

22 July 2003

Native Vegetation Inquiry
Productivity Commission
LB2 Collins Street East
MELBOURNE VIC 8003

Dear Sir/Madam,

Attached is EEMAG's supplementary submission to our submission of 4 July 2003 and faxed addendum of 7 July 2002. We respectfully request all this additional information be considered under "Mining Lease Renewal" on Page 11 of our submission where it deals with QCL's EMOS being accepted for lease renewal before their Application was lodged, together with our fax of 7 July.

FOI of a Ministerial Memo of 30 October 1995 to the Department of Business, Industry and Regional Development., refer Page 3, ISSUES quote: "The key issue facing QCL to obtain approval for the investment from its parent Board which meets in Switzerland to consider the matter this Friday, 3 November 1995, is that the project be world cost competitive."

"These relate to:

(a).....

(e) renewal of East End mining leases

(f) issuing of all approval processes by January 1996"

"An interdepartmental committee chaired by the Office of Major Projects, in the Premier's Department has been negotiating with QCL on these matters. [Officer] is the Department's representative on this Committee."

"Basic agreements have been reached on all of the above matters excepting for electricity tariffs." End of quote.

Page 4 states, "These issues were considered by Cabinet last week (23 October 1995) in Submission No. 04763. (*FOI Ministerial Memo to DBIRD 30 October 1995 Attachment 120.*)

Attached is FOI of a letter from QCL to DME dated 10 December, 1996, Page 2, quote:

"QCL also notes that many of the special conditions attached to the existing licence are now redundant through the implementation of the EMOS and POP, or obsolete through legislative change. We, therefore, request an indicative statement of conditions your Department would seek for the renewed leases." End of quote.

(*FOI of Letter from QCL to DME dated 10 December 1996 Attachment 121.*)

A DME letter to EEMAG of 03 November 1998 states quote “ However, I have conceded to EEMAG’s demand to retain the special conditions, even though the duplication serves no purpose and is open to legal challenge.” End of quote. (*Letter from DME dated 03 November 1998 available.*)

Why would retention of QCL’s Special Conditions be open to legal challenge? Did DME agree to discontinue QCL’s special conditions for lease renewal?

We request Attachment **121** - FOI of 10.12.96, and the DME letter of 3/11/98 also be considered with “DNR&M advised they had no intention to review any component of QCL’s IAS” on Page 17 after paragraph 5, and with “EEMAG’s requests for amendments to Mining Lease Conditions”, on Page 59 of our original submission.

Thanking you,

Yours sincerely,

Heather Lucke
Secretary

Attached 6 pages.