# FRIDAY, 21 MAY 1993

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. J. Fouras, Ashgrove) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

## PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

### Queensland University of Technology Campus, Sunshine Coast

From **Miss Simpson** (273 signatories) praying that the proposed new campus of the university on the Sunshine Coast be situated at Sippy Downs at Tanawha.

### Dryander National Park

From **Mr Robertson** (20 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reject any motion to revoke the dedication of the area of Dryander National Park adjacent to the eastern arm of Double Bay.

### Brisbane Casino

From **Mr Beattie** (23 signatories) praying that the proposed Brisbane Casino be not proceeded with.

### Police Staffing, Burleigh Electorate

From **Mrs Gamin** (4 691 signatories) praying for action to be taken to boost police numbers in the Burleigh electorate.

Petitions received.

## STATUTORY INSTRUMENT

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

Queensland University of Technology Act—

> Proclamation—14 May 1993 as the date on which the members of the Queensland University of Technology Council appointed by the Council on 3 March 1993 under section 8 (2) of the Act, assume office.

## PAPERS

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

Minister for Environment and Heritage (Ms Robson)—

(1) A proposal by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as National Park under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1975 of:

(a) that part of National Park 255, County of Herbert described as Lot 1 on Plan CP85689 held by the Department of Lands, Brisbane and containing an area of 60.37 hectares;

(b) all those parts of National Park 233, County of Canning described as areas A and B on Plan NPW448 held by the Department of

Environment and Heritage, Brisbane and containing in total an area of about 7.5 hectares;

(c) that part of National Park 573, Counties of Carlisle and Hillalong described as Lot 52 on Plan CP841921 held by the Department of Lands, Brisbane and containing an area of about 118 hectares; and

(d) all those parts of National Park 1353, County of Nares described as Lot 5 on Plan NR811971, Lot 6 on Plan NR811972 and the areas of road to be opened as shown on Plan RA4220 held by the Department of Lands, Brisbane and containing an area in total of about 10.8 hectares; and

(2) a brief explanation of the proposal.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Overseas Trip by Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development) (10.06 a.m.), by leave: Today I wish to report to the Parliament on my recent overseas trip. The aims and objectives of the mission were to promote—

(1) in key markets, economic and investment opportunities in Queensland;

(2) Queensland as a base for access to Asian markets; and

(3) Queensland companies as reliable suppliers of goods and services, and the opportunities for joint ventures.

The principal activities can be divided into two categories, the first revolving around a CEDOQ mission, that is, the Committee for Economic Development of Queensland, to Hong Kong and Taiwan and a visit by me to Shenzhen in the Guangdong Province of Southern China. In Hong Kong, I was accompanied by private sector members of CEDOQ and held meetings with representatives of the Hong Kong business community.

My decision to open an office in Hong Kong two years ago has, I believe, been more than justified with an increase in exports from Queensland to Hong Kong of 50 per cent in the last 18 months, and I am optimistic about Queensland's future opportunities. My visit was successful, I believe, in reinforcing the view that Queensland has a long-term interest in Southern China of which Hong Kong is a vital part.

My visit to Shenzhen in the Guangdong Province in Southern China was of particular interest, because here is a city of 2.3 million people that 10 years ago was a village of 27 000. In a meeting with the Mayor of Shenzhen he explained that economic growth was down from 45 per cent per annum to 33 per cent. This visit convinced me of the necessity for Queensland business to maintain its efforts to seize market opportunities in China. There are, of course, immediate opportunities for coal contracts and I was in fact accompanied by a representative of the Queensland coal industry.

The second stage of the trip involved meetings and activities in London, Paris and Munich and stressed the attractions of investment in Queensland as a gateway to the dynamic economies of Asia. A topic of interest to Queensland was the coal industry in the United Kingdom. There is significant change occurring in the industry and it is expected that there will be increasing amounts of coal imported for United Kingdom energy requirements. In both London and Munich, I was briefed by representatives of the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation on the tourism market in Europe, and I can report to members that their efforts have resulted in an increasing number of tourists visiting Queensland.

On Saturday, 1 May, I had discussions with Professor Finnis in Oxford on issues relating to oaths of allegiance and constitutional matters generally. I have spoken of

these matters in the House previously, and members will have the opportunity to debate this matter in the near future.

In Paris, I had the opportunity to meet with representatives of the French business community at a meeting hosted by the French Board for International Trade and at another meeting of the business organisation "Club Australie". I am pleased to report that France, which is the world's fourth-largest economy, is very positively disposed towards investment outside of Europe and in Australia. For example, at a meeting with the managing director of Chargeurs, the textile company, I was given an insight into the issues surrounding wool production and processing. Officers of the Trade and Investment Division of my department are now engaged in discussions with Chargeurs to attract its next major Australian investment to Queensland. After discussions with chief executives of companies including those with interests in tourism, I can report that the attraction of Queensland and Australia, both as a destination and investment opportunity, continues to grow.

Through my discussions with German Government and business representatives in Munich, I was made aware of the trends in the German economy and the possible impact on Europe and world trade. Germany is also undergoing significant structural change in relation to its coal industry, and there are significant pressures to abandon the expensive subsidies of German coal producers. Germany is also the source of an increasing number of tourists to Australia, due to the QTTC's continuing good work in promoting Queensland.

Mr Speaker, that is a summary of the trip. With your leave, I propose to table full details of the trip.

Leave granted.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### CEDOQ Trade Delegation to Hong Kong/Taiwan

**Hon. D. J. HAMILL** (Ipswich—Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Economic and Trade Development) (10.09 a.m.), by leave: From Sunday, 25 April 1993 to Friday, 30 April 1993, I visited Hong Kong and Taiwan as a member of the CEDOQ delegation promoting Queensland as a focus for trade, investment, tourism and business migration. The CEDOQ delegation was led by the Premier, Mr Goss, in Hong Kong and then by me in Taiwan. Regarding the Hong Kong visit, I refer honourable members to the report by the Premier.

Members of the delegation included senior representatives of both the public and private sectors in Queensland. The mandate for the mission was to create a clear impression of Queensland and its opportunities in the minds of the Hong Kong and Taiwanese business communities. In Taiwan, the delegation hosted three major functions for senior executives. A total of 150 business representatives attended and participated in detailed discussions about the potential of Queensland for their business interests. Taiwan is Queensland's fourth largest export market with almost $450m worth of Queensland products sold there in 1991-92. The local economy is recording growth rates of around 7 per cent per annum as it further develops its close economic ties with Japan and seeks to exploit the rapidly emerging opportunities in China.

Taiwan is two years into a six-year national development plan, which originally anticipated a $430 billion program of investment in economic infrastructure—potentially a fertile ground for Queensland expertise in infrastructure development. The plan is aimed at establishing an effective and efficient infrastructure base to facilitate development of new industries. We learned during the visit that the six-year plan is closely integrated into the planning of all Taiwanese enterprises. They have their gaze firmly set on growth, and are keen to explore opportunities for trade and investment in activities which will develop end products to be used in Taiwan.

The Taiwan Sugar Corporation is currently importing sugar from Queensland to supplement its supplies, and we encouraged that corporation to seriously consider the development of a bagasse pulp mill in Mackay. This is a project which the Government will monitor closely, as it offers great potential for increased utilisation of Queensland sugar cane. The CEDOQ delegation took the opportunity to meet with the chairman and senior executives of Taisugar to help consolidate that company's relationship with Queensland.

A considerable amount of my time in both Hong Kong and Taiwan was devoted to promoting the benefits of the Port of Brisbane to major shipping companies. Those companies were aware that changes were occurring in Australian ports, but were unaware of the outcomes of reform. They were impressed by the fact that Brisbane was handling 22 containers per crane hour, which was comparable to productivity levels in their home ports. In discussions with officials from Yang Ming Marine Transport Corporation, which uses the Port of Brisbane, and the Evergreen Marine Corporation, which does not yet operate any services in Australia, I had the opportunity to explain the efficiency improvements achieved at our port. We have reduced port charges in real terms while introducing new infrastructure to provide an efficient, cost-effective service. The companies in Hong Kong and Taiwan recognised the great potential in improved rail links to the southern states and on the north coast line on the Queensland Rail system, and clearly indicated that this enhanced the attractiveness of Brisbane as a key port for container traffic.

The CEDOQ delegation was successful in informing the Hong Kong and Taiwan business communities of the opportunities offered in Queensland. This increased awareness will be reinforced by our Trade and Investment Offices operating in those countries. Queensland companies will then be well placed to reap the benefits of the phenomenal growth that is taking place in and around China.

I now seek leave to table a summary of the meetings.

Leave granted.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Queensland Parliamentary Trade Delegation to South East Asia

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.14 a.m.), by leave: During the period 29 April to 11 May 1993, on behalf of the Queensland Government, I led the all-party Queensland Parliamentary Trade Delegation to four South East Asian countries—Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore. The delegation, as in the last several years, comprised six parliamentarians. These were: Mr Bob Dollin, member for Maryborough; Mrs Wendy Edmond, member for Mount Coot-tha; Ms Judy Gamin, member for Burleigh; Mr Michael Horan, member for Toowoomba South; Mr Warren Pitt, member for Mulgrave and Government Whip; Mrs Joan Sheldon, Deputy Leader of the Coalition and member for Caloundra. Mr Dermot McManus, Director (Policy), Trade and Investment Development Division of the Premier's Department, was delegation manager.

The specific objectives the delegation set for itself were—

to acquire a better understanding of economic developments in the growth economies of the South East Asian region by—

meeting key parliamentarians, Government officers and business people in the region and visiting development projects; and

assessing the economic potential of key markets in the region, particularly for Queensland exports and also for attracting investment to the State;

to promote the economic and trade development potential of Queensland in the South East Asian region by—

promoting Queensland's products and services and development opportunities; and

encouraging commercial contacts between our respective industries and businesses.

I also set a personal goal to return to Queensland with six better educated, better informed and more experienced parliamentarians. All of these goals were achieved.

Parliamentary trade delegations are an integral part of Queensland's Trade and Investment Development Program. This delegation, in addition to tackling the stated objectives, also served to consolidate Queensland's links with South East Asia and expand our knowledge on such issues as the processes for attracting international investment, the experience of Australian companies joint venturing in the region and opportunities for joint venturing between Queensland and South East Asian firms in Third World countries. Discussions between the delegation and the Economic Development Board of Singapore, the Board of Investment in Thailand, the Malaysia Industrial Development Authority and the Indonesian Investment Attraction Authorities regarding information on the investments attracted to those countries and the roles of respective Governments in facilitating those investments, particularly the question of a balance between financial incentives and market factors, were highlights of the tour.

No amount of financial incentives will lead to long-term foreign investment in a country if firm commercial opportunities are not on offer, such as a significant domestic market or close proximity to major growing markets. In that regard, Indonesia has a population of 170 million, compared with Australia's population of 17 million. Through a series of meetings with Queensland companies and their joint venture partners, particularly in Malaysia and Thailand, we were able to validate these conclusions. It was also brought home to us that investment by Australian companies in nearby markets can lift Australia's exports to those markets as manufacturing and other processing activities demand high-quality raw materials and other inputs from Australia. That also increases employment in Australia. Areas such as manufacturing expertise are representative of the broader need for Australia's skills in the region. This is becoming a growing export for Australia—earning foreign exchange from technical capabilities. For example, the booming construction sector in Malaysia is providing a ready market for architectural and project management expertise.

The more traditional areas of Australia's exports could be expected to see continuing growth as the standard of living increases throughout the region. Agricultural machinery and processing equipment suppliers are already well represented, particularly in sugar producing countries such as Thailand. Likewise, there is continuing demand for agricultural and fisheries products, and the provision of our primary industries expertise, particularly in the area of beef and dairy livestock. Specific requirements in these areas, for example, the provision of potatoes to major processing facilities in Malaysia for sale within the South East Asian region, have been followed up since the delegation's return. Other products and services which are regarded as in demand from Australia include professional consultancy services for infrastructure development, education services and tourism. As well, there is interest, particularly from Singapore, in developing with us wider Asian market items such as biotech products and creative services such as advertising.

The delegation felt that Singapore offered a most appropriate base for servicing of the booming South East Asian region and beyond. It provides ready access to the ASEAN group of countries, and it provides a commercial intelligence exchange point. It is extremely well connected with the business communities in that region, in Indochina as well as the Peoples Republic of China. It was made clear to the delegation that Singapore investors will follow normal commercial instincts and invest where growth

rates are highest, providing there is security for their investment. For that reason, a great deal of the focus by Singapore companies is on southern and coastal China in which huge populations are experiencing economic growth rates above 30 per cent per annum. The opportunity for our companies lies particularly in joint venturing with Singaporean companies in tackling those fast-developing areas.

Although many of our companies have proceeded already independently to invest in southern China and have established links in the region, there is no reason for them to overlook the opportunity to diversify and deepen their involvement through taking advantage of different product lines or areas being developed through the Singapore connection. The Government urges companies to consider carefully the benefits of tackling some of those markets with Singaporean companies, which have similar legal and business procedures to our own and offer high quality linkages into those developing areas.

Through factory inspections and discussions with industrialists, the delegation also gained an understanding of the strength and potential of Indonesia's manufacturing capability, and its economic growth. The delegation was also able to contribute to the growing strength of Queensland's sister-State relationship with the province of Central Java, and looks forward to contributing towards that development through supporting Central Java's feature status at this year's Warana Festival in Brisbane.

The delegation would like to record the cooperation received from the Governments of the countries visited and, in particular, the assistance provided by the Australian Government representatives stationed in those countries. It would also express its thanks to Dermot McManus for his organising abilities, and Qantas for its determination to maintain its excellent safety record. Despite the many "Bali" jibes the delegation received, Queensland avoided the need to hold seven by-elections. A schedule of meetings held by the delegation is appended, and I table same.

Leave granted.

**Mr CASEY:** I also table a medallion from Tan Sri Dato' Mohamed Zahir bin Haji Ismail, who is the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Parliament of Malaysia.

Leave granted.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Office of the Special Prosecutor

**Hon. D. M. WELLS** (Murrumba—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and Minister for the Arts) (10.19 a.m.), by leave: The Office of the Special Prosecutor was established on 13 December 1988. The first Special Prosecutor, Mr Doug Drummond, QC, served from 13 December 1988 to 19 November 1991. His successor, Mr Frank Clair, served from 20 November 1991 until yesterday. Mr Clair has advised me that the work of the Special Prosecutor's Office has reached such a stage of completion that the remaining workload no longer justifies the retention of a separate Office of the Special Prosecutor. There are now only two outstanding appeals that fall within the province of the Special Prosecutor. Mr Clair has advised me that, in his opinion, it is not necessary to appoint another member of the private Bar to hold the office of Special Prosecutor. Therefore, effective from today, the Director of Prosecutions, Mr R. N. Miller, QC, has been appointed to exercise the powers of the Special Prosecutor under the Special Prosecutor Act.

The determination of the last two outstanding appeals will mark the end of the work for which the Special Prosecutor's Office was established, and for which this

Parliament passed the Special Prosecutor Act. I also seek leave to table the report of the Special Prosecutor for the year 1992.

Leave granted.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Workplace Bargaining

**Hon. M. J. FOLEY** (Yeronga—Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Relations) (10.21 a.m.), by leave: I wish to report to honourable members on the progress of workplace bargaining in Queensland. Enterprise or workplace bargaining allows the parties who are best equipped to make informed decisions about the workplace, that is, the employer, the employee and the unions, to negotiate arrangements suited to an individual workplace. In November 1992, the House passed legislation amending the Industrial Relations Act 1990, primarily to facilitate workplace bargaining. As of 4 May, 18 certified agreements under the new provisions have been lodged with the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission, and 15 of them have been certified. These agreements cover more than 9 000 employees, approximately 8 000 of them in the Queensland electricity supply industry. In addition, 23 enterprise bargaining agreements have been lodged with the QIRC, and 17 approved under the original provisions of the Act.

These 17 awards and agreements cover in excess of 20 000 employees, the largest of which is the Queensland Rail agreement covering 17 590 employees.

To complement the amendments related directly to enterprise bargaining, provisions were also included to facilitate union rationalisation. These allow for single union site agreements. Since December 1992, eight applications have been lodged with the QIRC seeking such agreements.

As well as providing an effective legislative framework, the State Government has also sought to provide encouragement, information, assistance and support to employers, employees and their unions in the reform process. Seminars on enterprise bargaining were run in Toowoomba, the Sunshine Coast and the Gold Coast last November and December. These seminars are a tripartite presentation with case studies being presented by employers, union representatives or employees. Further seminars have been organised in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of Industrial Relations and I seek leave to table the list together with the details of enterprise bargains referred to previously.

Leave granted.

**Mr FOLEY:** One-day courses on enterprise bargaining are being conducted by awards management branch officers of my department. The courses are aimed at employers and employees interested in entering into enterprise bargaining agreements and provide a detailed but simple explanation of the nuts and bolts. Pamphlets are also being prepared which will provide further practical information, as is a model enterprise agreement to give would-be bargaining parties a starting point. These measures are targeted towards small business, particularly those in customer services and tourism. Many of these employers do not have access to information and advice available to larger businesses. As further assistance, awards management officers are promoting workplace bargaining in their day-to-day contacts and informing employers and unions of the added flexibility available under the certified agreement provisions.

Federal Industrial Relations Minister Laurie Brereton said in April that amendments to the Commonwealth's Industrial Relations Act 1988 would be introduced during the August/September session. Mr Brereton has undertaken to consult with the States on the draft legislation. The Queensland Government welcomes the commitment to consultation and to ongoing workplace reform.

The Queensland Government sees ongoing labour market reform as a means to improved productivity and higher living standards for all Queenslanders. In the State's interest, we will continue to promote and encourage its use.

## MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

### Death of Sir John Row, KBE

**Hon. W. K. GOSS** (Logan—Premier and Minister for Economic and Trade Development) (10.24 a.m.), by leave: I move—

> "(1) That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Honourable Sir John Alfred Row, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland and Minister of the Crown.
>
> (2) That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the widow and family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss that they have sustained."

Sir John Row was born at Ingham in 1905. He was educated at the Toowoomba Grammar School. In his early years, he was a keen sportsperson, with a particular interest in football, cricket and athletics. In 1924, he purchased a cane farm at Trebonne near Ingham, which he personally managed until 1960. During this period, I am told that he was also a representative of a number of agriculture-related bodies; Hinchinbrook's representative on the regional electricity board; and a councillor for the Shire of Hinchinbrook from 1952 to 1963. I am advised that he was also actively associated with a number of community organisations in the Hinchinbrook region, including the local rodeo association and the local show.

Sir John entered State Parliament as the member for the north Queensland seat of Hinchinbrook on 28 May 1960, representing the Country Party. Three years later, he was elevated to Cabinet as the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry, an office which he held for three months. After this time, he was appointed Minister to the new portfolio of Primary Industries. He remained the member for Hinchinbrook and the Minister for Primary Industries until his retirement from State Parliament in June 1972. As Minister for Primary Industries, he introduced legislation in relation to the operations of the Queensland meat industry, and legislation regulating the controlled use of agricultural chemicals. Both pieces of legislation remain as law in this State today, albeit in amended forms. Despite his long involvement in politics, Sir John Row also maintained a lifelong, active interest in the sugar industry.

On an interesting side note—I am also told that one of the more colourful moments in Sir John Row's political career came in October 1971 during the famous episode when Country Party rebels were moving to replace the still relatively new Premier Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. The story has it that John Row, who had sided with the anti-Joh group, let it slip in the Members Bar that the spill move was under way. A Joh supporter tipped off the Premier, who spent the night gathering the numbers and was able to survive the move against him the following day. This just goes to serve notice to us all of the danger of spending too much time in the Members Bar.

Lastly, I note that in 1974, John Row was knighted for his service as a member of Parliament and for his achievements as Minister for Primary Industries.

**Mr BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—Leader of the Opposition) (10.28 a.m.): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion moved by the Premier. On behalf of the Opposition, I support strongly the remarks made in support of this condolence motion for former Minister for Primary Industries, Sir John Alfred Row. I acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of Sir John Row's nephew, the former member for Hinchinbrook and former Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker of this House, Mr Ted Row.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr BORBIDGE:** It was with much sadness that I noted Sir John's passing, as he was a man who contributed so much to the State of Queensland and, in particular, to our primary industries over many years. I note that Sir John was a canefarmer. He purchased his parents' farm at the age of 21. A few years later, he began his long association with the canegrowers organisation. From 1948 to 1960, he was a growers' representative on the local Cane Prices Board, and a director of the Herbert River Cane Growers Cooperative Stores from 1955 to 1960. He also served as a councillor for the Hinchinbrook Shire and, prior to entering this place, was a member of the Townsville Regional Electricity Board.

In 1960, Sir John entered Parliament as the member for Hinchinbrook and as a member of the Country Party. He had built up a strong personal following in an area that previously had been held by Labor. Three years later, as the Premier indicated, he was appointed to Cabinet in the portfolio that later became Primary Industries. He entered Cabinet knowing the sugar industry well but somewhat unfamiliar with some of the other areas in Primary Industries. He set about diligently applying himself to learning about the tremendous facets of primary industry in this State and dealing with problems within his portfolio, especially in the dairy and wheat industries. He was a Minister at a time when almost all primary industries faced a period of crisis with a crippling drought—a drought not unlike the one which all primary producers in Queensland are facing today.

In the great tradition of Country Party and National Party Ministers, he prided himself in helping Queensland's primary industries and farmers get back on their feet. Ultimately, he was always concerned about the people of his electorate. He said that, despite his travels throughout the whole of Queensland and throughout Australia, he was still convinced that his district was one of the best, if not the best, in Queensland.

On his retirement from politics in 1972, he was quoted as saying that he believed that in his political life he had made more friends than enemies. His idea always had been to judge people by what they were, not by who they were or what position they held. He felt that he had made many good and valuable friendships with people from all walks of life in his district and elsewhere, and he valued those relationships greatly. He was dedicated to the people of his community and, on his retirement, paid tribute to the very many residents whom he served. His distinguished service to Queensland was rewarded two years after his retirement when, in 1974, he was knighted. Sir John Row will be a much-missed Queenslander. On behalf of the Opposition, I extend our condolences to Sir John's family.

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (10.32 a.m.): I join in speaking to this condolence motion not only as a successor of Sir John Row as Minister for Primary Industries but also as the only member in the House who served with him in this Parliament. John was a man whom one could not help liking. The expressions just used by the Leader of the Opposition about him were very true. One of the obituaries to him described him as a pugnacious type of bloke, and he was. He even looked the part. He was built around the girth a little bit like the member for Southport but was nowhere near as tall as him. He threw everything into whatever he did.

He started farming at a very young age. He was well known not only in the Hinchinbrook area but throughout north Queensland long before he came into the Parliament. That was one of the reasons for his success at the 1960 election. He had been a member of show societies and was involved in local government and different statutory authorities. He was a very well known north Queenslander. Consequently, his death will be mourned not only by the people of the Ingham and Hinchinbrook regions, but also by people throughout the whole of north Queensland and rural Queensland who knew him.

He was Minister for Primary Industries at an important period. It was the time of the finalisation of the big sugar agreement that had been negotiated by the late Ned Hanlon in 1949. Prior to then, a 25-year sugar agreement had never been heard of, but it was coming to a close because Great Britain was entering the European Community. They were very difficult times for the industry. At that time, a great question mark hung over the sugar industry's future. Queensland was fortunate to have a man such as Sir John Row as the Minister for Primary Industries to steer it through that period.

Even now, some of the long-serving officers of the Department of Primary Industries talk with great admiration and respect about John Row. I know that you, Mr Speaker, were an employee of the department at that time and would well remember the little nuggetty figure that used to get around from time to time in the department. I met John personally when I was a young man, well before my entry into this Parliament. From that time, I had a fondness for him.

John left Parliament because his health was not the best and he felt that he ought to pass on the role. Of course, his nephew Ted then took his place in Parliament and kept a family connection with the area. Unfortunately, the last five years of John's life were spent in the Canossa Home in the Ingham area, where he was not in the best of health. It was a happy release for him when God took him. I feel sure that there is a special spot somewhere—whatever people's beliefs may be—for people such as Sir John Row.

**Mrs SHELDON** (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.36 a.m.): I rise to support the motion of condolence before the House. Sir John Row served the people of Queensland in one form or another for most of his life, quite apart from his distinguished service in this House as Minister for Primary Industries over the nine years up to 1972. Sir John came from the classic background of those who came to this Parliament with an already established record of community service, and so were able to shape the Queensland from which we all benefit today.

Sir John was born in Ingham, north Queensland, in 1905. His family were graziers and canefarmers. After completing his education in the Ingham district and at Toowoomba Grammar, Sir John bought a cane farm near Trebonne in 1924 at the tender age of 19. Despite his busy schedule, Sir John was no absentee landlord. He personally worked the Trebonne cane farm for the next 34 years. At the same time, Sir John served on the Victoria Mill Suppliers Committee and executive, was the growers' representative on the local cane prices board, a director of the Cane Growers Cooperative Store and a member of the Herbert River Show Association. That is a very abbreviated list of the committees and organisations through which Sir John served his community.

He was one of two Queenslanders knighted by the Queen in her 1974 New Year's Honours List. Sir John enjoyed a long and productive life which was regularly studded with achievement. Queenslanders will mourn his passing. I extend condolences to the members of his family.

**Mr ROWELL** (Hinchinbrook) (10.37 a.m.): It is a privilege to join in this condolence motion for Sir John Alfred Row who passed away in Townsville on Saturday, 15 May, aged 88 years. Sir John Row was born in the Herbert River Valley at Hamleigh on 1 January, 1905. Prior to being elected to Parliament in 1960, he was very much involved in the affairs of the Ingham district. In 1926, he commenced canefarming on the Stone River Road outside Trebonne. It was only in the last few years that Sir John disposed of his interest in the farm.

Sir John was active in the community, serving on the Hinchinbrook Shire Council from 1952 to 1963; as a council representative on the Townsville Regional Electricity Board; as a member of the Victoria Mill Suppliers Committee and executive from 1932 to 1960; as a growers' member on the Sugar Cane Prices Board from 1948 to 1960; as a director of the Herbert River Canegrowers Co-operative Store from 1955 to 1960; as a member of the Farmers League; and as a member of the Australian Sugar Producers Association.

Sir John was married twice, firstly, to Gladys Hollins, who passed away in 1952, leaving daughter Lorraine Caldwell, living now in Devon, England. Sir John's second marriage was to Irene Sellars in 1966. His parliamentary career commenced in 1960 after unsuccessfully contesting the 1957 election which brought the Nicklin Government to power. In that Government in 1963, he became a Minister. He was given responsibility for the portfolio of Primary Industries, which he held for nine years. In 1972, he retired from politics to make way for his nephew, Ted Row, who represented Hinchinbrook for the next 17 years. I acknowledge Ted's presence in the Chamber today.

Sir John Row was dedicated to the rural industries of Queensland and did not hesitate to support them. During the latter part of the 1960s, the sugar industry was in dire economical circumstances. There was no light at the end of the tunnel regarding world prices. The future for the industry was bleak. In a moment of despair, Sir John rang Jack McEwan and told him forcefully that the Commonwealth had no alternative but to give financial assistance to the industry. Fortunately, the Federal Government of the day did give its support. The cyclic effect that plagues many primary industries passed, and the Commonwealth Government was paid back in full within four years.

Sir John Row had a positive attitude towards numerous matters in his Primary Industries portfolio, which won him the respect of those involved in the industry and the broad cross-section of staff within the department. The personnel staff have commented that they were relaxed because they knew where the objectives lay. Sir John's friendly disposition was a trademark of his approach to constituents and those who sought his assistance. There were often high expectations of a Primary Industries Minister in a rural electorate. Everyone who needed help got a fair hearing.

Sir John Row commenced sugarcane growing when the industry was in its fledgling stages. At that stage, most of the work was done with equipment that could have been classified as primitive. But, despite this, Sir John's keen interest in sport was evident. In his latter years, Rugby league, cricket, soccer, and in his later years bowls were all part of a diversion from the workload of this man who was dedicated to both the State of Queensland and the Hinchinbrook electorate. Sir John was made a life member of the Ingham Bowls Club, the Herbert River Show Association and the Rodeo Association for his commitment over a long period.

In 1974, in recognition of his distinguished and statesman-like service to the State of Queensland, a knighthood was conferred upon John Row for services rendered as a Minister of the Crown and a member of Parliament. During Sir John's latter years, he was ably cared for by the Sisters at the Canossa Home for the Aged, which was very close to the farm on which he had spent the greater part of his working life.

In conclusion—it is an honour for me to be able to pay this tribute to a true Queenslander on behalf of the constituents of the Hinchinbrook electorate.

*Motion agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.*

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Ministerial Intervention in Rezoning

**Mrs SHELDON** (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.43 a.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. Yesterday, in this House, the Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning raised the issue of a letter which I had written to him on behalf of a constituent. Mr Mackenroth accused me of asking him to interfere in a council decision. Mr Speaker, I will now table that letter. The letter in no way asks for ministerial interference in a council decision. It was a standard letter referring a request by a constituent that his objection to a rezoning and to a $150 fee be passed on to the relevant Minister—in this case, Mr Mackenroth. The copy of my letter to the Minister proves that the Minister misled the House over the matter of ministerial rezonings during question time yesterday.

Mr Speaker, I ask you to consider this very serious allegation against a Minister of the Crown, and I ask that you consider my request to refer this matter to the Privileges Committee.

## LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

**Mr VEIVERS** (Southport) (10.45 a.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

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

| AYES, 31 | | NOES, 46 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Beanland | Stephan | Ardill | McElligott |
| Borbidge | Stoneman | Barton | Milliner |
| Connor | Turner | Beattie | Nuttall |
| Davidson | Veivers | Bennett | Pearce |
| Elliott | Watson | Bird | Power |
| FitzGerald | | Braddy | Purcell |
| Gamin | | Bredhauer | Pyke |
| Gilmore | | Budd | Robertson |
| Goss J. N. | | Burns | Robson |
| Grice | | Campbell | Rose |
| Healy | | Casey | Smith |
| Horan | | Clark | Spence |
| Johnson | | Comben | Sullivan J. H. |
| Lester | | Davies | Sullivan T. B. |
| Lingard | | De Lacy | Szczerbanik |
| McCauley | | Edmond | Vaughan |
| Mitchell | | Elder | Warner |
| Perrett | | Fenlon | Welford |
| Quinn | | Foley | Wells |
| Randell | | Gibbs | Woodgate |
| Rowell | | Goss W. K. | |
| Sheldon | *Tellers:* | Hamill | *Tellers:* |
| Simpson | Springborg | Hayward | Pitt |
| Slack | Laming | Mackenroth | Livingstone |

Resolved in the negative.

## PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE FOR ELECTORAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

## Report and Submissions

**Dr CLARK** (Barron River) (10.53 a.m.): It is with pleasure that I lay upon the table of the House the unanimous report of the Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review on codes of conduct for public officials. This is the eighteenth report of the committee. I also lay upon the table of the House the 36 submissions on this matter received by the committee. Recommendation 10 (c) of the Fitzgerald report recommendations pertinent to the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission required the commission to implement and supervise the formulation of codes of conduct for public officials. The Electoral and Administrative Review Commission reported to Parliament on its review on codes of conduct for public officials on 7 May 1992. In reviewing EARC's report, the Parliamentary Committee for Electoral and Administrative Review has endorsed EARC's proposals that a public sector ethics model should be based on legislation; that codes of conduct should be prepared for both elected and appointed officials; that an office of public sector ethics and an advisory panel on public sector ethics should be established; and that ethics training and education will be crucial to successfully implementing the public sector ethics regime.

However, the committee has diverged from EARC's recommendations and its draft public sector ethics Bill in relation to matters including EARC's hierarchy of levels of codes, the manner in which codes of conduct should be prepared and approved, and the basis upon which public officials should be subject to disciplinary action. The committee's recommendations have been given effect to in a Public Sector Ethics Bill drafted by the Office of the Queensland Parliamentary Counsel according to the committee's instructions. The practical difficulty of applying EARC's draft general code of conduct to various categories of elected and appointed public officials was a recurring theme in submissions received by the committee. In response to issues raised in those submissions or identified by the committee, the committee has recommended that EARC's hierarchy of three levels of codes be collapsed into two levels. Under the scheme proposed by the committee, codes of ethics form general declaratory charters of ethical obligations for appointed and elected officials, and agency-specific codes of conduct consistent with those ethical obligations will be tailored to suit the needs and circumstances of each unit of public administration.

The Committee proposes that the responsibility for the preparation of agency-specific codes will rest with chief executive officers of public sector units and that the decision whether to approve a code of conduct will rest with the Minister responsible for a unit. In accordance with advice received from Professor Charles Sampford, Foundation Dean and Morris Fletcher and Cross Professor of Law, the committee has drafted statutory provisions requiring that, in preparing codes, the chief executive officers must consult with or take all reasonable steps to consult with the public officials to whom the code is to apply and with appropriate individuals and organisations representing their interests. The committee's Bill further provides that, in determining whether to approve a code of conduct, the Minister responsible for a public sector unit may not approve a code unless it is accompanied by a written statement by the chief executive officer describing the nature, extent and outcome of consultations held in preparing the code.

In relation to Parliament—the committee has included provisions in its draft Bill making it mandatory for a code of conduct to be prepared for members of the Legislative Assembly as elected members and making the Speaker responsible for taking the steps necessary to ensure the preparation of the code. The committee considers that the current practice whereby the Premier tables a ministerial code in Parliament should be enshrined in legislation. The committee has therefore drafted statutory provisions according to which the Premier must prepare a code of conduct for Ministers to be laid before the Legislative Assembly. EARC stated that the primary objective of its proposed legislation is to declare rather than to impose standards of acceptable official

conduct on public officials, most of whom, according to EARC's ethics survey, already seek to act ethically in performing their duties.

However, according to advice provided by Professor Charles Sampford, the effect of EARC's draft Bill is to make EARC's general primary obligations directly enforceable by themselves, thereby creating new ethics offences, which was in fact contrary to EARC's intent. Professor Sampford recommended that EARC's Bill be amended so that the adverse consequences do not flow from a failure to comply with the broadly stated primary obligations but from breaches of the more specialised codes of conduct for individual public sector units. The committee has accepted his advice and therefore recommended that contraventions of the detailed agency-specific codes of conduct should be the basis upon which public officials may be liable to disciplinary action.

Whilst the committee has endorsed EARC's recommendations that an independent office of public sector ethics be established in the Department of the Premier, Economic and Trade Development, the committee has recommended that the functions of the office should be to assist, to advise and to educate in matters relating to public sector ethics but not to investigate. Under the committee's proposed scheme, it will be the responsibility of the office of public sector ethics to prepare model codes where requested to do so by the chief executive officers and, in determining whether to approve a code of conduct, the responsible Minister will be required to have regard to any submissions made by the office of public sector ethics. In implementing the committee's proposed Public Sector Ethics Act and codes, the Committee has recommended that ethics education and training should be given the highest priority.

In closing, I note with dismay but not surprise that the latest *Time* Morgan poll shows that only 11 per cent of the public think that State politicians have high or very high standards of honesty and ethics. A code of conduct for MLAs based on fundamental ethical principles together with ethics education and training can make a significant contribution to the vital task of restoring public trust and confidence in the ability of politicians to put public duty before personal interest. I wish to thank all members of the committee for their contribution to the preparation of the report: the deputy chairman, Mr Tony FitzGerald; Ms Laurel Power; Mr Bob Quinn; Mr Marc Rowell; Mr Jon Sullivan; and Mr Rod Welford. The committee records its thanks for the expert assistance rendered by Miss Sandy Walker of the secretarial staff and the committee also records its grateful appreciation to its acting research director, Ms Karen Sampford. I move that the report be printed.

Ordered to be printed.

## DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members, I wish to welcome and extend a warm welcome to Mr Speaker Skate from the Papua New Guinea Parliament, who is in the Speaker's Gallery, together with the Clerk of the House, Mr Simon Pentanu; Mr Graeme Whitchurch, Director (Finance and Administration); and Mr Ben Marjen, head of Speaker Skate's personal staff. I welcome them to our Speaker's Gallery.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

## QUESTION UPON NOTICE

### Heiner Documents; Mr P. Coyne

Mr LINGARD asked the Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs—

> "With reference to her statement on 18 May that the disposal of the Heiner documents was done to reduce the risk of legal action and as Peter Coyne had a statutory right of access to these and other documents held in the Minister's office—
>
> What did she do as Minister to prevent the shredding of these documents?"

**Ms WARNER:** Clearly, the honourable member did not read the answer that I provided to him on 18 May. I advise him to read the answer and attempt to understand it. However, in order to assist the honourable member, I repeat: I initiated Cabinet's consideration of the best way to unravel the complex legal mess which I inherited from the previous Government. Cabinet decided to act on the advice of the Crown Solicitor and the State Archivist. My reply of 18 May 1993 details the action taken. The documents which were destroyed by the State Archivist were never in my office or in my possession, and I never sighted them.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Prostitution Legislation

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, I refer to the farce of his now totally discredited prostitution legislation and media reports today in which Government sources blame deficiencies in police evidence for failing to secure a prosecution, and I ask: as the magistrate involved has blamed the laws and not the police, and that if his findings stood the state of the new laws would be "a matter for the legislature", what action does the Minister intend to take, or have both the police and the courts got it wrong?

**Mr BRADDY:** As in all legal cases, there is a mixture of evidence and law, and an interpretation of law in the final decision. When we received the transcript of the magistrate's decision in this case, it was referred to the Director of Prosecutions so that we could obtain an objective assessment of the situation. It was his assessment that, on reading the material that was given to him, the primary reason for the failure of that case to succeed on behalf of the prosecution was that the evidence was not accepted by the magistrate, and that there was insufficient evidence that was capable of being accepted.

In addition to that, there were some obiter remarks by the magistrate in relation to his view of certain aspects of the law. The Director of Prosecutions was asked to advise whether that matter needed any further clarification at this time, and his advice to the Attorney and the Government was "No", that that was a remark in passing and that it had not been the basis for the decision; that, in effect, it was an observation by one particular magistrate; and that it was not appropriate at this time, in the light of other prosecutions which have proceeded and are proceeding, that any further action should be taken, and the Government accepts that advice.

### Main Roads Funding to Local Authorities

**Mr BORBIDGE:** In directing a question to the Minister for Transport, I refer to the rural crisis and reports that the Aramac Shire Council is to stand down its complete roadworks staff of 30 employees from 2 June owing to a shortage of Main Roads funds. I refer also to deep concern among local authorities across the State that his Government is planning further de-maining of roads, and I ask: what assurances can the Minister give local authorities that Main Roads funding will be sufficient to allow them to maintain their current work force? Does he intend to proceed with the de-maining of roads? If so, why is he placing further strains on rural communities during the present crisis?

**Mr HAMILL:** In response to the Leader of the Opposition's question—there is no plan for the de-maining of roads as outlined by him. Indeed, if one looks back into a little bit of history, one will see that the Government that was responsible for the large-scale removal of roads from the responsibility of the State Government was indeed the last National Party Government, when a very large section of roads right across the State was handed back to local authorities without giving local authorities the means to maintain the very substantial assets that were transferred to them. I might say that the old Main Roads Act, which was administered by the former National Party Government, did not allow funds from the old Main Roads trust fund to be deployed for the benefit of local authority roads.

During the term of the previous Goss administration, we amended legislation in this place, under the new Transport Infrastructure (Roads) Act, to do away with those arrangements and to provide flexibility in our legislation to enable funds to be directed from State sources to assist local authorities. We have had great success in doing that by a variety of cooperative funding arrangements, which local authorities have supported. There is a case where a number of local authorities—and in this case, the Aramac Shire Council—try to carry forward those years in which they have significant allocations for road construction and maintenance, and claim that that is their base funding arrangement. Quite frankly, that situation is untenable, and every other local authority in this State would agree. If the Leader of the Opposition presumably had his way on this one, it would freeze in place all allocations of funds for both road maintenance and construction as they stand in the current year. That would mean that areas of the State which currently do not have a major road construction project taking place in their area could never get a major road construction project in their area. What we have done in our legislation is seek to have local authorities cooperate with each other, instead of having boom and bust periods with the local authority work forces, where they rely upon new construction work to bolster their arrangements.

**Mr Borbidge** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr HAMILL:** We have been allocating additional funds to local authorities to generate work where it can best be derived, and that is through local authority road maintenance on behalf of the Department of Transport.

## Drought Relief

**Mr PITT:** I direct a question to the Minister for Transport and Minister Assisting the Premier on Trade and Economic Development. I understand that Queensland farmers have been receiving special load concessions on vehicles transporting drought-affected livestock into New South Wales but that, on 10 May this year, those concessions were to be revoked by the New South Wales Government. In the light of the serious consequences of such a move, I ask: can the Minister inform the House whether that revocation has actually occurred?

**Mr HAMILL:** This matter is a very important one. Certainly, the New South Wales Government had provided some relaxation of its load limits to enable droughted graziers both in New South Wales and in Queensland to move stock for agistment purposes. As members would be aware, drought conditions have eased very substantially across areas of New South Wales. However, that has not been the case in Queensland. On 22 April, I wrote to the Honourable Wal Murray, the Minister responsible for roads in New South Wales. I indicated to him that the proposed restoration of load limits in New South Wales on 10 May would cause very serious problems for Queensland graziers who were seeking to move stock for agistment purposes. I pointed out to him that the drought in Queensland—especially in some western areas—was worsening, and that the need to transport stock for agistment purposes would be increasing. I was pleased to receive correspondence from Mr Murray which acknowledged my representations on

behalf of the pastoral industry of this State. He acceded to my request. The proposed restoration of load limits in New South Wales on 10 May has not taken place and will not take place, thanks to the efforts of this Government on behalf of primary producers.

## Queensland Police Stationed in Cambodia

**Mr PITT:** I direct a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. In light of Mr Kennett's actions in withdrawing the services of Victorian police to assist with the elections in Cambodia, could the Minister advise the House what role Queensland police are playing in that exercise?

**Mr BRADDY:** The Queensland Police Service has sent a fingerprint expert to assist during the election currently being held in Cambodia. This is a very important time for that country and for that part of the world. The United Nations asked the Australian Government for assistance and, in particular, the provision of police officers who have fingerprinting experience to help in Cambodia during this vital election. The Australian Federal Police in turn requested assistance from the Queensland Police Service and other State police services. Commissioner O'Sullivan called for volunteers or expressions of interest from members of the Queensland Police Service. After consideration of those applications, Senior Sergeant Brian Sheehan was selected to assist in Cambodia.

At the request of Commissioner O'Sullivan, on 10 May, I granted formal ministerial approval for Senior Sergeant Sheehan to assist in Cambodia. Senior Sergeant Sheehan has 30 years' police experience. He is a fingerprinting expert and is a former member of the special emergency response team. Last night, Senior Sergeant Sheehan travelled to Bangkok. On Monday, he will take up duties in Cambodia for a period of three weeks. The United Nations is paying his airfares and all his other travel and accommodation expenses while he is in Cambodia. It is certainly a pity that the Victorian Government, at the dictate of Premier Kennett, has seen fit at this time to withdraw its experts and deny the provision of similar assistance. I certainly hope that the Victorian Government sees fit to play its part in this process.

I commend Senior Sergeant Sheehan for volunteering his services, and I assure the House that this Government will not ignore a request from the Australian Government and from the United Nations to play its part at this very important time in Cambodia and South East Asia.

## Gladstone Special Steel Project

**Mrs SHELDON:** I ask the Treasurer: will he confirm or deny that one of the departments or corporations under his control is involved in the cover-up of a report on a massive cost blow-out on the feasibility study into the Gladstone special steel project, taking the taxpayers' contribution to the study 25 per cent over budget to $6.5m; that the major Australian and international interest in the project has evaporated; and that the project is in trouble and taxpayers' funds—reported to be up to $8.5m in total—have been lost yet again?

**Mr De LACY:** I presume that the honourable member is talking about the Gladstone special steel project; is that correct?

**Mrs Sheldon:** Yes.

**Mr De LACY:** My recollection is that two contributions were made by the State Government. The first was from the Venture Capital Fund of the QIDC, and I presume that that is the one to which the honourable member refers. I cannot remember the amount of that contribution. I believe that it was $5m or $6m; the honourable member claims that it was $8m.

**Mr Borbidge:** Just five or six.

**Mr De LACY:** It was a venture capital contribution, and venture capital means exactly that.

**Mrs Sheldon:** What about the cost of the feasibility study—that's what I asked.

**Mr De LACY:** It all went towards the feasibility studies. I believe that the total cost of the feasibility studies was in the vicinity of $11m. We contributed towards that. We did that on the basis that the establishment of a special steel project at Gladstone would be a great boost for the Gladstone economy and for the Queensland economy. We make no apology for that. That is what venture capital is all about.

An international consortium was involved in the Gladstone special steel project and it had very solid support from German companies. That interest has been overtaken, in part, by the world recession, and in particular by the German recession. The Government accepts that the possible outcome of such a project is worth the initial investment. Heaven knows that the Opposition rails daily about inadequate development in this State. However, if the Government commits some funds to feasibility studies to get worthwhile projects going, the Opposition claims that it is wasting taxpayers' money. The Opposition cannot have it both ways.

## QIDC Venture Capital Fund

**Mrs SHELDON:** In directing my second question to the Treasurer, I refer him to the lead story in *Business Queensland* of 3 May, headlined "Venture Capital Fund Probe", and I ask: is it a fact that a committee examining the performance of the Queensland Industry Development Corporation's Venture Capital Fund has found that 18 of 21 investments made by the fund are to companies that have failed or are failing which, according to his policy adviser, gives the fund a hit and miss record on taxpayer-funded investment decisions. In light of this record, will he commit another $20m to venture capital this year?

**Mr De LACY:** I doubt it. The Venture Capital Fund was set up some years ago by the National Party Government. The honourable member is right: it has a hit and miss record, and its record is more miss than hit.

**Opposition members**: Oh!

**Mr De LACY:** That is what venture capital is all about. However, there have been three significant hits, and quite a number have not yet been resolved. The review about which the honourable member speaks is undertaken by the QIDC, not by Treasury, but I think that it ought to be the subject of review. My personal opinion at this time is that the strike rate is not high enough, and that Government funds——

**Mrs Sheldon:** What about Gondwanaland?

**Mr De LACY:** The honourable member asks about Gondwanaland. She continues to talk about Gondwanaland as though the Government forced the QIDC into investing in Gondwanaland. All it did was provide a guarantee on the basis——

**Mr FitzGerald:** You lend to anyone with a Government guarantee.

**Mr De LACY:** Exactly. That is what I wanted the honourable member to say. In one breath, the Opposition is saying that the Government forced the QIDC to lend——

**Mrs Sheldon:** Which you did, and you know they said to you that's not something they should put money into.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Yes—you provided the guarantee.

**Mr De LACY:** The Government provided a guarantee, and the QIDC was pleased to lend the money. As the honourable member for Lockyer said, once the Government provided the guarantee, the QIDC was pleased to lend. I have another comment to make about this issue. The Opposition talks about money being lost. The money is not being lost. The facility is there, and it is generating an income. It is servicing the debt and paying it off. There is no loss at all. It is a major theme attraction on the South Bank,

and that is why the Government gave the guarantee. It believed that South Bank ought to have a major theme attraction, and South Bank has that major theme attraction. The taxpayers lost no money at all. The honourable member does not understand what she is talking about. I suppose it makes good politics to keep regurgitating it, but it does very little for her credibility.

## Blood Bank Supplies

**Mr HORAN:** I ask the Minister for Health: now that blood bank supplies are at such a critically low level that blood cannot be supplied to troops in Cambodia and hospitals are down to supplying blood on a patient-by-patient basis only, will he take action to enable the Blood Bank to bring back into operation the mobile collecting service that had to be stopped due to his department's mismanagement?

**Mr HAYWARD:** The situation to which the honourable member refers has been played up fairly well in the media over the last couple of days. For the benefit of all members, I reiterate that, over the past three years, this Government has increased the funding to the blood transfusion service by 58 per cent. During that time, the service's staff has increased by 38 per cent, and blood collections have increased by 10.5 per cent. I have had discussions with the Blood Bank about its management structure. I do not think that it is understood by the member opposite—and I think that it should be understood—that the Health Department does not run the blood transfusion service. It is a separate organisation that is funded partially by the department. On the basis of the analysis that has been performed, the Blood Bank is considering ways in which the system could be made much more efficient.

## Dengue Fever

**Mr HORAN:** I direct my second question to the Minister for Health, and I refer him to the serious outbreak of dengue fever in north Queensland, with 500 confirmed cases already of Type 2 in the Townsville area alone, the potential damage to the tourism industry and reports of the Minister's disinterest, lack of knowledge of the situation and lack of support for prevention measures, and I ask: will he support the Townsville City Council in its attempts to keep properties free of mosquito breeding areas? Will he investigate why his department takes five weeks to provide results of dengue fever blood tests when private firms take two weeks?

**Mr HAYWARD:** In answer to the first part of the question—yes, the department is taking considerable interest in the issue and, yes, the department is supplying a considerable amount of funding towards the resolution of the problem. The second part of the question refers to the amount of time involved in testing. The reality of life is that one cannot speed up the generation of the viruses that have to be determined by blood tests. The department is proceeding as quickly as possible.

## Library Services

**Mrs McCAULEY:** In directing my first question to the Minister for Housing, Planning and Local Government, I refer him to a report prepared by Mr Ken Mead on the role of the State Government in the provision of public library services in Queensland, and his recommendation that the State Government inject an additional $15m over a three-year period to bring the public library system up to an acceptable standard, and I ask: does the Minister intend to implement that report, given that Queensland has the second-lowest funding level in Australia, the lowest level of book acquisitions per capita and the second-lowest level of qualified library staff per head of population and, if not, why not?

**Mr MACKENROTH:** When the member first raised this matter, I was unaware of the report. However, the Premier advises me that it relates to the portfolio of the

Minister for the Arts, so I think the member should have asked that question of the Minister for the Arts. That is my answer.

## Minister for Education

**Mrs McCAULEY:** I ask this question on behalf of all the feminists in the Labor Party who, obviously, are not going to ask any questions today. I refer the Minister for Education to his comments to an executive meeting of the High School Principals Association in March when, in referring to sexual harassment policy, he described the equity branch of his own department as, "those masturbators". He said that the branch had not had a good idea since it was appointed. I ask: is this the true nature of the Goss Government's commitment to equity matters in Queensland?

**Mr COMBEN:** I did not make the comment that has been quoted. The record of this Government in terms of equity and social justice is beyond compare, particularly compared with the record of the previous Government. My own commitment to abolishing sexual harassment in the department is well known in terms of my recent launching of that policy. The racial discrimination policy within the department was also launched by me, and the launching of a third anti-discrimination policy was one of the first things that I did in the department.

**Mr Lingard:** Why do people say you said it?

**Mr COMBEN:** I am not quite sure. Certainly, in terms of equity in general in the Department of Education, we have a marvellous record. Some 45 to 50 people are involved in social justice and equity——

**Mrs McCauley:** How come Eleanor Ramsay is leaving?

**Mr COMBEN:** Because she got a better job in Adelaide. She applied for it, I think, before I came into the department. She is very proud of the promotion and the fact that she is getting a pay rise and will have an opportunity to do things back in her home town. That is why she is leaving.

In terms of the general concept of equity and social justice in the department—I believe that we are doing a marvellous job. Some 35 to 40 people are involved in social justice studies. The equity directorate is extremely good, as well. But I have one reservation—and I put it on the front foot—when I say that we spend much time making sure that every unit—every school—has the same resources for social justice matters. When I go to the cape, I find that children in community schools are two years behind other children when they first attend high schools in Cairns. We do not do enough to pull some of our schools, particularly community schools and isolated schools, up to a particular level. We are very good at saying that everyone has the same access, but we do not pull up those schools.

I have been concerned to make sure that we are going in the correct direction, especially since I was told that I could not find $17,000 for the Marist school, St Augustines College in Cairns, which is undertaking a marvellous bridging program. At times, I look around and see some very good jobs being done, but I could not find $17,000 to allow some Aboriginal children from the cape to undertake a bridging program. In those terms, I certainly have some concerns, but my commitment to equity and social justice is total.

## Allegations of Verballing and Fabrication of Evidence

**Mr BEANLAND:** In directing a question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer to his refusal to establish a special unit to investigate individual allegations of verballing and fabrication of evidence by members of the Queensland Police Service alleged during the Fitzgerald inquiry, and I ask: will that not leave a continuing cloud over the heads of the Queensland Police Service, and is it not a denial

of the basic legal rights of persons who did not take independent legal action in the belief that the Minister's 1989 promise would be honoured?

**Mr WELLS:** One of the recommendations of the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry was motivated by the fact that under the National Party and, prior to that, under the Liberal/National Party coalition, there were a number of cases identified in the courts of people who were verballed. Fitzgerald's recommendation was designed to cope with the mismanagement that had occurred under the Liberal and National Party Governments. When he wrote his report, Fitzgerald was extremely clear in his mind and in his writing that these cases were capable of being dealt with through the courts. As a result of research which has been carried out following the establishment of a unit within my department, it appears that that work was done through the courts, and that those cases that occurred were identified through the appeal process. It should be remembered that the appeal process in Queensland is extremely extensive and comprehensive. It is possible for somebody to appeal on a point of law to the Court of Appeal. Prior to the establishment of the Court of Appeal, it was possible within the criminal justice system for people to appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal. That appeal process has always been available in respect of serious cases.

It has been known for some time that Fitzgerald made this recommendation in his report. It has also been known that it was under consideration. As a result of that, a number of people wrote to my department indicating that they wished to take advantage of this. The number of people who fell within the Fitzgerald categories was 17. Those people who fell within the Fitzgerald categories had to satisfy the following criteria: that they were still in gaol; that they had exhausted all their appeal processes; and that they were alleging that they were there as a result of a verbal. An analysis within my department has demonstrated that, of those 17 people, there are none who satisfy all the other Fitzgerald criteria. They include people who were not in Queensland at all, but were in gaol somewhere else for some other offence. They include people who have not completed their appeal processes. They also include people who pleaded fully to the allegations that they were making before the court. Those matters were determined by a jury. When one does a full analysis—as was done by the unit within my department and certified to me by Crown law within my department—one finds that of the people involved who made the complaints and fell within the relevant criteria, the bottom line is that none would be capable of being removed from their present state of incarceration by any legal process.

## Declaration of Stalking as Criminal Offence

**Mr BEANLAND:** I ask a second question of the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General: in view of the growing community concern and the concern expressed this morning on radio by a senior policewoman, will he, as the Attorney-General, take urgent steps to initiate legislation with a view to declaring the practice known as stalking as a criminal offence?

**Mr WELLS:** There are many offences in the Criminal Code which, taken together, come very close to establishing the offence of stalking. There is a variety of offences such as making threats, and going armed so as to cause fear. There is no specific section within the Criminal Code called "Stalking". Whether or not there shall be will, among other things, be influenced by the recommendations of the Criminal Code Review Committee. That committee has received submissions from various community groups indicating the necessity for such an offence. I will not pre-empt the recommendations that the Criminal Code Review Committee might make, but the matter is under consideration.

## Premier's Comments about Senate

**Mr GRICE:** In directing a question to the Premier, I remind him that on 13 May the Senate resolved to censure the Queensland Premier for what it called his ill-informed

campaign to abolish Upper Houses launched in this House and at a media conference. I point out also that the final form of that resolution was determined by the Premier's own party colleagues in the Senate when they divided to ensure that the word "censure" was included. The Premier will recall that I warned the House some months ago about strained relationships between——

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members are not allowed to make a speech when asking a question. The honourable member will ask his question or I will sit him down.

**Mr GRICE:** I ask the Premier: how does he intend to regain the regard of his Federal colleagues in the interests of ensuring that Queensland gets a fair shake in future dealings between the Commonwealth and the State?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The best thing that I can do is quote the words of Senator Peter Walsh, who said, "You haven't made it until you've been censured by the Senate." I do not think it is really a serious question, but I will attempt to answer it seriously. The honourable member referred to an ill-informed campaign. That is wrong on both counts. My comments were well informed to the extent that I said that the Senate was no longer discharging its original purpose, which was that of a State's House to represent the interests of the State; that the senators had become representatives of the political party of which they are members. That is obvious to everyone. I do not know that the Senate performs much of a useful role, but I am not leading a campaign to get rid of it. It was an observation, a throwaway remark at the end of a press conference about something else. It is not a campaign that I am leading, because I have other things to occupy my time.

## Queensland Labor Senators

**Mr GRICE:** I direct a second question to the Premier. Given his view that the Senate is a parties' House and not a States' House and given that his party has been able to count on the Democrats to vote its way most of the time in the last 10 years of Labor Government, I ask: on which occasions have Queensland Labor senators acted in the interests of the Labor Party and against the interests of the State of Queensland?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** As the member knows, this is not a matter that falls within my responsibility. However, as I said a week or two ago in trying to explain my remarks——

**Mr Borbidge:** Extricate yourself.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** No, it is not a case of extricating myself. I stand by everything I said. It is just that I am not taking what I said quite as seriously as some other people falsely claim to be. However, as to the senators, the point that I made a couple of weeks ago is perhaps made in the member's question, that is, it is a very rare occurrence and a long time since senators from a particular State banded to vote together irrespective of party allegiances in the interests of the State they claim to represent but no longer, in reality, represent.

## Post-school Options for Disabled Queenslanders

**Miss SIMPSON:** I ask the Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs: in light of her statements in her departmental magazine, *Intercom*, about how committed she was to post-school options for disabled Queenslanders, why are post-school options glaringly absent—with the exception of some respite and Government baby-sitting services—for severely and profoundly disabled Sunshine Coast youth, who are now forced to leave school at 18?

**Ms WARNER:** I thank the honourable member for her question. There is, I think, an identifiable gap in services both at Commonwealth and State levels. When children who are disabled are at school, they are cared for on a daily basis by the school. When they leave and are not able to go immediately into either tertiary education or

employment, there is quite often at that point a great difficulty for the family in trying to find either day care or an appropriate activity for them. Although the Commonwealth Government—as we are in Queensland, as well—is keen to see people with disabilities leading normal lives rather than having specific and different services made available for them which marginalise them and keep them separate from the rest of the population, we are looking for an appropriate program that will be able to fill that gap to provide post-secondary education facilities for people with disabilities. There will be a question of resources which will have to be taken into account, but also some very significant policy implications about what kind of services are the most appropriate for that period of a person's life.

## New High School, Maroochydore

**Miss SIMPSON:** I direct a question to the Minister for Education. In light of the fact that the National Party Government set aside land for a new high school to relieve the pressure on Maroochydore High School, I ask: when will the Labor Government build this new school? Why has the Minister allowed Maroochydore High School to reach a level of 1 600 students when high schools used to be duplicated at 1 200 students?

**Mr COMBEN:** I understand that the Education Department owns some 2 300 blocks of land around Queensland. If the honourable member would like to write me a letter informing me of exactly which block she is talking about, I will answer her question willingly.

## Noosa Ambulance Station

**Mr DAVIDSON:** I direct a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. In its 1992 election promises, the Goss Government promised a new ambulance station for Noosa. As the Minister is aware, the Ambulance Service is sharing facilities with the Fire Service—a situation that has its problems and limitations. I ask: could the Minister advise when the construction of the Noosa ambulance station is due to commence?

**Mr BRADDY:** As the honourable member well knows, I have had conversations with him and corresponded with him on this matter. As I have previously advised him, the preparation of plans and drawings for the Noosa ambulance station are well advanced and the matter is proceeding in accordance with the advice that I have given him previously.

## Noosa Summit Development

**Mr DAVIDSON:** I ask the Minister for Environment and Heritage: could he advise me when a decision is to be made on the application by the developers of the Noosa Summit, which is a development at Noosa National Park?

**Ms ROBSON:** Recently, the member approached me about this particular development. In fact, he asked me this question yesterday. I told him yesterday and I will tell the House today that we are progressing that decision. It has been on the books for quite a period, and I should have an answer for him in the next week or so.

## Sunshine Coast Rail Services

**Mr TURNER:** It has been that long since I have asked a question that I might mess it up.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair is here to help the member.

**Mr TURNER:** I have a parochial question for the Minister for Transport. I ask: is he aware of the need to urgently upgrade the frequency and standard of rail services to the Sunshine Coast region, which is one of the fastest growing regions in Queensland? What steps is the Government taking to address this issue?

**Mr HAMILL:** The answer to the first part of the honourable member's question is "Yes". The answer to the second part of the question is that there is already an order in place for new rolling stock which will enhance the service.

### Extension of Pensioner Concessions

**Mr TURNER:** I thank the Minister for his lengthy answer. In directing a question to the Treasurer, I refer him to announcements made last December by the Federal Government which indicated that State and Territory Governments had agreed to extend concessions to all pensioners with States accepting the offer of Commonwealth assistance to fund this extension. I understand that Queensland has been compensated financially for these changes, and I ask: what sum was received from the Commonwealth to help fund this extension of pensioner concessions and, in view of his Government's PR brochures indicating that extended concessions are available, why are increasing numbers of pensioners finding that they do not qualify for such assistance?

**Mr De LACY:** I think the honourable member's question would be more appropriately addressed to the Minister for Family Services. The subject of concessions is still the subject of negotiations between the Commonwealth and State Governments. When those negotiations are finished, we will make the appropriate statement.

### Professional Officers Association Superannuation Fund

**Mr LINGARD:** In directing a question to the Minister for Health, I refer him to his statement of 12 November 1992 that he had personally sighted letters from Calabro Pedlan Maynes, chartered accountants, stating that Mr Don Martindale and Ms Roslyn Kinder had rolled over the full amounts standing in their names in the Professional Officers Association Superannuation Fund into their own superannuation funds. I ask: given the present interest shown in this matter by the Senate inquiry into superannuation, will he table copies of those letters?

**Mr HAYWARD:** I think the answer to that question should be "No", because it is really not a matter that necessarily concerns this Parliament. It is a matter involving individual negotiations—I think the honourable member missed one of the employees—with their previous employment as members of the Professional Officers Association.

### Alleged Superannuation Fund Misappropriation

**Mr LINGARD:** In directing a question to the Minister for Health, I refer to his comments on page 367 of *Hansard* in November 1992 in which he used a media release from the QPOA's General Secretary, Jeni Eastwood, and President, Sean Curley, to claim that my allegations of possible superannuation fund misappropriation by Don Martindale and Ms Ros Kinder were wrong. As Ms Eastwood and Mr Curley have both denied before a Senate committee making any comments concerning Mr Martindale and Ms Kinder in that media release, and are doing everything possible to distance themselves from it, I ask: does he have the integrity to admit that he, in fact, got it wrong?

**Mr HAYWARD:** I do not even know what the honourable member is talking about.

### Drought Relief

**Mr STONEMAN:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: given that he continues to insist that the forward movement of drought-affected stock will not be reinstated because of a pig-headed claim of the possibility of rorting, what advice does he give to the many graziers, who are either shooting stock or watching them die, who do not have the financial resources to either avail themselves of the subsidy to bring feed to the stock or move the stock to feed?

**Mr CASEY:** I refer the member to answers that I gave in this House last week—and have constantly made—on this very subject. In answer to the second part of the question—we are looking at proposals at the moment from the United Graziers Association whereby in the very near future I will be making a submission to Cabinet regarding amendment of the Meat Industry Act regulations to enable the stock, namely sheep, to be treated within kangaroo abattoirs.

## Queensland Dairy Authority

**Mr STONEMAN:** I direct a question to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. Last night, the Minister for Primary Industries removed the statutory requirement that there be a consumer representative on the milk authority, and flagged similar action in respect of the meat industry. I ask: as Consumer Affairs Minister, does he support this change, and why?

**Mr MILLINER:** In answer to the honourable member—I think that when it comes down to it we are all consumers.

## Electrification of Rockhampton-Mackay Rail Line

**Mr RANDELL:** I ask the Minister for Transport: could he advise me of the timetable for the electrification of the railway between Rockhampton and Mackay?

**Mr HAMILL:** I am sure that it will be long after the honourable member and I are gone from this place.

## Police Stations, Mackay Region

**Mr RANDELL:** I thought that I would get a sensible answer. I direct a question to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Following persistent rumours about the closure of country police stations in the Mackay region, the latest being Marian and Farleigh, I ask: are these rumours correct, and when will the badly needed new police station in Mackay be built?

**Mr BRADDY:** There are no plans whatever for closing country police stations or any other police stations in this State. As the honourable member well knows, the planning in relation to the Mackay Police Station is well advanced. If he would like to write to me in relation to it and if he wants more specific timetables showing the various stages, I will supply that in writing.

## Land Bank

**Mr SLACK:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: does he support the establishment of a Government owned and operated land bank whereby the Government purchases land from farmers who are in difficulty and leases the land back to the farmers?

**Mr CASEY:** My answer to that is direct. The Government is prepared to look at any reasonable proposition that is put forward which may be able to help the future land-holders in the State of Queensland. If the member wants a more detailed explanation, he might ask the Minister for Lands.

### Unexploded Ordnance

**Mr LAMING:** I ask the Minister for Environment and Heritage: why has she dumped the responsibility of clearing unexploded ordnance onto local authorities when they are not the polluter? Does she not believe in the principle of "let the polluter pay"?

**Ms ROBSON:** I thank the honourable member for the question. Yes, of course the Government believes in the principle of polluter pays. The reality is that we are currently undertaking the activity of educating people about UXOs and their impact on the community. We are negotiating with the Federal Government and the Department of Defence, specifically. We know where most of the UXOs are. We are trying to negotiate funding to share the costs and clear up the UXOs. That campaign is currently under way. In the very near future, a public education campaign will begin in the public forum and it will educate people, give them information on what this Government is doing about UXOs and on what they need to do to be involved. In terms of local councils' involvement—quite clearly, there is an obligation on local councils to notify the Government of the location of UXOs so that we can complete our register of UXOs to ensure that there will be no untimely accidents and that people are well protected.

### Unexploded Ordnance

**Mr LAMING:** Following on from the previous question, I ask the Minister for Environment and Heritage: in clearing the UXOs, has she insisted on assistance from the Federal Government by the use of Army engineers or Air Force personnel who have the appropriate equipment for this task?

**Ms ROBSON:** As I have already said in my previous answer, we are negotiating with the Federal Government and the Department of Defence. Quite clearly, we are using all the expertise that is available through them. They have in fact done a lot of work on this issue for us, and we are tapping into that resource.

### Queensland AIDS Council Bumper Sticker

**Mr CONNOR:** Because of the obscene nature of the material, I seek leave to have an attendant pass it to the Minister.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Because of what?

**Mr CONNOR:** The obscene nature of the material. I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: is he aware that a Government-funded organisation, namely, the Queensland AIDS Council, is producing and distributing obscene bumper stickers? If so, what action has the Minister taken to deal with this matter? I ask the Minister to have a look at this material. I seek leave to have an attendant pass it to him.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr CONNOR:** I table it.

**Mr BRADDY:** As the honourable member would be well aware, as the Minister for Police, I am not responsible in any way for AIDS education or health matters relating to it. The material has certainly not been brought to my attention as Police Minister. If that is done in an appropriate manner, I will have a look at the appropriate document.

### Accounting Systems of Aboriginal and Island Councils

**Dr WATSON:** In directing a question to the Minister for Family Services and Aboriginal and Islander Affairs, I refer to a Public Accounts Committee report to the Forty-sixth Parliament concerning Aboriginal and island councils which recommended a series of proposals to overcome the serious deficiencies with respect to the councils' accounting practices. If she will remember, the report was agreed to be implemented by her department. I ask: precisely which recommendations has her department fully implemented? When will they be fully implemented so that the problems which have

occurred and which have been recently identified by the Auditor-General will no longer occur?

**Ms WARNER:** The PAC recommended a number of amendments be implemented in terms of amending the community services legislation, and a range of amendments were passed by this Parliament last year. Those amendments were also supported by the legislation review committee which was set up to look at making those procedures more amicable to councils. The basic problem identified by the PAC was that councils were being asked to audit their accounts as if they were Government departments. Quite often, that was inappropriate, given that those councils also operated enterprises and no other local authorities do that. Local Aboriginal councils find themselves in a position that is different from that of other local councils. However, the broad thrust of those amendments was to bring councils in line, wherever possible, with local authority regulations in respect of accounting.

The outstanding matters are the question of resourcing a central unit in the Aboriginal council area to assist those councils with their keeping of accounts. We are working with the Aboriginal Coordinating Council to develop that centralised body. We have already implemented the PAC's recommendations in respect of the ICC and have set up a centralised computing system. As the honourable member may notice, it did not actually have the effect of making those island councils deliver less qualified audits this time. Hopefully, that mechanism will work. Some of the mechanisms that were recommended by the PAC have led to improvements, but some of them have not yet done so. However, for a time, a concerted effort has been made in this area. It will take time before the results of the reforms are seen. The other major reform that the PAC recommended was that Aboriginal communities have a look at the mechanisms by which they are governed to try to find more appropriate mechanisms to suit their cultural needs, which may not be the sort of councils that are set up at the moment. I await advice from the Aboriginal communities about those new governing mechanisms, which may bring more culturally appropriate governing authorities to communities.

## Public Sector Deficit

**Dr WATSON:** I ask the Treasurer: given that the public sector in Australia will run a deficit this financial year of approximately 6 per cent of GDP, of which 4.5 per cent is contributed by the Federal Government, what does he intend to put forward to the forthcoming Loan Council meeting to ensure that the Federal Government will cut its own expenditure in 1993-94 rather than again cutting the States grants?

**Mr De LACY:** I do not think that it is for me to tell the Federal Government how to run its affairs, but I will tell the honourable member what I will do. I will make sure that Queensland contributes towards the reduction of the public sector deficit in the same way as the Government has contributed towards the reduction of the public sector deficit in each of the three Budgets.

## Fire Service, Emu Park

**Mr LESTER:** I ask the Minister for Police and Emergency Services: in view of the continuing investigation into fire services throughout the State, and in view of the fact that we have a fire officer and very excellent fire-fighting amenities at Emu Park, can the Minister guarantee that we will maintain that fire officer and the excellent amenities at Emu Park?

**Mr BRADDY:** No proposal has come before me about the fire officer at Emu Park. I am quite sure that the fire officer there and that the Emu Park Fire Service will continue to supply the excellent service that it currently does.

## Horse Riding in National Parks

**Mr LESTER:** I thank the Minister. I appreciate that. I direct a question to the Minister for National Parks and Wildlife.

**Mr Elder:** That's a long time ago.

**Mr LESTER:** I direct a question to the Minister for Environment and Heritage. I wanted to see whether everybody was listening at this late hour of question time.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr LESTER:** Having got everybody's attention, I ask: is the Minister aware—and I am sure that she is—of the applications by the Kuhn family to set up a horse trail riding company between Byfield and Five Rocks, and the fact that there is approximately 3 kilometres of national park in that area? Owing to the fact that vehicles can go through there, with permission, and owing to the fact that the animals that would be used do graze in that area, is there some way in which the Minister can——

**A Government member** interjected.

**Mr LESTER:** It is important for the people who are there. If the honourable member wants to laugh at the people of Keppel, that is his problem. I ask the Minister, who is listening: could she consider that issue to see whether the matter can be resolved? I believe that it would be good for the area; it really would.

**Ms ROBSON:** Certainly, we consider any proposal that is put before us in terms of people seeking access through national parks. However, the honourable member would be aware that we do not encourage the use of horses and horse riding in national parks. As a new project, if a written submission were put to us, we would consider it in the light of the national park policy.

## Aramac Shire

**Mr JOHNSON:** I direct a question to the Minister for Transport. Following the part answer given to the question by the Leader of the Opposition about the planned standing down of 30 Aramac Shire personnel for the month of June, because of total expenditure of the Department of Transport grants and other shire funds, I ask: what assistance will the Minister's department now give the Aramac Shire to prevent that disastrous situation from becoming a reality and the possibility of the problem compounding right throughout rural Queensland?

**Mr HAMILL:** I welcome the member's question, because, in the last few minutes, I sought some information regarding road funds and grants to the Aramac Shire Council. I am advised that the Aramac Shire Council received $1.91m this year in road construction and maintenance grants from the State Government, and that compared with $1.83m last year. It disturbs me that a 4.5 per cent increase in funding can put so many jobs in jeopardy. I have asked one of my officers to talk to the council this afternoon lest any further increases in road funding put more jobs in jeopardy at Aramac.

## Eyre Basin Catchment Area

**Mr JOHNSON:** I ask the Premier: as his Government has told the people of the Eyre Basin catchment area, known as the Channel Country of south-western and western Queensland, that his Government will not support the listing of that area on the World Heritage List, will he give that assurance to the South Australian and Federal Governments in writing?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** The Minister for Environment and Heritage is handling that matter. The honourable member is correct in terms of his identification of the attitude of the Government to the Queensland area. It is not our belief at this stage that World Heritage listing is justified.

**Mr Borbidge:** At this stage.

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** There is no information and no material put before us to justify——

**Mr Johnson:** Will you give that assurance to your Federal counterparts and South Australian counterparts in writing?

**Mr W. K. GOSS:** It is here in *Hansard*. The honourable member can photocopy it and send it to them if he feels so strongly about it.

### Cattle Tick Eradication

**Mr PERRETT:** I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: with reference to his 1992 election promise to eradicate cattle tick from that part of Queensland south of the Townsville-Mount Isa railway line, also referred to by Her Excellency the Governor in her address to the House, when will the program commence; how much will it cost; who will pay for the program—that is what producers want to know—and what makes the Minister think that he will succeed when a 100-year program in a small part of northern New South Wales has still not eradicated the tick?

**Mr CASEY:** I am glad that the honourable member raised New South Wales and some of the other matters. As part of his work, he should sit down and start reading the *Queensland Government Gazette*. If he were to do so, he would find that, within the past week or so, under the Minister who acted for me in my absence overseas with a parliamentary delegation, the first of 250 properties were taken away from the tick line and tick freed to enable cattle movements direct between Queensland and New South Wales. It has started. It is under way, and it is going well.

### Cattle Tick Eradication

**Mr PERRETT:** I will repeat my question to the Minister for Primary Industries. With reference to the Government's 1992 election promise to eradicate cattle tick from that part of Queensland south of the Townsville-Mount Isa railway line, also referred to by Her Excellency the Governor in her address to this House, when will the program commence? How much will it cost?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I have consulted with the Clerk. The honourable member is not allowed to ask the same question twice.

**Mr PERRETT:** He didn't answer it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! It is out of order. The time allotted for questions has expired.

## PUBLIC OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BENEFITS RECOVERY AMENDMENT BILL

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer) (12.01 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

> "That leave be granted to bring in a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Officers' Superannuation Benefits Recovery Act 1988."

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) (12.02 p.m.): I move—

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

The purpose of this Bill is to introduce amendments to the legislation for recovering State-provided superannuation benefits of persons who, having held public office, have committed a corrupt offence in that capacity. First, the amendments clarify the nature of corruption offences by public officials contemplated under the Act. The Bill now incorporates specific official corruption offences under the Criminal Code as well as a general definition of offences relating to corrupt conduct. The receipt or solicitation of benefits whilst in public office for the purpose of influencing the performance of that person's duties and responsibilities of office will be caught, as will the passing on of benefits to another officer in similar circumstances. In short, this will eliminate misappropriation offences—such as those which led to the convictions of some Ministers in the previous administration—which were not originally contemplated under the Act. Instead, there will be a stronger emphasis on offences in the nature of official corruption, such as bribery. The Bill, secondly, ensures that the specific base, or refund, benefit payable under the parliamentary scheme cannot be recovered by the State. This benefit, which is two and one-sixth times member contributions, is in lieu of the usual base benefit of return of member contributions and interest, and the amendment will provide members of Parliament with similar treatment to all other public officers.

The Bill also alters the treatment of pension entitlements affected by a recovery order of the court. Current legislation causes the whole pension entitlement to be removed. This Bill now causes the pension entitlement of the offender and any dependent to be reduced in accordance with actuarial principles in order to satisfy the judgment debt. Therefore, the pension entitlement will only be removed entirely where the lump sum value of the whole pension was necessary to satisfy the judgement debt. So not to prejudicially affect any existing applications before the court, a transitional provision has been included in the Bill causing the definition of "prescribed offence" to be retrospective in effect whilst simultaneously preserving the basis upon which any application to the court commenced prior to this Bill has been made. However, the Government does not intend to proceed further with cases which have previously been referred to the court where the particular offences did not involve corruption as newly defined by the amending legislation.

The Government has also recently approved that further amendments to this Act be drafted to extend its application to all officers of statutory authorities, including local government. This extension will ensure that the Government can take action against the superannuation benefit of any corrupt official. I would expect these further amendments to come before the next session of Parliament. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Sheldon, adjourned.

## SUPERANNUATION LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 May (see p. 2594).

**Mrs SHELDON** (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.06 p.m.): The Bill contains technical amendments and also seeks to amend the processes to ensure that State Government superannuation schemes comply with Commonwealth superannuation standards. These schemes relate to the Government superannuation scheme, the police superannuation scheme and the superannuation scheme for members of Parliament. We recognise that these provisions need to be in place before 14 August, as penalties will be incurred by the Crown under the Commonwealth legislation.

It is anticipated that the amendments will cause the police superannuation scheme to be brought into line with all other major Queensland Government defined benefit

superannuation schemes. Given that the actuarial deficiency in the Police Superannuation Fund is some $277.6m, these amendments provide for the Police Fund being able to support its portion of benefits, with the State setting aside its contribution in the Consolidated Fund. Following these amendments, members of the Police Fund will move across to the Government superannuation fund, Q Super. In this process, the pro rata portion of the deficiency in the Police Fund will also transfer to the Government superannuation fund. The coalition supports—as does the Government—the policy of the Police Fund fully funding its share of the superannuation liabilities, and as such the $277.6m deficiency should continue to be reduced. The balance of the amendments of a technical nature are based on recommendations relating to Commonwealth taxation efficiencies for defined benefit superannuation schemes. As this is the case, and given that any alternative approach will result in an unnecessary taxing of employee funds, the Opposition supports this Bill.

**Mr CAMPBELL** (Bundaberg) (12.08 p.m.): I rise with pleasure to support the Superannuation Legislation Amendment Bill. It amends the Police Superannuation Act of 1974, the Parliamentary Contributory Superannuation Act of 1970 and the State Service Superannuation Act of 1972. This amending legislation ensures compliance with the Commonwealth superannuation guarantee charge. It must be noted that these changes are necessary because of the changes to superannuation which are being imposed by the Federal Government. Those changes will be one of the lasting achievements of this Federal Labor Government. It will mean that, in the future, retirement payments will be met from superannuation, and all workers will contribute to their retirement. I want to raise one concern that I have. Although superannuation funds are available for parliamentarians, police and public servants, I am concerned for the battler. Many casual workers and other battlers do not receive the benefits of the Federal superannuation charge and the compulsory superannuation scheme. Most superannuation schemes incur excessive administration charges on contributions that are made on behalf of casual employees, those who are unemployed at different periods and those who change from one job to another. I place on record—and I will reinforce this in writing—that I believe that the Federal Government should give serious consideration to the establishment of superannuation savings funds with banks. That could be a very inexpensive method by which casual workers and others can contribute to a superannuation fund. The contributions will be paid to a savings account, which would attract reasonable interest payments. Moreover, those workers' funds would not be lost over a long period through excessive administration charges. It is important that, if a national superannuation scheme is to be implemented, every worker benefits. So often, the ordinary worker—the casual worker, the battler—misses out. The establishment of superannuation savings funds through banks, which would attract low administration charges, would be of great benefit to the ordinary worker. It would also be a positive move for social justice.

**Mr FENLON** (Greenslopes) (12.11 p.m.): I support the Superannuation Legislation Amendment Bill. I compliment the Treasurer for bringing it before this Parliament. I always speak about the subject of superannuation with some trepidation. For 11 years, I was an industrial relations practitioner. My colleagues in that field also share my trepidation about this subject. Occasionally, I had to deal with superannuation issues. The problem is that industrial relations involves a degree of predicability and precision, whereas superannuation is subject to various market forces and regular changes in legislation. This Bill will help clear up the nebulous area of superannuation. It provides greater predicability for future dealings with the funds that are covered by it. This legislation has three main purposes: to ensure compliance with the Commonwealth superannuation guarantee charge; to change the method of funding of the Police Superannuation Scheme so that employer contributions are accumulated within the Consolidated Fund rather than in the Police Superannuation Fund, which in the long run is more tax effective; and to overcome minor non-policy issues which have arisen from time to time in the administration of the superannuation schemes legislation. This legislation is consistent with the overall strategy of the Government, particularly its

financial management policy. It fits perfectly within the trilogy of financial management principles that were laid out very clearly in the State economic development policy, otherwise known as *Queensland— Leading State*, which was tabled by the Premier in 1992.

**Mr Stoneman:** A discredited document.

**Mr FENLON:** I take the interjection of the honourable member for Burdekin. It is the height of hypocrisy to make that comment. Never in the years of the Bjelke-Petersen Government—which he supported—was any attempt made to articulate as clearly and succinctly as that document does the long-term economic policy and plans for this State. During the former Government, there was a bland adherence to doing everything possible to assist the white-shoe brigade. The behind-the-door practices of the Bjelke-Petersen Government are now history. Its committee system was based at Bjelke-Petersen House, with policy formation taking place behind closed doors.

**Mr De Lacy:** That is not altogether true. Mr Ahern commissioned one from the Stanford Research Institute that was full of glossies, and I think it had public credibility for a week.

**Mr FENLON:** I take the interjection from the Treasurer. I was referring to serious attempts to formulate economic policy. We all recall the document to which the Treasurer referred, and we all know that it was a public joke. The *Leading State* document is now a matter of record, and the statements that have been made by the Treasurer about the respect that members of the Australian financial community and the international financial community have for this Government's economic strategy are well known. That document stands as an internationally respected strategy for responsible financial management.

The trilogy that is referred to within the financial management section of the *Leading State* document is financial management based on low taxation, full actuarial funding of long-term liabilities and restricting borrowing to economic assets. Essentially, this legislation will ensure that there are no hidden deficits within the accounts of the Queensland Government, and that when the crunch comes and moneys are required to be paid, the money will be there. The financial management principles are put in place to ensure that the return to the Government and, ultimately, to the employees of the Government, is optimised, and a sound financial management profile is presented to members of the financial community throughout the world. The legislation is well drafted, and it ties up many loose ends. I know that the Treasurer is ever vigilant in dealing with those matters, and I commend him for bringing this legislation before the House.

**Mr ROBERTSON** (Sunnybank) (12.17 p.m.): I am pleased to support this Bill. I am also pleased that this Bill has the support of the Opposition. It is probably an understatement to say that interest throughout all sections of the community in superannuation has exploded over the last 10 years. Although I hear much criticism about the significant changes that have occurred in the past and that, no doubt, will continue in the future, people should never lose sight of the principal goal of superannuation, and that is, simply, to provide a secure income in retirement. Coupled with this goal has been the extremely successful campaign by Australia's union movement to guarantee access by all workers to basic guaranteed superannuation entitlements. That, in itself, is an important point because in 10 to 20 years, when the current generation of employees start to reach retirement age, they will leave the work force with a sum of money that is a direct result of the successful campaign by the union movement which commenced in the early 1980s to broaden access to superannuation for all workers. Superannuation will not be just for the managers, or members of the public sector, or industrially strong groups of workers, but for all employees, including part-time and casual workers.

During the time that I have spent in this House listening to debates about superannuation, I have been surprised at the attitude that some Opposition members have towards superannuation, and their interesting interpretations of the history of the

campaign to guarantee minimum superannuation for all workers in Australia. The history of occupational superannuation is relevant to today's Bill, given that the amendments contained in the Bill provide for a top-up provision in the State public sector superannuation schemes to ensure that the employer-provided benefits from those schemes are sufficient in all cases to meet the level of employer support required by the Commonwealth Government Superannuation Guarantee Charge Act. Surely it is time that politics is taken out of the superannuation debate and, surely, it is time for all Australians to adopt a broader view of the challenges that lie ahead for this country—a country with a rapidly ageing population brought about by declining birth rates and increases in average life expectancy of both men and women. The union movement made that observation 10 years ago.

What would be the effect upon retirement incomes for Australia's rapidly ageing population if Governments sat on their hands, did nothing, and said that it was a problem for future generations? The taxation base in this country simply would not generate sufficient funds to continue to provide adequate aged pensions for the ever-increasing number of retirees who, on average, live longer than previous retirees. There could be no more graphic illustration of the challenge that lies ahead for Australia than the ABS statistic which indicates that by the year 2031—less than 40 years away—the ratio of Australians of working age to those who are over the age of 65 will fall from the current ratio of 5 to 1, to 3 to 1. Clearly, an alternative solution had to be found if we, as a nation, were to look after that section of the population who contributed so much during their working lives and who were approaching retirement age.

I ask honourable members to consider for a moment the situation that existed in Australia only eight years ago in regard to access to employer-funded superannuation in the work force. In 1985, an ABS report titled *Employment Benefits—Australia* showed that only 39.5 per cent of employees received superannuation cover as a condition of employment. Of that percentage, proportionately, more than twice as many public sector workers received superannuation cover as a condition of employment than did private sector workers; three times as many administrative, executive and managerial employees were provided with superannuation cover than were sales workers, service, sport and recreation employees, farmers, fishermen and timberworkers; and, importantly, twice as many males were provided with superannuation cover than females. Higher-paid workers received superannuation as a condition of employment much more frequently than did lower-paid workers. Superannuation was also geared to those people who worked full time, and employees who had intermittent working patterns were often excluded.

The success of the union movement's claim for a 3 per cent award-based superannuation contribution in the mid to late 1980s and changes in associated regulatory and taxation arrangements altered superannuation in Australia dramatically. Those changes in superannuation coverage have reduced significantly the extent to which the previous inequities existed. For example, between 1985 and 1991, the proportion of members of the Australian work force who received superannuation coverage as a condition of employment increased from 39.5 per cent to 72.2 per cent. The number of female workers covered by superannuation increased from 24 per cent to 71.8 per cent, and the coverage of part-time workers increased from 20.3 per cent to 49.1 per cent. It should be remembered that the 3 per cent figure was not an amount simply pulled out of the air by the ACTU. It was an amount determined on the basis of improvements in productivity in the national work force, and was a moderate outcome in terms of the prevailing economic conditions at that time. However, as is often the case, employer compliance with the minimum standards was low. The Federal Department of Industrial Relations estimated that by 1991, only 58 per cent of employers were meeting their superannuation award obligations, and that 25 per cent of employees were not receiving award superannuation entitlements, mainly in non-unionised workplaces.

Partly as a result of the problems arising from non-compliance with award provisions, and partly as a result of the Federal Government's commitment to ensure appropriate retirement incomes for the nation's work force—which my friend the member

for Bundaberg spoke about earlier—the Superannuation Guarantee Legislation Bill was introduced into Federal Parliament in April 1992. That legislation solved a number of important issues pertaining to superannuation. Firstly, the superannuation guarantee legislation has set a minimum percentage amount above the original 3 per cent which is both affordable and necessary to provide for secure retirement incomes. Secondly, it has extended the distribution of superannuation across the work force, and reduced inequities such as those that existed between males and females. Thirdly, it ensured that those employees who were not covered by awards were guaranteed minimum superannuation entitlements. This legislation has in part been responsible for the introduction into this Chamber of the current superannuation legislation.

Whilst the provisions contained in this Bill are generally procedural in nature, they do address a number of inequities in the State Service Superannuation Scheme and the Police Superannuation Scheme, and they ensure compliance with the superannuation guarantee levy. By highlighting these inequities, the introduction of this Bill allows this Chamber to consider the broader issues pertaining to Queensland public sector superannuation schemes and, in particular, defined benefit schemes. Whilst access to employer-funded superannuation in the State public sector has traditionally been high, it has been only in the past few years that the benefits and entitlements under these schemes for the average public servant could be considered to be reasonable. In fact, in a number of notable cases such as the Police Superannuation Scheme and the scheme with which I am most familiar, that is, the Queensland Fire Service Superannuation Scheme, the returns on the comparatively high levels of employee contributions were abysmal—not to mention the appallingly low levels of vesting for employees who retired or resigned from the service with less than 20 years' service.

In the latter years of the National Party Government, and certainly since the election of the Labor Government in 1989, significant improvements, particularly in the Fire Service Superannuation Scheme, have been achieved. These improvements are commendable, but they were certainly long overdue. I believe that there is still important work to be done in a number of areas pertaining to superannuation for emergency service workers, and that attention must always be given to recognising the type of work performed by police, firefighters, ambulance officers and so on. I am confident that when attention is turned to the future directions of superannuation for emergency service workers in this State, the specific nature of their work will be taken into consideration.

I want to conclude my contribution to the debate on this Bill by speaking about defined benefit superannuation schemes and misrepresentations made to public sector workers by what I hope is a minority of private superannuation consultants about the benefits available to them under these schemes. During my time as secretary of the United Firefighters Union, members of my union who were participants in the Queensland Fire Service superannuation plan would often contact my office and raise concerns about the level of benefits payable under that scheme. Over many years, private superannuation brokers have been walking into fire stations trying to sell a variety of products to firefighters. During their meetings with firefighters, they would inevitably turn their attention to the Fire Service Superannuation Scheme and claim that if the same level of employee contributions were made to private schemes, the benefits would far exceed those expected under this defined benefit scheme. In fact, outrageously high payout figures were often promised by some of those brokers while, at the same time, they would misrepresent the benefits that would accrue to a participant contributing to the existing Fire Service scheme. Time, of course, has proven that those promises of a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow could not be sustained. It is no surprise, therefore, that firefighters believed that their scheme was inferior and would make inquiries as to how they could resign from their own scheme.

What some of those unscrupulous sales people would conveniently and, I believe, deliberately ignore is that defined benefit schemes provide benefits on the basis of multiples of final average salary at the point of retirement, and that wages and salaries will inevitably increase significantly in the years leading up to a firefighter's retirement. I

understand that this continues to be a problem throughout the public sector. So, as I said, I hope that by highlighting in this Chamber the activities of what I hope is a minority of unscrupulous consultants, the insurance and superannuation industry will pay greater attention to training its employees to explain accurately and fairly the nature and benefits of defined benefit schemes. I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill to the House.

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer) (12.29 p.m.), in reply: I thank members for their support for this legislation. I am not surprised that everybody has supported it. It is not easy to criticise the Queensland Government when it comes to its performance in relation to superannuation. I believe that it is fair to say that, when we speak about superannuation, Queensland stands out like a solitary beacon. I noted the comments by the member for Sunnybank, and the need to have national superannuation so that employers and employees contribute to a fund which will provide a decent retirement income for all Australians in their old age. I believe that anybody with any sort of a social conscience would support that objective. The responsibility lies with both employers and employees. I believe that employees should not lose sight of their own responsibilities in that regard; nor, of course, should employers. As the honourable member for Sunnybank said, over the years throughout Australia many employers have not met their obligations in this regard. That means that Governments also have an obligation. It is an obligation which has been accepted by the Federal Labor Government.

State Governments also have a heavy obligation to their own employees. The member for Sunnybank mentioned employees who are in the public ambit but who are not public servants. Let me say in respect of public servants that the defined benefits scheme referred to as Q Super which is in place in Queensland is a comprehensive scheme which provides a decent retirement benefit. In round terms, employees contribute 5 per cent and the employer—that is the Queensland Government—contributes 14 per cent—a total contribution of 19 per cent. That scheme is in place and there is absolutely no intention of not continuing with that scheme. In that regard, it is worth mentioning moves by both the New South Wales Government and the Victorian Government to walk away from their defined benefits schemes. In New South Wales, their intention now, unless it has been revised, is to simply meet their obligations under the Commonwealth superannuation guarantee charge.

**Mr Robertson:** They didn't do their sums properly.

**Mr De LACY:** That is right. They have got into trouble because they have not fully funded their schemes.

**Mrs Sheldon:** This scheme was fully funded when you came to power, wasn't it?

**Mr De LACY:** Indeed it was.

**Mrs Sheldon:** Let's give credit where it is due.

**Mr De LACY:** I am taking credit for it, yes, where it is due.

**Mrs Sheldon:** It is not your credit. It was there when you arrived.

**Mr De LACY:** If the Leader of the Liberal Party would hark back to what I said, she would realise that I was not saying that it was a Labor Government scheme. I said that Queensland stands like a solitary beacon when it comes to superannuation, and that is the case. However, in New South Wales and Victoria, with the advent of Liberal and National Party Governments, they are walking away from their obligations in respect of superannuation and they are going to meet only their obligations under the superannuation guarantee charge. As honourable members would know, that requires a contribution of only 5 per cent at this stage, increasing to 9 per cent over time, which is a far cry from the standards which used to apply in those States, and which still apply and will continue to apply in Queensland.

As to the other schemes—the emergency service schemes—they grew like topsy. The ambulance schemes were originally run by the old boards and they are not fully

satisfactory. In fact, the ambulance scheme is totally unsatisfactory. The Fire Service scheme has improved in recent years, but it is still a long way short of schemes such as Q Super. We should examine more closely schemes such as those. The trustees of those schemes ought to bear in mind that the Queensland Investment Corporation, which has an unparalleled reputation for investing superannuation funds, is always ready, willing and able to take over the investment responsibilities of funds. However, we ought to continue to look at the contributions which are being made by both employees and employers because, as the member for Sunnybank said, this is an area of great social importance and, to a large extent, will determine the kind of future that we will have in Australia. In conclusion, I thank all members for their support for this legislation.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Clauses 1 to 45 and Schedules 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 May (see p. 2594).

**Mrs SHELDON** (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.37 p.m.): We have examined this Bill and have consulted with other State Governments to determine whether the Bill is in any way obstructive in its approach. It deals with technical or procedural matters relating to existing provisions in the financial institutions legislation. We understand that these amendments seek to overcome operational difficulties caused by deficiencies in the original Act.

We recognise that all the clauses in this Bill were approved clause by clause in a faxed link-up between the State Governments. Only those clauses which were agreed to by all the States were included in the Bill. As they are amendments to the Queensland Act, an Act which is the template legislation for all States, and given that all State Governments support the Bill, we in the Opposition will support it.

**Mr DAVIES** (Mundingburra) (12.38 p.m.): I rise to make a few comments in support of this Bill. The financial institutions scheme commenced on 1 July 1992 and provides for the uniform regulation of building societies and credit unions throughout Australia. The scheme is underpinned by the Financial Institutions Agreement which was entered into by each of the States and Territories. This agreement sets out in part how the legislation governing the scheme is to apply. The agreement aims to ensure uniform State-based supervision by adopting the process of template legislation. Under this procedure, the legislation is initially passed through this Parliament—the Queensland Parliament—then it is applied, through an Application of Laws Act, in each of the other jurisdictions. Amending legislation is to be dealt with in the same manner.

In Queensland, this legislation comprises four Acts, and they are: the Australian Financial Institutions Commission Act 1992; the Financial Institutions (Queensland) Act 1992; the Financial Institutions Legislation Amendment Act 1992; and the Queensland Office of Financial Supervision Act 1992. The first one, the Australian Financial Institutions Commission Act 1992, contains the principles on which the scheme is based and establishes the AFIC, the body which will ensure uniform prudential supervision.

The Financial Institutions (Queensland) Act 1992 replaces the Building Societies Act 1985 and the Credit Societies Act 1986. The Financial Institutions Legislation Amendment Act 1992 amends the primary objects requirements of building societies. The Queensland Office of Financial Supervision Act establishes Queensland's State Supervisory Authority for the scheme.

In accordance with the Financial Institutions Agreement, a Ministerial Council for Financial Institutions, or MINFIN, comprises the appropriate Minister in each jurisdiction. It has been established to oversee the operations of the legislation. One function of the council is to consider and vote on all proposed amendments to the financial institutions legislation. Since the introduction of the scheme, a number of suggested amendments to the legislation have been received from the AFIC, several of the State Supervisory Authorities, or SSAs as they are commonly referred to, and the various industry participants. A number of those have been identified by the applicants as urgent and non-contentious. They are dealt with by a short amendment. Another amendment Bill dealing with the balance of the submissions will probably be prepared towards the end of 1993.

The amendments in this Bill are, as the Deputy Coalition Leader said, of a procedural or a housekeeping nature, and they do not affect the fundamental principles of the legislation. The more significant of the proposed amendments are those relating to the payment of administration and supervision levies incurred by credit unions out of interest and other income gained from the investment of money standing to the credit of the Credit Unions Contingency Fund. The advantage to Queensland's credit unions under the proposal will be annual industry savings of approximately $700,000. The proposal to extend the time during which building societies can offer membership to those persons whose loans were approved when they were not members of the societies is another one of the more significant amendments. I am pleased to see that the Opposition is supporting this Bill. I also support it.

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer) (11.41 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their support for this piece of legislation. It is probably worth drawing to the attention of the House the unique nature of this legislation. As members would know, the whole issue of non-bank financial intuitions reform was initiated by the Queensland Government and largely carried by the Queensland Government, and we now have uniform State legislation. What that really means is that there is one piece of legislation. That legislation resides in our Parliament; we are the host jurisdiction, and when we change the legislation, the legislation automatically changes in every jurisdiction throughout Australia by the application of laws provision. So that means we have the responsibility for minding the legislation and amending it at appropriate times.

There will be no discernible action in the other Parliaments of Australia. Their legislation will now change automatically as ours changes. But, of course, before we can bring legislation into this Parliament, we have to have the agreement of all the other States. It can be a very complex and, at times, tedious process; but, nevertheless, it is a ground-breaking process. I am very proud to have been part of that process. As far as I know, it is still the only instance in this Commonwealth in which the States have cooperated to such an extent to introduce this kind of legislation. Again, I thank all honourable members for their support of these amendments.

Motion agreed to.

## Committee

Clauses 1 to 22, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

## Third Reading

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

## BRISBANE CRICKET GROUND BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 May (see p. 2595).

**Mrs SHELDON** (Caloundra—Leader of the Liberal Party) (12.46 p.m.): Today, I rise to speak on a Bill which could best be described as an insidious piece of legislation.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mrs SHELDON:** The drought had to break, did it not? This Bill is designed to take the cricket out of the Gabba. I know that the Minister will claim this is not the case, but upon reading the Bill, there can be no doubt of the Minister 's intention to sully one of the most famous and traditional cricket grounds in the world. He will sully this great ground by throwing the cricket out of the Brisbane Cricket Ground Bill. The contributions of the Queensland Cricket Association and the Queensland Cricketers Club, after many years as active participants in the operation and development of the Gabba ground, have been thrown away by the Treasurer as a result of this Bill. They have been unfairly dismissed—clean bowled by Mr De Lacy and this yorker of a Bill. Actually, this Bill is more akin to an underarm delivery—sneaky, unnecessary, and in the end, regrettable. In fact, the only time the word "cricket" is even mentioned in the Bill is as part of the title or in relation to the trust.

**Mr Bennett:** That's not cricket!

**Mrs SHELDON:** I am sure the honourable member has never played cricket and would not have the remotest idea of what the sport means to most Queenslanders and to most Australians. It is a national sport. Obviously, the Labor Party does not understand that and, hence, does not support the sport at all. What happened to the very reason for the Gabba's construction, which was cricket? What happened to the tradition and the history which has made the Gabba a household word wherever cricket is played—for example, the tradition of the tied test, and stars such as Greg Chappell, Jeff Thompson, Allan Border, and the overseas stars such as Viv Richards, Ian Botham and Graham Hick, and let us not forget the yearly battles for that Holy Grail of Australian cricket, the Sheffield Shield?

**Mr Budd:** We never win it.

**Mrs SHELDON:** We will win it. Unless people such as the honourable member support the sport of cricket in this State, he will be right—we will not win it. I hope all the members of Queensland's Sheffield Shield team realise the lack of support they get from that particular Labor member and the Labor Party in general. The tradition of many great tests and one-day battles, of the hill, and of the members' stand are lost on Mr De Lacy. He does not care about cricket and he does not care about the tradition and the history of the Gabba. He sees the Gabba as yet another cash register for his funds-starved Government. But not only has he treated the Queensland Cricket Association with contempt, he has also given the new winter tenants, the Brisbane Bears, an ungracious slap in the face. Not only are we insulting the fans and people in Queensland who really enjoy cricket, but also we are insulting everyone who follows Australian Rules football.

There is also no mention of Australian Rules in this Bill. This Brisbane Cricket Ground Bill is not about sport; it is about money, money and more money which Mr De Lacy wants. It is a sneaky little piece of legislation because it seeks to remove any influence on the operation of the Gabba from the very people who use it. That is right, Madam Deputy Speaker—this Bill is solely and entirely designed to throw the Brisbane Cricket Association off the board of trustees and to make sure that the Bears do not have a representative. In fact, this Bill specifically excludes representatives from the QCA, the Cricketers Club or the Bears from being on the board. Put simply, the very people who use the Gabba will not have any influence on the board of trustees. In fact,

the very people who bring in the money for the trust through the crowds that turn up to watch the games will have no say in the management of the Brisbane Cricket Ground. Mr De Lacy will go down in history as the man who took the cricket out of the Gabba. He is throwing it out—sixty years of tradition—and now the cricketers will not even have a say in how the Gabba is run. This is the sort of sneaky, underhand way in which this Government operates.

I have no doubt that former Brisbane Lord Mayor and Gabba greenkeeper, Clem Jones, will be less than impressed with what his party colleagues in this Parliament are doing. In fact, Clem Jones and Sir Gordon Chalk would have every reason to be furious over this Government's grab for power over the Gabba ground. Those two men loved the Gabba and worked long and hard to ensure that it remained one of the world's great cricket grounds. I understand that the name on the Sir Gordon Chalk stand—a very important memorial to a great man—has been covered over without any consultation with the Queensland Cricket Association. I ask the Treasurer whether he intends to replace the name of the Sir Gordon Chalk stand. It is very important that an answer be given by the Treasurer on this matter. I hope he addresses that matter in his reply. He had no right—nor did any member of the trust—to take the name of Sir Gordon Chalk from that stand. This just shows that members of the Labor Party have absolutely no concept of the role of tradition at all.

Now, because of the Brisbane Bears, the Gabba will also be known Australiawide as a place for football sides from the south and the west to fear. Unfortunately, in common with the cricketers, the Bears will have to bow and scrape to Mr De Lacy and his mates if they want any say in how their ground is run. The Bears, who have shown that the Gabba is a great football ground and one which has helped inspire them to a winning start this season—for which they should be congratulated—will be left in the cold by this Government. The Bears have tens of thousands of supporters and hundreds of club members but will not have a voice in how their ground is run. And what about the Queensland Cricket Association and the Queensland Cricketers Club? The QCA has more than 150 000 members across the State and 3 000 ground members. The QCC has about 5 000 members as well. Every one of those members has been sold out by this State Government. None of those people will have a voice on how the home of cricket in this State is run. This is an extraordinary push by the State Government to deny any rights to cricketers and their supporters and to Australian Rules footballers and their supporters. The question that will just not go away is: why would the Treasurer exclude the tenants from the Gabba board of trustees? Why exclude the two tenants who use the grounds and bring in the crowds? Why exclude the very people who make the money for the trust?

It is an interesting and important question, one which I am sure the Minister will not answer correctly and one which I have no doubt that cricket and Aussie Rules administrators are asking themselves because they definitely will not get any reasonable answer from Mr De Lacy. I think that I know the answer to the question of why. I think that I know the answer because what is happening with the Brisbane Cricket Ground Bill is happening throughout this Government's legislation. Effectively, the Bill will create a board of trustees for the Brisbane Cricket Ground, who will be appointed—surprise, surprise—by the Government through Executive Council. Who will the Government appoint? As the Treasurer has not specified that he will appoint any representatives from the major tenants—those who know a little bit about cricket and Aussie Rules football—

**Mr De Lacy:** Do you support the new chairman?

**Mrs SHELDON:**—but will be appointing people from the wider community, it is a fact that this leaves the way open for him to appoint as some members of the Brisbane Cricket Ground board of trustees his union cronies and Labor mates. Honourable members should wait and see. The action will unfold. The Government cannot help itself. It happens with every board that it touches. The Government will do that because it has done it before. It has consistently stacked any board that it controls with some of

its union bosses and card-carrying members of the ALP, regardless of whether they know anything about running something such as the Gabba. Jobs for the boys—no doubt there will not be any jobs for the girls. Equal opportunity does not go that far, does it? The Government has done it with statutory bodies. It did it with the dairy board last night and it will keep doing it. The Government will certainly do it with its new corporations. It will do it because it has to keep its union paymaster mates happy and secure and with steady income from trustee and directors' fees.

Earlier, the Treasurer asked me about the chairman of the board. As I understand it, the Treasurer may appoint Mr Don Nissen, and I would fully support that. He is a man of outstanding ability and high standing in the community. The Treasurer will note that I said "only some members". The Government does it because it means that the responsible Ministers—or should I say irresponsible Ministers—can then control the boards and basically get what they want, and we all know what the Treasurer wants. He wants as much money as he can get. In the case of the Brisbane Cricket Ground, the Government, through its board, will bleed every dollar that it can out of the cricketers and footballers. Financial efficiency is a laudable aim, one that we on this side of the House support and encourage. Unfortunately, this Government will bleed the money out of the Gabba and throw it into consolidated revenue to be spent on pet projects.

The Government will not spend the money on making the Gabba an even better venue, and the new Brisbane Cricket Ground board of trustees will not necessarily have the best interests of cricket and Australian Rules on its mind when it makes decisions. It may well have the best interests of Mr De Lacy and his greedy Government at heart, because the Minister has the ability to pull the strings. It is not those trustees who will have to pay off the debt incurred by the redevelopment of the Gabba; it is the tenants—the QCA, the QCC and the Bears—the very groups that will not have representatives on the board if this Bill becomes law. By looking at the past performances of the Government, we know that that is exactly what the Treasurer will do. He will use the board to raise the rents and squeeze every last dollar out of the cricketers and the footballers.

**Mr Fenlon** interjected.

**Mrs SHELDON:** In particular, that will raise the cost of going to watch the cricket and the football. Obviously, the Labor member opposite does not care how much the average, ordinary Queensland family will have to fork out to pay to watch the cricket. All that the Labor members are for is not looking after the average Queenslanders but sucking as much money out of their pockets as they can. The honourable member is a class act who supports that action. Once again, as we will see over the next couple of years when Labor's botched corporatisation starts rolling, instead of making something more efficient, the Government just uses it as a milking cow for funds. The people who will pay will be the Queensland sports lovers, who will be forced to pay more at the Gabba gate because of the Treasurer's cash grab. The Queensland Cricket Association, the Cricketers Club and the Brisbane Bears will miss out again.

When reading the Bill, I noticed a word which comes up in almost every one of this Government's Bills but which, unfortunately, has no real meaning. That word is "consultation". Certainly, we will be told by the Treasurer that much consultation took place but, in reality, how much notice did he take of any of the consultation that took place? He had his own agenda and he followed it to the letter. Yet again, we see lip-service. There is much community consultation, but the Government does not go as far as putting some of the recommendations of that community consultation into practice. As the member for Southport said during the debate on the Dairy Industry Bill yesterday, the Government believes in consultation at the barrel of a gun. Consultation with the Government is a bit like walking the plank with the Spanish Inquisition. If people do not answer the question the right way, they take a jump or end up with a noose around their neck. As I said, the fact is that the Government just pays lip-service to consultation.

**Mr Davies:** Watch out; you are almost out of time.

**Mrs SHELDON:** The honourable member should hang in there. I am sure that I can go for a little while longer. Under the Bill, historical ties with the ground can be severed. Nothing in the Bill gives the Queensland Cricket Association any security of tenure as a tenant of the Brisbane Cricket Ground. I am quite surprised at that. I would have thought that it was something that the Treasurer should have looked after.

**Mr De Lacy:** It is something we will look after.

**Mrs SHELDON:** The Treasurer has not specified it. Why not put it in the Bill? If the Treasurer were genuine, sincere and up front, he would list those things; he would not leave them to chance. The Queensland Cricket Association thought always that, as the trust was set up, it would have the right of tenure. On that basis, it never asked for a lease. It has no lease; it has no heads of agreement, and now it is at the mercy of whoever is on that trust to let it stay there.

**Mr De Lacy:** The Goss Government is fixing things up again.

**Mrs SHELDON:** If one is to put all one's trust and hope in the future on the Goss Government, God help us. There is nothing in the Bill, as there was before, that gave the QCA some concept of security of tenure at the Gabba in perpetuity. I know that, as short a time ago as 18 months or two years, the QCA asked of the trust whether there was any need for it to have a lease and it was told that there was not. The QCA has acted in good faith, but I cannot say that the Treasurer has.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

**Mrs SHELDON:** The Treasurer should watch out, or his very close Labor friend down at City Hall, Lord Mayor Jim Soorley, might attempt to do with the QCA what he did with the Broncos and entice them to move to QEII. Certainly, the Minister opposite has given the QCA no reason to feel secure in its traditional home at the Gabba. The very foundation of my concerns with this Bill is the Government's non-inclusion of the major tenants of the Gabba on the board. The Brisbane Cricket Ground Act, which this Act will replace, in section 5, under "Appointment of trustees", stated clearly—

"(1) Of the eight trustees—

(a) three shall be representatives of the Government of the State;

(b) one shall be a representative of the State Government Insurance Office (Queensland);

(c) two shall be persons who are associated with the activities of The Queensland Cricket Association;

(d) one shall be a person who is associated with the activities of the Queensland Cricketers' Club;

(e) one shall be a person who is associated with the activities of the Gabba Greyhound Racing Club."

Now, I know that Suncorp and the Gabba Greyhound Racing Club no longer need representatives on the trust, but there is absolutely no reason why the Bears, the Cricket Association and the Cricketers Club cannot have representatives on the trust. In the Committee stage, I will move an amendment to this Bill which will give the tenants of the Gabba a say in the running of their ground. The amendment I will move will give the QCA, the QCC and the Brisbane Bears a voice on the operation of the Gabba. It will give each organisation one member on the Minister's five-to-seven member board. The amendment also suggests that the Government hold two of the positions on the trust. Now, if the members opposite were decent, thinking individuals, they would support this amendment.

**Mr Beattie:** We are.

**Mrs SHELDON:** If they are, they can prove it by supporting my amendment. If the Treasurer had the true interests of presenting world-class sporting fixtures at the Gabba instead of sucking it dry of all the money he can, he also would support this amendment. The Government's support of my amendment would mean that this Bill could be

supported by the Opposition. The amendment would mean that the major tenants of the Brisbane Cricket Ground could plan for the future with the knowledge that they would have a say in the future. So I will ask the Treasurer if he will support the amendment. Mr Treasurer, will you support my amendment?

**Mr De Lacy:** There's not a snowflake's chance in hell.

**Mrs SHELDON:** Well, to quote the Treasurer, seeing there is not a snowflake's chance in hell, the Opposition unfortunately has no choice other than to oppose the Bill.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK** (Albert) (2.33 p.m.): That speech was like the Treasurer standing up and facing a maiden over: he could not lay his bat on anything and it was so wide that it sprayed out all over the place. He had no worries about being delivered a bouncer. I would like to speak to this Bill as it concerns the Gold Coast. The Brisbane Bears used to have their headquarters down at Carrara. This Government is committed to a $49m redevelopment of the Gabba, and with that redevelopment the Brisbane Bears will move from Carrara to Brisbane. There were some concerns down on the coast about the Bears moving. I know that two constituents of mine were quite upset about the Bears going to Brisbane. They were founding members of the Brisbane Bears and, rain, hail or shine, they used to go to Carrara and come home with their tails between their legs because the Bears always lost down there. They have come to terms with the Bears moving to Brisbane. They have bought season tickets and they have three seats in the Clem Jones Stand. They are quite happy to travel from the coast all the time. However, I hope that the Bears do not keep winning because they will keep buying tickets and keep going to games. With that, I wish the Bears well. I wish them good fortunes at the Gabba. I hope they stay there for a long time.

With the redevelopment of the Gabba, the greyhound races have been moved to Albion Park, and they are starting to pull the crowds out there. I am glad that the greyhound races have been moved to Albion Park because it is a purpose-built facility for racing. The speech made by the member for Landsborough was a bit negative. With sport in Queensland, we have to look to the future. I know that one day Queensland will win the Sheffield Shield.

**Mr FitzGerald:** At the Gabba or the ANZ Stadium?

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** No, it will be at the Gabba. One day Queensland will win the Sheffield Shield. Cricket is going well in Queensland. There are bright young stars such as Hayden coming up in the world. He is doing very well for the Queensland team. Cricket in this State should realise that it has to foster young players and build them up instead of importing players, as has happened over the last 20 years, such as Allan Border, Greg Chappell, Viv Richards and, the latest one, Graeme Hick. Queensland needs to foster young players in cricket. If it does that, it will win the shield. Until that happens, I do not think Queensland will ever win the shield. However, we cockroaches from the south are not too unhappy about Queensland not winning the shield.

**Mr Springborg:** Well go home, then!

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** I will take that interjection. If we all returned down south, there would be no-one left in Queensland. If one looks at the mass migration from the south——

**Mr FitzGerald:** The average intelligence would improve in both places.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** We will take our dogs home with us and the intelligence will go down. Cricket in this State is going well. Getting off the Bill—I wish Queensland well in the Sheffield Shield. It will do cricket the world of good for someone else to win it. I know that one day Queensland will win it; there is no doubt about that. However, as I said, young sportsmen need to be fostered and they need to attend the Institute of Sport. If that occurs, Queensland will win the shield.

**Mr Robertson:** They need to make more runs, too.

**Mr SZCZERBANIK:** Yes, they need to make more runs, and they need to get rid of some of those funny decisions that they make. In the match against South Australia,

Queensland should have sent South Australia back in to bat in its second innings when it bowled them out the first time and South Australia had not reached the follow-on target. That is one of the bad decisions that Queensland has made in the past, but it will win the shield. I wish the Bears well. I know that the team will have a long and successful career at the Gabba. I am sure that they will win many more games. I attended the first game played at the Gabba, which was against Melbourne. It was a great atmosphere. The game was attended by 14 000 people. The crowd was right behind the Bears, and the team won by two points. I support the Bears and this legislation.

**Mr STONEMAN** (Burdekin) (2.38 p.m.): I want to raise some points that I believe are valid, some of which have been touched upon by the member for Caloundra. This legislation is quite flawed. The Government could have done sport—and particularly cricket—a service by substantially leaving in place the former structure of the trust.

Recently, I attended the Queensland Cricketers Club sponsors' dinner. On that evening, the Treasurer delivered a speech. He could not have detected a warm glow of support for that speech. It went down like the proverbial lead balloon. Afterwards, people spontaneously expressed concern about its content. I have had a long association with the Queensland Cricketers Club and Queensland cricket generally. In common with the previous speaker, I come originally from New South Wales. However, unlike him, I am devastated when Queensland is beaten in any sporting event. I have grown to have an intense dislike for the cockroaches. For 29 years, I have been a member of the Queensland Cricketers Club. I think that I can speak with a fair degree of authority in respect of the activities and aspirations of that club. The club was formed in 1959. It has in excess of 5 500 members.

I do not know whether the Treasurer is aware of this, but the Queensland Cricketers Club is the only licensed cricket club operating on a cricket ground in the world. That is a unique feature of the Queensland Cricketers Club, not only in this country but also on a world scale. Visitors from other countries are delighted and amazed with the facility. A number of years ago, a fellow who is familiar to sporting readers around the world, Henry Blofeld, stated at a function at which only a few people were present that it was a facility of which the world cricket scene could be proud. In his view, it was an incredible facility. I support that view.

The Gabba has special attributes which have made it near and dear to sportsmen, particularly to cricketers, from around the world. As the member for Caloundra said, reference to cricket and to the Queensland Cricketers Club is totally removed from this Bill. That should be of concern to everyone. It is reasonable that the structure of the trust be amended. As previous speakers have noted, the greyhounds have moved to Albion Park and it is reasonable that representatives of that industry play no further role in the Brisbane Cricket Ground Trust. The Brisbane Cricket Ground stands for cricket—its continued existence, its betterment and its traditions. For a Bill to be brought before this House titled the "Brisbane Cricket Ground Bill" which does not acknowledge the continued existence of cricket, its betterment or its traditions is an appalling injustice. I believe that it is a slap in the face for cricketers who are associated intimately with that ground and also for cricket in this State.

I acknowledge that the establishment of a major winter tenant is vital. I commend those who negotiated the contractual arrangements which brought the Brisbane Bears to that ground. The presence of the Bears will ensure that the ground is used more regularly and will therefore secure its tenure. However, many problems are associated with the presence of the Brisbane Bears, and I will touch upon them later. I have here a joint statement by the Treasurer and the Minister for Sport, Mr Gibbs. It is dated 14 December. A study of that document gives rise to many concerns.

This legislation does not require that the ground have cricket as a dedicated sport. A requirement no longer exists that cricket be the focus of sporting activity at the Brisbane Cricket Ground. In fact, a careful reading of the Bill reveals that there is no requirement that cricket be played at all. I acknowledge the comments by the previous

speaker, who said that cricket will be there for a long time. However, the new trust does not have to maintain cricket as an entity. This is now regarded as a "sporting ground". The former trust allowed other sports to be played at the ground, and that was appropriate. We must utilise facilities such as the Gabba as much as possible. However, its prime focus has always been, and always should be, cricket and any other usage should be slotted in around cricket.

The member for Caloundra mentioned Clem Jones, who is one of the great supporters of cricket in this State and in this nation. I, too, wonder how he must feel about this matter. I know that, at present, Clem Jones is on his way to Geneva, but I feel sure that he would not be happy about this. He is a former Labor Mayor of this city. He was incredibly dedicated to cricket in this State, particularly the cricket played at the Brisbane Cricket Ground.

In fact, the Bill makes only fleeting reference to sport. It refers to returns and the need to show profits, which I will refer to during the Committee stage. The tenants are the paramount focus, but they are not specified in the Bill, hence the Opposition's concern as expressed by the foreshadowed amendment. The paramount focus of the Government is the financial return and the need to conduct a profitable operation. I do not say that the desire to achieve a profit is anything other than highly commendable, but it must be remembered that the Brisbane Cricket Ground is the focus of cricket in this State. It is an icon in the cricket world and regarded as one of the great cricket grounds of the world. Every time an international match is played at the ground, someone says that the Brisbane Cricket Ground is one of the great cricket grounds of the world. Cricketers love to play on it. The Opposition believes that this Bill should be titled "Brisbane Sportsground Bill", not "Brisbane Cricket Ground Bill". The fact of the matter is that the Brisbane Cricket Ground will be the only major cricket ground in this country where cricket is not the dominant sport. As I said, the Gabba is an icon of the cricketing world.

**Mr Beattie:** Are you opposing Aussie Rules there, are you?

**Mr STONEMAN:** In Sydney, Australian Rules is played at the Sydney Cricket Ground. I make it very clear that I agree totally that the Brisbane Bears should play at the Brisbane Cricket Ground. Although Australian Rules is played at the Sydney Cricket Ground, it does not share its training operations with cricket. I will refer to that later. The same situation exists with the Melbourne Cricket Ground, which is world famous for its Australian Rules games, but cricket is the dominant sport——

**Mr Beattie:** When was the last time you were in Melbourne?

**Mr STONEMAN:** In the context of the ownership and the operation of the Melbourne Cricket Ground. The South Australian Cricket Ground is owned by the cricket association in that State, and it is dedicated solely to that game, as is the case with the WACA. I am not too sure about the situation that exists in Tasmania. However, let me say that the Gabba should be considered in the context of what occurs with the other major cricket grounds in other States. Recently, when I attended the Queensland Cricketers Club for a sponsor's dinner, I thought that the ground looked beautiful, now that it has been expanded. However, it should be remembered that cricket did not need to have the ground expanded. Rather, it occurred to facilitate the playing of Australian Rules on the ground. I do not disagree with expanding the ground, but I make the point that it did not improve the standard of cricket.

I wish to refer to the joint statement made by the Treasurer and the Minister for Sport, Mr Gibbs. I am concerned because, according to the map that is on the back of this statement, the wicket block area is also the football centre bounce area. The Brisbane Bears will probably play only 11 matches a year on the ground. However, training will also take place on the ground. The Queensland Cricket Association, or whoever negotiates the processes of operation of cricket, has to blend the football training that will take place all over the ground, regardless of the weather, with cricket. However, the football training is concentrated in that wicket area. I am concerned about that. Honourable members cannot say that everything that has happened because of the

Brisbane Bears is good. Although it is vital that the Brisbane Cricket Ground have a major winter tenant—and it seems to me that the major winter tenant is, quite correctly, the Brisbane Bears—because the game of cricket is not the dominant game played on the ground, the damage that could occur during football training in any sort of weather, particularly in that centre bounce area, will have to be addressed. I say to the Treasurer that they are the sorts of day-to-day matters that are of major relevance, but they will not be addressed by a trust that is not required to have anything connected with the sport that should dominate. I make no bones about it whatsoever—the Brisbane Cricket Ground is a cricket ground, cricket should be the dominant sport, and it should be incorporated within the structure of the Bill.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I should be wearing my badge that recognises my 25 years' continuous membership of the Queensland Cricketers Club. Whenever I think it appropriate, I wear it with pride. I am proud of the fact that I have clicked up almost 30 years as a member of that club. The club started in 1959, and it now has five and a half thousand members. It is a substantial part of cricket and Brisbane's sporting society. Originally, it was part of the Queensland Cricket Association. It has assets worth between $3m and $4m tied up in the building and so on. However, this Bill does not acknowledge the club's presence. I am not too sure whether it acknowledges the assets of the club. Government members must remember that security of tenure is the all-important component of the operation of a club such as the Queensland Cricketers Club, yet that is not contained in the legislation.

I will refer again to this joint statement by the Treasurer and the Minister for Sport, and I ask: when Stage 3, which is set down to cost $27.4m, is completed, where does the club go? What assurance does the club have that space is allocated for it within the structure of Stage 3? What assurance does the club have that it will not be swamped by the Brisbane Bears club? I am not too sure where that club is going to operate. Are those clubs going to be forced into a marriage, or does the Queensland Cricketers Club maintain its appropriate place, which makes it unique in the world? I presume that this matter is part of a master plan, but I do not see in those plans, about which the Minister has talked, a process whereby that club is assured of continuity.

Again referring to that press release—I note with interest the gold pass proposal. I understand that that gold pass would be part of the facility, so that members would buy their gold pass, and that would give them the right to view various events. But what happens when one-day cricket matches are played? Does the cricket board receive a cut of that money? Does the Queensland Cricket Association get a cut of the money? Or once people have bought their gold passes, can they enter and leave the ground at will forever? These are the sorts of things that members should be concerned about, and which worry me as a member. That press release states—

> "State Cabinet today approved a $44 million redevelopment of the Gabba—including an expected $11.5 million contribution from the Fund. The remainder of the cost will be met by the Gabba Trust ($12.9 million), Club ($5.5 million) . . . "

The club is mentioned in the press release, but it is not mentioned in one single line within this legislation. It does not even score a representative on the board so that it can put its hand up. If, by a fluke, a member of the board happens to be a member of the club, that is a different matter. But the fact is that, as a matter of right, the club should have a member on that board. It has been given a bill for $5.5m. As a member of that club, I am concerned that the club has been given that bill, but has no security.

**Mr FitzGerald:** Do you have a personal interest in this matter?

**Mr STONEMAN:** I have already acknowledged that. I also have an emotional and philosophical interest in this, too. I make no bones about that, having been associated for many years with numerous people there, and particularly the club.

A number of vital concerns are wrapped up with this legislation. What do the tenants really get out of this? Are they assured that there will be a continuation of the

process whereby they supply food and things like that? Or can the trust bring in its own people? Can it tender out as a part of the process, particularly into the gold pass area or the other stands? Under this Bill, what is to stop the trust swamping the existing facilities and structures and saying, "We will do our own thing, because we can do a better job"? Although I am sure that the people on that board will have an interest in the ground, they do not necessarily have to maintain that interest. They have been taken out of the legislation, and they should be put back into it. The Brisbane Cricket Ground Bill should be directed towards cricket, which is the priority of that ground.

Time expired.

**Mr BEANLAND** (Indooroopilly) (2.58 p.m.): I rise to speak in the debate on this piece of legislation because of some of my concerns about it. At first blush, the legislation sounds very reasonable—that is, until one considers the previous legislation and thinks about this matter. In his second-reading speech, the Treasurer said—

> "With the redevelopment of the ground, a more commercial approach to its operation is essential to ensure the success of the sports played at the ground, to improve viability and consequently to service debt required to part fund the redevelopment of the ground. This can be best achieved by the appointment of trustees who have strong commercial managerial experience, knowledge of public facilities management and a strong interest in sport."

I believe that some very important aspects of that are the crux of this legislation. In common with previous speakers in this debate, I am very concerned about this. In fact, I had noted that the Treasurer has deleted the current arrangements, namely—

> ". . . two shall be persons who are associated with the activities of The Queensland Cricket Association."

He has also deleted the provision that—

> ". . . one shall be a person who is associated with the activities of the Queensland Cricketers' Club."

The other deletion relates to the Gabba Greyhound Racing Club, which is no longer a tenant. However, one would have expected this legislation to contain some reference to the Brisbane Bears.

I notice that the Brisbane Bears have not been mentioned in the legislation. It must be remembered that the Brisbane Cricket Ground has three major tenants. The development that is taking place is long overdue—and a great deal more development will be needed. The problem is that cricket is not a great revenue earner. For a long time, the ground has needed a winter tenant. I support the move by the Brisbane Bears to the Brisbane Cricket Ground. I believe that, rather than going to the Gold Coast, they should have been located in Brisbane in the first place. Had that occurred initially, the game of Australian Rules would have been far more successful in Brisbane and attendances would have been larger. I realise that the Brisbane Bears will generate revenue, but I point out that the redevelopment program is estimated to cost $49m. How will that amount be paid off? What percentage will the tenants have to subscribe? I accept that, in this day and age, we must have good sporting facilities. That is why some sporting facilities in this city are far more successful than others—they are much better. I am sure that is why QEII is proving so successful for the Broncos—its facilities are much better than those at Lang Park. The Brisbane Cricket Ground has three major tenants involved and a huge redevelopment bill, but we do not know how it will be paid. In common with previous speakers, I am concerned that, when the $49m redevelopment of the Brisbane Cricket Ground is completed, the rent required from the Brisbane Bears, the Queensland Cricket Association and the Queensland Cricketers Club will skyrocket. I would like an indication from the Treasurer as to how the rents will be set.

I am concerned that the rent charged to the Queensland Cricket Association will be so high that it will force cricket out of the Brisbane Cricket Ground. I understand that, at present, the Queensland Cricket Association pays an amount of between

$100,000 and $200,000—an approximate amount of $150,000. In his reply, the Treasurer can correct me on the figures. I am not sure of the amount of rent that the Queensland Cricketers Club pays. Even if we were to include a figure of rent paid by the Brisbane Bears and it added up to $1m, it would be a long way short of paying the interest bill on $49m. Those sporting organisations do not generate the huge amounts of cash that could meet that interest bill.

I would like the Treasurer to inform us of the basis on which he will require the tenants to subscribe and what the percentage of the overall debt will be. Will it be worked out on the capacity to pay? Will he stipulate a return so that those bodies will have to find additional money? Will the trust begin operations that might compete against the Queensland Cricketers Club? The trust might end up running another catering operation on the ground, if that can be achieved. After all, the trust is all powerful. I understand that agreement has been reached with the Brisbane Bears, but I have not heard in the media whether agreement has been reached with the Queensland Cricket Association or the Queensland Cricketers Club. That is the whole crux of the legislation and the debate that has gone on about this redevelopment.

In common with previous speakers, I am also concerned that the legislation contains no reference to cricket. Although it is called the Brisbane Cricket Ground Bill, there is no indication that the ground is held in trust for the Queensland Cricket Association. There is no indication in the legislation—far from it; the reverse is the case—that the ground will be held in trust for the cricketers. There is no assurance of long-term viability—that the rent will not be suddenly increased so that they have to move out.

**Mr De Lacy:** Why would we do that?

**Mr BEANLAND:** It is a very simple exercise. I am glad the Treasurer raised the point. Because the Queensland Cricket Association does not earn large amounts of revenue, the trust or the Government could look for another tenant during summer. The Treasurer might say that that is farcical, but it could occur as a result of this legislation. I accept that a percentage of the development costs will have to be recouped from the tenants, but nothing has been spelt out. That is where the problem arises. The matter needs to be clarified. I ask the Treasurer to answer those questions very specifically. It is fine to say, "Everything will be okay. They are assured of a long-term tenancy." I have seen it happen time and time again where people have come along with good intentions but, because they have had to meet certain commercial responsibilities, the charges have increased. That occurs in every level of government throughout the country. I understand that on the last occasion the Treasurer visited the cricket ground to attend a function, he certainly did not endear himself to the people there. The honourable member for Burdekin would agree with me.

**Mr Stoneman:** You can say that again.

**Mr BEANLAND**: I have heard on the grapevine that there is some concern about his——

**Mr Stoneman:** It was across political lines.

**Mr BEANLAND:** I know some very good Labor stalwarts out there who are very keen cricketers; they love their cricket, and I know that they are just as concerned as I am about this matter. We want to hear, in dollar terms, exactly how all of this will come together. I am interested to glean why there cannot be references—there is in the current legislation—to the current tenants. We are looking at them as long-term tenants; the Treasurer has indicated that. I ask why they cannot be given a position on the board or the trust, as they currently are. It is an important issue, and the Deputy Leader of the Coalition has already indicated that she will move an amendment to that effect. There has been no indication that the Treasurer will appoint people who will be representatives of those organisations—or those current tenants—to the board. We can easily find people who have an interest in sports—sport interests a wide cross-section of the community— who are commercially oriented and who, at the end of the day, as a result

of pressure from Government, are pressed into meeting their financial commitments and have to put aside their commitment to sport.

That covers the major points that I wanted to make. I look forward to the third stage. As yet, we have not seen the plans for the third stage. The program for the third stage to be developed is currently being prepared. We look forward to seeing that when it is developed. I am sure that the cricketers, the Bears and the people of Brisbane are very excited about the redevelopment that is occurring, but we want to make sure that it is also in the interest of the tenants who currently utilise that facility.

**Hon. K. E. De LACY** (Cairns—Treasurer) (3.10 p.m.), in reply: I must say that the comments made by members of the Opposition are probably on a par with the kind of comments that we have come to expect from the Opposition—totally negative and small-minded, and a little bit of two bob each way. Mr Beanland concluded his speech by saying, "I know everybody wants the redevelopment, and we want the Bears there, but . . . " Mr Beanland got closest to the issue because he did recognise that there has to be some "commerciality" in a redevelopment. Members opposite cannot live in the kind of fairyland that Mr Stoneman lives in when he talks about how great the game of cricket is but does not recognise the fact that the Gabba was a run-down facility. The Gabba was fast developing into a venue of national disgrace—a disgrace to this State and a second-rate facility. That is something that the Goss Government will not tolerate. Maybe the National Party could have tolerated that forever, but the Goss Government will not tolerate it. The Gabba trust——

**Mr Stoneman:** You're going to do to cricket what Mr Casey is doing to DPI.

**Mr De LACY:** What a great interjection! I should ask for applause from the multitudes. The standard of the honourable member's contribution today was the same as the standard of his interjections—absolutely negative and unconstructive. For a person who espouses an interest in cricket and some sort of sentimental attachment to cricket, one would have thought that the member for Burdekin could have been a lot more constructive than he was. The kind of contribution that the honourable member made, frankly, is not worth responding to. However, Mr Beanland did ask some important questions and he did raise some important issues.

I turn now to the contribution by Mrs Sheldon. She started off with a few quotes from cricket, talking about yorkers and bouncers, but really everything was just no balls and wides—she never got close to the point. She made some extraordinary interpretations of this piece of legislation, as did Mr Stoneman. The conclusion that one would draw from listening to both of those speakers would be that the object of this legislation and the objective of this Government is to kick cricket out of the Gabba. Why would we want to get rid of cricket from the Gabba? Her other incredible statement was that we are bleeding money out of the grounds. When I spoke to my Treasury officers, they were delighted about that because they had been under the impression that it would cost the Government between $15m and $20m. Now, all of a sudden, we have turned it on its head, and we are going to use it as a milking cow! I suppose that this is another cash grab. I will mention the financing issue again in a minute.

It is true that the QCA does not have security of tenure. That is the position that we inherited. They do not have security of tenure; they do not have a lease agreement. They said that they did not think they would need it, and the Opposition is blaming me for it. I can give the assurance that very soon they will have security of tenure. A lease will be signed between the Gabba and the QCA. We will put everything onto a proper basis—the kind of proper basis on which it has never been.

I turn now to the issue of renovations. Mrs Sheldon asked why Gordon Chalk's name has been painted off the Gordon Chalk Pavilion. To be frank, I do not know; but I know that they are in the middle of upgrading works. The other day, I asked somebody why the name had been painted off. I said, "If this name is off for long, somebody will blame me for it." However, the person I asked could not give me an answer. I can give the assurance that there are no ulterior motives or conspiracies. It is not going to be the Keith De Lacy stand; I can assure honourable members of that. The other assurance I

can give is that it will go back on. People spoke about Gordon Chalk and Clem Jones and the way in which they would be turning in their graves. I do not know whether that would apply to Clem Jones, but let me say that he has been involved the whole time. I appointed a working party to investigate all the options for upgrading, and Clem Jones was part of that. He certainly has an attachment to cricket and to that ground and he is a person whose judgment and advice I respect. I have been in constant communication with him, and he is not turning in his grave, metaphorically speaking.

There was a comment about the board being stacked with Labor cronies. We are always hearing this accusation about boards being stacked with Labor cronies. The definition of "Labor crony" is everybody who is not a Liberal Party or National Party crony. I find it quite offensive that the Deputy Leader of the Coalition always makes that allegation against me. The boards for which I am responsible are Suncorp, QIC, QTC and QIDC. If the Deputy Leader of the Coalition can stand up, look me in the eye and say that they are stacked with Labor cronies, I suppose I would not be surprised: for the whole week, I have heard her saying that black is white and white is black, so I presume that she would be capable of saying that, too. I can give the assurance that the board that will be appointed—and after the legislation is passed, I will be moving as quickly as possible to do that—the people will be selected because of their strong commercial and management experience. I think either the member for Indooroopilly, Mr Beanland, or the member for Burdekin, Mr Stoneman, referred to this matter from the press release. Those appointees will be selected also for their knowledge of public facilities management, and they will have a deep and abiding interest in sport. They will be the types of people whom I believe every member in this Chamber would support and would believe are suitable for running the Gabba Trust, both now and in the future.

The big issue is whether tenants should be represented on the board. I understand that the Deputy Leader of the Coalition intends to move an amendment to ensure that they are. This is a matter that I have considered deeply over a long period. The more I work with boards, the more I am absolutely certain that having a board with representatives of various interest groups is a flawed model. If there are members of a board whose primary responsibility is to report back to an interest group, then they are not wholly behind achieving the objectives of the board to which they have been appointed. I have had some experiences which show why they do not work. I will not bore the House with them today, but will offer the best example that I know, namely, the Gabba trust board. The biggest complaint I have had since I have been responsible for the Brisbane Cricket Ground is the lack of communication between the trust and the QCA. They say, "The board will not talk to us. We don't know what it is doing." I say to them, "You have got two members elected by right and nominated by you to be on the board." The fact is that it does not work because it is a flawed model. When I discuss this with the QCA, I am aware that the association is uneasy about my proposal to have a board that does not have a tenants' representative directly on it, but I have explained this position and the QCA has accepted it.

**Mr Stoneman:** They haven't got much choice. You've got the numbers.

**Mr De LACY:** The QCA accepted the proposal reluctantly, but it accepted the proposal nevertheless. Members of the QCA said that it was not their preferred option, but the Brisbane Bears and the Queensland Cricketers Club accepted it enthusiastically because they believe that that is the right model. Members of the Opposition can accept it or not, but let me say that there is no intention to write out anybody.

**Mr Stoneman:** We must have picked up an oversight when we said that there was no intention, but they are not in there.

**Mr De LACY:** No. There is no intention to put them on the board, and I have no intention of accepting the Opposition's amendment. As I said, the Opposition's proposal is a flawed model which does not work. We are going to have five to seven people who have proper qualifications and a commitment to making the ground into a great sporting

arena. They will be communicating and consulting widely with the tenants because, at the end of the day, they all share the same objectives. That is the direction in which we are headed. When members of the Opposition see the people I appoint to the board, they will see that we all share the same objectives.

The member for Indooroopilly, Mr Beanland, justifiably expressed concern about the financing of the redevelopment. The financing of the redevelopment of a cricket ground is not easy. As the member for Indooroopilly said, when it comes to providing first-rate national-level facilities, cricket is not a commercial game. The QCA was never going to be able to upgrade the ground. These days, there is a limit on the extent to which Governments can use public funds to upgrade these types of sporting facilities, so we had to get a package together, and that is what I have done.

The member for Burdekin, Mr Stoneman, has picked the eyes out of this legislation and made all sorts of absurd interpretations of what is intended. He has picked out all the negatives and forgotten about the positives, but he should not forget the positives for cricket. The honourable member said that the ground did not need upgrading for cricket. That is his view.

**Mr Stoneman:** No—for the game of cricket.

**Mr De LACY:** That is his view. All the facilities, even the practice wickets, were absolutely substandard. Having to practise cricket on the main ground is something that does not happen in other States any more. In Western Australia and New South Wales, large cricket practice wickets were constructed. The juniors practise side by side with the Sheffield Shield team and the Test teams when they are there; in other words, they practise alongside their cricketing heroes. They say in Western Australia that the reason why Western Australia's performance in the Sheffield Shield has been so good is the integration between junior and senior cricket. That is something that could never have happened at the Gabba, and part of the redevelopment is the construction of a whole new set of practice wickets.

Part of the redevelopment will be the installation of lights. Ultimately, in Queensland with our subtropical/tropical climate, we must play cricket under lights. We still have a problem with playing more than one-day games under lights. There is a problem with the technology in the cricket board. Ultimately, that will happen and we will be able to play. If we are to reinvigorate the Sheffield Shield cricket competition, we must start having day/night Sheffield Shield matches. For that, we need a decent set of lights and a decent scoreboard. Can honourable members believe that, at the Gabba, we still do not have replays on the scoreboard—and members opposite want to hark back to the grand old days! The grand old days have gone. We must try to get into the modern era. From listening to members opposite, I think that they want to go back, but I do not know where. They are obviously very negative about the whole redevelopment.

I turn to the northern stand, the Cricketers Club stand. Sure, the Cricketers Club has good facilities, but one would be stretching the point to say that that northern stand is an appropriate facility for the last decade of the twentieth century. My candid opinion is that it is a disgrace. It is a disgrace. That is all part of the redevelopment. New facilities will be provided for the players and for the media. Have members on the Opposition side of the House ever looked at the kinds of facilities from which the media broadcasts during a test match? The media, the patrons, the Cricketers Club and the players themselves can have modern, appropriate facilities—the kinds of facilities that the Bears now have. The Bears are telling everybody who wants to listen that they have

the best player facilities in the whole of Australia, yet still members opposite can find a way to be negative, a way to criticise and a way to be unconstructive.

I return to the financing of the redevelopment. The Government has done indicative cost estimates that justify the kind of development that it is proposing. Those are the kinds of things that must be thoroughly worked out and negotiated by the new trust and the tenants. There is no question of negotiating an arrangement that the tenants cannot meet. If members opposite are saying anything that is right, it is the fact that the Gabba is a cricket ground. I will give them an assurance that it will always be a cricket ground. It will be the home of cricket in Queensland. When I refer to the Government's indicative financing, I say "indicative" because it has scope for renegotiation. The Government's contribution will be $17m. This is the other side of the coin. Are those disaffected cricketers that members opposite talk about saying that they do not want the $17m Government contribution, or do they just put that in their pocket and criticise something else?

**Mr Stoneman:** I'm not talking about disaffected cricketers. I'm talking about what you've said.

**Mr De LACY:** The honourable member for Burdekin sounded very disaffected.

**Mr Stoneman:** No. I'm just asking you a question about what you said.

**Mr De LACY:** The honourable member was pretending that he was reflecting widespread views. The Government will contribute $17m. The trust will contribute $13m, which is debt and equity. I cannot remember how much is equity, but I think that about half of that is equity—money that the trust has. The other half is debt, and that must be serviced by the tenants of the ground. The club, $5.5m; gold pass, almost $7m——

**Mr Stoneman:** You didn't talk about that. You gave a bit of detail on the club.

**Mr De LACY:** I cannot give the honourable member any more detail than that. As I said, these are indicative——

**Mr Stoneman:** Will you be sending a bill? That is what I was asking.

**Mr De LACY:** No. It will not be sending a bill; it will be a leasing arrangement. That is worked out on net present value.

**Mr Stoneman:** What about the gold pass? Do they pay for their tickets when they go to the ground?

**Mr De LACY:** I cannot answer those kinds of questions. On present value, if we sell off the income stream, the gold pass will bring in $7m and others—whatever "others" is—will be $1.679m. That adds up to almost $44m. As I said, those are indicative costings, but they are indicative on the basis that a lot of negotiations and a lot of financial investigation, or financial study, has taken place to know the kinds of income streams that those bodies will be able to sustain. There is a lot of negotiation. We have a trust. Obviously, in terms of signage, the parties must have a proper arrangement. If the trust has all the signage, obviously the rent will be very much less, or the summer tenant may be allowed to have all the signage but will pay a lot more rent for the use of the facilities. Those kinds of negotiations must still be carried out. That is why we must have a competent, commercially oriented but sports sensitive trust—the kind of trust that I am going to appoint.

In conclusion, some concerns of members opposite are well founded, particularly those expressed by the member for Indooroopilly about the cost. I know that some tenants are concerned about their viability if they have to pick up too much of the rent. Nevertheless, that negotiation must happen and, ultimately, we will come to a conclusion that is satisfactory to everybody. The conclusion will be a modernised, upgraded facility of which we in Queensland can all be proud. The honourable member for Burdekin spoke about my unpopularity with the cricketers. I do not know whether that is the case. I usually do not take the word of the honourable member for Burdekin on anything at all. I am not in this game to be popular. What I am in this game for, whatever I do, is to make sure that the State of Queensland gets the right outcome—in this case, at the Gabba.

I have been working on this redevelopment for the better part of three years. It is not as though I have come charging in at five minutes to midnight with some scatterbrained scheme for redevelopment. The redevelopment must take account of all of the tenants. Why has the Government not mentioned cricket in the legislation? It is called "the cricket ground" right through the Bill. That is the way that we write modern legislation. The old-fashioned legislation with the greyhounds written into it must now be changed because the greyhounds are not there. That is the way in which the legislation is written. The tenants are given their security by entering into proper commercial long-term leases, and that is what we will be doing.

Members opposite can take their choice. They can be a part of this process. I believe that cricket is a bipartisan issue in this State. I have never tried to play politics in this game. I do not see it as a party political issue at all. I think we ought to be big enough in this game when we are talking about our sport—whether it is cricket, Australian Rules or Rugby League—to be bipartisan, because we are all proud of Queensland and we are all proud of Australia. That is what this is about. I have to say that I resented some of the small-minded accusations, allegations and interpretations which came from many of the members of the Opposition. All I can say by way of conclusion is that there has been a lot of consultation—and members opposite tried to deride my consultation—with all of the stakeholders in this game. Basically, they accept what we are doing, and at times it is not 100 per cent acceptance. I will say that the QCA is nervous that it perhaps does not have the totally dominant position that it had before. But there are enormous benefits to cricket in this upgrading, the kind of benefits that it would never have obtained unless we entered into this whole integrated arrangement for the redevelopment of the Gabba.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided—

In division—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Bredhauer): Order! For any future divisions of the House on this Bill, the bells will ring for two minutes.

| AYES, 41 | | NOES, 27 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ardill | Pearce | Beanland | Stoneman |
| Barton | Power | Borbidge | Turner |
| Beattie | Purcell | Connor | Watson |
| Bennett | Pyke | Davidson | |
| Bird | Robertson | Elliott | |
| Budd | Robson | FitzGerald | |
| Campbell | Rose | Gamin | |
| Casey | Smith | Gilmore | |
| Clark | Spence | Grice | |
| Comben | Sullivan J. H. | Healy | |
| Davies | Sullivan T. B. | Horan | |
| De Lacy | Szczerbanik | Johnson | |
| Edmond | Vaughan | Lester | |
| Elder | Warner | Lingard | |
| Fenlon | Welford | McCauley | |
| Foley | Wells | Perrett | |
| Goss W. K. | Woodgate | Randell | |
| Hamill | | Rowell | |
| Mackenroth | | Sheldon | |
| McElligott | *Tellers:* | Simpson | *Tellers:* |
| Milliner | Pitt | Slack | Springborg |
| Nuttall | Livingstone | Stephan | Laming |

Resolved in the affirmative.

## Committee

Hon. K. E. De Lacy (Cairns—Treasurer) in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

**Mr STONEMAN** (3.39 p.m.): The Treasurer has made much of the so-called negative attitude of the Opposition. I thought that it was the duty of the Opposition to ensure that the intent of legislation such as this is properly understood. In that context, we are trying to make sure that the Government has it right, and I suspect that it does not. The Opposition is delighted with the idea of an expansion of the operations of the Brisbane Cricket Ground. However, clause 7 (b) states that the trust's function are to—

> "maintain the Brisbane Cricket Ground to a standard appropriate for the conduct of international and interstate sporting events."

I remind the Treasurer of his earlier comment. He said that this upgrading will provide facilities so that the ground does not have to be used for training. The Treasurer said words to the effect that that is not on; that the ground should not be used for that purpose. I point out that the Brisbane Bears will have to practise. Earlier in this debate, I expressed a concern about the overlap between seasons. I know a little about turf, but I am sure that, having been involved in that area for a while, the Treasurer has a better understanding of it than me. Prior to the commencement of the cricket season, the centre pitches have to be prepared. Football training does the real damage to a ground. The games are not so much of a problem, because only a few games are played each year. The fields in Melbourne and Sydney can have a bit of a spell. However, in Brisbane, the training will be continual and it take place regardless of the weather. That is my first point. Perhaps the Treasurer could respond to that now so that he does not have to remember all the points I make.

**Mr De LACY:** Those are the sorts of issues that need to be resolved by the trust. They will no doubt be resolved between the curator of the ground and the representatives of the relative sports through the medium of the trust. Surely the honourable member does not suggest that those sorts of management details should be included in this legislation. Those concerns have been expressed to me, but I do not believe that I am the appropriate person to resolve them. Cricket is the summer tenant. The field must be in an appropriate state for cricket during the summer months. Those issues are capable of being resolved. If, during the latter part of the year, training is causing a problem to the preparation of the pitch, the Brisbane Bears may have to train elsewhere. That issue cannot be resolved here; nor should it be resolved here by people such as the honourable member and me.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I draw the Treasurer's attention to the fact that I was challenging his statement. He upbraided me for suggesting that the improvements would not necessarily benefit cricket per se. I made the point that extension of those areas is not necessary to provide a first-class operation. With due respect to the Treasurer, I suggest that more damage will be inflicted on that ground by football training than is inflicted by cricket training and practice wickets. I will leave that issue aside. I take the point that he and I are not qualified to make that determination. However, once again I raise the point that there is no certainty that the trust will have a deep understanding that the preparation of a good wicket area well prior to the commencement of the season is a necessary factor for a successful cricket season.

I turn now to my next point. Paragraph (c) of this clause states that the trust's functions are to—

> "provide and maintain facilities for patrons that will encourage public attendance at events conducted at the Brisbane Cricket Ground."

Does that really mean the provision of structures or the provision of facilities such as catering for patrons? However, I assume that that might mean the provision and the maintenance of viewing and comfort facilities. Would that be the case?

**Mr De LACY:** Yes, most certainly. The place must be made attractive to get the patrons in. That is what it is all about, and that is not what has been happening in the past.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—

**Mr BEANLAND** (3.46 p.m.): I listened very closely to what the Treasurer said in relation to funding. I accept that there is going to be an amount of $6.5m involved. There is a trust debt of $13m, and half of that amount means that there will be a debt of $6.5m that will be serviced by the trust. If the interest rate is 10 per cent, the figure involved could be about $650,000, although it could be less. However, I will use that as a round figure. During the second-reading debate, I asked how the trust will set the amount of rentals for both groups. I listened very carefully to what the Minister said, but I think that the Brisbane Bears have a much greater capacity to pay a rental to the trust than the QCA has. Working on a rental figure of $150,000, which I noticed in a paper some time ago, based on the current rentals that the trust is paying, that would leave a rental of close to $500,000, of the amount of $650,000 for the Brisbane Bears. It may be that the trust would receive funds from signage and a few other odds and sods, and the amount could vary by a couple of hundred thousand dollars. However, will there be a formula applied, or will it be negotiated? I am not quite clear on this matter. I would think that there would be a vast difference between the amount of money that the QCA could pay and the amount that could be paid by the Brisbane Bears. If the Queensland Cricketers Club is putting in $5.5m—and I presume that that is a separate amount; I am not sure what the current arrangements are in regard to rental—is it going to pay part of the rental also? How will that be worked out? I want some clarification about how the formula is going to be arrived at; or is it still open to negotiation? If it is still open to negotiation, I want to place on record that I hope that the same formula is not applied to

all three major tenants. Clearly, that will not work, because at least one of the tenants has less ability to generate revenue than the other two.

**Mr De LACY:** I am not in a position to provide the specific responses that the member seeks. That is the reason why a trust consisting of members who have commercial experience and a range of other abilities will be set up. During the second-reading debate, I said that there are a range of ways in which this could be negotiated. To write off signage as just simply "odds and sods" is missing the point completely. A lot of money could be generated by the sale of signage. There is no fixed formula. It is up to the trust to negotiate it. This will all be part of the master planning process that is now under way. The kind of commercial agreements that can be arrived at between the trust and the tenants will depend on the magnitude of the final redevelopment, particularly of the northern stand. So it all has to add up. It may even be that at some stage things will not add up and the trust will come to me and say that the Government would need to access further the revenue stream from poker machines. I do not know. I am determined to get this development completed. A preliminary financial analysis has been carried out, and I believe that, in the end, the broad figures that I have supplied will work out. However, there is still an awful lot of negotiation to be done.

**Mr STONEMAN** (3.50 p.m.) I am interested in this same matter. I acknowledge that the trust has a responsibility, and that it is not unreasonable to manage the ground in the way in which it is stated in the Bill, which states—

> "(a) is consistent with sound commercial principles and produces an annual cash surplus over operating costs and committed debt repayment."

However, the problem is that the law requires that a profit must be made. If it is impossible to generate that profit, what happens then? I make the point strongly that I am totally supportive of the redevelopment of the Brisbane Cricket Ground; it is desperately needed. However, I am also supportive of the need to maintain facilities such as the Queensland Cricketers Club. All the other cricketers' clubs throughout the world are located in the middle of the city. From memory, the cricketers' club in Sydney is located in Castlereagh Street. In London, it is located away from the cricket ground. Cricketers' clubs in other cities are not located near the sport which they represent. I think that is the unique component of the Brisbane Cricket Ground, and we need to make sure that is part and parcel of the redevelopment.

I direct a question to the Treasurer about the way in which the gold pass structure would work. I am aware that, in Melbourne, gold passes are sold to the exclusion of other people who might otherwise wish to go to the game. The gold pass members can effectively block out an area. That is probably their right, but I also would like the Treasurer's assurance that, in the structuring of the gold pass operation, the Queensland Cricket Association or the Brisbane Bears are not excluded from receiving some of the cash flow that is generated by people who come into the ground with gold passes. Do those people pay a component for each game? if it is a day/night match, the stands might be filled. Those people might not be interested in other matches, yet people might be a turned away at those matches because of a lack of seating facilities elsewhere. I am concerned about the meaning of the gold pass component. I am not against the principle, but I am worried that the stand, which is going to be built at a cost of $6.9m, will be just for the benefit of the people who have bought a gold pass, and not for the wider supporting community.

**Mr De LACY:** I presume that the member is saying these things only because he thinks that they sound good or because he likes the sound of his own voice. If the honourable member accepts the principle, why does not he not accept the principle and let the experts work it out?

**Mr STONEMAN:** Because of the mood that the Treasurer is in, I expected a snide remark. I thought that this debate was about trying to flesh out and flush out the intent of the Bill. I know the principle. It is in the Treasurer's press release. I am just trying to find out what it means. Does it mean that there will still be the capacity to generate income for the tenants who, after all, have to pay the amount of money that is

required of them because, according to this clause, which relates to the management of the trust, they must show a cash surplus? The only way that they can have a cash surplus is to charge rentals, and so on. That is my concern. We have already talked about this. It was most unbecoming of the Treasurer of this State to use that opportunity to make a snide remark about me. I believe that it says a lot about him.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9—

**Mr STONEMAN** (3.54 p.m.): The trust's powers, as envisaged in this clause, effectively give it the power to become a trading entity in its own right, that is, to engage operators and suppliers of services in its own right. Is that the intent of this clause? How are the existing tenants protected if the trust decides to enter into a separate contract with another operator to supply food, beverages, and so on?

**Mr De LACY:** The powers provided for the trust by clause 9 are the kinds of powers that one would expect to be provided in any legislation for people who represent the owner of a ground. All the commercial and financial arrangements entered into between the tenants and the trust will be the subject of negotiation. It seems incredible that the member asks what would happen if the trust decided to enter into a commercial arrangement in competition with one of the tenants. These are the kinds of issues that need to be resolved: who does what? What are the returns? What are the rents? Who has the responsibility for this and that? They are the subject of negotiation. We cannot determine those here.

Ultimately, it is all about the redevelopment of the ground and maintaining the ground as a viable sporting stadium of high standard. We cannot write any more into legislation than what is here. I cannot give the honourable member any more detailed information, because that information is not yet available. It must be negotiated with the trust. The best thing that we can do is pass this legislation, let me appoint the trust, let it get on with the master plan, let it start the negotiations with the various tenants, and let us get it all worked out and locked up, and get on with it.

**Mr STONEMAN:** Under normal circumstances, I would not disagree with what the Treasurer is saying or with this clause, because I believe that it is perfectly valid under the normal circumstances that prevailed under the previous legislation. But the fact of the matter is that the Queensland Cricket Association and the Queensland Cricketers Club do not exist under the terms of this Act. They are not recognised. They are not there. This Bill talks about giving reasonable powers to the trust, but it does not give reasonable security to those tenants, who are there at the whim of the trust. They are the Queensland Cricket Association, the Queensland Cricketers Club and the Brisbane Bears. None of this is mentioned in the negotiation process.

**Mr De LACY:** I do not know that I should be provoked into answering the member once again. This is one of those absurd conclusions that only this member could arrive at. Clause 8 (2), which relates to the management of the trust, states—

> "In managing the Brisbane Cricket Ground, the Trust is to have regard to the requirements of the tenants of the Brisbane Cricket Ground with a view to implementing policies to the mutual benefit of the tenants and the Trust and for the improvement of the sports played on the Brisbane Cricket Ground."

**Mr Stoneman:** Who are the tenants?

**Mr De LACY:** The tenants are the Brisbane Bears, the QCA and the QCC. I know that the honourable member thinks that we are going to give it to the Trades and Labor Council or somebody else, but I cannot disabuse him of that if he wants to sit there with all those crazy conspiracy theories that rattle around in his tiny mind.

**Mr STONEMAN:** Obviously, the Treasurer is still in a snide mood. This is the law that we are talking about, and the law recognises only the trust, only the fact that there is an edifice called the Brisbane Cricket Ground, and nothing else. That is the point that I want to make.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

**Mrs SHELDON** (3.59 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"At page 7, line 12—

omit the clause, insert—

'Appointment

'14. The trustees are to be appointed by the Governor in Council and not less than—

(a) 2 trustees are to represent the Government; and

(b) 1 trustee is to be a person who is associated with the activities of The Queensland Cricket Association; and

(c) 1 trustee is to be a person who is associated with the activities of the Queensland Cricketers' Club; and

(d) 1 trustee is to be a person who is associated with the activities of the Brisbane Bears Football Club.'."

That seems eminently sensible to me. In his own words a minute ago, the Treasurer said that the tenants would be just those three bodies. If they are going to be the tenants, why not have their representation on the board? Although I know that the Treasurer does not agree with me, it makes commonsense to me that the major tenants, particularly those associated with the cricket association and the cricket club—after all, we are talking about the Brisbane Cricket Ground—should have representation on the trust to give the point of view and to look after the interests of those tenants.

Earlier, the Treasurer indicated that considerable cost will be incurred in the redevelopment of the grounds. It seems quite reasonable that the trust will proceed to increase rentals. Those three bodies will have to find the capacity to pay for that increased rental. This amendment may affect how well they operate and the services that they provide for their members. In the long run, it will also influence their decision on whether they continue to stay at the cricket ground or find another place where it will not cost them so much. The amendment is not unreasonable. As I intimated to the Treasurer in my speech during the second-reading debate, if he had accepted that, we would have agreed to support the Bill at the second-reading stage. He has not done so. I ask him to give consideration to this amendment.

**Mr BEANLAND:** I rise to support the amendment. In view of what he stated earlier, I would have thought the Treasurer would be happy to accept the amendment. He said that he believed that the current trust was not working and that there was not a flow of information. It is fair to say that, if he thinks he has problems now, they will multiply many times over as a result of this legislation. There is no justification for failing to include in the legislation a provision that representatives of the three major tenants be on the board. The amendment speaks for itself.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! I call the member for Burdekin.

**Government members:** Oh, no!

**Mr STONEMAN:** It might be a joke for Government members, but this clause contains the key to the Bill. I rise to support the two previous speakers and to again assure the Committee that this is not an unreasonable amendment. It is a reasonable amendment. The Treasurer is saying that he does not believe there are suitable people within those three organisations to run a business entity. He is damning them by exclusion. I completely support the amendment.

**Mr De LACY:** I cannot accept the amendment. This clause is fundamental to the whole Bill. By accepting the amendment, I would be turning the whole Bill on its head.

During the second-reading debate, I said that to have representatives of interest groups on a board is a flawed model. It is anachronistic.

**Mr Stoneman:** But you put the union people on in Mr Casey's Dairy Industry Bill last night.

**Mr De LACY:** There are many boards around like that. But, if the honourable member wants my personal view, it is a flawed model.

**Mr Stoneman:** You are in disagreement with Mr Casey?

**Mr De LACY:** I am telling the honourable member my personal view.

**Mr FitzGerald:** The Treasurer's view, we want.

**Mr De LACY:** Well, that is whose Bill it is.

**Mr FitzGerald:** You said it was your personal view.

**Mr De LACY:** It is the Treasurer's personal view. The trust is the landlord and the tenants are the lessees. Honourable members opposite are proposing that the landlord and the tenant be the same person. How does the landlord negotiate with a tenant who is itself? It is a contradiction in terms. We need a landlord who can negotiate with the tenants. I accept that, ultimately, their objectives are the same.

**Mr Stoneman:** If you believed that, we would be happy, but you don't agree with that for enterprise agreements.

**Mr De LACY:** When the trust is negotiating with the Cricketers Club for a lease, what is the role of the supposed two members of the Cricketers Club?

**Mr Stoneman:** They can put their interests on the table and then withdraw.

**Mr De LACY:** If there was negotiation, the trust would have to negotiate with the QCA; but Opposition members will have the QCA on the trust. Do honourable members opposite know what they are proposing? They do not understand. They are living in the past. It is anachronistic. It is not what this Bill is about. It is about having an expert independent board that can do the job that we are charging it with doing. It is absolutely fundamental to this legislation. There is no way that I can accept the amendment.

**Mrs SHELDON:** In his arrogance, the Treasurer believes that he is the only one who knows anything about this and the only one who is entitled to have an opinion. In the long run, it might serve him and the interests of cricket to occasionally listen to what the Opposition is saying. We are not just knocking; we are genuinely concerned.

**Mr De Lacy:** You don't know what you're talking about.

**Mrs SHELDON:** The Treasurer has just said that I do not know what I am talking about. It would seem that he is the supreme font of knowledge for all Queenslanders. God help us! The association may well be the tenant, but we are talking about the Brisbane Cricket Ground and its history. We are talking about why the Gabba is there and what its major function has always been. We are not talking about a landlord and tenant as one would in relation to a local shop. Because of the history of the ground, the major tenant should have representation on the trust. It is a nonsense to suggest that it should not. One wonders what ulterior motives the Treasurer really has.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I was not going to say anything else on this clause, but the Treasurer has provoked me. I cannot believe that he said it is his personal view that no vested interest should be represented on any board. I put on the record: why then would Bill Kelty, for instance, be on the board of the Reserve Bank? He is not a banker. A union person is on the board of Qantas. The Ministers must be in conflict because, last night, Mr Casey cut the consumers out of the milk authority, but he said that we have to have producers, processors and the people who do the deliveries represented on the board because they are the people who know the industry. Time and again, we see Bills come into this House that include a token man, a token woman and a token union man; yet, the Treasurer says that this instance is different to all others and, therefore, we should not have anyone running a cricket ground who knows anything

about cricket, football or about the operation of the most unique cricketers' club in the world. What a lot of poppycock!

**Mr BEANLAND:** I listened very closely to what the Treasurer said in relation to the current trusts, and I just obtained a copy of the Cricket Ground Trust's annual report for the year ended 31 March 1992. I have browsed through it to find out the types of people who are on the trust as representatives. As I read about their backgrounds, I do not think that it is very fair to the people who are currently on the trust; they have a wide experience in the community, in sport, and some of them in business. Representing the Queensland Cricket Association is Mr Errol La Frantz, who has a very wide experience in sport and business; Mr Lou Rowan, who is an ex-Queensland police inspector and who has wide and varied interests across broad sections of Queensland's community and who is an international cricketing umpire; and Mr Applegarth from the Queensland Cricketers Club. It is clear that the types of representatives on the current trust board—the nominees from the two tenants—are people of first rate experience and tremendous calibre. I do not think that the Treasurer's comments stand up to scrutiny. In considering the current representatives on the trust, I am not sure what the Treasurer is getting at when he talks of a breakdown in communication, that the system does not work and that this will be so much better than the previous system. The Treasurer said that he thought long and hard about it; however, with respect, I think that he needs to think a little harder and a little longer.

**Mr De LACY:** Although I said that I would not respond any more, I want to make one comment. I said that the model was flawed; I did not say that any of the members of the current trust were flawed. I stand by that. In no way did I impugn any of the members of the current trust. I said that there was a breakdown of communications because the model does not work.

In turning to Mr Stoneman's comments about Bill Kelty being on the Commonwealth Bank board—I am not ruling anybody out from being on a board. What I am saying is that they should not be appointed to that board to represent an interest group.

**Mr Stoneman:** But they are; Bill Kelty was.

**Mr De LACY:** Bill Kelty is on the board because the Commonwealth Government of the day thought that he could contribute to the Commonwealth Bank board. I know that the honourable member would never accept that because of his blinkered anti-trade union attitude. I am not ruling out any trade unionist; I am not ruling out any business people; I am not even ruling out any members of the National Party. I am saying that every person who is appointed to this board will, firstly, have ability and expertise, as I spelt out before and, secondly, they will all be there to achieve the objectives of the trust, not to report back to some other interest group.

**Mr STONEMAN:** So the Treasurer is saying that from the 100 000 or so people who are members of the Queensland Cricket Association, there is no-one within their ranks who, in common with Mr Kelty, has a capacity; there is no-one within the ranks of the 5 500 members of the Queensland Cricketers Club who has a capacity; there is no-one from within the Bears who has a capacity. Surely the Treasurer could go to a panel and say, "Give me five, six, eight or 10 that you would be happy that I pick one from so that you know that they have the interest of the club or the association at heart because membership is paid up." In fact, the Treasurer is denigrating the capacity of those organisations—which is what the Brisbane Cricket Ground is all about—to have within their ranks anyone of the capacity that fits within his criteria to manage this operation. I think that that is appalling.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

| AYES, 42 | | NOES, 28 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ardill | Milliner | Beanland | Stephan |
| Barton | Nuttall | Borbidge | Stoneman |
| Beattie | Pearce | Connor | Turner |
| Bennett | Purcell | Davidson | Watson |
| Bird | Pyke | Elliott | |
| Bredhauer | Robertson | FitzGerald | |
| Budd | Robson | Gamin | |
| Campbell | Rose | Gilmore | |
| Casey | Smith | Goss J. N. | |
| Clark | Spence | Grice | |
| Comben | Sullivan J. H. | Healy | |
| Davies | Sullivan T. B. | Horan | |
| De Lacy | Szczerbanik | Johnson | |
| Edmond | Vaughan | Lester | |
| Elder | Warner | Lingard | |
| Fenlon | Welford | McCauley | |
| Foley | Wells | Perrett | |
| Goss W. K. | Woodgate | Randell | |
| Hamill | | Rowell | |
| Hayward | *Tellers:* | Sheldon | *Tellers:* |
| Mackenroth | Pitt | Simpson | Springborg |
| McElligott | Livingstone | Slack | Laming |

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 23, as read, agreed to.

Clause 24—

**Mr STONEMAN** (4.18 p.m.): I wish to mention a matter that underlies the whole concern in relation to this clause, which states—

> "The Trust holds the property of the Trust on trust for the tenants from time to time of the Trust's land."

That is fair enough, but the Treasurer made much of the fact that in the past the QCA did not have a tenancy agreement. I wish to read the relevant part of section 18 of the original Act, which states—

> "On and from the date of the coming into operation and by virtue of this Act—
>
> (a) The lands described in Part IV of Schedule II to this Act shall vest in the Trust upon trust for the members for the time being of The Queensland Cricket Association to be used as a cricket ground and, subject to section twenty-three of this Act, for such other purposes as the Trust may from time to time approve . . . "

In effect, that was a contract contained within the Act which prescribed that the Brisbane Cricket Ground was to be used by the Queensland Cricket Association for playing cricket. The word "cricket" is not even mentioned in the Bill, nor are the tenants mentioned. We had the security that the Treasurer pooh-poohed. He said that the tenants did not have an agreement before, so why do they need one now? The proof is section 18 of the Brisbane Cricket Ground Act 1958, which was subsequently amended. That was the safeguard for the QCA, and that is why it did not require a lease. That Act protected cricket and the Queensland Cricket Association which, in turn, founded the Queensland Cricketers Club. Other tenants have since become involved and should be recognised in the Bill. I ask the Treasurer: how does he suggest that this Bill represents the same situation as existed in the past when there was no lease agreement? The

Treasurer says that the QCA did not need it in the past, so why does it need one now. The fact of the matter is that the safeguard was contained in the Act. I ask him how he can justify those earlier comments.

**Mr De Lacy** interjected.

**Mr STONEMAN:** I place on the record that the Treasurer of Queensland, the person in charge of this Bill, refuses to justify his comments or give a decent answer in respect of this situation. He is treating with contempt the old Act and the QCA, and this is a sad day for cricket in this State.

**Mr De LACY:** The only person I hold in contempt is the member, not the QCA or anybody else. But he is right; I hold the member in utter contempt, because he just cannot understand.

Clause 24, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 25 to 34 and Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## AGRICULTURAL STANDARDS AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 11 May (see p. 2605).

**Mr PERRETT** (Barambah) (4.23 p.m.): In rising to speak to the Agricultural Standards Amendment Bill 1993, I would like to say that the Bill before the House again is further testimony to the futility of Labor's headlong rush to centralise power in Canberra. Only last year, the State Labor Government used its numbers to force through a Bill to hand over very important powers over agricultural chemicals to the Commonwealth. It is now back here to ask us to approve a delay in the handover. The reason is that the Commonwealth cannot get its act together on registration.

The Opposition will not oppose the passage of the amending legislation but I want it on record that the Opposition is still not comfortable with the idea of Canberra having the sole responsibility for presale evaluation and registration of products essential to the viability of primary production in this State. That opposition is based on the cost and efficiency penalties of the new arrangements. They take control of a vital element of management in primary production away from an efficient State structure and hand it to a Canberra bureaucracy which is out of touch with reality. Agricultural chemicals are hated by the green movement to which Labor panders when there is a chance to pull a few more votes. Chemicals are too important to producers for us to risk their restriction for less than compelling scientific reasons. The safe use of our agricultural chemicals helps make our producers among the most efficient in the world. They are part of the efficient production of high-quality food and fibre for both the domestic and export markets. We should retain local and knowledgable control over their registration and clearance.

Presale evaluation and registration of agricultural chemicals was the responsibility of the Agricultural Requirements Board of the Minister's department under the Agricultural Standards Act, requiring chemicals to be registered before they can be sold in Queensland. The board has been responsible for evaluating chemicals and then recommending their registration or not. The Opposition does not object to a single evaluation of chemicals before they go on sale. It is the next step to which we object.

There should not be a single remote authority deciding on specific applications. That is where the real additional cost in terms of time and money will come from. Our local DPI people have an enviable record of getting on with the job. The Commonwealth has the opposite reputation. In the past, DPI officers responded quickly to new problems. They made sure that approvals for new applications of already tested chemicals came through quickly. A Minister who knows anything about primary industry would recall situations in which quick decisions about chemical use have saved crops that might otherwise have been lost.

Unlike the Labor Party, the Opposition does not believe that Canberra knows best. It is dominated by academic theorists who have no idea of what goes on in the real world. We are not happy to hand over important functions to them just to satisfy some Labor centralist ideal. Producers are already hamstrung enough by Government interference in the way in which they run their properties. The Opposition bitterly opposes the concept of handing the Commonwealth power to rule on the use of chemicals that might have application specific to Queensland. We fear that, too often in the future, a problem will get out of hand while the Commonwealth bureaucracy dithers in the airconditioned comfort of Canberra. That was the basis of our opposition to Labor's original amendments to the Agricultural Standards Act. It remains the basis for our objections to the handover. In spite of that basic objection, the Opposition has decided that it would not be in the interests of farmers, manufacturers or distributors of chemicals to oppose the legislation. We recognise that to do so would cost members of those groups a great deal of money. Of course, in times such as this, no farmer or agricultural supplier can afford one cent of added cost. So the Opposition supports the amending Bill in the interests of saving costs for the producers in Queensland.

As the Minister pointed out in his second-reading speech, registration was to be handed over to the Commonwealth on 1 July 1993. Legislation is not in place, and it would cost lots of money to reregister chemicals under the Queensland law that ceases on 30 June. The Bill extends the time of that Queensland registration and would, in the circumstances, seem a sensible amendment to the Act. The Opposition supports the Bill.

**Hon. E. D. CASEY** (Mackay—Minister for Primary Industries) (4.27 p.m.), in reply: I place on record the Goss Government's determination to continue to reduce costs for the primary sector of our great State and to do what is sensible and right with the legislation.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

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

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## STATUTE LAW (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

### Second Reading

Debate resumed from 13 May (see p. 2807).

**Mr FITZGERALD** (Lockyer) (4.30 p.m.): The Opposition will be supporting the Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill 1993. The Statute Law (Miscellaneous Provisions) Acts were recently debated in this House. The Bill is rather lengthy. In fact, it contains 130 pages. The Minister said that he does not wish to answer detailed

questions on any of the provisions contained in it because of the large number of Acts that it covers. In fact, this legislation amends 43 Acts, and listed in Schedule 3 are 100-odd Acts which are obsolete and are being repealed. There is also a whole host of Acts that will be repealed, but they will stay in force, and others, of course, have no force at all.

I checked with the Opposition members whose responsibility it is to shadow portfolios and asked them to come back to me if they had any concerns. I know that the shadow Attorney-General had a few questions, and I hope that I have been able to satisfy those queries. I trusted the Government when it said that it was not going to put anything controversial in this legislation and that everything is mechanical. One clause refers to the Motor Vehicles Control Act 1975, which contains a reference to penalty units. Some of the legislation has a reference to penalty units or, as an alternative, a term of imprisonment for six months. When Sam Doumany was the Justice Minister, I was a member of his committee and we reviewed an Act which had not been reviewed for some time. The direction was given to a couple of officers to double the penalties in the Act so that we could bring it up to date. Not only did they double the penalties, such as increasing a $100 fine to a $200 fine, but at the same time they increased a penalty from six months' imprisonment to 12 months' imprisonment. When we looked at the legislation, we asked them about that and they said, "Well, you said to double the penalties." I thought that if a person was given life imprisonment, it would be rather crook if he was given two terms of life imprisonment. That is why there should be somebody who actually physically scrutinises what somebody else has done. It may have been a mechanical matter, or the instructions might not have been clear enough for the officer at the time. I forget who it was—thank goodness for that—although I would not name the person in this place. However, that is an indication of the type of thing that can happen.

We have some Imperial laws that have ceased to have any force. We have in this legislation a number of laws that are declared laws whose repeal does not end their effect. One is the Weekend Detention Act of 1970. We can see from the passage of laws that were introduced into the Parliament that, obviously, some do not work. We have moved on and tried something else. The weekend detention laws were introduced in the 1970s and subsequent amendment Acts went passed in 1983 and 1984. This Parliament tried those laws, but obviously they were not successful in solving the problem.

I did notice in the list in the Schedule that contains 100-odd Acts a couple of Acts that have been repealed. There is the Daylight Saving Act of 1989. That is probably one of the most recent Acts that is being repealed. There is also the Save the Steam Car Fund Act. I think three former members of Parliament were involved with a foundation that was to raise funds to support a steam car. I think they came from all political parties. That Act came into the Parliament in 1985 so that somehow or another the funds that remained could be distributed. That is part of the history of the legislation.

A number of the amendments in this legislation seek to make name changes. We now have a Returned and Services League of Australia. Once, that organisation used to be called the Returned Sailors', Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League of Australia, Queensland Branch, which subsequently became the Returned Services League of Australia (Queensland Branch) and, as I said, it is now the Returned and Services League of Australia (Queensland Branch). That will enable the more modern title to be inserted in a number of Acts. I do not think there is anything else that I wish to say. This legislation is quite interesting. For example, in relation to the Reprints Act of 1992, the terms "employer" and "employee" have been inserted in place of the old titles of "master" and "servant". Not many of our Acts now contain the expressions "master" and "servant". That is an indication of the type of amendments contained in this Bill. The Opposition supports this legislation. I note the assurances from the Leader of the House that this legislation contains no controversial matters.

**Mr BEANLAND** (Indooroopilly) (4.35 p.m.): I will be very brief. Page 48 of the Bill relates to the District Courts Act of 1967. While I was in the process of debating the previous Bill, I asked the Leader of Opposition Business, who is handling this Bill, to talk to the Attorney-General about this change for me. This amendment changes the titles of the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the District Court to that of the Chief Judge and the Senior Judge of the District Court. Mr Wells, the Attorney-General, has clarified the situation and has indicated that in fact this was asked for by the Chairman of the District Court, Judge Helman, and that he is perfectly happy with the change. Secondly, Judge Helman will not have to be reappointed to his position as Chief Judge of the District Court. In fact, he will automatically remain as Chief Judge; it is merely a change of title and no further appointment will be necessary. That is the only point I raise.

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning) (4.36 p.m.), in reply: I thank the Opposition for its support for this legislation. The Leader of Opposition Business in the House raised the issue of process and the way that things happen. I would say this, not as criticism of the past but certainly as a comment on the way things have changed: I hope that the process that we as a Government have in place is such that would not allow a situation to occur whereby a public servant would increase a penalty from six months' imprisonment to 12 months' imprisonment. I can well understand that happening—that if he was told to double the penalty, he would go away and do something like that.

The Office of Parliamentary Counsel has a greater role to play today in drafting legislation than it played a couple of years ago. We as a Government would expect that Parliamentary Counsel would draw that to our attention. I chair the parliamentary business and legislation committee of Cabinet. I meet with the Parliamentary Counsel every Monday morning before Cabinet. With the committee, I go through each piece of legislation. Every piece of legislation must comply with the fundamental principles that we as a Government have set down. If any legislation does not comply in any way, it is drawn to our attention. We raise such matters in Cabinet so that we can decide whether that is what we as a Government want. Hopefully, the Cabinet Office will also ensure that those things do not happen.

Another point raised related to the removal of the word "imperial" from the name "RSL". It was stated that this was non-controversial. If the Government was to do such a thing, it would be controversial. The RSL has requested it, so it is non-controversial. But if the RSL had not requested it, the Government would be taking us away from Queen and country. I thank the Opposition for its support.

Motion agreed to.

### Committee

Clauses 1 to 5 and Schedules 1 to 5, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

### Third Reading

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

## SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. T. M. MACKENROTH** (Chatsworth—Leader of the House) (4.39 p.m.): I move—

> "That the House, at its rising, do adjourn to a date and at a time to be fixed by Mr Speaker in consultation with the Government of the State."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.40 p.m.