



Speech by

**Hon. R. E. BORBIDGE**

**MEMBER FOR SURFERS PARADISE**

---

Hansard 17 August 1999

**INTERACTIVE GAMBLING (PLAYER PROTECTION) AMENDMENT BILL**

**All Stages**

**Hon. R. E. BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.43 p.m.): This further compounds the scandal that this Premier and this Government have got themselves into. What we are about to be presented with is obviously—

**A Government member** interjected.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** That is your problem.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat while I seek advice from the Clerk. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** This legislation compounds the scandal that this increasingly lost Government is demonstrating to the people of Queensland. What is being presented to the Parliament is a motion by the acting Treasurer to produce legislation that we have not seen and have not been briefed on, and which we will be required to respond to and make a sensible contribution on during the course of the debate.

As I indicated earlier today during the debate on matters of public importance, this acting Treasurer has every piece of power and authority that he needs to take action in respect of the very questionable issuing of the Gocorp licence to three Labor mates—three Labor mates who stood to benefit from an executive decree of the Treasurer, which was perhaps part of a parcel of up to \$200m. The circumstances leading up to this legislation are unfolding into one of the great political scandals in the history of this State. At the present time, we have an investigation by the Auditor-General and we have an investigation by the Criminal Justice Commission. The legislation that is about to be presented to the House may get in the way of and circumvent those inquiries and, in fact, may be contrary to the recommendations of the Auditor-General and the recommendations of the Criminal Justice Commission when handed down.

When the interactive gaming legislation was introduced into the Parliament, it gave the acting Treasurer all the authority that was needed to deal with any suggestions of impropriety or wrongdoing. The question that this Premier and acting Treasurer must answer to the people of Queensland today is this: why has he failed in his responsibilities to apply sections 44 and 48 of the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998? That legislation provides an opportunity for the Governor in Council to suspend or cancel the licence to Gocorp without the taxpayers of Queensland being exposed to compensation and, indeed, without the State of Queensland being subjected to legal challenge in the courts. Indeed, section 59 of the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act states—

"Decisions about interactive gambling licence not to be justiciable.

59.(1) A decision of the Governor in Council or Minister made, or appearing to be made, under this Act about an interactive gambling licence, a person with an interest or potential interest in an interactive gambling licence, the authorisation (or revocation of the authorisation) of an interactive game or the approval (or cancellation of the approval) of an exemption scheme—

(a) is final and conclusive; and

- (b) cannot be challenged, appealed against, reviewed, quashed, set aside, or called in question in another way, under the Judicial Review Act 1991 or otherwise (whether by the Supreme Court, another court, a tribunal or another entity); and
- (c) is not subject to any writ or order of the Supreme Court, another court, a tribunal or another entity on any ground."

If the acting Treasurer applied his legal responsibilities under the Act as it now exists, the Deputy Speaker of this place would not be able to challenge that decision in the Supreme Court. There would not be a question of compensation. It raises the very interesting question as to whether the Premier and acting Treasurer is incompetent or corrupt. He can take his choice. Quite simply, if legislation is introduced into this place that retrospectively confirms the licence to Gocorp minus the three Labor mates who we know about but including whoever else may be in there, then in my view that is an act of potential political corruption by this Premier and acting Treasurer, ahead of investigations by the Criminal Justice Commission and by the Auditor-General.

The Premier might like to explain his negligence in not enforcing the provisions of section 44(1) of the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act in the two weeks that he has been acting Treasurer. It states—

"Each of the following is a ground for suspending or cancelling an interactive gambling licence—

- (a) the licensed provider is not, or is no longer, a suitable person to hold an interactive gambling licence;
- (b) a business or executive associate of the licensed provider is not, or is no longer, a suitable person to be associated with a licensed provider's operations;
- (c) the licensed provider has been convicted of an offence against this Act, a gaming Act or a corresponding law;
- (d) the licensed provider has been convicted of an indictable offence;
- (e) the licensed provider has contravened a condition of the interactive gambling licence;
- (f) the licensed provider has contravened a provision of this Act or a corresponding law (being a provision a contravention of which does not constitute an offence);
- (g) the licensed provider has failed to discharge financial commitments for the licensed provider's operations;
- (h) the licensed provider is bankrupt, has compounded with creditors or otherwise taken, or applied to take, advantage of any law about bankruptcy;
- (i) the licensed provider is affected by control action under the Corporation's Law; or"—

significantly—

"(j) the interactive gambling licence was obtained by a materially false or misleading representation or in some other improper way."

Bearing in mind that we are being told that this legislation is necessary to deal with the Gocorp scandal, I point out that section 48 reads—

"Immediate suspension

The Minister may suspend an interactive gambling licence immediately if the Minister believes—

- (a) a ground exists to suspend or cancel the licence; and
- (b) the circumstances are so extraordinary that it is imperative to suspend the licence immediately to ensure—
  - (i) the public interest is not affected in an adverse and material way; or
  - (ii) the integrity of the conduct of interactive games by the licensed provider is not jeopardised in a material way."

What we have is legislation that is not justified. What we have before the House is a proposal to protect those who have already been caught out. What we have is a scandal that is unfolding day by day, minute by minute. Another person who apparently snuck through the probity audit runs a dodgy hotel in the Philippines and apparently has control over a porn site on the net. Where were the probity checks?

Councillor Pisasale's former convictions are a matter of public record. Today in this place the Premier and acting Treasurer refused to answer whether there had been probity checks into other people who may have had difficulty meeting the probity standards. Then the Leader of the Liberal Party in this place was able to disclose further information that indicates that any sort of decent probity check

into this first electronic cyber casino—this licence to make money in Queensland—would have knocked the applicants out of the ring one by one. But what we have had is Government of the mates by the mates for the mates. We have a Premier who said he knew nothing about it—the Sergeant Schultz defence. Then there is the issue of the ministerial directive to the member for Ipswich telling him to get involved in the entire affair and to hold discussions with Mr D'Arcy over Internet gaming on the very day of the official opening of this Parliament.

We then had the extraordinary comments of the acting Treasurer on the John Miller show. After his memory came flooding back, he said that this was all about getting the edge on the rest of the world. He could remember that. Who was going to get the edge on the rest of the world? Three Labor mates! We do not know how many other Labor mates are still left in this smelly affair that threatens the future credibility of the Premier and his Government in this State.

For legislation to be coming before this Parliament today in this manner when the existing legislation already allows the Premier to suspend or cancel this licence is totally improper. This legislation is being introduced and rushed through this Parliament when it may well, for all we know, subvert inquiries that the Auditor-General or the Criminal Justice Commission may be conducting into this issue and the subsequent recommendations that may be handed to the Parliament. That is a totally improper act by a totally improper Premier. This is a totally improper piece of legislation from a Government that has thrown all propriety, ethics, common decency and standards into the rubbish bin. This is a Government that has redefined cronyism.

Let us not underestimate the scale of the deceit and the extent of the financial windfall that the three Labor mates so far identified— and those Labor mates whom we do not know about yet—nearly got away with. We had the admission from Councillor Pisasale that he might be prepared to get rid of his interest in Gocorp for about \$1.2m or \$1.5m. He showed that he was a real Labor battler. He said, "I reckon I could have got in excess of \$20m." We know the game plan. It was to get the licence, to organise the public float as soon as possible and to make out of the signature of the stood aside Treasurer tens of millions of dollars.

The action of this Premier and acting Treasurer today confirms the stench of corruption in respect of this Government's handling of this affair. Nothing the member for Brisbane Central has done from day one in this exercise has been done without his being forced into a corner. He said he knew nothing about it. It has been revealed that he knew about it. He said that he gave no directions to anyone in respect of this issue. He directed the Treasurer to become involved. He said that the Treasurer need not and should not stand aside. The Treasurer was forced to stand aside.

**Mr HAMILL:** I rise to a point of order. The claim of the Leader of the Opposition is untrue, false and offensive, and I ask him to withdraw it. I stood aside of my own accord.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will withdraw.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** Mr Speaker, why would anyone believe anything the member for Ipswich says?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will withdraw.

**Mr HAMILL:** I rise to a point of order. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that offensive remark as well.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** If the honourable member under investigation is so touchy, I will withdraw the particular comment that he finds offensive. I would make the point that the honourable member announced his resignation the night after the Independent member for Nicklin called for his resignation.

**Mr HAMILL:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member continues to mislead the House and misrepresent me. I have not resigned. I ask him to withdraw that statement.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Will the Leader of the Opposition withdraw?

**Mr BORBIDGE:** For the benefit of the record, I point out that the honourable member for Ipswich, currently under investigation, stood aside after the member for Nicklin said he should. That is the fact—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ipswich asked the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** If the honourable member finds anything else I said offensive, I withdraw it. But the fact is that the honourable member for Nicklin said that he should stand aside after the Premier said that he need not. Of course, the honourable member then stood aside. Another backflip! Then we had the backflips in respect of the Deputy Speaker. The member for Brisbane Central said that he could not interfere in terms of the Deputy Speaker being removed or stood aside. Then he came out and said that he might have to move a motion in the Parliament if the Deputy Speaker did not stand aside. In another backflip, the member for Brisbane Central said that he could not stop him from going to Trinidad and Tobago. He knew all along that he could do so by asking me to withdraw the pair.

The other day we had the incredible backflip when he was pushed into another corner in respect of the pending privatisation of the TAB. Labor crony and State treasurer John Bird sits on the board of

the TAB and also advises Labor Holdings on what it should be investing in—presumably its share portfolio. We said that Mr Bird should not be there and that, if the Premier, Mr Beattie, was fair dinkum, he would be legislating to make sure that Labor investment companies could not purchase shares in the TAB. But then the member for Brisbane Central, the acting Treasurer, said that that would be illegal. Yesterday, in another backflip, he reversed his decision and apparently in the legislation it will now be illegal for Labor members and companies to purchase shares in the TAB—at least in the initial float. Do members not love that qualifier, "at least in the initial float"? We have the incredible situation whereby the State treasurer of the Labor Party continues to sit on the TAB board during the course of its privatisation.

Sitting suspended from 1 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** This morning if the acting Treasurer had been open, honest and accountable, he could have allayed some of our concerns over this particular scandal. He had the opportunity to tell us why he had failed to exercise his powers under sections 44 and 48 of the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act of 1998. He had the opportunity to tell the Parliament whether he or the member for Ipswich issued any instructions to the Under Treasurer, the Deputy Under Treasurer or the Director of the Office of Gaming Regulation, and he failed to do so. He had the opportunity to indicate how Mr Rodney Hegarty was permitted to be ticked off as a suitable person when he was the operator of a sleazy Philippines based hotel. He could not tell us.

The acting Treasurer had the opportunity to tell the Parliament about the briefing given by Treasurer Hamill at the Atherton Cabinet meeting on 26 July. Again, he refused to tell us. He had the opportunity to advise the House during the period after he came to power until 27 July 1999 whether he or anyone in his office had any contact whatsoever with any of the concerned persons. Again, he refused to answer. He was given the opportunity to advise the House whether any other person associated with the Gocorp application for an Internet casino licence was having difficulty with the probity process. Again, he declined to answer. He declined to answer when he became aware of Mr Mick Dittman's interest in Navari Pty Ltd.

The Premier—the acting Treasurer—had every opportunity in this Parliament today to allay some of the concerns that are being expressed not only on this side of the House but also in the wider community as well. He was not open, he was not accountable, and it is becoming increasingly clear that the only time we will see this Premier telling the full truth—everything he knows—is if he is subjected to questioning and cross-examination at a public hearing in terms of a Criminal Justice Commission investigation. This particular exercise this afternoon to suspend Standing Orders to pass this dodgy legislation is a further indictment that this Premier and this Government have corrupted their mandate.

## Second Reading

**Hon. R. E. BORBIDGE** (Surfers Paradise—NPA) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.04 p.m.): The legislation before the Parliament is a sham. It is a stunt. It is unnecessary. It is improper in so far as it relates to Internet gambling interests while inquiries that could well contradict its intent are under way.

I will make a few statements of fact. There was no requirement whatsoever for the stood aside Treasurer to grant a licence, conditional or otherwise, to any entity, even if the entity satisfied all requirements of the Act—see section 32(2). In fact, he had an unfettered ability to not grant a licence—also section 32(2). Given that the licence was issued, the Queensland Treasurer has had and has today a variety of remedies of the sort now the subject of redundant legislation in the House via the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, for example: powerful rights to vary the conditions of a licence, section 39; suspend or cancel a licence, sections 44 and 48; direct rectifications, section 50; get reports about a person's criminal history, section 58. Section 59, detailing the fact that no decision by a Minister under the Act is justiciable, is also relevant.

It will take more than two lines of a so-called legal opinion of 15 pages, presented to this Parliament today by the cover-up Premier of Queensland, to convince the Opposition that this legislation is in any way necessary or warranted, that it is anything but improper and that it does anything but confirm the highly questionable issuing of a licence to Gocorp ahead of the results of the investigations of the Criminal Justice Commission and the Auditor-General.

This Bill, as anybody who has followed the net bet fiasco of recent weeks knows, is simply a theatrical facade to try to plaster over a crack in the Premier's image. That is all it is. It is doomed to failure. It is doomed to failure because what can be demonstrated in this debate is that what has been cracked in relation to the Premier's handling of this issue is not just his image. What has been cracked beyond repair is the Premier's facade of competence and his facade of character. In that sense this legislation, as the latest net bet stunt is rolled out by the circus clown who leads the Government opposite, is totally in step with every other blind and panic-stricken stride he has taken along this road.

Let us look at what has happened from the point of view of the Premier. He has consistently pleaded the Sergeant Schultz defence: he knows nothing. It is in tatters. Let us look at the Premier's

behaviour. Has he been doing the right thing? He has not. He has been doing everything but the right thing. He has been doing the panicky thing, the reactionary thing, the forced thing, the expedient thing, the sacrificial thing and the media thing. Above all, he has been doing the "save the Premier" thing.

Let us go through some of these stunts and some of these antics. Let us deal first with the big one: the claim from the Premier and acting Treasurer that until the day before the publication of the first news item on this matter on 27 July this year he had no really substantive knowledge about what was going on in the net bet affair, that he was on all substantive matters in relation to it an ingenué.

What the Premier repeatedly put to the people of Queensland was that before Monday, 26 July 1999 the extent of his knowledge on the interest of the member for Woodridge in Internet gambling flowed from the fact that the member had lobbied the previous Government and that he had had one brief discussion with the member at some time when Labor was in Opposition but he could not remember the details. Beyond that, he long maintained that he had no meaningful knowledge, but of course he did. He has now admitted as much. I refer to two crucial pieces of evidence. The first is the official memorandum signed by the Premier's chief of staff and addressed to the chief of staff in the office of the Treasurer, dated 29 July 1998. It states—

"The Premier has requested that you urgently have an appropriate staff member discuss Internet gambling with Bill D'Arcy MLA, who has raised some concerns with him."

End of memorandum.

What a damning indication of the personal involvement of the Premier in this affair from the very day he achieved the support of this House on 29 July last year—a personal involvement that was there just over 12 months ago! It means that one of the Premier's first acts—after his confirmation in Government by this House—was to engage the interest of the member for Woodridge in relation to his interest in getting an edge on the rest of the world via an Internet gambling licence from the Government of Queensland. That was one of his very first actions.

The Premier requested urgent action from the Treasurer's office in relation to discussing the concerns of the member for Woodridge in relation to Internet gambling. And of course, ever since that memo was released by the Premier, he has been trying to disown it. Of course, we still do not know what was in the first two pages of the fax. He said that he cannot remember whether Mr D'Arcy approached him personally with his concerns or whether the approach was made to a staff member. He has claimed that memos of this sort from his office are a dime a dozen, that in response to yet another deputation he did not have the time or the inclination to deal with it was just the pro forma flick pass from the Premier's office to a Minister that is apparently so very common in his office.

That makes the second piece of evidence very interesting. I refer to the transcript of one of the most extraordinary radio interviews the Premier has ever given. And that is a mouthful in itself! The interview I refer to is an interview with Mr John Miller of 4BC on the morning of 6 August. Foremost, it indicates a significant improvement—a potentially crucial and damning improvement—in the Premier's recollections of the extent of his previous knowledge of the member for Woodridge's interest in Internet gambling. There are two relevant sections in the transcript. The first is quite garbled—in fact, barely lucid—but the key word is there. It states—

"Well, you see, John, the point with all this is that when we were in Opposition ... and I've said this publicly, so there's no surprise about all this ... Bill D'Arcy sat next to me in a division. He mentioned that he was applying ... that he was talking to the then Government ... that's Mr Borbidge, that's Dr Watson, that's Joan Sheldon, that's Bob Harper ... he mentioned that he was, in fact, talking to them about it. In a brief conversation I had with him I expressed my concern that he was talking to the then Government about the issue. The next time I heard about this was on Monday."

There are three big issues in that quotation. The first is that the Premier, when he was in Opposition, knew that the member for Woodridge was applying to the previous Government for an Internet gambling licence. The second is that he expressed his concern about that. And the third is the repeat of the claim by the Premier that the first he knew about the matter was "Monday", which is a curious claim to make almost 24 hours after he had himself released a memo which shows that he knew about the currency of Mr D'Arcy's interest on 29 July 1998, more than a year ago!

There is another crucial statement by the Premier in his interview with Mr Miller. The Premier said this in response to a question from Mr Miller as to whether Bill D'Arcy had ever asked the Premier whether Queensland was "missing the boat on the casino licensing". This is the Premier's response verbatim—

"If I recall correctly, he was talking about this happening and, you know, he wanted to get the edge on, you know, the rest of the world or whatever. I don't remember the detail now."

He does not remember the detail. But on 6 August 1999, he told us two crucial details in relation to his recollection of these matters. He knew some time during his time in Opposition that Mr D'Arcy had an

interest in an Internet gambling licence—at the level of applying to the previous Government—and he knew that what Mr D'Arcy sought, when they personally discussed the matter, was his achievement of "the edge on ... the rest of the world"—the edge on the rest of the world! And that is to the nub, because that is just what the member for Woodridge was seeking. Correspondence that we have released establishes that. And we rejected that lobbying from the member for Woodridge out of hand.

But what is important here is the corroboration that the Premier's memory is accurate. He knew, not only in July 1999 when he caused the memo to be sent to the Treasurer's office seeking urgent attention to Mr D'Arcy's concerns, precisely what the member for Woodridge was on about. He knew about it much, much earlier. He knew the crucial aspects of Mr D'Arcy's ambitions from his days in Opposition, when it "concerned" him. And those revelations then make an absolute nonsense of the attempts by the Premier to wriggle out of the import of other related revelations in other parts of his interview with Mr Miller.

The Premier implied in that interview, for instance, that there were two things which helped maintain the facade that he somehow remained an ingenu in the process, even after sending the memo last year. The first was that, attached to the memorandum, was a media transcript which established that the Tasmanian Government was close to awarding an Internet gambling licence. What the Premier sought to establish with Mr Miller was along the lines of: what could a Tasmanian Internet licence conceivably have to do with Queensland? And of course the Premier answered that himself elsewhere in the interview. He admitted that he knew that what Mr D'Arcy sought was "the edge ... on the rest of the world".

So of course Mr D'Arcy was going to be concerned about developments in Tasmania. The granting of an Internet gambling licence in Tasmania would mean that his chance of being part of a company that achieved the edge on the rest of the world via an Internet gambling licence from the Queensland jurisdiction was under threat. Far from getting the Premier away from the heat, the Tasmanian issue actually gets him in deeper. I appreciate that the Premier is trying to play dumb, but I do not think any reasonable person believes that he is so dumb that he was incapable—either then or now—of appreciating the significance of the Tasmanian issue in the context of the successful Queensland application.

The Premier's second claim to ignorance is as unconvincing. He implied to Mr Miller that there could not have been a connection between his direction to the Treasurer's office re the member for Woodridge and the subsequent granting of an Internet gambling licence to a company in which the member for Woodridge held an interest, because there was a significant time lapse between the two events. The memorandum directing urgent attention to the member for Woodridge's concerns was sent to the Treasurer's office in July 1998, and the application for the licence was not made by the relevant company until October 1998. But there is an obvious explanation for that, and the Premier—if he reads his own press releases and remembers what he says at press conferences—knows it as well as the rest of us. The enabling legislation which created the opportunity for applications to be made for Internet gambling licences was not proclaimed until October 1998.

And as if that is not enough, relevant questions emanating from the Premier's memo do not end there. In fact, that is really only the beginning of the potential real meaning of that extraordinary little document. When the Premier himself released it—no doubt as part of his crash-through or crash approach to the issue—it told us a very interesting thing. It told us—via the fax details at the top of the pages—that it came back to the Premier's office, not from the former Treasurer's office, or the stood-aside Treasurer's office, to which it was originally sent, but it arrived in the Premier's office at 6.04 p.m. on 4 August 1999 from the office of the executive director of the Office of Gaming Regulation. It arrived back in the Premier's office from that very office in the Treasury, that public sector office which has responsibility for the processing of applications for Internet gambling licences. How did it get there, of all places? What was it doing there?

We have had the former Treasurer, and now the current acting Treasurer, swearing—constantly—that there was absolutely no political interference whatsoever in this process. We have had the stood-aside Treasurer shovelling—hurling—responsibility for that decision down the throats of some of his most senior public servants, including the Under Treasurer, despite the clear reality that the buck stops at the Treasurer's desk. The legislation makes that very clear. How then did a memorandum from the Premier to the Treasurer for the attention and action of a ministerial staffer get into the public sector? And what was attached to it? It would have been a virtually senseless piece of paper, arriving in the Office of Gaming Regulation without an explanatory attachment. Where is the explanatory attachment? Or who made the explanatory phone call or sent the explanatory email? And what was said?

Where are pages 1 and 2 of the transmission from the Office of Gaming Regulation to the Premier's office at 6.04 p.m. on 4 August 1999? We have the memorandum, which is page 3 of the transmission. We have the attachment, namely the annotated media transcript concerning the Tasmanian licence, which was page 4 of the transmission. But we do not have page 1 and we do not

have page 2. What do they say? Where are they? Page 1 may well be a header sheet. Let us see it. What does page 2 say?

I am told that the Premier's office claims that both have been misplaced. How convenient! Have they also been misplaced in the Office of Gaming Regulation from whence they were faxed? Has the Premier's office lost the copies and has the Office of Gaming Regulation lost the originals? Does anyone really expect people to believe that? If the Government wants to clear this up, I say to the Premier and acting Treasurer, "Distribute pages 1 and 2 today."

**Dr Watson:** It may be difficult. They have gone through the shredder.

**Mr BORBIDGE:** It may be difficult because they have gone through the shredder, as the member for Moggill says. Before we move on to other interesting issues concerning the performance of the Premier and other senior members of the Government in this saga, there is one more observation I want to make. I refer briefly to the note at the conclusion of the transcript concerning the then current developments in Tasmania that was attached to the memorandum. The notation is from Brad to Bill. The "Bill" is obviously Bill D'Arcy. The transcript is marked to his attention. "Brad" is no doubt Brad McCosker, who is the cyberspace expert for Gocorp. His note reads—

"This is what I told all of you would happen. When will they wake up?"

What Brad was doubtless referring to was the significance of the potential for an Internet licence to be issued in Tasmania in relation to the negative impact on the commercial benefit which Gocorp hoped to achieve via its plans for the first Internet gambling licence in Australia to go to it out of the Queensland jurisdiction. The Premier and acting Treasurer may still protest—and doubtless he will—but he is in this, and he is in this up to his neck.

He can start to explain where missing pages 1 and 2 of the fax went to—how, all of a sudden, they were lost. No-one believes that. No-one believes the Premier any more on this issue because time and time again we have seen his inconsistencies. We have seen his backflips. We have seen his double standards. We have seen his political opportunism. But we have not seen his honesty. We have not seen his integrity. We have not seen his decency. We have not seen his much publicised ministerial standards. What we see in this Parliament today is a travesty. This will compound the particular controversy rather than fix it. This will ensure that the licence that need not have been issued under the Act remains issued to Gocorp.

After what has happened, any assurances given by the Premier are totally meaningless. He knows that, as acting Treasurer for two weeks, he has had the executive ability under the statutes of this Parliament—under the law of Queensland—to suspend Gocorp's licence pending the outcome of the investigations by the Auditor-General and the Criminal Justice Commission.

---