to be able to travel to the Cherbourg Aboriginal community to open a TAFE centre on that Aboriginal community which was made possible through the provision of Commonwealth funding and developed in close cooperation with the Cherbourg community. Again, having regard to the International Year of Indigenous People, the decision has been taken to establish a TAFE centre at Normanton. That was made possible as a result of the energetic efforts of the member for Cook and the member for Mount Isa. The Commonwealth will be providing some \$500,000, with the State paying some \$580,000. That will serve people, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, in the lower Gulf communities of Normanton, Karumba, Mornington Island, Burketown, Doomadgee and Croydon.

### Department of Primary Industries

**Mr PERRETT:** I direct a question to the Minister for Primary Industries. Following his bumbling answer about his electorate research officer, I refer the Minister to the public hearings conducted on 26 May 1992 by the all-party Public Accounts Committee, wherein senior management complained about a lack of clear direction in Government policy, and I ask: why did the Minister fail to act on that information? Does he agree that these concerns have resulted in the massive financial irregularities uncovered by the Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee?

**Mr CASEY:** As to the honourable member's further reference to my ministerial office member working in my electorate—I indicate clearly to him that she is kept very busy in north Queensland looking after all the inquiries that come in, especially from north Queensland electorates that are represented by National Party members who are totally ineffective. She is flat strap, as are my other ministerial departmental officers here in Brisbane who answer inquiries from south-east Queensland because of some of the real problems——

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I am having great difficulty hearing the Minister.

**Mr FitzGerald** interjected.

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

**Mr CASEY:** Many inquiries have been made from the electorate of a very lazy and incapable National Party member.

**An Opposition member:** Who?

**Mr CASEY:** The member should go and talk to them.

As to the second part of the honourable member's question—quite obviously, he was not listening or could not understand or comprehend my ministerial statement to this House earlier this morning, to which I refer him.

### Sale of Department of Primary Industries Research

**Mr PERRETT:** In directing a second question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to an article that appeared on 3 December 1992 in the respected newspaper *Queensland Country Life* reporting the private sale of research by a senior DPI officer, Mark O'Sullivan. The newspaper report makes it clear that the research has

been done at least in part using the facilities afforded Mr O'Sullivan by his Government position, and the contact number listed by *Queensland Country Life* is the Government-funded number assigned to Mr O'Sullivan's desk. I ask: how does the Minister define conflict of interest for a public servant? How does he justify the private sale of what is clearly State Government intellectual property?

**Mr CASEY:** In my previous answer, I referred to the honourable member's slowness in catching up with things. I note that his comments were in regard to an article in the *Queensland Country Life* of December 1992, which is six months ago. As he has not brought the matter to my attention previously and I am not an avid reader of *Queensland Country Life*—I do not think too many members of the ALP would buy it on a regular basis—let me say: if the honourable member would forward to me the article concerned and indicate his concern about it, I will make sure that under the various public service Acts the matter is inquired into.

#### **Mr M. Takumi**

**Mr DOLLIN:** In directing a question to the Treasurer, I refer to claims made yesterday in Federal Parliament by the Liberal MP for Moncrieff about activities of a Mr Masaru Takumi. I ask: can the Treasurer advise whether Mr Takumi purchased a unit on the Gold Coast and whether there is evidence of Mr Takumi laundering money at Jupiters Casino on the Gold Coast?

**Mr De LACY:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I am pleased that it was asked, because this morning's *Courier-Mail* contained a front-page story titled "Jupiters linked to gang". It quotes at length the member for Moncrieff, Mrs Kathy Sullivan. I am pleased to see that Mrs Sullivan has arrived back in the real world. We have not heard from her for three or four years. I am pleased to see that she is back on the job and is spending her electorate allowance wisely on research. On Saturday, she spent 90c to buy the *Courier-Mail* and then quoted at great length from that newspaper, and even acknowledged that. She stated—

"I am indebted to The Courier-Mail report by David Ross for most of the factual evidence, and it is straight factual evidence."

Whatever else she said when she stood up in Parliament was not factual; so it is true that whatever was factual obviously came from the *Courier-Mail*. I am pleased to see that, after three years' hibernation, she has not lost her faculties—she can read the newspaper.

Mrs Sullivan spoke about the laundering of huge sums of money in Australian casinos, including Jupiters on the Gold Coast. That is a pretty heavy allegation which is not borne out by any of the factual evidence that was included in David Ross' *Courier-Mail* story. I put it to honourable members that it is a great leap of faith to come to that conclusion from the evidence that she had. If Mrs Sullivan has any evidence, she ought to make that evidence available, because it flies in the face of all the other evidence that is available, not the least of which is the National Crime Authority's report last year, which stated that there was no evidence that casinos in Australia, including Jupiters, were being used to launder money. I do not have to draw the attention of members of this House to the fact that last year the CJC made some ill-considered comments about money laundering through Jupiters Casino. At least the CJC was good enough to apologise afterwards, when it had to admit that it had no evidence. My challenge to Mrs Sullivan is: if she has evidence, make it available. If she has not got evidence, do not stand up in the coward's castle in Canberra and make unsubstantiated claims—and if she does not have evidence, at least have the same decency that the CJC had, and apologise.

#### **Maryborough College of TAFE**

**Mr DOLLIN:** I direct a question to the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations. The Maryborough College of TAFE has been a leader in vocational education and training reform in Queensland since 1990. I ask: can the Minister advise the House of the latest advances in the college's role in advancing competency-based training?

**Mr FOLEY:** The Maryborough college has played a vital role in the development of competency-based training. I thank the honourable member whose interest in matters of employment and training for the residents of his electorate is well known and very well respected. The Maryborough college has been selected for the implementation of competency-based training in the State. What is competency-based training? In short, it is an approach to training designed to be an alternative to time-based training. It allows apprentices, trainees and students to progress, based on the skills that they master rather than on how long they may have spent training and studying. Those courses which will be run in the competency-based training mode, or the CBT mode as it is sometimes called, allow students using computer programs, handbooks and videos to train and study at their own pace at a time and a place which suits them. State and Commonwealth Governments, employers and trade unions have all expressed commitment to the implementation of competency-based training throughout the vocational and educational training system.

At Maryborough, apprentices in carpentry, fitting and machining, fabricating, and the electrical and motor trades have been studying under a CBT pilot since 1990. That college's success has made it the logical centre for furthering CBT throughout the State TAFE system and through business and industry. The State Government will invest \$195,000 and the Australian Automobile Industry Training Council a further \$20,000 to set up the centre at the college's city campus. That competency-based training centre at the TAFE college will be responsible for the training of TAFE staff in CBT teaching methods and assisting other TAFE colleges, group training companies and private training providers in introducing CBT. The commitment to the TAFE college at Maryborough is a plain recognition by the Government that centres of public expertise and excellence can and should be developed throughout regional Queensland. It reflects this Government's commitment to decentralisation in Queensland and to the proper development of regional Queensland.

#### **Electorate Research Officer**

**Mr HOBBS:** I refer the Minister for Primary Industries to the previous question about his electorate research officer, and I ask: is this person paid by his department?

**Mr CASEY:** As I have said, the person referred to before by honourable members opposite is a member of my ministerial staff. In common with all members of the ministerial staff, including the Opposition's staff members, quite clearly she is a public servant and she is paid by the taxpayers of Queensland. I have already given a clear answer to this question. She is part of my ministerial staff allocation. Incidentally, I have conducted a bit of a head count while I have been sitting here. I inform honourable members that there are not 19 staff, as suggested by Mr Lingard, but 13, including my driver. The important point is that my staff offer an effective and efficient operation, as is the case with the staff from other ministerial offices.

#### **Department of Primary Industries**

**Mr HOBBS:** I direct a question to the Minister for Primary Industries. If he accepts the responsibility for the administration of his department, as he said, I ask: how does he account for the deterioration of efficiency within that department since he became Minister as outlined in the Auditor-General's report, which states—

"In my long audit experience I have never encountered a more extensive series of discrepancies in the accounts of a public sector entity"?

**Mr CASEY:** Some 53 minutes ago, prior to question time, I made a ministerial statement that covered the matters referred to by the honourable member. However, it does take National Party members a little while to catch up.

#### **Jobs in Outer Metropolitan Areas**

**Mr BUDD:** I ask the Minister for Business, Industry and Regional Development: could he advise of Government moves to create jobs in outer metropolitan areas?

**Mr ELDER:** In his previous capacity and now as a member of Parliament, the honourable member has taken a very keen interest in job creation. That is what this Government is about as well. In the fast-growing areas around Brisbane, particularly in the corridors north and south, out to the bayside suburbs and west to Ipswich, it is important that the Government look at priming and assisting economic development. Most of the workers in those areas commute to work, and the challenge for the Government is to provide jobs in those areas. Consequently, my department has provided a series of grants totalling \$75,000 in the Logan and Redcliffe Cities and in the Pine Rivers and Redland Shires, and three separate grants have been made in Ipswich City, to assist in enhancing economic development growth in those areas.

The thread running through those grants is working with the local community and having them drive that particular project. For example, in the honourable member's electorate of Redlands, the Government has provided \$5,000 to the Bayside Community College which will enable business students—those doing the associate diploma courses that the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations mentioned earlier—to compile a database on business in the Redlands area. It will have two effects: firstly, it will provide a sound knowledge of the small businesses in the Redlands area; secondly, it will provide those students with the experience that they will need for the outside world by doing that actual training. The fact is that in those areas not enough is known about the small business community and networking within it. As I have moved around many of those areas, I have found that a lot of companies access their equipment from outside those areas—from Sydney or other parts of Queensland. If we can get those businesses networking and if we can provide the information that enables them to access the resources from businesses within their local community, then we will see money circulating within that area and job opportunities created. In particular, in the honourable member's electorate, job opportunities will be provided in the Redlands area.

In addition, we will be conducting a future search workshop in the bay islands that will focus attention on providing job opportunities for those who live in that area and who have limited access to those opportunities. Those are the types of initiatives that, as a Government, we should be involved in. They are the types of initiatives that will create job opportunities for people in the Redlands, Pine Rivers, Logan and Redcliffe areas.

#### **Availability of Molasses**

**Mr BUDD:** In directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries, I refer to concerns expressed by industry leaders regarding the non-availability of molasses, and I ask: what has the Minister done to overcome this crisis?

**Mr CASEY:** I thank the honourable member for a sensible question about a very real problem in Queensland—the drought. It is a problem which this Government has constantly moved to address. It is far more important than information about research officers; it is far more important than information about documents that have already been tabled in the Parliament and should have been read from cover to cover by all members. During recent weeks, because of demand, a shortage of molasses has occurred in the south-east and southern Queensland region. Molasses is a very important part of the drought stock food program. The demand has meant that supplies

have run out in Bundaberg. However, the Government has made arrangements to transfer 9 000 tonnes from Townsville to the Bundaberg region to restock the supply.

I assure the honourable member for Redlands and other interested members of Parliament—certainly not the Opposition members because they are not inclined to ask questions about this—that that 9 000 tonnes will arrive in Bundaberg by 20 May and will be available for distribution to the various areas, as has been the case until now. Members might be interested to know that the price will be approximately \$89 per tonne, which includes the freight component of \$30 per tonne to transport it and put it into place in Bundaberg. Because of this Government's work in subsidising transportation during the drought, \$15 of that amount will be met under the subsidy scheme, so it will cost approximately \$74 a tonne to people in Queensland. Approximately 11 000 tonnes are still left in Mackay, and this is being distributed at the rate of about 500 tonnes a week to major drought areas of central Queensland. That should last until the new crushing season commences. We have fresh molasses available for the next six months throughout the whole of Queensland. It is very important for people to know that that will occur. If Mackay runs short of molasses, it will be supplied from other areas.

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

## MATTER OF SPECIAL PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

### Department of Primary Industries

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I advise the House that I have received a proposal for debate pursuant to the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 5 November 1992. The proposal submitted by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition has been selected by me for debate and it relates to the following matter—

“The failure of the Minister for Primary Industries to efficiently administer his department at a time when rural Queensland is in crisis.”

I now call on the Deputy Leader of the Coalition to speak to the proposal.

**Mrs SHELDON** (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (4.01 p.m.): Mr Speaker—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! We will let everybody take a deep breath and when they do that, it will all be fine. Members who wish to have a conversation will please go outside.

**Mrs SHELDON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I rise today to speak of a situation which strikes at the very heart of government. I rise to speak of a situation which has highlighted the importance of good government, which is more than just a catchphrase. It is a phrase that can mean the difference between happiness and misery for every Queenslander. I rise today to speak about the Department of Primary Industries and its inability to provide basic services at a time when its services are needed more than ever. I know that members opposite, who have the smell of ministerial leather firmly entrenched in their nostrils, believe they are beings of great power and influence. I know they believe they are worthy of many accolades and the advantages of higher office because they are Ministers of the Crown and have thousands of employees and multimillion-dollar budgets. That is what they think, but they are wrong. The members opposite who sit on the Government's front bench are servants—servants of the people of Queensland who have been elected to their exalted position to provide the best in Government services for the money available.

Unfortunately, I am forced to rise today to speak about the Department of Primary Industries' Minister, Ed Casey, with whom over the last 11 days it has been my pleasure to be a member of a trade delegation. They were 11 very constructive days of hard work which culminated in a, shall we say, very interesting 38-hour flight back to Brisbane

from Singapore. But, as shadow Treasurer, I cannot ignore the problems that have been highlighted within three separate reports about the financial accountability of the Primary Industries Department—or, should I say, the manifest lack of financial accountability in the Minister's department. What is truly criminal about this lack of financial accountability is that while rural producers in Queensland—

**Mr Barton** interjected.

**Mrs SHELDON:**—are facing their bleakest time since white settlement, the department which should be looking after their interests, the department which should be striving to support our essential rural industry, and the department which should be providing a public service to its clients—the Primary Industries Department—is bogged down in a financial quagmire of its own making that is affecting its most basic of functions—the provision of services. I wonder at the actions of the Labor member at the back of the Chamber who said that I was joking when I said that this is the worst drought we have had in living memory. I hope that the rural constituents of Labor members take note of that comment.

Let us have a look at some of the financial mess that this department—one of the biggest in the Government—has got itself into, as detailed by the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor-General—

“The collections shown in the departmental ledgers were out of balance with the public accounts by a massive \$7.352 million;

The expenditures shown in the department ledgers were out of balance with the public accounts by some \$2.39 million;

Receipts recorded twice in the ledgers totalled \$640,000;

Salaries, wages and superannuation contributions not recorded at all in the ledgers totalled some \$1.31 million;

\$161,000, in a total of 180 cheques paid, was not identified in the department's ledger, and for which vouchers and other supporting documentation could not be produced to audit. In short, no-one knows what the money was spent on or where it went.”

If this is the department that is managing Government assistance for rural communities, then I hope that everyone in Queensland is praying for rain because only an act of God will save us from this mess. Is it any wonder that thousands of Queensland battlers who are struggling through the worst rural disaster in more than 100 years have lost all faith in this State Government? Is it any wonder that the Department of Primary Industries' reaction to the drought and the reaction of the Minister to this crisis has been inept, at best, and, at worst, criminal? The fact is that the people of rural Queensland are angry about the Government's inaction over the rural crisis and they now have the real target of their anger—the Minister responsible, Mr Ed Casey. As the Minister for Primary Industries, he is responsible for his department, and his department has failed in its basic duty to provide help and assistance to the primary producers of Queensland. This department's failures have been detailed graphically by two reports by Auditor-General Barry Rollason and a third by the Public Accounts Committee. In fact, Mr Rollason's audit of the department shocked even him and forced him to make the following incredible statement—

“In my long audit experience I have never encountered a more extensive series of discrepancies in the accounts of a public sector entity. The very fact that cheques drawn and moneys banked were not recorded in departmental ledgers while other items were receipted twice clearly demonstrates that there was a total collapse of managerial control in the department . . .”

I repeat, “a total collapse of managerial control in the department” and ask: what more damning comment could be made about a Minister of the Crown? After all, according to the Premier's own *Cabinet Handbook*, State Labor Government Ministers are the ultimate managers of the departments and hold ultimate responsibility for their

departments' action. In other words, the buck stops with Mr Casey—that is, if there are any bucks left in the DPI!

The rural producers of Queensland, if they had time, would have been concerned when they read the first report of the Auditor-General which made extensive comment and criticism of the Minister and his department. If they had then read the second report of the Auditor-General, which served as an even greater indictment of the Minister for Primary Industries' incompetence in running a major department, they would have been extremely concerned. Having read the third report by the parliamentary Public Accounts Committee, they would have reached the firm opinion, which I must share, that Mr Casey cannot control, direct or lead the administrative operations of his department.

Let us look at the department's financial checking function, one of the most standard check and balance systems within any business. The PAC report found that in the area of bank reconciliation there was, firstly, an absence of effective systems development methodology; secondly, a lack of quality management; thirdly, inadequate service/support/training; fourthly, a lack of skills, knowledge retention; fifthly, a lack of reporting flexibility; and, sixthly, the chart of accounts was too complex and inflexible. With one of the largest budgets of the Queensland Government, it is difficult to understand how the financial management and administration of the Department of Primary Industries could go so wrong. If a farmer or grazier was to run his affairs in the same way, I would expect even the most experienced would not be able to sustain his business for more than a year in the good times, let alone survive a prolonged drought. The man on the land is looking to the Minister for Primary Industries to assist him in this most severe of droughts. If the people on the land only knew just how this current Minister is not salvaging his own department's financial position, they would truly despair.

In general, the Auditor-General has this to say about the operations of the Department of Primary Industries—

"In view of this serious state of affairs, I qualified my certificate, and provided a disclaimer in my certificate to the departmental statement as I was unable to certify that the prescribed requirement in relation to the establishment and keeping of accounts had been complied with in all material respects and whether or not the departmental statements had been drawn up so as to fairly state the transactions of the department as at 30 June 1992."

These events and the statements made by the Auditor-General are unique in the history of any Government in Queensland. They are an indictment of this Minister and this Government which has badly let down its constituents in rural Queensland.

As I suggested earlier today, the Minister must take the blame for the removal of nearly 1 000 DPI staff, many of them experienced field officers, and the cuts in the budget of DPI. As one of the Minister's own senior managers stated to the PAC, the problems with the department were "largely selfimposed". It is time that the Minister for Primary Industries was shown up for the truly inefficient manager that he is, and for his failures in managing his own department, and the rural crisis which has crippled this State. Things must change before the Primary Industries Department collapses and rural Queensland loses all faith in this Government.

The Public Accounts Committee detailed recommendations which should be carried out immediately to begin to rectify the problems within the DPI. The recommendations referred to the areas of financial management systems, bank reconciliation processes, and the unexplained discrepancies in the DPI ledgers. Put simply, Mr Casey has not understood any of the events relating to financial management difficulties or, alternatively, he has not acted on the concerns raised with him during his department's process of change. As Minister, one of his roles is to establish a culture within the amalgamated former departments. He did not do this, either, and the new department has suffered as a result. His role as a Minister, like the role of all chief executive officers and senior managers, is to bring about an understanding within his department of what is required and how one must conduct himself within the

departmental framework. What the PAC found, however, was that the Minister's department threw out the baby with the bath water.

I refer to the ridiculous process of staff reductions which resulted in the exiting of the department's brains, trust and skill base through the offering of indiscriminate voluntary redundancy packages. So, instead of streamlining his department as he would have us believe, the Minister got rid of a huge percentage of his skilled and experienced staff and left inexperienced or ill-suited replacements who were overworked and totally incapable of dealing with any sort of problem, let alone a crisis of the magnitude currently facing the rural sector.

Time expired.

**Mr PITT** (Mulgrave) (4.12 p.m.): I rise today to speak to this matter of special public importance put forward by the Opposition. It never ceases to amaze me that the members of the Opposition have the great propensity to punish themselves by inviting a comparison on issues such as this. They seem to have a fixation with the portfolio of Primary Industries, and I can understand that. It was the sacred cow of the National Party. They would believe that they are the only ones who can successfully carry out the role of Primary Industries Minister. Today, they have attempted to denigrate probably the most successful Minister in the Goss Government. It is a difficult portfolio. He is handling this portfolio in an exemplary manner, following a couple of decades of mainly mediocre performances from those members on the opposite side of the House. As a matter of fact, Minister Casey has been a breath of fresh air to the Department of Primary Industries. He has put primary industries in a position to do well in the future, not just looking after today. He has taken on the restructuring and modernisation of what I believe has been a badly neglected string of primary industries in this State; industries that were geared for the British colonial market, pre-EEC days. They were not geared for new markets in the Asia/Pacific region, and elsewhere. This change has occurred only since the Goss Government has come onto the scene and Minister Casey has become the Minister for Primary Industries. He has succeeded in bringing about these changes, in spite of dogged resistance from the members of the Opposition who did nothing in Government and obviously have learned nothing in Opposition about how to run a department successfully. The Minister has a plan; he has a strategy; he has a practical and viable vision for the future.

The Goss Government is determined to take the Department of Primary Industries and primary industries in this State into the modern era. We no longer want to see them locked into sectional interest groups. We no longer want to see narrow-minded people with insular perspectives making decisions that were not based on fact or reality. No longer do we want to see people being subservient to electoral imperatives. That is what has occurred in this State. We had people involved in the Department of Primary Industries on the political side, who made sure that the bikkies came their way. They were not interested in the industry itself. As long as people had money in their pockets, they were happy.

This Minister and this Government are not frightened about taking the necessary steps. They are not frightened to take those hard decisions that this State depends so heavily upon to stand it in good stead for future years. There is no doubt that it is perceived by the members of the National Party that the primary industries sector was their power base. They gave in, therefore, to any particular push or shove from sectors within that industry. They were quick to react to change. They attempted to ensure that change did not occur because change meant pain; it meant actually doing a bit of thinking, some organising and some restructuring, in which they were not interested. They were quick to give in to the demands for short-term quick fixes, and those quick fixes were usually in the way of cash. I point out to members opposite that dollars alone are not enough. We have to make sure that the restructuring occurs. Nothing stands still; nor will primary industries. The days are long gone when Australia could ride, as it did, on the sheep's back, dig something out of the ground, or grow something and expect the world to come to us with an open chequebook and purchase those things.

We have to restructure our primary industries. If that is to be done and the Government is to fulfil its charter correctly, the department has to be restructured as well. Also, our efforts must be directed in different ways. No longer should we rely upon production as the main base. We should rely upon things such as marketing and making sure that what we are producing is going to be not only available but also desirable for consumption or trade elsewhere.

**Mr Littleproud:** In demand.

**Mr PITT:** That is right. I agree—in demand. I do not think that was occurring before. We had a department that fostered the view that, if production was increased, everything would be okay. That certainly was not good enough. This particular Government and this Minister are not blinkered by the farm gate mentality of its predecessors. Value adding for the Goss Government is not just a fancy catchphrase. Value adding is the way of the future. We can no longer just pass on our raw materials to others to turn them into products and sell them back to us at inflated prices.

Under the National Party Government, the Department of Primary Industries was trapped in a 1950s mind-set, not unlike the cold war. It might best be termed an agricultural cold war in which the producers themselves were basically at war with the rest of the world—traders, manufacturers or whatever. It is important that we realise that it becomes a partnership—a partnership between those who produce, those who refine or manufacture, and those who sell and those who consume. Only by making sure that the department is able to give the right advice, the right support and the right assistance to people in those respects will, I believe, it carry out its real charter.

Success is not measured in dollars spent; success is not measured by the number of people on one's payroll. Real success is measured in outcomes. The emphasis must be on research and efficiency. We must boost production by all means—yes, but only if there is a market for the goods we produce. I think over the last couple of decades there have been some pretty salient examples of people who have gone down the other track. I refer to the EEC and its mountains of butter; the United States, where farmers were paid not to grow corn because there was too much of it already; and Australia, where we have wool—wool to burn, as some would suggest. This is not smart thinking; this is not smart operation. If a Government is to be truly effective, it has to ensure that those in the industry are given the right information and the right support.

We must also flatten out the effects of the peaks and troughs of the supply and demand equation. We cannot afford to have boom and bust situations with primary industries. They have to be flattened out to the extent that we are able to produce to our maximum capacity but still on-sell those things to a hungry world or a world that requires our produce. The other aspect that the Minister has been very, very strong on is that of quality assurance. Quality assurance programs are keynotes of this particular Minister's portfolio. What has happened, of course, is that we have done away with the old system of regulation, of Primary Industries policemen who stood on every street corner and made sure that things were done in the right way. Mention has been made of the number of people who were working for the DPI. I suggest to members of the Opposition that a lot of people were put in very, very unproductive positions, standing there checking and rechecking people. The emphasis should be on quality. The onus should be on the producer to make sure that he puts that quality uppermost in his mind when he produces that particular product. If that is done, and if the people who buy that product can have faith and if the people who trade in that product can have faith, that person's product will be in great demand.

The other thing is Government involvement. Exactly what should the Government be involved in? It is my view that the Government should not go down the EEC track, which protects people through protectionism. I have nothing against protecting primary industry. When I say "protect", I mean protect against unfair practices. But protectionism is something different altogether. Protectionism means that inefficient practices are protected because someone does not want to take the hard decisions. I support Government support for private initiative. As we move into the next century,

quality, research, development, marketing and cooperation should be the buzz words of the Department of Primary Industries. If the agrarian socialists from the National Party had their way, we would go the way of the Soviet Union. We would just produce for production's sake. We would become as inefficient as it was.

I speak of the sugar industry, because I know that industry reasonably well. The sugar industry in Australia is the most efficient sugar industry in the world. It has not got that way by overprotection; it has got that way by getting out there and using what we have a lot of in Australia. We might not have the numbers and we might not have the consumers, but we have a lot of people with brains and skills prepared to take a punt and do the right thing. Our sugar industry is in a reasonably healthy state. I forget the doom and gloom forecasts of people from time to time. I have just come back from South East Asia and I now know full well that, in the short term, we have no immediate threat from other so-called big sugar-producing nations. We can always keep ahead of those people by doing the things that we are doing best. The Minister, rightly, is not protecting those people from outside; he is protecting them from themselves, making sure that they do not slump back into the old ways whereby a cheque at the end of the day was all that counted, and when the cheque ran out someone else had to come in and bail them out. That is just not on.

Time expired.

**Mr PERRETT** (Barambah) (4.22 p.m.) During the recess, the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts delivered a report which should have the Government, collectively, hanging its head in shame. The report on the Department of Primary Industries was a damning indictment of the so-called reforms that this Government has made in public administration. It is an indictment of the towering incompetence of the Goss Government. It is especially an indictment of the Minister for Primary Industries. He has presided over the destruction of his department as an effective unit of public administration. In his summary, the chairman of the committee pointed out that this was the first such report on a department since the committee was established five years ago. Another first for Labor! In light of the report, there is no doubt that the Minister has to go. He is responsible for what has happened. The PAC report made that point very clearly. It stated—

“The Minister for Primary Industries and the Director-General of the Department of Primary Industries share the responsibility for the department's accountability.”

Those words appear in the report. The Minister must resign to accept responsibility for the terminal decline of financial and administrative competence in his department. He has to go to accept responsibility for the disastrous decline in standards of service which have accompanied the gutting of the department. He must go if the Government is to have any shred of credibility in terms of the Westminster conventions of ministerial accountability.

Any leader of a Government which gave even lip-service to the conventions which have served the nation well could see no alternative to the resignation of the Minister for Primary Industries. That applies especially to a Premier who puts such high public store on his commitment to open, honest and accountable Government. Indeed, I believe that there is a strong case for the Premier to walk out of the Cabinet room with his disgraced Minister. The Minister has had the full support of the Premier and his Cabinet in carrying out some of the basic policies which have led to the demise of his department. How many times did the Premier hector previous Premiers about how they should take responsibility for the alleged misdoings of Ministers or public servants? The conventions relating to ministerial responsibility are basic to our democracy. Ministers rule their departments only as the delegates of the people, represented by the members of this Parliament. They are responsible to the people by answering to this Parliament for the administration of their departments. Where they have failed abjectly, Ministers have a duty to report that to Parliament and then to atone for their failure of public trust by resignation. As it was expressed last week in Canberra with respect to the inept

bungling of Senator Collins and Mr Beddall—one cannot have the red leather without accepting the responsibility.

We are not talking about minor problems here. We are talking about bungling and mismanagement on a massive scale. We are talking about the total failure of a vital department of State to perform to even an acceptable standard. The public sector in Queensland has been demoralised by purges, political re-education and severe budget constraints. But even by the general standards of this demoralised public sector, the Department of Primary Industries is a shambles, a laughing-stock. The department is a disgrace, the Minister is a disgrace and the Government is a disgrace for doing nothing about it.

What has been happening in the Department of Primary Industries should come as a shock to no-one. The parliamentary committee report is only the most recent review of the failure of the Goss Government to administer the department properly. That report comes on top of two adverse findings by the Auditor-General, an officer of this Parliament, whose warnings should have triggered urgent alarm bells in the Government. Of course, they did not, as we now know. The Government ignored what was happening in the Department of Primary Industries. The public servants, battling to bring order out of chaos, were left to fight alone. The report by the parliamentary committee makes it very clear where the blame lies—squarely on the shoulders of the Government.

The basic problems of the department stem from decisions taken by the Labor Party, both before it came to Government and after it got its hands on the levers. The root of this disaster is the silly idea of amalgamating the Departments of Primary Industries, Water Resources and Forestry, and then taking on the Boating and Fisheries Patrol. There is no logic to that sort of amalgamation, and there never can be. The new department was simply too big, with too many separate programs to try to administer. The results of that foolish course are detailed in the report of the parliamentary committee. How often in that report do we see reference to the strains caused by the amalgamation? How often in the report do we see reference to a lack of staff with the necessary skills to maintain a financially accountable system? How often in the report do we see reference to forced staff departures in the department? The Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts hit the nail on the head when he said—

“The difficulties experienced by the department due to amalgamation, the PSMC review and budget constraints are recognised by the Committee.”

The very essence of proper administration is financial accountability. The taxpayers of Queensland can have no confidence in a department that does not have a clue about what money is coming in or going out. However, that has been the situation at the DPI. There can be no proper budgeting in the situation prevailing at the DPI, and there can be no proper planning for the provision of services. Financial accountability is at the heart of proper administration, and it is here that the major flaws have been exposed. It is here that the parliamentary committee recommends that real control of the department be taken away from the incompetent hands of the Minister. Recommendation 2 boils down to the appointment of a regency to take over the department. It calls for a joint advisory team to take over the oversight of the department's finances. The team is to consist of nominees of the Under Treasurer and the Director-General of the Premier's Department. In other words, the committee has no confidence in the Minister; it wants the Premier and the Treasurer to take over. Perhaps the parliamentary committee has no confidence that the Premier will do the right thing and replace the Minister, who has failed his department so spectacularly. Perhaps it realises that the best it can do is to put another layer of controls over the department while, hopefully, things are sorted out. What is needed, of course, is the departure of the Minister as a first step. After that, a new Minister needs to be appointed, one with enough clout in Cabinet to obtain the proper resources to undo the mess.

We all know that Mr Goss had to appoint Tom Burns to bail the Minister out of trouble, and he has done it time and time again. Resources are at the heart of this problem, as the Government, the parliamentary committee and the public service all

know. With the decision taken to amalgamate, the Government then compounded its unforgivable mistake by ordering a purge in the new department. The Public Sector Union has complained that in the vicinity of 1 000 establishment positions have disappeared. Farmers have long realised that the bulk of those vanished positions have been in the service delivery areas. They are feeling the disastrous effects of that every day. We know, of course, that Labor's vendetta against the department extended to labour force reductions in the critical area of financial management. This occurred just at the time when the administration was hard-pressed trying to marry up three different accounting systems. Members of the Government knew about the problem of losing skilled administrators. It was long ago revealed at hearings of the Parliamentary Committee of Public Accounts. The problems were compounded even further when the academic administration theorists moved in on the department. Professor Coaldrake's Public Sector Management Commission caused even more disruption and even more diversion from the task of getting things in order. The people charged with administering the Department of Primary Industries have faced formidable odds. Considering that, they have done a far better job than the Government could expect. It is obvious that the result is not good enough. However, the blame does not lie with officers of the public service—the people whom the Government now tries to implicate—it lies squarely with the Government which made the critical decisions, such as the one to amalgamate, and with the Minister who did not take the fight for resources to Cabinet.

We should be very clear on what this report is: it is not based on material leaked by a disgruntled public servant to the media; it is not something prepared by the Opposition to embarrass the Government; it is not some picky document prepared by an accountant obsessed with the rule book; this report has been prepared by an all-party committee of this Parliament. It is the document of a committee with a Labor Chairman, who was hand-picked by the Premier. It is the document of a committee with a Labor majority. Even the Minister's peers within his own party have found his administration wanting. The committee has now said what I have been saying and what other members of the Opposition have been saying since the first report by the Auditor-General. For at least the past two years, the Department of Primary Industries has been a shambles. It has been such a mess that the Minister should have known about it. Far from being cleaned up, the mess continues. The Minister has done little or nothing. It is time he went. It is time that the Government installed a new Minister with the resources to clean things up and a brief to do just that. It is time the public servants in the Department of Primary Industries got a proper leader.

Time expired.

**Mrs BIRD** (Whitsunday) (4.32 p.m.): I rise with pleasure to speak to this motion, although my pleasure is tinged with a certain amount of sadness. I have known Edmund Casey for 20 years. I know of Edmund's energy, I know of his sincerity and I know of his commitment to people in rural communities. It then comes as a shock to have someone such as the Deputy Leader of the Coalition stand up and make a speech that she has not written, saying words that she does not understand about people who she has obviously never met and about communities that she is never likely to visit. One would think that a matter such as this would be of great importance to those members who represent country electorates. One wonders why neither the member for Warrego nor the member for Gregory were present while the Deputy Leader of the Coalition was speaking. Further, one wonders why the members for Lockyer, Beaudesert, Burdekin, Tablelands, Warwick, Gympie, Toowoomba South, Burdekin, Callide, Mirani and Hinchinbrook are not in this place listening to the debate and at least trying to understand the situation of people in rural communities. They simply do not care. My advice to the Deputy Leader of the Coalition is to get a copy of the Public Accounts Committee report and read it—read the recommendations in context and not make selective quotes to suit her purposes.

The topic of this debate is directed specifically and personally at the Minister. It is a hopeless misrepresentation of the Minister's achievements over the last three years. Edmond Casey is a Minister who works towards future achievements for Queensland's

primary industries. He is not one of those people who looks continually in the rear-view mirror or watches the world go by. After decades of serious neglect, his achievements have been outstanding in providing rural industry with a good future. They have been outstanding in bringing about major restructuring and modernisation of key industries that will stand Queensland in good stead in years to come. More importantly, this work was carried out in close consultation with rural producers and the leaders of rural industry organisations who have supported them. Given the need for reorganisation in the structures of Government and the universal problem of selling any program of change, it has not been without difficulty. The greatest difficulty has been the sorry, sickly legacy left by previous National Party Governments. During the decades when major markets, notably the British market, were lost and promising new markets, notably in our own Asia/Pacific region, came on stream, very, very, little was done. There was no aggressive marketing on behalf of Queensland producers and no reorganisation to adjust to the need to pursue markets and compete for them fiercely. Opposition members, who when they were in Government had failed to prepare the State for change, now fail in Opposition to support change in the interests of progress for all Queenslanders. They continue to gaze into the past—looking in those rear-vision mirrors.

The outstanding example of reconstruction that has gone well and done well for Queensland is in the sugar industry, which was made possible by the Sugar Industry Act of 1991. All sectors of the sugar industry are now in expansion mode. The industry has never been better placed to capitalise on increased world prices for sugar. Fettered as the industry was by the red tape that existed under the old National Party regime, those opportunities would never have been able to be taken up. There is now an air of optimism in the industry, and the industry has control over its own future. Decision making is in the hands of the industry, and those decisions are being made in the mill areas.

A major result of the reform of the sugar industry was the expansion of land under cultivation. That allowed for expansion of production and culminated in an outstanding season in 1992. This Minister recognised that, although the efficiency of the Queensland sugar industry is indisputable, it cannot afford to be complacent. In 1991, with the support of the Sugar Policy Council, Mr Casey announced a 5.5 per cent expansion of assignments in 1992. The industry's positive response was mirrored by the demand for increased assignments that outstripped supply by 10 000 hectares. Sugar, as with any other industry, has been dealt a heavy blow by drought. It is interesting to note that yesterday in this place, the Opposition bemoaned the lack of question time in which to ask important questions about the drought. However, today, not one Opposition member mentioned the word "drought". Not one Opposition member rose in this place and asked a question about the drought, nor did any Opposition member ask for any information about the drought.

**Mr Hobbs:** Be reasonable.

**Mrs BIRD:** The totally awesome member for Warrego wants me to be reasonable. Yesterday, the Opposition complained; today, it did not deliver. The Queensland Government has set up, as a direct result of the work of this Minister, a support network designed to——

**An Opposition member** interjected.

**Mrs BIRD:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I am insulted by what the member has just said. I ask him to withdraw it.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Power): Order! I did not hear anything. The member will continue.

**Mrs BIRD:** The Queensland Government has set up, as a direct result of the work of this Minister, a support network designed to help rural families cope with the many problems of drought. These support people can help primary producers with technical, financial and social matters. State Cabinet approved the spending of \$400,000 to

implement a social support strategy for farming families in drought-affected areas for a six-month period. The role of the community agency will be to provide a multipurpose service involving the components of direct material assistance, support counselling, information and referral. As well, they will assist their communities in the development of other strategies to strengthen their capacity to deal with the social effects of drought, including ongoing links with families and the range of other existing community support agencies.

Ed Casey knows the sugar industry and the people in it. Together with them, he devised the terms of the restructure and modernisation, put it into operation, and has already seen it produce results. He is looking to a good future for Queensland, not looking back to days when State-managed industries relied on State-managed marketing, with little room for enterprising producers to move.

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Gregory will cease interjecting.

**Mrs BIRD:** The sugar package agreed on at the beginning of this year between the Commonwealth Government and the Goss Government under this Minister sets the pace for years to come. The Federal/State sugar package includes a freeze on tariffs at \$55 a tonne for a minimum of four seasons, support for infrastructure investment, with combined Commonwealth/State funding of \$40m, retention of the single desk selling arrangements and modification to price pooling.

Recently, Mr Casey received high praise from canegrowers in my region when he released his department's report on the feasibility study into the development of the Teemburra Creek Dam project.

**Mr Johnson** interjected.

**Mrs BIRD:** My family are farmers.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Gregory will not disrupt the Chamber. If he wanted to speak during this debate, he should have had his name placed on the list of speakers. He will now listen to the member for Whitsunday in silence.

**Mrs BIRD:** As I was saying, Ed Casey released his department's report on the feasibility study into the development of the Teemburra Creek Dam project in my electorate. Water from that dam would be used to meet some of the urban, industrial and rural needs of the Pioneer Valley. The summary and conclusions of the report were most favourable, and indicate that for a total capital cost of \$59.3m, which includes \$14.7m for reticulation works, in excess of \$51.3m of annual income from raw sugar and bagasse pulp would be generated. While this project is shown to be economically viable, it becomes far more attractive with the proposed bagasse pulp plant.

Sugar led the way with restructuring and modernisation of the whole rural industry. It suffered through drought and adverse international market circumstances, but has been to a high degree not quite so hard hit. Its success stands for what the Minister for Primary Industries has achieved for the future. It is the model for what the future holds for other industries. Restructuring and modernisation have been well under way in other areas.

Time expired.

**Mr HOBBS** (Warrego) (4.42 p.m.): The topic of this debate—"The failure of the Minister for Primary Industries to efficiently administer his department at a time when rural Queensland is in crisis"—is regrettable but necessary. The demands on Government are great. I sympathise with members opposite who must weigh up the competing demands of various sections of the community against the resources available. Good government is all about deciding where the priorities lie in pursuing the long-term interests of Queensland. Today's debate deals with a priority of the highest order, for the drought and wool crisis affects not only the sustainability of our primary industries, producers and families but also the survival of rural towns, businesses and

employees. It affects the level of Government services provided to shrinking communities, such as education, police and emergency services and health, which are readily available in the cities, and it affects the economic base of this State, which has repercussions for the standard of living of every Queenslander.

Much has been said and written in recent weeks about the drought and the wool crisis, and I commend the efforts of the media in general for their attention to this grave problem. I would like to emphasise, however, that the problem did not arrive overnight. It has been building up to crisis proportions for some 12 to 18 months, and neither will it suddenly subside, even if we are blessed with a deluge of rain tomorrow. On many occasions in this House I have spoken of this impending rural debacle. For those of us close to the industry, the position in which we find ourselves today was inevitable. Now, however, is not the time for point scoring or to harbour ancient political hang-ups. Now is the time to extend the hand of understanding and compassion.

The implications to Government are profound. Without properly targeted and significant assistance now, the wool industry will not survive the next two years. No matter what the weather holds, if 40 per cent of producers are forced to leave their properties, if two million sheep die for want of feed, and if rural towns collapse for want of business and employment, it will take literally generations to replace the wipe-out of enormous personal and financial investment. Over the past couple of years, crippling debts have doubled during poor seasonal and market conditions which have substantially lowered asset values and made it impossible for any wool grower to go forward. For every kilo of wool sold at auction, a grower is \$2 out of pocket.

Both the State and Federal Governments have made much of their drought and wool assistance packages. Both Governments have made the same basic mistake by merely extending the schemes they already have in place, which have failed to help the majority of growers who cannot qualify because they are not deemed to be viable. When the wool price is so far below the cost of production, who would be viable? Wool is presently selling for about \$380 to \$400 a bale net. The cost of production without debt is \$600 a bale. Therefore, for each bale of wool produced, the grower will lose approximately \$200.

A lot more could have been done by the Minister to pursue the needs of rural Queensland, particularly for assistance from Canberra—a clear breakdown in administrative responsibility. Very few producers who have previously been knocked back on Rural Adjustment Scheme funds will get any relief from the extended RAS measures outlined in the Government's package. Once again, 40 per cent of producers in drought areas are left to fend for themselves in a daily battle against foreclosure. The Deputy Premier turned the only true initiative of the State drought package into a humiliating PR exercise when the rural shire councils were called up like kids in a school parade to accept cheques from the whip-yielding headmaster. This initiative did nothing to assist the massive problem of ratepayers unable to meet the shire rates. This initiative did nothing to address the future debt problems of the councils that will not be able to continue subsidising employment and propping up towns. This initiative did nothing for land-holders facing land tax and rental increases from the same Government.

A major omission from the State drought package which could have done so much to provide immediate practical relief for the State's livestock producers was freight subsidies for the forward transport of stock to agistment. It seems that the State Government has an ideological block on this issue. This is no time for blocks of any sort. While the Government delays, our breeding herds and flocks are dying. Our transport operators are going out of business and the export earning potential of a once great industry is crumbling around the feet of a Government with a huge chip on its shoulder. A realistic agistment freight package must be implemented urgently to provide assistance for all stock owners. It must include all livestock, those that come from viable enterprises as well as the battlers who need and should be able to keep their stock alive. In addition to forward movement State subsidies, a relaxation of the hike in land rentals and land tax should be made. Because of continuing drought, the Government of New

South Wales has halved property rentals in the west of the State. Rentals will be frozen at the reduced rate for four years.

There are a number of other specific measures which the Government and the Minister could move on to alleviate the widespread distress in rural areas. The Government should be exercising what little power it has on its Federal colleagues to proclaim this drought as a natural disaster, which would allow more producers to better carry on and obtain restocking financial assistance to assure their long-term viability. In living memory, there has never been a combined drought, finance and commodity collapse catastrophe such as this. Never before has a drought struck so many rural industries—grain, wool, beef, dairy, cotton.

Our living rooms are privy to nightly scenes of dry, dusty plains and fly-blown carcasses, and farmers walking off into the sunset. Forty-three per cent of the State is officially drought declared, yet still our Governments hesitate to call it a natural disaster. What does it take to move them? Their inertia in the face of such an obvious calamity is like that of a kangaroo transfixed in the glare of approaching headlights. Why does the Government hesitate? What more heartbreak does it want? The industry desperately needs room to move to restructure by amalgamating small land-holdings into greater, more viable areas. Farmers need a well-resourced land bank program such as exists in Western Australia where land-holders who are marginal can get out with dignity and their properties can be built into larger viable enterprises.

The Government is also presiding over a discriminatory stamp duties exemption scheme. If a producer is fortunate enough to have secured RAS funding to help refinance borrowings, that producer can claim stamp duties exemption. However, those producers who cannot get RAS because they are deemed not to be viable according to the current code book, but still manage to refinance with their banks, cannot get stamp duties exemption. The Deputy Premier is fond of portraying himself as a Messiah to the Aussie battler. This is at odds with the Government's policy on stamp duties which penalises the producers who need assistance most and who are doing it on their own without RAS assistance.

Another way to help keep millions of livestock alive throughout this ordeal would be to recognise the importance of diesel fuel to the day-to-day operations of pushing mulga, which is a renewable resource, to feed stock. In country Queensland, we have the biggest haystack in the world and we cannot use it. A diesel subsidy would help livestock stave off starvation and enable sufficient livestock numbers to survive the drought so that properties could return quickly to the required productivity. I referred earlier to the need to take a long-term view once the drought breaks and there is an improvement in commodity prices. The industry must be in a position to make the most of it, not wandering around for years trying to rebuild what was lost.

The Federal Government has announced a review committee to report on the future structure and marketing of the wool industry. This is an essential element from a long-term viewpoint which will entail advising on significant issues such as the wool stockpile, value-adding, future demand and marketing structure. While I applaud the need for such a review in the hope that it will restore sustainability and confidence to the wool industry, I fear greatly for any industry placed in the hands of the grand master of economic rationalism, Professor Ross Garnaut. While he may be a theoretically brilliant man and a good former Ambassador to China, even Bob Hawke balked at committing Australia to Garnaut's plans for zero tariffs by the year 2000 and the abolition of anti-dumping measures. The Deputy Premier has made it very plain that he has no time for theoretical economic rationalists. How, then, can he and the Minister for Primary Industries sit by and watch the future of a giant Queensland industry being placed in the hands of the most committed economic rationalists of them all? I said at the beginning that good government is about deciding where the priorities lie for the future prosperity of Queensland. The importance of the wool industry to Queensland demands that it be given the highest priority. Great government is about taking the hard decisions, the brave decisions—not hesitating or being hindered by emotional or political baggage.

Time expired.

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (4.52 p.m.): The text of the subject matter put forward by the Opposition endeavours to talk about accountability, so let us look at what the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee report stated about ministerial accountability. It stated—

“The Minister for Primary Industries and the Director-General of the Department of Primary Industries share the responsibility for the department’s accountability.”

I accepted that principle today during question time. The report continues—

“This duty could not be fulfilled because neither the Minister nor the Director-General were formally or promptly advised of the state of affairs within the Department.”

That is the finding of this Parliament’s committee. It continues—

“The Minister learned of the nature and extent of the problems when the Auditor-General’s Reports were tabled.”

I can assure the House that when that occurred, it nearly blew the roof off my department.

I want to stress to members that, on reading the rest of the report, they will find that no funds are missing and no funds were lost. There was no misappropriation, or anything of that nature. The Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee acknowledges the positive steps that have been taken since that period. The period referred to by the Auditor-General was back in the first stages of the 1991-92 financial year—that first six-month period. Since that time, a lot of water has flowed under the bridge and a lot of things have happened. Those bodies are saying that the work has improved, that there has been some reconciliation of the statements, and an external audit committee has been established. All those things that I have mentioned are in place, and I reported that to the Parliament this morning—the first occasion on which I have been able to do so since the PAC report was tabled. This debate is an endeavour by the Opposition to try to be selective, as they so often are, and say, “This is the succession of terrible things that have happened!”

Let us consider where the Department of Primary Industries in Queensland has come from, the state that it was in, and the property that the DPI had when the Labor Government came to office. I am absolutely amazed that today’s debate was led by the Leader of the Liberal Party, not by the Leader of the Opposition, who recently returned from a trip to western Queensland where he was supposedly rediscovered, not by some of the major spokesmen for rural affairs but by the Leader of the Liberal Party. I guess she certainly is one of the Opposition’s management team. I suppose one could also say that she is the northern member of the Opposition’s management team—that is, if one is a “real” Queenslander who accepts that Caloundra is part of the north.

What was the position of the DPI when this Government attained office in 1989? We found a department that for decades had been politically manipulated by the vested interests of the National Party in Queensland. We found a lack of long-term vision; we found a consistent pattern of overspending of the budget. The National Party Government thought that, rather than debate the issue, the best way to get out of that was to vote itself some more money and throw it in. The National Party would fix it. National Party Ministers were not prepared to even talk with the Commonwealth. However, those former Ministers now say that the Government is not doing enough to get drought aid from the Commonwealth. Ex-Minister Harper did not allow communications between people in his department and the Commonwealth Government. What a disgrace! In 1985, former Premier Bjelke-Petersen instructed former Minister Turner—he is not here, so he cannot deny it—not to talk with the

Commonwealth in relation to sugar issues. I might add that the department had not been reviewed since 1945 postwar reconstruction.

This Government had the PSMC look at the department and all of its 32 branches, and it was found that efforts were being duplicated as it continued to follow its supposed management program. Earlier this afternoon, I answered questions in relation to many of those 160 recommendations that clearly displayed that there was a lack of decision making on key issues; poor organisational structure; excessive levels of middle management; a centralised administration; a lack of strategic direction; and decision making and resource allocation were being held back. It was a shame that the National Party supported centralisation rather than looking to the bush.

This Government was faced with the major problem that had been created by previous Governments. We were faced with the major task of cleaning up the mess—and what a mess it was! We have cleaned up that mess; there is no question about it. No-one could deny that we have brought together the people working in Water Resources, the Forest Service and in the Boating and Fisheries Patrol to create an efficient management team leading an effective department. We have shaken out the cobwebs and we have used the skills base. We have used it to specialise in natural resource management to a far greater extent than has any other State Government. We have introduced better irrigation management. We have improved the coordination of the department. The taxpayers of Queensland are now getting value for money so far as the department is concerned.

What have been the benefits? An integrated catchment management program has been introduced. Again, we are way out ahead of the other States. Even the Commonwealth is very impressed by what the Government is doing in this field and is now trying to encourage the other States to follow suit. We have looked at future development; we have looked at the drought; and we have formulated a drought policy that was accepted nationally—including Liberal/National Party Governments such as New South Wales—as the best way to go. We have taken the DPI back to the bush.

**Mr Lingard** interjected.

**Mr CASEY:** Yes; we have sent DPI workers to the bush where they can work effectively with farmers instead of where the honourable member's party had them—in south-east Queensland.

**Mr LINGARD:** I rise to a point of order. There are 70 people who have received their redundancy notices.

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

**Mr CASEY:** That is typical of members of the National Party. No wonder the honourable member is not one of the National Party leadership team trying to dominate this debate. On these matters, he is the biggest dill in the House. All of these changes mean that we have a more effective and modern Department of Primary Industries. We have revised the legislative program, particularly as it relates to the sugar industry. Despite opposition from National Party politicians at the time—not from the industry because we negotiated with it—people can go anywhere in Queensland in the sugar belt—which supports our main agricultural industry—and they will hear people say that the Sugar Industry Act of 1991 was the best thing that ever happened to the industry.

The grain industry has been totally restructured. We did away with four old statutory authorities and six Acts to bring them together as one. The dairy industry and

the beef industry—the major industries of this State—are being restructured. They are positive achievements of the Goss Labor Government in Queensland. What did the National Party do? Members of the National Party did what they are doing today; they just sit on their backsides and whinge about things. That is all they have ever done for Queensland. They believe that it is possible to get things done through the Government as long as a person at the local National Party branch meeting whinges long enough and loud enough. That is the way they formulated their drought policy. Let me take a look at drought policy.

This Government has implemented measures that were never even discussed let alone tried by National Party Governments in this State for the simple reason that those Governments were not prepared to sit down with the industry and negotiate—unlike this Government. Matters have been negotiated at a very high level indeed by this Government, and this Government is responsible for changing all the things I have mentioned. For example, the Drought Industry Working Party is a positive initiative of this Government. Earlier today, the Treasurer reported that \$19.5m has been spent on drought relief.

I acknowledge that there have been difficulties associated with the administration of the Department of Primary Industries. Unlike previous National Party Governments, this Government is doing something about it. Previous National/Liberal Party Governments just stuck their heads in the sand. Unfortunately, Governments that adopt that approach expose themselves in another direction, and that is another problem. This Government has taken to them in that other direction to show the people of this State how badly they were governed by those former National Party Governments and former Liberal/National Governments in this State. This Government has taken those steps in the rural sector, which is supposedly the heartland of members of the Opposition and the place where they believe they have control. Once again, the situation is that we are the people to whom rural Queenslanders have come to get good government.

Time expired.

## **RACING AND BETTING AMENDMENT BILL**

### **Second Reading**

Debate resumed from 11 May (see p. 2617).

**Mr VAUGHAN** (Nudgee) (5.02 p.m.): As the Minister indicated in his second-reading speech, the purpose of this Bill is to amend the Racing and Betting Act to remove impediments to the effective prosecution of unlawful bookmakers. Unfortunately, even though there has always been provision for substantial fines for unlawful bookmaking, it has continued to flourish because, in the main, those who have been caught doing so have been able to avoid paying the fines that have been imposed upon them. For example, according to the recently released second report of the Auditor-General on audits performed for 1991-92, as at 30 June 1992 outstanding fines for unlawful bookmaking and certain other offences under section 218 of the Racing and Betting Act 1980 totalled \$900,380. This amount represented fines imposed on a total of 46 offenders. The report indicates that of this amount, \$806,118, or almost 90 per cent of the total fines outstanding, is in respect of 39 offenders, and that it is doubtful if the amount outstanding will be recovered.

The report points out that under the provisions of section 218A of the present Act, the only avenue available for the recovery of outstanding fines from offenders who default on the payment of such penalties, is by way of civil proceedings which,

according to experience to date, is both costly and largely ineffective. The Queensland Police Service annual reports show that racing and betting offences in the State have fallen from 262 in 1988-89 to two in 1991-92, and that convictions for illegal bookmaking have gone from 17 in 1988-89 to one in 1990-91. One can only presume that this is because of the costs involved in prosecuting offenders and the inability to recover fines imposed. The records show that in the three years up to the change of Government in December 1989, fines received from persons convicted of betting offences amounted to approximately \$63,000. In 1990-91, the amount recovered was \$46,215. In 1991-92, \$21,000 was recovered, and, since June last year, \$6,665 has been recovered. I understand that the reason why there has been a reduction in the amounts recovered annually since 1990-91 is that the easiest collection cases have been dealt with first and the harder cases remain.

The racing industry is a valuable industry to this State. Since 1988-89, revenue received by the Government from the TAB has increased by \$24m to \$78m. In 1992, total turnover from gallops, harness racing and greyhounds amounted to over \$1 billion. There is a huge investment in race tracks, horses and equipment. Thousands of people are involved in the industry and earn their livelihood from it. Unlawful bookmaking, which is estimated to involve in excess of \$200m annually, is a parasite on the industry. It benefits from the industry, but gives nothing back to the industry. If those involved are not deterred by the size of the penalties prescribed, if they are able to avoid paying fines that are imposed when they are caught, then the imposition of an unavoidable penalty must be prescribed. Since 1981, the penalty for illegal bookmaking has ranged from a minimum of \$15,000 to a maximum of \$20,000 for a first offence to a minimum of \$30,000 to a maximum of \$50,000 for a third and subsequent offence. This is currently the state of affairs. However, where a judge is satisfied in a particular case that there are special circumstances, a penalty less than the minimum may be imposed.

If a fine is not paid—and, as I have already shown, most are not—then it may be pursued as if it was a civil debt. Unfortunately, this does not seem to worry those involved as, in common with so many others in our society, they have devised ways to avoid meeting their commitments. It is interesting to note that the Minister who introduced the existing penalties in 1981 said he believed that the prospect of incurring a substantial monetary penalty would prove to be a sufficient deterrent for those who were flouting the betting laws of the State. Although there had been provision for prison sentences since 1954, they were not included in 1981. In 1954, the penalties for illegal bookmaking ranged from \$300 to \$400 for a first offence to \$1,000 to \$1,500, plus 28 days' to 6 months' imprisonment. In April 1980, legislation brought before this House increased penalties to \$10,000 or one year's imprisonment for a first offence to \$50,000 or three years' imprisonment, or both, for a third or subsequent offence. However, that legislation was never proclaimed and for some reason or other those penalties were superseded in April 1981 by the existing penalties which, as I have pointed out, do not provide for imprisonment.

The penalties prescribed by this Bill do provide for imprisonment of from three to six months for a first offence where a convicted person fails to pay the monetary penalty imposed. A person convicted of a third or subsequent offence faces a term of imprisonment of up to five years if the monetary penalty is not paid. In accordance with other provisions contained in the Bill, the terms of imprisonment imposed must be served in full in prison. The Bill prohibits the court from making an order that would result in the person not serving the sentence in prison—there are no alternatives to imprisonment if the fine is not paid. The increase in monetary penalties plus the imprisonment provisions will certainly make those people who have been flouting the system stop and think. For the information of the House, I would point out that penalties in every other State and the Northern Territory include imprisonment provisions. Illegal bookmaking is denying the racing industry in this State millions of dollars. As I said before, the people involved are parasites on the industry and it is about time they were tackled head on. While substantial fines were introduced in 1981, they alone have

proved not to be a deterrent to the smart operators. It now remains to be seen if these people consider it is worth risking a term of imprisonment. I support the Bill.

**Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory) (5.09 p.m.): I rise in this debate today very briefly. Firstly, I think a lot of people in this House tend to think that Oppositions are here to knock Governments. Sometimes we do. We will knock a situation if we do not agree with it. We have got them going; it does not take long to get them going. Firstly, I congratulate the Minister and his department on the very successful Triad meetings we have just witnessed in the central west in my electorate of Gregory, with the Blackall, Longreach and Barcaldine centres benefiting from this concept. It has been a very successful concept and it is great to see that the size of the fields at those meetings was beneficial to racing in general, and I hope in the future that we will see this as an ongoing event and that the funding will be ongoing as well. I hope we will see our fair share of the substantial funding that comes from the TAB going into racing in the central west.

There is one thing I am a little hesitant about, and that is the Racing Development Fund clubs that benefit from that distribution. Whether there is 10 per cent growth or 10 per cent discount in the TAB funding, the onus is wholly and solely on the Minister to see whether or not we have funding for the clubs that are not TAB funded. It is entirely left to the Minister's discretion to see whether these clubs are ongoing or not. As we have heard in the earlier debate, the drought has affected racing in the central west at this time. I think that the honourable member for Nudgee mentioned what a valuable industry racing is to Queensland. I have just conferred with my colleague the member for Southport, and we agree that it is approximately the fourth most important industry in this State. It is absolutely paramount that racing in the bush as well as racing in the metropolitan and provincial areas be patronised by not only the people who go to the races but also Governments, the principal clubs and other people.

The one thing I wish to make reference to tonight is not so much the bookmakers but the TAB. When I refer to the TAB, no doubt the Minister would be well aware of the dilemma facing some of the people in the west at the moment, namely those at Alpha, Springsure and Aramac where small TABs will be closed and incorporated into the PubTAB concept. I know that in the larger centres the PubTAB concept works, and it works well. It is something that the small centres have been accustomed to for a long time. We have a lot of elderly people in those centres who are not accustomed to going into hotels. That is something I ask the Minister—

**A Government member:** Rubbish!

**Mr JOHNSON:** I heard somebody say "Rubbish!" over there. I do not know where it came from.

**Mr FitzGerald:** You are a little bit shy yourself sometimes.

**Mr JOHNSON:** I am a shy person, but I will tell the honourable member that when it comes to sticking up for the people in my electorate, I will fight hammer and tongs for them, and in this instance that is what we are talking about. The people in the little centres such as Alpha, Springsure and Aramac are suffering now one of the worst droughts, as members have been told here tonight, in white man's history. It is something for which we must show a little consideration and compassion.

**Mr Dollin** interjected.

**Mr JOHNSON:** As the member for Maryborough is an old bushie himself, he ought to know, but he does not show any compassion at all. However, returning to the Racing and Betting Amendment Bill—I make the point that these people are just as entitled to their bet on Saturday as are the people at the larger metropolitan courses, or those who have access to the big metropolitan TABs.

Reference was made to the bookmakers. They play a very important part in racing in western Queensland. When I think back to the time when I was a child, I think of the great Charlie Moxsome, who was a legend in western bookmaking and probably one of

the legends of the west as far as racing goes. In Charleville, there is Rod Kinivan; in the central west there is Wacka Jackson and Popeye Saunders. All these fellows are great racing identities. They are the colourful figures who keep racing going in those centres. The bookmakers who field there are part of the attraction of racing. Western racing is alive and well, provided they are given the service that they need to keep that racing going, and that is Government support. Earlier, the honourable member for Nudgee said what a valuable industry racing is in this State. As to the Racing Development Fund—I hope and pray that the smaller clubs in the bush will not just be paid lip-service and that they will continue to progress and provide the social outings that they have provided for 100 years or more.

This afternoon, in answer to a question, the Minister mentioned the 48 per cent increase in the number of QTTC centres throughout the State, which is very good. However, at the same time, he mentioned the Matilda Highway concept. It might be thought that I am getting away from the subject of racing, but I am touching on something that is relevant to tourism in my area. People come to the west not only to see different tourist attractions but also to see the racing and other venues. This Government is taking away another service, namely, the Midlander service from Longreach to Winton. As of November this year, that service will be terminated. The people of Winton, another big centre, have been sold out. It has a lot of good, solid racing people. The Combo Waterhole is one of the area's tourist attractions. The Government is trying to promote tourism and all of the other aspects of Mr Gibbs' portfolio, but the people of that area have been sold out. Some 68 per cent of the people who utilise the Midlander service to the central west are aged people—people who have paid their taxes and done their honest day's work. Now they will be penalised because that service will be terminated. I do congratulate the Government on the new concept of the Spirit of the Outback. However, this new service will arrive in Longreach at night and depart in the morning and people will have to wait for two or three days before they are able to catch the next train out.

**Mr Beattie:** Oh, come on!

**Mr JOHNSON:** That is the truth. I will take the interjection from the member for Brisbane Central. If he had gone to Winton about a month ago when the people from Queensland Rail went out there and told the people of the central west exactly what they were in for, he would have been on my side at that time. This Government has sold those people out.

I return now to the subject of racing. I urge the Minister to make sure that he keeps his eye on what is happening in racing in the central west and make sure that those smaller clubs are not left to perish on the vine and become a relic of the past. As I said, I congratulate the Minister on the great concept of those Triad meetings that we have just witnessed out there. I hope and pray that we will not see only three big meetings in the west every year, or probably four with the meeting at Birdsville, because I point out that the other smaller centres such as Windorah and Jundah are just as important.

**Mrs ROSE** (Currumbin) (5.18 p.m.): It gives me pleasure to speak in support of the Racing and Betting Amendment Bill 1992. The Queensland Government recognises that illegal bookmaking is synonymous with organised crime and imposes unacceptable costs on legitimate punters, bookmakers and the community as a whole. The cost of illegal bookmaking to Queensland has been great. The activities of illegal bookmakers costs the TAB in Queensland a large amount of money and, of course, deprives the Queensland people through reducing the potential amount of State consolidated revenue through lost betting turnover tax. In this sense, illegal bookmaking is a crime which effectively robs the public purse.

In the past, too many people in Queensland have taken the attitude that illegal bookmakers are harmless larrikins who do not necessarily cause much damage. That attitude was echoed in the words of the convicted illegal bookmaker Terry Page, who said while he was walking away from the court in November last year—

“ . . . SP bookmaking isn't really that bad, is it?”

In an attempt to answer Mr Page's rhetorical question, I would like to reaffirm the Government's view that illegal bookmaking is a corrupting and costly crime against our community. There is no such thing as a larrikin small SP bookie. Even small illegal bookmakers turn over a large amount of bets and cannot be perceived as insignificant. Illegal bookmaking falls within the cash-flow and money-laundering network of organised crime and drug trafficking and encourages its growth. It is a problem that can only be brought to a stop by the Government's taking a more positive and harsher stance. This Bill represents such a stance.

The problem that we now face is finding an effective method of deterring the incidence of illegal bookmaking. This Bill provides effective penalties for those found guilty of illegal bookmaking. For too long, the lack of effective and decisive penalties for such transgressions of the law has led to many illegal bookmakers becoming masterful at avoiding the full brunt and intent of the penalties imposed upon them. This Bill creates a lot more uncertainty in the world of an illegal bookmaker. Currently, a convicted illegal bookmaker can simply avoid paying his fine. When action is taken by the Crown to recover the fine as a civil debt, illegal bookmakers have traditionally engineered their personal records and affairs to show that they have very few or no assets which can be seized in lieu of the fine. Many illegal bookmakers have flouted the system and publicly admitted that they structure their financial affairs in a deceptive way in order to avoid the payment of fines. Cash, which is the illegal bookmaker's largest asset, can be easily transferred and not disclosed to the court.

The Racing and Betting Amendment Bill 1992 provides default gaol terms for illegal bookmakers who have ignored outstanding fines. It also makes provision for gaol terms as an alternative to a fine at the time of sentencing for a second or subsequent offence. A provision for default gaol terms is designed to take away any incentive convicted illegal bookmakers may have to avoid fines by restructuring their financial affairs. Significantly, the magnitude of the offence will be reflected in the severity of the sentence under the amended Racing and Betting Act. The most important issue in this instance is that a scale of penalty exists which cannot be avoided by the convicted illegal bookmaker. If illegal bookmakers choose to avoid the fine, they face a gaol term. I believe this discourages the main impetus behind repeatedly committing such a crime. Repeat offenders must see a monetary advantage in continuing to break the law. It would not be unreasonable to say that the more money illegally attained, the harsher the penalty should be. This has always been the case. However, the cunning illegal bookmaker can earn as much as possible, incur a fine indexed to the amount illegally earned, avoid the fine, and finally provide few or no substantial assets in place of the fine and so effectively avoid the penalty imposed by the court.

Under these amendments, convicted SP bookmakers cannot avoid the penalty scale. They have three options: pay the amount prescribed by the court according to the severity of the offence; avoid the fines and incur a gaol term; or cease their activities before they are caught. If they are caught and convicted a second or subsequent time, they may face a gaol term. The Queensland Government is committed to depriving criminals of the profits of their activities. As a result of that commitment, the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act was reviewed. Threatening to confiscate the profits that criminals make is an effective way of deterring them from repeating the crime. Another effective method is utilised in the Racing and Betting Amendment Bill, that is, increasing the severity of the sentence by applying default gaol terms for those who evade monetary penalties. Effectively, there is no way out for illegal bookmakers. They must either pay the fines imposed or face a gaol term. In that way, these provisions will act as a deterrent to those contemplating conducting illegal bookmaking and to convicted illegal bookmakers who persist in contravening the law.

Although the amended Act will still enable the court to exercise warranted discretion when sentencing a convicted illegal bookmaker, an absolute minimum monetary penalty of \$3,000 will apply. This will further strengthen the provisions within the Act which make it an effective deterrent to illegal bookmaking. This Bill provides effective amendments to an Act which has been ineffective in deterring illegal

bookmaking in Queensland and penalising offenders. In the past, the Act has effectively allowed convicted illegal bookmakers to determine whether they pay the penalties imposed. The law imposes a scale of penalty according to severity or magnitude of the crime. That is just. Illegal bookmakers have been flouting this system by manipulating a lack of effective penalty in the Act. These amendments introduce a sensible structure of penalties that will not allow the SP bookmaker a way out of paying for transgressing the law. By my understanding, the potency of this amendment Bill is not necessarily the harsher penalties but the introduction of an effective and structured penalty scale. I congratulate the Minister. I support the Bill.

**Mr SANTORO** (Clayfield—Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party) (5.25 p.m.): As a member whose electorate covers Brisbane's three major racetracks, I am very pleased to speak to this Bill. With a little leniency from the Minister and from the Chair, I want to canvass some of the issues that affect many of my constituents who have a very genuine and real interest in the racing industry.

As my colleague the shadow Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing has indicated, the Opposition supports the Bill because it supports the Government's attempt to crack down on unlawful bookmaking. In his second-reading speech, the Minister indicated his intention to undertake a complete review of the Act in the near future. As I visit racetracks, whether it be on a race day or of a morning during training sessions, I talk to people who are looking forward to the consultative process taking on real meaning and to participating in a genuine way in the review of the Act. The Minister has pledged that he will undertake extensive consultation with all levels of the industry and with the community at large. According to many of the people whom I represent, that will be a welcome change. During this brief contribution, I want to refer to consultation, as did the Minister in his second-reading speech.

I do not want to be too harsh in my comments, but I am afraid to say that the residents of Hamilton and Albion do not think very much of the Minister's previous attempts at consultation. They do not think that the Minister knows the meaning of the word. They have evidence of a total lack of consultation literally in their backyards. I refer to the decision to move greyhounds from the Gabba to Albion Park. On previous occasions, I have discussed that matter with the Minister. After various warnings by the media that the switch was on, the first that the surrounding residents knew of the transfer of the dogs to Albion Park was May last year when the Minister announced it as a fait accompli. To give the Minister some credit, an advertisement was placed in one of the major newspapers. However, apparently that advertisement was so far back in the paper and was so small that it was missed by the majority of people who have a genuine interest in the matter. I do not claim that no notice or no advance warning was given. However, in reality, notice in the form of letterbox drops and effective advertisements just did not occur. I have canvassed previously the lack of consultation on the relocation, so I will not continue with it at any length.

To give credit where credit is due, the trustees of Albion Park have made genuine attempts to deal with their neighbours' concerns. However, they have had to do that against a backlog of anger over the way in which the whole matter was handled in the first place. I submit to the Minister that no consideration was given to the effect of increased traffic, noise and light caused by the greyhound racing. I want to touch on the specific effects of that move. I am happy to say that greyhound racing has not brought with it the traffic jams and some of the undesirable elements which some of my constituents feared. As a result of the opening of certain gates and the closing of certain other gates, the expected traffic increase has been minimised. On behalf of my constituents, I am happy to place on record that those fears have not materialised. However, greyhound racing has brought with it penetrating lights, which are extremely harsh, and the piercing squeal of the lure. Those are the complaints that I am now receiving from my constituents.

As the Minister may be aware, the management of Albion Park has received many complaints from the local residents who have been affected adversely by the lights. I

want to stress that not all residents have complained, because some residents—perhaps the majority—have not been affected adversely by the lights because of the positioning of trees and the various ridges on the hill referred to as Hamilton Hill. However, no doubt exists that some residents have been affected by the lights. I believe that the management of Albion Park has an obligation to seek to assist the residents affected adversely by those lights and the compromise that they represent on the residential amenity.

I am suggesting that the management can adjust the positioning of the tower lights. Again, I have been given advice that those sorts of adjustments are not out of order or out of the question. It can provide partial shade, and it could be considered. The management can also consider overseas technology which, I am told, reduces the pitch of the noise that is created by the lure but does not compromise the greyhound's ability to hear it and, therefore, its ability to follow it. Nevertheless, it is not as audible to the human ear as the present system. Shortly, I will be travelling to the United States and I will undertake to make inquiries about technology in the racing industry in that country. If I have any advice which the Minister may find useful, as I usually do whenever I go on study tours, I would be very pleased to offer it.

**Ms Spence:** Talk about SP bookmaking.

**Mr Nuttall:** Talk about the Bill.

**Mr SANTORO:** I will take the interjection——

**Mr T. B. Sullivan:** Have you bashed the unions yet?

**Mr SANTORO:** No, I am not going to bash the unions.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Power): Order! Government members will cease their interjections. The member for Clayfield asked for some leeway, and I have given him that leeway. I ask him to return to the Bill.

**Mr SANTORO:** Basically, in my contribution to this Bill——

**Mr Beattie:** Have you got the name of the Bill?

**Mr SANTORO:** Yes, I have the name of the Bill. In fact, if the honourable member wishes, I would be very happy to show him the very careful notations that I made during my careful reading of it. They would show that I am aware of what this Bill is trying to do. I say to members, and I reiterate for those members who were not listening, Opposition members support the Bill.

**Mr Beattie:** Have you got the right speech?

**Mr SANTORO:** Opposition members support the Racing and Betting Amendment Bill 1992. There is not a problem. However, members should——

**Mr Beattie:** Denver handed you a piece of paper.

**Mr SANTORO:** No, I have it all here. There is not a problem. I say to the honourable member for Brisbane Central that nobody has to hand me a piece of paper. This Bill enables me to make a contribution which, hopefully, will reflect the concerns of my constituents. I have decided that I will recommend to my constituents that they contact the Albion Park management directly and detail for them their precise concerns. Some of my constituents have done that already. I dare say that some of the concerns of my constituents have been handled very well, and others have not. I am going to suggest to my constituents that they persist with their concerns. In relation to the lure, I am going to suggest to my constituents that they contact the Noise Abatement Authority. I am also going to suggest to them that they contact the trustees of the complex who, ultimately, are the people responsible for its proper running.

I ask the Minister to listen specifically to this point: last night I attended a p. and c. meeting at a local school. Government members may ask, "What has this to do with SP bookmaking?" Madam Deputy Speaker, I am mindful of your earlier ruling. However, I simply say that unless horses are racing around the track, there can be no betting, either legal or illegal. Last night, several people who attended a p. and c. meeting, at which I

was present, reminded me of the Government's lack of will to provide a safe walkway for the horses stabled around Doomben and Eagle Farm. I was told that last Tuesday or Wednesday, a horse broke loose.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I am not going to allow the member for Clayfield to continue in this vein. It is really stretching the limits of the debate in this House. The Bill is specific in its amendments. I ask the member for Clayfield to confine his remarks to the contents of the Bill for the rest of the time that he is on his feet, or I will ask him to sit down.

**Government members:** Hear! Hear!

**Mr SANTORO:** I hear the glee from the Government members. I will return to the Bill. It is about racing and horses. In a broad sense, it is about the ability of the industry to exist——

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have made my ruling. I warn the member for Clayfield. He will return to the Bill and make his comments, or I will ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr SANTORO:** Madam Deputy Speaker, if you ask me to sit down, that is all I can do. I do not have many more notes to go through. However, I would be happy to circulate my unrepresented speech which, obviously, Government members are keen that I do not present. I will let my constituents know that, unfortunately, because of the very ungenerous nature of Government members, I was not able to represent properly their interests in this place.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Clayfield will resume his seat.

**Ms SPENCE** (Mount Gravatt) (5.36 p.m.) I am pleased to speak in support of this legislation. Unlike the member for Clayfield, I intend to speak to the Bill because I think that it is a very important piece of legislation. It is part of the Government's overall strategy in curtailing SP bookmaking in this State. This Bill is consistent with the recommendations of the CJC report of 2 December 1992. I read that report on SP bookmaking. Perhaps if the member for Clayfield had done so, he would have been able to speak to this Bill. It was very thorough and detailed.

**Mr SANTORO:** I rise to a point of order. I take offence to that statement and that insinuation by the member for Mount Gravatt. I have read the report and I have read Bill. However, I chose to speak on issues that were related to the Bill and to the racing industry. I find the comments of the member for Mount Gravatt offensive, and I ask that she withdraw them.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I ask the member for Mount Gravatt to withdraw those comments.

**Ms SPENCE:** I withdraw those comments. As I was saying, I found that particular report by the Criminal Justice Commission very detailed and thorough. I confess to having no intimate knowledge of SP bookmaking, and I confess that I am not a great gambler in general. However, I think it is fair to say that we have provided enough opportunities in this State for people to indulge in legal gambling through the TAB, PubTAB and legal bookmaking without the need to condone SP bookmaking. I believe that people in this society are dumbfounded when others who profit from white-collar crime, such as illegal gambling and illegal bookmaking, are given small or large fines and continue conducting their illegal activities. I know that SP bookmaking has had a long and colourful history in this country. However, there certainly are a number of negative aspects of the crime which I believe make it very unfair and very un-Australian. Most of the aspects are economic. I should like to dwell on some of those for a few minutes.

SP bookmakers pay no turnover tax or licensing fees. This represents a substantial denial of Government revenue. SP bookmakers do not pay their full share of income tax. The racing industry suffers as a result of SP bookmaking, as both the TAB and licensed bookmakers are denied a substantial amount of turnover which they could legitimately

expect through lawful gambling. Racing clubs suffer as a result of reduced race meeting attendances, reduced oncourse totalisator turnover and reduced disbursements from TAB profits. The prize money available to owners of racing animals is thus less than it could be. The amount of money generally available within the racing industry which could be paid as fees to trainers and jockeys is also diminished, but the greater economy also suffers as a result of money being siphoned into the black economy, that is, into SP bookmaking. Money that is currently being wagered there could be wagered lawfully elsewhere. More direct costs are associated with unlawful bookmaking in this State. These include the police resources and the significant legal costs associated with the prosecution of SP bookmakers, the time and resources of police officers and prosecution staff, and staff of various Government departments who spend their time hunting out illegal bookmakers. The CJC identified that SP bookmaking in this State, as elsewhere, can have links with major organised crime. Of particular concern in this regard are links between unlawful bookmaking and illicit trade in narcotics. The SP bookmaking industry in Australia has proved to be one of the principal sources of corruption for police and other public officials in other Australian States. Because of its unlawful nature, SP bookmakers are able to resort to either threat or use of violence to ensure the prompt payment of debts. There is certainly a great degree of violence associated with the crime.

For all these negative reasons, not only economic but also social, SP bookmaking does need to be outlawed in this State. This legislation provides for imprisonment to occur as a natural consequence of failing to pay a fine, and includes options for sentences of imprisonment as an alternative to a fine for a second or subsequent offence. Provision has also been made to ensure that an offender who is ordered to serve a term of imprisonment actually serves a sentence in prison, not by way of community service or on probation. Thus, for some offences the courts will not be allowed to provide alternatives to imprisonment. I believe that this legislation gives a clear signal to the judiciary and to SP bookmakers that this Government's attitude to their activities is one of complete disapproval and that they will be dealt with severely by the courts in this State. I congratulate the Minister and his department on this initiative.

**Mr BEANLAND** (Indooroopilly) (5.43 p.m.): This racing and betting legislation was introduced into this House on 27 November last year—almost six months ago. It was at that stage that I first jotted down a few notes about things that I might say about this particular piece of legislation. But despite the Parliament having sat for only a handful of weeks this year, it is clear that the Government does not consider this legislation sufficiently urgent for it to have been debated earlier in this House. Six whole months! I was quite staggered when I sat down and added them up a little while ago. My turn to speak to this Bill kept falling by the wayside, so I was paying careful attention to how long ago this legislation was actually introduced.

Whilst the Opposition supports this legislation—as has already been indicated by the shadow Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing—it does not go anywhere near far enough if people believe that it will crack down on SP bookmaking. I noticed—and I am sure that the Minister would have noticed this—that there is somewhat of a gulf between the rhetoric that members hear and the reality of this legislation. One member made the point that hundreds of thousands of dollars are outstanding in SP bookmaking fines. I accept that. It is almost impossible to collect those fines. But whilst this legislation allows for SP bookmakers to be imprisoned, it does not allow for the clients of unlawful bookmakers, that is, the punters who are betting with SP bookies, to be treated in a similar manner for placing a bet with those bookmakers. I mention this in passing, because last year the prostitution legislation was introduced.

When that legislation was introduced in this place, I spoke in the debate. I cannot help noticing the difference between the prostitution legislation and this legislation. Under the provisions of the prostitution legislation which was introduced by this Labor Government, a client who is found without reasonable excuse on premises at which there is more than one prostitute guilty of a crime. In fact, if a person is convicted, he

can be imprisoned. In that case, the client is also being treated as an offender. In this case, although it takes two people to be involved in SP betting—the bookmaker and the punter—the legislation does not make the punter an offender, unlike the prostitution legislation. There seems to be a different principle applied. I am not sure whether the Minister has created the double standard because he does not agree with what is contained in the other legislation. However, I am sure that he understands my point about the existence of a double standard. In his second-reading speech, the Minister stated—

“The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Racing and Betting Act to remove impediments to the effective prosecution of unlawful bookmakers.”

I am sure that all honourable members, for a host of reasons which have been enunciated in this Chamber, would support that statement. However, I believe this is a Claytons amendment because it does not go all the way. It is a welcome amendment, nevertheless. It allows for the imprisonment of convicted SP bookmakers, but the same penalty does not apply to the punters. Queenslanders expect that, if the Government is to apply a set of principles in some areas of legislation, the same principles should apply in other similar areas such as, in this case, SP bookmaking. Instead, the Government has dipped its toe in the water but is not prepared to go further.

In his second-reading speech, the Minister stated that he intended to undertake a full and complete review of the Racing and Betting Act. As one who is a regular visitor to the racetrack and who does not mind having the occasional bet, I am interested in this matter. I would like to ascertain how the review process is proceeding. When I made inquiries several weeks ago, there did not appear to be any widespread inquiry being undertaken. I understood that some officers of the Minister's department were undertaking a departmental inquiry. This review should be conducted throughout the whole racing industry. Queensland has a huge racing industry, and all the participants should be involved in any review of the Act. Everyone in the industry would be prepared to put forward useful proposals that would help the Government improve the legislation and crack down on SP bookmaking. I am interested to know who is undertaking the inquiry, where it is going and what stage it has reached. Six months have passed since the Minister announced that a review would be undertaken.

I turn now to the proceedings leading up to the recent conviction of Mr Terry Page for SP bookmaking. On 18 November last year, just prior to the introduction of this legislation, Mr Terry Page was ordered to pay \$2.75m after being convicted of money laundering and SP betting over a period of 27 months from 1 May 1989 to 11 August 1991. Of course, the next day a headline in the *Courier-Mail* stated “Convicted SP bookie faces \$2.75m payout”. At the time, under the Confiscation of Profits from Crimes Act, Mr Acting Justice Shanahan ordered that Mr Page pay a pecuniary penalty of \$2,726,179.88. He ordered also that an accomplice, Willits, pay \$30,000. I do not support or condone what Mr Page and others did. Far from it. I believe that we must prosecute those people when those offences occur. However, I will raise some strange matters that occurred throughout that case. When people are convicted of unlawful SP bookmaking and money laundering, the penalties must be harsh. However, in this instance the enforcement agency has been called into question on the issue of accountability. It is all very well having the Criminal Justice Commission or other enforcement agencies, but someone has to check the checkers to keep an eye on how they are performing. The case to which I will refer shortly raises some serious questions. One cannot help thinking that the whole exercise was carried out to gain a misleading headline for the Criminal Justice Commission and the other agencies involved in law enforcement. The facts contained in the newspaper article were not correct—far from it. That is very unfortunate for all concerned.

I note that on 10 November 1992, eight days prior to the court case, a deed of agreement was entered into between Mr Terry Page and the Director of Prosecutions who was acting on behalf of the Criminal Justice Commission. Clause 1 of that deed of agreement stated—

"This Deed shall come into effect immediately upon the conviction of:—

- (i) T. A. Page, if and only if such conviction occurs on or before the 19th day of November, 1992 upon the charges of having engaged in Money Laundering between the 29th day of March, 1990 and the 21st day of August, 1991, and Carrying on Unlawful Bookmaking between the First day of May, 1989 and the 11th day of August, 1991."

Clause 5 of this document states—

"T. A. Page and L. M. Page will refrain absolutely from comment to any person upon any matter in connection with the terms of this Deed and with all dealings which have occurred between themselves and the Director and the Criminal Justice Commission or any officer of the Director or the Criminal Justice Commission."

I am concerned about the secrecy provisions that are being implemented. I am concerned about what benefit could be gained by placing these secrecy provisions in the Deed of Agreement. As we know, it was indicated elsewhere that Mr Page was convicted and that, in the circumstances, he would pay \$250,000. In fact, \$250,000 would be the total sum of money that would be accepted under this conviction and under the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act. He would not have to make good the \$2.7m at all—only \$250,000. That was before the case went to court. The judge himself was misled on this matter, and the matter had to be returned to the court.

During the period since I first made these notes, the matters I raise have received some little publicity

**Mr Gibbs:** Misled by the CJC?

**Mr BEANLAND:** Misled by the CJC, I believe. I am not accusing the Director of Prosecutions because—

**Mr Gibbs:** What a dreadful thing to say!

**Mr BEANLAND:** Never mind about that. I want to make it quite clear that we have a situation in which secrecy is prevailing and deals are being done. I am all for convicting SP bookmakers, but we have to bring these matters to the fore so that the truth can come out. The "truth" was portrayed in the *Courier-Mail* as a penalty of \$2.7m. It was not; it was a penalty of \$250,000.

I want to discuss a few more important points. The Attorney-General said that the entire issue needed clarification. He went on to point out that if it was proven that Mr Page had more assets than the Criminal Justice Commission believed, then he would have to pay \$2.7m. That is the reason why it went for the full penalty of \$2.7m. Nowhere has anyone explained why the secrecy provisions have been placed in this Deed of Agreement. In a one-page letter to the solicitors for Page dated 19 November 1992, the Director of Prosecutions stated—

"Might I also acknowledge your facsimile of the extract of the Gold Coast Bulletin dated 19 November, 1992. I take note from the article of the fact that you appear to have gone to great lengths to placate your client Lynn Page.

I recognise your efforts in this regard and acknowledge that I regard most seriously the confidentiality clause contained in paragraph 5 of the Deed of Agreement signed by the parties."

I place on record my concern about the secrecy surrounding this whole exercise. For the information of honourable members, I table the documents, of which there are several. They are all from the relevant authorities.

I turn now to the recent attacks by some Ministers and the CJC on the racing industry. We have heard some outrageous and unfair attacks on the racing industry. On more than one occasion, the Minister has seen fit to tackle the three codes of racing by using the CJC reports. A report tabled by the Criminal Justice Commission in 1992

contains a number of serious allegations. The result of those allegations has cast a slur over hundreds and thousands of mums and dads and other members of the public involved in the racing industry. I am talking about everyone—from the owners themselves right through to the smallest of punters. It casts a slur on everyone involved in this great industry. In spite of making serious allegations about such things as race fixing, nobbling, drug running and murder, as I understand it, no evidence has been supplied to the Queensland Chief Thoroughbred Racing Steward. I have not noticed cases referred to in the media, although we have seen one or two single instances. If one read those reports and heard the Minister's statements, one would believe that drug peddling, nobbling and a whole range of serious offences were happening right across-the-board. I understand that a list of these serious offences and the people allegedly involved was handed to the Minister and we were going to see some action taken. That was many months ago. That was the last time that the Minister spoke. Since then, the silence has been deafening.

Previously, statements have been made by the Minister in relation to people in the industry. I recollect that, at one stage, the Harness Racing Board and the Greyhound Racing Control Board were sacked, yet we have seen little for it. I think that the Minister would have to agree. I am concerned because, at present, times are tough. Poker machines are affecting the three codes of racing and the charities. Brisbane is going to have a casino. I know that a range of industry leaders are concerned about the effect that the casino will have on the industry. Therefore, it is terribly important that slurs are not cast upon the industry. If there are issues of concern, the responsible Minister should tackle them. It should not be forgotten that the racing industry is comprised of a broad cross-section of the community. People from all walks of life are involved in the industry. One only has to visit the track to witness that. This is the fourth-largest industry in Queensland; in other words, it is a mirror of the community.

From time to time, problems will occur in the industry, but generally it has been a well-run industry up to this stage. I find it most disquieting, however, to hear statements made that are not supported by evidence. The main point is that, if the situation as described by the Minister is in fact the case, some prosecutions will have to be undertaken. I reiterate that the Minister has not produced any evidence. It is very easy to take a number of cheap shots at the industry, but it is far more difficult to make the industry work.

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Power): Order!

**Mr BEANLAND:** The Minister has thrown the industry into a great deal of turmoil. He believes that some of the changes that have been made are necessary, but other members of Parliament do not. At the end of the day, there has to be a viable industry in which the community can safely participate. It must be remembered that hundreds of millions of dollars are invested with the TAB alone—the figure of \$1 billion has been mentioned—not to mention the amounts that are spent in other areas of the racing industry. All people involved with the industry have to feel comfortable being associated with it. One only has to read some columns in southern newspapers to find out what is occurring in this State. Those events do not appear to make it into the newspapers in Queensland. An article states—

“Brisbane solicitor Malcolm Quirrey was warned off after a recent inquiry into betting transactions which, in effect, means he is not allowed on any racetrack in Australia.”

In spite of that, I now find that he is a representative on the board of the South East Queensland Racing Association. This matter has to be cleared up. For years, it has been my understanding that when a person is warned off, that is that; but this person is back running the racetracks. It would not matter who is the person involved. It might be Mr Quirrey or it might be somebody else—I am not concerned about the individual or the name of the person. I am concerned about the effects which that and other events are having on the racing industry in this State. I point out to the Minister in charge of this

Bill that one cannot take the industry for granted or too lightly. If one does, at some time in the future we will find that the industry will not operate in the way it is operating at present.

Time expired.

Sitting suspended from 6.03 to 7.30 p.m.

**Mr WELFORD** (Everton) (7.30 p.m.): I join other members on both sides of the Chamber in supporting the amendments to the Racing and Betting Act that have been put before the House by the Minister. There are a few points that I would like to canvass in my short contribution. Firstly, as other members have done, I note that this Bill provides for imprisonment in default of the payment of fines which, under the Bill, are significantly increased in respect of offences relating to SP bookmaking. In the normal course, these sorts of penalties might be regarded as draconian. To the extent that one of the mischiefs of SP bookmaking is that the Government is defrauded of revenue, then even in comparison to Commonwealth penalties in respect of tax avoidance or tax evasion, these penalties are very severe. One thing is very clear and that is that these penalties are being increased for the very important reason that the practice of SP bookmaking causes significant disruption not only to an important and valuable industry in this State from the point of view of Government revenue—and many Opposition members have commented frequently about that—but also to the many honest players in the industry—the honest bookmakers—who pay their turnover tax and make their contribution to the industry in a genuine and honest way.

One of the points made in the Criminal Justice Commission report into this matter emphasises the likelihood that associated with SP bookmaking is potentially a whole bagful of other offences involving money laundering, corruption, race fixing and the like. It is certainly not beyond the bounds of credibility that in any activity where there are large amounts of cash unaccounted for, unrecorded and certainly outside the regulated system of taxation, there is the real prospect or risk that other offences are involved. Wherever there are large amounts of money involved, there is obviously a risk that that cash will be diverted into other nefarious activities.

I note, in particular, that the CJC report refers to drug trafficking. I rather suspect that that observation—unless the CJC had direct evidence of it—appears to me to be stretching the bow a little, although it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that in connection with race fixing there is doping and other activities which could be inspired by the very high stakes with which SP bookmakers deal. The reference to drug trafficking raises an interesting point. What we are dealing with here is a very serious incursion into what is regarded as the right of the State to levy taxes and to regulate the industry. It is relevant in this sense: as we have already seen in respect of the Page case, to which the previous speaker, the member for Indooroopilly, referred, there are now offences of such seriousness in respect of SP bookmaking that the Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act under State law now applies. It is, of course, that Act under which the offence of money laundering is created. That Act is specifically designed to freeze assets and to allow the imposition of pecuniary penalties assessed according to the value of profits made by an offender arising out of his criminal activity.

Earlier in this debate, one speaker made what I considered to be a quite extraordinary comment. On one view of these activities, they are really only quasi-criminal; on one view, all that these people are doing is engaging in a form of business. From my experience in the Federal tax avoidance industry, and from working, as I did, for the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions after the Costigan royal commission to try to clean up what was effectively a massive haemorrhaging of revenue to the public coffers, there seems to be absolutely no excuse for going light on people who evade their responsibilities in that regard. Quite apart from the associated criminal activities that might arise out of the cash proceeds of SP bookmaking, it seems to me to be serious enough to require, and justify, the very serious penalties that are imposed by this legislation on any SP bookmaker who is conducting illegal betting in respect of which no turnover tax is paid.

It is worth making the point—and I make this point in the context of the very gung-ho statements that the member for Indooroopilly made in the media in the last couple of days about the Government's failure to impose serious penalties in another area—that penalties alone are not a panacea. Penalties alone, no matter how severe, are not the complete answer to these problems, because at the end of the day a proper investigation is still required to yield evidence which will sustain a prosecution, and convictions are needed. On one view, increasing the penalties might act as much as an incentive as a disincentive. On one view, it could be argued that if the fine is to be in the vicinity of \$18,000, then if SP bookmaking is to be engaged in, it needs to be done in a big way so that the person can afford to pay the fine. Of course, that is not the primary purpose of these penalties. Penalties alone are not an answer to people who want to go out and engage in this sort of criminal activity. What the high penalties do, however, is make it very clear to the courts that the Government regards these offences as serious offences and offences in respect of which the courts should not deal lightly. I think that that more than anything else is the rationale behind these very high penalties.

I come back momentarily to this question of seizing assets and imposing pecuniary penalties. What should be remembered, as the Minister pointed out in his second-reading speech, is that fines which are imposed by way of conviction for offences of SP bookmaking are, in effect, civil debts which the Crown must recover as one would recover any civil or commercial debt in the ordinary course of events. That is, judgment has to be obtained against someone and the fine has the effect of being a civil judgment. Then either that judgment has to be executed against the assets of the individual or he has to be bankrupted. That is a very slow and convoluted process. The Crimes (Confiscation of Profits) Act allows for the imposition of a pecuniary penalty. Once a pecuniary penalty is assessed, there are other aspects of that Act which allow the freezing of assets and execution against those assets much more expeditiously than would otherwise be the case.

In his contribution, the member for Indooroopilly tabled in this House a deed of agreement purportedly signed on 10 November between Terence Anthony Page and the State Director of Prosecutions. That agreement does nothing special. It recognises that the defendant, Terence Page, acknowledges the pecuniary penalty and indeed agrees, in advance of the hearing to finalise those proceedings, to consent to an order which imposes the pecuniary penalty in the full amount of \$2,726,179.88.

**Mr Veivers:** What did he end up paying?

**Mr WELFORD:** I will come to that. The member for Southport raises the question about what Page ended up paying. The agreement also required Page, by agreement, obviously, to consent to variation on the original restraining orders made over assets that had been identified. Very early in the piece, before any restraining order was imposed, an application for a restraining order was lodged and at the same time certain assets belonging to Page were identified by the prosecutor. The prosecutor then obtained restraining orders freezing those assets pending the criminal conviction, because a pecuniary penalty cannot be collected until a conviction is imposed. Once the conviction is on foot and the pecuniary penalty is in place, the restraining orders can be varied to include all the assets that can be identified to pay for it. As with any debtor, if there are no assets to pay the debt, the full debt will not be paid. There has been no compromise here in the sense that this agreement still allows the Director of Prosecutions to pursue the balance of the pecuniary penalty, that is, the amounts that have not been recovered by virtue of this agreement. This agreement identifies certain assets.

**Mr Veivers:** But it is finished.

**Mr WELFORD:** No, it is not finished. This agreement says: "Page, you have identified certain assets. We will accept those assets in partial payment of your pecuniary penalty, but if it is determined at any future time that there were other assets which you did not disclose, we can pursue you for the balance." That is what the agreement provides.

The other aspect raised by the member for Indooroopilly is that of a secrecy clause. Let me make a very quick comment about that. It is normal, of course, in ordinary commercial arrangements in which court proceedings are settled, for the parties to come to an agreement that neither party will comment upon the terms of their settlement. That is the case in ordinary commercial settlements.

**Mr Veivers:** In a civil case.

**Mr WELFORD:** Hang on a minute. That is the case in normal civil settlements; that is right. What needs to be recognised is that this is not one of those cases, and I acknowledge that point. It is analogous, of course, to a settlement of income taxation debts, which were often settled in the courts in a similar way. In such cases, it is not uncommon for the parties to agree not to disclose the terms of their settlement. But of course, there is another reason for that. In the case of the Income Tax Assessment Act, under Federal law there are specific requirements that secrecy, privacy and confidentiality be maintained. But in this case, I must concede that although it is not unusual for those sorts of clauses to be inserted in settlement agreements of this nature, there seems to be no sensible reason why that clause is in this agreement.

Presumably, the member for Indooroopilly has obtained this agreement by way of an FOI application. I will not ask him to respond in case he otherwise incriminates himself. If indeed he has obtained it under the FOI provisions, it seems to me that he is perfectly entitled to raise within this House with the Attorney-General the question as to why in this particular agreement there was considered to be a need for a secrecy clause. I cannot see any particular reason, and I really do not think there was any reason other than that the lawyer who may have drafted it thought it was a good idea at the time. However, there really is not much to be served by the member for Indooroopilly or anyone else getting up and trying to suggest that there is something sinister without asking the question.

**Mr Bennett** interjected.

**Mr WELFORD:** That is right, he thinks there is something sinister under every bushel, and he would like to think there was, simply to try to embarrass the Government. The option open to him is that he could ask the question of the Attorney and get whatever the answer is. For my part, I concede to the member for Indooroopilly that there is no particular reason, in my view, from a legal point of view, why that provision would need to be in the agreement when the substantive purpose of the agreement is simply to provide for a consent order to be made in the court for the payment of the pecuniary penalty, for the settlement of part of that pecuniary penalty out of assets which have been identified and which leave open to the Director of Prosecutions the opportunity to pursue the balance of the pecuniary penalty in the event that other assets are identified and which the defendant has not disclosed.

I support the proposed amendments contained in this Bill. I think they make some important symbolic and practical differences to the way in which the courts will deal with these matters and the way in which the community recognises the Government's position in relation to this activity, namely, SP bookmaking. The Government is under public pressure and political responsibility to act in this way. While penalties alone are not the complete answer, this legislation will certainly go some way to make clear both to the public and to the courts that the Government is serious about stamping out this substantial incursion upon the public revenue.

**Mr STEPHAN** (Gympie) (7.45 p.m.): As the Opposition spokesman stated, the Opposition is not opposing this legislation. I want to make a small contribution to this debate and refer to a couple of aspects of the racing industry.

**Mr McElligott:** Is there a racetrack in Gympie?

**Mr STEPHAN:** Yes, there is a racetrack in Gympie. I will refer to it in a moment. In his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

"The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Racing and Betting Act to remove impediments to the effective prosecution of unlawful bookmakers."

I concur with that principle. I suggest that perhaps we need to discourage the effective operation of bookmakers in clubs in some centres. Further on in his second-reading speech, the Minister said—

"Provision has been included in the Bill to ensure that an offender who is ordered to serve a term of imprisonment actually serves the sentence in prison . . ."

That is the aim of many in the legal fraternity in relation to all sentences. Occasionally an offender will serve the full sentence imposed, but that does not often happen. I hope that, in relation to sentences handed out under this legislation, that aim is achieved.

I turn now to sprint racing. The member for Thuringowa just asked whether there is a racetrack in Gympie. Sprint racing plays a very important role in the viability of the racing club at Gympie. In some instances, people own thoroughbreds and sprint horses. A decision has been taken that the Queensland Principal Club will cease running races under 800 metres. That decision will have a tremendous effect on some clubs in this State, including the Gympie race club. One of my constituents, who is a sprint horse owner, sent a letter to the Queensland Principal Club pointing out his concerns about that decision. His letter stated that he had recently shifted from north Queensland to the Gympie district, at considerable personal cost, so that he could race his sprint horses on the Gympie circuit. The letter stated—

"My string of horses which I had raced down are all sprint bred with foals at foot and in foal to a top sprint stallion and are all AJC registered.

I find the decision of the QPC to be very discriminatory as the difference between a 400m horse and a 1 000m horse is the same equivalent as 1 000m is to a 3 000m horse. These sprint bred horses are AJC foal returned, registered, handicapped etc. the same as distance horses.

The paragraph that states that by having no shorter races than 800m—this brings Queensland in line with all other States—then what are Queensland and New South Wales doing racing clockwise while other States race anti clockwise. Why should we have to fall in line with other States—just because Australian Rules is the major football played in Victoria, does this mean it should be in Queensland also."

His point is that Queensland does not fall in line with other States in many areas, so why should that be used as a reason to make a decision to cease conducting races under 800 metres? The letter further states—

"By the QPC taking these steps to dictate the length of races, this means that if they please they could cut out the races shorter than 1 500m for example, or any races longer than 1 500m if they so desire. Ask any trainer or owner how they would feel with a decision such as this.

Many owners and trainers who are also in thoroughbred racing have invested a substantial amount of money in sprint horses which by the way are bred from thoroughbred lines from America and Australia.

Over the past seasons of sprint racing at Gympie the initial prize money has been made available by the Queensland Sprint Racing Association with sponsorship money."

His point is that the Gympie racing circuit is supporting itself.

**Mr Ardill** interjected.

**Mr STEPHAN:** I did not catch what the honourable member said, but sprint racing is certainly assisting the Gympie club to remain a viable operation. I have written to the Minister about this issue. I am disappointed that he has regurgitated the excuses given previously in the local newspaper. I appeal to the Minister that this decision will make a

difference to the racing fraternity in that centre and in other centres. If we are to keep the industry alive in smaller centres, that decision should be reconsidered. Gympie is a fairly large area, but it has competition from the race meetings run at Corbould Park. Many of the patrons who now attend that smaller centre once frequented the Gympie circuit. The Opposition does not oppose this Bill, and I wish the Minister all the best with it.

**Hon. R. J. GIBBS** (Bundamba—Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing) (7.52 p.m.), in reply: I thank all members who have contributed to this debate. I particularly thank my parliamentary committee and my colleagues on this side of the House who have made a contribution. I want to respond to some of the comments made by members opposite. I am pleased to note that all Opposition members who have participated in this debate have expressed their support for the broad thrust of the Bill. I welcome that as a commonsense approach to a problem which has been around for a long time and which must be tackled professionally by whatever Government happens to be in power. However, the Opposition spokesman, the member for Southport, was his usual negative self. He had to be provocative and make some quite outrageous statements about the legislation, of which he obviously has very little knowledge. It is not so much his lack of knowledge of the legislation but his paucity of knowledge of the industry—he owns a couple of horses—that is quite incredible. For example, he accused this Government of milking the racing industry via the TAB. Apart from the board of the TAB, and with the exception of the turnover tax issue, since this Government has been in office very little has been done in terms of changing the financial structure of the distribution of TAB funds.

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

**Mr GIBBS:** I will answer those questions for you.

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

**Mr GIBBS:** I will answer them, because the honourable member would be aware that it would not matter what the Government does, a very small minority of people within the industry would never accept change. The judgment on that remark can best be made by the fact that, recently, an administrator stated in a newsletter that was sent out to the membership of his club that, for the last 10 years, every day he has woken up with a political brawl with the Government of the day on his hands. This Government has only been in power since 1989, so the administrator was referring to having political brawls with the previous National Party Government as well.

I know that if the late Russ Hinze was here, he would not mind my mentioning—and I have said it before and I will repeat it again—that if he was left to his own devices, he would have been a major reformer and would have made major structural changes to the racing industry. However, I know as well as the honourable member knows that the vast difference between this Government and the previous National Party Government is the fact that certain influential people in the National Party were able to backdoor the racing Minister of the day to the Premier of the day. Under this Government, that cannot happen. The Government has made significant changes not only to the administration of racing but also to the set-up of racing in this State. On 1 July this year, the new TAB distribution formula will come into operation.

Again, because the Opposition spokesman alluded to the structure of the TAB, I make the point that he has missed the broad picture, which is what he must look at. During the debate, much was said about declining crowds at racetracks. I will address that issue in a moment. However, to say simply that it is the Government's fault that crowds at racetracks are declining, and that we should stop doing this and that through the TAB, is to lose sight of the fact that, apart from the horses being taken to the track, the racing industry today is basically the TAB. That is from where the majority of prize money comes. The simple fact is that it will not matter how professional people are with their promotions, or how good are the champion horses of the day—and we all know that good crowds will go to racetracks to see great horses; that will never change—in the broader picture, as we approach the year 2000 and the competition for the

entertainment dollar gets more intense—which it does every year—there are many more outlets at which people can enjoy gambling, such as poker machines and PubTAB, and excellent facilities in clubs, nightclubs and shows. Those facilities are going to be, and are now, in competition with the TAB. In the years leading up to the year 2000, we must look ahead and say, “We are in the position in which crowds are continuing to decline, and people are not going to the racetrack.”

Recently, I was delighted to hear that the Australian Jockey Club announced that it has signed up with Mr Packer and Channel 9 to broadcast in the not-too-distant future Australian races to Asia via Sky Channel. That will begin at the end of this year. It will start in every casino in the United States. That will mean additional revenue for the TAB. That is money that will go back ultimately into the industry as prize money. So when the day comes that we have pay television, we will have people sitting in the comfort of their lounge rooms on Saturday watching live racing from Randwick and live racing from Doomben, Eagle Farm, or wherever else it may be. If we are going to continue to have a racing industry, the only way in which people will support it is if people are prepared to invest in it. The investment is a horse. The only reason that people will invest in a horse is the lure of prize money. Consequently, prize money is paramount in any argument that is put up about restructuring of the industry. I make no apologies for the restructuring that has taken place because it is designed to ensure that that incentive for people to buy a horse is there by way of prize money.

However, let us consider some of the positive aspects of the racing industry. A constant group of knockers—and I know where they come from—never want to talk about the positive initiatives in the racing industry that have been displayed by this Government. For example, they will not talk about that the fact that this Government said to the TAB, “Go out and buy a radio station”, which it did. As a result of that decision and the establishment of 4TAB, an additional \$2m a year is being saved. That money is going back into the racing industry. For the first time in Queensland’s racing history, within the next eight months the people of the outback and other isolated areas throughout this State will be able to hear live racing broadcasts. That will increase interest in and turnover through the TAB. This Government has introduced PubTAB, which has been an outstanding success. It has generated massive dollars already for the industry by way of investment by the punters, which goes back into the industry as prize money. As the honourable member for Gregory mentioned, the Triad series has been introduced in the west. It was such an outstanding success that the Government will ensure that it goes ahead on a yearly basis. It involved the highest prize money ever offered for races in western areas. The introduction of the new racing incentive scheme involves another \$1.5m going back into the industry throughout Queensland as prize money. The new TAB distribution scheme is designed and written into the regulations to ensure that moneys from the new TAB distribution scheme for the incentive payments must go into prize money. No longer will it go into the lavish boardroom lunches, drinks for the boys in some of those rooms, and some of the other lurks and perks that were used in the past; it will go where it should, that is, into prize money in the racing industry. I will expand on that in a moment to show members exactly what will happen under the new TAB formula.

**Mr Veivers:** You are not going to thank the sponsors.

**Mr GIBBS:** When I left this Chamber yesterday evening, I went up to my room and I opened a dictionary. I looked up the meanings of two words. The first one I looked up was “Mick”—the meaning of “Michael”. It was “intelligent”. I then looked up the meaning of “Veivers”, and it was “not very”. In addition to those initiatives, this year, for the first time, again as a result of initiatives by this Government, we have introduced a proper and professional scheme for the winter carnival in Queensland, based very much on the very successful campaigns that are run in the south for the Melbourne Cup and the spring carnival. I expect that this will do a lot to revitalise public interest in racing.

The honourable member also mentioned telephone betting for bookmakers, which commenced in South Australia last weekend. I understand that the figures quoted by one member are correct. It was reported that an additional \$80,000 was held in the ring. But \$80,000 in the ring at Morphettville is a drop in the bucket. I was over there two or three weeks ago for a Racing Ministers conference. Let me tell honourable members how strong that ring is and why some incentive is needed. My private secretary, who is in the lobby this evening, went into the ring to place a \$100 bet on a horse running in Brisbane at odds of two to one, and the bookmaker would not stand him the bet. Is it any wonder that this sort of incentive is needed? I am on record as saying that I am not bitterly opposed to telephone betting at all.

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

**Mr GIBBS:** The honourable member has had his chance. He can ask me questions later. I have seen a number of the problems that can arise from the introduction of telephone betting.

**Mr Veivers** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Bredhauer): Order! The member for Southport has had his opportunity. He will cease interjecting.

**Mr GIBBS:** I am not prepared to ensure that we will simply follow South Australia without sitting back and seeing what the consequences of it are going to be. Already, South Australia is under threat from the AJC and the VRC, which are very reluctant to provide price fluctuation services. So a problem is already emerging. My advice is—and it will be my advice to people here shortly—that we take a watching brief. We have done a lot of work on it in the department. We have a number of options ready to go, should we need to introduce them, and we will do that.

I thought that the member for Toowoomba North made a very good contribution. I thank him for that. But again, he spent a lot of time talking about the need to introduce telephone betting and consider other alternatives, some of which were suggested in the CJC recommendations. I will go on record as saying—and I make no apology for it—that I do not necessarily believe that every time the CJC brings down a report it is correct, or that as parliamentarians we are bound to follow what the CJC recommends. One thing that I do value in this place is that I am elected by 20 000 people in my electorate. I am not elected from the boardrooms or the structure of the Criminal Justice Commission.

I have mentioned that my department has been working on a review of the Racing and Betting Act. As to why there has not been the broad review to which the honourable member was alluding—that is about to happen. It is not too far off, but we have been very much tied up with looking at all the logistics associated with the telephone betting issue. That has taken up a lot of the time of my departmental officers, because it has been a very big issue to wade through. But I assure the honourable member that, on that issue, a very broad area of consultation was undertaken with race clubs, bookmakers, punters and, I think, some owners—people right across the industry. The CJC and the Police Department were also involved in that consultative process.

The member for Toowoomba North spoke about the need perhaps for an upgrading of the computer system. Queensland TAB has the most sophisticated, advanced computer system anywhere in Australia and, I might add, anywhere in the world, quite apart from the Hong Kong Jockey Club. It is recognised as such. It is at least five years ahead of the systems used by our counterparts in the southern States. If we needed to consider the introduction of telephone betting, we could probably do it very easily through the use of the monitoring systems that we already have in place within the TAB in Queensland.

One of the recommendations from the CJC which the honourable member mentioned related to the provision of credit betting with the TAB. Sorry, but for as long as I am Minister there is no way in the world that this Government will sanction credit betting with the TAB. What does the honourable member expect the TAB to do? Run

around the State getting defaulters? The TAB would be issuing notices on punting defaulters every week. That is not the role in which we want to see the TAB involved. The issue of fixed odds is a hardy perennial. If one speaks to members of the racing industry, particularly in South Australia—and I am sure that he would not mind my mentioning his name, that is, the deputy chairman of the TAB there, Colin Hayes—one will find that that State has developed a computer program for fixed odds. The system has been offered all over the world, but it will not stand up to scrutiny. Nobody wants it, because there is not a system of fixed odds betting with the TAB that will be successful or that will work. It will not matter whether we are in Government or the Opposition is in Government in years to come, the job of government ultimately is to gather revenue and use it in various areas. It simply is not worth the risk of looking at fixed odds betting with the TAB.

As to the national pool for the TAB—I have no intention at this stage of advocating that we should enter a national pool. I say that for two reasons, the first being the one I just mentioned and the second being that we are five years ahead of the other States with our computer network set-up. Why should we cut our customer service to meet the standard of service that is supplied in other States? In New South Wales following a race, punters wait up to 10 minutes for the declaration of a dividend. The reason for that is that the Australian Jockey Club controls the whole system. While this Government is in office, I will not allow that system to be introduced here. I will never have a board of the TAB which is controlled or run by the race clubs. That does not make for professional judgments within the industry.

I thank the member for Gregory for his contribution. He correctly mentioned that the triad series was an outstanding success. He spoke about TAB services in Springsure, Aramac and another town the name of which I forget. I am aware that there have been a couple of cases, albeit sporadic cases, of dissatisfaction in a number of smaller centres throughout Queensland where a number of agencies have been replaced as a result of the introduction of PubTAB. That has been done on a twofold basis: for commercial reasons and customer service. I have heard the argument about the little old lady who has been a punter for 15 years and will not bet in the TAB service in a hotel. All our research has shown that that is a nonsense. I have always found that, where dissatisfaction is voiced, it is usually because the person who has the agency is not happy about losing the agency licence. That basically explains that position. However, I assure all honourable members that the TAB does not intend to sacrifice customer service in any area of the State. In country areas where people may have a problem in getting to PubTAB, we already provide a free telephone betting service.

The member for Clayfield raised again the problems that he saw with Albion Park as a racing centre. If my memory is correct, Albion Park was declared as a registered racing centre in 1870, and has been a registered racing centre since then. For as long as it has been there and there have been houses close to Albion Park, there have been complaints from residents. I am not unsympathetic to some of the problems raised by the honourable member. However, I take exception to the problem he raised about greyhound racing. I do not want to suggest that he does not know what he is talking about, but I suggest that one night he should accompany me to Albion Park so that I can show him how the lighting system works. Anybody who complains about a light problem as a result of the lights at Albion Park is making a frivolous complaint. The lighting produces a strip light or a ribbon light which focuses directly down onto the track. It has been designed that way specifically so that clients have a proper view of greyhound racing at night. As well, it ensures that those in other areas of Australia who want to watch the races on Sky Channel get the full benefit of the event. The lighting does not throw a beam out into suburbia.

The honourable member for Clayfield spoke about the noise from the lure. I acknowledge that perhaps the lure is a little loud. I will have that checked out. Again, that is a part of modern-day greyhound racing. The most modern lure has been installed at Albion Park. It is designed to excite the dogs. As the dogs hear the lure coming

around, they are trained so that, when the boxes open, they bound out and are on the chase immediately.

The member for Indooroopilly made a number of salient points. He asked why we did not include in the legislation clients of SP bookmakers. He claimed that they should be treated exactly the same way as SP bookmakers. I agree totally with him. As we work our way through the procedure of reviewing the Racing and Betting Act, I assure the honourable member that, when I come back to Parliament later this year with further amendments to the Act, I intend to include the same provision for clients of SP bookmakers. I have explained to him that the delay in carrying out the full review was as a result of being tied up with a telephone betting investigation. The honourable member made reference to Terry Page and the CJC. I cannot make any comments about the CJC. Since it has been established, I have had two dealings with it. One experience was to write, as I was required to do under the Act, about a copy of the Auditor-General's report. The other experience I had with the CJC was when it wrote to me two years ago advising me that I had been cleared of an investigation into myself which I did not even know was going on. They are my dealings to date with the Criminal Justice Commission.

**Mr Veivers:** What was that about?

**Mr GIBBS:** It was a complaint from a woman in the tourist industry who claimed that somehow I had interfered in her product and she was not getting a fair go. She made a complaint to the Criminal Justice Commission and it investigated me. As I said, I appreciated the fact that the CJC did not have the courtesy to let me know that I was under investigation. However, the CJC had the good manners to write and advise me that I had been cleared.

I am not unsympathetic to the matter raised by the honourable member for Gympie about sprint racing. I ask him to read the Racing and Betting Act. I am not trying to hide behind that Act, but the honourable member cannot have it both ways. Opposition members and people in some sections of the racing industry will claim that they do not want Government interference in racing. However, when I amend the legislation to remove the right of the Minister to be involved in the day-to-day administration of racing—I do that to satisfy the industry and people such as the honourable member who say that the Government should not be involved—the moment the honourable member has a problem in his electorate, he will want me to jump in and take action on his behalf.

The member is quite an amazing character, and I will tell him why I say that. I read a copy of the National Party's policy on racing. Coincidentally, apart from one small section, it appears that the National Party has copied exactly what I have written into the Racing and Betting Act. It stole what I have in there. For example, it states that the industry should be represented by one principal club—which is what I have introduced—and that that principal club should consist of representatives of jockeys, owners, trainers, bookmakers, etc. They are all there; I have included them, but the member for Gympie does not like it. The policy states also that clubs are to control their own affairs within—and this is the important part—the Australian Rules of Racing and the parameters set by the principal club. The honourable member's party policy states that the clubs are to abide by the rules of the Australian Jockey Club and the conference of the principal clubs in Australia. Yet, in his press release, the honourable member states—

“Mr Stephan said the significance of this reason escapes him as there seems no apparent reason why Queensland should simply follow southern States.”

Do honourable members know why? Because I was told—and the member should appreciate this—“We won't recognise your principal club.” While we were debating this matter over dinner, I asked one of the gentleman at the table why. He said, “Because you've got non-racing people on your principal club.” I replied, “What do you consider to be non-racing people?” He answered, “Jockeys, bookmakers, trainers, owners.” They are the people who they consider to be non-racing people. I find that amazing.

In the few minutes remaining, I want to talk about the accusation by members on the other side of the Chamber that we have milked money from the industry and that the industry is not getting the benefit of it. The new TAB distribution formula introduced by this Government commences on 1 July this year. I will tell honourable members what it means. For the Beaudesert Race Club, it means an injection of funds of an additional \$62,500 per year; for the Brisbane Amateur Turf Club, \$1.29m in prize money; for the Esk Jockey Club, \$38,500; for the Gold Coast Turf Club, \$450,000; for the Lockyer Race Club, \$115,000; for the Queensland Turf Club, which often claims discrimination and says that the Government does not give it a fair go, \$1.124m; and for the Sunshine Coast Turf Club, almost half a million dollars. The honourable member does not want to hear it because he knows that he is wrong. For the Toowoomba Turf Club, it will mean an extra \$254,000. The Rockhampton Jockey Club and the Cairns Jockey Club—all of them—will benefit significantly from this new TAB distribution formula.

In addition, the honourable member said to me the other night, "What have you ever done for the breeding industry in Queensland?" I am delighted that he asked that question, because he has absolutely reaffirmed my faith in the breeders in this State.

**Mr Veivers:** The first thing you have not done is put them under Primary Industries. They can't get any drought relief.

**Mr GIBBS:** The member must be kidding! I am the first Minister ever to have them listed through a decision in Cabinet as primary producers. Horse breeders are now considered to be primary producers, something which the member's party would never do.

**Mr Veivers:** When are you going to do it? When they are all gone?

**Mr GIBBS:** It is done.

**Mr Veivers:** When are they going to get it?

**Mr GIBBS:** They are already making claims. I can show the honourable member the list. If he asks me a question in the House tomorrow, I will show him the list. This Friday, after a long consultation with the breeding industry, I will announce the most outstanding and the best incentive scheme in racing in Australia for Queensland breeders. It will focus on Queensland-bred horses and on assisting this industry that is in a terrible state as a result of the drought. The honourable member for Southport cannot come to grips with it. He is an old National Party man who has been brought up in the belief that members of his party have sole rights to the bush—the born-to-rule syndrome—and he cannot bear sitting on that side of the Chamber in Opposition. He cannot accept the fact that in those country areas, which used to be tiger country for the National Party, there is now a great acceptance of what the Australian Labor Party, a Labor Government in Queensland, is doing for the people in those areas. He should ask them what they thought of the Triad series. The fact is that members of the National Party are men and women of the past. They are not wanted and they are going to be sitting on the Opposition side of the Chamber for a long time.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

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

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

**Mr VEIVERS** (8.22 p.m.): The Racing and Betting Amendment Bill amends the principal Act. I want the Minister to tell me when he will pay the clubs the new TAB dividends. Will it be at the beginning of the season or at the end of the season? The Minister has announced new TAB payouts for the clubs, and I am just wondering when the payments will be made.

**Mr GIBBS:** There are two categories which will be introduced under the new formula, that is, the Racing Development Fund clubs and the TAB clubs. The RDF clubs will be paid pretty much on a regular basis as they hold their events. When it is verified by the Queensland Principal Club that the events have been held, they will be paid virtually upfront. The whole idea is to prevent the clubs from having to borrow from the banks, which they had to do in the past, thereby incurring high interest repayments that caused them a lot of problems. We have removed that difficulty and they will now be paid regularly. Under the new distribution formula, the TAB clubs will be paid three times a year as against their being paid twice a year at the moment.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 and Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 2—

**Mr GIBBS** (8.24 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

“At page 15, omit lines 8 to 12.”

It is only a technicality. It is not a drama.

**Mr BEANLAND:** We do not have a copy of that amendment.

**Mr GIBBS:** It is a matter which has been made redundant as a result of the introduction of the Penalties and Sentences Bill.

**Mr Mackenroth:** The Penalties and Sentences Bill was introduced yesterday.

**Mr GIBBS:** It was introduced yesterday and it overrides this legislation.

Amendment agreed to.

Schedule 2, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## CLASSIFICATION OF FILMS AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 18 March (see p. 2422).

**Mr STONEMAN** (Burdekin) (8.28 p.m.): On behalf of the Opposition, I rise to support a proposition being put by the Government tonight in respect of this Bill. I must say, though, that we have reservations. The Opposition will not divide the House or oppose the Bill, but the reservations we have are realistic. In many ways, I think they are probably supported by the Minister. Given the modern environment and expectations of the community, the classification of any material, much less videos and films, is a very difficult matter. There is a divergence of opinion within the community. On the one hand, the community has a right to extension of the capacity of people to view material—that is, written, film and other forms—in the privacy of their own homes. Of course, that means that a production process is involved, and that creates an underground trade. Ordinary, average people do not wish to be affronted by the products of that trade, but they necessarily become affronted and confronted by it in the course of their daily lives.

One of the difficulties of addressing a censorship process is applying the law. I acknowledge that the existing M classification is far too broad within the context of the Bill. I also acknowledge that the proposed MA classification will bring some benefits to the community. Because it is a benefit to the community, I believe it is necessary for the Opposition to support this process in the House tonight. I know that there will be other speakers raising points of concern from this side of the House, but I must say that whilst

we believe it needs to go much further, it is difficult to proceed to any degree in this situation simply because there needs to be agreement across the States and within the Commonwealth context. I guess the nigger in the woodpile in relation to the classification of any material in Australia is the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory—paradoxically, of course, the seat of power. They are hiding, if you like, behind the provisions of section 92 of the Constitution in the requirement that there be free trade between States. The material that has been coming out of the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory is probably much more explicit and antisocial, if one likes to put it that way, than members on either side of the House would probably wish. I acknowledge again that probably there are members on the Government side who would fight for the right of people to look at any material regardless of how unacceptable it might be in moral terms. I am not suggesting that the members opposite are immoral. What they are looking at is the basic right of the individual. I guess that is the paradox that we face in the censorship process.

I must say I am not sure that I could put forward to the House a proposition that would necessarily solve the concerns that I have or, I am sure, members on this side of the House and, I am equally sure, members on the other side of the House would have in respect of the processes of censorship, because it is not easy. It is just not easy. Where does one draw the line? Of course, the legal processes are such that there always seems to be a loophole. I know that, part and parcel of this Bill, there is an attempt to redefine the processes that are attached to the existing M classification and to create a situation in which there is more adult control over the viewing of certain films and the exploitation of them. There should also be a process which puts the onus back on the video shop operators, on film producers and, of course, those people involved in the various public showings of films. I think it is a good thing. It is a step in the right direction; whether or not it is a step far enough in the right direction is another question.

I also acknowledge the difficulty that there is legally in maintaining a process with the so-called swap clubs and the very difficult processes involved in applying that law. Whilst there will always be loopholes, as I said earlier, I think the Minister has gone some way in attempting to address this. One would think that in the future there will be a further tightening up of the processes. I realise also that, in this modern day and age, as one door is closed there are others that are opened by people who probably have views contrary to those that seek to make the law a little bit more acceptable in the community sense. There are four areas that would concern me to some degree. The Bill also addresses the problem of the delegation of power in relation to the censor in Queensland. I do acknowledge the fact that the poor devil needs to go on a holiday occasionally and do those sorts of things. I have no hesitation in supporting that component. Oh, to have a holiday!

I thank the Minister for making available the officers of his department to brief members of the Opposition in relation to the impact of the Bill. The member for Maroochydore raised a point of interest in this area. Unfortunately she cannot be in the House tonight because of a prior commitment. She particularly wanted to speak about some areas of concern she has in respect of the Bill. In fact, today she raised with the officers the problem of how censorship is addressed in terms of computer programs and video programs that are becoming more and more accessible to the community, particularly young persons. Computer programs are becoming more sophisticated and more difficult to assess. The nature of the programming that can be now installed within a program is complex. Considerable time is involved in assessing those components that might need to be censored. That is a very difficult process. I do not believe this Bill seeks to address that, but I think it is something about which we should be aware. In the near future, these matters have to be confronted by the people of Queensland and by the members of this House, as the law makers of this State. There is an era of sophistication that is upon us and probably we are not very well prepared to accommodate it in terms of the impact it can have on the community, and the broad moral values that we in the community expect. There is a major concern within the community about the impact of explicit and graphic films depicting violence, degrees of

sexual conduct that I think 99.9 per cent of the population would feel is not really conducive to promoting good community life, family life and all those things that most of us, I am sure, hold dear. There is a major concern, though, that there is almost a competition in the community to produce material that is more graphic and more explicit and therefore will sell in a more sensational manner than the competitive article. Again, I believe that the reclassification is an attempt in some way to approach those concerns. Since the last foray into censorship made by this House, I have observed less community concern than was the case prior to that legislation, wherein, particularly at the newsagency level——

**Mr Fenlon:** It was good legislation, wasn't it?

**Mr STONEMAN:** I understand that it was legislation that was supported in the House. I do not know whether or not it meets all of the concerns that I am sure members on both sides of the House have. People coming to my office, who prior to the introduction of that legislation had a concern, generally seem to have accepted that there has been a change for the better. I would expect that situation to apply again in due course. We need to understand that the mere passing of this Bill or its receiving assent does not mean that immediately, tomorrow morning, there will be a change on the street. Thousands and thousands of videos are not going to be changed immediately because of the reclassification process. The bureaucratic process that would be required to do that overnight would be horrific. Again, we discussed that with the officers today. I think it was generally conceded and accepted by all of those present that the processes of wear and tear are going to take a toll on those videos, but that there will be a lot of young people—and I guess older people—who are going to have access to videos that we are seeking, via the processes of this Bill, to make somewhat harder to be accessed. They will continue to have access to them for some considerable time. As members of Parliament, we need to accept that we have a commitment to the community to make sure that it understands that it is not going to be an immediate process, that it will not happen overnight, but that it is part of what I would hope is a continuing process towards a re-emergence of an acceptance that there needs to be a greater focus on the things that impact on the moral values of our community.

At times, probably all of us are affronted—or switched on, if you like, or turned on or off, depending on our preferences—by what I call the sexuality in the advertising in the community now. There is more and more explicit advertising, using the sexuality of men and women—but more particularly women—that I think will have to be addressed in due course as well. That is really where we are coming to with this Bill. It is because we as a community have been pushed to the fringe of consensus, if you like, that we are required to address the situation and take some sort of a stand—draw a line. That will have to be addressed in relation to sales advertising. There is a subtle conditioning of the community to the view that what we accept now as being perfectly normal—and I apply this to films, magazines and all of those sorts of things—would have been absolutely and totally taboo only a few short years ago. Maybe, because I have now moved into grandfatherhood and all of those things, I am old fashioned enough to believe that the more flesh, perhaps the less turning on. Maybe that is an ageing process. There is a subtlety in the way in which we are being conditioned to accept that, unless we see almost a totally naked body or a totally sexual process, advertisers are not able to sell a motor car, a cigarette or whatever it might be. I think that is sad. It is in trying to stop that progress that we support this Bill.

There is a need to balance what we might term the Victorian attitude and the present-day attitude. Maybe that is what the Premier seeks to do with his movement into republicanism, to try to balance the need or the desire of the community to not necessarily stay in the Victorian age. I think we can gallop too far into the modern age and say that change means that we are modern. I do not think we need to cast off the old values. I know that we do not. We do not need to say that everything that was done in the Victorian era was necessarily correct, but there are some values, some concerns and some indicators that we need to recognise. The ultra-modern might be fine, but I

think we need to maintain that balance. I hope that this Bill will be a part of the process of assisting us in the maintenance of that value and that balance.

I guess the other thing that probably concerns virtually every member of the House, most members of the community and certainly every thinking parent is the increasing use of coarse language in the community. It appals me to go to functions from time to time where it seems to be the done thing to use language that is totally unacceptable in normal, everyday communication. Yet one attends social functions, mainly, where it seems to be smart to use language that is absolutely coarse, vulgar and not necessary. I am not a prude. However, I must admit that I have moments when I use expletives under my breath. In the course of my non-political career prior to coming into this House when I was out in the scrub charging after a scrub bull or trying to shear a rotten sheep that was a bit tough, or doing something like that, I have probably used language that I would not be proud of.

**Mr Littleproud:** What if you got lip from a fast bowler; how would you go then?

**Mr STONEMAN:** Well, that is different, but I would not be proud of it. However, I believe that I chose the appropriate time and place. I did not use language that offended those around me. I am sure that most other members would be in the same category. Even so, the language that I used in the paddock was far less coarse than that I now hear in the city, where once one never would have heard bad language.

**Mrs McCauley** interjected.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I will not take that interjection. That concerns me. I believe that it nibbles away at the edges of community and family values which all honourable members attempt, in various ways, to maintain. All of those conditioning processes—more explicit material and more violence in films—flow through to the community. If a film portrays some poor devil being shot through the ear 11 times with a bullet, we think, "That was not too bad. It could have been 45 times through both ears." Violence is growing on us and it is being accepted. That might be acceptable to adults; they can control it. However, what about children? What about those who are legally adults but who do not understand that they are extremely impressionable and are subject to numerous pressures? Adults have a responsibility to set standards, to maintain standards and, if you like, to be a bit old-fashioned, Victorian and pig-headed and say, "Enough is enough."

I am sure that other members will bring this up, but I must say that I was affronted by an article which appeared yesterday in the *Courier-Mail*. It carried the headline, "Censor not way to fight violent sex crime: prof". The "prof" is Professor Paul Wilson of the Queensland University of Technology. I wonder where Professor Wilson lives—under a rock? From where does that man come? I will give him the benefit of the doubt; perhaps he has been misquoted, but I suspect not. He seems to be implying that the values incorporated in this Bill are not worth while. According to Professor Wilson—

"Queensland's 'ruthless censorship' of sexually explicit material had not reduced the number of violent sex crimes in the state . . ."

He uses Canberra as a comparison. For God's sake—excuse my language—Canberra is a totally different society from those in the rest of Australia. It is a false society. It has nothing to do with ordinary Australia. It has a standard of living and a standard of society—perhaps that is the origin of the language to which the member for Callide referred—that is not average. I am sure that the Premier would agree that Canberra is not an accurate representation of average Australia. However, Professor Wilson says that, because fewer rapes occur in Canberra, where X-rated videos are sold with open slather, it means that Queensland is adopting the wrong approach. What a lot of rot! As a parent, I will not accept that. I have seen my son become totally aggressive because of the types of films he had been watching. I have seen the rainy-day syndrome, as I am sure other parents have. On a rainy day, to keep the kids occupied, parents will put on a video or make the television set the baby-sitter. If children watch enough programs of the wrong type, they become aggressive—as we all do—and they want to punch the

fridge or do something worse. I am not a psychologist or a professor, thank God, if Professor Wilson is representative of that profession, because I believe that he is off the planet with his suggestion.

**Dr Watson:** It doesn't happen to all of them.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I am sure that the member for Moggill is not in that category. That sort of article receives a headline, yet the ordinary, average mum and dad who are battling with the aggression of kids know that there is absolutely no doubt that the increasing aggression and violence in society are a part and parcel of the conditioning via the television—not so much by the hard-core material but by the depictions of violence on film. The Minister would not be old enough but, as he is of pretty much the same era as me, my friend the member for Maryborough would remember Tom Mix and Hopalong Cassidy. When I went to see the Saturday afternoon flicks and came out into the back street, I was dodging ricocheting bullets and riding horses. I relived what I had seen on film. It had an impact on me and I would go into a fantasy world. That is a part and parcel of the impact that films have on people at every level of society.

**Mr Mackenroth:** The thing I remember about every Saturday afternoon is that they would leave you in suspense as to what would happen next week to get you back to pay your money again.

**Mr STONEMAN:** It was clever marketing. However, the——

**Mr Mackenroth:** The thing I remember about it is that every Saturday afternoon, they would leave you in suspense as to what would happen; whether he went over a waterfall, or whether the train ran over him.

**Mr STONEMAN:** Yes, but the Minister would agree that although it was a momentary impact, it was an impact that he remembers to this day. That is the point that I am making.

**Mr Milliner:** That was before my time.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I recognise that the youthful Minister would not know about that. That is why I was very careful to pick out someone from my era. The fact of the matter is that violence does impact on people. It concerns me that in a socioeconomic structure, credibility is given to those movies and to the perpetrator of what I believe to be an act of violence. In this instance, I do not blame the *Courier-Mail*. I blame it for many things, but I do not blame it for printing the article. However, the fact of the matter is that it is, by any decent form of observation, incorrect. It is not correct to compare apples with oranges. Queensland has nothing to do with Canberra. Apparently, there are fewer rapes in Canberra. It might be that fewer rapes are reported. I do not know. The fact of the matter is that I think that is most unfortunate. I will leave to others the article by Professor Wilson, the processes and the journey of reminiscence.

As I say, I am sure that the violence and explicit sexuality in videos and films has an impact upon us and our children. It may be that, as adults, we are able to control the urges, or the violence, that might otherwise come out in us. However, from time to time, we see some very sad situations in which there are bashings and shootings. Having said that, the Opposition supports the intent of what the Minister is seeking to do. It recognises that it is necessary to create commonality throughout Australia. The Territories are the only places that are out of step with the requirements of the community.

I must say that I have had representations from very well-meaning people who have suggested to me that there many pluses in maintaining a process that allows X-rated films to be sent from Canberra around the country. That may be the subject of another debate. Personally, I do not think that anything is gained by it. I prefer to see those films burnt. However, that is not going to happen, and we would be kidding ourselves if we thought that that would be the case. I acknowledge—as Professor Wilson stated in the article—that there are points of view and arguments to the contrary. However, as a parent, a grandparent and a member who represents a constituency, my

deep belief is that people want less violence, fewer sexually explicit videos and fewer magazines that demean people of both sexes. Those items are unnecessary, but they probably fill a market niche. Many books have been written about the good that those things do. However, they are not for me. I think that there should be some mechanisms by which parents and other members of the community can have some degree of control over those items, and their families can be afforded some degree of protection.

This legislation is not totally adequate, and it would be unrealistic of us to say that it is completely adequate and that it will solve all the problems. Nevertheless, I think that it is a reasonable step. I am sure that some of my colleagues believe that it does not go far enough. However, it is a step that the Opposition supports.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Bredhauer): Order! Before I call the member for Maryborough, I would like to observe that some use has been made by members of the vernacular. Although that may once have been commonplace, I regard it as unacceptable and, in these more enlightened days, even offensive, racist and beneath the standard to which this House should aspire. I ask members to choose their language carefully.

**Mr DOLLIN** (Maryborough) (8.58 p.m.): In rising to speak to this Classification of Films Amendment Bill, I must say that I am not up to date, as some of my colleagues may be, on the story lines of the latest movies. Because I live in Maryborough, I have to wait until I come down to Brisbane to catch up with the latest movies. The last of Maryborough's cinemas, the Wintergarden, closed its doors more than a decade ago to the pounding hoof beats of the big movie of that time, *Phar Lap*. The modern trend appears to be somewhat along the lines of how much horror, sex, foul language and sheer violence the producers can cram into two hours of entertainment. Comparisons of movies such as *Crocodile Dundee* with *Cape Fear*, or *My Left Foot* with *Silence of the Lambs* have been canvassed already. To my mind, they are probably the stock standard benchmarks for M and MA classifications.

I wish to mention another little gem advertised in this week's Entertainment Guide in the *Courier-Mail* titled *A French Vampire in America*, which is rated M. The advertisement for this homely piece of relaxing entertainment showed the face of a young lady transformed into some sort of creature with glazed, bulging eyes, hair sticking out, protruding fangs and blood dripping down like sweat from a marathon runner. In the advertisement we are told, "She sleeps all day, stays out all night. Marie also watches what she eats. . . creeps, criminals, low lifes." One probably does not need to watch this movie to know what it is all about—a modernisation of the old Vincent Price zombie and vampire movies, with an emphasis on shock, horror and visual revulsion. The M rating in the advertisement is accompanied by the following statement—

"Recommended for mature audiences 15 years and over. High level violence, coarse language and sex scenes."

I cannot understand why mature audiences would pay money for this type of entertainment. But that M rating virtually means that anybody at all can go and see that movie, but it is really only suitable for people 15 years of age and over. This is a classic case of what sort of films should at least be classified MA, thereby making it illegal for youngsters under 15 to watch them unless accompanied by an adult. In the very same entertainment guide there was an advertisement for *Sommersby*, billed as "a great old-fashioned love story." This "classic" love story was also rated M with the following explanation, "Low-level sex scene." I am not trying to do the chief censor's job, but I would suggest that the M rating attributed to both those films would do absolutely nothing to differentiate between the entertainment value and the suitability for viewing by young teenagers.

I am especially interested in this legislation because there is a concerted push to have a new cinema opened in Maryborough. The bulk of the people leading this push are pensioners and youngsters who would probably not be beating down the doors to see *A French Vampire in America* or similar movies. Perhaps the youngsters may wish to

view these films, but I believe that we have a duty to protect them from mindless violence and Hollywood-type sex fantasies. That may sound like over-protection, but if the MA-rated movies are particularly appealing to our youth, then they can always attend public screenings in the company of an adult. At least then the onus is on the parents or responsible person to show some concern for what our youth of today are subjected to.

On 13 March, the *Courier-Mail* presented a report on sex and violence in movies titled "Hollywood Verses Civilisation". Most of that report regarding the standard of current movie making made a lot of sense to me personally. However, that is not the point in this legislation. We are not here to judge whether or not people should be allowed to view *Silence of the Lambs*, *Cape Fear* or *Terminator II*. We are here to make it just that little bit easier for parents to judge between what is good for their kids to watch and what is potentially damaging. It also gives the kids a bit of guidance as to what they may not have had before, and the cinema owners have some legitimacy over who they can and cannot accommodate.

As I said, Maryborough has not seen a picture theatre for the past decade or so. We have been restricted to videos and the odd encounter with the drive-in. I am sure that many of my colleagues, especially those from rural areas, would have experienced the joys of a cinema like the old Maryborough Wintergarden. One never had to worry about the airconditioning breaking down or being choked to death with cigarette smoke. The old Wintergarden was an open-roofed building that doubled as a "Summergarden" during the hot, sweaty, summer afternoons. It is pleasing to note that the standard of theatres has definitely improved over the years. I envisage that the new theatre in Maryborough will be airconditioned, comfortable, smoke free, and equipped with the latest in audiovisual equipment. What a shame the standard of movie making has not improved at the same rate!

There is the standard argument from the billionaire movie makers that they are bringing reality into our lives. The theory is that Julie Andrews and the tribe of kids flanking her on top of those beautiful Swiss mountains are a fantasy; that it just does not happen in real life for all those people to suddenly appear over the mountains in perfect voice singing, "The hills are alive with the sound of music." Maybe not! But I am not sure that I would accept as reality the sight of Anthony Hopkins inside a perfectly lit, well-guarded cage inside City Hall suddenly stripping the meat and flesh off two police officers and escaping from the entire American law enforcement agencies. That scene from the *Silence of the Lambs* was particularly graphic and unnecessarily gruesome, and was enough for me to classify it as at least MA, if not R. There are people in the community who actually believe that films have absolutely no influence on people's behaviour. They rationalise that everybody knows that films are only make believe and, therefore, their brains automatically tell them that the films are entertainment and have no value as influence factors. To bolster their argument, they normally quote such hard evidence as, "I used to watch the Lone Ranger, Superman and the Texas Rangers every Saturday afternoon, and I never went out and shot everybody in sight"—or superheroes such as Audie Murphy, who killed more baddies in one movie than did the entire allied forces during World War II. I suppose that in our youth we all had our cap guns, slingshots and water pistols, and we all played out fantasies as neighbourhood heroes. Nowadays, the kids run around with meltdown ray guns, or laser guns that freeze your veins and suck the eyes from your sockets. Where do we stop? At what point do we say, "This is gory, sick, torturous material to be feeding to our children."

As responsible adults, I suppose that society expects us to make decisions on what we believe is entertainment and what is rubbish. At the same time, society expects us to impose some standards, rather than allowing us to become totally uncensored. I believe that this legislation improves that balance between censorship and free for all. We have an obligation to our children and their children to nurse them through their infancy, guide them through their youth and, hopefully, have them mentally and socially equipped to judge reality from fantasy once they reach maturity. I have concentrated on public viewing in cinemas, perhaps because I am looking forward to the day when Maryborough gets its new cinema.

Before I sit down, I would also like to touch on the relevance of this legislation to the very lucrative video industry. Videos are really hard to police, no matter what legislation is introduced. However, this Bill will make it an offence for a proprietor of a video store to hire to a child under the age of 15 years a video rated MA. Such offences will attract a fine of 10 penalty units, currently \$600. Obviously, there will be occasions on which the kids will hoodwink the video store proprietors, and the Bill provides defences where reasonable steps have been taken to establish the age of children. There again, if dad or big brother or sister hire an MA video and let the youngsters under 15 watch it at home, there can be no penalty, as no offence has been committed. I guess that it all comes down to responsibility. This legislation makes the exhibitors or video shop proprietors responsible for who hires a video or comes to see an MA-rated movie. The ultimate responsibility lies with the parents, guardians and friends of our youngsters. I hope that they will show by their actions that they value the most precious of all commodities that children have—innocence. Innocence does not last for long; so, if we can take a small step to preserve it and protect our kids from the harsh reality of adult life, I am all for it. I congratulate the Minister on bringing this amending Bill before the House.

**Mr LAMING** (Mooloolah) (9.08 p.m.): The Classification of Films Amendment Bill has been classed as having three objectives. I will restrict my comments to only the first objective. It would seem, however, that the first objective is itself split into two segments. The first is to create a new film classification by subdividing the existing M rating into M and MA. The Explanatory Notes claim that this Bill addresses recent community concerns expressed about the breadth of the M classification for films and videos. My first question to the Minister is this: is the community concern really about the breadth of the M classification or is it really that the community is concerned about the increase in coarse language, violence and explicit sex in films and videos generally? I believe that that is closer to the actual concern.

The Bill's stated intent is to create a new section. That section is ostensibly created by dividing the old M rating into M and the new MA. The old M rating allowed—

crude language;

sexual intercourse may be implied or simulated; and

realistic violence of medium intensity.

The new MA is supposed to include those parts of the M classification that are not suitable for those under 15 years of age. But we now have six possible classifications of films and videos: G, PG, M, R, X and another group that will not be classified. Is the Minister suggesting that seven classifications are necessary or will really address the problem? I would like a specific answer to that question.

I suggest that most people do not fully understand the present classifications and may be even more confused following this amendment. Let me put forward my view. I believe that all examples of coarse language, violence and explicit sex should be reclassified to the R classification. I submit that, if scenes or language are deemed undesirable for 13 or 14-year-olds, they are not suitable for 15 or 16-year-olds either. To my mind, there is no way that 15-year-olds are automatically more psychologically mature than 14-year-olds. I do not believe that we need more classifications. I believe that the main concerns can be addressed by applying a more responsible allocation to the existing classifications.

The other aspect on which I would like to touch is that of the object of making the various States' legislation uniform. I do not necessarily subscribe to that when considering moral issues. If we believe that it is imperative to have uniform social legislation across Australia, perhaps we should abdicate this responsibility to the Commonwealth Parliament. In the meantime, it is our responsibility in this House to consider legislation for Queenslanders. It would be insulting to our electorate to go back and say, "Well, we had to support it because of interstate uniformity." I do not agree with that. However, as the member for Burdekin has said, we will not be opposing

the Bill because it may, hopefully, result in an improvement in the current situation. I fervently hope that it does. I just hope that there will be a new appreciation and understanding by those charged with the heavy responsibility of making the classifications of movies.

Might I close by repeating that I do not believe that even 15 and 16-year-olds should be subjected to some of the current M-rated movies. As the Minister said in his 1991 speech, "The evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society must be upheld and strengthened." I note the Deputy Speaker's comments a few moments ago about the standard of language which is required in this Chamber. I applaud and support his remarks. Why then should we tolerate a different level of acceptance in our own homes and theatres for the tender ears of 15-year-olds? Nobody should be exposed to unsolicited material which is offensive to them. Those are again the words of the Minister. Children must be adequately protected from material that is likely to harm or disturb them.

**Mr PYKE** (Mount Ommaney) (9.13 p.m.): Earlier in this debate, the member for Burdekin, Mr Stoneman, used a phrase that I find offensive. For the benefit of members who may have been absent from the Chamber and for the purpose of the record, I will repeat the phrase. He used the phrase "nigger in the woodpile". Not only is that dreadfully offensive to me—it is degrading, unparliamentary and unacceptable language. I find it a shame that in 1993 a member of the Forty-seventh Queensland Parliament can still be using such offensive language. I wish to record my absolute horror at that statement this evening in relation to a Bill which relates to the classification of films in our State. In 1976, I entered the profession of policing and noted very early in my policing career that we have an unacceptably violent culture. I believe that is because we have a history which is founded on myths—myths of inequality, myths of cowboy heroism, and myths that are perpetuated throughout our modern culture, particularly in the very powerful film and television media.

I commend to all members of the House, particularly those who share the same views as the member for Burdekin, a movie called *Unforgiven*, which I viewed fairly recently and which I found depressing. I walked away from it and wondered what the message was. Later, I realised that the message from the movie was that the western cowboy era in the United States was a myth and a lie. The writers had glorified a very violent culture in which people who went around killing others, often for small financial gain, became heroes in that culture. It is an interesting movie. I urge members to watch that movie to see the way in which women were treated and to see the way in which violence was an everyday part of that culture.

As I said, it was very early in my police career that I learned how violent our culture is, particularly towards women, children, those of us who are not Caucasian in appearance, our indigenous people and ethnic people. It was later at the University of Queensland that I had the advantage of studying the media and violence against women, so I take the opportunity this evening to speak to some of those issues. I reiterate that film and television are a very powerful medium for the perpetuation of a violent culture—a violent, sexist and racist culture. What we are talking about here is not a revolution; we are talking about an evolution. I commend the Minister and the Government for its interest in raising our consciousness and taking the responsibility to care for and be responsible to all groups in our community.

We are talking here about a wider classification system to prevent the desensitisation and normalisation in our culture towards images of violence and inappropriate gratuitous sexuality. We have to be careful—and I think that the Government is mindful—of the fact that there are groups in our community with axes to grind. I do not find the actions of the Goss Government in this regard as being those of a wowsie Government but as those of a responsible Government acting to prevent violence against women and children. I hope that we can learn from this and ensure that we choose our language carefully and support initiatives of this nature which will not perpetuate a violent culture. I want also to go on record as saying that I have similar

concerns about video games, computer arcade games and personal computer games. I believe that we need a classification regulation system to ensure that similar protection is provided within that system.

I challenge film and television producers to produce quality films and videos that are uplifting of a free, just and equal global community—films and videos which will enrich our diverse culture, not perpetuate and glorify an often violent and mythical culture which appears directed at ensuring that women and children continue to be at risk of male violence. I encourage women to take a leading role in the production, direction and script writing of film and television to prevent the continued production of mindless and gratuitous sex and violent content in videos and television. Again, I commend the Minister and the Government for its speedy action to ensure greater control in our State over access to film and television with a violent sexual content.

**Mrs McCAULEY** (Callide) (9.21 p.m.): We have obviously been hearing from a sensitive, new age man. It is just a shame that he was so pompous about it. This Bill is to be commended. I have a certain standard that I require when I go to the movies—which is not very often—and I always like to see something that is entertaining in the true sense of the word. It has to be funny, with no sex and no violence. Recently, I had a night off and I went to see a movie at a local cinema. I cannot remember the name of it, but the actor Jeremy Irons was in it, and I really like him. I thought that it would be an interesting movie. I lasted only half an hour before I fled. I was pleased that I was on my own and that I did not drag someone else out of the theatre with me. It was just too much for me to watch.

**Mrs Woodgate:** You stick to *Tom and Jerry*.

**Mrs McCAULEY:** That is probably about my scene. I am not a prude, but I really did not need to be watching that. It is very hard to find films that fulfil my criteria. The film has to make me laugh and there has to be no sex or violence. It is unfortunate that, these days, there obviously seems to be the demand for other types of films to which I referred.

This legislation follows on from Federal Government recommendations and changes. I think it is a positive move to narrow the M category to include an MA category which will ban people under 15 years of age from viewing or hiring, unless accompanied by an adult. It allows for an enforceable category as against the advisory M category, and I think that is a positive step. However, there are some other moves that I believe could be made to make the legislation even better. One is to widen the legislation to cover video games. Honourable members who saw the ABC's *7.30 Report* on 3 May would have noted the high level of gratuitous video games used in fun parlours such as Funzone. The report targeted the game *Mortal Combat* which was full of very graphic, excessive violence and a lot of blood was shown. I think those games are cause for concern. I do not think that parents are as aware of them as they should be.

Video games are used widely by a variety of age groups but they particularly target people aged 9 to 15 years. Because these games are seen by the parents as safe, they tend to be unsupervised in terms of parents checking out their contents. Parents are often unaware of the software content because of the skill needed to access them, which tends to be a child's skill rather than an adult's skill. The parents say, "Johnny is playing a video game", but they do not particularly check out exactly what the video game is all about. It means that little Johnny can have long hours of exposure, which is unfortunate. There is a link between the exposure to television or video violence and violent crime, regardless of what Professor Paul Wilson says. I will talk about him later.

Society is becoming more and more concerned about the link between videos and violence. On 21 December 1992 in the *Courier-Mail*, the Australian Broadcasting Authority's comments on violence were reported as follows—

"Violence (on TV) worries more Australians than sexually explicit material."

I think that is quite correct and that violence is more damaging than sexually explicit material. Video violence is an invidious problem. Kids grow up thinking that it is all right to bash someone on the head or put his arm on a chain saw, or whatever is being portrayed, but that sort of violence gives me the horrors. Unfortunately, it is very widespread.

I think it is important to encourage the provision of an education program for parents and other adults so that they are aware of each of these categories. The M category is very broad and still includes violence, sex and bad language. The MA category takes away the rather nebulous top end of the old M category but people may not be aware of what the M category still contains. The Chief Censor, John Dickson, commented that it is "essential parents play their part" and that "they have to get involved". I think that is true and I do not think that enough parents realise that they should be involved and need to know what their kids are watching. A long time ago—it would be six or seven years now—I remember my children bringing home a video one Saturday afternoon and sitting with some mates to watch it. I thought that I would sit with them and watch it as well. The violence in that particular video was horrific and it gave me the horrors. I was quite perturbed that my children were watching this type of film in my house. We then introduced a system of censorship so that the violent videos did not come into our house. It is very easy for this type of thing to occur because most parents do not have the time to sit down and take note of what their kids are watching.

Education is needed to ensure that parents can make well informed judgments on their children's proposed viewing by telling them what can be expected within each of the categories. I believe that that is most important. In the *Australian* on 26 November 1992, a discussion on this matter led to the comment—

"What Governments can do is limited. They cannot do much if parents abdicate their responsibility."

That is true. It is parents' responsibility, and they must accept that responsibility. As a follow-on to educating the public, we need to urge newspapers to display the ratings and the symbols in TV guides and the entertainment sections of newspapers so that people become familiar with them and can tell at a glance exactly what the rating of a particular movie is. I think that is most important also. We should encourage regular explanations of those classifications, particularly during the school holiday period when the kids are watching the films.

We also need to encourage the classification of promotional material. Classifications exist in a lot of other areas, so why should that not happen in this area, too? We need to restrict the early promotion of AO and MA material. The shorts usually contain the juicy bits and are shown during the day in the 5 p.m. to 7.30 p.m. timeslot when all the kids are watching. This is done to promote videos for hire, TV programs or cinema-based films. To my mind, it is not acceptable to have these juicy bits of a video for hire being promoted during programs such as *Burke's Backyard*. It is wrong. It should not happen. There should be a way of stamping that out. The scenes are fairly explicit. For example, scenes from the movie *Fatal Attraction* have been shown. This film is in the top end of the M category but the excerpts from it are being shown in a G timeslot. Although I would hate to see this classification process being bogged down by having more specific categories, I think that care should be taken to ensure that there is not too great a gap between the PG category and the M category. We should monitor the situation in case at some future stage there is again a need to amend the legislation. The original legislation was introduced in 1991 and I think it should be monitored continually to see whether or not it needs to be further amended.

In conclusion, I will make brief comments on Professor Paul Wilson and his statements. The member for Burdekin has already referred to this. After reading Professor Wilson's comments, I am left with the impression that his views are most misleading, inaccurate, offensive and just plain stupid. I am also left with the impression that Professor Paul Wilson is one of those people who go home at night, sit in a darkened room and watch pornographic videos while doing things that little boys get

smacked for. I really do not think very highly of him. He is using his position in a most discreditable manner. He is promoting a point of view that is patently not true. There certainly is a link between violence on television and violence in our community, and I think he is totally wrong. I do not know what barrow he is pushing or for what gain he is pushing it, but I believe that he is not serving the community at large by his comments. I hope that he is very seriously discredited in the near future.

**Mr NUTTALL** (Sandgate) (9.30 p.m.): I do not intend to speak at length on the Bill other than to make a few relevant comments. One of the comments I wish to make concerns the fact that this new classification covers not only films but also videos. A number of members have spoken about videos. We now live in a society in which most homes have not only a television set but also a video. I think it is incumbent upon not only parents but also proprietors of video shops to ensure that they handle properly the distribution of videos. When I go to the movies, I personally tend not to be keen on violence and that sort of thing. I like to go for a bit of entertainment and enjoyment. That is the main idea of movies today.

The other point about this legislation—and it has been mentioned before—is the fact that it is supported by all Governments in Australia. I think it is very important that the legislation has the support of all Governments in Australia and the fact that we have some sort of national standard throughout the country.

The other important component in the Bill is the fact that children under the age of 15 years will not be able to hire any of the MA classified videos unless they are accompanied by an adult. The onus therefore simply falls on the proprietors of both movie houses and video shops to ensure that they do not allow in children who are under the age of 15 years and that they do not hire out videos to children who are under the age of 15 years. I understand from the proprietors of video shops and movie house owners that one of the problems is the fact that sometimes it is hard to detect how old children are. That is certainly a problem. However, they never seem to find it too hard when they charge a full adult admission price to someone who is 14 years of age or younger. So if the line can be drawn there, I am sure the line can be drawn when they are looking for people who are around the 15 years of age mark or over. There is an old saying, "When in doubt, throw it out." So if they are unsure about children's ages, the simple matter is that they should just not let them in. In a society in which we tend to make many laws, one of the things we must realise is that somewhere along the line parents have to take some responsibility. For far too long it has been the old adage, "Give the children some money and let them duck down to the video shop, sit in there, watch the video and away they go." I think parents must play a far, far greater role in resolving the problem.

There are a couple of other things I want to refer to. In relation to our role as a Government, we do not intend to be too heavy handed on movie house proprietors who are trying to abide by the law. In fact, we will do all we can to assist them in that regard. In relation to the other part of the legislation regarding the definition of the word "sell", this simply relates to swap clubs that are formed. They are formed for the sole reason of making money. They are not set up simply to swap videos. They simply charge some sort of an up-front membership fee, and then when swapping a video they charge a service fee. What that does obviously is proliferate the distribution of films and movies that certainly should not be viewed by younger people. I am glad to see that provision in the legislation.

Debate, on motion of Mr Healy, adjourned.

#### **GOVERNMENT OWNED CORPORATIONS BILL**

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer) (9.35 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to provide for the corporatisation of nominated government entities and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

### First Reading

Bill and Explanatory Notes presented and Bill, on motion of Mr De Lacy, read a first time.

### Second Reading

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer) (9.36 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

The Government Owned Corporations Bill will provide the centrepiece for the Goss Government's second-term micro-economic reform agenda. The Bill is a major legislative initiative by the Government and will provide an overall framework for the corporatisation of Government-owned enterprises—GOEs—in accordance with the Government's corporatisation policy outlined in the White Paper entitled Corporatisation in Queensland released in March 1992.

Essentially, the legislation provides for a process under which GOEs can be corporatised. It prescribes conditions under which these corporatised entities will operate, including the role of the board and the shareholding Ministers, reporting and accountability mechanisms, duties and liabilities of directors and other officers, and industrial relations.

As stated in the White Paper, corporatisation is a structural reform process for GOEs which changes the conditions under which they operate, so that they are placed, as far as practicable, on a commercial basis in a competitive environment. Corporatisation is a major component of the Goss Government's program to improve the efficiency of the public sector in the delivery of its commercial and non-commercial objectives. Under the Government's corporatisation model, public ownership of GOEs will remain, but the strategic focus, structure and operating practices of these entities will be aligned with the best commercial practice to provide an operating environment for improved commercial performance and increased efficiency in the delivery of community service obligations—CSOs—undertaken by GOEs.

This Bill maintains the momentum of reforms by the Goss Government designed to improve the way that the Government sector does business. Previous reforms have included budgetary and financial reforms such as the Public Finance Standards, program evaluation systems, the release of guidelines for the private sector involvement in infrastructure projects, project evaluation guidelines for public sector investment, and a review of Government approval systems. By targeting GOEs, the Bill focuses on a major sector of the Queensland economy. GOEs in Queensland contributed around \$3,100m— or around 6 per cent—to gross State product in 1990-91. An increase of 20 per cent in the productivity of Queensland GOEs, as a group, would benefit the State by \$600m annually. Compared to other States, Queensland's GOEs perform well. Nevertheless, it is vital that the benefits of initiatives that have been taken to improve performance in recent years are entrenched, and that an environment is created to facilitate further efficiency gains. Moreover, we need to keep ahead. Queensland GOEs must set their standards not only by interstate measures but by world best practice. On this basis, there is significant room for improvement. For example, although the Queensland electricity supply industry— QESI—is the most efficient in Australia, its productivity falls below world best practice standards by 20 to 30 per cent. The potential gains from improved performance will provide the Government with a continuing capacity to implement its social agenda, and to the extent that GOEs represent major cost inputs to the private sector, a more efficient Government trading sector will clearly impact upon the competitiveness of private industry within the State.

In introducing this legislation, I emphasise that, unlike in other States, the reform of GOEs in Queensland is not revenue driven; quite the contrary. Unlike elsewhere in Australia, State finances in Queensland are in a sound position. As a result of its responsible financial management over the last three years, the Queensland Government

is able to undertake this reform initiative undistracted by the Budget imperative to sell off State assets for short-term financial gain. I highlight here the stark contrast between the Goss Government's commitment to public ownership, with the privatisation mentality of the Opposition. The Government is serious about GOE reform and will seek outcomes from the corporatisation process which are in the best long-term interests of the State. In this regard, a key consideration of the corporatisation process will be the extent to which a GOE should be subjected to increased competition to create the right climate for further efficiency gains and improved performance. Following my announcement in last year's Budget Speech that the Government would proceed with the corporatisation of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation—QIDC, the Government intends to nominate major GOEs as candidates for corporatisation. Apart from the QIDC, for which the corporatisation process is well advanced, the Government intends to corporatise the Queensland Investment Corporation—QIC, Suncorp, the ports of Brisbane and Gladstone, the Harbours Corporation and the Queensland electricity supply industry, Queensland Rail—QR, remaining Queensland ports and the State gas pipeline within this existing term. It is also envisaged that major progress towards corporatisation will also be effected to Water Resources and Forestry.

Overall, this legislation represents the culmination of an exhaustive process of consultation which commenced with the release of a Green Paper in August 1990 and which has involved not only all Government departments but industry, the union movement and the GOEs themselves. Indeed, a feature of the Government's approach to corporatisation will be a continuation of this consultative process under which working parties, with broad representation from the Government, unions and the private sector will play an important role in the corporatisation of specific GOEs. A special feature of this legislation is the flexibility it provides the Government in the management of the process from GOE to a corporatised Government-owned corporation—GOC. First, in line with the White Paper, the Bill provides for entities to be corporatised as either statutory GOCs or as company GOCs operating under the corporations law. Entities corporatised as statutory GOCs can become company GOCs at a subsequent stage. Under this process, public ownership of GOCs is retained by shareholding Ministers holding shares on behalf of the State. Second, mechanisms are included in the Bill to facilitate the corporatisation process and enable the Government to manage the corporatisation process across all GOEs to ensure a consistent application of policy.

I regard the facilitative mechanisms in Chapter 2 of the legislation as essential for the success of the overall corporatisation agenda. It will enable the Government to vary the rate of progress of each GOE towards corporatisation. In this respect, I point out that the Bill will not automatically apply to GOEs. GOEs will continue to operate under their existing legislation until they are nominated as a corporatisation candidate pursuant to this legislation after which time, and until they are corporatised, only the facilitative mechanisms apply. Additionally, because the GOC Bill is umbrella in nature, particular issues arising during the corporatisation of each GOE will need to be addressed in its specific legislation. Such specific legislation may contain a provision which expressly overrides the GOC Bill or any of its provisions. Specific legislation may also contain provisions complementary to the GOC Bill to enable the GOC to operate efficiently. For instance, if any State immunity is required for a GOC, the specific legislation may contain the necessary provision.

The Bill essentially has two parts. The first being Chapter 2, which provides for a process under which GOEs can be corporatised in a managed and consistent way, and the remainder of the Bill which sets out the provisions under which corporatised entities will operate. It is to highlight some of the elements of this latter aspect of the Bill to which I will now turn.

The replication of private sector operating environments for GOEs requires that the legislation strike the right balance between GOC board accountability on the one hand and authority and autonomy on the other. A feature of this Bill, I believe, is that this right balance has been achieved. Under corporatisation, the Government will continue to be involved in the key strategic decisions concerning GOCs' activities and functions.

However, the Government will abrogate any involvement it may have had in the past in day-to-day management to enable the board and management to focus on clearly prescribed commercial objectives. In this respect, the corporate planning process and the statement of corporate intent, which is an agreement between the board and the shareholding Ministers in respect of the GOC's operations for each financial year, are cornerstones in the corporatisation process. The statement of corporate intent will outline the GOC's objectives, performance targets and any operating parameters for the year and will be the basis for the monitoring of GOCs' performance. A feature of the legislation is that the role of shareholding Ministers is clearly defined and shareholding Ministers' powers to direct are clearly specified. Essentially, these powers to direct are in the nature of reserve powers and, where exercised, they will be made public in the *Government Gazette* within 21 days. Any such directions will also be detailed in the GOC's annual report.

Conversely, there will be increased levels of accountability to ensure that corporatisation provides sufficient protection against the failure of accountability experienced by some Government-owned enterprises in other States. Apart from clearly prescribed performance targets in the statement of corporate intent, GOCs will be required to report on a quarterly basis to shareholding Ministers who will be advised by a specialised GOE monitoring unit established within my department. Additionally, whilst statutory GOCs are not subject to the corporations law, certain of the duties and liabilities of directors and other officers have been adapted from the corporations law and included in the Bill. In particular, these include the duty of officers to exercise due care and diligence in the exercise of powers and the discharge of functions. Further duties analogous to those in the corporations law require an officer not to make improper use of information acquired because of his or her position and not to make improper use of his or her position. An officer is also required to act honestly in the exercise of his or her powers and in the discharge of his or her functions as an officer. For company GOCs, corporations law will apply except in some areas where it has been overridden to take account of the special circumstances of Government ownership of GOCs.

The Bill applies the provisions of the Financial Administration and Audit Act to statutory GOCs with any modifications that are made by regulation. For company GOCs the provisions of the FA and A Act relating to audit and to furnishing and tabling of annual reports can be applied by regulation. Before making any regulation under this Bill in regard to the application of the FA and A Act to either statutory or company GOCs, I will consult with the Auditor-General on the form of the proposed regulation. The result of these arrangements will be that, as a general rule, the Auditor-General will undertake GOC audits. GOCs of both types will be subject to the Public Accounts Committee Act.

Provisions along the lines of those contained in the Commonwealth Corporate Law Reform Bill (No. 2) 1992 relating to indemnity and insurance of officers have been included. An exception has been provided from the prohibition on a statutory GOC from indemnifying an officer of the GOC or exempting an officer from a liability incurred as such. The exception from the prohibition applies so that the GOC is not prevented from indemnifying a person against a civil liability—other than a liability to the GOC—unless the liability arises out of conduct involving lack of good faith. Before giving such an indemnity, the statutory GOC requires the prior approval of the shareholding Ministers.

The Bill provides only limited circumstances where a statutory GOC is prevented from paying a premium for insuring an officer of the GOC against liability. A statutory GOC must not pay a premium for insuring an officer against a liability arising out of a wilful breach of duty in relation to the GOC or in breach of the improper use of information or improper use of position provisions of that clause of the Bill setting out the duty and liability of certain officers of a statutory GOC. By means of the provisions relating to indemnity and insurance, officers of GOCs will operate under similar provisions to those proposed by the Commonwealth for inclusion in the corporations law. These provisions should be of considerable assistance to the officers of GOCs.

I also wish to make the point that this legislation will improve rather than detract from the Government's social program. The Government will be able to require GOCs to undertake community service obligations—called CSOs—with funding provided direct from the Budget or, in some cases, by reducing the GOC's targeted rate of return. Instead of the costs of these CSOs being hidden from view—both from Government and Parliament—they will be funded from the Budget and come under ministerial control. Greater cost transparency and performance monitoring of CSO delivery will also enable the Government to more effectively and efficiently manage its CSO program.

Finally, there are special provisions in the legislation in respect of employees. First, the Industrial Relations Act applies of its own force to both statutory and company GOCs. Secondly, the statement of corporate intent provides for the formulation of an employment and industrial relations plan which is to specify all major employment and industrial relations issues for the GOC. It is not the intention of the Government to become involved in day-to-day industrial relations issues between GOCs and their employees. Rather, the purpose is to ensure that best practice human resource management standards, including the principles of equity and merit, will continue once GOEs are corporatised. In preparing this plan, the Bill provides that proper consultation takes place. Beyond this, the GOC will be free to negotiate genuine enterprise bargaining arrangements for employees on a case-by-case basis.

In getting to the point of introducing into Parliament this landmark piece of legislation, significant contributions have been made by a number of people. In particular, I would like to pay tribute to officers of my department who helped the Government commence this process with a Green Paper in 1990 and have since guided the policy of corporatisation through the White Paper stage and subsequently 36 versions of this legislation. I would also acknowledge the commitment and involvement of the Parliamentary Counsel in this latter process—a reform that members opposite could never introduce. Finally, I would like to thank the members of the Corporatisation Steering Committee, comprising senior Government officials, together with Mr Dawson Petie from the Trades and Labor Council—

**Government members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr De LACY:** Let us hear it again—and Mr Bob Flew from BHP Coal—come on, come on—who provided invaluable assistance in drawing up this legislation and the initial corporatisation timetable. I commend this Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr FitzGerald, adjourned.

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Racist Comments by Member for Burdekin

**Mr STONEMAN** (Burdekin) (9.53 p.m.) I rise on a matter of privilege. During his speech on the Classification of Films Amendment Bill, the honourable member for Mount Ommaney made reference to my apparent use of the term “nigger in the woodpile” during my earlier contribution to the debate. I find it personally insulting that the innocent and honest use of such a term—a term of worldwide use and one used more in affection than anything else—should be turned into a cheap attempt to paint me as I racist and bigot. In my view, under normal circumstances, the honourable member's comments are not worthy of rebuttal. However, given his clear attempt to score a cheap, political shot in the hope that some naive journalist might give him a moment of what he might believe to be glory, I have two comments that I wish to place on the record. Firstly, if I did use the term, it was clearly in the innocent, and definitely not the racial, context. I make no apology for that. Secondly, by raising the issue, the honourable member has shown himself to be narrow-minded and to have no understanding of ordinary, everyday life. Such innocent expressions are a fact of life.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Power): Order! I think that, in fact, that was a personal explanation and not a matter of privilege.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (9.56 p.m.): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

***Queensland Drivers Guide***

**Mr J. N. GOSS** (Aspley) (9.57 p.m.): Because of changes to the State driving regulations, the State Government is arranging for a new Transport Department *Queensland Drivers Guide*. The current guide, which costs \$3.50, is a must for any person wishing to obtain a driver's licence or to upgrade their existing licence. The new *Queensland Drivers Guide* is to contain 16 pages of advertising as well as the Transport Department advertisements, and this job was given to Prestige Publications. This is where the wheels fell off the project. Prestige Publications started contacting a number of possible advertisers, and it contacted a number of driving schools and made appointments with those driving schools to discuss the advertising. However, one driving school, Ace, took 13 pages of advertising. The other three pages were taken by a tyre merchant who also contributes towards road safety in the brochure. At that time, the owner of Ace Driving School was the president of the Australian Driver Training Association of Queensland. He has since left that position after an executive meeting. I understand that it was probably good business by that owner that Ace got the jump on all the other driving schools—all 225 registered schools.

It will appear that the Government is promoting one driving school. It will be the clear perception of people purchasing the new *Queensland Drivers Guide* that the Government favours Ace, and it would be easier for people to get a licence if they used Ace Driving School. That will be the clear perception. Surely, there was a clause in the contract between the Transport Department and Prestige Publications that allowed for the approval or rejection by the department of any or all advertising. What would have happened if Prestige Publications had taken 13 pages of advertising from a massage parlour? Surely, when one advertiser wanted 13 of the 16 pages, the alarm bell started to ring. The contract between the Transport Department and Prestige Publications will not be made public. So much for fair and accountable Government! So much for the Labor Party's justice for all!

The production of the new *Queensland Drivers Guide* is a shambles. It is known that the department has offered to produce a small booklet listing all the driving schools but, of course, the learners will be interested only in the guide, which they will have to have and which they will study, and the 13 pages of one company's advertising. It does not matter that the department qualifies that advertising; it is the perception that will be created from those 13 pages of advertisements. How can an agency tie up the Government in a legally binding contract before the Government knows what is going on? I will table a copy of a letter from the Transport Department dated 7 April 1993, which refers to the placement of advertising in pamphlets. It states—

“The Department cannot be seen promoting or advertising any private business houses including driving schools or motor dealers.”

Obviously, the policy has been changed for the sake of Ace Driving School. I seek to table the letter.

There is concern in the industry about the privatisation of licensed testing officers—that they may be corporatised and that training and testing will be conducted by the same organisation or the same business. Obviously, the Government is going to allow one driving school to get the lion's share of the testing market throughout this State. The Government has a responsibility to accept that a monumental blunder has been made and it has a duty to cancel the contract. Why should the driving schools of Queensland pay for this mistake by the Government? There will be a clear perception

that one driving school has a definite advantage over all the other driving schools. No matter what, the Government must cancel that contract with Ace and start all over again, and make sure that it has the right to vet any advertising that is placed in the *Queensland Drivers Guide* brochure.

#### Articles by Lawrie Kavanagh on Queensland History

**Mr ARDILL** (Archerfield) (10.01 p.m.): Lawrie Kavanagh's *Courier-Mail* articles on Queensland's history and, particularly, little-known aspects of it make entertaining and informative reading. Many of the obscure incidents and details that he elicits would otherwise never be known to the public, and his facts help to create a composite picture which is lacking in the history books. Lawrie is an iconoclast for whom I must confess a sneaking fellow feeling, although I would vigorously disagree with many of his opinions. However, he cannot whitewash the black mounted police and their white officers. In the interests of truth in history, their story can be told only by admitting that they were basically a group of scoundrels, similar to the vigilante groups in America who are alleged to have hanged horse thieves as a matter of course.

There is no doubt that many squatters sought the attention and perceived protection of the police on a very violent frontier where the death rates from disease and violence were equally alarming. However, the records show that for many the position worsened after a visit by the native mounted police, and they sought to have them kept away from their stations at any cost after that. There are many recorded incidents of what were termed "tame blacks", in the racist language of the day, who were considered an asset by the settlers, being murdered and raped by these privateers and turned into implacable enemies of all Europeans.

The book *Black and White* by Blagden Chambers describes a totally unjustifiable attack on Aborigines at Chesterton Station on the Warrego in the late 1860s, which resulted in a massacre of the blacks after the white officer had been apprised of the true situation and had agreed to leave them alone. A report to Parliament dated 7 October 1867 details a murder of a handcuffed Aborigine by an officer named Hill in the same area, and also that eight or nine were shot down "like wild pigs". The lack of concern is illustrated by the fact that the number was not important; eight or nine was immaterial. These depredations by the so-called upholders of the law resulted in retaliation in this and many other instances.

The records of the police force and reports to Parliament give a clear indication of the arrogance of the officers both in their dealings with white settlers and the black population. In some instances this also extended to the black troopers whom they commanded and who were recruited to serve long distances from their homeland and relatives. However, generally, these troops were allowed to rape, pillage and murder blacks at will, as long as they obeyed their officers in other matters. The arrogance of these British officers, whose qualifications were often very sketchy, was demonstrated by their attitude to settlers and their superior officers. They failed to pass on cheques, pay accounts and sometimes even supply their troops. Many left under a cloud, including Frederick Walker, their founder, and some were never heard of again. Others subsequently showed up in an unfavourable light in their later activities. The depredations and murders by these scoundrels began before Queensland achieved self-government, and the earliest reports to Parliament by Police Commissioner Seymour indicate his concern about the problems with the "native police" while he indicated concern at the lack of resources available to him.

The evidence is overwhelming that these native mounted police were guilty of unlawful killing on a large scale, and the many place names dotted around Queensland bear witness to this. Unfortunately, Black Shoot Creek on the Nerang River, where a whole tribe was decimated, has now disappeared under the Hinze Dam, but Battle Mountain is still there, and the legend will remain despite attempts to discredit it. Urquhart was an interesting character—one of their officers—but he cannot be whitewashed or sanitised. It is possible that his reputation with the blacktrackers and

their minds had an effect on their work in trying to solve the Gatton murders at the turn of the century.

I have knocked about Queensland a fair bit, and there are many more stories to be told about this infamous period of our history. However, I believe that Lawrie Kavanagh should also look at the official history, as well. The official police history, the *Long Blue Line*, does not seek to hide the truth relating to the "native mounted".

Time expired.

### **Correspondence to Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations**

**Mr LAMING** (Mooloolah) (10.06 p.m.): I rise to give voice to my concerns regarding the delays that my electorate office is experiencing in receiving replies to letters sent to one particular Minister of the Goss Labor Government. I refer to the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations. Let me give details. The first communication to which I refer is my letter on behalf of Mr Peter Jacobson in reference to a position as a tutor at a Caboolture college. It was dated 4 February. It was acknowledged by Robyn Paulson on 8 February. I followed up again on 30 March, six weeks later. I had to follow up again by urgent fax on 4 May. It is now over three months, and I still have no response.

The second communication is my letter on behalf of a Mr Bruce Sinn, who expressed concerns regarding TAFE courses available in the building industry. It was dated 15 February. It was acknowledged by a Wendy Ingram on 22 February. I followed up again on 25 March, four weeks later. I followed up yet again on 21 April—then a wait of eight weeks. I had to follow up again by urgent fax on 4 May. It is now over two and a half months, and I still have received no response.

In common with most new members, I have come into this place from private enterprise. I bring with me a sense of the reality of how things need to be done in the real world. If the Minister conducted his business like this in private enterprise, he would be broke. My constituents, as do all constituents, deserve an immediate answer to their concerns. We work for our constituents, not the other way around. These delays are an indication of either an arrogant or an incompetent Government—perhaps both.

**Mr Foley:** Will you take an interjection?

**Mr LAMING:** I will take an interjection.

**Mr Foley:** Have you heard of the practice of approaching the Minister?

**Mr LAMING:** As I said, I have approached the Minister with two letters and an urgent fax requesting attention. That is what he has staff for.

**Mr Foley:** You have never raised this with me personally previously, have you?

**Mr LAMING:** Not personally. Because I have another matter to address, I will continue. I bring to the attention of the House another very serious matter that will affect all non-Brisbane Queenslanders. Following the Government's recent decision to slash funding to the arts, the impact on the touring program for State companies and the ability for local organisations in places such as the Sunshine Coast to provide support for local activities has been severely impaired. For instance, this year Nambour will miss out totally on any State Government assisted performances by the major companies. Surely the Minister is aware that the major performing arts companies provide the bulk of employment for performing artists in this State. Surely he understands that touring produces an economic multiplier effect, which is said to be of the magnitude of 2.7, which benefits the whole local community in areas such as the Sunshine Coast. I am advised also that during 1992, the State companies' touring activities were a direct generator of employment to the tune of 1 523 people weeks. What has happened to the Premier's "Jobs, jobs, jobs"?

**Mr De Lacy:** There was nothing before we got in.

**Mr LAMING:** I ask the Treasurer: was it just for Brisbane? The Labor Party's own policy paper entitled "Arts Policy Priorities of the Goss Government" clearly states—

"Labor will ensure that Queenslanders living outside the south-east corner are not denied access to major arts companies and exhibitions available in the capital."

Let me advise this House that during the past three years the Nambour Civic Centre has seen touring performances by the Lyric Opera of Queensland, the Royal Queensland Theatre Company and the Queensland Philharmonic Orchestra. I am reliably informed that in 1993 none of the above companies has sufficient funds to tour. Yet touring fulfils the right of the entire community to cultural enrichment through the arts based on the democratic principles of access, equity and participation. Obviously, the Goss Labor Government has abandoned those principles.

#### **Allan Nelson and Associates**

**Mr BEATTIE** (Brisbane Central) (10.11 p.m.): I raise a matter of grave concern involving the activities of a person I have previously mentioned in this House, that is, private investigator Allan Nelson. Members of this House will recall that on 24 October 1990, I raised serious issues involving Allan W. Nelson, who deliberately extorted \$28,000 from a Mrs Jessie Brown of Loganholme. Mrs Brown was a grieving sister who tried to seek the truth behind her sister's death and paid \$28,000 to Maxwell Nelson and Associates to investigate her sister's death. She handed over \$27,000 in bank cheques and another \$1,000 in cash, copies of the receipts for which I have previously tabled in this House in 1990.

The investigator, Mr Allan W. Nelson, deliberately played on Mrs Brown's grief for her sister to con her out of the money. I tabled previously in this House the details of the payments made in September 1989 to Maxwell Nelson and Associates and agent Kerry-John Myers. However, despite determined efforts by Mrs Brown, after the payment of this money, she was unable to obtain her file or the results of the investigation she paid for. In other words, Nelson accepted \$28,000, promising to carry out an investigation for Mrs Jessie Brown, yet refused to provide her with the outcome of that investigation. Honourable members need to be informed that, in addition to his dealings with Mrs Brown—I table copies of 21 separate newspaper reports—Allan Nelson was involved in a number of illegal telephone buggings. I table also a copy of an article in the *Courier-Mail* on Saturday, 21 July 1990, which stated—

"A Brisbane private investigator was fined a total of \$5,000 yesterday for his involvement in the 'bugging' of three telephones.

Allan Wayne Nelson, 35, pleaded guilty in the Brisbane District Court to two counts of having conspired to intercept telephone communications in November 1987.

The prosecutor, Mr John Griffin, QC, said Nelson had been the principal of Maxwell Nelson and Associates private investigators in Brisbane.

Mr Griffin said Nelson had been hired to investigate three Melbourne people.

Nelson had instructed two agents to buy voice-activated electronic equipment and told a third agent to buy telephone intercept devices.

Through another agent, Nelson then engaged a man named Allan Neal, a specialist, to plant the devices in telephones at three Melbourne premises.

Mr Shane Herbert, for Nelson, said his client had been a private investigator for 13 years and would lose his licence to operate as a result of convictions.

In sentencing, Judge Boyce said the offences were a 'gross violation of the privacy of individuals in the community' and had 'no place in a democratic society'."

That is not all. An article in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 17 May 1989 stated that a private eye, Mr Frank Monte, accused of plotting to murder his estranged wife, walked

free from court following a decision dismissing charges against him. In his decision, the magistrate, Mr Gilmore, pointed out that the main prosecution witness, Mr Allan Nelson, had been caught out in many inconsistencies and was unworthy of belief. That is an indication of what Mr Allan Nelson is like. Yet, notwithstanding these matters, Allan Nelson and Associates are now holding themselves out to Queenslanders to be people who can properly advise on security matters. I warn the people of Queensland that any seminars or activities organised by Allan Nelson and Associates would have to be suspect.

I table for the information of the House an advertisement that appeared in the *Courier-Mail* on 22 April 1993, stating—

“Attention!

‘A Business Must’. If there is only one seminar you attend this year this must be it.

‘The Enemy Within’.”

It sounds a bit like post-war Europe. The advertisement went on—

“A seminar on all aspects of corporate information security including information crime—internal loss—employee fraud—security management—risk assessment—market intelligence—intellectual property theft.”

That seminar has been organised at the Mayfair Crest International Hotel for Wednesday, 19 May 1993. Attendance at the seminar will cost \$205 generally and \$100 for students. Attending that seminar will be a number of people who I am sure have been conned by Allan Nelson into believing that he is running a legitimate operation. The only thing that Mr Nelson can teach people attending his seminars is how to be a fraud and a crook. It is absolutely appalling that he has been allowed to get away with his activities in Queensland. Clearly, the licensing of private investigators in this State is needed to protect the many honest investigators who seek to do a legitimate job. A number of private investigators have raised this issue with me, as have individual citizens such as Mrs Jessie Brown. I am not prepared to sit by while people such as Mr Nelson rip off innocent people.

I have raised Nelson's activities before. I urge people not to attend this seminar, and I call on Allan Nelson, a well-established crook, to return the \$28,000 he owes to Mrs Jessie Brown. I urge those innocent people who are being hoodwinked into attending and speaking at the seminar, not to attend.

Time expired.

#### **Power Lines, Lockyer Electorate**

**Mr FITZGERALD** (Lockyer) (10.16 p.m.): I want to raise the issue of the extension of power lines through my electorate. The Queensland Electricity Commission has decided that it needs to plan for an extension of the power line from the Greenbank area—the Greenbank switching station—to a new switching station being built six kilometres north of Gatton, known as the Springdale switching station, and to also make a connection to the Blackwall switching station, which is near Mount Crosby. The reason for that extension is that the future growth in Queensland will make it necessary to have 500 kilovolt lines to conduct electricity. For the information of members, 500 kilovolt lines are currently in use in New South Wales and Victoria; however, the highest voltage lines in Queensland are 275 kilovolts, and they are generally connected from the major power stations to the major switching stations. At present, there is one in my electorate that is connected from the Tarong Power Station to Middle Ridge, which is south of Toowoomba.

As honourable members would understand, when power lines are planned through a member's electorate, residents become concerned about the effect the power lines will have on land values. The power lines have to be constructed above ground, and the

towers are quite tall—about 50 metres for a 500 kilovolt line tower; whereas an ordinary 275 kilovolt tower would be somewhere in the vicinity of 30 metres tall.

The Queensland Electricity Commission has engaged the Merz company to report to it on possible options and to also make assessments as to the best options. The Queensland Electricity Commission will then make up its mind which route to take. Consultation is taking place at present, and the reaction from the residents differs from area to area. In some areas, for instance the Ripley area, which is south of Ipswich, a group of residents are very strongly opposed to the power line. Those residents live in the electorate of Lockyer and also in the electorate of the Minister for Tourism, Sport and Racing, the Honourable Bob Gibbs, and are totally opposed to the power line. However, when rational discussion takes place, everyone realises that the power lines have to go through.

In the past, we have heard a lot from Governments saying that they will cut down the use of power and that they will not have to build new power stations. It has been said that we now have new light bulbs that use a fraction of the power that other light bulbs use and because extra generating capacity does not have to be provided, additional transmission lines will not have to be built. However, most of the rationalists in the place realise that all that is doing is postponing the expansion. If we experience general population increases, we will have to increase power capacity, and that means the construction of additional transmission lines.

I know that the Government has not made up its mind where the next power station will be located, but I totally support the processes that are taking place at present. I have great sympathy for those residents who are concerned and I am doing everything that I can to make sure that they get a fair hearing. I do not think that political power or the power of numbers will determine where the power line will be located. I hope that that is determined by the use of the proper procedures. That means a reasonably economical route inconveniencing the least number of people. I think that people should definitely come before economy, because there is a principle that if the whole southern part of the State will be benefited by a power line going through, I do not believe the cost burden should be imposed on a small group of people. There should be some compensation for them, or some process whereby the cost is shared by all the beneficiaries. They are the people who are going to use power, so therefore the cost should not be greatly increased by this option. For instance, the cost of power lines is about \$700,000 per kilometre, so they are not cheap.

I have been representing these people and I intend to attend as many of their public meetings as I can. I attend with the electricity authority people and the gentlemen from the Merz company so that at least I can talk with them. Some of those residents are able to point out to the companies that there is a better route in places. For instance, they say that the power line should go across the Purga area instead of prime land that will be used for residential purposes in the future. Provided that this matter is handled sensibly, the power line extensions, which are not proposed to be constructed for 10 or 15 years will be located in the correct place.

Time expired.

#### **Aged Care, Sandgate Electorate**

**Mr NUTTALL** (Sandgate) (10.21 p.m.): I rise to speak about the good work being done in my electorate by a large number of people. I want to mention particularly the caring for the aged in my electorate. A large number of elderly people reside within my electorate, which contains eight nursing homes. They include Eventide, which is one of the largest nursing homes, and is run by the Health Department; Yallambee Lodge, which is run by the Uniting Church; Symes Grove and St Martin's Nursing Home, which are looked after by the Anglican Church; Blue Waters and the Seahaven Nursing Homes, which are privately run; the nursing home at Bald Hills, which is run by the Health Department; and the large Freemasons Homes.

One of the most important things about these homes is the fact that together they look after around about 1 500 residents. The number of employees of those nursing homes totals in excess of 1 000 either on a full-time, part-time or casual basis caring for the elderly residents of those homes. As I said before, Eventide, which is run by the Health Department, has around about 520 residents who are looked after by about 420 staff—that is, nursing staff, doctors and other people who carry out different types of work there. I mentioned the Masonic home, which has approximately 572 residents and approximately 232 employees. One of the other factors which contributes to the local economy is that most of the daily produce used in the homes is purchased from local business houses. Fresh fruit, vegetables, bread, milk and butter are purchased in the local community, which in turn assists in creating further employment in my electorate.

I pay a particular tribute to those who look after the aged people who live in my electorate. I am referring to doctors, administrative staff and others who spend a great deal of time looking after the aged and who have to have a very great deal of patience. A lot of these residents are infirm and need very special care and attention. I am very proud to say that most of the people who work in the nursing homes live in my electorate. Quite often, they come into my electorate office and thank me very much because the homes provided by the Health Department are of such an excellent standard.

**A Government member:** You should be in there.

**Mr NUTTALL:** I take that interjection, but I point out that I only turn 40 next month, so I have a long way to go—I think. Over the last few years, a lot of money has been spent by the Government in bringing the Eventide Nursing Home up to an acceptable standard. The old wooden, derelict buildings that were built in the 1940s have been replaced by beautiful gardens and walkways down to the ocean. The surrounds provide a very welcome change for the residents who live there. The Premier's wife has visited the centre and has spent some time with the residents. I am pleased to say that the new Federal member for Lilley, Wayne Swan, has also been down to talk to the residents.

I believe that the Freemasons Home also needs special attention. It is a very large building which stands high on one of the hills at Sandgate. Just by looking at the nursing home, one can tell that it is very planned and very structured. Over a long period, the Government has set about creating units for couples. The home even has a hospital for those who are very sick. Properties situated around the home have been purchased with a view to future expansion. The people responsible for these homes are indeed to be congratulated.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.