

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 4 APRIL 1978**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## TUESDAY, 4 APRIL 1978

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. J. E. H. Houghton, Redcliffe) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

#### Proclamations under—

- Metric Conversion Act 1972.
- Diseases in Plants Act 1929–1972.
- Meat Industry Act Amendment Act 1977.
- Wheat Delivery Quotas Act 1970–1974.
- Queensland Marine Act 1958–1975.
- Forestry Act 1959–1976.

#### Orders in Council under—

- Audit Acts Amendment Act 1926–1971.
- Police Act 1937–1977.
- Explosives Act 1952–1975.
- Apprenticeship Act 1964–1974.
- Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act 1959–1974.
- The City of Brisbane Market Acts, 1960 to 1967.
- Dairy Products Stabilisation Act 1933–1972.
- Foot and Mouth Disease Expenses and Compensation Fund Act 1958–1969.
- Meat Industry Act 1965–1977.
- Primary Producers' Co-operative Associations Act 1923–1974.
- Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926–1976.
- Stock Act 1915–1976.
- Sugar Experiment Stations Act 1900–1976.
- Wheat Pool Act 1920–1972.
- Harbours Act 1955–1976.
- Port of Brisbane Authority Act 1976.
- Fisheries Act 1976.
- Water Act 1926–1976.
- River Improvement Trust Act 1940–1977.
- Irrigation Act 1922–1977.
- Forestry Act 1959–1976.
- Architects' Act 1962–1971.
- Companies Act 1961–1975.
- The Supreme Court Act of 1921.

#### Regulations under—

- Police Act 1937–1977.
- Inspection of Machinery Act 1951–1974.
- Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act 1959–1974.
- Agricultural Standards Act 1952–1972.

The Banana Industry Protection Acts, 1929 to 1937.

Brands Act 1915–1975.

The Drought Relief to Primary Producers Acts, 1940 to 1961.

Foot and Mouth Disease Expenses and Compensation Fund Act 1958–1969.

The Fruit Marketing Organisation Acts, 1923 to 1964.

Hen Quotas Act 1973.

Meat Industry Act 1965–1977.

Milk Supply Act 1977.

Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act 1926–1976.

Stock Act 1915–1976.

Tobacco Industry Stabilisation Act 1965–1972.

Wheat Pool Act 1920–1972.

Queensland Marine Act 1958–1975.

Fisheries Act 1976.

The Canals Acts, 1958 to 1960.

The Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Acts, 1944 to 1967.

Main Roads Act 1920–1976.

State Housing Act 1945–1974.

Valuation of Land Act 1944–1977.

By-laws under the Harbours Act 1955–1976.

Notifications under The Soil Conservation Act of 1965.

#### Reports—

Timber Research and Development Advisory Council of South and Central Queensland, for 1976–77.

Perpetual Trustees Australia Limited, for the year ended 30 June 1977.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

#### REPORT, "FAMILIES AND SOCIAL SERVICES IN AUSTRALIA"

**Hon. J. D. HERBERT** (Sherwood—Minister for Welfare) (11.9 a.m.): Mr. Speaker, for the information of honourable members, I present a report entitled, "Families and Social Services in Australia".

The report is the result of the work of a committee established by the former Social Welfare Commission and continued after its abolition and reported to the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security, Senator the Honourable Margaret Guilfoyle.

Perhaps I should say a little of the history of the committee which prepared the report. With the abolition of the Social Welfare Commission, it appeared that the particular committee compiling the report would also be abolished. I had been advised that the work being done by the committee was of

value and I think this report will show that to be the case. Further, I consider it to be wasteful for a committee which had been meeting for approximately two years to disappear because of administrative reorganisation when it was within six months of completing its task.

The question of the future of the committee came before the conference of the Council of Social Welfare Ministers and I was pleased to move that the committee be allowed to complete its task and report in the first place to the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security. The report was then to be shared with State Ministers responsible for welfare, as in fact it was, prior to the tabling of it in the Commonwealth Parliament. I have presented the report to Cabinet and it is presently being studied by a committee of officers.

This report devotes much of its content to an examination of the characteristics of families in Australia, noting the demographic statistics and trends, the high proportion of one-parent families and the high proportion also of Australian families who come from a variety of cultural backgrounds. Aspects of the report discuss the needs of families for assistance during the phases of family development through to the point at which children leave home and the family comprises adult members only.

In the compilation of the report, an examination was carried out of the patterns of welfare services provided by State Governments, by non-government agencies and by the Commonwealth of Australia. The study of welfare services was carried out with the support and co-operation of State Government departments.

The report concludes by making some recommendations about possible changes in approaches to providing services for families, both in respect of Commonwealth activities and in respect of the service providers at State and community level.

I consider that this is a report of some value because of its attention to the needs of families in Australia today and to the extent to which government and community agencies can assist in meeting those needs. It is also an important report because it was produced as a co-operative venture between the Commonwealth Government, State Governments and the community.

The committee which has produced the report was chaired by Mrs. Marie Coleman, formerly the Chairman of the Social Welfare Commission and now the Director of the Office of Child Care. The members of the committee at the time of finalisation of the report were:

Mr. Spencer Colliver, First Assistant Director-General, Department of Social Security.

Mr. Chris Creswell, Attorney-General's Department.

Miss Lado Sybaczynskij, Department of Health, and the Hospitals and Health Services Commission.

Mr. Robert Plummer, Director, Department of Children's Services, Queensland.

Mr. Keith Maine, Director, Department for Community Welfare, Western Australia.

Miss Valerie Douglas, Royal District Nursing Service, Melbourne.

The report was discussed last year at a special meeting of State Ministers for social welfare, which I attended and which was also attended by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security and a representative of the Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. In the main, the State Ministers welcomed and endorsed the report. Ministers agreed that they would sponsor regular national conferences on families and social welfare services in Australia, and the first of these is now in planning.

In her tabling statement, the Commonwealth Minister commented that copies of the report will be deposited in State public libraries and State parliamentary libraries and that copies will be available through the normal Commonwealth Government Publishing Service outlets to interested members of the community.

I table the report and commend it to the House.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid a copy of the report on the table.*

#### CANCER THERAPIST, MILAN BRYCH

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Minister for Health) (11.13 a.m.): Over the past 18 months, and especially over the past few days, there has been a great deal of controversy, discussion and debate regarding the treatment programme allegedly provided by Milan Brych of the Cook Islands. This discussion has occurred in the community, in the medical and other professions and within the media, with such widespread publicity for claims and counter-claims that there is great confusion in the minds of many people. Such confusion could well be adding to the trauma experienced by patients, especially those suffering from malignancy, and also by relatives of such patients.

Milan Brych was until 1976 a resident of New Zealand. The details of his professional activities in that country have been fully investigated and are well documented. For some of his period in New Zealand he practised as a medical practitioner; but finally, as a result of serious charges laid against him, the Medical Council of New Zealand, in November 1974, requested the Supreme Court of New Zealand to erase Brych's name from the medical register.

Neither the New Zealand Government nor the medical profession of New Zealand has the responsibility for registration or deregistration. This responsibility is solely that of the New Zealand Medical Council set up and appointed according to an Act of the New Zealand Government which also governs its functions and procedures for operation. This function includes the fitness and ability

of a person to practise medicine in that country. Under the same Act, Milan Brych had the right of appeal against the decision of the Registration Council to a legally constituted court of appeal. I wish to place on record in this Parliament that Milan Brych lodged his appeal against the decision of deregistration but later withdrew his appeal and, by so doing, accepted the decision of the Medical Registration Council. He left New Zealand and went to the Cook Islands, and his statement that he was deregistered for only 20 hours is a complete fallacy.

Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to table the documents released by the New Zealand Medical Registration Council and other documents for the information of honourable members. (Leave granted.)

I will therefore leave it to members and the community to make their own judgments on that matter and those proceedings.

To my mind, Milan Brych should have exercised his right of appeal, as any aggrieved person believing his innocence would do, but the decision to withdraw his appeal was made by that man, and that man alone. It is important to note that Milan Brych recently stated on a Brisbane television channel that he actually tendered his resignation from the registration council as this is necessary by law for any person leaving the country in which he practises. This is, of course, not in accordance with the facts, as they exist, and is untrue, and it is also not necessary for registered practitioners to resign when departing from their country of normal residence to live or practise elsewhere.

Since that time, Milan Brych has been registered in the Cook Islands despite an initial decision by the medical board of that country not to register him, according to the legislation existing at that time. But Milan Brych is now registered in the Cook Islands following specific changes in the legislation to allow him specifically to be registered.

Because of a number of requests from people in Queensland and because of the controversy surrounding Milan Brych, I made numerous inquiries in my position as Minister for Health concerning his treatment regimes, the results of his treatment and the basis of his alleged successful remissions. I wrote to Brych on 16 July 1977, and again in February 1978, requesting details of his treatment programmes and any other information. I table copies of those letters for the information of honourable members.

I have not received any acknowledgement or reply to my correspondence.

I also interviewed two patients after their return from the Cook Islands. Both could give no information as to the form of treatment except to say that they received courses of injections and some tablets.

The Queensland Cancer Fund offered to bear the costs of sending an independent team of experts, nominated by me as Minister for Health, to the Cook Islands with the single aim to try to discover if Milan Brych did have a possible further method of management of malignant disease. This offer had only one condition—that co-operation be given by Milan Brych. I publicly supported the fund's proposal, but to this date the offer has not been accepted. I also supported moves announced recently by the Federal Minister for Health, the Honourable Ralph Hunt, in his Press statement. I table a copy of that Press statement and a copy of a letter forwarded to Milan Brych by Mr. Hunt.

I also wrote to relatives of two patients allegedly treated by Milan Brych asking if they would seek from this man details of treatment offered and given. This attempt has also been unsuccessful.

As well as this, I have made numerous public statements requesting information from Milan Brych, with the assurance that if evaluation proved optimistic I would be prepared to have medical practitioners, expert in the field of malignancy, conduct a treatment regime and programme under proper assessment and evaluation methods.

The Premier, in his capacity as a private citizen, and because of his interest in the welfare of people with malignant disease, invited Milan Brych to Queensland. The Queensland Government, as far as I am aware, and certainly my own department, have not been involved in any arrangements. Milan Brych arrived on a visitor's visa and, according to the Federal Minister for Immigration, Mr. McKellar, had no restrictions at all placed upon him. The original restrictions signed by Milan Brych were cancelled following requests from the Queensland Premier. It is therefore absolutely inaccurate and untrue for Milan Brych to say, as he did on television, that, because of restrictions placed upon him by the Federal Government, he would not answer questions from the medical people who met him.

I table the transcript of Milan Brych's statement on the Channel 7 news and a copy of the Press release received from the Federal Minister for Immigration, Mr. McKellar, released last night, confirming my statement that no restrictions were placed upon this man.

At the request of the Premier, I met Dr. Warren Hastings, a young Melbourne general practitioner, who has acted as the contact man for the Premier in his discussions and invitation to Milan Brych. This meeting occurred on Wednesday morning, 29 March, in the office of the Premier's Press Secretary in the Executive Building. At the Premier's request, Dr. P. R. Patrick, Director-General of Health and Medical Services, attended with me. The Premier was not present at that meeting. Dr. Hastings showed us a three-page letter giving vague details of

Milan Brych but absolutely no specific details on his treatment. He also indicated that Brych would be arriving on Thursday, 30 March, and that Milan Brych would answer any questions placed before him regarding any aspects of his practice, his procedures, and his treatment.

Dr. Hastings made a particular point in the discussion that, where he could not give answers to questions asked by the Director-General or me, such questions should be asked of Milan Brych. Dr. Hastings also advised that Milan Brych had a method of blood analysis carried out in a sophisticated laboratory in the Cook Islands which Dr. Hastings had claimed to have seen. This analysis involved the identification of malignancy in a patient and the type of malignancy in such patient, even though no details of the patient's history were available to Brych.

I advised Dr. Hastings that this would be a remarkable breakthrough in medical science, as this could be used as a screening procedure for the whole community to detect early and, thus, completely treatable and curable malignancy. Dr. Hastings asked me to discuss this with Brych. He also indicated that Brych would be happy to discuss the preparation of specific serum and solutions for patients as a result of blood scans and tests on the patient's serum and, as well, that he would willingly and fully discuss his therapy.

Dr. Hastings submitted to me the names of some people he wished to be present for the discussion. These people were—

Dr. C. A. C. Leggett, a Brisbane surgeon.

Dr. F. Hunt, a Brisbane pathologist.

Dr. K. Donald, a Brisbane pathologist and presently Director of Pathology at Royal Brisbane Hospital.

Dr. M. Murdoch, general practitioner and President of the Queensland Branch of the General Practitioners Society.

Mr. Russell Collins, senior laboratory technologist at the Royal Brisbane Hospital Pathology Department.

I fully endorsed these invitations, and I arranged for these people to be available for 7.30 p.m. on the Thursday evening, 30 March 1978, in the Premier's room.

I indicated to Dr. Hastings that the Premier had agreed with a list of names of other doctors for the purpose of discussion when Milan Brych was to arrive prior to the Premier's visit overseas. I indicated to Dr. Hastings that I felt these people should also attend. Dr. Hastings agreed, and in fact said that he would be pleased for anyone to meet with Brych for discussion. I then arranged for the following additional people to be present:—

Professor Douglas Gordon, Emeritus professor of Social and Preventive Medicine at University of Queensland.

Professor Brian Emmerson, Professor of Medicine at Queensland University.

Professor R. Doherty, Professor of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Queensland, and formerly the Director of the Queensland Institute of Medical Research.

Dr. Keith Mowatt, Director of the Queensland Radium Institute.

Dr. Harry McKenna, a Brisbane pathologist.

Dr. Daniel Hart, a Brisbane ophthalmologist and President of the Queensland Branch of the Australian Medical Association.

Dr. Trevor Olsen, a Brisbane physician specialising in chemotherapy for malignant disease.

Dr. William Halliday, an immunologist from the University of Queensland.

As well, I requested that Dr. P. R. Patrick, the Director-General of Health and Medical Services, and Dr. P. G. Livingstone, the Deputy Director-General of Health and Medical Services, be present to meet Milan Brych.

I approached the Acting Vice-Chancellor of the University of Queensland, Professor Davies, and asked him to nominate a non-medical person to be present as an independent observer to make certain that the discussions were held in a rational, reasonable and sensible manner. Professor Davies nominated Professor B. Zerner of the Biochemistry Department of the Queensland University, who is also Chairman of the University Research Committee.

Later that day, I was advised by the Premier that the meeting set for the Thursday evening was cancelled, as Brych had been delayed, but that he would arrive next morning and the meeting was set for 4.00 p.m. in the Premier's Department. Dr. Hastings and Mr. Ian Clelland, the President of the Friends of Rarotonga, also were present.

A recording of the meeting was made with the approval of the Premier, Milan Brych, Dr. Hastings and the other people present. Dr. Hastings asked for a transcript of the recording, and I have arranged for this to be forwarded to him today. Milan Brych was invited to address the meeting but said he did not want to do this but would welcome questions. I table a copy of the total transcript of the whole meeting.

The meeting was a great disappointment. All therapeutic and diagnostic procedures, drugs and reagents mentioned by Milan Brych, sometimes extremely vaguely, are known and have been known by Queensland doctors for a long period of time, with the exception of a vague and indefinite but continuous reference to "800 Tumour specific antigens". This is considered to be in current scientific knowledge throughout the whole world an absolute impossibility. When pressed for details, Brych at first refused to give details but, as time proceeded, the answers given by him were conflicting, vague and contradictory.

Brych refused to discuss even simple scientific and technical details and procedures, and he continued to make contradictory statements about the results of his work in New Zealand. He also refused categorically to elaborate upon his methods of acquisition and/or preparation of solutions for patient management.

He was given a most courteous and reasonable but persistent questioning from a group of highly qualified and dedicated people who had only one desire—and that was to try to find some further method to investigate, treat, relieve, and, if possible, cure malignant disease. Some significant factors did emerge.

1. Milan Brych appeared totally incapable of discussing technically or scientifically even the simplest of medical and laboratory techniques. There was no evidence produced to indicate that he has other than the most elementary knowledge of even basic scientific procedures.

2. He stated that he would produce a report of his management of his cancer cases in October 1978. He did not indicate where such a report would be produced. However, in reading previously documented references to Brych's public statements in New Zealand, he has also promised that public reports of his work would be released in 1974, again in 1975 and further in 1977. He has not fulfilled these public assurances, despite his early statements. One can only hope that there will be no further disappointments in October 1978.

3. Milan Brych refused to discuss the preparation of his solutions specific for particular patients and refused to divulge contents of such solutions and, furthermore, would not agree to forward to Queensland samples for analysis.

4. Milan Brych categorically refused to allow me to send people nominated by me to visit the Cook Islands to inspect his facilities and to observe his investigations and management of his patients. Such a procedure, of course, occurs in every hospital throughout the world, where in fact doctors are welcome to observe other practitioners, especially those working in a particular field. Brych was quite definite in his absolute refusal for this normal procedure in medical and hospital practice which occurs every day of the week.

5. Brych assured me that he would make available to me the names of all Queensland patients treated by him and I, as Minister, offered to arrange for follow up of these patients for him to evaluate their progress in Queensland. I look forward to receiving this list of Queensland patients.

6. Brych finally said that he had not come to be questioned but had come at the Premier's invitation to discuss the possibility of a Cancer Symposium. I indicated to Brych, in no uncertain terms, that the Premier and Dr. Hastings had agreed for him to answer questions, and he, in fact, at the beginning of the discussion had said, "You ask me questions".

Mr. Speaker, cancer or malignancy is a common disease destroying the lives of many Queenslanders, Australians and, indeed, citizens of the whole world. As such, it has brought tragedy and sadness to countless families as they observe the signs and symptoms of the spread of malignancy in their loved ones. The aim of the Queensland Government, my aim as Minister for Health, the aim of the medical profession in Queensland and, I am sure, elsewhere in the world, is to give to our patients the very best care possible whether in private practice or within the public hospital system.

In 1976, the latest year for which figures are available, 3,033 persons died from malignant disease in Queensland alone, and deaths will continue to occur unless some further enlightening management evolves. We are improving our survival rates. They are produced continually for evaluation and comment. We are providing more people with remissions from their disease pattern and continually our experts are meeting with others here in Brisbane, throughout Australia and indeed throughout the world exchanging ideas, techniques and methods to try to break through the cancer barrier.

There is no place for secrecy; there is no place for exclusiveness of treatment to those few who can travel to one physician in the world who claims unproven results never published in medical or scientific journals for critical analysis and is prepared to allow them to be shown by personal stories emotionally told by journalists for the patients for whom he claims remission. Brych has produced no evidence whatsoever so far to indicate his treatment has any value at all. No information is available for follow-up or evaluation. Brych has indicated that he may set up a clinic here in Brisbane. His prescription and use of the drugs necessary for such a clinic would depend on his being registered by the Medical Board of Queensland. I table details of the requirements for registration of the Medical Act, passed and amended by this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, from information available to me, from my own observations of this man and from the advice given to me by the Director-General of Health and Medical Services of my department, Dr. Patrick, and also on the advice of the experts in Queensland who attended this meeting, I have to report to this Parliament that Milan Brych has absolutely nothing new to offer to Queenslanders in cancer therapy. In fact, I believe that any little success he may have achieved has been reached by the administration of drugs in an unscientific and often fatal combination, but a combination which, on those occasions where remission has occurred, has brought about spontaneous temporary holding of the disease—which, of course, can occur with any form of management of any malignant disease, even in the terminal phase, even in Brisbane. Medical practitioners

observing such remissions realise they are not necessarily as a result of treatment and never make a claim of success for them.

I am not at all convinced in any way that Milan Brych should be encouraged to establish a clinic in Queensland, nor am I convinced that this man's methods of treatment or results from his treatment are even comparable to methods or results being achieved here or anywhere else in Australia. As well, Mr. Speaker, I regret to advise that I cannot support any encouragement of any person to visit Cook Islands for treatment.

I look forward to Milan Brych keeping his word on matters raised on which he gave an assurance of information, but, on his past performance of such actions, I must admit I have grave doubts that his obligations to which he gave a commitment will ever be met.

Mr. Speaker, it has not been easy for me to take this stand on this important matter. Decision-making is never a simple process and often when emotional involvement is overwhelming, and hope for even minimal success is present, the decision is even more difficult. There will be some people who will be highly critical of my stand and my position, and I understand their criticism of my advice, but I feel it is essential for me as Minister for Health in the State of Queensland to make my position abundantly clear for the benefit of Queenslanders. I hope those who do not accept my advice to this Parliament will be tolerant and understanding and will not use the media or other methods to parade those patients who may have had some response from the therapy used, as this will only further add to the confusion.

Milan Brych is the only man who could convince me, my advisers and indeed the Parliament and the community that he has any method of investigation, treatment or therapy which can change the course of the disease of cancer. It is his responsibility, and a grave responsibility at that, to play an ethical, responsible and necessary role in the sharing of any knowledge he may have or claim to have. If there are those who feel I am being unfair to Milan Brych and wish to protest against my statement, I suggest that they use their same energy and same enthusiasm to convince this man to release details for the benefit of the whole community. Those genuine supporters have a responsibility to try to convince Milan Brych that, if cancer is to be further relieved or progress to be made, it will not be achieved by public debate, by bitter personal abuse or by emotional arguments, but will be made by the simple method of the production of information for critical analysis and evaluation. I am prepared to say that I believe this man's main asset is a near-hypnotic charm, with little or no medical knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, as Minister for Health in Queensland, I am proud of the medical history of this State. I am proud of the dedication of doctors and nurses and other workers in the most demanding, most interesting and yet most intricate profession of all—that of caring for another human being. This is a great privilege, a great responsibility, and no man or woman within these professions must ever take that responsibility or obligation lightly.

I am not interested in proving one person right or wrong, but I am interested in one fact only—to give every man, woman or child the greatest opportunity for the best treatment possible. We in Queensland are indeed fortunate to have the dedication, the ability and the expertise of medical and other personnel in our hospitals and in private practice. We have offered every co-operation towards Milan Brych. If this man has anything more to offer, let him release it now and, if there is even minimal success, then let us honour and praise him accordingly. If, however, he continues his present methods of inaccurate, contradictory statements of little or no value, he must stand totally condemned, and the condemnation must be even stronger and even more ruthless if he continues with his secrecy and vagueness for the doubtful benefit of a select few patients.

Mr. Speaker, all men and women have a right in any modern society to the best medical services possible. In Queensland, there are no financial barriers to such treatment, no matter what the cost of provision of such services. If there is any value at all in what Milan Brych offers, it can be provided in our hospitals; it can be provided in our clinics; it can be provided in our private consulting rooms; it can be provided in our State. The challenge has been made but has not been accepted or proven.

Milan Brych has been given a most courteous and complete opportunity to lead the world if he has anything to offer in therapy. We can do no more towards this man in Queensland. I leave it to honourable members for their own assessment and I am prepared to leave it to history for final analysis of my statement. I have not the slightest fear that the advice I have been given or the observations I have made here this morning will be in any way challenged or found to be on false premises. However, I place it on record that I will be just as willing to make a further statement at any future time if information of any value from this man's treatment is found or produced. The onus therefore rests on Milan Brych to present and demonstrate the details and validity of his treatment. So far he has lamentably failed to accept every opportunity offered to him to do so.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the documents, correspondence, Press statements and transcripts referred to.*

## SITTING DAYS

## SESSIONAL ORDER

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for the dispatch of business at 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in each week, and that on Tuesdays and Thursdays, and after 1 o'clock p.m. on Wednesdays, Government business shall take precedence of all other business.”

Motion agreed to.

## MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

## SESSIONAL ORDER

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, and notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, on each sitting Wednesday a period shall be allotted until 1 o'clock p.m. for discussion of matters of public interest on which any member may address the House for ten minutes. If the discussion is still proceeding at 1 o'clock p.m., it shall be terminated by Mr. Speaker.”

Motion agreed to.

## TIME LIMIT OF SPEECHES

## SESSIONAL ORDER

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That during this session, unless otherwise ordered, the following amendments to the times allowed for certain speeches shall apply:—

(1) Under Standing Order No. 37A (Disallowance of Proclamations, Orders in Council, Regulations or Rules):

Mover of the motion, fifteen minutes; seconder of the motion and any other member, ten minutes; Minister in reply, twenty minutes. Total time allowed, two hours.

(2) Under Standing Order No. 109 (Time Limit of Speeches):

(a) Paragraph 4—In Committee on a Bill, Motion or Estimate—substitute ‘ten minutes’ for ‘fifteen minutes’.

(b) Paragraph 8—In Committee on the introduction of a Bill—substitute ‘twenty minutes’ for ‘twenty-five minutes’.

All other provisions of Standing Orders Nos. 37A and 109 shall continue to apply.”

Motion agreed to.

## STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That the Standing Orders Committee for the present Parliament consist of the following members:—

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, Mr. Burns, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Mr. Houston, Mr. Knox and Mr. Newbery.”

Motion agreed to.

## LIBRARY, REFRESHMENT ROOMS, AND PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS COMMITTEES

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That the Library, Refreshment Rooms, and Parliamentary Buildings Committees for the present Parliament be constituted as follows:—

Library: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ahern, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Fouras, Mr. Frawley, Mr. Gygar and Mr. Wright.

Refreshment Rooms: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Goleby, Mr. K. J. Hooper, Mrs. Kippin, Mrs. Kyburz, Dr. Lockwood and Mr. Prest.

Parliamentary Buildings Committee: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Akers, Mr. Hartwig, Mr. Moore, Mr. Müller, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Yewdale.”

Motion agreed to.

## PRINTING COMMITTEE

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier): I move—

“That a committee be appointed for the present Parliament to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing to be executed by order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members.

“That such committee consist of the following members:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Miller, Mr. Milliner, Mr. Powell and Mr. Scassola.”

Motion agreed to.

## CITY OF BRISBANE MARKET ACT AMENDMENT BILL

## INITIATION

**Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN** (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the City of Brisbane Market Acts, 1960 to 1967 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

## WORKERS' HOMES ACTS REPEAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION

**Hon. C. A. WHARTON** (Burnett—Minister for Works and Housing): I move—

“That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Workers' Homes Acts Repeal Act 1961–1972 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

### 1. QUARANTINE FOR ASIAN REFUGEES

**Mr. Hartwig**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) With reference to an article in “The Courier-Mail” of 30 March which stated that information from Malaysia and Indonesia indicated that another three or four refugee boats are on the way to Australia and also another article which stated that in Malaysia a cholera epidemic broke out some four weeks ago, that some 73 schools in the State of Perak have been closed and that many deaths have been reported, is he aware of what action is being taken by Commonwealth health authorities to quarantine the people illegally arriving in Darwin?

(2) What period of time can a carrier of cholera virus exist before the disease becomes notifiable?

*Answers:—*

(1) I am advised that Commonwealth authorities place such arrivals in quarantine until they are satisfied their release would not endanger the rest of the community.

(2) The incubation period of cholera is a few hours to five days—usually two or three days.

### 2. SEMP

**Mr. Houston**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

Concerning Cabinet's decision to ban the SEMP course—

(1) What organisations approached him requesting that the course be banned from State schools and when?

(2) How many individual requests did he receive for the banning and when, and how many of these were from (a) teachers and (b) parents?

(3) How many of his Cabinet colleagues were fully aware of and understood the course prior to their voting in Cabinet for the banning?

(4) When did the Director-General of Education recommend the non-use or banning of the course?

(5) Did his department play any part in the compilation of the course and, if so, what part?

(6) When was the course first approved for use in Queensland?

*Answers:—*

(1) No organisation approached me requesting that the SEMP materials be banned from State schools.

(2) None.

(3) SEMP is not a course of study; it is a collection of resource materials for a number of secondary school subjects. I prepared for my Cabinet colleagues a comprehensive list of these materials.

(4) No recommendation on the banning was made by the Director-General. It was recommended that some materials were unsuitable for use in Queensland schools.

(5) My department was responsible for compiling the section on “The Consumer in Society”.

(6) No such overall approval had been given but some materials had been on trial for varying periods of time as they became available in draft form.

### 3. INCREASED STATE LEVIES

**Mr. Houston**, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

Since 12 November 1977, what State Government taxes or charges have been increased and from what date did they become effective?

*Answer:—*

Contrary to the assertions of Opposition members generally, and the Leader of the Opposition in particular, Government taxes and charges were not increased immediately the Government was returned to office. In keeping with our undertaking given in April 1977, no Government taxes and charges were increased during the remainder of 1977—the only State not to do so. In fact, since 12 November 1977 there have been no increases in Government taxes. The honourable member can't even read the proper documents. Apart from some minor fee increases in a few areas only and an increase in company fees in accordance with an all-States agreement, there has been no general increase in State charges. There could be some service charges increased in isolated areas and if the honourable member seeks detail to this degree, he should direct his question to the respective Ministers.

As part of the normal process now that the promised increase pause is ended, other charges are under review and in some instances, for example registration of motor vehicles, decisions have been taken but these charges have not yet been increased.

4. COMMONWEALTH UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Labour Relations—

As the Commonwealth Government has now issued more than one set of figures concerning the number of people unemployed in Australia and as there are other organisations providing figures or indicators, which set of figures is officially recognised by the Queensland Government and what is the latest monthly figure for this State?

Answer:—

It is not quite correct to say that the Federal Government now issues more than one set of figures relating to unemployment. It is true that two sets of monthly figures are now available. However, one set is produced by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), a statutory authority, and the other by the Commonwealth Employment Service (CES), a section of the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations.

To speak of one set of figures being “officially recognised” is to ignore the fact that the figures are collected in different ways using different criteria. The final results have to be assessed against this background and interpreted accordingly. There are no “right” or “wrong” figures.

The chief function of the CES is to assist those seeking employment to find suitable jobs and to help employers fill their vacancies. One of the by-products of this service is the production of statistics on the number of persons registered with the CES as unemployed at the end of each month. Common practice has been to treat this figure as an indicator of the level of unemployment.

Obvious defects are that some unemployed will not bother to register with CES while, because of recording delays, many registrants will have obtained employment but their cards will not have been brought up to date. Also this figure does not give a measure of the number of people seeking part-time work.

These deficiencies have been known for some time but, as a result of a recommendation of Mr. J. D. Norgard in his report of the Review of the Commonwealth Employment Service (1977), it was decided by the Commonwealth Government to introduce a monthly labour force survey to provide more reliable labour market information.

It was felt that the survey method would have the advantage of providing timely, accurate figures which are independent of any changes in CES procedures and which would more closely conform to the internationally accepted definition. However, it could only be expected that the figures

would differ because of the use of different definitions of “unemployed”, different collection procedures and differences in timing.

The basic difference in definition is that the ABS figures include persons who are seeking part-time work, while CES figures refer only to those seeking full-time work, that is, 35 hours a week or more. ABS figures do not classify as unemployed any person who does one hour or more of paid work during the survey period. Accordingly anyone who had lost his job that week or had worked for a short time would not be regarded as unemployed but could be registered with the CES. Most importantly, for any particular month the ABS figures will generally relate to a survey carried out in the first two weeks of the month while CES figures relate to the last Friday of the month. This difference is crucial when unemployment is rising or falling.

Mention is made in the question by the honourable member of “other organisations” providing figures but no examples are given by him. Obviously ABS and CES statistics are regarded by all as reliable figures but, as with any economic indicators, they must be interpreted in the light of how, when, where and why they were collected. This is the approach that the Government will adopt.

February unemployment figures for Queensland are:—

AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS

	Males ('000)	Females ('000)	Persons ('000)
Full-time—			
15-19 ..	13.2	11.1	24.3
20 and over ..	29.0	13.1	42.1
TOTAL ..	*42.1	24.2	66.4
Part-time ..	3.1	9.7	12.8
	45.2	33.9	79.2

\* This column does not add because of rounding off of figures

COMMONWEALTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ('000)

Males	Females	Persons
50	21.9	71.9

5. INEQUITIES IN REGIONAL ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr. Akers, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines, Energy and Police—

Has his attention been drawn to statements by the Lord Mayor of Brisbane on his T.V. session, which is paid for by

the ratepayers of Brisbane, that electricity users in South-east Queensland are subsidising large mining companies in Central Queensland and, if so, what is the position?

*Answer:—*

The statement by Alderman Sleeman has been brought to my attention and once again I can only say that it seems a great pity that the Lord Mayor of Brisbane does not concentrate his time on trying to save ratepayers' money rather than making completely unfounded accusations against State Government instrumentalities. If only he would make a simple check on the facts before making such statements, I am sure he would end up with just a little less egg on his face at times.

His allegation that electricity users in South-east Queensland are subsidising large mining companies is simply not true. The large mining companies in Central Queensland, which use vast amounts of electricity to operate walking draglines and other machinery, are charged the standard industry two-part tariffs that are available to other industrial consumers that consume heavy loads.

Their tariffs are, in fact, very similar to equivalent industrial tariffs in South-east Queensland and are certainly not concessional in any shape or form. In fact, if they were applied to a typical load for domestic consumers, the average price for each kilowatt hour of electricity would be slightly higher than the domestic tariff. So I can assure the House and Alderman Sleeman that, far from South-east Queensland electricity consumers subsidising mining companies, it is the mining companies that are assisting domestic consumers, for without the income derived from this source some of our electricity charges would be higher.

#### 6. NEW RAILWAY STATION FOR BRAY PARK AND STRATHPINE AREA

**Mr. Akers**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Transport—

As the rapid population growth in the Bray Park and Strathpine area is creating an even greater need for a new railway station in this vicinity, has the study into the provision of this station been completed and, if so, when will the facility, which has been promised for 20 years, be provided?

*Answer:—*

I understand that a draft report on the feasibility of establishing a new station between Strathpine and Lawnton has been received from the consultants and is being discussed with the authorities concerned. It is hoped that a final report will be available within a few weeks. I will make an announcement as soon as a decision on this proposal has been reached.

#### 7. TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION CENTRE, BALD HILLS

**Mr. Akers**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

(1) What is the purpose and the programme of construction and implementation of the proposed Institute of Technical and Further Education at Bald Hills?

(2) What area is the facility meant to serve and how will it fit into the education system of Queensland?

*Answers:—*

(1) The proposed Bald Hills College of Technical and Further Education is one of two major colleges being constructed on the north and south side of Brisbane—namely at Bald Hills and Mt. Gravatt. The initial development is intended primarily to alleviate the problems of training automotive apprentices at the South Brisbane College of Technical and Further Education. Site works have commenced and building construction is scheduled to commence in June 1978 with student occupancy estimated for June 1980. The first building of the Bald Hills complex will provide training facilities for motor mechanics (all stages), electrical fitting (automotive), mechanic (light marine engines), mechanic (motor cycle and similar machines) and the Advanced Trade Courses, Automotive A and Automotive B. The number of student places for these courses is 292.

The ultimate Bald Hills College of Technical and Further Education complex has been master-planned to provide workshops and learning spaces with a flexibility that will meet the present and future technical and further education needs of the area it serves. On completion in the early 1980s, the college will offer a full range of technical and further education courses in the fields of vocational and continuing education.

(2) The college which is being constructed in Norris Road will serve all suburbs on the north side of Brisbane but more especially those within a radius of eight kilometres. Thus the college will form an integral part of the post-secondary educational systems in Queensland. If the honourable member requires further information, the Director of Technical Education will supply it.

#### 8. PRACTICE OF ACUPUNCTURE IN QUEENSLAND

**Dr. Lockwood**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Health—

(1) Are registered medical practitioners allowed to practise acupuncture in Queensland?

(2) What conditions are treated by acupuncture?

(3) What persons other than medical practitioners practise acupuncture in Queensland?

(4) How are they qualified?

(5) Are they in any way controlled, licensed or registered?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The usual conditions for which acupuncture is used are alleviation of pain and analgesis in obstetric and minor surgical procedures. I understand that its use for surgical procedures is not extensive in Queensland.

(3 to 5) I understand that there are people other than medical practitioners who are using acupuncture. I am considering introducing legislation to control the practice of this procedure.

9. SPEECH THERAPY

**Dr. Lockwood**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

(1) What is the duration of the speech therapist course at the University of Queensland?

(2) In what months are the final examinations held each year?

(3) How many days after the final examinations are the results published?

(4) When are graduates presented with their degrees?

(5) How many students of speech therapy graduated in each of the years from 1973 to 1977?

(6) In each of the years from 1974 to 1978, how many graduates were employed by Queensland Government departments?

(7) At the present time, how many vacancies for speech therapists remain unfilled within the Education Department?

Answers:—

(1) The speech therapy course at the University of Queensland requires three years' study as a full-time student.

(2) Semester examinations are held in June and November.

(3) In 1977 results were published on 7 July and 3 December. The date of the last examination varied in the three years of the course. The latest examination in each semester was on 24 June 1977 and 14 November 1977, that is, 12 and 18 days before publication.

(4) The main degree ceremony was held on 12 December 1977. Some students are subsequently admitted in absentia after supplementary examinations.

(5) The number of graduates in recent years has been as follows:—

1973-74	..	..	..	26
1974-75	..	..	..	31
1975-76	..	..	..	35
1976-77	..	..	..	64
1977-78	..	..	..	33

(6) The number of graduates in speech therapy referred to in (5) employed by the Department of Education was—

1974	..	..	..	13
1975	..	..	..	8
1976	..	..	..	3
1977	..	..	..	6
March 1978	..	..	..	3

I do not have figures for other departments.

(7) Earlier this year all speech therapy positions were filled. Since then there have been a number of resignations. These are filled progressively. At present there are six vacancies.

10. PROTECTION OF PROVINCIAL RACE CLUBS

**Mr. Gunn**, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

As Brisbane owners and trainers have boycotted country provincial race clubs holding Wednesday meetings as part of a plan to annihilate small country clubs and thus deprive them of T.A.B. funds, will he do his utmost to protect the clubs?

Answer:—

When consideration is being given to the allocation of racing dates for 1979, my paramount concern must be to ensure that, in accordance with the Act, the whole racing industry is provided with a racing program that most suits and best serves its needs.

The merits and demerits of altering the mid-week allocation will have to be considered at the appropriate time. However, so that I can be fully aware of the opinions and aspirations of the Gatton and Beaudesert Race Club officials, I have already made a commitment to meet them in August next, that is, prior to the time when the allocation of dates is settled.

11. BUFFALO FLY

**Mr. Gunn**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) How far has buffalo fly spread into South-east Queensland?

(2) Has any damage been inflicted on herds in this locality?

(3) What is being done to halt the spread of the fly?

Answers:—

(1) Buffalo fly has spread to Miles, Chinchilla, Dalby, Toowoomba, Gatton, the Brisbane Valley and to the coastal districts south of Brisbane.

(2) No damage has been reported.

(3) Stock owners are being advised to spray their livestock with recommended insecticidal solutions and to install back rubbers impregnated with recommended insecticides.

#### 12. TESTS FOR BLUE TONGUE VIRUS

Mr. Gunn, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Primary Industries—

(1) Have buffalo at Queensland Agricultural College been tested for blue tongue virus?

(2) If testing did take place, what were the results?

(3) Have herds in the Lockyer Valley been tested and, if so, what were the results?

Answers:—

(1) Yes, all buffalo at the Queensland Agricultural College were tested for blue tongue (C.S.I.R.O. 19) virus during November 1977 using the serum neutralisation test.

(2) Of a total of 29 buffalo tested, 3 were positive. The 3 positive animals, which originated from the Northern Territory, were destroyed.

(3) All sheep and cattle on the college have given a negative test for blue tongue (C.S.I.R.O. 19). Over 800 animals on 40 properties surrounding the college have been tested for blue tongue using the serum neutralisation test. No positive animals were detected.

#### 13. SEMP

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education—

(1) With reference to the article in the "STOP & CARE" publication attributed to the Premier, are the views expressed also the official attitude of his department?

(2) If so, will he explain what was meant when it was claimed that SEMP presented a philosophy which was questionable in the light of our traditional values and certainly would have encroached on the time now devoted to learning?

(3) Will he table in this House evidence to substantiate the further claim that SEMP contains much of the same underlying philosophy which sustains the secular humanism of both the socialist and national socialist ideologies?

(4) Will he further explain and publicly substantiate the Premier's claim that, inter alia, "SEMP is out of touch with Queensland standards and outdated in a number of themes and in some instances, it was actually harmful to the educational process", as the Queensland Education Department played the prime role in preparing the Consumer Protection Unit of SEMP while other units were prepared by the Education Departments of other States?

(5) In view of the Premier's statement that "my Government is not going to pander to any minority", how can such a claim be validly made, in view of the known role that the minority group "STOP & CARE" has played in the banning of SEMP?

Answers:—

(1) The Honourable the Premier, with me and officers of my Department, wishes to provide education in Queensland schools which meets the needs and standards of the people of Queensland. This is the reason a committee of inquiry into education will be formed.

(2) I offer to the honourable member the opportunity to show to his constituents, and the parents in his electorate in particular, certain materials contained in SEMP. I have grave doubts that he would be prepared to give an assurance to those people that he favoured the use of their questionable sections in schools in his electorate. This is no doubt the type of material to which the Honourable the Premier referred when he made the statement.

(3) Every endeavour is being made to have all SEMP materials made available to the Parliamentary Library, where it will be at the disposal of all honourable members. The honourable member can form his own conclusions after he has perused all of the material.

(4) I refer in part to my answer in (2) and refer to another comment by the Honourable the Premier that the Queensland Education Department was capable of preparing resource materials that are more eminently suited to the values of Queensland parents. I concur with that comment.

(5) The honourable member should be aware that the Government must consider and investigate the views on education of all groups in the community.

At 12 noon,

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! As this is a day allotted for the debate on the Address in Reply, the questions remaining unanswered will appear on tomorrow's Notices of Questions.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIRST ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 30 March (see p. 52) on Mr. White's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (12 noon): Once again I pledge the loyalty of the Australian Labor Party to Her Majesty the Queen. I take the opportunity to congratulate the Governor Sir

James Ramsay on the excellent job he is doing as Governor of Queensland. He most certainly has won the respect of the people of Queensland by the work he is doing as our Governor.

I also take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to again congratulate you on your election, and assure you of our support in the orderly and dignified conduct of this Parliament.

Since the last Parliament was dissolved on 6 October, Queensland has experienced six months of perpetual division, confusion and controversy. Week after week, with almost predictable consistency, new decisions are arrived at, amazing still further an already bewildered State and nation. This morning has been a typical example. No wonder the Liberal Party State President on Sunday spoke of her own Liberal-National Party State Government as "lurching from crisis to crisis week after week".

SEMP is banned without study or reason. Cabinet decides to forcibly take over church missions without any consideration or consultation with the Aborigines or churches involved. Tarong is chosen instead of Millmerran as the site for the new powerhouse, despite reports of a \$259,000,000 cost difference. The Gold Coast City Council is sacked. Church leaders are named Comms and heathens when they want to march, and Comms and atheists again when they don't. Government-appointed education planners are accused of corrupting young minds, and the State Electricity Commission of misleading Cabinet. The Premier is at war with our schoolteachers, and in public dispute with the medical profession. I think he got a caning this morning.

The recommendations of the high level criminal law inquiry are to be watered down by the low-level review committee of the Cabinet. Normally law-abiding citizens are scooped up in their hundreds by police in normally empty streets on Saturday afternoons for questioning legislation that over 50 per cent of members in this Parliament now concede is wrong. Even Cabinet Ministers are rebuked and humiliated. It is little wonder amid such fears, threats and confrontation that Queenslanders are asking, "What is going on? Where will it all end?"

As Queensland staggers from one controversy to another, I concentrate today on an issue that is frightening in its secrecy and contradiction. I refer to the Iwasaki tourism project near Yeppoon in Central Queensland—a project that despite the absence of public scrutiny is already blessed by the Premier, and no doubt will be approved by his consenting Cabinet in the weeks to come. It is time Queenslanders were acquainted with the facts that this Government appears desperate to conceal from them.

In particular today I intend to trace through documentation the silent but dangerous reversal that has occurred in Government policy towards foreign ownership

of Queensland land. I might add that I have here a number of letters. I am going to table each one of them so that members on the other side can read what their Ministers and the presidents of their political parties have been saying. I intend to quote only sections of the letters in my speech but I will table the complete letters. I will ask that three or four letters be included in "Hansard" so that everybody can see what was said. We want to make it clear so that everyone can understand what shady deals have been concocted by this Cabinet. When they are read, this Government will emerge as the shameless participant in overseas land take-overs I can only describe as treacherous and treasonable. It not only encourages these highly questionable—and I believe, undesirable—deals, but is prepared to bend our laws backwards to manipulate them. The Government has become a real estate middle man for foreign interests.

I believe that the evidence coming to light now is so serious and so alarming that it cannot be dismissed through parliamentary debate. It cannot end with the franchise legislation that the Premier has already foreshadowed and will no doubt rush through this Parliament to satisfy his new crony, Iwasaki. There is about this whole adventure a stench and suspicion of political collusion that demands a royal commission into the land administration of this State.

If the National and Liberal Parties in Queensland refuse to have such an inquiry, it will, regrettably, be up to Canberra to investigate this whole shoddy mess before foreign funds are permitted to enter Australia to finance the Iwasaki proposal.

Already, on 4 March, the R.S.L. Central District conference in Biloela—in the centre of the Iwasaki area, in the electorate in which Iwasaki will control this large area of our land—has requested Federal investigation into land sales to aliens. It appears that a Japanese developer can bulldoze a road through Queensland Government property without the approval and even without the knowledge of the State Minister for Lands.

Then there is the spectacle of the Premier spending 11 days of his fortnight in Japan as the feted guest of this man who is supposed to be involved in delicate negotiations with the Government.

**Mr. Hinze:** How many days did you spend in Peking?

**Mr. BURNS:** To say the least, it is a curious set of circumstances; it is political behaviour so unusual that it reeks of impropriety. And the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads is one of those who tried to cover it up. It was a secret itinerary for Government business. Although it was a public-paid trip, I am told that when at least two journalists wanted to accompany the Premier they were either dissuaded from going or were refused permission to go.

When the Premier's itinerary became known, his deputy, the Treasurer, leaped to his defence, declaring that Cabinet had sent abroad with him a long list of questions for reply by Iwasaki. Then it was the turn of the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads. Before the questions were known, let alone the answers; before the Premier returned, let alone reported—before any of these basic formalities occurred—the Minister for Local Government announced that the project would start inside three months. No worry about Parliament; no worry about the rights of the individuals in the State—the Minister announced it was a goer.

That is a funny way to conduct the important business of this State. We have a highly controversial project still to gain Cabinet or parliamentary approval, yet the Premier endorses it in advance and the Minister for Local Government says that it will start in three months, before Parliament is given the opportunity to debate it.

**Mr. HINZE:** I rise to a point of order. It is obvious that the Leader of the Opposition is off on one of his expeditions—

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! The Minister will proceed to make his point of order.

**Mr. HINZE:** Very definitely, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is off on one of his expeditions into the unknown and is making accusations concerning a matter which he obviously knows nothing whatever about. He is suggesting that I—

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the Minister to come to his point of order.

**Mr. HINZE:** I will come to my point of order, all right.

**Mr. BURNS:** You're taking up my time.

**Mr. HINZE:** I am, but that's O.K. The Leader of the Opposition said that I said on one occasion that the Iwasaki project could be a goer within three months. What actually happened here—

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Does the Minister deny that statement?

**Mr. BURNS:** No, he can't deny it. Make him sit down.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. BURNS:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I accept his withdrawal.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Very early in the piece all honourable members should understand that when the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker is on his feet honourable members will resume their seats.

**Mr. Casey** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mackay will be dealt with if he does not contain himself. The Minister has risen to a point of order and is taking the point of order. I ask him to express his point of order as quickly and as succinctly as possible.

**Mr. HINZE:** The reason why I am taking so long is that I want my point of order accurately reported in "Hansard". I am getting round to taking my point of order, and I do not want to be interrupted again. I intend telling the Leader of the Opposition, who was invited to a public meeting, that he did not have the guts to turn up.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. BURNS:** I accept the Minister's withdrawal. It is obvious that the Minister has something to hide. At certain meetings he promised to produce maps, but he has failed to produce them.

I turn now to a series of letters and documents that I propose to table. I shall seek leave to incorporate two or three of them in "Hansard" as proof of the frightening change in the Government's approach towards foreign land acquisition.

This whole affair had its origin away back on 27 April 1965 and in the removal of section 16 from the Lands Act, which prohibited aliens from holding land in Queensland.

I table a letter from the then Minister for Lands, now Minister for Transport, dated 30 August last year, which explains what happened on that occasion, and ask that it be incorporated in "Hansard". (Leave granted.)

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following letter:—*

"Minister for Lands, Forestry,  
National Parks and Wildlife  
Service

"30th August, 1977.

"T. J. Burns Esq., M.L.A.,  
"Leader of the Opposition,  
"Brisbane.

"Dear Mr. Burns,

"I write with reference to your letter of August 22, 1977 with reference to Section 16 of the Land Act.

"Prior to April 27, 1965, the Land Act of 1962 contained this provision:

"16. An alien shall not be qualified to apply for, acquire, or hold land under any tenure under this Act, including under any license or under a demise, pursuant to section one hundred and seventy-six of this Act, unless he has first obtained a permit under "The Alien Acts, 1867 to 1958", entitling him to hold chattels real in Queensland.

This section does not apply to an alien who purchases from the Crown any land made available for sale for an estate in fee-simple'.

"The Aliens Act of 1965 was assented to on April 27, 1965: for your information and convenience, I attach a copy of that Act.

"You will note from the Second Schedule to the Act that Section 16 of the Land Act of 1962 was thereby repealed.

"The effect of that legislation was that an alien could then take, acquire, hold and dispose of any land or interest in land whether freehold or leasehold in all respects as if he were an Australian citizen.

"I trust this adequately answers your query.

"Kind regards,  
"Yours sincerely,

K. B. TOMKINS,  
"Minister for Lands, Forestry,  
National Parks and Wildlife Service."

**Mr. BURNS:** I turn now to 19 December 1972, when Sir Wallace Rae, then Lands Minister, wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Capricorn Coast Protection Council. Referring to early activity by Iwasaki, Sir Wallace (now Agent-General in London) said—and I quote the last paragraph of the letter—

"As I stated recently, I propose to examine the reintroduction of controls on the acquisition of land by foreign nationals."

Seven years after the change to the Land Act allowing aliens to control our lands (well before the Iwasaki take-overs began), Sir Wallace was so concerned he was already proposing controls on foreign land acquisitions. I table that letter so that members can read it, although I am not asking that it be incorporated in "Hansard".

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** Come now to 26 January 1973. Sir Wallace goes even further in a letter to the secretary of the Capricornia Protection Council, in which he says—

"I propose to recommend to the Government that certain controls on the acquisition of land in Queensland by foreign nationals be re-imposed."

So, having obviously assessed the situation since his letter a month earlier, Sir Wallace is no longer investigating controls on foreign land grabs but recommending their re-imposition. I table that letter so that members may be aware of it.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** Next is another letter dated 23 January 1973, this time written by the National Party State President (Mr. Sparkes)

to Mr. Dalton. This correspondence refers to the acquisition of 16,000 acres by Iwasaki, and I read this section of Mr. Sparkes' letter—

"My party for some time has been expressing concern at the possible detrimental consequences of excessive acquisition of freehold land in this State by alien interest."

Mr. Sparkes goes on to say—

"We have been endeavouring to formulate some method of controlling this situation. Although we have not formulated the details of the administrative machinery, we have suggested that the State Government should establish machinery to exercise surveillance and control over foreign acquisition of freehold land to ensure this process does not prove detrimental to the interests of the people of Queensland."

In his final paragraph Mr. Sparkes says about Iwasaki—

"You may rest assured that we sympathise with your concern and will do all that we can to ensure this matter does not get out of hand."

That was five years ago, with Bob Sparkes and Sir Wallace Rae, on the same day, expressing concern about the need for State Government controls. Those controls have never eventuated. Neither has the method of surveillance suggested by Mr. Sparkes, which was still supported by the National Party Management Committee as late as a month ago.

For the information of members, I table the letter from the National Party President.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** I go forward now to 30 April 1974, and the author is the National Party member for Callide, in whose electorate the Iwasaki development is proposed. He said in a letter to the secretary of the Capricorn Coast Protection Council—

"I can assure you that I have asked several questions in the House to determine the amount of land held by the Sangyo group and I have been given the assurance of the Minister for Lands that he will not be allowed to buy leasehold land. . . ."

I stress that—"he will not be allowed to buy leasehold land"—

"... an opinion with which I agree entirely."

Finally, in the last paragraph—and I remind honourable members that this was four years ago—the honourable member for Callide said—

"Finally I am quite adamant that the Iwasaki, Sangyo Group, has adequate land to implement their proposed complex."

I table the letter and ask that it be incorporated in full in "Hansard". (Leave granted.)

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following letter:—*

"Parliament House,  
Brisbane, 4000  
"166 Alma Street,  
Rockhampton. 4700.  
"30th April, 1974.

"Mr. Merv. Scope,  
"Secretary,  
"Capricorn Coast Protection Council,  
"P.O. Box 323,  
"Yeppoon. 4703.

"Dear Mr. Scope,

"I wish to acknowledge receipt of your correspondence, (undated), re the Iwasaki Project.

"I read with interest your submissions on background and objections and I am sure that your objections will merit the consideration they deserve.

"I can assure you, that I have asked several questions in the House to determine the amount of land held by the "Sangyo" group, and I have been given the assurance of the Minister for Lands, that he will not be allowed to buy Leasehold land, an opinion with which I agree entirely.

"Just recently, I have been informed that a Company of which Mr. John Dalton, your Chairman and Chief Advocate, is interested in, is prepared to sell to Mr. Iwasaki also.

"If this is true, it would seem that money speaks many languages.

"I would be interested to know if you have confirmation of this or otherwise.

"Finally, I am quite adamant that the Iwasaki, Sangyo Group has adequate land to implement their proposed complex.

"Best wishes in your endeavour.

"Yours faithfully,

L. E. HARTWIG, M.L.A.,  
"Member for Callide."

**Mr. BURNS:** Four years ago, in 1974, the member for the area involved believed Iwasaki had sufficient land for a project which the Under Secretary of the Premier's Department in a letter of 25 January this year, according to the Premier, said is basically unchanged. I table that letter for the information of honourable members.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** More importantly, this member had been given an assurance from the Minister for Lands that Iwasaki will not be allowed to buy leasehold land. The letters from both Mr. Hartwig and Mr. Spann have been tabled.

No wonder many Queenslanders are very worried. Here is a foreign developer, who in the opinion of the National Party's local member owned enough of our land—more than enough of our land—four years ago, still swallowing up huge areas of the Central Queensland coastline, as late as last Thursday, and the State Government is helping him do it.

According to the new Lands Minister, Iwasaki's landholdings have now grown to 20,687 acres (11,749 of them freehold) and other transactions are either being processed or are under Government consideration.

I have obtained a copy of the United States Department of Commerce Travel Service booklet. It says—

"Disneyland, in Anaheim, is located 53 km south of Los Angeles. This famous theme park is a magnet for visitors of all ages. Spread over 30 beautiful landscaped hectares."

What does Iwasaki own—20,000 acres in Central Queensland! And we are told that he wants to build a Disneyland. I table that booklet.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the booklet on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** This is Fantasyland, which has been evident in Cabinet for some time.

This overseas landlord has already acquired 285 times more land for his unexplained, unapproved tourist venture than is involved in the entire spacious landscaped setting of world-famous Disneyland near Los Angeles.

Around the same time—on 15 February 1973—the National Party's federal leader (Mr. Anthony) also entered the Iwasaki controversy. He said in a letter to Mr. Dalton—

"I wholeheartedly agree with you that there should not be an open cheque arrangement towards the purchase of Australian land."

Sir Wallace Rae, Bob Sparkes, the member for Callide and even Doug Anthony—all four displayed concern, yet only five days ago this foreign promoter was still buying up our land and the Government was twisting and bending the rules to make his task easier. I table that letter from Mr. Anthony.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** I move now to correspondence of 25 March 1976, again from Mr. Sparkes. He says in this letter to the assistant secretary of the Capricorn Coast Protection Council—

"My party organisation has proposed to the State Government that it make a practice of keeping under constant surveillance the degree of foreign acquisition of unrestricted freehold land with a view to ensuring that nowhere was such acquisition likely to be detrimental to the public interest."

Bob Sparkes was repeating in 1976 what he recommended in 1973 and was still saying only a month ago.

Either he is not fair dinkum and merely grandstanding or the National Party Government is so dogmatic on this question it refuses to take the slightest notice of his suggestions.

I table this letter from Mr. Sparkes.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** Back to 17 March 1975, and another letter from Mr. Spann on behalf of the Premier. This time he said—

“As you are aware, the State Government has under consideration a system of registration of foreign ownership, including both land and company holdings and it is anticipated such a scheme would be of considerable benefit to the Government in formulating and implementing guidelines for foreign investment in this State.”

For over five years spokesman after spokesman for either the Government or the National Party has declared support for restraints on foreign land purchases and not the slightest thing has been done about it. They have in fact followed policies to multiply the very transactions they criticised and questioned.

While the Government prolongs this scandalous inactivity, the Premier's Japanese running mate is aided by the Government to increase holdings already above the size required for his project. No wonder so many people think something fishy is going on. No wonder more and more Queenslanders are asking how many yen and other foreign coins are going into the National Party's election funds.

I table this letter from Mr. Spann.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** Back to 31 July 1974, and yet another letter sent by Sir Wallace Rae before he was despatched to London. This letter, concerning grazing selections Nos. 8815 and 8747, says—

“You are aware that these leases cannot be held by a company nor can they be held by a company if they should be converted to freehold.”

I demand to know if that provision still applies within the Land Act or if it has been quietly amended or repealed since the departure of Sir Wallace. My check shows it has not.

These two areas, which Sir Wallace Rae said could not be held by a company under any circumstances, are shown on the map produced by the Local Government Minister recently as under Iwasaki control and ownership.

We are entitled to know just what is going on. Has this foreign developer been allowed to accumulate holdings through some back-door arrangement that the laws of this State render illegal?

This letter from Sir Wallace refers also to special lease No. 32827 and the Government rejection at that time of a request to convert it to freehold. Those Government objections have since vanished and according to last Thursday's answer by the Lands Minister this area is at present on its way into the freeholding hands of Iwasaki. Why would the Government refuse to convert a lease to freehold for an Australian group and expedite one for Iwasaki?

I now table this letter from Sir Wallace and ask that it be included in “Hansard”. (Leave granted.)

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following letter:—*

“Minister for Lands  
and Forestry,  
“31st July, 1974.

“J. B. Dalton Esq.,  
“Chairman,  
“Capricorn Coast Protection Council,  
“P.O. Box 323,  
“Yeppoon.

“Dear Mr. Dalton,

“I refer to your letter of 8 March 1974 concerning the proposals put forward by Mr. Y. Iwasaki for tourist development in the Yeppoon area.

“Firstly, I regret the delay in replying to your letter; this was occasioned by my many absences from Brisbane on Ministerial duties and I know you will appreciate how things do accrue during one's absence.

“You will probably be aware by now that the Government has declared as a Fisheries Habitat Reserve, the area of Corio Bay and Fishing Creek. This was done by Order in Council dated 14 March 1974 and published in the Government Gazette of 16 March.

“In your letter, you made mention of Grazing Selections Nos. 8815 and 8747, Rockhampton District. There is no proposal before my Department to grant any ‘development leases’ in respect of these areas.

“Provision does exist in law for the lessee of a grazing selection to apply for conversion of tenure of his lease and any application so made in respect of the tenures mentioned would be thoroughly examined by my Land Administration Commission, as a responsible Department. You are aware that these leases cannot be held by a company nor can they be held by a company if they should be converted to freehold.

“Turning now to Special Lease No. 32827—in accordance with the provisions of Section 207 of the Land Act, the lessee

of a special lease may apply to convert to freehold; in terms of that section, before such an application may be approved; it is required that the leased land be reasonably improved having regard to its unimproved value or purpose for which it is used and it must be established that the land is not required for any public purpose. An application to convert this lease has been refused.

"Proposals have been put forward to this Government by Iwasaki Sangyo (Aust) Pty. Ltd. for development of an area north of Yeppoon for tourist purposes. The State Government, as a responsible Government, is currently investigating all the ramifications of the proposal and the Co-ordinator General has been directed by Cabinet to arrange for the preparation of a comprehensive report on the matter for consideration and examination by Cabinet.

"It is anticipated that the report will be compiled in the near future; the views of your organisation are appreciated and will be borne in mind at the appropriate time.

"Yours sincerely,  
W. A. R. RAE

"Minister for Lands and Forestry"

**Mr. BURNS:** Every scrap of evidence indicates something highly irregular about this project, something inconsistent and highly unusual. There is, for example, this letter of 25 November 1974 from the Local Government Minister to the former Liberal member for Mt. Gravatt. The Minister professed concern about beachfront development and States control methods were being studied and where possible applied. Yet a recommendation in 1974 by the former Co-ordinator-General (Sir Charles Barton) that a 150-metre foreshore strip be retained by the Government for esplanade development has been casually cast aside.

It was in fact this same Local Government Minister who in 1974 pretended such deep concern for beachfront protection who announced recently that Sir Charles Barton's recommendation had been altered from 150 to 50 metres. Confusion remains on this matter for I have been told since the Minister's announcement that Iwasaki will build to within 50 metres and in some areas will own to high-water mark.

**Mr. Katter** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** It will be to the discredit of the honourable member for Flinders that the Australian people will not be able to go on the beach when the tide is in. That area will be owned by the Japs and Australians will be kept off it.

Why would a Government grant a special lease over an area that a committee of our top public servants, including the Director-General of Primary Industries, the Secretary of the Land Administration Commission, the Senior Planning Officer of the Local Government

Department, the Director of the Department of Harbours and Marine and the Director-General of Tourist Services, headed by the State's then Co-ordinator-General, said was unstable and no plans for its development should proceed or be prepared without reference to the Beach Protection Authority?

Why has the Beach Protection Authority been told now that the Premier will make these decisions? Why has it been told to keep out?

I table the Minister's letter.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** The next letter I propose to table is one dated 1 March 1976 from the present Culture Minister, then Minister for Tourism and Marine Services. He said in correspondence to a Dr. Springell of Rockhampton—

"While I do not have to justify my views to you, I might add that I am personally not in favour of selling Queensland land to any overseas interests."

For someone with such strong personal views, this Minister has done precious little to restrain the land gifts the Premier and the Government appear determined to bestow on Iwasaki.

I table this letter from yet another member of the Cabinet on this matter.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.*

**Mr. BURNS:** I believe the records of correspondence tabled today are indisputable evidence of the sinister contradictions that surround the Government's role in these negotiations. We have a project that has been under Government attention since the early 1970s, a project that, according to the Premier, is basically unchanged since 1974, a project that the Local Government Minister believes will start inside three months. Yet this project, about which the Government should know so much, remains cloaked in secrecy, secluded by Cabinet from both the Parliament and the people.

As if the facts I have already presented are not sufficient to arouse doubts and disquiet, I turn now to a document that is even more frightening. This letter of 13 July last year from the then Lands Minister, Hon. K. B. Tomkins, to the member for Callide concerns new leases over Grazing Farm Nos. 8747 and 8815. The letter discusses the possible inclusion of these two leases in the Iwasaki scheme, and a final decision on the renewal of the leases was in fact deferred at ministerial level pending further consultation between the Japanese promoter and the State Government.

But even more disturbing than the contents of the letter is a departmental direction added at the bottom of the Hartwig letter. I read in its entirety this departmental post-script relaying a ministerial instruction to the acting officer in charge of the Land Opening Branch—

“The Honourable the Minister considers that if Thomasson’s leases are included in Iwasaki’s proposals (should those proposals be approved by the Government) they should be renewed by way of Special Lease (by arrangement with the lessees) which could then be transferred to Iwasaki.”

That was the departmental order of the then Minister for Lands.

If that was not bad enough, there’s more that is even worse to implicate this member of the Cabinet. The departmental direction proceeds to say—

“That would put this case on a similar footing to that of the Brazilian, Mr. Maia, who is involved in purchasing Grazing Selections in the Julia Creek Area.

“To note please and to await developments.

“Action to issue O.L. in respect of expired G.F. 8747 could proceed.”

I table that letter and a letter from John McCabe and ask that they be included in “Hansard”. (Leave granted.)

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following letters:—*

“L. E. Hartwig, Esq., M.L.A.,  
“P.O. Box 40,  
“Yeppoon, Q. 4073.

“Dear Mr. Hartwig,

“I refer again to your personal representations on behalf of Mr. Albert Thomasson of Barmoya, via The Caves in regard to his application for the renewal of the leases of his Grazing Farms Nos. 8747 and 8815, Rockhampton District.

“When I was in Rockhampton on 27th February last, you will recall that we spoke to Mr. Thomasson’s two sons and at the time of those discussions I must admit that it seemed a fairly simple exercise to be able to indicate in a relatively short time the future of the two leases. The Land Commissioner’s report had been received and I understood that neither Mr. Thomasson or his sons had any commitments at the time with the Iwasaki project.

“However, as you know the next day we made a personal inspection of the various lands involved in Mr. Iwasaki’s proposed developments in the Yeppoon area and that inspection included Mr. Thomasson’s selections.

“After seeing the whole position first hand, I feel, and I think you will agree, that Mr. Thomasson’s lands, particularly

the ‘wetlands’ must be looked on as an integral part of Mr. Iwasaki’s project and must be considered in conjunction with that project notwithstanding Mr. Thomasson’s advices that he is not currently in that situation.

“As you know we had talks with Mr. Iwasaki and his advisers both in Rockhampton and Brisbane and I had hoped to have further talks in somewhat more detail shortly afterwards. For that reason I delayed advising you further in regard to the Thomassons.

“However, those further projected talks have not eventuated—Mr. Iwasaki has not yet returned to Queensland and I have no firm advice as to when he might do so—hopefully it will be very shortly.

“I know that Mr. Thomasson and his sons are anxious to know their future as far as their Grazing Selections are concerned, but I am now convinced that their case cannot be entirely separated from the Iwasaki proposal. It is on these grounds that I write this letter so that Mr. Thomasson will be better aware why a firm decision has not been made on his new lease applications and why we have not been able to confirm tentative advices given to his sons.

“However, I can confirm that I do not see any eventual Departmental action on those applications being to the disadvantage of the Thomassons, but I must defer any firm indication until after Mr. Iwasaki has further advanced his case to the Government.

“I will contact you again as soon as developments allow.

(Prepared after discussion with Hon. the Minister.)

Sgd.?

“Yours sincerely,  
“(K. B. TOMKINS)

Minister for Lands, Forestry,  
National Parks and Wildlife Service.”

“B/C

“Acting Officer in Charge,  
“Land Openings Branch.

“The Honourable the Minister considers that if Thomasson’s leases are included in Iwasaki’s proposals (should those proposals be approved by Government) they should be renewed by way of Special Lease, (by arrangement with the lessees) which could then be transferred to Iwasaki. That would put this case on a similar footing to that of the Brazilian, Mr. Maia who is involved in purchasing Grazing Selections in the Julia Creek area.

“To note please and to await developments.

“Action to issue O.L. in respect of expired G.F. 8747 could proceed.”

"Capricorn Conservation Council  
P.O. Box 795.  
"Rockhampton, 4700.  
30th March, 1978.

"The Honourable Tom Burns M.L.A.,  
"Leader of the Opposition  
"Parliament House,  
"Brisbane. 4700.

"Dear Mr. Burns,

"Re Crown Land, Iwasaki Proposal area.

"At a brief meeting at Rockhampton Airport in March 1977 with the then Minister for Lands, Mr. Tomkins, the question of Crown Land transfers to Mr. Y. Iwasaki was raised. Mr. Tomkins had just visited the Crown Land areas of Boglands and Windmill Plains and expressed surprise that these areas had not at some stage been proposed for national park status to protect the extensive waterfowl populations. It therefore came as something of a surprise to find later that the Minister was planning to negotiate the transfer of this land to Mr. Iwasaki. These transfer plans are continuing with the present Minister and it appears that no restrictions will be placed on Mr. Iwasaki's activities in the area and in fact that the land may be freehold which will in effect place it outside the realm of Queensland's wildlife protection laws.

"The Premier on his return from Japan and the care of Mr Iwasaki announced that Mr. Iwasaki was one of the world's great conservationists and that he had donated several areas of land for national parks in Japan. This raises the distinct possibility that the Queensland Government may give this land to Mr. Iwasaki and are perhaps hopeful that he will then be inclined to show his generosity and donate it back.

"I feel there must be a more rational way for this State to treat its valuable coastal lands.

"Yours sincerely,  
JOHN McCABE,  
"Secretary."

**Mr. BURNS:** Why has this Government bent over backwards to change rules and sell thousands of acres of freehold land to Iwasaki, when it went to the High Court to stop the Australian Government buying land at Cooloola for Australians to use as a national park and goes even now to great lengths to prevent Australian Aborigines enjoying rights to their own native lands? Why this preference for Iwasaki? Why did the Government oppose the national park at Cooloola? Why did the Government stop the natives from having some say about their own land in this country?

It's not just Iwasaki, it's the Brazilian millionaire, Sebastiao Maia, as well who is receiving favoured treatment at ministerial level to acquire Queensland land that should be protected under Queensland law.

**Mr. KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. There is absolutely not a shred of truth in what the Leader of the Opposition has just said.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr. BURNS:** I know honourable members opposite are getting a little touchy because they promised us that Maia would build a meatworks in the Julia Creek area a couple of years ago.

How many more are enjoying a form of Cabinet patronage that is rarely, if ever, extended to our own Australian citizens who wish to acquire land in their own country?

I demand to know if this ministerial policy still operates, if it enjoyed the blessing of Cabinet, or was just the personal invention of the now Transport Minister.

It's a scandal that demands a royal commission—a scandal involving directions at ministerial level I regard as traitorous, treasonable and completely in conflict with the controls Sir Wallace Rae felt necessary five years ago and which the Premier and others were talking about some time later.

The controls Bob Sparkes supports, Anthony supports, the member for Callide supported and the member for Mirani supported.

Here is a Minister of the Crown sworn to protect the interests of Queensland conspiring to aid and abet the shady, silent take-over of our land by foreign speculators. Not only, according to these documents, was this man less than a year ago occupied personally in such activities but also he was using the authority of his political position to force others in the Government service to act as his accomplices.

If ever there were grounds for a royal commission, this must be it; if ever there were grounds for the immediate suspension of a Cabinet Minister pending inquiry, again this must be it.

We have a Minister still within Cabinet not just approving foreign take-overs but suggesting devious ways around the law to facilitate them. I might add: unless this Minister can prove otherwise, the take-overs are ones I regard as the type of acquisitions over which his predecessor promised controls back in 1973 and 1974.

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr. BURNS:** The Minister has got a bit of legal advice.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order!

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that statement. I did not seek to do anything around the law.

In actual fact, and in explanation, if you will allow it, Mr. Deputy Speaker, regarding the Iwasaki lands, the two lots—

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. TOMKINS:** Will you allow it?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I think it is sufficient to ask for a withdrawal. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept that explanation.

**Mr. BURNS:** In accordance with the forms of the House, I will withdraw it because it takes up time to argue about it. But the ministerial letter will be printed in "Hansard" and it will be there for all to see whether or not the instruction about this particular land came from the Minister. There will be no argument about it; it will be there for all to see.

Now that the Minister has made his explanation I challenge his successor in the Lands portfolio to state without delay if it is still the ruling policy of the National and Liberal Party Government to assist Iwasaki and other foreign nationals in this way while restricting the sale of land to our own people. Are public servants still subject to ministerial instructions to expedite detours around the law to help foreigners acquire more and more of our land under political conditions denied our own Australians? The Public Service is aghast at stories of senior public servants being dressed down by the Premier and accused of deliberately delaying things or being described as obstructionist, just as we are told that Sir Charles Barton was described as an obstructionist and accused of deliberately delaying this good man Iwasaki. They are aghast at tales of normal departmental requirements being overridden and of Iwasaki handing out calculators, watches, beads and pearls to Public Servants who are far from impressed. It's like the old blackbirders visiting the islands dispensing gifts in search of kanaka slaves. He's doing it all over the place. Young ladies have told me about his handing out beads to them, and yet the Government lets him treat our people like that. It is disgusting.

Let us hear how much land Maia has gathered together through ministerial guidance, how much Iwasaki has now above his holdings considered adequate by the member for Callide four years ago, how much other foreign nationals, whose names we have not yet heard, have accumulated because of this ministerial preference and promotion?

To show the duplicity from start to finish in this shady, shifty exercise I turn to a letter to me from John McCabe, the secretary of the Capricorn Conservation Council which has been incorporated in "Hansard".

Mr. McCabe claimed at Rockhampton airport in March 1977 that Mr. Tomkins suggested national park status for the leases he conspired last year to transfer to Iwasaki. He said that Mr. Tomkins had just visited the

Crown land areas of Boglands and Windmill Plains and expressed surprise that these areas had not at some time been proposed for national park status to protect the extensive waterfowl populations. Mr. McCabe's letter said—

"It therefore came as something of a surprise to find later that the Minister was planning to negotiate the transfer of this land to Mr. Iwasaki."

There is documented proof of ministerial inconsistency; proof of ministerial participation and pressure to give away huge areas of the Queensland "farm"—not just for short-term leases but for permanent freeholding.

We have the Premier fraternising in secrecy with one of the foreign principals behind these activities; environmental studies that the Government refuses to release; submissions that are withheld on works due to start within three months. It's royal commission material if ever I saw it.

There are the dubious circumstances of the 262 beachfront acres resumed by the Livingstone Shire Council for arrears of rates in the 1940s and now acquired by the State Government for easier sale to Iwasaki. This land enters the Iwasaki empire on terms that prevent any Australians enjoying even the normal right of tender. I am told now that this freehold land Iwasaki will own stretches right down to the high-water mark—not 150 metres back, as recommended by Sir Charles Barton or his high-powered committee, or even the 50 metres announced by the Local Government Minister.

This whole franchise agreement and the shadowy ministerial involvement is too alarming, too serious for the speedy dismissal of this issue on convenient legislation presented by the Premier. I believe that, apart from a royal commission, the Iwasaki file, without omissions, must be released not just to this Parliament but for public examination in the court-houses and post offices of Central Queensland.

No Government with any conscience can proceed with a deal that hides beneath unanswered charges of ministerial complicity and Cabinet collaboration. Just where do the Treasurer and his Liberal Party stand? Will he now table here the questions transported to Japan with the Premier, together with the answers from Iwasaki?

We have the correspondence from Mr. Spann, for the Premier, that this project has not altered basically since 1974 despite very important precautions from the then Co-ordinator-General. What has happened to Sir Charles Barton's report presented to this Parliament covering 11 pages of recommendations, evidence and doubts? We are entitled to know what amendments Iwasaki has made to his original plans to accommodate this expert evaluation tabled as a ministerial document in this House.

There are the fears concerning fishing nurseries—the future of an industry involving 60 vessels, over 180 employees and a combined \$7,000,000 in export earnings. Are these valuable breeding grounds—the backbone of this growing local industry—to be destroyed so that Iwasaki, through one means or another, can elevate the level of wetlands at present 1.3 to 1.5 metres below the high-water mark?

Why does Iwasaki need so much land when the tourist development covers only the coastal fringe? Did Iwasaki say, in one of his many plans submitted, that he would not build his international hotel for 10 years? Did he submit a proposal so outlandish that a former Treasurer said that no Australian would invest in it? This alone ensures it will remain 100 per cent Japanese-owned.

Has Iwasaki suggested he would need to bring in 100 Japanese families for the project, and is this the motive behind the Premier's sudden desire for Japanese migration at a time when there are already 72,000 Queenslanders out of work? As I said, what's going on?

On 21 January 1974, the Premier said in a letter to a Mr. A. C. Evans, the then secretary of the Capricorn Protection Council—

"I may have pointed out that there are what you may term 'foreign interests' holding land and business interests all over Australia. This is nothing new to our nation. We have American, French, British, Dutch, Chinese, etc.—all nationalities who have had business interests in Australia for a long time."

As Opposition leader, I might add that all the countries that the Premier mentioned have never followed a policy other than non-aggression towards either our security or our property.

In this letter the Premier continued—

"As a government we have a responsibility and are very alert to this to see our lands are not misused or taken over in large areas and this is why we have refused (I say again refused) to sell any freehold land to certain interests near the Rockhampton area."

I table the letter and ask that it be included in full in "Hansard". (Leave granted.)

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the following letter:—*

"Premier's Department,  
"Brisbane. Q. 4000  
"21st January, 1974.

"Dear Mr. Evans,

"Your letter of the 10th December has been drawn to my attention where you say that I 'indicated' on open line radio that I was quite happy to allow freehold land to be sold to foreign interests.

"In this regard, I may have pointed out that there are what you may term 'foreign interests' holding land and business interests all over Australia. This is nothing new to our nation. We have American, French, British, Dutch, Chinese, etc.—all nationalities who have had business interests in Australia for a long time.

"However, as a Government we have a responsibility and are very alert to this to see that our lands are not misused or taken over in large areas, and this is why we have refused to sell any freehold land to certain interests near the Rockhampton area.

"Yours sincerely,  
J. BJELKE-PETERSEN,  
"Premier.

"Mr. A. C. Evans,  
"Secretary,  
"Capricorn Coast Protection Council,  
"P.O. Box 323, Yeppoon, 4703"

Mr. BURNS: How does the Premier equate this attitude with his present unconditional stance on foreign hand-out? How does he equate it with the departmental direction at ministerial level of his aspiring successor on how to help an alien buy out Queensland?

On 4 March 1978 a "Courier-Mail" report stated that the National Party Management Committee wants a State Government register of land owned or leased by alien corporations or individuals. It also mentioned that no register was now kept. I can but assume that this decision represents belated concern by sections of the National Party towards a policy transformation in foreign land ownership that has developed progressively "under their noses" over the past four years.

I demand to know what weird and wonderful deals have been negotiated to bypass our gambling and vice laws. What guarantees have we received from Iwasaki, Maia and others? At what stage are negotiations on the millions Maia promised for a meatworks at Julia Creek? How much more land must Iwasaki command from this Government for a project that differs little from 4 years ago?

Not one Government member could seriously imagine that Japanese tourists will pour by the thousands week after week into Yeppoon, Nippon or Jappoon (whatever it may be called) to play Bingo on the beaches. I am told elsewhere that they insist at least on a casino, poker machines and legalised call-girl services. Are we to have the mixed bathing, for which Iwasaki is famous in Japan, with, according to the "Guardian", giggling schoolgirls at one end of the pool and naughty old men at the other? All the naughty old men in the Cabinet will be there.

Just what concessions has the Premier made to his Japanese friend that will apply under law only to his establishment and be excluded from our established Queensland tourist resorts?

The Premier returned on Good Friday proclaiming his Japanese host as—to use his term—“the greatest conservationist in the world”, because he planted trees. I learnt from the same article in the “Guardian” that Iwasaki’s attraction to foliage was aroused by what that newspaper described as the honeymooners’ tree-planting. Starry-eyed couples are charged \$16—“clear profit”, Iwasaki says—for their marital sapling. He jokes that, provided divorce doesn’t intervene, the delighted couple usually help his till at least once again by a nostalgic return to see how their love tree is sprouting.

I am sick and tired of the Premier and some of his cronies lavishing praise on faceless foreigners, some of whom now seek by favoured investment what they once missed by more direct, aggressive means. I am sick and tired of hearing from a Premier who can find nothing attractive in what was once a very easy-going, contented State unless it is foreign-operated and the proprietors have an overseas passport rather than an Australian Bankcard.

Last Thursday in State Parliament the Premier said—

“Queensland and Australia owe more to Japan than to any other country or nation.”

That is the Premier’s statement. That is his first international priority not just for Queensland but for Australia as a whole. He must have a short memory. Last year, on 27 February, in “The Sunday Mail” newspaper his heroes were the shahs and sheikhs of the Middle East. According to the Premier they were pouring here from their Arabian palaces, loaded with millions. He said—

“We must get rid of our over-reliance on Japan.”

The Premier continued, and again I use his words—

“I am determined to break the barrier of our dependence on Japan.”

This Premier, who only a year ago was reducing our reliance on Japan, said last Thursday of the Iwasaki project—

“But for Japan we would be in a very serious situation: we depend very heavily on Japan. On this basis alone, I, and this Government” (the Government that has not yet approved this deal) “support very strongly the Iwasaki project which will come before the House very shortly.”

I am informed that the reason why this Government is restricted on information is that the latest plans from Iwasaki on a scheme supposedly submitted four years ago and due to start within weeks did not leave Japan until last Thursday, arriving here by

air on Saturday. The Premier was demanding Cabinet approval for plans his ministerial colleagues had never seen, let alone studied. There had to be a special session for Cabinet last night to open their eyes.

Queenslanders may have imagined that approval of the Iwasaki venture would have rested on its feasibility and desirability. Such, unfortunately, from last Thursday’s remarks by the Premier, is not the case. According to him Queensland and Australia owe Japan so much that the slightest wish of one of that nation’s businessmen, no matter what is involved, is our unquestioned, unqualified command.

This is a project which, as it accumulates more and more land, expands uncomfortably close to our defence training establishment at Shoalwater Bay, only eight or nine miles away. Are we to have a defence set-up bordered by roads subject to Japanese traffic control for the passage of vehicles of our Armed Forces? Are we to have beaches in sunny Queensland where Queenslanders need permits from Kagoshima before they can throw down their towels and enjoy their own surf, sun and sand? Only last month the Local Government Minister admitted that there would probably be an escape clause within this unique agreement so that Iwasaki could change the use of his land.

I demand to know what protective assurances will be written into the agreement to prevent his using the land for other than tourism. What safeguards will we have against an elderly foreigner with so much freehold land converting it immediately into real estate, woodchip or live cattle enterprises? These are the questions commanding answers before any Queensland Parliament can give carte blanche endorsement to a scheme riddled with contradiction and smothered with the tarnish of Cabinet collaboration and even corruption.

I have an independent character analysis of Iwasaki that portrays him as “terribly stingy and cruel”, “a man who does everything for the sake of money earning.” The “Manchester Guardian”, in the article I mentioned, said (these are the words of its correspondent)—

“What the native will not yet know is that the Japanese entrepreneur’s plan is a resort intended only for Japanese—the only Australians disturbing the Japanese aesthetic sense will be the baggage handlers at Rockhampton Airport, and the waiters. No whites or dogs allowed.”

That is what the journalist Robert Why-mont in Tokyo foresees as the result of this Government’s expanding, still secretive “Costa Nippon” in the Queensland tropics. They are very real fears and they should be examined now. But it’s not just Iwasaki; there is also the Brazilian, Maia. How much do they and others own of our heritage, of our land, through the fawning patronage of this Government at Cabinet level?

Here we have a shifty and sinister deal from a Government that today seems to prefer unconventional secrecy to its responsibilities to both Parliament and the people.

As my time is about to expire, I shall conclude by saying that, if members of this Parliament allow this deal to come before it, we will have more to say at that stage.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): I call the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt. This is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask the House to extend to him the usual courtesies.

**Mr. SCASSOLA** (Mt. Gravatt) (12.41 p.m.): I am pleased to have the opportunity of associating the people of Mt. Gravatt with the motion of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen so ably moved by the honourable member for Southport and seconded by the honourable member for Warwick.

I congratulate His Excellency Sir James Ramsay and Lady Ramsay on the excellent manner in which they are discharging their duties in this State.

In November 1977 I had the honour to be elected to this Parliament as the representative of the electors of Mt. Gravatt, which is situated geographically in the south-east of Brisbane in a rapidly developing area. I am deeply appreciative of the confidence that has been expressed in me. I see my task as that of representing my constituents, amongst other things by expressing and reflecting in this Parliament and elsewhere the views and wishes of the people whom I have the honour to represent.

Concern has been expressed at the fact that Parliament was not convened until 28 March, some 4½ months after the election. As I perceive it, one of the functions of a parliamentarian is to represent his constituents in Parliament. Moreover, between elections the Executive Government is answerable, and indeed can only be answerable, to Parliament. A parliamentarian cannot carry out one of his functions effectively, nor can the Executive be answerable to Parliament with respect to important decisions and issues, unless Parliament meets frequently.

As member for Mt. Gravatt I follow Geoff Chinchin, who served ably in that capacity for some 15 years before his retirement. Geoff Chinchin is highly respected as a man of great propriety. He has an unswerving loyalty to the principles of liberalism.

The Mt. Gravatt, MacGregor and Sunnybank areas are rapidly developing ones; however, because the development was not preceded by adequate planning a number of problems exist. Some of them are inadequate public transport, the requirement placed on roads to convey traffic volumes far in excess of those for which they were designed,

inadequate usable open space and the lack of community facilities. Each of those problems will require attention if the area is to be more than simply brick and mortar and if the people living there are to be happy and have the opportunity of making a worthwhile contribution to the community. Some of those problems are currently the subject of representations to a Minister; others will be the subject of future submissions.

I am pleased to say that the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads has taken an interest in the foregoing matters which have come within his ministerial jurisdiction. He has welcomed, received and taken a personal interest in submissions made by the local community. Most matters to which I have referred are, nevertheless, within the province of the Brisbane City Council. The most pressing matter at this time is that of traffic congestion, having in mind that the 1982 Commonwealth Games will be held at the Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Sports Centre, which is within my electorate at Kessels Road. The Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital, which is also in Kessels Road, is presently under construction.

Despite statements by Brisbane City Council spokesmen that the council has been planning for years to alleviate traffic congestion, there has been no observable implementation of the plans. I am informed that the council allocated for expenditure on improvements to Kessels Road in this financial year a sum in the order of \$2,000,000. No road-works have been effected to date. Significant traffic congestion occasioned by the Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Sports Centre is already apparent.

The Commonwealth Games are but four years hence. By that time the Queen Elizabeth II Jubilee Hospital will be a significant generator of traffic. I appreciate that the extension of the South East Freeway will have a marked effect on alleviating road congestion. However, unless urgent steps are taken to alleviate road congestion and traffic problems in Kessels Road, Mains Road and neighbouring roads, chaos will surely result.

In November last year the then Minister for Transport (the Honourable Fred Campbell) announced the Government's intention to erect a new overhead railway bridge in Mains Road, Sunnybank, upon the council's commencing road-widening works in Mains Road—in accordance, I might say, with the council's stated intention. To date, the council has not commenced any road-widening works in Mains Road.

I desire today to speak principally about a minority group in our society, which is unable to speak for itself and is lacking in political pressure; a group that has been hidden from the gaze of society and, indeed, excluded from it. I speak of past indifference and neglect. I speak of human

dignity. Because of ignorance, prejudice and misconception, few parents suffer a shock greater than the birth of a mentally retarded child. There are, nevertheless, subsequent problems which periodically confront those parents—for example, the uncertain future, problems of schooling, prospects of employment and the care of the child upon the demise of the parents, to mention but a few.

The initial reaction of parents ranges from disbelief and rejection on the one hand to over-protection on the other. Until relatively recent times, most children who were diagnosed to be mentally retarded at birth were placed in institutions, often upon the advice of medical practitioners. Some newly born infants are still placed in institutions.

The gradual realisation that the child's only real prospect of development is at home with the parents and that the institutions are unsuitable for such children is encouraging parents to reject institutionalisation as an alternative. The disastrous effect which the institutional environment has on normal children's growth and development is well known. It is to be expected, therefore, that the effect of such an environment on children whose development is retarded in average environments is nothing short of devastating.

The parents of a newly born retarded infant who take the child home and seek support and encouragement, have little to look forward to. Family support services remain limited and fragmented. Counselling and support services are ineffective in that they are lacking in continuity, are performed by different agencies which do not have co-operation, and are carried out by an insufficient number of experienced personnel who do not have comprehensive back-up planning.

Competition between various agencies is keen. One gains the impression that the welfare of the child in some cases is secondary to the "business" gained. Not only are greater planning and co-ordination very necessary in support services but they are indeed a matter of urgency.

The absence of opportunity for adequate education, about which I shall have more to say later, and the insufficiency of support services have created anxiety, frustration and, above all, vulnerability in parents. Because there is no right to an adequate education, parents are reluctant to discuss or criticise existing programmes, on the basis that if "we do not accept what is offered, we may get nothing at all".

Generally speaking, mentally retarded children are traditionally defined as those with a measured I.Q. of less than about 55. Their number was estimated, in a recently published study, as being approximately 3.5 per 1,000 population.

Historically, the treatment of the handicapped in our society, educationally, has been tragic. Whilst the talented have been saluted,

the handicapped have been rejected. Because most have been regarded as ineducable, they have been left to languish in institutions. Many have been devoid of basic skills and many have been unable to walk or talk. They have been subjected to prejudice and a denial of human dignity.

For over a century, education of children has been accepted as a proper function of Government. Under the Education Act, education is compulsory for all except those in respect of whom "some reasonable excuse exists". In 1938, the Backward Persons Act was enacted in this Parliament. It was "An Act to Make Provision for the Education and Care, Treatment, and Control of Backward Persons". A backward person was defined as one "whose mind has been arrested or is incomplete" and one "who on account of such arrested or incomplete development is incapable of adapting himself to the normal environment of his fellows in such a way as to maintain existence independently of care, treatment, or control."

The Act in fact makes no specific provision for the education of backward persons; it merely provides that regulations may be made for that purpose. To the best of my knowledge, no education system was ever implemented under that Act. Between 1923, when opportunity classes were established in this State, and 1952, a number of retarded children found their way into State opportunity schools. A report on the education of the mentally handicapped in Queensland prepared by the Research and Guidance Branch of the Education Department and published in 1952 recommended that only "educable children be catered for in opportunity schools". One of the conclusions of that report was that "opportunity schools can not fulfil their true function whilst ineducable children are admitted". Ineducable children were regarded as those with an I.Q. of less than about 55.

Accordingly, parents whose mentally retarded children were excluded from the State school system had to fend for themselves or to seek assistance from voluntary organisations that were formed at that time in an attempt to fill the vacuum. By contrast, special provision has been made in this State under the Education Act for other forms of handicap. Deaf children, for example, have been provided for since 1915. The Narbethong School for the Visually Handicapped was established in 1964.

Despite the recent welcome development of the admission of some mentally handicapped children to pre-schools, to this day all mentally retarded children, other than those who are diagnosed as mildly retarded, are ejected from the State education system after pre-school. The education of such children is left to charity and to the initiatives of the few. The mentally retarded child does not enjoy the benefit of adequate funding. He does not enjoy the benefit of an education with precisely defined goals, nor

does he have the benefit of accountability, financial or otherwise. He does not have the benefit of an education that only the State can properly provide.

In 1978 the fundamental questions are whether the needs of the handicapped can continue to be left to voluntary separate organisations, whether those organisations are likely to have the resources to provide services that will realise the potential of each child, and whether it is now time for the State Government to assume its responsibility of ensuring that each mentally handicapped child has an equal opportunity with the normal child to obtain an education that will realise his potential capabilities.

Are mentally retarded children in fact ineducable, as the popular concept suggests, or are they capable of learning skills to enable them to take their place in society? Should such children have earlier education assistance? The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Handicapped provides—

“The mentally retarded person has a right to proper medical care and physical therapy and to such education training, rehabilitation and guidance as will enable him to develop his ability and maximum potential.”

[*Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.*]

**Mr. SCASSOLA:** The most urgent need at this time in respect of the mentally retarded is the establishment of a proper early education programme. In recent years there has been an increasing interest in the education of the mentally retarded, particularly in the area of early education—sometimes called early intervention.

A pilot research programme for the early education of mental retardees was instituted at the University of Seattle in Washington State in the late 1960s. Encouraging results were achieved indicating that mentally retarded children can make progress beyond the scope of what had been thought to be their limitation. In 1975 an experimental unit was established at Macquarie University in New South Wales under the directorship of Dr. Bernard Thorley, a senior lecturer in education and a man who had studied special education techniques under Sir Fred Schonell in Queensland in the mid-1950s. The examination at Macquarie centres on the evaluation of the benefit of early education and was established against the beliefs that mentally handicapped children will not respond to teaching and that their ability to learn is independent of the quality of that teaching.

Accordingly, a group of intellectually handicapped children aged 0 to 5 years was chosen. The choice was restricted to that group of mentally handicapped known as Down's syndrome children, commonly referred to by the unfortunate label of mon-

golid children. That group was chosen for a variety of reasons, the principal of which were the objective diagnosis of the condition at birth, the fact that the group constitutes the largest percentage in the moderately to seriously intellectually retarded range and because the handicap is of known organic origin; it has its origin in a chromosomal abnormality.

The goals of the programme were to have children functioning at normal or close to normal levels in pre-academic, academic and social skills by the time they attained the age of five years so that they could be given the opportunity to take their place beside their peers, and to establish a practical and effective programme rendering support to parents in keeping their children's development as close to normal as possible, especially in areas which are considered to be educationally significant.

Traditionally the Down's syndrome child at five years of age is regarded as being, and often is in fact, well behind a normal five-year-old in essential skills. As a result, the probability of that child being segregated in accordance with traditional thinking increases, and he would then be denied the right to a normal involvement in everyday life.

The essentials of that programme appear to be control over the learning process in a natural setting, initial and continuing assessment in considerable detail, a programme compiled by specialist teachers having specific objectives designed to meet the needs of each child and planned integration. Children are trained to sit quietly and to actively respond. Single learning steps are broken down into “easy to difficult” ones. Assessment is made at regular intervals on which individual and graded programmes are based. Objectives are set on the basis of behaviour of each child and continuous information is kept on the child's learning for the programme to be effective. The teacher is required to be a fully trained professional with a background of experience.

The results to date have shown that mentally retarded children between the ages of 0 to 5 years can function much closer to the levels of normal children than was ever thought possible. The 1977 report from Macquarie University contains this statement—

“The results can be seen in many hospitals, institutions, kindergartens and private homes throughout Australia in the raised hopes which parents, teachers, nurses and doctors have to their Down's syndrome children.

“The fact that we have helped Down's syndrome children to achieve levels of competence in areas which were previously considered impossible has changed attitudes. The one attitude change which is

apparent is the belief that Down's syndrome children can learn if they are taught."

In a paper entitled "The Need for Early Education of the Intellectually Handicapped", Dr. Thorley says—

"First of all these children can be ready to read at 3 years old and begin to read at 4 years. In child after child both here and in Seattle the children develop a minimum sight vocabulary of at least 40 words and can respond appropriately to reading material containing these words by the time they reach the age of 5. Indeed all the data is not yet available. There are a variety of reasons for predicting that these children can become functionally literate at an age very close to the normal age at which this occurs."

Not only has the Macquarie programme demonstrated that handicapped children are not ineducable but it has also underlined the necessity for early education. Most normal young children in this State begin their education at about the age of four years, thus acknowledging that the child's education from that age is too important to leave solely to the parents. It has been said that mentally retarded children do begin to deteriorate mentally after birth unless given special help from an early age.

Is the early education of intellectually handicapped children an economically practicable proposition? The alternative to home care of an intellectually handicapped child is placement in an institution. It has been estimated that the cost of placing a child in an institution is in the order of \$12,000 per annum. By the time that child attains the age of five years, the State will have expended the sum of approximately \$60,000 on that one child. On the other hand, the cost to the State of an early-education programme is in the order of \$600 per child per annum. The only major expenditure to the State would be the salary of teachers, presuming that premises were available.

The concept of early education has been accepted by a wide range of professional people. The Education Department in Queensland, in its publication "Children with Special Needs" says, "Queensland adopts the practice of early intervention". Unfortunately, that principle has not yet been put into practice so far as it relates to the mentally retarded.

The Mt. Gravatt College of Advanced Education has commenced its own experimental programme, enrolling individuals under 18 months of age.

Early in 1977 a programme based on the Macquarie concept was commenced at the W. R. Black Home for Children at Chelmer conducted by the Uniting Church of Australia. That programme catered for a number of visiting day children as well as residential

children. The programme proved to be an instant success and has been the subject of laudatory comments from parents. Many parents have commented on the observable improvement in development made by their children. At the commencement of 1978 a greater number of children sought the benefit of this service than the available facilities would allow. Admission was initially restricted to those already attending. The Uniting Church of Australia has now decided that the programme will be discontinued. Only those children for whom no "suitable alternative exists will be accepted". There is no other early education programme in existence in this State at all for mentally retarded children. There is in fact no alternative to the W. R. Black programme, let alone any "suitable alternative".

Whether educational programmes for the handicapped should be integrated with or segregated from the normal system has been a matter of argument for some time. The successful results of the Macquarie programme pose a powerful argument in favour of integration. I have been informed by a number of pre-school teachers, for example, that handicapped children have been readily accepted by others. Indeed, the short-term object of the exercise is to equip handicapped children to take their place beside their peers in the normal class-room, albeit with continuing specialised help. The long-term object is to assist these people to become at least partially self-supporting, and to give them the opportunity of becoming part of the community. In the words of the Assistant Director of Education in New South Wales—

"With support and based on the continuing work of the Macquarie University's early Down's syndrome programmes, it is possible that the least restrictive environment for young mongoloid children in the foreseeable future may well be in normal kindergartens and infants' departments . . . then placement in small numbers in normal classes. With an itinerant teacher support, service could be mutually rewarding to them and their normal peers and would effect a marked reduction in the per capita cost of education."

For over a century the education of children in our society has been accepted as a function of Government. Indeed, every normal child is guaranteed a free education at a Government school. Sadly, in 1978, most mentally retarded children are denied that basic right. Because they have the misfortune of being handicapped, they are excluded from the system. No attempt has been made to enable them to overcome their handicap.

Research of the kind undertaken at Macquarie has served, among other things, to change attitudes. Apart from demonstrating that mentally handicapped children can learn, it has shown that early education is as important as physical care and attention.

The success of that research has also raised parental expectations. Whilst academics can wait years to establish with precision the ultimate benefit of their research, the parents of the mentally handicapped child cannot. The cost of inaction is immeasurable. Whilst the cost of inaction is borne by the community, the results of that inaction remain with the parent always. Parents should have to wait no longer for early education support for their handicapped children to give them the opportunity of enjoying relatively normal living. It is totally unjust to deny them that support.

The present Government policy is to leave the education of the mentally handicapped to charity and to the initiatives of the few. Apart from the fact that voluntary organisations do not have the wherewithal to provide the type of education to which retardees are entitled, the present system serves to preserve the outmoded beliefs, the prejudices and the old wives' tales of a bygone age. Furthermore, it perpetuates the uncertainty and vulnerability of parents.

The recent experience of the W. R. Black Home programme is testimony to the fact that there can be no guarantee of continuity in any voluntary support programme. While mentally handicapped children are denied the right to a free, adequate education for their needs, their parents will remain reluctant to speak out for fear that even the inadequate services available will be denied them.

A system of accountability needs to be built into the education of the handicapped. Clear, precise goals and objectives need to be laid down. Any new system needs to be staffed by professional people who have competence and expertise in bringing children towards these goals. Integration and normalisation will not be achieved by having watered-down curricula or by having untrained people. If the advantages which appear possible through early education of the mentally handicapped are to become a reality, the education system of those people will need to be integrated into the Government system under the control of fully trained professional educators who are accountable.

It is time that the mentally handicapped child was given educational opportunities equal to those of his normal peers to take his place in a society from which he has been banished for so long.

**Mr. LESTER** (Peak Downs) (2.33 p.m.): I congratulate the previous speaker, the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt, on his maiden speech. I am very sure that many of the points he raised will be of special significance to Mr. and Mrs. Kelly of Moranbah, the father and mother of Stephen. I hope it will be possible for me to send a copy of the honourable member's speech to the Kelly family in Moranbah.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on the excellent contributions that they made. I also offer my personal congratulations to each and every new member of this House. I hope that it is possible for all of us, irrespective of our political beliefs, to work together for the benefit of all people in our State.

There is no doubt that today there is far too much point-scoring, and both sides are guilty of it. Many people lose much by it. Progress is generally halted by these wars of words, words that often do not mean a lot and often do not solve the problem. I hope it is possible for us to pay more attention to action and attitudes.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Where are you now—Clermont, Moranbah, Emerald or Blackwater?

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LESTER:** It is very obvious that the A.L.P. member for Archerfield is not interested in people; otherwise he would not have made that irresponsible comment.

I renew the pledge of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen of all my people in Peak Downs and hope—

**Mr. Wright:** They call him "Twinkle Toes".

**Mr. LESTER:** It is interesting to note that the honourable member for Rockhampton is not interested in listening to the comments I make about my people.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

I remind the honourable member for Peak Downs, too, that after this debate concludes there will be no further reading of speeches. The older members particularly should be aware of that rule.

**Mr. Frawley:** The honourable member for Archerfield is the worst offender. He reads speeches prepared by the Trades Hall.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. LESTER:** The new electorate of Peak Downs is derived from the old electorate of Belyando. From my former electorate I have lost the areas of Collinsville, Alpha, Jericho, Bluff, Dingo, Duaringa and Bauhinia. I assure the people of those areas that their new members (Mr. Katter, the Honourable K. B. Tomkins and Mr. Glasson) will look after them very well. If those members can look after these good people better than I did, well and good.

My electorate includes the towns of Moranbah, Clermont, Blair Athol, Capella, Emerald, Bogantungan, Gindie, Comet and Blackwater, and the gemfields. The mining town of Blackwater has a population of 8,000. In the last 10 years its has grown to be the significant town that it is today. Recent new amenities include the fire station,

the pre-school, the court-house buildings and the school library, as well as the police station which is under construction. In conjunction with the new bridges over the Dawson River and Blackwater Creek and work on the Capricorn Highway east of Blackwater, they have given that town an independence as well as a degree of pride. That was highlighted by the art show I had the pleasure of visiting only last week. It has been very heartening to see that town progress through the years to such a significant centre. Next week the Blackwater Hospital Week sporting activities will help the town no end.

I point out, however, that further amenities are needed in Blackwater. A new school apprenticeship training annexe, a full-time medical superintendent and extensions to the Blackwater Hospital are all matters that I will continue to seek in this coming term. The family care centre in Blackwater is doing a magnificent job. Like the sporting and various other organisations in the town, it is going ahead in no uncertain fashion.

I feel that it is important to let people know that the town of Comet is holding its school centenary on 29 and 30 April this year. That will be a very significant event for the residents of Comet. One of the problems experienced in the Comet area—and, indeed, in the Theresa Creek area—has been soil erosion resulting from the recent rains. It is very disturbing to find that so many people have been affected by this catastrophe. It is difficult for them at this stage to get compensation.

The town of Emerald celebrates its centenary next year. I am very hopeful that the Queensland Government will hold another Cabinet meeting there to enhance the occasion of the centenary. Emerald is about to boom. It has grown significantly in recent years. With its cotton ginnyery and its meat-works, and with Dampier Coal Mine coming into existence, Emerald has a rosy future.

Emerald holds the Sunflower Festival each Easter. Without doubt it is becoming the most important festival in Central Queensland—even more significant than the Gladstone Easter Festival.

Improvements in the Emerald area include the commencement of the Comet River Bridge, the completion of the court-house in May, which I hope the Premier will open, the library at the Emerald State School, and the imminent start on the community health centre, all of which help to give the town a certain amount of significance. We hope that the Government can keep up the pace of development and that we do not have to keep coming cap in hand to the Government seeking for our area the needed additional amenities that are staring Government officials in the face.

The present grasshopper plague in Emerald and the surrounding district is causing some concern. I hope that the Department of Primary Industries can assist our primary producers who are affected by this plague.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** What about parthenium weed?

**Mr. LESTER:** I am coming to that.

The suitability of the soil in the Emerald irrigation area is causing some concern. I hope that the Department of Primary Industries will work actively to solve the problem so that the farmers in this area will be able to grow good cotton crops. The livelihood of many people in that area depends on cotton-growing. It is a little frightening to know that this soil problem exists, and I hope that it can be solved.

Improvements I will be seeking include the State High School library, and more widening of the road between Emerald and Capella, the section of the Capricorn Highway between Yamala and Emerald and the sections of the Capricorn Highway west of Emerald.

Capella has a new lease of life because Dampier Coal Mine is providing some houses in the Capella area and because the new Oaky Creek organisation will be based generally at Capella. The population has increased considerably. I am heartened to know that a new pre-school will be built in Capella for the commencement of the 1979 school year. My only wish is that it could be opened sooner.

I should like a start to be made on the provision of a medical centre at Capella. It is wonderful to see the Minister for Health walking into the Chamber to listen to what I have to say about it.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. LESTER:** When Labor members stop interrupting, I shall point out that although Capella is a small town its population is increasing rapidly. As a start, we need a small clinic to provide an interim medical service. We are not asking for the world. We want a small medical centre to be established in Capella as a prelude to bigger things to come when the town gradually expands. It would be handy if television could be extended to Capella and so give residents good television reception. The Government therefore has some serious problems to consider in this area. With the present stage of development of Capella, we have the ball at our feet and if the Government keeps on the ball there will not be the serious problems that have arisen in the development of some other mining towns.

One problem for those on the gemfields is the drop in gem prices over the last two years.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** What caused that?

**Mr. LESTER:** The honourable member is well aware of what caused it. It is a problem very much concerned with marketing. I should like to point out that, whereas an ounce of gems was worth over \$200 two years ago, the price is now down to about \$40 to \$60. That is very disturbing for the small miner because his production is

somewhat limited, and it is particularly disturbing for large miners many of whom are paying off machinery and employing men. They have many problems and indeed they are unable to comprehend these low prices.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. LESTER:** It surprises me that I am getting so many interjections when I am speaking about a serious problem that affects many people. I hope it will be possible for the State Government to take some action in an attempt to stabilise the price of gems so that Australian miners get at least a fair return for a fair day's work. I should also like to point out that the Australian gem cutter, with disabilities such as a 27 per cent sales tax to overcome, is at an extreme disadvantage and cannot produce as cheaply as his Thai counterpart. I merely point out that low gem prices are creating a very serious problem.

When Ministers, both State and Federal, go overseas to promote the sale of beef, coal and other commodities, which they have a duty to do, I hope it will be possible for them to promote the sale of Australian gems throughout the world. The gem-bearing area is only small but it is one of the few such areas in the world today. It has to be looked after. We have to ensure that it is not raped and that prices remain reasonable.

The town of Clermont has had an excellent spin from the Government in the last three years. The Government has provided a new manual arts block, a new science room, and an aged persons' home, which is doing an excellent job. The maternity centre and the dental clinic are also helping to fill a need in the Clermont area.

I again stress that there is a problem at Blair Athol because the Rockhampton Power Station, for economic reasons, will be closing down. It would be very helpful if some Blair Athol coal could be used in the Gladstone Power House complex. There are some problems in the transport of the coal because of the state of the track and because the small wagons are not geared for unloading coal at Gladstone. But Blair Athol has excellent steaming coal and I hope it will be possible for at least a small part of Blair Athol's production to go to Gladstone, thus keeping 30 or 40 men in work at Clermont. If this cannot be done, the town of Clermont will suffer if not a death blow—it would not perhaps be quite that serious—at least a severe set-back.

**Mr. Wright:** It would hurt them, though.

**Mr. LESTER:** Of course it would hurt them.

The people of Moranbah feel very proud this year after winning both the Australian Rules and Rugby League football premierships last year. There is an excellent high school in Moranbah which is, I hope, to be opened by the Premier later this year.

Other amenities include a pre-school, maternal and child welfare centre, which is now being built, and the ambulance centre, on which all those concerned deserve congratulations. A court-house is under construction and is much needed at the moment. The youth centre, which is being organised by a group in Moranbah with the co-operation of the Belyando Shire Council, is going to serve an excellent purpose in this town.

I point out that Moranbah has further needs. I hope that class-room accommodation at the State school will be upgraded more quickly than is happening at the moment, with the Government perhaps considering a new State school because more than 1,000 students attend the existing school.

Hospital extensions are needed in Moranbah in the not too distant future because at times the present hospital capacity is severely taxed. Bridges are needed over both Nebo Creek and the Isaacs River. Nebo Creek is in the electorate of the Minister for Culture, National Parks and Recreation, whom I see in the Chamber. I mentioned this matter last year and said that I hoped he would support my request. He did support me, but obviously we need a bit more support.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. LESTER:** It is a very serious business. Every time it rains the creek rises and cuts off Clermont, Moranbah and Dysart and causes severe problems.

Generally speaking, nobody could deny that the Government's record in the Peak Downs electorate has been good. Housing Commission homes are required urgently throughout the electorate. Although a number have been built, housing continues to be a problem. Railway housing in Blackwater, Emerald and Clermont still causes considerable concern. I hope that railwaymen can be encouraged to buy or build their own homes, although this suggestion is fraught with problems because of difficulty in acquiring land and raising a deposit. The deposit required seems to be out of the reach of many railwaymen. Because they normally accept transfers to gain promotion, they face problems in the acquisition of a house.

**Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt:** You did a good job for the men in Bluff.

**Mr. LESTER:** I did an excellent job in Bluff, but unfortunately Bluff is not now in my electorate. However, railway housing is a real problem and I really feel that the Government has to strive hard to come up with some sort of solution. Anything that the Government can do to encourage local home-ownership would be a step in the right direction, but I do not yet know, and I do not think anyone else does, just what is the complete answer to this problem.

I now want to turn to my old hobby-horse of housing for fettlers, which has still to be upgraded considerably. Certainly, great improvements have been made in the Peak

Downs electorate. Houses in some areas have been painted and a number of new units have been built. However, there is still a lot more work to be done and I hope that electricity can be connected to houses in some of the more remote areas in order to give these people the chance to live a normal life.

The operation of the apprenticeship scheme concerns me greatly, and we in country areas have to consider seriously the establishment of technical annexes at high schools. I believe that the apprenticeship block-training scheme is on the verge of causing a disaster for country people. A country employer has to send his apprentice to Brisbane, Rockhampton or wherever for block-training. He gets a taste of city life and finds that it appeals to him. Some apprentices have got into trouble in Brisbane and their employers face all sorts of problems in trying to look after them, especially when they are taken away from their place of work for lengthy periods.

I believe one way to partly overcome this problem and give country areas a certain independence would be to organise some type of technical annex at high schools in country areas. I understand members of a committee of inquiry are looking into this problem, and as far as I am aware their thinking is more or less along the same lines as mine. Of course, more money is needed, but we must look at the problem.

The more I think about the restrictions relating to emission controls on motor vehicles, the more annoyed I become. They are causing enormous problems for country people. New cars now being bought are not as mechanically reliable as those bought in earlier years. They do fewer miles to the gallon, engines are breaking down earlier and valves are burning out at a relatively early stage in the life of many motor vehicles. For the life of me, I cannot understand why, with modern science, some type of fuel cannot be developed that will make cars run better. I cannot help thinking that it is to the advantage of oil companies to have cars using a great deal of fuel and to the advantage of motor vehicle manufacturers to produce cars that are slightly less reliable. It means that more parts have to be sold and thus there is a greater turnover for them.

I hope that some research will be done into the lead-filtering system, which appears to have a lot going for it. Technical experts have told me that if the system can be perfected, mileage per gallon will be higher and cars will be more reliable and will use less fuel. It seems that that system has something to commend it, and I hope that our scientists will try to find an answer to the problem.

Safer motor cars also are needed. The moment one begins speaking about safer motor cars, motor vehicle manufacturers say that the cost of producing such vehicles

would be too high. For the life of me, I cannot understand why, with all the advantages of modern science.

Action must be taken to make cars stronger than they are at present. If one sees any of the ordinary, basic cars such as Holdens and Falcons turned over, one usually sees that the uprights holding the roof are bent and that the bodywork is completely crumpled. If a head-on collision occurs, even at reduced speeds, almost certainly the dashboard is pushed back onto the driver. If a vehicle is damaged at the rear in a collision, almost certainly the goods from the boot spill forward onto the driver. Basic strengthening in these areas would not cost a lot of money but would make cars much safer.

I cannot understand, either, why the sides of motor vehicles cannot be strengthened so that a person involved in a side-on collision is not likely to be wiped out. If a person is wearing a seat-belt when a side-on collision occurs, the seat-belt immediately locks and he is crushed.

One has only to look at present-day cars to realise how fragile they are. Basically, if one puts a finger on the door of a motor vehicle one dents it. I am not talking about the expensive motor cars when I say that. I reiterate that I believe basic strengthening of motor cars could be carried out at a reasonable cost. It irks me that one has to pay upwards of \$9,000 for a reasonable motor car—say, an ordinary Falcon with automatic transmission and perhaps air-conditioning—and basic strengthening is not included in it so that a person involved in an accident will at least have a fighting chance of surviving.

It is beyond my comprehension why, with the scientific knowledge available today, motor cars are so dear, yet the people producing them tell us that they are making net losses. I hope that they are keeping their books properly and not trying to put anything over the public. It is all very well for some honourable members to laugh at what I am saying, but one has only to go down the street and listen to people talking after they have bought motor cars to know that the very things I am mentioning in this Chamber today are what they are talking about.

If motor cars were safer and cheaper, people would purchase more new vehicles. This would result in a bigger turnover and in more people being employed. I hope that research into fuel and motor vehicle design can be undertaken in order to help the average fellow in the street who has to put his hand in his pocket to purchase a motor car.

Workers' compensation payments are reasonable for the first six months, but anybody who is in the unfortunate position of being off work for more than six months finds that he is back to the bare basic wage. This has a very frustrating effect on the higher wage earners in mining towns.

Because these people are in the minority, not many stick up for them. They have not a loud voice and therefore not many people take notice of them. When the bread-winner in a family suffers an injury which necessitates his being off work for more than six months, he is back on the basic wage after six months. Not too many people are on the basic wage today, but that bread-winner is in difficulties because of his various commitments, such as the buying of a motor vehicle.

He is just unable to cope, particularly if he is paying a high rental. This has led to many marriage break-ups. It has also led to the loss of many items that have been hard fought for. I would hope that workers' compensation could be organised to help those few people in the unfortunate position of having to be off work for more than six months. I have had many genuine cases presented to me, but unfortunately I have been unable to help.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper** interjected.

**Mr. LESTER:** The honourable member for Archerfield had better not start talking about parties. In the days of the Labor Government there was no six months' period. The basic wage was payable right from the start. It is this National-Liberal Government that changed the Act so that for six months employees receive a reasonable degree of compensation. Don't let him pick at me on that one.

Widows have certain problems. I would draw attention to the plight of a widow with two children who is trying to rear and educate her young family. If she wanted to improve her lot by earning more money as the bread-winner, she might apply to one of the mining companies for a job, only to find that she could not get a job because all the houses are allocated to miners. Normally the wives and daughters of miners would have priority for jobs. I am not in any way trying to knock anybody but merely trying to point out that a problem exists. If out of the goodness of its heart a mining company wanted to help a widow living in Mackay or Rockhampton by providing work in an office on a mining field, that company would have to build her a house at a cost of \$40,000-odd. Obviously it would be totally uneconomic for the company to do that. Many widows find that they are unable to save enough money to purchase a house because of the high rents they are paying.

I would suggest that any widow who is prepared to go out and work should be still paid the pension, but that that pension be paid into a trust fund, and after a period of five years the amount of pension which would normally have had to be paid to her if she had not worked be made available as a deposit on a home. Basically that would not cost the Government a lot of money. If she had some reason for not working, the Government would have to pay the pension anyway.

That money could go into a trust fund and subsequently be of assistance to the widow by way of a deposit on a home of her own.

Widows with young children are in the minority. Not many people take much notice of them, but they have very special and very real problems. We as legislators have to try to ensure that all sections of the community are helped. A lot of research is needed to find the solution to their problems, but I am sure that if we use our heads we can work out some way of giving an incentive to those people who are prepared to try to help themselves. If they are not helped they might say that because they have to look after their children they are entitled to a pension. If they are given a pension, you, me and everyone else will be paying it. People who are prepared to work could be given incentives to build their own homes, thereby creating employment and generally a healthier attitude.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** You promised me you would speak on parthenium weed, and you haven't.

**Mr. LESTER:** I turn now to parthenium weed. I would suggest to the member for Archerfield that instead of interjecting he listen very carefully to my remarks on this very serious problem.

As I predicted some three years ago, the spread of parthenium weed, a noxious weed, is of alarming proportions. People on all sides laughed at me then, but they are not laughing at me now. Parthenium weed is spreading throughout the length and breadth of Queensland as well as into northern New South Wales and the Northern Territory.

It is not fair to condemn the Government for the serious situation that has arisen. It has spent money on the problem and has held many meetings to discuss it. A lot of local organisations have been trying to control parthenium weed. Furthermore, someone has been sent to Brazil to carry out research into biological control of the weed. I am sure that, no matter which Government was in power, the weed would have spread just as much as it has. Even if 100 jumbo jets were to fly all over Queensland spraying parthenium weed, it would grow again after the next fall of rain. The point I am trying to make is that it is almost impossible to eradicate the weed by normal chemical means; they just do not work. Biological control is the only method of eradicating the weed. Unfortunately at this stage we have not found a suitable biological method of attacking parthenium weed without affecting other plant life.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Are you suggesting that parthenium weed has a strong biological urge?

**Mr. LESTER:** If the member would stop making irresponsible interjections and try instead to assist me in my fight against parthenium weed, I would be deeply grateful.

The plight of the cattlemen continues to be a source of concern to all of us. I only wish that I had the answer to the problems confronting cattlemen. I never cease to be concerned at the severe problems that beset them. They continue to borrow money knowing full well that their debts are getting beyond them.

I am very pleased to learn that my suggestion to Qantas to provide Australian meat on their overseas flights, thereby introducing it to householders throughout the world, has been accepted and appears to be working very well. This at least has made one small contribution to the marketing overseas of Australian meat. We must be fair dinkum about meat-marketing and be prepared to go further than merely advertising in newspapers overseas. Instead of giving dinners to important people who visit Australia, we should get our meat into the kitchens of the housewives overseas, thereby creating consumer demand for our meat overseas. We must beat the competition that we have. It is a simple fact of life that on the world market there are more cattle than are generally needed.

All of us must view the steel recession with some concern. I hope that its effects will not be too severe in Queensland. If they are, more workers will lose their jobs. We have to try as best we can to gain overseas orders. It is heartening to know that the prospects are bright for steaming coal. It would appear that if there is an energy crisis overseas, large quantities of steaming coal will be needed to meet that crisis. That is why I say again that if Blair Athol can be kept going for a couple of years it might be possible to get a sizeable overseas order.

Of late there has been a lot of talk about our Government. It is under fire. I do not deny that for a moment. One only has to look in the newspapers. But let us not get carried away. It is a fact of life that Governments sometimes come under fire. Probably the Government most under fire in Australia at the moment is Don Dunstan's in South Australia. That fact cannot be denied. I looked at an Adelaide newspaper the other day and I was amazed at the things I read in it. For the life of me, I would not say that all of the things in the newspaper were true; but equally all the things in the paper about our Government are not true, either. Quite clearly, all Governments come under fire from time to time. I point out, too, that when Clem Jones was Lord Mayor of Brisbane he was continually under fire; but nobody in his right mind would attempt to say that Clem Jones was not a good Lord Mayor of Brisbane.

It is a fact of life that any Government trying to do a job and prepared to stand up in doing it will come under fire; so let us not put in the boot in one place only. It is a fact here in Queensland. It is a fact in South Australia. It was indeed

a fact when Whitlam was in power. So let us not kid ourselves that we are the only people in Australia coming under fire from time to time. However, so often when we do come under fire we are eventually proved right. Doubtless in many instances we will again be proved right.

In the minute remaining to me, I would like to point out that country people, generally speaking, have to try to get a better deal. It irks me that there seems to be a numbers game; if an area has the numbers, then it gets the benefits. Places such as Twin Hills and Douglas Creek are entitled to school facilities and medical services, because the people in those areas have to put up with a lot. In conclusion, I say sincerely that country people have to be thought of much more, because we in the country are making a magnificent contribution to the development of the State, and, without us, Queensland would not be such a great State.

**Mr. R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (3.14 p.m.):** I am sure that the member for Peak Downs has missed his true calling. He should have been a geography teacher.

I welcome the opportunity given to me to speak in this Chamber on behalf of the electors of Wolston and to raise matters which affect my electorate, and other matters which I am sure will disturb many Queenslanders.

It would be remiss of me if at the outset of this speech I did not make special mention of my predecessor, the former member for Wolston, the late Mr. Evan Marginson. Mr. Marginson was elected to this House in 1969 as the member for Ipswich East. As a result of a redistribution in 1972 he was re-elected in that same year as the member for Wolston and he served in that capacity until October 1977. Prior to his election to Parliament he served for many years on the Ipswich City Council, attaining the office of vice-mayor. During his career in public life he carried out his duties in a distinguished and dignified manner. He was highly thought of by members in this Chamber, the constituents of Wolston and members of the Australian Labor Party. During his time as secretary of the Ipswich Hospitals Board, many of the progressive changes that took place in that body were directly brought about by his vision and foresight. His advice and assistance to me in the early stages of my campaign were deeply appreciated. His untimely passing has deprived the Ipswich area of an outstanding citizen.

I should also like to place on record my thanks to my campaign director, Alderman Bill Austin, who worked tirelessly during my campaign, to Steve King and to Tom and Val Easterbrook for their work, encouragement and support, and to Paul Tully for his excellent work on advertising. I express a special thank-you to the many members of the A.L.P. branches in Wolston who worked so hard to achieve a magnificent result.

While various redistributions have, to some degree, changed the geographic nature of the electorates contained in the Ipswich city boundaries, it is very clear that voters in this area have indicated their outstanding support for the Australian Labor Party. The result in Ipswich West saw the defeat of the National Party candidate and the election of my colleague David Underwood. The 11 per cent swing to the Australian Labor Party in the seat of Wolston and the 13 per cent swing to the Australian Labor Party in the seat of Ipswich show quite conclusively that Labor and Ipswich go together. I am confident that at the State election in 1980 we will see the Minister for Health unceremoniously tipped from his seat and that electorate also return to the Labor fold.

The Wolston electorate is highly diversified, consisting of multiple industry such as woolen mills, pottery works, coal-mines, railway workshops, brickworks, cement works, car and truck assembly, market-gardening and fruit-growing. The accommodation of the area consists mainly of Housing Commission homes.

As I mentioned earlier the Wolston electorate has demonstrated a clear preference for Australian Labor Party representation and it is my belief that Government policy towards my area has been one of deliberate deprivation. This was demonstrated very clearly at the recent State election when the Premier went to every corner of Queensland and made it very clear that the election of non-Government members meant victimisation against the citizens in those particular electorates.

The most outstanding example I can give in this House today is the desperate need for the construction of a high school in the Goodna area. Questions have been asked in this House since 1969 of various education Ministers on when a date for construction of this high school could be given. In nine years not one undertaking has been given by this Government in spite of repeated representations.

Recently I wrote to the Minister requesting that he meet a deputation representative of all parents and citizens' associations in my electorate to discuss this matter. The Minister advised that because of his work-load he was unavailable. Perhaps his unavailability stems from his spending too much time with Mrs. Joyner and her small band of fanatics and his banning of sensible education courses such as MACOS and SEMP.

He further advised that he had visited the schools within the electorate and had spoken with various people concerning a high school. What the Minister did not point out was that his visit took place two years ago and that at that time much of the development that is taking place in the Wolston electorate had not even commenced.

The West Moreton region is the fastest-developing shire in Queensland. Housing development is expanding rapidly at places

such as Collingwood Park and its neighbouring area Redbank Plains. Children, when ready for their secondary education, are required to travel either to the Bundamba High School which has a shocking problem with overcrowding or, alternatively, to the Oxley, Corinda or other high schools in the Brisbane metropolitan area. This year, some 600 children are travelling daily to the areas I have mentioned and the projected figure by 1980 is approximately 1,000. This alone indicates the necessity for the commencement on the high school as early as possible.

In the winter months many of those children who are involved in sports and music programmes or other after-school activities arrive at their local railway stations in the dark and, because of poor public transport facilities and lack of private motor vehicles, are required to make their way home through darkened streets. There have been incidents of assaults on young women during this particular time of the year.

I again wrote to the Minister requesting his presence at a public meeting on a date convenient to himself to discuss this matter. Again I have been advised that he is not prepared to attend and I was told to contact the regional office for further information. I have contacted the regional office, but, whilst I appreciate the assistance from the staff, they are unable to furnish me with any relevant information.

I have with me today petitions carrying in excess of 3,000 signatures. Unfortunately I am unable to table them in this House because the concerned parents have worded them incorrectly. To every parent in the Wolston electorate, and to me, this issue is of the utmost concern and I urge the Government to give its consideration a high priority.

While on the subject of education, I want to make special mention of specific problems at the Riverview State School. This school was opened on Tuesday, 25 January 1977. It provides a much-needed education facility in the area but, because of lack of construction time prior to the commencement of the school term and lack of forward planning, it has continually had problems.

Attached to the primary school is a recently built pre-school centre, which caters for only 50 children a day. Enrolments are now at capacity and many children are prevented from attending. Surely the Government should have taken into consideration that this is an area primarily of young families and that the construction of two pre-school centres would have better suited its needs. The school itself is within the boundary of a current mining lease and, bearing in mind the Government's attitude in that area, one could assume that it might not be permanently located. Within a radius of one kilometre from the school are both abandoned and currently worked mining shafts. Unfortunately a number of abandoned mining shafts have become filled with

water and, being within easy range of the residential area, they provide popular if dangerous playing grounds.

The condition of the school grounds makes them unusable for sport or recreation. In an area that is suffering from dire socio-economic problems, the parents and citizens' association is required to raise some \$20,000, which is an almost impossible task. Very little turf has been laid in the grounds. There is one toilet block for boys and one for girls, which is completely inadequate. There is no fence between the pre-school and the primary school, which is an accepted norm at other schools throughout Brisbane. There is no sealed surface from the main road to the administrative block.

On Thursday, 16 March, a young boy was bitten by a snake when he was very close to the grade 1 class-room and it was only prompt action by the school principal that prevented a tragedy. This incident occurred because of scrap material and overgrowth in the school grounds, which the Works Department never finished cleaning. I have written to the Minister on these matters and I sincerely trust that he will have this position rectified in the very near future.

Of primary concern to all in our community is the high level of unemployment. In November last year, during the State election campaign and amid the hollow and deceitful promises of the Government that jobs would become available, there were 2,069 unemployed males in the Ipswich area and 933 females. Today there are 2,397 males and 1,154 females unemployed—an increase of 549. In spite of attempts by the Premier and the leader of the Liberal Party in this House to skate over this subject, it is becoming more apparent to all sections of the community that this situation is being brought about directly by the inadequate policies of the Fraser Government federally and the Bjelke-Petersen Government in the State of Queensland.

Much has been said in this House about unemployment and a lot more will be said in the future; but today I want to turn my attention to the depressing effect that it is having on young people in our community. The tales manufactured by Liberal and National Party Governments that young people are content to live on the dole are just not true. I have spoken to hundreds of young persons in my electorate whose one concern is to find gainful employment. After they have been consistently rejected in their efforts to find employment and they begin to feel that they have no role to play in the community, I can well understand that many resign themselves to accepting that they will be recipients of social security payments for quite some time. Consequently their incentive and pride vanish. This Government stands condemned not only for its attitude on unemployment but because it is prepared to do nothing about it.

Suitable youth recreation facilities are practically non-existent in the Wolston area. I commend the efforts being made by rugby league clubs, soccer clubs, church groups and others under extremely difficult circumstances. But surely the Queensland Government has a responsibility in this area. I call on the Government to make suitable funding available for the establishment of a recreation centre to service the needs of the Wacol, Gables, Goodna, Redbank and River-view areas. This project would help to alleviate the unemployment in the area. It would provide a much-needed facility and, with forward thinking and planning, could be designed to include a further needed facility—a maternal and child welfare centre.

It is interesting to note that the birth rate in the area, as I have mentioned, ranks among the highest in Queensland—obviously related to many socio-economic factors. Facilities for pre and post-natal care are most inadequate. The mobile centre visits these areas on a rotating basis, and expectant mothers and women with young children are often required to queue up in the sun. This is most uncomfortable and has caused distress to these people in the past. I would point out that adequate maternal and child welfare services are available at Ipswich and Inala and were funded by the Whitlam Government.

**A Government Member: Rot!**

**Mr. R. J. GIBBS:** It is not rot. The honourable member would not know. Because of completely inadequate public transport it is impracticable for these women to travel to either of those centres.

In my capacity as Opposition spokesman on Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement I have recently completed a tour which took me to Yarrabah, Horn Island, Thursday Island, Badu, Kuban Village and St. Paul's Mission—both on Moa Island—and then to Hammond Island. I was appalled by the treatment of the black people that I saw.

Before going into detail on this matter I wish to refer to the report of the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement for the year ended 30 June 1977 and the comments made by the director of that department, Mr. Killoran. He said—

“In addition to the problems that are now faced by Islanders, Aboriginal Queenslanders are struggling to maintain their identity, their self-respect, and their right to contribute to the benefit of the broad society.”

He further stated—

“In Queensland this Department will continue to consider the needs of the total Queensland community and to regard indigenous citizens as citizens of this State, not an elite group to be risked in the process of bold social planning.”

It is true that these people are struggling to maintain identity and self-respect because of exploitation by the Queensland Government and a lack of compassion. The Queensland Government's attitude was made very clear by the Minister—and it is a shame to see him leaving the Chamber—in his first statement after his appointment to that position, when he said that blacks get too much. Let me prove to this House how untrue that statement is. The Queensland Government is daily flouting Federal laws passed to prevent exploitation of and discrimination against Aborigines and Islanders. The result is that thousands of Aborigines and Islanders are being grossly underpaid and are being denied rights which they have been entitled to since 1975.

Under the Commonwealth Constitution, Federal law overrides State law. The Queensland Government has been evading its obligation under the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (Queensland) Discriminatory Act, which was passed by the Whitlam Government prior to its defeat. Section 11 of the 1975 Federal Act states unequivocally that Aborigines and Islanders must be paid full award wages whether they work on reserves or elsewhere. Yet the Queensland Act exempts employers from the payment of award wages to Aborigines and Islanders on reserves. On board the Government training vessel, "The Kuzi", which is based on Thursday Island, crew members are paid \$19 each per week plus board. Board is a bunk to sleep on, and their food consists mainly of the seafood from their catch. Presumably the crew are being trained to operate the vessel and are under the impression that when training is completed they will be in control, but after eight years not one is considered trained and the vessel is still captained by a white Australian.

On Palm Island the average wage being paid to adults is \$63 per week, a discriminatory payment which could not be offered off the reserve without exposing the employer to the risk of court action. In contrast, white labourers on the island are paid \$115 per week. At the same time, there are in the vicinity of 200 unemployed Aborigines on the island, who do not receive the full dole but a special discriminatory benefit of \$34 per week. A deserted Aboriginal mother with one child receives \$15 a week from the State Government and \$2.50 for each additional child—about one-third of the State benefit available to whites for the first six months after their desertion or widowhood.

The medical practitioner at Palm Island wanted to pay increased wages to Aboriginal nursing aides, who are receiving between \$40 and \$60 a week compared with the \$90 to \$110 a week paid to white nursing aides. The Health Department applied to the

Director of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement, who refused the increase on the basis that they would be out of parity with other Aboriginal workers on the island.

At Kuban Village I spoke with some black men who were employed to construct a number of houses. They were working a 40-hour week and their take-home pay each fortnight was around \$123.

These examples illustrate the fact that statements of concern by this Government are made with tongue in cheek, particularly on health facilities on Thursday Island and throughout the Torres Strait.

In a report called "The Forgotten Island", compiled by Mr. Gene James, who was a clerk at the Thursday Island Hospital some five years ago, the serious incidence of venereal disease was brought to the attention of the Queensland Government. This report received wide coverage in the national magazine called "Identity", Vol. 1 No. 10, in March 1974. It is interesting to note that in what has become expected political retaliation by the Queensland Government, Mr. James was almost immediately transferred from Thursday Island. That report has since been substantiated by concise medical evidence for the last four years, which shows that syphilis has now reached alarming proportions.

Several months ago a former Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement, Mr. Wharton, made a statement that venereal disease was not a problem on Thursday Island. Only recently Health Minister Dr. Edwards announced that a health team was being trained for the area. I believe that this statement was prompted by my visit to the islands and by a leak to the Minister that I had obtained certain information.

The facts and figures are that 20 per cent of the adult population between the ages of 12 and 40 now suffer from one new infection with V.D. each year. The annual number of new cases of venereal disease has increased by almost 200 per cent over the last four years. Primitive and gross forms of the rarer types of V.D. are on the increase, due mainly to the fact that illegal immigration of Papuans and Taiwanese has greatly increased.

As recently as 1977 a health survey was carried out on students at the Thursday Island High School from classes 8, 9 and 10. The blood tests were done in a Brisbane hospital laboratory and showed a positive reading for 40 per cent of the students tested.

Members of this Assembly should be aware of the consequences if this disease is left untreated. It ultimately results in paralysis, insanity, blindness and brain damage, and it renders females incapable of reproduction. Many of those who have this disease are not aware of it because of poor health education, and others are embarrassed to attend the outpatient services. Provision for private-practice facilities for evening use by medical officers on Thursday Island would undoubtedly contribute to better surveillance measures. The

private practitioner should be given access to hospital records of the patient's medical treatment card, thus ensuring a high standard of treatment and follow-up. According to my information, the Minister for Health has refused permission for the use of the out-patient department by private practitioners after hours, even on a rental basis.

On outlying islands the clinics are run and administered by the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and the nursing sisters and untrained staff are not under the authority of the Thursday Island Hospital Board or its medical superintendent. The supplies of drugs and equipment for these clinics are similarly the responsibility of the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and the Thursday Island Hospital Board has no authority over them. This makes it unnecessarily hard to organise any central control over the problem. It is of great importance that the Government give consideration to placing these outlying islands under the control of the Thursday Island Hospitals Board.

The reports that I speak of show that venereal disease is only one of the chronic health problems in Torres Strait. Fifteen to 20 per cent of the Islanders over the age of 12 years have diabetes mellitus. There are 22 cases of tuberculosis—more than all the Cairns/North Queensland area put together. In the space of three years 420 children have been found to have chronic middle-ear infection. There are even isolated outbreaks of malaria in different parts of the Strait, again because of the insufficient enforcement of immigration laws. Ten per cent of Thursday Islanders under 20 years of age and 32 per cent on outer islands suffer from trachoma, something with which the Premier of this State is well acquainted, and I will make reference to that in a few moments.

In the interests of all people in the Torres Strait area the Government has an obligation to train and equip more staff to deal with these outrageous medical problems. It certainly will not attract people with the needed expertise if the advertisement in "The Courier-Mail" of 4 March 1978 is typical. The advertisement called for an itinerant dentist to be employed by the Thursday Island Hospitals Board and based at Bamaga. The salary offered was in agreement with the Dentists' Award and Public Hospitals Board but the highlight of the position was the paltry district allowance of \$4.40 per fortnight, which offers no incentive to people to serve in that area of the State.

I mentioned the trachoma project—one that is vital to the well-being and eye health of thousands of Aborigines and Islanders. Trachoma is an infection of the conjunctiva or mucous membrane of the eyelids. According to statistics black people constitute 1 per cent of Australia's total population but account for more than 20 per cent of the

blind population. In every four blacks over 60 years of age one is blind and another has poor vision. One in every five blacks needs an eye operation, and one in every two blacks needs attention from an ophthalmologist. These are alarming figures, and should be of concern to all who care and have a humane attitude towards their fellow-man.

On 8 November 1977 during the lead-up week to the State campaign, Queenslanders were shown the real Christian attitude of the Premier of Queensland when he suddenly announced that the programme was to be deferred because two local Aboriginal members of the trachoma team had allegedly distributed A.L.P. pamphlets among Aboriginal groups who were being examined by the team. Other sources claimed that they had distributed only voting enrolment cards. The trachoma team is led by Professor Fred Hollows, Professor of Ophthalmology of the University of New South Wales. In reply to allegations by the Premier he said—

"I have no knowledge of Mr. Grogan or Mr. Miller engaging in political activities. They would not have had time to scratch themselves. We have worked three times faster in Queensland than in any other State."

He said that Mr. Miller and Mr. Grogan were excellent workers and valuable members of the field team. Their contribution had allowed the team to work as efficiently as it did in Queensland. Those are strong words from a man who is highly respected in his profession.

Let me give yet another example. Writing in "The Courier-Mail" on 10 November 1977, prominent Brisbane ophthalmologist Dr. Laurel MacIntosh said—

"I was in the field with Professor Hollows' trachoma and eye-health programme for nearly three weeks recently in the Gulf and Cooktown areas. I returned with considerable admiration for the work being done and the sympathetic way in which it was handled. Although aware of the political affiliations of some members of the team, I saw no political literature at clinics nor any electioneering."

The Premier claimed that Mr. Mick Miller had handed 200 to 300 enrolment forms into the Cairns Electoral Office, but the Chief Commonwealth Electoral Officer for Queensland, Mr. Coleman, said he had checked with his Cairns office and was not aware of any enrolments having been lodged by Mr. Miller.

It is recognised as being no exaggeration to say that the eyesight of some people could well have been lost because of this absurd and irresponsible act of the Premier. Both men accused are active members of the Northern Land Council, which is a source of embarrassment to the Premier. He fears the activity of the council in its bid to gain land rights and to his discredit his actions were politically motivated. It is all

very well for the Premier to go around making accusations against innocent people, but why doesn't he come clean and tell the people of Queensland the real motivation behind his incessant drive to retain control of the black people of this State?

On my recent trip I was reliably informed of blatant breaches of the Queensland Electoral Act by employees of the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement. Such breaches were: black police in uniform handing out National Party how-to-vote cards and directing people how to vote; National Party balloons and bags of lollies being handed to young children inside polling booths as an inducement to their parents to vote for the Government; and huge posters of the Premier and the local candidate being displayed directly above ballot-boxes.

From the result at Doomadgee in the Mt. Isa electorate a very clear pattern emerges. The Labor Party polled two votes whereas the National Party polled 164, but in the Federal election the Labor Party polled 48 per cent of the vote compared with 52 per cent for the National Party. What a remarkable difference! Doomadgee Mission, which is administered by that very dubious religious sect, the Bretheren, is reputedly one of the poorest missions in Queensland in terms of medical and educational facilities, which are the very reasons the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs gives for wanting to take over Aurukun and Mornington Island. Why not the same proposition for Doomadgee? I will hazard a guess why not—because there are no bauxite deposits and because the Government on a State basis can manipulate the vote. As I said before, the Premier should come clean and tell the people of Queensland why he wants to retain control of black affairs in this State, and tell them the real reasons.

The recent decisions by this Government to take over Aurukun and Mornington Island have been made without any thought for the people or consultation with them. They are decisions which are against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people and which demonstrate once again the jackboot approach that this Government adopts. The Opposition will have much to say when this matter is debated here.

In the short time remaining I wish to raise some matters pertinent to Mornington Island. On 19 December 1976 Mornington Island was flattened by cyclone "Ted". The Premier visited the island and attempted to persuade the island people to pack up and move to Doomadgee. What a remarkable coincidence it is that the name "Doomadgee" should keep cropping up!

**Mr. Bertoni:** You know we can't interject during a member's maiden speech?

**Mr. R. J. GIBBS:** The member can interject any time he likes. He'll be fruit off the sideboard.

The Premier visited the island and attempted to persuade those people to go to Doomadgee Mission, but the people were not going to be manipulated by the National Party and told the Premier in no uncertain terms that they had no intention of moving. Emanating from this we have seen one of the greatest exercises of buck-passing that have ever taken place between the State and the Federal Governments. The Queensland Government wants to control but not contribute. In reply to a question by the member for Mt. Isa on 24 March 1977 the Deputy Premier and Treasurer said—

"... the State Government does not have the financial capacity to go it alone and must depend on a favourable response from the Commonwealth to its request for financial assistance."

Financial assistance eventually came from the Commonwealth but to date nobody knows how much or what proportion of that money has been spent. Some of the existing homes on Mornington Island were repaired, but until September 1977 no new homes had been constructed. During the wet season the people were forced to live in battered Army tents and shanties. This accommodation was substandard and provided very little hygiene or personal privacy. In contrast, buildings owned by the State Government received first preference in reconstruction and repair.

Official figures show that unemployment on Mornington Island is very high, largely because there is no established industry. Surely some of the people could have been employed in a rebuilding programme. Even without basic skills, they could still have been placed under suitable supervision.

I mentioned the lack of established industry. An Australian Labor Party senator, Senator Jim Keefe, approached the former Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries, Honourable C. A. Wharton, for financial assistance to enable the people to establish a fishing industry. The Minister obliged by providing two or three small dinghies to teach the islanders how to fish. The islanders were expert fishermen for 50 years before Mr. Wharton was born—a further example of this Government's complete unawareness of the problems being faced by the black community today.

I am very glad to see that the member for Merthyr has entered the Chamber. Last Tuesday in this House he took advantage of the lack of a Speaker to launch an attack on members on this side of the Chamber who have had a background as full-time union organisers. I happen to be one of those persons, and today I want to state quite unequivocally that I am proud of that association with the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union. In common with the experience of my colleagues, I found the position of union organiser to be one of hard honest work, helping people who had problems and who were being ripped off by people such as the member for Merthyr. This is in

marked contrast to his activities. For years before his election to this House he skulked in the byways and back alleys of this State as a member of the Special Branch, spying and prying on honest citizens.

**Mr. LANE:** I rise to a point of order. I find the member's remarks offensive and untrue and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to accept the denial and withdraw the statements.

**Mr. R. J. GIBBS:** Are you asking me to withdraw that, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Mr. R. J. GIBBS:** I go along with your request.

The member for Merthyr is a noted union-basher.

**Mr. LANE:** I rise to a point of order. The remarks made by the member for Wolston are offensive and untrue and I ask that he withdraw them.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

**Mr. R. J. GIBBS:** I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. It is remarkable to me that the other day in this Chamber the member spoke about people on this side of the House breaking protocol by interjecting on maiden speeches; yet here he is today the greatest exponent of going against a tradition that has existed in this Parliament for many years.

The member for Merthyr is an activist in the National Civic Council, one of the most dangerous, subversive, Right-wing organisations in this country.

**Mr. LANE:** I rise to a point of order. The remarks made by the honourable member are untrue and I ask that they be withdrawn.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member objects and asks for a withdrawal of the remarks.

**Mr. R. J. GIBBS:** I withdraw the remark, on the basis that probably he has not paid his membership.

The National Civic Council in this State of Queensland is firmly entrenched in the Queensland branch of the Federated Clerks' Union. The secretary of that union, Miss Joan Riordan, spent five days in Melbourne in January 1977 at a D.L.P./National Civic Council meeting and training school at the expense of union members. She recently completed an overseas trip to Korea, Tokyo and Waikiki Beach at the expense of union members—not on union business, but to make first-hand contact with other ultra-Right-wing organisations.

Miss Riordan, Mr. Thornton and Mr. Muller (from the Clerks' Union) at some time or other have had discussion with the member for Merthyr, and in 1976 ran a successful campaign to gain control of the Clerks' Union. They based their campaign on the fact that the union was going broke but, from 1973 to 1976, Thornton and Riordan were the union trustees. It is a known fact that this year at least \$100,000 of members' money will be paid into the funds of the National Civic Council.

The full-time paid staff of the N.C.C. have a close personal relationship with the honourable member for Merthyr as they also have with a Mr. Ted Kowalski, an organiser with the Clerks' Union, but previously a full-time officer of the National Civic Council. These are the sort of people with whom the honourable member for Merthyr associates and he is in no position to criticise those who honestly run and administer trade unions. He may rest assured that every time he tries, the compliment will be fully returned.

I said at the outset of this speech that I welcome the opportunity to speak in this Chamber. I thank the electors of Wolston for their support in electing me as their representative. I pledge myself to serving them as their full-time State member. Just as they voted in Wolston in the recent State election, the people of Queensland will vote in 1980 and the Australian Labor Party will be returned to the Treasury Bench in this State.

**Mr. BISHOP** (Surfers Paradise) (3.52 p.m.): It is with a considerable amount of pride and some trepidation, Mr. Speaker, that I make this speech today.

I am proud to be able to associate myself with my colleague the member for Southport in his expressions of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and to her representative, His Excellency the Governor.

I join with other members, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating you on your re-election to the high office you hold and, at the same time, I thank you for the courtesy and hospitality you have shown me in the short time that I have been a member of this Parliament.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, I have spent many years in finally achieving the honour of being elected to this august Assembly, as my friend the honourable member for South Coast will testify. So now that I have gained the honour, I trust I will be a model member and not add to your trials while I am in this place.

When I arrived in Queensland in 1959 from Victoria to take up residence, the sitting member was the late Mr. Eric Gaven. I came to know him well and, I must say, was saddened at his early retirement from the political scene. He was a tremendous fighter for his electorate and because of his qualities

very much loved by the people he so ably represented. In his very first speech he said—

“As a Member of this Parliament I shall always do my best to be fair. If I believe the Government are deserving of credit or praise I intend to give it, but if I think they should be criticized for the way in which they discharge their responsibilities I shall be prepared to offer just and constructive criticism”.

The fact that he was in Opposition when he said that in no way detracts from the sentiments he expressed and in no way lessens my commitment to the same views.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to address myself to certain matters affecting my electorate. The first of these is, of course, the tourist industry. The Surfers Paradise electorate is one of the fastest-growing in Queensland. It has a population of over 30,000 people with a growth rate of 44 per cent from 1971 to 1976. There are over 16,000 electors on the roll, of whom some 9,500 reside in the City of Gold Coast and the remainder in the Albert Shire. It is an electorate whose economy is totally dependent on the destiny of the tourist industry. To service it, there is a multiplicity of small businesses, accommodation houses, light industries and professional people. Most of them are migrants from other States and countries, with a fierce love of the area and a will to succeed. They recognise that they live and contribute to the success of one of the world's most successful resort areas and they realise that it has been built by their own hands and the drive and enthusiasm of those who preceded them.

Very little encouragement has been given by Governments to the development of tourism in Australia. There are many reasons for this, not the least of which is the industry's apparent lack of political muscle arising from its fragmented structure and diversity. Tourism is, however, an identifiable nationally important industry. The industry involves a wide cross-section of component activities, including the provision of transportation, accommodation, recreation and related services. The industry is all about people. It serves a common human need, a need typical of a maturing society—the desire to travel.

The refusal to recognise the integrated nature of those components of the industry I have just mentioned has meant, in the past, a lack of broad measures for assistance. There is no doubt that the travel industry is severely hampered by the absence of reliable basic statistical data, and it is an extraordinary fact that only late last year the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau was able to finance the employment of its first research officer. Unless a comprehensive and sophisticated data base is developed to assist the formulation of a balanced policy which will give proper recognition to the travel

industry, we will continue to flounder along on our past hit-or-miss basis. I hope that the Government increases its support and encouragement to the tourist bureau to rapidly expand this section of its activities.

To indicate what I mean by the lack of data available on the industry, we only have to look at the 1977 Queensland Year Book. It is in many respects very comprehensive and, as honourable members are aware, it totals some 600 pages and 25 chapters covering such subjects as Law, Order and Public Safety and Metric Conversion, and has one section called Miscellaneous. Within this latter section a subsection comprising 4½ pages is headed “Tourism”. In the first paragraph on page 569 we are told that tourism has emerged to a leading place among the State's most valuable services. Tourism, it states, was in 1969-70 worth more than \$135,000,000 a year to the State. One wonders how much more it is worth eight years later! I imagine over \$200,000,000. It is rather paltry then that this State is spending only \$700,000 this financial year on advertising and promoting such a huge industry.

I hope that the Government Statistician records its worth more effectively in the 1978 edition by according it the prominence of a chapter of its own, more in keeping with its financial importance to the State's economy. I am sure every member of this Parliament would agree that in one form or another tourism and travel do have an influence on the economy of his electorate. But, I am sorry to say, tourism has been one of the most sadly neglected areas of debate in this House over recent years.

Tourism can make a significant contribution to solving a number of problems facing this State by creating new job opportunities. Statistics indicate that the travel industry directly employs 10 per cent of the Australian work-force and, in addition, provides part-time work for at least as many people as are permanently employed.

There is a multiplying effect from tourism, particularly upon rural communities, which compounds the benefits of travellers' spending. The tourist dollar is a fresh dollar to the economy. It has been shown that for each dollar spent \$2.40 is generated into the community.

The tourist industry is, by definition, a dispersed industry and in many parts of the State may be the only viable alternative to single product primary production. It supports regional distribution of goods and services and contributes to the more efficient use of public facilities and regional resources.

Broadly speaking, the people who travel can be classified into two groups, the vacationer and the traveller. The vacationer is seeking relaxation; the traveller seeks excitement in new experiences. The vacationer wants to escape routine and repetition; the traveller

has a more sophisticated view of the travel experience. When people take a vacation they go through three phases. The first phase is when people speculate about the ideal vacation. The second phase is concerned with gathering information and help in exploring the possibilities of realising their vacation. The last phase is when practical travel decisions are made.

The first phase calls for "image" advertising; the second for "inquiry" advertisements or those which offer information. The third phase is "hard sell" advertising such as "drive" to the Sunshine State. It is therefore important for the Government to assist regions in this State to determine what their image is. One effective means of practical assistance is to offer a dollar-for-dollar subsidy to those local authorities that employ a tourist development officer, as is done to those who employ industrial development officers.

I also hope that the research programme to be shortly undertaken by the Government will include image studies as to how particular markets in Australia feel about the many destination areas we have in this State. If an area is viewed as a place for fun and games, advertising can be aimed at groups who want that kind of entertainment. Areas which project images of "rest and relaxation" can be promoted among other markets.

One facet of relaxation and entertainment has been completely ignored by this State. It creates certain images in people's minds, of course, but I am not aware of any serious Government research having been done into the prospect of establishing a casino in Queensland. From time to time the occasional entrepreneur has floated the idea of establishing one in my electorate only to be greeted with invective and outpourings of prejudice and preconceived misconceptions from some quarters.

I think it is about time that we researched the question thoroughly and determined its worth and whether the advantages are sufficient to encourage the establishment of one in my electorate and under what control and operation. At the same time it is opportune to clear up some of the misapprehensions that exist about what type of casino people on the Gold Coast think is right for them. It has been suggested, right from the early days of our research in 1962, that the most valuable and suitable style of casino is a European one, not a Las Vegas poker machine operation.

If there was any doubt about it the Wrest Point success surely ends any suggestion otherwise. It shows that a high class casino can be run in Australia by Australians for Australians—and for the financial benefit of the State. Yesterday's copy of "The Australian" mentioned a gambling report prepared in England. The article stated—

"Britain's legalised gambling, an industry with an annual turnover of more than \$7,000 million and with more than 90,000

employees, demands the most careful research. And the economists and sociologists have been put to work.

"The result is a 257-page study turned out by the Home Office, which supervises gambling through local boards so strict that organised crime has reportedly never been able to break into the big casinos, despite a turnover last year of \$1,300 million.

"The study makes several intriguing points in a country where four out of five adults gamble at some time or another in the casinos, at the horse tracks and dog tracks, on the football pools, or on bingo and lotteries." (Rather like Queensland.)

"The most sociologically important is: 'There is little or no evidence to suggest that, as a pastime, moderate gambling has harmful consequences either for the gambler or society.'

"There are some who gamble away everything, of course, just as there are drinkers who become alcoholics. But most gamblers, said the study, do not squander money recklessly either in the amounts they bet or the winnings they spend."

Wrest Point has been operating just five years and, in spite of the predictions of doom, has been a financial success and an asset to Tasmania. About 5,000,000 people have visited the casino, and an average of 100 conventions are held there each year. This has enabled the company to spend \$12,000,000 on goods and services and more than \$4,000,000 for entertainment in the Cabaret Room. Over that period more than \$9,000,000 has been paid to the State Government in casino taxes. The company is currently engaged in extensions at a cost of \$20,000,000 which are due for completion in August.

We should also take a look at what is happening closer to home. I don't regard the Twin Town Services Club at Tweed Heads as a casino, although others may, especially when its income for the year ended 31 December 1977 was \$4,975,835. In the last 10 years the income of this club has grown by over \$4,600,000 and the membership from 973 to 8,708. Over that period the club has paid in taxes, licence fees and turnover tax to the N.S.W. Government \$3,292,000.

Tweed Heads has a population of 27,500—2,500 fewer than my electorate—and it is not insignificant that it has one of the fastest-growing commercial areas in the region. It would also be a reasonable conclusion that a large proportion of that money and business growth is coming from the Gold Coast tourist industry.

One cannot escape the irony of a situation where this Government is spending funds to promote the tourist industry in Queensland and the N.S.W. Government has silently

and gratefully received \$3,292,000 as a result of our success. It must think we are the greatest benefactors of all time.

It is my view that the travel industry is at the crossroads in this State. The labour intensiveness of the industry, whilst one of its assets, has made it particularly sensitive to escalating labour costs. Recent substantial wage and cost increases in the accommodation sector have occurred at a time when it has been difficult to offset them by increasing tariffs. An example of the cost increases appeared in today's edition of "The Australian". It sets out that in 1972 a housemaid earned \$45.40 a week; in 1975, \$98.90; and in 1977, \$129.70. In 1972 a waitress earned \$55.80; in 1975, \$100.30; and in 1977, \$131.20. I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that those increases are enormous, and that they far outstrip the increases in tariffs. When one adds the penalty rates, sick pay, holiday pay, payroll tax and so on it is realised that the gross wage of the housemaid is lifted to about \$180 a week.

There is no doubt that it is going to be very difficult for the accommodation and travel industry to absorb these higher rates, especially when it is considered that the industry has to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week within salary structures based on an 8-hour day, 5-day week, with penalty rates outside normal working hours.

There are many aspects of Government policy which undoubtedly have a serious effect on the economy of my electorate. I do not want to overlook them today. Among these was the decision taken some years ago to discontinue the rail service to the coast, and the subsequent failure to commence a more appropriate and up-to-date service to what is now the second largest city in the State.

My electorate fares very poorly in the area of transportation. We are served by one of the worst airports in the country, which suffers the additional embarrassment of all the planes landing at virtually the same time, with the atrocious crowding and inconvenience that it entails for the traveller in a dilapidated and decrepit building.

We suffer from a poor and unreliable city-to-city bus service, which creates severe physical problems for the people wishing to use the service. About a third of my electorate are over 50 years of age and one-sixth over 65, and it is intolerable that they are forced to make their way for long distances between stops to catch a bus to Brisbane. One could be forgiven if he believed that there was a conspiracy abroad to deprive my electorate of adequate transportation facilities. Owing to the inadequacy of our roads, Surfers Paradise becomes clogged with traffic continually, which makes it virtually impossible for those people living in the area from Broadbeach to Miami to travel in any reasonable comfort. It makes it extremely

hazardous for the fire and ambulance services—and the Police Force—to serve the community in the efficient manner they wish to.

The decision by Cabinet to abandon the freeway proposal for the city is one I have not been convinced was the right one. No doubt exists in my mind, and in the minds of the population, that it will have far-reaching effects on the future orderly development of the area. Only last week the monthly edition of the "Surfers Paradise Chamber of Commerce Bulletin" had this to say—

"Traffic is gradually squeezing the life-blood out of the Gold Coast. Not only is the lack of a freeway strangling the city, it is also driving away visitors. Long established Gold Coast supporters are now making alternative plans for vacations: simply because they don't want to leave the congested roads of their home city and face the frustrations of driving through worse traffic here.

"The Chamber feels that unless some positive moves are made immediately to acquire the land originally set aside for the inland freeway it will be too late.

"The Gold Coast Bulletin, in a recent editorial, made the comment that: 'Bridges are being built and roads improved. But frequently the easing of a problem in one area creates a new traffic hazard in another. An inland freeway behind the Gold Coast still seems to be a vital part of the answer.'"

The Government has repeatedly underestimated the growth factor of my electorate. This is further indicated by the lack of hospital facilities in the electorate. There is no doubt that there is a need for an out-patients clinic in the Miami area in view of the critical transport problems faced by the people. The Government already owns land for hospital purposes.

The Government has continually been unable to provide a Police Force of the size the electorate needs. Whilst we have been blessed with enlightened officers and men, the work-load they are asked to carry is beyond reason. At present Surfers Paradise has three sergeants, 12 constables, four detectives and two Juvenile Aid detectives on a temporary basis. They have been taken off normal duties and not replaced. This force operates from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. In practice, however, because of the demands made on the station the manpower is stretched over longer periods. There is also a 24-hour, two-man wireless car in operation. Broadbeach has one sergeant, six constables and two detectives.

Considerable dissatisfaction exists among the community about the force's inability to cover the crime rate satisfactorily. In spite of repeated promises to upgrade the Surfers Paradise Police Station to a 24-hour station, nothing has been done.

The figures show that there is, on the average, one member of the Police Force to 1,000 residents or about one member of the Police Force to 2,000 persons, including peak tourist traffic. In other words, our force has to look after four times the number of persons that is considered reasonable throughout the rest of the State.

It is no wonder, then, that Surfers Paradise recently suffered the indignity of being labelled the crime capital of Queensland. The country's No. 1 holiday area should not have to wear this label, nor should the men of the undermanned Police Force have to bear this curse. I trust that the Minister for Police will look very carefully at remedying this sad state of affairs.

Having had a close association with local government for a number of years, I can appreciate how much Government attitudes and policies affect rating structures and the standard of living of people. I have some examples that I should like to emphasise today. I do not know whether the Government is aware of the situation that has developed in which local authorities are being forced to tax their residents more than before in order to finance essential works programmes.

Some time ago the Federal Government took over large portions of the State Government debts extending over a period of five years. None of the benefits flowing from this move, however, were passed on to local authorities. At the 1970 Premiers' Conference, when the Financial Assistance Grant was being negotiated, the Commonwealth agreed to help the State's debt position in two directions.

Firstly, about one-quarter of the State's future borrowing programmes was made available each year interest free and non-repayable; secondly, in the five years of the current agreement the States were to receive new grants equal to the debt charges payable on a specified parcel of State debts which would total \$1,000 million by the end of the fifth year. None of these benefits have been passed on to local authorities.

As a result of this the Public Debt in Queensland is moving forward at a slower rate and the local authority debts are moving forward at a faster rate. This has the effect of raising local authority rates or alternatively slowing down local authority works programmes, thereby increasing unemployment.

In recent years there has been no expansion of State rates of subsidy. On the contrary, there has been a reduction in subsidy rates and items have been deleted from the subsidy schedule. Examples of this are found in the provision of major headworks, reservoirs and trunk water mains.

We all know that the protection of our beaches is of vital concern. In spite of this the State persists in providing to beach protection only a 20 per cent subsidy and the Federal Government provides nothing

at all. When one considers that over recent years the Gold Coast City Council has spent \$6,400,000 on beach protection work and obtained loan funds equal to that amount only on the condition that it completed the recommendations set out in the Delft Report—at a total cost of \$14,000,000—one can see what an impossible burden it is that is being carried by the ratepayers.

In the annual report of the Director-General of Tourist Services for the year ended 30 June 1977, the Beach Protection Authority said that it believes that the existing State subsidy of 20 per cent will not offer sufficient encouragement to local authorities to give reasonable priority to developments that will properly meet the problem. It also states that the longer these beach protection works are delayed, the greater will be the spending on stop-gap measures which, in the long term, will be a waste of money.

A number of local authorities in the State find that the increasing costs of protecting and patrolling beaches are becoming a heavy burden on ratepayers. The Gold Coast City Council will spend \$250,000 this financial year patrolling beaches and subsidising 18 surf life-saving clubs. This means the ratepayers are paying nearly \$5,000 a week to provide safety on beaches. Naturally ratepayers use the beaches, but the greatest use of the beaches would be by visitors, and their safety must be ensured. Many less important things are subsidised by the Government and, as this involves people's lives, it is of paramount importance.

While local authorities appreciate the establishment of schools and other Government buildings, it is an unreasonable tax on ratepayers when provisions for parking, which are required of other developers, are not met. How can local authorities provide large sums of money to develop parking areas particularly where, if they operate a regulated parking fund, the State Government will not subsidise parking schemes for their own developments? In these circumstances it is hard to understand why the Government has refused to allow increases in the parking penalty where regulated parking is enforced.

There are many areas in which the Government can assist local authorities, and indeed should. Some local authorities are adversely affected by the State Government's not paying general rates. A way of passing funds to local government would be for the Government to pay ex-gratia general rates. The ratepayers of this State, Mr. Speaker, are being forced to bear an intolerable financial burden. I know that in my electorate, which encompasses two local authorities, the rates have gone high enough.

I am looking forward with optimism to adequate provision for off-street car-parking being incorporated into the new State high school at Clear Island Road. This school will be a magnificent acquisition to education

in the electorate, and I trust that the Honourable the Minister for Education has taken note of my request that it be named the Merrimac State High School.

When the question of education is being discussed, it is most important to remember that one of the essential elements of tourism development is the hotel, restaurant and tourism training school. Adequate instruction should be available at the new College of Technical and Further Education at Southport, to prepare workers for the skilled and semi-skilled jobs required. If the industry is to continue to grow, it needs skilled persons available for employment in all tourist services, including not only restaurants and transportation, but also travel agencies, tour operators and retailing.

One of the most gratifying aspects of the travel industry is the manner in which it is completely dominated by the small businessman, and the opportunities it gives him to prosper. It is what makes the Gold Coast—and makes Queensland the State of the future. The small businessman prospers in the travel and tourism industry, and he dominates it. Now if, as has been suggested in some quarters, drastic changes are to be made to trading hours, then we can look forward to the destruction of the small trader. In today's unreliable economic climate he will not have the capacity to go through a major upheaval in trading hours. Not one organisation representing traders in my electorate supports unrestricted shopping hours. The Surfers Paradise Chamber of Commerce, the Surfers Paradise Traders Association, the Surfers Paradise Progress Association, the Mermaid Beach Chamber of Commerce, the Nobbys Beach Progress Association, the Miami Progress Association, the Pacific Fair Traders and in addition the Gold Coast Visitors Bureau have all told me that after canvassing their members they are totally opposed to unrestricted trading hours.

It is very popular these days to talk about the small businessman and how essential he is to our free-enterprise system. We should go further than that. We will come to recognise that because of the drop in the agricultural, manufacturing and finance sections of the economy, we have a whole new industry—the service industry—to be encouraged and nurtured.

Tourism, of which the small businessman is a part, is one of the largest service industries. It must be given recognition by more positive measures than those taken in the past.

It has been said, whether truly or not, Mr. Speaker, that politics is the science of how who gets what, when and why. I have spoken of the what and why—I hope I do not have to wait too long for the when!

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Caboolture) (4.26 p.m.): Even though this is my maiden speech as the member for Caboolture, I do not want any privileges, and I invite members on both sides of the House to interject whenever they feel like it.

I renew my oath of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. This is something we rarely hear from members of the Opposition. I congratulate the Governor (Sir James Ramsay) and Lady Ramsay on the manner in which they have discharged their duties.

I am a State rightist. I believe in the rights of Queensland first and foremost above everything else and, whilst I am a member, I shall continue to do so.

I welcome all of the new members on both sides of the House as well as some of the former members who have been lucky enough to regain their seats. I refer particularly to the honourable member for Brisbane Central.

I draw the attention of the House to what I consider to be a breach of parliamentary etiquette by the honourable member for Wolston. When a new member delivers his maiden speech, he is not subjected to interjections unless he has already interjected during somebody else's speech. It is also recognised in this as well as in every other House of Parliament in the British Commonwealth that a new member, in his maiden speech, should not attack any other member of the House. He can attack him in his second speech but not in the speech during which he is protected by the unwritten law.

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I am glad that the honourable member is here. He will get something in a minute. Anyone who can be knocked over by a 65-year-old pensioner must be pretty weak, even though he had a Bible in one hand. The honourable member for Wolston will probably give him a few lessons in boxing so that he can defend himself against the pensioners.

I thank the people of Caboolture, which contains five-sevenths of the former electorate of Murrumba.

**Mr. Casey** interjected.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Unlike the honourable member for Mackay, I would not go crawling back to a party if I left it. I would be here as an Independent.

As I was saying, five-sevenths of the seat of Caboolture came from the former electorate of Murrumba and I believe I was entitled to stand for Caboolture. I moved there three weeks before the boundaries were altered.

**Mr. Wright:** How did you know about it?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I worked out the boundaries myself and moved there three weeks before the decision was made. I declared myself as the honourable member for Caboolture well and truly before the election. The Labor Party stood two candidates against me and I will outline their efforts later on.

**Mr. Kaus:** Did they lose their deposits?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** One almost did.

**Mr. Davis** interjected.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, would you give the honourable member for Brisbane Central a microphone. I am unable to hear his inane interjections.

Earlier today we listened to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. He ranted and raved and carried on in his usual style. He is nothing more than a loud-mouthed hypocrite as I shall prove in a minute. He told us that people expect the Government to make decisions. So it does. But he is under the complete domination of the Queensland Central Executive of the Labor Party and he dances to its tune.

The Labor reform group is trying to cut the rotten core out of the A.L.P. Denis Murphy won the plebiscite for the Federal seat of Griffith and the Q.C.E. reversed the decision and put in a Left-winger named Humphries, who won the seat. In the recent State election Mrs. Jordan won the plebiscite for Ipswich West and the Q.C.E. reversed that decision. I am not attacking the member concerned. I am not even sure who he is. Where is the democracy in the Labor Party?

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** That's a lie.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** It is not; it is the truth. I shall give the figures in a moment.

The Leader of the Opposition is the weakest leader of any parliamentary Labor Party in the history of Queensland. I worked here back in 1951 when the Labor Party was in power. I have told this House on more than one occasion how Labor members robbed this place. They even sold the very furniture from the House to pay their betting debts. I was here when they lowered tables to the ground over the veranda. I saw what went on down here.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Miller): Order!

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** When the Leader of the Opposition was the Labor Party spokesman on health, he found the then Minister for Health (Sir Douglas Tooth) a little too tough for him. So he chickened out and resigned from that position as health spokesman. His home was robbed on a couple of occasions and he even had the audacity to claim that the perpetrators of those thefts were mem-

58539-4

bers of the Liberal and Country Parties. That, of course, was absolute rubbish. In fact, he defrauded the insurance company when he claimed that he had 12 suits stolen, because I know for a fact that he got six suits the week before from St. Vincent de Paul in the Valley!

I am now going to prove some of the hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition. I have in my hand a Press cutting dated 27 May 1976 containing the heading, "State Five will pay their own way". When I read that I thought, "This a pretty good. Here are five Labor members of Parliament, led by the Leader of the Opposition, who are going on a trip through Red China and they are to pay their own way." Many people thought that that was very good. But then, during a debate in this place on 9 August, the honourable member for Rockhampton let the cat out of the bag. Inadvertently, in answer to an interjection by, I think, either the honourable member for Everton or the honourable member for Stafford, he told us that those five State parliamentarians who allegedly paid their way to Hong Kong had their expenses for their accommodation and everything else during their trip through Red China paid by the Government of Red China.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed in this House that the Premier had some ulterior motive in going to Japan and meeting Iwasaki. What were the promises made by the Leader of the Opposition to the Government of Red China, which paid for his trip across Red China? I think the people of Queensland should remember this very well. The Government of Red China would not be paying anybody's way through that country unless it was to get something out of it. Of course, it did get a Murray Grey bull. That is something else of which I should like to remind the House. Whitlam took a Murray Grey bull to Red China. The Leader of the Opposition in this House went along in the same aircraft. People have asked me which was the biggest bull in the aircraft. At least I know which weighed the most. That was the time when the Leader of the Opposition was christened Moses, because out of his mouth "the bull rushes".

Many deliberate lies were told during the election, especially in Caboolture. As I said before, I had two Labor candidates standing against me. One was a hardy old war-horse who stood in 1966 against Sir Francis Nicklin. He also had a couple of cracks in Landsborough. He stood against the present member for that electorate and, when I moved to Caboolture, he decided to take me on. Probably he thought that I was easy meat for the table.

**Mr. Wright:** What about your brother?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Oh, shut up, you dill.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of a total of 14,435 valid votes, one Labor candidate received 13.66 per cent, which was 1,972 votes. The

other candidate was the deputy chairman of the Caboolture Shire Council. Incidentally, I have had the chairman and the deputy chairman of the council standing against me. God knows who will be picked to stand against me next time. They might as well pick somebody else because they will not do any good themselves.

The deputy chairman received 3,952 votes, which was 27 per cent of the ballot. I, of course, picked up 8,511 votes and won the seat by 2,587 votes. I am not boasting; in fact, I was quite disappointed. On seeing the calibre of the two candidates against me, I expected to win by a lot more. However, I did not.

When the Leader of the Opposition had all the new candidates gathered in the Trades Hall, or wherever it was he got them together to give them a run-down on what to do during the election campaign, I really believe that he should have briefed them on some of the things to say. They had people in my electorate believing all sorts of stupid things. They spread a story that Utah was going to sack all its Australian workers at the coal-mines and bring in Spanish labourers. That was completely untrue, yet they had people believing it. They made so many promises to the people of Caboolture that if by some miracle the Labor Party had gained Government (Heaven forbid that that should ever happen again!) the whole Budget for Queensland would have had to be spent in the electorate of Caboolture to make good the promises that they made. A week before the election they promised a community health service and an electric train service to Caboolture straight away.

I attended a public meeting in an old disused picture theatre on Bribie Island with the other two candidates and somebody in the audience asked each of us the same question. The question was, "Will any of you take a rise in salary when it is offered?" I jumped up to answer it first because I knew I was the only honest politician in the place. I said, "Yes, I will take it any time it is offered." The other two hummed and hawed and hawked and spat and coughed and said, "Oh, we'll have an investigation into it." Of course, everyone knows that any time an increase in parliamentary salaries and allowances is mooted one cannot get near the Treasury for the Labor members in the queue. As far as I am concerned they are nothing but hypocrites. Anyone who says he will not take a rise in his salary is a liar. I will take any rise I get at any time, because in my view I am worth it.

Some of the other things these candidates said were absolutely shocking. I have to use the honourable member for Rockhampton as an example here. I know he will not mind. These two candidates claimed that members of the Labor Party had to pay 3½

per cent of their salaries to the Trades Hall. I have here the statement made by them, as reported in a newspaper article. It reads—

"The Labor Party men said they referred to the statement that the A.L.P. parliamentarians pay a 3½ per cent levy to the Trades Hall, but this was not so.

"Certainly the parliamentary members of the Australian Labor Party pay 3½ per cent of the salaries—and this is paid into a fund administered by the parliamentarians themselves."

That is not correct. Now for the punch line. It reads—

"This fund is used to counteract the frightful conditions imposed on Her Majesty's Opposition by this present Government", they said.

"This money is used to finance such things as travel by A.L.P. parliamentarians around the State to enable them to do their job more effectively'."

They claimed that the only members of Parliament who received free air travel were Government members. The honourable member for Rockhampton must admit that he receives 60 free first-class trips a year to attend Parliament, and I agree that he should. But these two fellows said that Labor members got nothing, so I had to arrange to have printed in the Press some of the privileges which are given to members of this Parliament. All back-benchers are allowed five air trips in Queensland each year—and there is nothing wrong with that—and on two of those they are allowed to take their wives. But the people in Caboolture were amazed when I told them that Labor members were allowed these trips and that on two of them they were allowed to take their wives.

These two people were telling lies. They claimed that the only members who got any of these free trips were Government members. That is a deliberate lie, because all members of the Opposition, too, receive these trips, and I do not begrudge them the trips. I have said here on more than one occasion that I do not begrudge the Leader of the Opposition his car, his driver or his personal staff. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should also have a car. I have never been against that, but for Heaven's sake do not tell the people deliberate lies. Opposition members should get out and tell the people the truth about the allowances they receive and not have them think that the only members of Parliament who receive allowances are Government members. That is not true. For Heaven's sake, try to tell the truth at least at election-time.

People in my electorate and at the Glasshouse Mountains receive a publication known as "The Free Press", which is dropped in people's letter-boxes. It is run by a homosexual, and straight away we know that he

is a member of the Labor Party because the Labor Party panders to all the homosexuals, lesbians, and way-outers in this world, hoping to get their vote. This "Free Press" printed some shocking things. I am not going to read out all the things printed. It printed a fair bit about me, of course.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** All true.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The article it printed on what I said about women who call themselves Ms. was true. I have never met an Ms. who has had any success with her husband. Most of them are women whose husbands have given them away and left. I have never yet met a happily married Ms., but if there is one and she meets me I hope to God she mentions it. I am just dying to meet one who is happily married. Every one of them has failed with her husband, as I have said before in this House. Yet these idiots up in the Glasshouse Mountains had to go and print an extract from "Hansard" about it. I attribute the good vote I received to that. I think it helped me. Anyway, I have said enough about that.

I now want to give the Seamen's Union a bit of a serve for a change. I have already said that during the election campaign Labor spread the idea that Spanish workers were to be brought in to work in the coal-mines at Norwich Park. This was completely untrue. Of course, development by Utah has been delayed because of the actions of the Seamen's Union. It is a strong, militant Left-wing union and the well-known Communist Eliot V. Elliott is its secretary. He has publicly stated that he believes in the overthrow of capitalism and is doing everything he can to achieve it. He has also said that the Union Jack makes him sick and that if he had his way we would be flying the Red Flag. I do not doubt that.

I will give members an example of the values and priorities of the Seamen's Union. They should listen to this. In 1974 the Seamen's Union made a donation of \$8,758 to the Greek political prisoners and donated \$76,000 in aid to Vietnam. It gave the Federal A.L.P. a lousy \$10,000, but it paid only \$1,363 to the Queensland Flood Relief Fund.

**Mr. Davis:** How much did you put in?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I hesitate to tell. By holding up work at Norwich Park, the Seamen's Union is delaying jobs for 1,500 people.

Of course, the Seamen's Union has been involved for years and years in an extortion racket against shipowners. It is complaining because Utah would not use Australian seamen in any of its coal ships, but the Utah ships are registered under the Liberian flag and employ Spanish crews at wages lower than those paid to Australian seamen. Utah is suing the Seamen's Union for damages caused during the strike, which prevented the

berthing of the Utah ship "Lake Berryessa" at Hay Point in 1977. The Seamen's Union wants Utah to sack all crews on its eight vessels and replace them with Australian crews, and it wants two 40-man crews for each ship.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Miller):** Order! I think that matter could be sub judice. It is before the court. I ask the honourable member to move on to the next subject.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Getting back to the Seamen's Union and its Communist Secretary—it has a record of activity against ships flying the Australian flag or, in fact, against ships flying any British Commonwealth flag. The union's main target seems to be ships with low-paid crews entering Australian waters or Australian ports.

Some years ago Sydney waterside workers refused to work until the Korean crew of a ship called the "Nadine", flying the Liberian flag and owned by Global Bulk Carriers of New York, received better pay. The wages of the crew ranged from \$US135 to \$US207 a month. I am not going to disagree with that, and many people might say, "What a great job the Seamen's Union and the Waterside Workers' Federation are doing for the seamen of overseas ships who are paid low wages." But the interesting fact is that action is always taken against American or British-owned ships, never against ships from Soviet Russia.

Twice each week this summer Soviet ships will depart from Brisbane and Sydney on cheap cruises around the Pacific. They can afford to cut their fares because the Soviet pays its seamen well below the rates determined by the International Transport Workers' Federation. By exploiting its seamen, Soviet Russia has been able to conduct a cut-rate shipping business throughout the Western world. This cut-rate competition could put many Australian seamen out of work and could cut Australian crew strength by half, yet the Seamen's Union does not do anything about it. Why? Because, as I said before, it is dominated by a Communist.

Even Charlie Jones, the Labor Minister for Transport in the Whitlam Government, expressed his concern in Parliament regarding Soviet inroads into Australian shipping. He said it had cut prices by up to 40 per cent by using cheap labour. I remind honourable members opposite that Charlie Jones, a member of the A.L.P., said that. The Seamen's Union and the Waterside Workers' Federation have a record of penalising their own countrymen because they do not want to upset a Communist country.

Huge sums of money have been demanded from some companies by the Seamen's Union simply to permit the movement of their ships around Australia. The secretary of the Seamen's Union, Eliot V. Elliott, is allowed to

go unpunished. He was hauled up before the A.C.T.U.—I will give Bob Hawke his due on that—when it was alleged that Elliott and some of his mates split up \$4,000 collected from a ship called the “Benalbo” in 1974. The A.C.T.U. tried to stop the practice, but Elliott said that he would continue to blackmail shipping in Australia.

The managing director of the Australian Newsprint Mills, Mr. R. W. Henry, said that his company paid \$18,000 to the Seamen’s Union to allow the “Thunderbird” to dock and unload newsprint, and also that the “Sevillan Reefer” was allowed to leave Sydney only after \$17,600 was paid into the funds of the Seamen’s Union. Later another payment was demanded so that the “Thunderbird” could dock again, and Mr. Henry complained to Bob Hawke—and rightly so—and he set up an inquiry which found that \$80,000 had been paid to the Seamen’s Union as a result of blackmail.

The A.C.T.U. is helpless to curtail the activities of the Seamen’s Union. In fact, in Queensland the A.L.P. enlisted the Seamen’s Union to give out how-to-vote cards. The Seamen’s Union, in its bid for power, has backed other militant unions and is doing its best to keep people out of work in the coal-mines. Frankly, I cannot understand why it does such things. It gave out how-to-vote cards in the electorates of Landborough, Redcliffe and Caboolture. There are plenty of other matters that I could talk about. I have mentioned the summer cruises operated by Soviet Russia. No wonder it can undercut the Australian cruises—it is paying its seamen well under the Australian rate.

About three years ago there were six Communist leaders who stated that they had a plan to take over the mining industry in Queensland. The latest threats came only recently. I think the honourable member for Nudgee (Mr. Vaughan) might be interested in this. The latest threat came from Mr. Neil Kane, the secretary of the Electrical Trades Union. With your indulgence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I will read this article concerning the granting of the powerhouse to Tarong—

“The Electrical Trades Union State secretary (Mr. N. D. Kane) said that power would not be allowed to go into the electricity system from a powerhouse built at Tarong.

“He said he would guarantee that a Tarong power house would not put power into the system.

“He made that guarantee, he said, because of the Cabinet decision to site the powerhouse at Tarong, when the State Electricity Commission recommended that it should go to Millmerran.”

Had he said that after 2 p.m., I could understand it because by that time every day he is intoxicated. But he said it before 2 p.m.,

and I think it was a severe miscalculation of the right of the Electrical Trades Union to make some decision about what it will do and what it won’t do.

Mr. Kane is known as Kisser Kane. For the benefit of new members and to refresh the memories of old members, I will explain why he is called Kisser Kane. In 1971, I think it was, at the Brisbane Airport Mr. Kane actually kissed the Deputy Mayor of Hanoi. There would be only one thing worse than that, and that would be to kiss Senator Georges.

**Mr. Jones:** What about Senator Bonner?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I might include him, too.

On 10 January 1977, Mr. Kane was convicted in the Southport Magistrates Court of driving a motor vehicle whilst he had a concentration of alcohol in his blood of 140 milligrams per 100 millilitres of blood. He was the driver of a motor vehicle that left the scene of an accident. I am reliably informed that he damaged the E.T.U. vehicle so badly that the cost of repairs amounted to \$758. That money was paid from union funds. In other words the members of the E.T.U. paid the cost of Kane’s drunken rampage. Union members should check just how much of their money goes out from the trade union account to pay Kane’s grog bills. I am sure it would be a fair bit. One certainly cannot find him sober any day after 2 p.m.

Certainly some strange things have been going on at the Trades Hall lately. If Kane spent more time on the job and less time in the pubs and with prostitutes, I am quite certain that members of the E.T.U. would get something for their dues. I was a member of the E.T.U. for roughly 20 years. It is no good anybody saying that I did not pay my union dues. I have all my membership documents with me, because I expected somebody to say that.

**Mr. D’Arcy interjected.**

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The honourable member for Woodridge is interjecting from other than his usual place. I am glad he interjected. The Labor Party had many way-outers and idiots standing at the last election. It also had a drug addict standing, and here he is—the honourable member for Woodridge. He has been on drugs for years. He is a great old bloke to have in this Parliament.

Getting back to happenings at the Trades Hall, and I bring the Leader of the Opposition back into this—Kane certainly has something going for him at the Trades Hall. He told the Leader of the Opposition to get stuck into the reform group—as I said before, Denis Murphy and his crowd. Denis Murphy was robbed, of course, in the seat of Griffith.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I like to refresh their memories. They have a lot of bone between the ears.

Kane told the Leader of the Opposition to get stuck into the reform group, and he has done so. They are pretty much afraid of the reform group.

As I am on the job, I have to do something for the people of Redcliffe. Even though Redcliffe is out of my electorate now, I made a promise that I would expose a few of the crooks who operate in Redcliffe. I refer to a group of crooks known as Coastline Distributors Pty. Ltd. That company is not to be confused with a firm down there known as Coastline Frozen Foods. Coastline Frozen Foods is run by K. J. & H. E. Kelly, and it is a sound ethical business. I would hate that firm to be confused with Coastline Distributors Pty. Ltd. Coastline Distributors Pty. Ltd. was incorporated on 1 April 1975 as company No. 417 of 1975. Henry M. Bodman, John A. Chiverall, Russell J. Peters, Paul A. S. Brigg and Noel R. Rentoule are a bunch of crooks if ever I saw one. They are all registered shareholders of the company and also registered directors of the company. Coastline Distributors Pty. Ltd. was named trustee by a trust deed dated 16 April 1975 for the Centavo Unit Trust, for which five units were issued as follows:—

Dunrobin (that's a good name; they have "done robbin", because they are out of business) run by Henry Bodman;  
Kouraway Pty. Ltd., run by Chiverall;  
Deano Pty. Ltd. run by Peters;  
Nijami Pty. Ltd., run by Brigg; and  
Kingshelf Pty. Ltd., run by Noel Rentoule.

These people robbed the people of Redcliffe. They robbed the little businessman and the little fellows who did repairs to their frozen-food vehicles. They robbed everyone they could.

On 29 July 1977 provisional liquidators were appointed. At a meeting of the creditors, one of the partners, Mr. Rentoule, was pretty evasive and said that he knew nothing about \$60,000 that was missing. He and his partners had misappropriated it for their own use. Trust assets were distributed by virtue of a deed dated 28 July 1977, one day before the provisional liquidators were appointed by the court but two days after the summons was filed in the court registry. These people thieved \$60,000 from that trust and distributed it among themselves. Then they had themselves declared bankrupt and went into liquidation. They robbed some of the small business people of Redcliffe.

No general ledger was kept, yet their accounts were prepared from cash book totals. It is pretty difficult to believe that financial statements were prepared from cash books. It is obvious that these crooks

kept two sets of books, one for the business, the other for the Taxation Department. I shall send the Taxation Department a copy of this document and make sure that it gets on to these thieves and robbers. All available funds were taken from this company just prior to liquidation.

**Mr. Davis:** It sounds like Frawley's service station.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** In answer to the interjection by the member for Brisbane Central—I know for a fact that when he was running the A.C.T.U. Solo service station he was mixing super petrol with standard petrol and selling it at the super petrol price.

I want to tell honourable members a little story about the "Rider for Democracy", or as I would term him, the "Easy Rider". He was allegedly lost at Childers in the Isis electorate. Of course, he wasn't lost at all. This story is so fresh in my memory that I do not have to refer to notes. When the "Rider for Democracy" was on his famous ride from Cairns to Brisbane to try to drum up some money for the coffers of the A.L.P.—

**Mr. Powell:** They are still broke, I hear.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** It is pretty well broke; and why wouldn't it be with Kane, a senior vice-president, flogging the money week after week for grog!

The A.L.P. decided to try to get some publicity out of this, and I am pleased to see the member for Archerfield in the Chamber, because he figures in it. In fact a great deal of credit should be given to him for the way he handled it.

It was decided to gain as much publicity as possible from the search for the "Rider for Democracy", who, as I say, was supposedly lost at Childers. The A.L.P. decided that it would send out a search party. And what better man to head that search party than the member for Archerfield? Shades of Banjo Paterson! We can just imagine the member for Archerfield riding along the street on his trusty horse, singing in the saddle, stockwhip on his shoulder and a cattle dog at his heels, leading the search for the missing "Rider for Democracy".

A message was sent to Childers, but the local A.L.P. man was where he always is—in the pub—and the message became mixed up. The message was that a member of Parliament was coming up to lead the search for the "Rider for Democracy". The chap who took the message knew only one member of Parliament, that is, the member for Cairns. He said to his people in Childers, "I have been ordered by Brisbane to get a horse for a member of Parliament who will lead the search for the 'Rider for Democracy'." I have no doubt that honourable members know what is coming next.

The member for Archerfield travelled through the night and arrived in Childers next morning ready to take on the search. This brings back the words, "All the tried and noted riders from the stations near and far gathered at the homestead overnight." The local fellows brought forward a horse van containing a horse, but, lo and behold, when the van was opened all the honourable member's hopes faded. In it was a saddled Shetland pony.

**Mr. Casey:** We would never have guessed that.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** They thought the member for Cairns was coming, so naturally they ordered a Shetland pony. The pony took one look at the member for Archerfield and took to the bush. It hasn't been seen since. But who could blame it? It would have been far better if the position had been reversed and the saddle had been on the member for Archerfield. However, the "Rider for Democracy" contested the seat of Ashgrove against the sitting member.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** He gave him a fright, too.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No, he didn't; he was given a hell of a hiding.

I want to remind the House of a couple of questions that I asked the Minister for Police concerning the "Rider for Democracy". I was told that it cost the Police Department \$2,300 to send men to Childers on what turned out to be a fictitious report of the disappearance of the "Rider for Democracy". That was a shocking waste of public money. The Leader of the Opposition had the temerity to ask the Premier for the use of the Government aircraft. The Police Minister at the time (Mr. Newbery) said that the expenditure of \$2,300 would not be recovered; that it was a service provided by the Government when anyone is lost. It is a shocking thing that the search for that person who was allegedly lost in the Childers area cost the State \$2,300. When a child or an adult is genuinely lost, nobody minds in the least going out on a search. However, when someone pretends to be lost for straight-out publicity purposes, that is shocking conduct. I sincerely hope that the Opposition never does that type of thing again.

**Mr. Powell:** Do you know that a self-employed person was injured in that fiasco and that he hasn't been paid?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Yes; but that's the old story.

In the few minutes I have left I would like to talk about sprint racing. That is something the member for Archerfield would never know anything about, because he couldn't even walk 50 m, let alone run that distance.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Wait till I speak next Thursday. I'll put a shot-put on your javelin.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** He wouldn't even know the weight of a javelin. Anyway, I like him. He's not a bad bloke. One thing about the member for Archerfield is that, although he can dish it out, he can take it, too. He is not thin-skinned like some A.L.P. members in this House.

Sprint racing has been carried out in Queensland for many years now without the assistance of bookmakers, the T.A.B. or any other form of Government revenue. In fact, because of opposition—mainly from the major race clubs—it has been pretty difficult to hold sprint meetings anywhere. Sprint racing in America is a fairly big attraction. I have no doubt that if sprint races are held in Queensland they will become the blue ribbon events of the programme.

There is nothing more exciting in horse-racing than watching sprint horses run over a distance of 400 to 500m.

Kerry Packer, who rarely backs a loser, recently spent \$600,000 to buy one quarter-horse stallion and 13 mares in America. At the present time they are being held in England because of Australia's quarantine laws—and I agree with those laws. The horses will eventually be kept at Ellerston stud in the Hunter River district of New South Wales. Packer is building a race-track on the station to ensure that all the horses he breeds are sold as running horses. Next June in Melbourne the World Cup for sprint horses is to be held at the Calder Park motor raceway, in which Bob Jane is interested. He is making the course available for running the sprint horses.

On more than one occasion over the last few years I have spoken in the Parliament of the need to allow sprint horses to run at registered race meetings. Last February at a joint Government party meeting a decision was made in favour of amending rule 43 of the Racing and Betting Act, which states that no race can be run under 800m. It is proposed to amend this Act to allow two races under 800m at every country club. It will not apply to Brisbane clubs, but only to country or provincial clubs.

If the former member for Bundaberg were here, he would agree that many horses in Brisbane cannot run a mile, and he would have backed plenty of them. They cannot even run six furlongs. I suggest that many owners who have horses that are no good over six furlongs or a bit farther would be only too pleased to run their thoroughbreds in sprint races. It should not be thought that sprint horses are not thoroughbreds. The horses involved in sprint racing—for instance, Appaloosans and quarter-horses—are stud-book horses. Their breeding lines are just as good as those of other horses.

I am quite certain that when sprint racing is legalised many Brisbane owners of horses being run at Doomben, Ascot and Albion Park, where they cannot run the distance, will be quite agreeable to entering their horses in shorter races.

The owners of sprint horses are quite agreeable to sprint races being held under the rules of racing. They do not want to conduct sprint racing; they are quite happy to have those horses run under the rules of each club as part of the racing structure. I am certain that, when sprint racing is run by country clubs, the gate takings will increase. Jockeys and trainers also will reap the benefit. I urge the Deputy Premier, who is the Minister in charge of racing, to expedite the amendment to the Racing and Betting Act to allow sprint racing to be held at registered clubs as soon as possible. On Anzac Day—in the afternoon, of course—a sprint race meeting will be held at Caboolture. All honourable members are welcome. I will even get them in on the house, if they wish. I would like to take the member for Brisbane Central.

I should now like to deal with some of the one-eyed selections of athletes and sportsmen made in the South, resulting in the exclusion of outstanding Queenslanders. A glaring example was the omission of David Ogilvie from the Australian test team. Members of the Opposition should be on my side in this matter. For years Queenslanders have been robbed by southern selectors. I shall mention some of the names. Don Tallon should have been in the Australian test team long before he was included. However, my main interest lies with the athletes. Barbara Wilson, the Queensland woman sprinter, ran the fifth fastest time in Australia and Terri Wangman of Victoria ran the 19th fastest time, yet the selectors for the Montreal Olympic Games, who are dominated by Victoria and Tasmania, selected the Victorian girl ahead of Barbara Wilson. I would not have objected so much if Wangman had run the sixth, seventh or eighth fastest time, but she was No. 19 in Australia while Barbara Wilson was No. 5 and missed out. However, owing to the subsequent hue and cry, she was eventually added to the team.

In 1962, Eric Bigby was robbed. In 1962, I was in the South for the Commonwealth Games trials. I was the assistant manager and coach of the Australian field games at the time. Bigby definitely ran fourth in the 100 m and fifth in the 200 m. To make certain that he did not get selected, the judges who were one-eyed Victorians placed him fifth in the 100 m and he was deprived of a place in Australia's 100 m team for the 1962 Commonwealth Games.

Another glaring case was Joan Henriksen. She was the Australian 100 m champion in 1966 and had run second in the 200 m and the 400 m, but she still could not get selected to go to Kingston. That absolutely stinks.

The next victim was Lenore Liscombe. In 1968, she was the long-jump champion but could not gain selection. She is now married to a Victorian.

Over the years, Queensland athletes have been getting the rough end of the deal from the southerners. It is about time that all Queensland sporting bodies insisted that every selection panel contain at least one Queenslanders. For years, the Amateur Athletic Association did not have a selector on the Australian Athletic Union panel. One has just been appointed. I know him. He is a pretty fair selector. He will not choose Queenslanders simply because they are Queenslanders.

I do not believe in the quota system. Anybody who is good enough should get into the team. It is wrong to choose so many Queenslanders and so many people from New South Wales and Victoria. I do not disagree if the whole team is chosen from one State. But Queenslanders must be given a fair chance in sport. For years we have been robbed by southern selectors who are one-eyed and are interested only in getting their State quotas into the team.

I should now like to talk about some of the pressures put on me—and no doubt other members of this Parliament—by various organisations throughout Queensland. The Registered & Licensed Clubs Association of Queensland wrote to me on 3 November 1977. The letter commences—

"This Association intends to insert a prominent advertisement in the 'Courier-Mail' on Saturday, 12 November, listing the names of all candidates for the election who are supporters of the Club Industry."

I support the club industry but I will certainly not support the introduction of poker machines, and that is definite. I get very dirty when such people write to me and try to threaten me just before an election.

Another group wrote to me concerning local government superannuation. It was signed by Mr. Edgar Williams, branch secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, A. J. McHenry, from the Queensland Trades and Labor Council, Mr. K. V. Byrne, State secretary of the Municipal Officers' Association and Mr. R. D. Hewitt, regional industrial officer of the Association of Professional Engineers. They asked me if I would support the local government superannuation scheme.

**An Opposition Member:** Read out your reply.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I will. It reads—

"I acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 21st, which I consider to be an attempt to stand over and intimidate me.

"Your last paragraph, in which you state that if I do not reply by November 2nd, indicating clearly and unequivocally my

support for your proposition regarding the Local Government superannuation scheme, you will inform your members that I am opposed to the scheme, is clearly an attempt to intimidate me before the election of November 12th.

"You, Mr. Hewitt, and the other three signatories to the letter, Mr. Williams A.W.U., Mr. Byrne, Secretary, Municipal Officers' Association, and Mr. A. J. McHenry, Queensland Trades and Labor Council should realize that your Trades Hall Tactics do not impress me at all.

"My answer to you is 'Go to Hell'!

"When I was a financial member of the Electrical Trades Union for twenty years, I did not allow any Union Officials to stand over me and I do not intend to start now.

"A copy of this letter and your letter has been forwarded to the press and at every public meeting that I attend I shall be reading both letters to the audience..."

which I did—

". . . so your threat to inform your members of my attitude does not worry me. When Parliament resumes I intend to raise this matter and you and your partners will be on the receiving end of a 'Good Old Serve' to put it mildly.

"If, after the Election you care to rephrase your letter in the form of a request to help employees of Local Authorities receive better superannuation benefits, I shall be happy to assist if I can.

"In conclusion, remember this: neither you nor any other Trade Union Official is going to stand over me.

"Yours faithfully,

D. J. Frawley,

"Member for Murrumba."

I am very pleased, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the latitude that you have allowed me today and I congratulate you on your appointment as one of the Temporary Chairmen of Committees. When Mr. Speaker read out the list of Temporary Chairmen and came to Mr. Jim Blake, I thought, "That's not such a bad selection because he's not such a bad bloke." But when he read out the name of the honourable member for Rockhampton I realised then that we were really scraping the bottom of the barrel.

**Mr. SCOTT (Cook)** (5.7 p.m.): It is with a sense of pride and a great deal of pleasure that I rise to take part in this debate. I have pride because I have been elected to represent the people of Cook and I am pleased at the trust that they have shown in me. It is also very interesting to note the increasing number of voters in the country who are turning back to the Labor Party and it is good to see that the electorate of Cook has changed hands. I know a couple of members who hold very shaky seats and

they will be very concerned in three years' time as the present trend will surely accelerate.

It gives me great pleasure to speak from the benches on this side of the House. I am proud to be a member of the Australian Labor Party and happy to speak in this debate after our leader, Tom Burns. He acquitted himself very well in the election campaign and he has similarly acquitted himself in this House since the beginning of this session.

I also congratulate the honourable member for Wolston on his maiden speech. It was one of the strongest made in this session and I noted that he had the attention of all present. There were probably more members and Ministers present during his maiden speech than were present during any other maiden speech.

It is quite common in maiden speeches to do in effect a Cook's tour. Indeed, something was said about that earlier. I noticed that the honourable member for Peak Downs had a book almost a foot thick to support his notes. Some comment was made to the effect that it might have been a geography book.

I intend to go round the various centres—not all but some—in the Cook electorate and point out their needs. I do not intend to make the type of maiden speech that deals with dimensions, population dispersal and social and other requirements. I am quite certain that that has been done by previous members for Cook, and I shall not bore members with such a repetition. I do, however, want to refer to some who have represented this electorate. I was honoured to have as my guest at the opening of Parliament Mr. Eddie Wallis-Smith, who is present in the gallery of the House. Over a great many years it was my pleasure to receive the support and encouragement of Eddie Wallis-Smith. Taking note of the way he did his job gave me a lot of guidance which helped me to gain election to this seat.

I should also like to comment on Mr. Bill Wood, an earlier member for this area, who unfortunately lost his seat as the member for Barron River. Bill Wood has been treated very harshly by the Premier. It is well known that Bill Wood was given back his job by the Education Department as a relieving headmaster in Mossman. Of course, the word very quickly got back to the honourable member for Barron River, and I have no doubt he got on the telephone to the Premier and had Bill Wood put off again.

**Mr. TENNI:** I rise to a point of order. At the time that this took place I happened to be in Perth. I did not know about it until three days later. I ask the honourable member to withdraw those remarks.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member finds the remarks offensive and asks that the honourable member withdraw them.

**Mr. SCOTT:** I am happy to accept the statement of the honourable member for Barron River that he was not responsible, but no doubt the word came down to Brisbane very quickly, and everyone in North Queensland knows what happened as a result of that.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have asked the honourable member to withdraw the statement and he has not.

**Mr. SCOTT:** I am sorry, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do withdraw the statement.

I want now to refer to Eric Deeral, who was defeated by me in the last election. I regard Eric Deeral as a very nice person, and he did the job as well as he was able to do it, but he lost his seat because he was espousing the policies of this Government on Aboriginal affairs. I do not know whether they were really Eric Deeral's views or whether he was just espousing the policies of the Government, as it was his duty to do, but he lost the seat because he lost the confidence of the people in the far northern part of the electorate of Cook.

It is very interesting to stand here speaking for the first time and I want to take the opportunity to pass some comments on things I have seen so far. I support the honourable member for Wolston, in his criticism of the honourable member for Merthyr's piffing attacks on the Australian Labor Party. I was rather interested to note that the Premier interjected while the honourable member for Merthyr was making his remarks and wanted entered in "Hansard" the names of the former union officials who have been elected to this House. Members on that side of the House take great delight in having such things entered in "Hansard" so that they can be read and used for nefarious purposes later. Unfortunately, the honourable member for Merthyr could not recall the names so the Premier was foiled in his attempt.

I listened with amazement to the utter and absolute piffle that the honourable member for Caboolture went on with in his speech to the Address-in-Reply motion. These speeches are read by the electors and I cannot imagine what they would think of a person who would waste the time of this House by speaking on such trivial matters. I appreciate that members on the other side of the House find themselves caught in a cleft stick. They can do one of two things: criticise their own Government—as has been done—or make very weak efforts to defend the Government.

**Mr. Davis:** They could resign.

**Mr. SCOTT:** Yes, and I do not doubt that some of them feel like doing that in disgust because of the sort of things they are being

forced to do. During the election campaign I was perturbed about opposition expressed to me on a number of subjects, and I will refer to that later on. But people who supported Labor candidates during the last election paid the price. I refer particularly to public servants who were moved sideways as a result of their activities on behalf of the Labor Party in the election campaign in the electorate of Cook. I say that that is a vindictive action on the part of the Government to take out its spite on public servants in that manner.

Earlier I said that I would not be making a Cook's tour of my electorate, but I will make a Cook tour because, in going round the electorate, I have found that it is in fact an electorate of deficiencies. Whatever the people in the southern part of the State, and perhaps in the central part of the State, enjoy, the people of the Cook electorate certainly have to a lesser extent. I refer to such things as rail transport (both freight and passenger), road transport, education facilities, health facilities, the needs of the aged—a whole range of matters. Anyone who goes to the remote parts of the Cook electorate in North Queensland will find fewer facilities there.

Probably the principal matter of debate in the Cook electorate is the unsealed roads. To go on my Cook tour it is necessary to drive over many kilometres of unsealed roads. I will take honourable members first to Cooktown, and the bitumen ceases at Mt. Carbine, hundreds of kilometres away from Cooktown. I commend to honourable members a visit to the fair city of Cooktown. It nestles like a little jewel between the hills at the mouth of the Endeavour River and, of course, was named after Captain Cook.

However, the people who live in the area lack not only sealed roads but also accommodation for aged persons. That matter was raised during the election campaign, and I note that nothing further has been done about it although it was brought to the Premier's attention at a meeting in Cooktown.

There is a need for a high school at Cooktown, too. A pre-school has been established, but it has been built underneath the school, thus limiting the sheltered area, and I find that quite deplorable. A petition relating to the problem of sun cancer has recently been brought to the attention of the House, but we find the Education Department still saving money by putting a pre-school under an existing building. I should point out that that has been done in many schools in my electorate, so the area in which young children can play in either dry weather or wet weather is severely restricted.

I well remember, too, when the road to Bloomfield was brought to the attention of the Premier at a public meeting in Cooktown in 1972. Mr. Wallis-Smith would also

remember that, because the Premier was under attack from quite a few people present at that meeting. As an interesting sidelight, I might mention that that was one occasion when the National Party candidate was not introduced by the chairman of the meeting, Jim Bidner. I can remember a voice behind me saying, "Joh, Joh! They haven't introduced the candidate." There had been such pressure at the meeting, with people tackling the Premier and the candidate about things that were lacking in the area, that the chairman probably honestly forgot to introduce his party's candidate. It was very remiss of him, I must say.

Let us go back from Cooktown to Lakeland Downs, where again there is a school problem. The small school there is almost surrounded by a swamp. It is approached through the one dry area, and the effluent from the local caravan park drains into the swamp. Eighteen months ago the Minister for Education promised that something would be done about the relocation of the school at Lakeland Downs. The land has been provided by the company that now runs Lakeland Downs, and the school could have been shifted at least a year ago.

There is no medical aid post at Lakeland Downs, either. It is a pity that the Minister for Health is not in the Chamber; I want to tackle him on a couple of other matters pertaining to health. He said that the facilities of the Cooktown hospital were available. What he did not say was that people would have to travel over many kilometres of unsealed roads and unbridged creeks. If you are ill, you get there if you can.

The same applies at Laura. There medical emergencies are treated on the veranda of the local police station. Royal Flying Doctor Service clinics are conducted in a room of the local hotel. Again a two-year old promise by the Minister to do something to provide a small service for these people in that little township of about 150 people has not been kept.

From there roads go right up into the Peninsula. I will not take members beyond that point lest their tender skins get a little burnt by the hot sun up that way.

I come back to Dimbulah, another area which has suffered from National-Liberal Party administration, both State and federal. Dimbulah and Mutchilba are tobacco-growing areas that have seen their tobacco quotas cut by 15 per cent over the last two years. I am astounded that the honourable member for Barron River can sit over there as part of the Government that effected that reduction in income for ordinary working people. Around Dimbulah and Mutchilba are other areas with needs. People there have been battling for a high school for some time. I think it goes back to the time of a much earlier member for that area, but there are still no prospects of a high school.

Irrigation problems have been mentioned in the House. I can cite the case of a farmer at Mutchilba who has seen 10 per cent of his best farmland washed away—not because of bad farming practices but because of irrigation problems simply because this Government will not spend the money on doing the right thing in such areas.

I go on from there to Chillagoe, the tourist centre. Again it is suffering because the Government would not support the making of the film "Crocodyl". Cooktown and Chillagoe, as well as a whole lot of other centres in the Cook electorate, while not dependent entirely on tourism, rely on it as one of their major industries. I intend to ask the Minister for Maritime Services and Tourism at a later date just what he has done to promote tourism in those areas. I imagine he will have very little to report. I hope he does not go up there at election-time. Someone remarked in Chillagoe at one stage that if the roads were not bad the tourists would have nothing to complain about. Those roads serve not only tourist centres but also the agricultural and mining areas further up the Peninsula. People who want to use them, and need to use them, have to get into town once or twice a week for supplies. They have become disenchanted and they can understand why the Country Party changed its name to the National Party. It was an indication that that party no longer intended to do anything for the residents of those remote rural areas.

I turn now to Irvinebank. I know that these town names will sound very strange to the ears of honourable members opposite because I am certain that they do not know where they are. Irvinebank has a State Treatment Works which has been allowed to degenerate both in efficiency and in the construction of the buildings. It has simply been allowed to degenerate so that it no longer treats ore efficiently. The only people who take their ore there are those who cannot avoid doing so. The people in Irvinebank are crying out to have something done about the Irvinebank State Treatment Works. They want it upgraded so that it not only returns money to the State by way of revenue but also efficiently treats the ore of the small miners in that general area. Literally thousands of yards of tailings have been taken almost past the door of the State Treatment Works to a private treatment company a few kilometres away—again at a loss of thousands of dollars of revenue to this Government and of work for the local people.

The water shortage in that township is causing serious concern and I believe that before very long there may not be enough water for the treatment works to operate.

I move now to Georgetown, Forsayth, Croydon, Normanton and Karumba. In each of those centres there is a great need for the Government to spend money. I notice

that in his Opening Speech the Governor said that this Government is conscious of the fact that the people of Queensland pay the lowest tax per head of population in Australia. No doubt that is a most commendable state of affairs; but why not spend more money in the areas where the greatest need exists? The people who are the backbone of the electorate want nothing more than a chance to continue producing.

I have said that the electorate lacks certain things. One thing it does not lack is goodwill of the people who live in it. However, because of this Government's lack of attention to those people their goodwill is fast running out. They have had three years of under-representation.

As I travel through these towns I am continually asked questions such as, "Where are the police?" I have had numerous complaints from people in Weipa, Normanton and Croydon that there are not enough police in those towns. On another day I shall ask questions about that matter.

Unemployment is a major problem throughout the Cook electorate, particularly in Normanton. It causes grave concern to everyone in the area.

The grazing industry has been very shabbily treated by the Government. This morning a question was asked on notice concerning any action that might have been taken by the Government in connection with the blue tongue virus. I would say the Government has not done enough. In fact I have heard the opinion expressed in the Cook electorate that the Government is not really concerned about the blue tongue virus and is using the exercise of attempting to isolate this serious virus merely as a trial for the battle against foot-and-mouth in the Far North should it ever break out. Such a charge is a very serious one to level against the Government; nevertheless it has been made. Grazing people in the area are so disgusted at the lack of support given to them by the Government that they could well accept the story as being true.

As this debate will be adjourned at 5.30 my speech will be divided into two parts. The next part of my speech will relate to the Torres Strait islands and Aurukun. Again I would make a plea for the spending of more money on the Torres Strait islands area and I urge the Minister for Aboriginal and Island Affairs to visit the area and have a very close look at it.

*Under the provisions of Standing Order No. 17, the debate stood adjourned.*

[*Sitting suspended from 5.30 to 7.15 p.m.*]

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

**Mr. AHERN** (Landsborough) (7.15 p.m.):  
I move—

"(1) That this House do appoint a select committee to inquire into, report upon and make recommendations in

relation to the system of education in Queensland and the extent to which it meets the expectations of students, parents and the community, and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, with particular reference to the following matters:—

"(a) the efficiency and adequacy of the present system of secondary education;

"(b) appropriate emphasis in primary education between basic education and other activities;

"(c) adequate technical and further education to meet today's industry needs;

"(d) a review of the decision-making process in education and the role of the community in this area;

"(e) adequacy of social science courses for primary and secondary students;

"(f) the need for new courses, the ability of the education system to provide them and the administrative machinery for implementing them;

"(g) the introduction of an independent authority to investigate complaints by parents or community organisations concerning any aspect of education; and

"(h) any other matter pertaining to the matters for inquiry, report and recommendation as aforesaid;

"(2) That the committee consist of Messrs. W. D. Hewitt, L. Powell, C. J. Miller, E. F. Shaw and the mover;

"(3) That the committee have power to appoint persons possessing special expertise and experience in the field of education to assist it in an advisory capacity in its meetings and deliberations;

"(4) That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records unless otherwise determined by the House in any particular case, save, however, that a Minister of the Crown or an officer of the Public Service shall not be obliged to provide information, oral or written, which has been—

"(a) certified by a Crown Law officer to be information which, if it were sought in a court, would be a proper matter in respect of which to claim Crown privilege; or

"(b) certified by the responsible Minister, with the approval of the Ministers of the Crown in Cabinet assembled, to be information such that its disclosure would be against the public interest;

"(5) That the committee have leave to sit during any adjournment of the House notwithstanding that such adjournment exceeds seven days;

"(6) That the committee may sit during the sitting of the House;

"(7) That the committee may sit outside the precincts of the House and may adjourn from place to place;

"(8) That the committee report to the House at the conclusion of the work undertaken by it pursuant to the provisions of this motion;

"(9) That the foregoing provisions of this motion, so far as they may be inconsistent with the Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders."

Approximately a fortnight ago I circularised all members of Parliament with the form of the motion that is now before the House. To my knowledge, this is the first time that this type of action has been taken, and I hope that all honourable members appreciate it. The idea was that this would give honourable members as much time as possible to examine the form of the motion and to consult on it.

The proposal to establish a committee of inquiry into education in Queensland was first mooted in a statement by the Premier in which he announced that a committee comprising four parliamentarians and three educationists would be appointed to inquire into the State's education system. However, subsequent legal advice by Crown Law officers indicated that if such a committee were appointed the seats of those honourable members who participated in it could be placed in jeopardy. I think those honourable members who were in the last Parliament would remember, and remember very well, the amendments to the Constitution Act that gave rise to that very inflexible situation. I am sure they would be familiar with the decisions that were reached and would agree with them.

Frankly, I was more than happy when the Premier told me that it was concluded that a select committee of parliamentarians would conduct the inquiry. In this regard I was asked to enter into discussions with the Premier's officers on the details of such an inquiry.

Select committees have not been used enough in our Parliament in recent times. In fact this is only the fourth occasion during my 10 years in this place on which we have had the pleasure of speaking to a motion to establish a select committee. There is a lot of ignorance, of course, about select committees, their powers, their privileges, and so on. I believe that a select committee of parliamentarians is the most competent body to carry out such an inquiry. It is, in any event, the most competent type of inquiry for any parliamentarian to serve on. The select committee is a portion of the Parliament itself, and the rights and immunities that append to members of Parliament in this place append, therefore, to members of Parliament in their service on a select committee of the House.

The Standing Orders of our Parliament devote much of their content to the procedural matters associated with the conduct

of select committees of the House. Many of the procedures that have been established are written down for the express purpose of advising parliamentary select committees in their actions.

As I said, I have been associated with three of the four committees of inquiry appointed by the Parliament in recent times. I was a member of the Select Committee on Punishment of Crimes of Violence; I had the honour of chairing the Select Committee of Privileges; and I will have the honour to chair the Select Committee on Education. I want to emphasise that, in my opinion, the appointment of a select committee is the most appropriate way of tackling the education inquiry currently, and I hope that the Government will see fit to use this device more in the future than it has done in the past.

Members of Parliament should know that I was closely involved in the drafting of the terms of reference of the committee and that the detail of the terms of reference was not altered by Cabinet when, subsequent to the Premier's original announcement, he submitted the amended proposals for the appointment of a select committee with certain powers.

The terms of reference are very wide and they should not be criticised on that basis. Honourable members can peruse the document before them now. At the start it says that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the system of education in Queensland, and none of the consequent matters in the terms of reference limit that basic premise. It has a very wide brief. It needs it. The committee will be able to inquire into absolutely any area of concern in the education area that is expressed to it.

The select committee will be clothed with the powers relating to select committees that have been usual to our Legislature. However, in this particular instance, to enable it to carry out its particular task, some extra and different powers have been scheduled in the formal motion that I have just presented to the House. The committee will have the power to sit from place to place, as indeed it intends to do, rather than to sit at Parliament House, which has been the normal procedure for parliamentary select committees. It will have the power to appoint an advisory panel, which is most unusual but I believe appropriate in the professional matters that will be under discussion before the committee.

This procedure is well settled by recent practice in parliamentary committees operating within the Westminster system. I draw the attention of honourable members to the latest edition of "Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice" at page 655 under the heading

“Expert Assistance and Consultation”. For the record, I would like to have it written into the report—

“In the past select committees of both Houses have been given unusual powers to secure assistance when it appeared necessary for them to consider and evaluate complex technical or professional evidence. These sometimes took the form of powers to employ qualified individuals who should conduct their own investigations and report to the committee. More frequently orders made by the House of Commons have envisaged the committee’s consultation with persons of professional capacity and expertise. As a recent development of this practice committees are now frequently empowered to appoint persons with specialist or scientific or technical knowledge for the purposes of their inquiries, either to supply information which is not readily available or to elucidate matters of complexity within the committee’s order of reference. In modern practice, such advisers normally attend not only meetings of the committee at which oral evidence is taken but also meetings at which the committee deliberates. They do not examine witnesses or take part in voting.”

The committee will have the power to sit during any sitting of the House. It is not intended that the committee take oral evidence during the sitting of the House, but it is intended to sit from time to time to consult on matters of detail suddenly arising so that the inquiry can be quickly completed and a report made to the Parliament as expeditiously as possible. However, it will be the rarity rather than the norm.

There has been some recent discussion about the specific provisions in the motion relating to Crown privilege. On that point, I draw to the attention of honourable members the other three forms of select committee that have been used in this Parliament in recent years. In fact, the detail of this particular provision is exactly the same as that which has applied recently. Actually, the Government has had no hand in this matter. This particular clause was recommended by me, and I assisted the Crown Law officers and Parliamentary Counsel in the drafting of the motion now before the House. Much of the criticism on this matter has been directed by members who do not know of its necessity and the law relating to Crown privilege. I believe—and I think all honourable members who are reasonable would agree—that it is necessary to preserve the absolute confidentiality of advice from departmental heads to a Minister of the Crown. I want to assure honourable members that it is not the intention of this committee to intrude into this area. It will not be necessary to do so to get at the matters under the terms of reference.

Incidentally, it would be covered by Crown privilege anyway, should it arise. In any event, it is my understanding that the law in relation to Crown privilege is well settled. I speak now as a former chairman of the Parliamentary Select Committee of Privileges with some knowledge of the law in this respect. My advice is that if the Crown wishes to claim privilege, whether or not these clauses are contained in this particular motion, it would in fact be able to do so. However, the fact that it is there for all to see is useful and appropriate so that, if the matter does arise, honourable members will be able to see the particular machinery that will be used to deal with it. I am confident that it will not.

The committee has already had some informal meetings. I hope that honourable members will not consider the holding of those meetings in any way contemptuous of them or of Parliament. They happened for a particular reason. We have been advised by those assisting us that it was necessary to give as much time as possible—in fact more than we are giving—to organisations that want to present matter to the committee, and that is reasonable. It was suggested to us that the organisations should be given until, say, September to prepare their submissions, consult with their committees and reach their decisions democratically. Of course we were not able to do that.

The spirit of select committees is that they meet during the recesses of the Parliament. The biggest recess for this Parliament is between May and August. We want to use that particular time to conduct most of the hearings and the examination of submissions which will come before us.

Our advisers told us to have all of the machinery matters ready to proceed immediately this motion is passed by Parliament. So the date we have set for the receipt for submissions—4 July—is a compromise between what is advisable and what is indicated by the exigencies of time. Also, there has been considerable Press speculation regarding the constitution of the advisory panel and the terms of reference. It seemed sensible to resolve those matters so that organisations can commence submissions to the committee. We have endeavoured to settle most of those arguments.

At this stage I seek leave to incorporate in “Hansard” a copy of an advertisement which the committee proposes to lodge in all provincial newspapers in Queensland and major metropolitan newspapers throughout Australia seeking submissions. (Leave granted.)

#### “SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION IN QUEENSLAND

“The Queensland Parliament has by Resolution appointed an all-party Select Committee to inquire into, to report upon and to make recommendations in relation to the system of education in Queensland and the extent to which it meets the expect-

ations of students, parents and the community and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, with particular reference to the following matters:

“(a) the efficiency and adequacy of the present system of secondary education;

“(b) appropriate emphasis in primary education between basic education and other activities;

“(c) adequate technical and further education to meet today’s industry needs;

“(d) a review of the decision making process in education and the role of the community in this area;

“(e) adequacy of social science courses for primary and secondary students;

“(f) the need for new courses, the ability of the education system to provide them and the administrative machinery for implementing them;

“(g) the introduction of an independent authority to investigate complaints by parents or community organisations concerning any aspect of education; and

“(h) any other matter pertaining to the matters for inquiry, report and recommendation as aforesaid.

“Submissions, observations and other material relevant to the terms of reference are invited from members of the public and interested bodies and organisations. These should

- be in writing—ten (10) copies from organisations; individuals may provide single copies in writing or typed.
- be forwarded to Mr. E. S. Newton, Secretary of the Committee, Parliament House, George Street, Brisbane 4000, telephone 221 2477.
- be forwarded as soon as compiled but, if possible, so as to reach the Secretary by Tuesday, 4th July, 1978. Late submissions will be allowed providing written intention is given before 4th July.
- indicate whether, in addition to making a written submission, the author wishes to appear in person before the Committee.

“The Select Committee will commence public hearings at Parliament House, Brisbane in June, 1978. Appearance before the Committee will be by invitation.

“Submissions already to hand will be considered by the Committee.

M. J. AHERN, M.L.A.,  
“Chairman.”

**Mr. AHERN:** An inspection of the advertisement will show that it is proposed that submissions should be received in writing and, where organisations are concerned, it will obviously greatly assist the panel if all members of the committee and of the advisory panel have a copy initially. So it is asked that 10 copies be forwarded. The bulk

of material coming forward could severely strain the resources of Parliament if it had to do the necessary photocopying. I can see, by your expression, Mr. Speaker, that you agree with me on that. It is sensible that organisations be asked to provide 10 copies. However, special consideration will be given to those people who write in as individuals. This will be encouraged. It will not be necessary that their submissions be typewritten, although that is desirable. It is proposed that all submissions currently in hand—and there are literally hundreds of them—will be considered by the committee.

It would not be safe to assume, either, from a reading of the advertisement that the committee will not commence public hearings before 4 July, the cut-off date for submissions. In fact, we hope to receive early submissions which would enable us to commence the substance of the inquiry in June. However, this will depend upon the individual submissions that we receive.

It is proposed that the committee should visit some regional centres. This is specifically provided for in the motion before the House and it is a matter that will be under review by the committee in the near future.

The committee also proposes to write to all members of Parliament inviting submissions from them and from any organisation or person with whom they have contact. Members will receive those letters within the next few days. It is proposed also to write to all Ministers of the Crown inviting submissions from their departments. Interested organisations will be written to and invited to make submissions to the inquiry. I propose to have this speech copied so that any honourable member who wishes to obtain copies of it for presentation to any interested parties within his electorate can do so.

No specific time frame is envisaged for the inquiry but it is hoped that some particular matters will be resolved in time for the next curricular year. Obviously the committee members and the panel would want to see the inquiry completed as expeditiously as possible.

Consideration has already been given informally to the constitution of the advisory panel. At present it is proposed that it consist of four persons, namely: Dr. Rupert Goodman, of the Queensland University; Mr. Peter Krebs, principal of St. Paul’s School, Bald Hills; Mr. Kevin O’Connor, principal of Wavell State High School; and Mrs. Jan Herron, parent representative. Members of the advisory panel were recommended informally to the committee by me after very wide consultation with interested organisations, members of the Government and other individuals. It should be clearly understood that they are not delegates representing any organisation. They are to be there in the capacity of helpful professional representatives. It is critical in this professional area

that a committee such as the one proposed be afforded professional advice on a continuing basis. These persons will, I believe, be able to provide adequately that continuing advice.

I want to assure honourable members that a lot of discussion and consideration preceded the appointment of these persons to the advisory panel, and I would now like to detail some further background information on the proposed appointees.

Dr. Rupert Goodman has a B.A., B.Ed., Ph.D., F.A.C.E., and he is a Reader in Education at the Department of External Studies of the University of Queensland. He has been a primary and secondary teacher in private and State schools. He has been a headmaster, university lecturer and administrator. He is a Fellow of the Australian College of Education. He has had wide experience in education at all levels. He was formerly chairman of the council of the Kindergarten Teachers' College, a member of the Presbyterian and Methodist Schools Council and the Board of Adult Education. He is currently a member of the Board of Teacher Education, a member of the University of Queensland Senate, and Queensland commissioner for the A.B.C. He is a member of other committees of inquiry, including the UNESCO Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education in Indonesia and Ethiopia and the Royal Australian Nursing Federation Committee of Inquiry into Nursing Education. His other community appointments include member of the board of governors of St. Andrew's Hospital and chairman of the Queensland Council for Children's Films and Television.

Mr. Peter Krebs was educated at Barker College, Sydney, and the University of Sydney, receiving a B.A. in 1949. His teacher training was with the Teachers' Guild of New South Wales in 1949. He taught at St. Andrew's School and Barker College in Sydney and then at the Church of England Grammar School in Brisbane from 1950 to 1954 and from 1956 to 1960. He spent 1955 touring Europe. He has been the headmaster at St. Paul's school at Bald Hills since 1960 and in 1970 he visited Europe in order to inspect the schools in England, take a linguistics course and visit schools in France, and to teach English for four months at Frederiksberg LEA, Copenhagen, Denmark. He is a past president of the Independent Schools Association of Queensland.

Mr. Kevin O'Connor is the principal of the Wavell State High School in Brisbane. He was educated at the Christian Brothers' College in Rockhampton and the University of Queensland, where he received a B.A. and M.Ed. He has taught at one-teacher and public schools in the Mackay and Rockhampton areas. He was a deputy principal at the Rockhampton High School and the Mt. Morgan High School. He is now in his 16th year as a principal, having been the principal of Newmarket, Everton Park and

Pimlico High Schools before coming to Wavell. He was a foundation member of the Board of Secondary School Studies and served on that board for four years. He is currently vice-president of the Queensland State High School Principals' Association. He is a member of the Queensland Teachers' Union.

There has been some criticism of the appointment of Dr. Goodman to the panel inasmuch as he is on record as making certain reference to certain social education programmes in Queensland that are the subject of recent controversy. It is difficult to find any educationist who has not expressed a view on this, but in this respect his presence on the panel is balanced by the two other educationists who are professional men and were chosen on the basis of their professionalism. I do not know what their attitude is to SEMP and MACOS; I have not asked them.

Mrs. Jan Herron is a parent of 10 children. She is not representing any parent organisation; she is simply a parent with a lot of knowledge of parent problems. She is a past president of the Mater Hospital's Women's Auxiliary and has had a lot of experience in public life as well, and I am quite certain she will make an excellent contribution to the committee.

It would be possible to detail another 20 and, some would say, 50 people who could adequately fill this role. However, it was decided that to be at all workable the panel should be kept reasonably small. It may be added to for particular purposes or generally as the committee proceeds in its work.

Mr. Ted Newton is the secretary of the proposed committee. He is an official of the Parliament and I am very happy to have him associated with us. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you and your officers for the immense amount of help you have given to us in relation to this inquiry so far. It has been greatly appreciated.

It is possible that a committee such as this will require a research person as well, and that is something that will be considered by the committee as time goes by. It is important that Parliament and the public understand that this inquiry is not an inquiry into SEMP and MACOS. An inspection of the terms of reference of the inquiry would very clearly, I think, indicate that it is an investigation into education in the broad in our State. However, the areas of social education, literacy and numeracy and their effect on employment, and the Radford scheme, will certainly be the subjects of detailed examination.

Initially, the decision has been taken to commence the inquiry with a general look at education in an endeavour to isolate areas of concern and then these particular matters

can be considered at a later time in the context of the education system as a whole and the direction in which we feel it should be heading in 1978.

This inquiry will be but one facet of the information and inquiry system that goes to Government—a parliamentary inquiry. The Government has professional inquiries continuing at the moment. It also has a wealth of senior departmental advice. In this respect our committee's contribution and report will be only one facet of the information going to Government. However, a Parliamentary committee has a particular value, I believe, that no other form of inquiry can adequately serve. I refer particularly to the ability, by contact through members of Parliament, through organisations out in the field, to detail and crystallize views of average ordinary persons in the community—the mums and dads, the children, the employers and employees, the electors, the interested parties, whoever they are. So I ask for the co-operation of honourable members in this respect, in assisting our inquiry to see that we get information of that type.

Education must be accountable to Parliament, and this issue is central to the debate which has been raging in recent times. It has always been the bane of some people involved in public administration that they have had to account to elected representatives for their recommendations. But that is at the core of parliamentary democracy, and that is the central issue in relation to the appointment of this committee. The qualification of the members of the inquiry cannot be argued; they are elected representatives of the people of Queensland.

Mr. Speaker, some have said—and it has generated a lot of comment—that the action to appoint this inquiry was prompted by one or two groups in the community. However, I think it is fair to say that during the 1970s increasing concern has been expressed by many sections of the community about aspects of education in our State. While it has been acknowledged that more money than ever has been spent on education, more modern buildings have been erected with very sophisticated teaching aids, more teachers have been appointed with longer and more specialised training, and overall there are smaller classes, there has been—and it is not possible to deny it—a constant questioning about the quality of education. Whether or not it is justified is another matter, but for more than a decade there has been widespread criticism in the community of, for instance, the behaviour of adolescents—their dress, their manners, their habits, their indiscipline. This, it is stated has been associated with a decline in the quality of secondary and post-secondary education. In this context, the Radford scheme of continuous assessment instead of the external public examination system which previously applied has been

a constant target, despite several reviews of the scheme which have been carried out by the Board of Secondary School Studies and educationists appointed by it. Although more and more students were remaining at school to complete year 12 and continuing on to tertiary studies, the trend to emphasise the liberal arts courses rather than practical courses has been criticised by, for example, employer organisations. Employers were critical of the vocational emphasis in education from apprenticeship through to technical and further education.

The downturn in the economy in recent years and the very large increase in the number of people unemployed, even among those who have stayed on for higher qualifications, accentuated public concern that somehow the schools were to blame, at least in part. Moreover, uneasiness was expressed at the quality of some teacher graduates from colleges of advanced education, over which the Government had little control. Some parents have been complaining of their philosophical attitudes indicated by the setting of textbooks and the development of courses.

In March 1977 the Minister for Education, following complaints from parents, saw fit to withdraw a secondary school English text "Messageways on a Small Planet. Book One", on the ground that it over-emphasised violence. A major public debate has waged throughout Queensland over social studies programme MACOS being trialled in 17 primary schools. There was widespread discussion in the media, an active campaign against it by some community organisations, and much concern expressed by parents in many country areas. The Minister for Education halted further development of the course, cancelled a special seminar for MACOS teachers and called for a special report on the matter from the Education Department. Subsequently Cabinet decided to scrap the course. In primary education questions have been raised about the adequacy of literacy and numeracy studies, and there has been fairly widespread public disquiet about standards in basic skills. There has been concern at the political level over the intrusion of the Commonwealth Government and Commonwealth agencies into the field of education, traditionally and constitutionally a State responsibility. Some of these enterprises appeared to have a philosophical basis different from that underlying State activities in education.

Controversy developed over the SEMP programme produced by the Curriculum Development Centre in Canberra as resource material for use by teachers and students in a wide range of secondary school subjects. Following numerous community complaints Cabinet investigated this material and decided that it should be prohibited from use in State schools.

This great education debate is not unique to Queensland; it is not unique to Australia; it has been going on in the United Kingdom for a number of years. In the United States parents are suing the schools. In Missouri 23 public school districts have been sued by a group of taxpayers who charge that schools do teach religion in the form of secular humanism. The plaintiffs have asked for a refund of their education taxes. Pending the litigation tax funds have been placed in escrow by the courts.

On the other hand, while these Government decisions on education were welcomed by some sections, serious objections were raised by the Queensland Teachers' Union, the Queensland Council of State School Organisations, by many academics, by education associations and many others. They have asserted that there is nothing wrong with the system at the moment, that an immense amount of effort has gone into establishing a system that is serving our State very well, that there is a lot that is good and right in the schools in Queensland, and that the only cause for concern is the shortage of money to rectify the errors.

Some teachers have been affronted by Government interference in this area. They feel somehow that their professionalism is affronted. Others believe that the problems which are the subject of public concern have been created outside the school. One could go on. We have a very excellent Department of Education that is somewhat bewildered about it. With the best of intentions it has been endeavouring to provide the best advice to Government, and so, who is right? Is there cause for concern? What ought to be State education in 1978 and into the '80s? This is the time to appraise. I want to tell all honourable members and the people of Queensland that we will rest only on rational argument.

Claims have been made to the effect that statements made by senior Government members have in some way pre-empted the inquiry. On the contrary, I am very happy that there is controversy. I ask, though, that it be a controversy of quality from which some good ideas will come. No statements can be made, have been made or will be made that will in any way pre-empt this parliamentary inquiry, and I am very hopeful that all honourable members will feel free to express themselves as fully and frankly as they can, wherever they can. I think it will be useful. The suggestion that this inquiry is in some way a witch-hunt is not really worthy of comment. It is a ridiculous proposition to suggest an all-party committee to carry out such a task. It is ridiculous in the extreme. I can assure all honourable members that that will not be the case. It has not been suggested to me by anyone, by any member of the committee or by any member of

the panel. No rational person could make that comment about the committee. Knowing the personalities that are involved, I say it will not happen.

The M.L.A.s who are serving on the committee have been carefully chosen—not, incidentally, by me. I served on Sir Alan Fletcher's education committee when many of the boards that are at present a feature of our education system were introduced and when the Radford scheme was introduced. I have served on three select committees of the Parliament and I know how committees operate.

The member for Isis, Mr. Powell, is a former teacher and a former member of the council of the Teachers Union in this State. The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Bill Hewitt, has been a member of the Minister's parliamentary education committee since he came into the House. He is a man of considerable committee experience and he will be a great asset to this committee. I am very happy to welcome my friend and colleague from Ithaca, Mr. Miller, who has had more than 15 years of parliamentary experience. As honourable members who have been here for some time would know, he has always been a keen advocate for industry and apprenticeship matters. His expertise will be invaluable to the committee. The Labor Party has, of course, nominated its shadow Education Minister.

It has been suggested in the newspapers that some organisations, probably well-meaning, have publicised the fact that it is their intention to act as a clearing-house in some way for matters coming to the committee. Whilst recognising that they are acting with the best intentions, I want to discourage that. The integrity of this inquiry requires that all submissions come direct to it, and I think that as chairman of the committee I can offer the privileges of the House to anybody who appears before the committee. To anyone who indicates confidentiality I say that it will be observed.

All the machinery associated with the inquiry is well in motion, so that on the passing of this motion the committee will be able to move quickly into the investigative stage. I thank all those who have been associated with bringing this about.

I look forward to some constructive debate on the subject tonight. As it is a parliamentary inquiry I will be looking for thoughtful and helpful co-operation of all members of Parliament irrespective of their party. I want to assure everybody that we will do our job thoroughly and impartially. We need opinions, but we will be relying on facts.

One-third of this Government's Budget goes into education. The appointment of this education inquiry is the most important

business of the Government this session. All who are associated with it are deeply conscious of the responsibility that has been given to us and I want to assure everyone that we will discharge that responsibility in the best and fairest way that we can.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT** (Greenslopes) (7.54 p.m.): I second the motion. The Government is to be commended for referring such an important issue as this to a parliamentary select committee. All honourable members will know my own feelings about select committees, their importance in a parliamentary institution and the necessity to have more frequent recourse to them.

It would be a mistake for members of Parliament and the public generally to imagine that the decision to establish this committee is an ad hoc one of recent days. It is in fact the result of intense agitation in the joint Government parties over the past 12 months or so. Members, reflecting concern for the people they represented, were of the opinion that the whole education system in the State should be looked at critically and that a committee should be charged with the responsibility of making that assessment.

Honourable members will well recall that the Minister's committee in the last Parliament was given the task of carrying out certain investigations. The members of that committee applied themselves to the task faithfully and well; but, with the best will in the world, the task was clearly beyond them without the aid of supportive staff. Nevertheless, the demand was very real and incessant, and it is pleasing that the Government has responded to that demand and has decided that a committee whose structure we debate tonight should be appointed.

It is important to realise that this select committee is being appointed by Parliament, it is being clothed with authority by Parliament and it is to be answerable to Parliament. It is the prerogative of the Government to decide what recommendations will be implemented, and of course the Government will consider those recommendations very closely indeed; but it is not the prerogative of the Government to colour those recommendations. It has the right to allow its officers or any of its instrumentalities to make submissions to the committee, and I hope that that right will be exercised. However, I emphasise again that this committee is appointed by Parliament, authorised by Parliament and answerable to Parliament. It is the Government that will be taking cognisance of its recommendations.

Because of that background, it should be established quite clearly and without equivocation that this is not a tame-cat committee. It is composed of five parliamentarians with strong individual views but, importantly, imbued with a high sense of responsibility

and a firm determination to discharge the responsibilities entrusted to them. It is important at the outset to establish the goodwill of each and every member of the committee and their firm determination to discharge their responsibilities honourably and properly.

We must establish that understanding at the outset because what is wanted more than any other thing is the goodwill of every section of the profession—the utmost goodwill and the utmost good faith—because without goodwill and good faith submissions will not be forthcoming, and, with the best will in the world, therefore, we will not be able to avail ourselves of the best advice. Every point of view and every submission will be considered on its merits. We will be trying as hard as possible to enter the deliberations without any preconceived ideas.

I commend the Government very warmly for this course of action in setting up the committee. I commend it warmly also for its choice of chairman. I have worked in close harness with Mr. Ahern since he came into this Parliament. I hold him in very high personal regard. Putting aside my personal regard for him, it should be acknowledged that he is a disciplined person, an organised person and a reasonable person, and the success of this committee will be attributable in no small measure to his firm guiding hand upon its deliberations.

There have been some criticisms about the selection of advisers—the people, their competence, their background and other things. It has been suggested that other advisers should have been appointed. It is surprising that such a broad spectrum should have been suggested for representation on the advisory committee. If all of those requests had been acceded to, we would have had an entourage so formidable that it would have been quite overwhelming and it would have broken down under its own weight. We acknowledge that there is a great fund of expertise at our disposal, and we will not hesitate to call upon it.

About those who have been appointed, let it be said that they are not necessarily representative of specific disciplines; rather are they representative of a broad spectrum. To those who voice criticism of the advisers, I say with no disrespect whatsoever to the advisers that I echo the words of a former Labor Premier of this State (Mr. Forgan Smith) who once said, "You have the experts on tap but never on top." The clear interpretation of that is that we will be looking for advice from our advisers and others, but it will be the five parliamentarians who will be sifting the advice and making decisions upon it.

Why is there the necessity for an inquiry into education? The Government has expressed its concern and taken a quite proper course of action. But that concern

only reflects concern that has been expressed in the community for a good number of years. People are questioning the basic purpose of our education system, the selection of subjects, the efficiency or inefficiency in the teaching of the three Rs, the preparation of students for post-school life, the question of discipline and respect, the tertiary stage and, indeed, the whole gamut of our education system. All of these things have provoked great interest, concern and observation.

It is not for us tonight to pre-empt any of those things and say whether or not those fears are well founded or ill founded. I spare myself the luxury of making this observation: it is easy to say that there is not the same efficiency in the three Rs today as there was many years ago; but we overlook the fact that, even in my boyhood, the smaller number went to high school, the greater number left school after the Scholarship examination, and only those whose parents could afford it were able to go to high school. To measure the three Rs concept is, indeed, an enormously difficult task. But we will tackle it. We will do what we can to establish whether or not that is a valid criticism.

It is not my role tonight to say where our priorities will lie. In personal terms, I say that I am vitally interested in technical education. I am of the opinion that this nation has been on a 25-year ego trip, where every kid who came out of school had his parents pushing him towards an academic career or towards a job where he wore the white collar. Let it be clearly said that this nation is still dependent upon the men who go home with dirt under their fingernails each night, and the sooner we relate our education system to the need for technicians, the better. I am of the firm opinion that when our economy is vitalised and this nation starts to move again, we will not have the tradesmen and the technicians available to respond to the challenge. I lament over that; I hope it is not right. But indeed it is one of the things I will want to look at.

**Mr. Armstrong** interjected.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** My friend from Mulgrave says that I am spot on. I have always respected his point of view. As I say, that is one of the things that attract my urgent consideration.

One hears a good deal of mention these days about teacher-training, its adequacy or inadequacy, and the type of product that is turned out from the training colleges. Certainly, teachers from the old school—those who have been out in their own schools for many a day—say that in their time they were taught to teach and that, in their opinions at least, students at training colleges are not taught to teach; they are expected to acquire

that capacity when they go into the classrooms. Again, the older schoolteachers seem to be of the opinion that too much emphasis is placed on innovative programmes and not sufficient on the basic things that should be taught day by day. I believe we would be lacking in our responsibilities if we did not look closely at teacher-training and, if this investigation shows that there is no great area of concern, so much the better.

One constantly hears criticism also about primary schools and the necessity to identify core subjects. I agree with those observations. I agree also with the observation that high schools are too related to students who are going to pursue tertiary careers. Perhaps we should look at those who are not so interested and see that there are different courses geared to their requirements.

I personally am satisfied that a greater effort than ever is being made by teaching professionals to get parents involved in the life of schools. I am totally convinced of that and I warmly compliment teachers on those efforts. It is a matter of regret that the response from parents has probably never been poorer. That, in my opinion, is attributable to two things. It is attributable in the first place to the general inexplicable retreat from community involvement. Why that is so I will never know, but it is very much in evidence. It is also attributable to the poor understanding by parents of what precisely is happening in high schools and what precisely is being taught to their children. That is a discernible breakdown in communication that should concern us all.

The best example of that, of course, is the Radford scheme. I comment not upon that tonight. I am of the opinion that it has been a good scheme but that it has been explained in the most deplorable fashion. There is an abysmal ignorance of the Radford scheme among parents. They really cannot understand its workings and are therefore probably reluctant to avail themselves of invitations from teachers to become involved in the life of schools.

**Mr. Moore:** Nor can employers understand it.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Precisely.

My friend from Landsborough made some reference to controversial courses that have been banned in recent times. I merely say that the decision to ban SEMP would probably better have been delayed till after the deliberations of the committee had been completed. Those who say that it is humanist in content must surely be embarrassed, if those people can ever be embarrassed, by the endorsement of SEMP by Catholic schools.

Equally there is a good deal of comment these days about the books that are available to young children in our schools. I concede readily that principals should be concerned about the books in their libraries and the contents of those books. But I am equally convinced that principals by and large are concerned and do demonstrate a healthy responsibility. We should feel sad and sorry rather than angry that there are people who believe that such classics as "Gone with the Wind" are in some way or other damaging to our children.

I give an example of the way in which one high school handles the question of books. It happens to be the high school that my own 14-year-old daughter attends. By a strange coincidence, she brought this letter home from her school principal today—

"Dear Grade 10 Parents,

"The English Department at Camp Hill State High School requires your child to read the following books as part of the Semester 1, Grade 10 English course at this school:

"Grade 10

"'The Pigman'—Paul Zindel

"'And the Big Men Fly'—A. Hopgood.

"'Pygmalion'—G. B. Shaw.

"The members of the English Department at Camp Hill High School have chosen these books carefully for their literary importance and for their appeal to the students.

"However, if you object to having your child read any of these books, then please let us know and we will happily make alternative arrangements for him or her.

"Students are also required to read wide-reading books, but because of the extensive selection of books available in the school library, there should be no problems in this area. Parents are encouraged to discuss with their children the selection of these wide-reading books. The Library Staff and English teachers will be very pleased to help with the selection of appropriate material."

A singularly responsible attitude by the subject master and by the school principal! I applaud it totally, and notwithstanding that Eliza in *Pygmalion* said "Not bloody likely!" I am not taking any objection to the book whatsoever. But that is the sort of responsibility that we can anticipate, and on most occasions the responsibility that is forthcoming.

The ramifications of this inquiry are quite enormous. Our charter is wide. There are no aspects of education that we are not permitted to look at, and with goodwill we

will look at any areas that are referred to us. I use the word "goodwill" consistently because it is important. If the goodwill of all branches of the teaching and education profession is not forthcoming, then our efforts are doomed to failure from the outset. It is true that the Teachers' Union has expressed some reservation about the terms of reference and about the advisers. The Teachers' Union is a responsible body and it has the same democratic right as any other body in the community to express dissent and criticism and those points of view are taken into account. But I would say to the Teachers' Union that if it looks at the terms of reference it will find they are not restrictive. They are intended to be open-ended; they are intended to give us the greatest possible licence so that we can discharge the obligation that the Government has imposed upon us, and if everybody approaches this inquiry with a sense of goodwill, then I would hope that our deliberations will be useful and that the children of this State will be served in good stead. That is what it is all about—the children of Queensland and making sure that they have an education system that will equip them for the trying years in front of them, making sure that they have a good, sound, firm education and making sure that the content of that education will equip them to be useful and fine citizens of the State of Queensland. I am happy to be associated with this committee, I support the motion and I commend the Government once again for this step in appointing the committee.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba) (8.13 p.m.): Because of the public concern about Queensland's education system, the Opposition supports the setting up of a Select Committee on Education. Having made that clear, let me also make it clear that we suspect the motives behind the creation of the select committee and we question the composition of the committee and the advisory panel. We also question the terms of reference set out in the motion and the power of the committee.

Although I am sure every member of this House has a high regard for those honourable gentlemen named on the select committee and also a high regard for those people who have been chosen to be the advisers to the committee, what we are really concerned about is what is going to happen to the findings of the committee, because, after all, having an inquiry, having all the experts about the place giving advice and having the committee members give up many hours of their time is one thing, but it is another thing of no value at all if, when the final report is made, the Government of the day decides that it is not going to take any notice of it or take notice of some minor aspects only. That is why right from

the word go I say that we suspect the motives associated with the setting up of the committee.

The honourable member for Landsborough scouted round the reason why the Committee was necessary and when that necessity became apparent to the Government. When it really became necessary cannot be determined. The honourable member for Greenslopes said that 12 months ago the Government's Education committee decided that it was necessary to have an inquiry and urged the Government to institute one. But it was singularly unsuccessful in its advocacy, because in the 1976 debate on the Budget Estimates, although the spending of millions of dollars was provided for, the Government decided that honourable members would not be given the opportunity to debate the Education Estimates separately. It is true that members had an opportunity to speak on education among many other matters, in their speech in the Budget debate, but they were not given the opportunity to look at education in particular. That was in 1976-77.

**Mr. Bird:** You had had two years running, and we have to take turns.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Well, what about 1977? I am pleased that the Minister has come in on that. A few moments ago the honourable member for Greenslopes said that 1977 was the year in which the Education committee was urging the Government to take some action, yet the Minister and the Government did not allow the members of this Assembly to speak on the Estimates for the Education Department.

**Mr. Bird:** If I let you speak on them every year, you would complain that you could not speak on anything else.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I have never complained about working in the House, and neither have my colleagues. What we have complained about—and this is recorded in "Hansard"—is the Government's performance in 1977. It was shocking. In fact, when the Budget debate took place, the Leader of the Opposition was given his correct time of an hour and a half but virtually every other member of the Opposition was compelled to restrict his speaking time, and no time was allotted, as I said, to debate the Education Estimates. So the Minister should not talk to me or my colleagues about what the Government wanted to do for education.

Let me turn now to the election campaign. Prior to 12 November 1977, all I heard and all I read about education was the Government's claim that Queensland had the best education system in Australia—there was nothing wrong with it; it was a great system. That was said while, as the honourable member for Greenslopes said earlier, the Education committee was asking for an inquiry.

Apparently things went bad between 12 November 1977 and 22 February 1978—just 15 weeks.

For years members of the community, particularly employers and others associated with young people, have been complaining about the education system. They have been complaining about students failing, but not in the subjects that were under discussion by Cabinet in January and February this year. The public—employers in particular—were complaining about the maths of the children and the spelling of the children. How often have we read in the news media complaints by employers about the spelling of many of their junior employees? They complained also of the standard of maths achieved by many of them. So when we talk about having an inquiry, I suggest that an inquiry could well have been held 12 months ago. I agree with the honourable member for Greenslopes on that point. I said many times that we did need an inquiry, particularly when it was found that the public was not accepting the Radford scheme and was questioning the system of assessment under that scheme.

I agree, too, that because members of the public were not correctly informed, many of them gained wrong impressions about what was required. That is when the Government should have been talking about an inquiry. It was a Government of the same political colour which, with a great fanfare, abolished the State Scholarship examination and, again with a great fanfare, abolished the Junior Public Examination. The Government substituted its own internal examination for appointment to the State Public Service. Although the Government, on the one hand, abolished public examinations, on the other hand, it still did something about having virtual public examinations for specific purposes. These are things that have been going on for years. They have been known to the public. On many occasions the Opposition criticised the Government when it had an opportunity to talk on education matters. On every occasion the Minister for Education and other Government members have said that there was nothing radically wrong with the education system.

**Mr. Bird:** I never said we had a perfect education system.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I did not say that the Minister said it was perfect. He said there was nothing radically wrong with it. He said that we had the best education system in Australia. He cannot deny that.

**Mr. Katter:** That is true.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Well, God help the rest of them!

The Government is having this inquiry because it is trying to get itself off the hook.

I first suspected direct Cabinet interference with the State education system, which is what it amounts to, in March 1977 when, as mentioned by the honourable member for Landsborough, "Messageways on a Small Planet, Book One" was banned, according to Cabinet, because of its violence. I do not know the book so I am not querying the judgment. The point is that it was a Cabinet decision.

**Mr. Bird:** It was not a Cabinet decision. It was my decision.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister can take the credit if he wants to. He caused it to be banned. September 1977 saw the prohibition on teachers' discussing the building society problems that were current in the State at that time. Was that the Minister's decision?

**Mr. Bird:** I think you ought to get your facts straight.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** At any rate the word went out to schools not to discuss the liquidity crisis of the Queensland Permanent Building Society. If the Minister wants to argue about that, I suggest that he talk to some of his colleagues about it. At that time the Government decided that it did not want the matter discussed, even though in almost every home in Queensland there was talk about the current building society problems.

Let us come to more recent times, when the Government started to worry about what the public was thinking of it as a Government. In January 1978 MACOS was banned. I suppose that was either the Minister's or Cabinet's decision. I think it was Cabinet's decision. It was banned although it had been taught in some Queensland schools since 1973.

**Mr. Bird:** Trialled.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Fair enough. It was a four-year trial before Cabinet decided that it was to be banned because it was no good at all.

The Minister said that it was not a rash decision. I am saying only what was published in the Press. I do not want to deliberately misquote the Minister. The Minister has said that he wants credit for things he did, and I do not want to take anything away from him. By the same token, he has to stand up to things he did that were wrong. He has never said who made the recommendations to him or to Cabinet, but we do know from Press reports that a prominent educationist and another member of the community who is interested in matters of morals were elated when the Cabinet decided to ban MACOS. They were very quick to go into Press supporting the Government on that occasion.

It was a controversy at that time because there were people in Queensland who supported it and others who were against it,

but nobody at that stage was suggesting that there should be an inquiry. While the controversy was raging, on 22 February 1978 Social Education Materials Project (SEMP) was banned. Again I believe that the Minister took the matter to Cabinet, but he has not said why it was banned. Never once in any report I have read did he say why it was banned. Nor did he say who came forward with the advice.

The Premier, however, had more to say. I am glad to see that he is in the House. He is reported as saying that someone in the Education Department did not seem to know what the Government wanted children to be taught. How are we to interpret that comment? Will the Premier say to this select committee when it publishes its findings, "Those are not the findings the Government wants you to bring down. Go back and sit again."? The Premier's comment is one of the grounds on which we base our suspicion of the motives behind the setting up of the inquiry.

The Premier was reported as going on to say, "Educators will get the message that we will only allow wholesome, decent and factual material in our schools." In saying that he is expressing only his own view on what SEMP is all about. Other people for whom I have a very high regard have said that they believe the project could be of value in schools, to be used with discretion by teachers. Why could not that type of decision be made by the State Education Department?

Queensland has two recognised parallel education systems. On the one hand we have the State education system and, on the other, we have what is generally termed the private school education system. The latter system comprises both secondary and primary schools, some of which are conducted by boards and others by church organisations. The Catholic Church, which is one of the major groups conducting independent schools, has left no doubt in anyone's mind that SEMP can be used in its schools and that the decision is left to the principal or the subject master who will act in co-operation with the parents. The approach adopted by the Catholic Church is totally different from that of the Government.

The Premier was further reported as saying that Cabinet had acted after strenuous objections to SEMP from Ministers. The Minister for Education is reported as saying that Cabinet made the decision after a full and frank discussion of SEMP. However, when he was asked for details of what was objected to he said, "I am not very familiar with all of the SEMP materials." Yet, as I say, he suggested that Cabinet, after looking at this material, arrived at a considered judgment of the situation.

**Mr. Bird:** There is a big difference between being completely familiar with all of the material and doing as I did, that is, give Cabinet a precis of the material.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Either the Minister is very good at giving a precis or Cabinet is very trusting of the Minister's judgment. The fact is that responsible educationists had already passed judgment on the material and held views contrary to those of the Minister.

The Minister was also reported as saying that Cabinet's decision was based on a submission by an independent committee. Was the committee an independent one, and who was on it? To this day we have not been told.

**Mr. Bird:** I was misquoted there. It was one of my departmental committees that made a recommendation to me.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Who was on the committee?

**Mr. Bird:** It was a departmental committee. I have numerous departmental committees that make recommendations to me as Minister for Education.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** This is the first time the Minister has told us that. This House is setting up a select committee and I believe it is entitled to know who made the recommendation to the Minister. I am not doubting the Minister's word, but if it was not an independent committee it must have been some other local committee. A spokeswoman for CARE claimed that her organisation played some part in the recommendation. I do not know whether it did or not.

**Mr. Bird:** I have tried to explain to you that it was a departmental committee. It was not a committee of independent persons outside the Education Department. Have you got that?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I have it very clearly. This means that some subcommittee in the Education Department virtually persuaded the Minister to go to Cabinet and have SEMP dispensed with in our State schools. Surely that is clear enough.

**Mr. Bird:** Would you say that you know all about SEMP?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I think I know more about it than the Minister does, and of course that doesn't make me an expert.

**Mr. Camm:** Would you adopt it in its entirety?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Because, like the Minister, I have not seen all the material that is available, I cannot answer that question.

**Mr. Camm:** I have seen enough of it to ban it.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** You want it banned?

**Mr. Camm:** Yes.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Government is talking about setting up an inquiry and yet it has already banned it. Even if this committee comes back with a statement that it should be taught in the schools, the Cabinet vote will be to ban it. Therefore, what use is an inquiry?

The Deputy Premier entered the education controversy by reportedly telling a Liberal Party conference that the Government would soon be making legislative amendments to put policy control firmly back in the hands of the Government. If the Government has lost control of policy-making, that is the Government's fault. After all, for 20 years the coalition has been in Government in this State. If our education system has got to that stage, Government members should start looking at themselves.

The Minister for Education has just said that it was a little group in his own department that made the recommendation. Who is carrying out the policy? Is it the Department of Education or a small group—not the lot and not the Director-General, but a small group—whom the Minister refuses to name? We do not want their names, but information on the positions they hold would be of importance to us. The Minister spoke about a small group, but the Deputy Premier spoke about putting control back into Government hands. I say quite definitely that if the Government has lost control of policy-making, that is its problem.

It is one thing for the Government to make policy, but it is an entirely different matter when we get down to tin tacks and deal with the syllabus and the curriculum. In this instance the Cabinet has entered into the field of the practical operation of education, which is an entirely different matter from policy. It is not the coalition parties that have done it; it is the Government—the 18 Cabinet Ministers who, after hearing this great precis, were persuaded by their colleague to ban SEMP. There are other things too, but SEMP is the one I am mainly interested in, because it will be taught to many of our children—not SEMP, but the material available.

**Mr. Camm:** Parts of it.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Parts of it, that's right; yet the Government has banned the lot.

**Mr. Camm:** Yes, because some of it was bad. I challenge you to find any educationist in Queensland who claims that the whole of SEMP should be taught in schools.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No-one is claiming that at all. It is completely ridiculous to say that, because one part is bad, we must get rid of the lot. My colleagues who have been teaching for years will answer that argument without any trouble at all. The logic of it is that, if one part of a system or one part of a method is not really needed, surely it is possible to carry on with the major portion of the system, leaving out the objectionable bits. I do not want to go into specifics, but it would be very easy to do so.

In the field of education it is not just a matter of what the 18 members of Cabinet think. They are there as the Government—as the Cabinet. I do not know what expert knowledge they have on education. I do not know their personal backgrounds. However, I could name 18 educationists, or 18 other people, who could more than match the knowledge of Cabinet on this issue. What about educators, parents, employers, employees and, in the case of the syllabus, the more mature students themselves? Why were they not given some opportunity to express their views? What about the Queensland Teachers' Union? Surely that is a body of professional people. Apparently the Government did not ask the union or the school principals for their opinions on these matters. Before any matter can be taught in schools, regardless of whether it concerns the syllabus, the curriculum or the programme for the day or the week, the principal and the subject masters are responsible. They determine the hours for teaching and what will be taught.

The Government is saying that these professional people are incapable of sorting out the segments that it does not want to be embraced in our education system. The Government preferred to set up, as we have it now, a two-tier type of education. Some children will be taught one thing and given explanations through the use of SEMP material and other children will be taught differently. The Queensland Council of State School Organisations is another body that should have been approached.

**Mr. Bird:** There is no guarantee that every non-State school in Queensland will use SEMP material.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** There is no guarantee at all.

**Mr. Bird:** There is even a difference among the non-State schools. Some might use it and some might not.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is right. But the Government has not given anyone a chance. The Government just went bang. Possibly the Government had public opinion on its side when it came to MACOS, and it thought it could do the same thing with SEMP. The Government thought it was creating a halo around its head which would make it appear to be a saint. But it realised quickly that that was not to be so. Many educationists who have some influence in this city and

State came down on the Government, and the Government realised that it did not have the information to back up its case.

Firstly, the Premier said that there would be an inquiry by seven people—four members of Parliament and three educationists. I accept the explanation of the honourable member for Landsborough on why that form of inquiry was not proceeded with, but it indicates the Government's shoot-from-the-hip attitude. Instead of asking how this matter could be looked at, whether education needed looking at, what was the best way of dealing with it, and talking to people such as members of the Queensland Teachers' Union and the State Schools Association, the Government jumped straight in, shot from the hip and said there would be an inquiry by a seven-man team. The only constant feature has been the appointment of the honourable member for Landsborough as the chairman. As I said earlier, there has been no fight about the personnel on either body.

Then we reached the stage where the inquiry would be conducted by five parliamentarians. The previous select committee, which investigated the punishment for crimes of violence, comprised five Government and four Opposition members—three Labor members and one Independent. That inquiry went about its duties in a correct manner.

On this occasion the matter to be investigated is education. The decision to set up the inquiry was made by Cabinet, which comprises National Party and Liberal Party members. Very generously, Cabinet decided that there should be four Government members and one Opposition member. And that was only an afterthought. I venture to say that no Labor member would have been one of the four parliamentary members of the original seven-man inquiry. A Labor member was included on this committee because the Government wanted it to gain some kind of public acceptance as an all-party select committee. If that was desired, why is it to be composed of four Government members and only one Opposition member? Surely the Labor Party is entitled to two members. If it is to be a non-political inquiry, why appoint only one representative of the Labor Party? He will be the odd man out.

**Mr. Katter:** You've got your percentages wrong.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Not at all. That is the trouble with this great numbers game. Let us compare the number of people who vote for the Labor Party with the number who vote for the Government parties. We are talking about human beings, not cattle or trees. We are talking about things that honourable members opposite do not want to talk about. I am talking about important things.

This inquiry would have been established on a better foundation and would have had a greater chance of success if its composition bore a closer relationship to the numbers who support the various political parties. In other words, there should have been closer representation of the Government and Opposition. As it is now, it is all Government representation. The fact is that there are four Government members to one Opposition member. We believe that there has to be an inquiry, but the constitution of the committee places a tremendous responsibility on the shoulders of the honourable member for Wynnum.

There has been controversy about whether certain material should be taught to children. I do not think that the standards and views that applied when we were children can be applied to the children of today. When I think about my generation and my schooldays and compare them with today's generation and their schooling, I find a completely different situation. Attitudes to nature and the environment are completely different today.

Some people have objected to a film showing Eskimos killing seals and eating some parts of them. That would perhaps upset me because it depicted the killing of an animal. But on reflection we must realise that animals are killed by the thousand every day. In my day children who passed the local butcher shop on their way to school, particularly if it was outside the inner metropolitan area, would see cattle, calves, sheep and pigs being killed. They would see this and accept it as part and parcel of everyday life. It is a matter of how things are presented and taught. Someone said, "They handle intestines." What about the way sausages were made in the old days? Even today they are still used in this way.

The Premier objected because, he said, this material showed the mating habits of seagulls. I have never been sufficiently observant to notice such things, but I point out that years ago almost every backyard had a fowl run in which nature took its course. One of the problems today is that we tend to look upon certain things as being dirty. Many things can be learned from nature and it is the attitude to it that an education system has to take into account.

How far we go in such things is a different matter altogether. It is important that children in passing through our education system should be prepared, for example, for employment. It is also important that they should be prepared for tertiary education. But it is also important that they understand life and everything around them. Young people are no longer under the firm hand that controlled the young people of my generation.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member does not practise that in his home any more than I do. But some of us can remember when the father was the master of the home. His was the iron fist. Whatever he said went. Let there be no doubt about it; he was the head of the household. Does the honourable member advocate the return of those days? Of course not!

Mr. Frawley: There should be more of it.

Mr. HOUSTON: Never mind that. Actually, if we are looking for what is wrong with that attitude, we have only to look at the honourable member for Murrumba. He is a product of that age. That was what was wrong with it and why we wanted it to change.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to me as the member for Murrumba. I am the member for Caboolture.

Mr. HOUSTON: All right, Mr. Speaker, I accept that. I am sorry for the honourable member for Murrumba; he would not adopt the same attitude.

The way things are today we have to look closely at the education of our children. We have television, radio and the other news media. One has only to look at the news on television on any day of the week to hear words being used that were banned in homes only 10 or 20 years ago because they were considered to be swear words. Attitudes today are different. We also have to consider the presentation of the news. We talk about violence and crime and yet every so often an accident is reported on the news and media that really turns one's stomach. It is shocking, but that is news and no-one is going to deny that that is what the great majority of people accept it as. If the report of a particularly bad accident shocks some people into driving better, that is certainly all to the good. We see all kinds of documentaries being shown on television. I do not know how parents handle their children's viewing habits today, I am past the stage of having young children. One has only to pick up the newspaper to see words such as "sex", "lesbianism" and "homosexuality" being used daily. What happens when a child asks his parents what those words mean? Right throughout their school years children are told to read the newspapers. I say to the Government that if educationists decide that some parts of SEMP are not in the interests of our children, that is all right, but do not ban the whole lot of it just because somebody disagrees with one particular idea.

Mr. Camm: Why should it be in there?

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not know why it was in there. Let us talk about why it should be there. Let us have a look at what SEMP consisted of. It consisted of eight different

topics which were selected by important, influential and competent members of the Australian community including people from the New South Wales Department of Education, the Headmasters' Conference in New South Wales, the Victorian Education Department—it operates under a Liberal Government and has done for donkey's years—the Queensland Department of Education, the South Australian Department of Education, the Western Australian Department of Education and the Tasmanian Education Department. Surely the Minister is not going to say that those Education Departments are not competent bodies? Each of these departments prepared one of the topics, but the Minister not only condemned everything that was put forward by these other Government departments, but also banned the topic that was prepared in Queensland. Queensland prepared the topic titled "The Consumer in Society" and the Minister has banned even that—something that was created within our own education system. The Government has now set up a so-called inquiry, but I say that it has been created only in response to problems that the Government itself has partly created.

In my question today, I asked the Minister who made submissions to Cabinet or to him in relation to the decision that Cabinet made. He told me that no organisations and no individuals had made submissions. But we find, Mr. Speaker, that organisations and individuals are claiming credit and suggesting that they, by some means or other, persuaded the Government to take action to ban it. Who is right? Are those organisations right, or is the Minister right in his answer to me in this Chamber? I asked him simply, "What organisations approached him requesting that the course"—I was referring, of course, to SEMP—"be banned from State schools?" His answer was, "No organisation approached me requesting that the SEMP material be banned from State schools." I also asked, "How many individual requests did he receive for the banning and when, and how many of these were from (a) teachers and (b) parents?" His answer was, "None."—none at all. Where did the demand come from? We hear about demand, and the Government usually makes decisions when there is some movement somewhere. I am very interested to know where the demand came from in this instance.

Apart from the fact that I believe that there should be an additional member of the inquiry to give a better balance between the Government and the Opposition, I believe also that the time is opportune for the inquiry to consider the idea of having an Education Commission. In my opinion, an Education Commission might solve many of the problems relating to what should or should not be taught in Queensland schools, and such a commission, as I envisage it, would have much broader representation than simply a few individuals in the Education Department who apparently wield such tremendous power.

I accept paragraph 4 (a) of the motion—that is normal procedure—but why does paragraph 4 (b) say—

"certified by the responsible Minister, with the approval of the Ministers of the Crown in Cabinet assembled, to be information such that its disclosure would be against the public interest;"?

As we are discussing the education of the children of this State, what, I ask, could possibly be against the public interest in having it known and discussed at the inquiry—nowhere else; not publicly, but at the inquiry? I believe that that clause could make the whole inquiry virtually worthless.

**Mr. Ahern:** Rubbish!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It could. What part of the evidence that any public servant could give to the committee would not be in the public interest?

(Time expired.)

**Mr. GUNN (Somerset) (8.54 p.m.):** I express my support for the setting up of this Select Committee on Education. In my electorate in particular, people have been expressing their concern over a long period. I have three high schools, six secondary departments and 60 primary schools in my electorate, and I manage to visit all of them.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** That doesn't make you an expert.

**Mr. GUNN:** Well, I certainly have a great variety of schools there, from little one-teacher schools and two-teacher schools up to secondary departments and high schools. I have to admit that I can find very little wrong with any of the schools in the electorate of Somerset. However, parents in some areas are expressing concern and I read in "The National Times" recently that Professor Karmel, one of the greatest educationists in Australia said—

"There is no doubt that the education system is losing community support. Although we are pouring millions of dollars into education, we are still turning out children that are illiterate and innumerate."

This is one of the areas that we should be looking at.

I can well remember that when my children were attending State school, parents were invited to the school once or twice a year to have a look at the class and see how things were progressing and to look particularly at their own children. That is probably still occurring in most schools. I still have one daughter in primary school and I attend her school every year. I did notice in one particular class that a couple of the children were writing backwards. The teacher said to me, "What do I do about them? I am putting all my time into those children and neglecting the children who are much brighter." There is a great need for more

specialist teachers. A lot of problems can be corrected quickly by the right type of teachers. I think the Minister for Education and departmental officers will agree that we are not turning out enough remedial teachers. Teachers unskilled in this field are trying to cope with a class of some 35 or 36 children among whom are some students who are not able to properly comprehend.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** What actually is your opinion of SEMP?

**Mr. GUNN:** I will be saying something about that in a few minutes.

In this State we are spending one-third of our total revenue on education. That alone must make all members aware of the great importance of education. As I have travelled around the various schools I have found that discipline has been wanting. I take my mind back to when I went to school. I could find nothing wrong with the principal of the school having a pretty long cane which he used on occasions when a student was sent to his office. The honourable member for Archerfield would probably remember that very well because I have reason to believe that he was sent there on many occasions. If he wasn't he should have been. I think that sort of discipline did a lot of good. There should be more of it in schools today.

**Mr. R. J. Gibbs:** Why don't you bring in capital punishment?

**Mr. GUNN:** What rot!

I cannot see anything wrong with proper discipline and I think it should be brought back into the schools. Discipline is of primary importance. Discipline in the home is another matter.

As a parent of five children I can find nothing wrong with the present education system. Four of my children have gone right through the State education system. They have all ended up in good positions. The eldest went from a small country school to the University of Queensland to obtain a medical degree. I have a girl who took a Bachelor of Science degree at the university last year, and she is doing her honours course at Griffith University this year. When they were in 11th grade they were better educated than I was at that stage. They could read and write well and certainly they could spell.

I hope that the proposed committee will look not only at the school system itself but also at the part that parents should be playing. It might also look into what television is doing about education. Some television programmes would have a lot of merit for schoolchildren, but I venture to say that in most instances children are watching John Wayne knocking over Indians instead of looking at some of the current affairs programmes that have a deal of educational merit.

Another area that could be looked at is the size of schools. They can get far too big. Once a school's enrolment gets up around the 1,000 mark, it is time to call a halt. I realise that the Minister has a major problem with funds and costs. The construction of a high school or a secondary department calls for the expenditure of between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000. Would I be right?

**Mr. Bird:** Yes, \$1,000,000.

**Mr. GUNN:** Clearly the Minister's budget would not be able to provide for many high schools at that figure. I am sure he will agree with me that schools can become too large and too cumbersome. We must have a good look at this aspect in the future.

Another matter that should be examined is the availability of courses in secondary schools. Many children who are forced by their parents to go on to Grades 11 and 12 are a dead loss to the school. A lot of children do not have the ability to undertake their courses in those grades. I would suggest that in country areas more agricultural courses and manual arts courses be made available to cater for some of these children.

I have followed the progress of children in families I know and some of them simply did not have the ability and in Grades 11 and 12 only wasted the time of their teachers; but their parents insisted that they go through Grades 11 and 12 because they believed that their children would not be able to get good jobs unless they completed those grades. What is the sense in a child remaining in those grades if he cannot cope with them? No doubt the Minister's department is well aware of this problem, and I am sure that he is looking at it. Once again no doubt the lack of finance hamstring him.

**Mr. Bird:** It is something that we are looking at very closely.

**Mr. GUNN:** That is excellent.

I hope the committee examines the problems associated with small one-teacher schools. In some areas it would probably be better to close the smaller schools, but politically such a decision is not a good one. Parents would be up in arms if a Government attempted to do that. However, these days bus services are provided to transport children to the bigger country towns where they could receive a better education. I am not suggesting for one moment that teachers in charge of the small country schools lack ability. In fact I believe that some of our best educationists today had their start in one-teacher schools.

**Mr. Powell:** Some of the best education occurs there.

**Mr. GUNN:** That could be so. However, trying to cope in a small country school with only one or two children in each grade

up to Grade 7 imposes a tremendous burden on the teacher. I am sure that children in such a school would suffer a disadvantage. Whilst, as the honourable member for Isis has said, some of our best pupils are turned out in such schools, it depends on the teacher.

No-one can expect all teachers in Queensland to be experts or top-grade teachers. I must say, however, that in my experience I have found very few lemons among the teachers I know. There is the occasional teacher who was not cut out for the profession. Furthermore there may be a highly educated person who simply does not have the ability to communicate knowledge to others. I can well remember a teacher who taught me history at high school. He was an excellent scholar and passed through university, yet he did not have the ability to communicate with schoolchildren. That is a tragedy.

Another aspect that should be looked at is the school bus system, under which some pupils travel up to 70 miles a day to attend school. Provided funds are available, more secondary departments should be created in country areas. Some children who live in the Esk region travel right down to Brassall in Ipswich to attend school. They start off at about 6 or 6.30 in the morning, and if they live on outside farms they could set off even earlier, at 5 o'clock in the morning, and not get back till 5 o'clock in the afternoon. My own children left home at half past 7 in the morning and arrived home at half past 4 in the afternoon. They were not nearly as badly off.

Education, of course, must be the province of this Parliament in general and of the Government in particular. It has the responsibility of seeing that our children get the best for the vast amount of money that is put into education.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition talked about MACOS and SEMP. I have not read all of the SEMP material, but I did see some of its bad parts. In my opinion the Minister did the right thing. I would hope that he removes the warts, shuffles the pack again and introduces those parts that have some merit in them. The honourable member for Bulimba mentioned also, when referring to MACOS, the killing of seals. I do not think that is of any consequence. I would not think that MACOS was banned on that score at all. As to intestines—the kids out in the country see their mothers plucking a duck or killing a fowl probably every week-end and do not take any notice. He need not worry about that part of it. However, there were other parts of the course—and I do not intend to go into them here—that should never have been brought forward. Probably some good material was lost as a result.

If there are a few bad potatoes in a bag, the whole lot are emptied out; they are cleaned up and then rebagged. I will repeat

what I told some teachers one night. When I mentioned this to them, they said to me, "Don't you trust the teachers of Queensland with this material?" I made this point: "There are some teachers I would trust with anything, but there are other teachers in the Queensland education system that I would not trust." That is all there is to it. I hope that those parts of MACOS and SEMP that are of some advantage and some merit will be made available for use in our schools.

I have the utmost faith in the select committee. I believe that its members will carry out their duties with the dignity they exhibit in performing their ordinary duties in this Parliament. I hope they will look into every aspect and every avenue in order that ours can be made into a better system. I am certain that they will.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** I think you know more about pulling a cow out of a bog.

**Mr. GUNN:** I know a lot about that, too. It is a pity the honourable member for Archerfield would not take a greater interest. I do not know whether his children are in school or have grown up, but I hope that he has taken an interest in their education. In my opinion, therein lies the crux of the matter. With so many parents working today, when the children come home from school they get no encouragement from their parents. I am not here to brag, but I did take an interest in my children and their education. This is where we go wrong today. A lot of parents are not taking the interest in their children that they should. In many cases the teachers are not to blame; rather it is the parents, and I believe that that will be proved by this select committee.

I give the committee my utmost support and I wish it well. I myself will be putting material before them and I hope that as many as possible from the Parliament will be making submissions. I hope the parents will do likewise.

**Mr. SHAW (Wynnum) (9.9 p.m.):** It is unfortunate that the formation of this select committee took place with the background that it had. The honourable member for Landsborough went to great lengths to assure the House that the inquiry would not be a whitewash—a snow job aimed at covering up events which have occurred on the education scene in recent times. I fully support the remarks that he has made, and I hope that he will go to even greater lengths to convince people in the community in Queensland that such is not the case. I believe that much more will have to be done before the people of Queensland believe that this inquiry will be all that it should be.

I intend to approach it believing that it will be a genuine inquiry into education in Queensland. Judging by the make-up of the

committee, I believe that would also be the belief of the other members of it. Unfortunately, there is a feeling at large that that is not the case. Again unfortunately, not much has been done to overcome that feeling. Some of the statements made here tonight could lead certain people to the conclusion that the Government is looking for certain results from this inquiry.

The honourable member for Landsborough said that Queensland teachers had asserted that there was nothing wrong with the present system. I am not here to speak on behalf of those teachers. However in my discussions with teachers I have not found that to be their attitude. Many teachers have been quite anxious to suggest the improvements that they feel could be made in our education system. It is not true that our teachers are saying that the system is perfect, that they are right and everybody else is wrong. Also, it is not fair to sheet home solely to our teachers the blame for any ills that we might find in the system. Like you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very wary of expressing opinions on what is right and what is wrong in the present system. It is the job of the committee to decide if anything is wrong and, if so, what is wrong.

I intended to quote some material but, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has already done so, I shall not engage in tedious repetition by reading all of it again. "The Sunday Mail" reported the Premier as saying that Queensland children were the unwitting guinea pigs of failed education experiments and that many colleges of advanced education and university educationists were living in ivory towers that should have been pulled down 20 years ago and that the emphasis today must be on technical training because there are already enough white-collar workers looking for jobs. Those statements may or may not be correct. It is a shame that they were made immediately prior to this inquiry being set up to judge whether they are correct or not. The same argument holds true of the banning of MACOS and SEMP. Without going into the arguments on whether that decision was correct or incorrect—it is unfortunate that the decisions were made just prior to this committee commencing its investigations.

As a result of some of these statements, many people are fearful of repercussions should they come forward and make submissions to the committee. The honourable member for Landsborough has assured them that they have no reason for fear, but it is not unreasonable—in fact, it is quite understood—that those fears exist, considering that apparently John Sinclair had action taken against him for things done outside his departmental activities and, as previous speakers have mentioned, a person who stood for election to this Parliament and was defeated was not reinstated as a teacher. These things led people in the Education

Department to believe that it is just possible that some sort of action would be taken against them should they come forward and make submissions that are not in line with what is wanted. If the committee is to have any chance of success at all, it is imperative that these people be convinced that that will not happen and that they are free to make submissions without fear of recrimination should they not be in accord with what some people desire.

The make-up of the inquiry is in some ways unfortunate, for several reasons. I think those who have been appointed to both the committee and the advisory panel are held in high regard and I am sure that they will carry out their duties to their full capacity and without bias. But unfortunately some have already been seen to take a somewhat biased stand. This is unfortunate because it leads people to believe that the attitude that they have made known prior to appointment will be carried into the deliberations of the inquiry.

I said previously that I thought some of the criticism of teachers was unjust. If children do not learn to read and write correctly and if they fail to reach the necessary T.E. score to go on to university, their parents have a tendency to blame the education system. They often go further than that and blame the teachers. Whilst I would be the first to admit that there are good and bad teachers, I think it is unfair to sheet home to teachers the blame for all ills that we see in the education system.

I will go further and say that I believe there is no more important role in the education system than that played by teachers and it concerns me that the morale of teachers in this State at present has certainly been damaged by attacks launched by many irresponsible people on their personal integrity and professional attitude. I think it is fair to say that no matter what the inquiry finds and no matter what changes are introduced to the education system of Queensland in the future, the system will rise or fall on the work of the teachers. They are the very foundation of the education system.

If teachers want to do the wrong thing, they will do it. We have heard some statements to the effect that teachers are promoting homosexuality and—I forget the term—other ills of life.

**An Honourable Member:** Alternative lifestyles.

**Mr. SHAW:** I think it was a little stronger than that. I think it is unfair to say such things. If there are teachers who would do that, they would try to do it irrespective of whether material such as SEMP and MACOS was provided.

This leads us, of course, to the big question of what replaces these courses when they are banned holus-bolus. One of the great

things about SEMP was that it was Australian produced. It concerns me to see children passing through the education system in Queensland today knowing more about America and being able to tell about the Alamo but knowing nothing about Australian traditions and history. I think the more we can do to promote the knowledge of our own country and background, the better it will be. The more we promote educational material and courses devised by Australians for Australian schools, the better off we will be.

If I may point to one fault that teachers, particularly university lecturers and others associated with education, have, it is their habit, as found in all other professions, of developing their own particular language. In fact, sometimes the parents and the people standing on the sidelines do not quite understand what they are saying. I know that in particular the legal profession make their living out of talking a different language that not even they can understand. But teachers have a vested interest in ensuring that the community at large understands what it is they are trying to do for our children, and I believe that for the greater part they are trying to do what is best for them.

To my mind the terms of reference of this inquiry are very broad. In fact, it worries me a little bit that they might be too broad—if we can have a criticism that something like this can be too broad—in that for the first few months of its activities the inquiry will probably spend all its time trying to ascertain in just what directions it is going to move.

I have had a look at them and very quickly jotted down some of the things which I think would be appropriate for us to have a look at, some things that certainly would be exercising the minds of the community at large. I refer to questions such as: are standards of literacy and numeracy declining, and if so, why? I think this question has been asked so often that it has to be answered by this inquiry. Is the Radford scheme a success or a failure? That is a question which on its own could probably take up the time of the inquiry for the next two years. There is also the question of apprenticeships and the future of education for our apprentices. Is the education system adequate preparation for later life? Reference has also been made by previous speakers to the needs of industry and commerce and whether education adequately prepares children for them. More particularly, if it is not adequate, why is it not adequate and what can we do to correct it?

I have already mentioned the supply of adequate Australian-oriented materials, education for ethnic groups, education for

Aborigines and the procedures which ideally should be followed before new courses and new materials are introduced into Queensland schools. Questions on sex, political and religious education could each take up 12 months of the inquiry's time. There are others such as teacher education and technical education. I think the honourable member for Wolston spoke of the need for special education. It concerns me that a full and complete inquiry into each one of these subjects would need not just a committee of inquiry but a standing committee of this Parliament for the next 12 years, and probably longer.

I wonder how we can establish the priorities for dealing with some of these matters. They are all terribly important and I do not think the specific terms of reference go a long way towards helping us. They seem to have arisen largely out of the current debate about SEMP and MACOS, Mrs. Joyner, and CARE and STOP. These things are certainly exercising the mind of the community at the present time, but I must agree with the honourable member for Bulimba when he referred to the broad issues raised by CARE and STOP in a document that I have here at the moment such as bloodshed, physical violence, bashings, beatings and rape. It sounds like the latest issue of the "Telegraph" or perhaps a programme tonight on television. I wonder how far we can go in banning these things from the education system when our children are confronted by them day and night. This raises a most important question when we talk about what our education system should be. Should we ensure that these matters are discussed in the schools in a proper manner, or should we allow our children to find out about them through the back door in a manner over which we have no control?

Sometimes I think we tend to leap to conclusions and believe the worst of what is being suggested. I have here a copy of an article written by a reporter for "The Bulletin". He was dealing with a teaching aid that was being used in the Victorian Department, and it was one of the games—I think one might call them that—in which children in the class play the role of a person confronted with a problem. The one in question had to do with the organising of strikes. I use this example because it is an issue that is very close to the hearts of many honourable members opposite, and I believe that some of the suggestions being put forward by them for legislation to control strikes show that they have a misconception about what happens in strikes.

In the game being used in Victoria, children adopt all the roles in the organising and seeing through of the issues of a strike. Some adopt the role of strikers; others have

the role of management, and other have the role of arbitrators. The comment that the reporter made was—

“Most thinking Australians know that the Education Departments of the States are falling steadily into left-wing hands. The majority of those teaching the young of Australia are socialists at best, rabid Communists at worst.

“This instruction kit on organising a strike may bring home to a few people just what is going on in the business of moulding young minds.”

The point is that that gentleman immediately leapt to the conclusion that what these people are setting out to do is teach children to strike and teach them that that is the answer to all problems. I ask: did it ever occur to him, or to anybody else, that in doing that they are perhaps teaching children that to strike immediately is not necessarily the answer to all problems, that their side is not the only one to be viewed, and that there are other aspects to be looked at? As I said earlier I believe that we sometimes leap to conclusions and believe that the worst is going on in our schools when we ought, perhaps, to look a bit deeper and see whether or not education means putting more than one point of view.

Many people believe that they have the answer to all the ills of education at present. The most common view put forward is that we should return to the three Rs, and I must confess that, in my view, that is a very popular statement. It is also, to me, a very frightening statement, because I believe it means absolutely nothing. It means all things to all people. Most people agree with it because they put their own interpretation on what it means. I think it is fair to say that a return to the system of education which existed in this State 20 or 30 years ago would be totally inadequate for today and for the future, and it is a very poor argument to suggest that we should return to that type of education or to the methods used in those days.

It probably is natural, as someone suggested, for old teachers to find fault with the present system. I think we all tend to believe that the way we learnt must be the best way, that the education we received must be the best. When our children come home from school and say that they have learnt something with which we never even dealt in our days at school, we tend to think, because we do not understand it,

that it is wrong. Having in mind today's technology and today's requirements, I believe that a modern education system is needed.

Today opportunities for the self-taught man are very few and far between. Twenty or 30 years ago when youngsters left school prior to the Scholarship examination they possibly learnt a trade and then received further education at night school and in the university of hard knocks. The opportunity for persons in that category today are very few and far between. We need to move into the future, and we need an education system geared for the future.

I wonder how many people who today condemn the role of social science courses in schools said in days gone by, “If only people didn't leave school not knowing what sort of contracts they can be caught up in, not knowing the sort of things that fast-talking salesmen can talk them into and not knowing what is going on in the world.” I can remember people saying that the schools should be educating people to know what life is all about. Many do not go on to tertiary education but they need some sort of further education. We can be a little hasty in condemning social science courses by saying that they are wasteful of time which could be used in teaching the three Rs, which is generally taken to mean English and Arithmetic. Certainly we need to ensure that an adequate standard of English and Arithmetic is taught to all children in accordance with their expectations from the education system.

That raises the question referred to but not enlarged on by a previous speaker—the expectations of commerce and industry. I have found that in many instances those expectations are not realistic. Persons who have written to me, and I am sure to proposed members of the inquiry and other members of Parliament, point out the inadequacies of people coming to them for employment. In fact they themselves lack an understanding of the Radford scheme, an understanding of the gradings of children who have left school and an understanding of the courses they have done which would lead them to being useful employees in the particular role in which they would want them to serve. For instance, an employer seeking a shorthand typist would ask for passes of a certain grading in shorthand and typing, but then he might ask for a certain number of points in various other subjects. A lass might

be the best shorthand typist in the State, but she might be rejected by a firm because she received terrible marks in Ancient History or some other subject that she would not need at that level of employment. The Public Service and local authorities are guilty of this in many respects in not moving with the times. Perhaps there has been a breakdown in communication between officers of the Education Department and prospective employers to ensure that when the employers require a certain standard of education they know what to look for and how to understand the innovations introduced in the education system.

I agree with you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that it would be a shame if we were to adopt the suggestions made somewhat hastily by some people and say that we should go back to the old system of external examinations and completely eliminate the rating system as it presently exists. If there are problems in the system let us look for them in this inquiry. Let us sort them out, and hopefully we will find that we can improve the system without adopting the attitude of "Let's get back to the good old days." That is a very dangerous attitude. It is popular to believe that the so-called good old days were in fact just that, but in reality the good old days were at the time the bad days.

It is important that we come up with an education system that is acceptable to the Parliament as a whole, not just the Government parties. It is important that we evolve a system that will lay down guide-lines for the Education Department so that it might draw up a curriculum designed by people who understand what they are trying to achieve and also what they are doing. I doubt whether politicians making quick judgments on what might be termed the nuts and bolts of the education system provide the answer.

We must have an education system implemented by responsible people who are given guide-lines as to the principles that the Government and through it the people of the State expect. It would be wrong for us to improvise and to create the impression that all the people within the education system are wrong. It is fair to say, as I commented earlier, that all people involved in the education system in Queensland, from the teachers in primary schools to the lecturers at tertiary institutions, have the same aims and objectives as we in this House have, that is, to ensure that the education

system in Queensland is the best that can be provided for our children and is adequate to meet future needs.

I look to this committee to come up with a balanced finding. I hope that the committee will not be expected merely to come up with a result that is acceptable to Cabinet, to the Government parties or, for that matter, to anybody else. I am sure the other members of the committee will agree with me that that is not their role. Their role should be—and I think will be—to tell the story as it is, to find out what is wrong and hopefully to come up with some suggestions as to what could be done to correct any mistakes that are found. If recommendations made by the committee are not acceptable to the Government, that is a matter for debate in this House. It is not the role of the committee merely to make acceptable recommendations.

I look forward to playing an active part on the committee. I do not intend to adopt the role simply of spokesman for the Opposition or spokesman for the Labor Party. I am sure I will receive your support, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that of other Government members on the committee in putting forward my views. I hope the committee will fulfil the expectations of the people who hope to receive the best from it.

I urge anyone who has fears about coming forward to do so and make his submissions. I say to anyone who feels that he cannot make submissions without fear of reprisals that he is at liberty to make his submissions through me and I will forward them on to the committee. I assure everyone that there is no possibility of reprisals being taken. But I do not think it is necessary for me to give that guarantee; the chairman of the committee, Mr. Ahern, has already given it. If anyone in the community feels, however, that he would be able more confidently to make his or her submission through me, I would welcome the opportunity to assist.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I thank the members of the House for the courtesy extended to me on the occasion of my maiden speech. I did not make use of written notes—which is probably just as well, because most of the previous speakers stole my material anyway. I did not make use of a written speech because I was under the impression that written speeches were not allowed in the House. However, I find that many speakers certainly rely very heavily on copious notes. Perhaps I will learn from them in the future.

**Mr. KATTER** (Flinders) (9.41 p.m.): First, I wish to say that I was very pleased with many of the things said by the previous speaker, and I think other members on both sides of the House will agree with the very sensible viewpoints that he put forward. I was, however, a little distressed at some of the very firm points that he advocated. I most certainly hope that he and other members of the committee do not enter the inquiry with a closed mind or fixed ideas. I hope that they keep an open mind and stay receptive to the ideas that will be put to them. I certainly hope that the points made by the previous speaker are not to be construed as being a hard-line view that will not change during the committee proceedings.

**Mr. Jones:** There were some hard-line views on the other side of the House.

**Mr. KATTER:** I do not think that the honourable member for Landsborough put forward any hard-line views.

**Mr. Jones:** I didn't nominate anyone. I said that there were some hard-line views on the other side of the House. You only listen with one ear.

**Mr. KATTER:** Was the honourable member referring to somebody else? I accept that.

I would like to comment on one thing mentioned by the previous speaker. He said that we should not shy away from teaching social science in the schools and that we should look at that concept. I got the distinct impression from what he was saying that we could somehow teach in schools the solutions to the problems faced in the outside world. When I was at the University of Queensland, the social science course was taught in the main to the daughters of the very wealthy people of Brisbane. With their social science degree, they then proceeded out into the world to solve all the problems of the poor and the uneducated. If I were asked to select the people least able to help people in the outside world, I would pick those graduates in social science from the university. Whilst I do not wish to delve into personalities, I can say with a great deal of conviction that the way their own lives have worked out is no advertisement for the training they received at the university.

The point I wish to make—and make fairly forcefully to the House—is that the major part of the social science course at the university in those days consisted of the teaching of the Freudian approach to psychology. Students were taught at that stage that the Freudian approach to psychology was the basis for all sorts of action; that if the Freudian analysis was used, they would come up with all the right solutions. It was very amusing to me to find out five years later from people doing that course at the same university that they were being told that

Freud was right out, that all his teachings were entirely wrong and that they should never use the Freudian analysis. I think of all those people who received their training five years previously and the fortune that the State and Federal Governments spent on giving them their education, and the fact that they are now out there somewhere in society trying to help people, yet the tool they have to use—the Freudian analysis—is completely and utterly wrong. I bring that point to the attention of the House. It is my own personal conviction that the matters to be delved into in social sciences are not the things that one can learn in a class-room. They can only be learned by going out into the world, getting one's hands dirty and experiencing life by living it.

Reverting to the subject under discussion at the moment, I contend that it is very unfortunate when public servants within a Government department commence on a course of action that diverges from the view of the community as a whole. I regret to say that a very strong case can be put forward in the field of education for saying that members of the community are walking along one path while some of the administrators in the education system are walking along another path, one which diverges very strongly from that of the rest of the community. I regret to say that this is occurring in the field of education.

Some of it might be only a P.R. problem. I am told—and many statistics have been produced to indicate it—that children can, in actual fact, read. All I know is that the people in my area do not believe it and will not believe it. We have a very unfortunate public relations situation or, if not, a very unfortunate situation in the particular schools. I said that there is a divergence in the views of public servants in this case and the views of the remainder of the people in the State.

Many of the troubles and the upheavals of the past three or four weeks have stemmed from a meeting held in the late Legislative Council Chamber of Government members—there may have been some Opposition members—and members of the Board of Secondary School Studies. I did not want to go to that meeting but a person in the House insisted that I go so that I could gain some sort of idea of the situation that existed in the Education Department.

The chairman commenced the meeting by saying that if we had spent 50 years in the education system, as he had, and if we had read the 500 pages of the Radford Report we might then have the right to pass an opinion, but that, if we had not done so, we had absolutely no right to tell the meeting how the specialists in their particular field should do their jobs.

He had absolutely no understanding of democracy and how things work in a democratic system. In such a system, the only

control that the people have over public servants is through us in this House. Once that link is broken—once the public servants can go their own way without any control by us in this House—we no longer have a democratic system; we have another type of system, such as a bureaucracy. I was struck by and deeply disappointed at the arrogance of those people.

Some 15 years ago I belonged to a church group which was trying to give some sort of feedback to the church schools on the sort of product that they were producing. We invited the heads of all schools in Brisbane to a meeting. Every principal invited turned up. They did not come along and dictate to us. They sat there for the entire evening taking notes and questioning us. I was left with the distinct impression that they were very keen to find out how things were working out at the other end. In the case I just referred to, we went into a meeting and it was felt we had no right to express an opinion.

One of the great drawbacks or failures of the education system is that 70 per cent of the people who go through it fail. They may not have failed as such at Senior level or whatever it is called now, but they failed in the sense of not obtaining a sufficiently good mark to go on to tertiary education. They are left with some sort of idea that they are failures—or at least not as intelligent as the person next door.

I shall go off at a tangent for a moment. When I was at university one fellow scored 80 in an I.Q. test. Those in charge said, "That can't be right. This fellow won an essay prize in a Queensland competition and came second in Queensland in two subjects at the Junior level. There must be a mistake." He was sent back to do the I.Q. test again. The result was a score of 82. For those who are not familiar with I.Q. ratings, that is a very low score and a person achieving that level might be considered for remedial teaching today.

**Mr. R. J. Gibbs:** Did you get that score?

**Mr. KATTER:** The honourable member keeps chiming in with very foolish statements. He lowers the tone of the proceedings and makes a fool of himself. I hope, for his own benefit, that people in his electorate do not read this. He has come into this place and passed a number of comments that he thinks are funny. He is the only one in the House who has laughed at them. Very soon he will wake up to that and he might not then make such a fool of himself.

As I said, this man's I.Q. score was 82. The year before last he obtained his doctorate in laws from one of the universities in Queensland and has just published a book

for the legal profession. Maybe the examination system, the system we have in our schools and the system of pass and fail are not the ultimate criteria.

I move on and, in passing, mention another matter. I cast my mind back to the days when I was younger and we were reading the book "1984", which was particularly popular at that time. One of the horrendous spectres that used to come up in those days was the feeding into a computer of answers to questions given by young people and the receipt from the computer of a sheet which said of each person, "You will be a doctor", "You will be a street planner" or, "You will be a dog catcher" or whatever.

I regret to say that that system is virtually upon us at the moment. A person now undertakes an aptitude test to gain entrance to a university and that test decides which fields are available to him. A person with tenacity and the ability to work hard might have a great desire to become a doctor. And how badly we need in that profession hard-working, dedicated and selfless people. But people of that type can be eliminated not by reason of a standard applied to them because of their ability or knowledge but by a computer. So those spectres are already upon us. I know that the Education Department can do very little about this as it occurs more at university level. But I feel that the department could influence to a great degree the wayward thinking at tertiary-level institutions at present.

**Mr. Bird:** May I say firstly that there is a quota system applied to enrolment numbers at the university. Not everybody can get into tertiary institutions. Secondly, the Federal Government is looking very closely at who should go into tertiary institutions, and this it has found to be the best system.

**Mr. KATTER:** I thank the Minister for his comments, which I think are quite pertinent under the circumstances.

I now move on to one specific issue that has caused the present controversy. Whilst it may have been the lightning rod that sparked the action, I think the action is excellent. I refer to SEMP. One thing that it does is produce an alternative set of standards. To use the expression used in SEMP itself, it presents people with alternative life styles. Although much more so, that was the general idea in MACOS.

Many alternatives are being put before children today. I speak now as a parent and I say that I do not want those alternatives put before my children. Some people will say that children need to see and to consider these alternatives. All I can say is that a generation of children grew up without having a look at these alternatives and, so far as I can see, they are reasonably happy

and successful people. I therefore do not see any great necessity for these rather ugly alternatives to be presented to the young people of this State.

I certainly do not think that we should give people in schools a licence to go round putting these alternatives before children. Teachers have in effect the option to sell those alternatives to schoolchildren under their care. There is a very special relationship between a schoolteacher and his pupils.

I do not want my remarks to be construed as criticism of teachers in general, although there are some of whom I would most certainly like it to be construed as criticism. However, in my specific area I find a close working relationship with teachers and a close harmony with the approach that they adopt in the schools. There are problems from time to time but I have at all times found the teachers to be most helpful and open-minded in accepting the sort of proposals that I have put before them with the suggestion that perhaps we are going wrong in some areas.

A second aspect of SEMP that I regard as highly questionable is the way in which teachers and pupils can spend most of the school week sitting around discussing the meaning of life. Taxpayers' money is used to have someone at schools stand up before children and teach them to acquire certain skills that they will need in life. If it is said that the meaning of life should be learnt by living life, I see little purpose in the sort of activity that could be undertaken with such material as SEMP.

Let me mention one point made earlier by the honourable member for Greenslopes. He dismissed the charge of social humanism being taught at schools because of the fact that the Catholic schools had backed SEMP. Let me say that the very reason they picked SEMP is that it is an absolutely perfect vehicle for them to get across their particular moral and ethical viewpoint. They have a definite moral and ethical viewpoint to get across to the children. That is why they are in business. That is their objective and the reason for their separate existence, and it is a very expensive existence, as a parent whose children go to a Catholic school would know. So when we say that Catholic schools at the present moment are quite happy with this system, it is because it lends itself very much to their particular approach.

I should be horrified to think that the State Government would have a definite moral and ethical viewpoint to push in the schools; but if it does not have a definite moral and ethical viewpoint, then it is up to the teacher himself to adopt whatever viewpoint he might choose. I received a letter from a parent who once lived in my area, and whose child now attends a school in South-east Queensland. She is most distressed because the

child's teacher lives with a fellow who has been convicted on drug charges on numerous occasions in the past two or three years. This parent feels that this particular young lady is, as a teacher, getting messages across to the children that the mother does not want her child to receive. We could be giving teachers of that particular bent all the opportunity in the world to push their own ethical and moral viewpoint.

In addition to that, in many of our western schools we have extremely young teachers who are only just out of schools, and I would really question whether a person aged 21 who has never been out in the world and who has never had a job is the sort of person to teach such emotionally charged material. I would like to give honourable members some of the headings of topics in SEMP. I am quoting here from a talk that was given by one of the fellows from Canberra. He referred to such things as "Divorce is a desirable thing", "The pathological and destructive effects of family life", "Alternative Life Styles", "Living together before marriage", and "Group marriages now appear to be working." I for one would not like my child to be attending a school whose teachers behaved like the one I have just mentioned, who is living with a fellow who has been convicted on drug charges on numerous occasions.

That is not the sort of thing that I want to be taught to my children by that sort of person, and if we proceed with an across-the-board acceptance of those objectionable parts of SEMP, we are certainly proceeding on that particular course. I do not think anyone on either side of the House really wants that sort of tuition.

In winding up I want to say that we have a 1984-type situation in respect of university entrants. I would like to praise the Radford situation, if I could call it that—the elimination of the objective standards in the primary school—because I think it has been a giant step forward. I think what has been done in the primary education system, whilst it has been very radical—if I could use that expression—has been successful. I think children are able to read at a younger age and are being given a wider concept of education that incorporates such things as art. I think children today are much happier than were children when we were going to school. I think there have been magnificent forward steps in the primary sector of education and I for one am very pleased with what we have accomplished in the Queensland education system.

I think that when we start bordering on areas of a moral and philosophical nature we are getting into a semi-religious or quasi-religious area. One of the great opponents of the abolition of SEMP—one of the great pro-SEMP people in North Queensland—keeps saying that SEMP is a

great breakthrough in that we can now have social engineering in the schools. It is not my phrase: it is his phrase. I think that would be a very regrettable situation.

Finally, I recommend very strongly to the committee that it look at the concept of teaching survival courses—adventure-type training. There have been very few times in the history of man when there has not been some sort of initiation ceremony for young men. I do not mean “initiation ceremony” in the correct sense of that phrase; I mean it in the sense that young people can be put through some sort of course of training, if I might use that expression, in which they will be taught and in which they will grasp such concepts as initiative and self-reliance—things which, unfortunately, are not taken up officially in the schools at present. Many schools are doing it unofficially, and I am very proud of what the Charters Towers High School has accomplished in the field of adventure-type training. However, I think it should be looked at as a whole by the Education Department, and very careful consideration should be given to the introduction of survival courses similar to those now being taught in many American schools.

**Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (10.1 p.m.):** At the outset, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I take the opportunity to commend the newly elected member for Wynnum, Mr. Shaw, for what I believe was a very positive and balanced contribution to the debate. I think all honourable members would agree that, as a member of the select committee, Mr. Shaw had a rather difficult task, and I believe that he performed that task in a very exceptional manner. He certainly maintained the high standard of debate set by two other members of the Opposition today, and I refer specifically to the honourable member for Wolston, Mr. Bob Gibbs, and the newly elected member for Cook, Mr. Bob Scott.

I support the principle behind the motion now before the House—that is, the appointment of a parliamentary select committee to carry out an in-depth inquiry into education. I welcome the appointment of another select committee. Having served on the previous one on crime and punishment and having been a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I am very much aware of the importance to this Assembly—

**Mr. Frawley:** And you made a hash of it.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I do not mind the comments of the honourable member for Caboolture, as we know his standard of intelligence.

**Mr. Frawley interjected.**

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt):** Order!

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The honourable member for Caboolture referred earlier to the 80 I.Q., and I assure him that he is even below that.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Getting back to the motion before the House—the committee system has been very advantageous to the Queensland Parliament. It has certainly allowed members to thoroughly involve themselves and investigate issues that have been brought before them, issues that have been of concern to the people of Queensland. It has given due recognition to the role of Parliament as a watchdog, and surely that is one of its functions. It has allowed an apolitical approach to matters that affect the people of Queensland as a whole, and, again, surely this is our responsibility.

It has been an education for members of Parliament to serve on these committees. I admit that I certainly learnt a lot both from the Subordinate Legislation Committee and from the one dealing with crime and punishment. It has also been an opportunity, and a very important opportunity, for interested groups in the community to present their views to Parliament. I know that the honourable member for Brisbane Central would agree, having served on the committee investigating crime and punishment, that that was an excellent opportunity for many people from all parts of Queensland to come to this Assembly and present their views.

It certainly has guaranteed greater involvement for private members, and there has been real need for a greater role for private members in this Assembly. At the election of the Speaker a few days ago, members of the Opposition, particularly the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Mackay expressed concern at the erosion of the role of Parliament. I believe that one of the answers to this is to set up instruments such as select committees—joint parliamentary committees, committees that can themselves be weapons against the growth of Executive government.

Other members have stressed the point—and I agree with them—that there certainly is a need for an education inquiry. There has been wide community concern about deficiencies in our education system. In many instances it is debatable whether that concern is warranted, but the concern has been there. All sorts of general claims have been made—often totally unsubstantiated, but they have been made. We have heard that we are no longer teaching the three Rs, that not enough attention is being given to the teaching of literacy and numeracy skills in schools. There has been worry amongst parents and employers about spelling and the lack of skills amongst young children—young girls and boys—and new employees in spelling simple words. I contend that that skill has always been lacking. If honourable members were honest and went through some of the correspondence they have received from people not of 20 years, not of 30 years but of 60 and 70 years

they would realise that spelling has never been one of the greatest Australian traits. That deficiency is still there.

The concern exists not only in these areas; there is concern also about the numerative skills and the lack of communicative skills. Many honourable members who have spoken to young Americans often wonder, I am sure, how it is that the Americans can speak so freely, how it is that they can get across their views, and how it is that so often the Australian high school student seems to be tongue-tied. Has there been this lack of ability to converse, to read and to express one's views? This is surely important in our society.

There has also been concern as to the use of school-time and the teaching methods used in this State and other States. I suggest that we always have to balance the attacks on our system and criticisms of it with the fact that there is an ignorance in the community as to what is really going on in schools. Recently I went to a meeting in Mt. Morgan of a group of some 20 or 30 parents, and we spoke about the SEMP issue. I asked them there and then if they could name the teachers who at this present time are teaching their children. It was rather surprising—perhaps not really surprising—to find that fewer than half of them actually could do that. I might ask members of this Parliament whether they can honestly tell me the names of all the teachers who are actually teaching their children. If we had a quick survey I think that most would fail. I want to stress this point because there is a lack of involvement and a lack of interest in the education system. So it is no wonder that there is ignorance.

When there is a measure of concern—and this has certainly been shown by the media coverage—the Parliament has the responsibility to act. It is always seen that the easiest way to act is to set up an inquiry. This inquiry is required as well because in recent months we have seen a total reversal of the policy introduced some years ago of gradually increasing community involvement in the decision-making process in schools.

The honourable member for Flinders talked of Charters Towers. Some time ago, with the permission of the Minister for Education, I was able to get a teacher at the Charters Towers High School to come to Rockhampton to be involved in a seminar on the new concepts that he had of community involvement in schools. I was very pleased with what he put forward. I know that the honourable member for Rockhampton North will back me when I say that the same type of concept has been developed in the Glenmore High School, and also in a number of Brisbane schools, where over a number of years the parents and citizens' groups have been given more say

in the running of schools. There has also been an acknowledgement of the professional rights of teachers, and more so of principals, in selecting the material used in schools. I emphasise resource materials. There has been an increasing role for the school community. This has not been only in the State system but also in the Catholic system. There have been seminars on community involvement. These have covered certain areas such as the use of school-grounds and the involvement of parents and citizens in general administration and in curricula areas. There has been this gradual acceptance that there is a role for the community to play in the decisions that should be made about education as it affects the "school community".

I suggest that there has also been an acceptance that decisions on education should only be made after there has been thorough investigation and trial. Surely this is something with which every member in this Chamber would agree. The procedures have been used thus: trials in schools after careful consideration and study by the Education Department, in particular by the Curriculum Branch. The Curriculum Branch has played a vital role in the selection, design, development, adaptation, trialling and evaluation of all sorts of resource material and equipment used in Queensland schools. It is a body of experts who are skilled in this vital area of education. I point out to all honourable members that this skill has been acknowledged in the annual reports. It is very interesting to see what is contained in the 1976 annual report. I would like to quote from that report because it refers to the specific issue under debate tonight. In the "Planning and Services" section of that annual report presented by the Minister we find—

"The Queensland team of the Social Education Materials Project was involved with the production of teacher developed materials for secondary schools in the area of 'The Consumer in Society'. This formed part of a national project funded by the Curriculum Development Centre. Draft materials were trialled in schools both in Queensland and interstate, and were revised in preparation for commercial production in 1977."

Honourable members would surely agree that the members of the Planning and Services Curriculum Branch are experts in their field. They certainly have the expertise that is necessary to advise the Minister in these important areas as to what sort of resource material should be used in schools. I am sure honourable members would understand the role that has been played by the Curriculum Branch. Why then, it should be asked, have important education decisions on courses and resource materials been made without reference to that branch? Why have vital decisions that affect the very education futures of many children in this State been made without at least some reference to the experts,

who are paid many thousands of dollars to carry out a very important role? I refer to the recent decision of Cabinet to ban SEMP and also to previous decisions. These decisions have been an intrusion into the field of education.

**Mr. Katter:** The Government does not intrude into the field of education. It is there all the time, surely.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** If the honourable member listens to what I am saying I will enlighten him as to what does happen.

As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, it started not with the banning of SEMP but with the banning on 22 March 1977 of "Messageways—On a Small Planet", Book 1. That was banned by the Minister, but let me recall for the benefit of honourable members what actually happened.

The issue was constantly raised in this Chamber by concerned members who had representations made to them by concerned constituents. The matter was then the subject of a ministerial statement made by the Minister. We agreed with what he did. It was his final action of banning the book that we agreed with. And why? Because a part of the book asked students to tell a story from the perspective of a murderer and then from the perspective of the murder victim.

That decision by the Minister was generally applauded. I certainly agreed with it. I could see no reason for having such a morbid discussion or study carried out in schools. I believe it was unwarranted and unnecessary to include such a topic in the book. It is a pity that the whole book was banned because of one section, but unfortunately sometimes that has to be done. The point is made, however, that the decision was arrived at only after the matter had been raised in this Parliament by way of questions and then referred to in a ministerial statement.

The next decision was that to ban MACOS or "Man: A course of Study". We first heard about that when the seminar in Toowoomba was cancelled. Next the Minister was forced into making a decision to ban MACOS. I have heard all sorts of arguments as to who put pressure on the Minister—that he was pressured by the Premier and that he was pressured by the STOP and CARE people. Not for one moment do I deny those groups the right to put pressure on the Premier or the Minister. I do not deny any group the right to express a viewpoint.

I personally was concerned about MACOS, firstly because of the cost—it was far too dear—secondly because it was American produced, and also because it subtly contained the teaching of evolution. Whilst we might argue this from a scriptural or religious aspect, we have a right to question those things, because evolution is still only a theory. But that is by the way.

**Mrs. Kyburz:** It's just as well you said that.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I accept it. The honourable member has a right to hold her views on a subject just as I have the right to hold mine. As I said, I disagree with MACOS. However, the way the decision was made was wrong, and this is the issue at stake. Even though the course had been used in schools for something like four years—16 or 17 schools in Queensland had been experimenting with it or trialling it—no reference was made to teachers, students or parents and citizens' groups. I point out to honourable members that when MACOS was introduced into schools, the parents and teachers had to agree to its introduction, but when it was withdrawn there was no going back to the parents and asking them, "What do you think? Were you satisfied with it? Have you any disagreement with it?" I have spoken to many teachers and parents at schools in which MACOS was used and on only a couple of occasions have any doubts been expressed.

The question we have to consider here is: why weren't the teachers involved asked to state their attitude? No effort was made to obtain the views of the teachers or the parents and students. The views of the Curriculum Branch were not sought either. The views of the Education Department were apparently overridden. Instead we had a decision made at Cabinet level, without thorough investigation into the claims of the critics.

It is very interesting to note that MACOS is used in Catholic schools. I cite those, because there has been some concern about the religious aspect. It has been used in Catholic schools in Sydney and in Armidale. From the point of view of the fundamentalists—and as a practising Baptist I want to say this to those who are fundamentalists—

**Mr. Bourke** interjected.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Yes, I am. I make mistakes, and everyone has done so, but I try my best. The Southern Baptist Convention in the U.S.A. approved MACOS in 1976.

**Mr. Frawley:** Rubbish! They didn't. When I get up, I'll prove it.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The honourable member for Caboolture has just proved his ignorance on the issue. It certainly was approved by the Southern Baptist Convention. This can be backed up by the Southern Baptist American evangelists at present visiting Queensland.

The action that was taken by the Minister—or the action that was forced upon him—upset many teachers and upset many parents. It upset those who adhere to the concept of increasing community involvement in education.

Whilst I accept the point that there may be two sides to the MACOS debate, it certainly cannot be said about the SEMP debate—the debate on the Social Education Materials Project. That surely must be looked upon by this Chamber as an unbelievable decision. It was made—and it has been admitted by members of the Cabinet in Press statements that it was made—after the Cabinet had had a brief look at a photostat of a newspaper cutting on the family unit of the material. That is amazing.

As is explained in "The Catholic Leader", the Social Education Materials Project was years in the making and cost millions of dollars of taxpayers' money; yet we can get a Cabinet of 18 men—allegedly responsible men—meeting together in the hustle and bustle of everything else they have to do and determining there and then to throw out something that took so much time, effort and money to make.

**Mr. Simpson:** You would keep it all?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I ask the honourable member to listen to my speech.

That decision indicated a total lack of understanding by the Cabinet about what SEMP is. It obviously is so with the member for Flinders, too, for he said that SEMP was an alternative life-style. How ridiculous! I would urge the honourable member for Flinders to read the first three pages of "The Catholic Leader" because it explains well what SEMP is all about.

The decision by Cabinet demonstrates the questionable approach that many Ministers must adopt to important decisions.

**Mr. KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. I did not say that at all. What I said was that SEMP contained a certain alternative life-style.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr. W. D. Hewitt): Order! It does not matter what the honourable member said. He did not take his point of order forthwith.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The honourable member for Flinders would not understand Standing Orders. He has not even bothered to read them.

I come back to the point I was making that it indicates a total lack of understanding by the Cabinet about what SEMP is. It also demonstrates the questionable approach that many Ministers adopt to important decisions that they must make. We must start to wonder what they do at Cabinet meetings and how much time they give to decisions that affect the people of Queensland. It is proof also of the contempt that members of that Cabinet—and of this Government, because of its association with that decision—have for the Government's own Education Department officers.

I personally believe that it is a slap in the face for the Minister for Education. I do not think he deserved it. I have been critical of the Minister for Education, but I believe he has definitely tried to make a positive contribution to the education system in this State. We might continue to disagree; we will argue from different sides of the Chamber; but I honestly believe that he has tried as an individual—as a generalist—to express views and see that the education system progressed in certain ways. I would be pleased if one day he would get up and tell us of his real involvement in the banning of SEMP, what chance he had to present his views and what advice he received from his department, because that is the real secret at this moment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they threw out the results of four years of specialised work. It is not as though that work were done by radical groups. If honourable members check on SEMP they will find that it was produced by the Education Departments of the various States of Australia and also by the Headmasters' Conference of New South Wales. I point out to members that that is a group of headmasters from private schools. It was the Education Departments of the various States and not the radicals who did it. And three of those departments were controlled by Labor and three by the National and Liberal Parties.

The other point is that it is not a course. I have heard honourable members talk about its being a course. It is not; it is resource material. It is a result of a national survey conducted by the National Committee on Social Science Teaching. That committee got to the teachers and said, "What are the needs and what are deficiencies?"

A Government Member interjected.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I have been involved for some time.

The teachers identified these areas. They believed that there was a need to develop resource materials. The reason was that they were not available or that those that were were inadequate.

SEMP covers eight areas. They are: community study, the consumer in society, decision-making processes and Government, family groupings, people and change, race and ethnic relations, social control and conflict and urbanism. Surely a person with any interest in his own society and in the future of his own children would agree that it is important that teachers have resource material of these subjects.

**Mr. Katter:** You would have to see the marks I would get for the answers to some of the questions I would be asked.

**Mrs. Kyburz:** They are not marked.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I appreciate the interjection from the honourable member for Salisbury. There is no such thing as marking. I urge the honourable member for Flinders to go into one of the schools—unfortunately he would be restricted at Catholic schools—and learn what is happening, because he has just shown his ignorance.

The material was produced by experts—qualified teams of educationists appointed by the various Departments of Education. The teachers involved came from the disciplines of history, geography, English, art, commerce, home economics, social studies, general studies, integrated studies, science and environmental studies.

It was welcomed by secondary teachers throughout the nation. It was welcomed by Departments of Education throughout the nation. I read from the annual report that the Minister presented to this Parliament that it was thoroughly tested and trialled in the schools before its publication was commenced, and it was a vital resource aid to teaching.

But it has been banned. It has been banned without full investigation. It has been banned without reference to departmental advisers. It has been banned without reference to the teachers, the parents and the students who were using the material.

The joke of it all is that I read in an article where the Premier said that part of it was out of date. He referred to the consumer side of it. I point out that this was the part that was being prepared by the Queensland Department of Education. The point is that it has not yet been published. And the Premier had the audacity to say that it was out of date! That proves that he did not bother to look at it. It proves that he did not have faith in those in the consumer education field and those in the Education Department who spent a lot of time preparing that material. That action was irresponsible. It certainly raised the wrath of the community. There have been meetings all over the State which have been attended by hundreds of people, including hundreds of teachers.

**Mr. Simpson interjected.**

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I accept the interjection. The teachers generally in our community are fairly conservative people when it comes to politics. This Government ought to take notice—

**An Honourable Member interjected.**

**Mr. WRIGHT:** We will not debate it, but I believe that it is true. The Government ought to take notice when, at a meeting in Rockhampton, 130 of the 150 people who attended, were teachers. In parts of Brisbane dozens and dozens of teachers have been willing to come out publicly. I point out to

the Minister that, in Rockhampton, when I asked the people to indicate whether they supported the Government's action on SEMP, except for three or four dedicated National Party supporters, all of the people put up their hands to indicate that they condemned the Cabinet decision. And these are teachers who are normally conservative people.

If honourable members are honest, they will admit that they have received dozens and dozens of letters from concerned people—teachers, representatives of parents and citizens' associations and principals associations—people who are prepared to stand up and be counted.

We need to have a darned good look at what has happened to SEMP. The criticisms of it have been unsubstantiated. The critics of what the Cabinet has done have been backed up by the Catholic education system and again I refer to this newspaper and to a letter sent to all honourable members. The second paragraph read—

"In accordance with its role, this Council" (which is the Catholic Education Council by the way) "initiated an investigation of the Social Education Materials Project. Having sought advice from a group of experienced teachers," (something that the Minister did not bother to do) "having inspected materials published to date," (something that Cabinet did not bother to do) "and having addressed itself to a decision concerning the use of SEMP, this Council resolved to leave the decision to use SEMP in whole or in part to each local school community; school authorities will be notified that consultation with the parent body must be assured in respect of the whole school curriculum."

That surely is a responsible attitude. The education authority says in effect, "Look, we have investigated it and considered all the material and now, because we believe in community involvement, we are going back to our school communities and telling them to make the decision. We are telling them to decide whether to use that material in whole or in part."

I discussed the material with teachers, both religious and secular, and not once did I encounter any opposition. In fact, at the Rockhampton meeting one sister stood up and said that she had used the material and would like to continue using it. At that time the Catholic education authorities had not made their decision. It should be pointed out to the honourable member for Flinders and other critics that no school is forced to use all the project material. If for some reason a school cannot afford it, it does not buy the lot. There are eight sections to use and part of each section can be used. If an issue raised is controversial, surely there are competent teachers to decide how it should be handled.

I should like to present to the House some of the types of controversial issues that are raised in SEMP. One of them is, "Should the wearing of school uniforms be compulsory?" Fancy saying that that is controversial! Another is, "Should the Federal Government stop uranium mining?" Is that controversial? Is that something on which young people should not make a decision, when their lives could be at stake in the future? Another is a reference to alternative life-styles. I had a look at that one because I, too, was concerned about it. It is a photostat copy showing an American couple who were married. They were homosexuals. We may not agree with their attitude but they have a right to live that way. Then, in contrast, there is criticism of the attitude to homosexuality by a Sydney priest. Surely it is fair when two balanced points of view are presented.

**Mr. Katter:** But I don't want that sort of material put before my children.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The fact is, however, that we have in the class-room competent teachers who can raise and present these controversial issues. We have teachers who are highly trained professionals, who adhere to professional ethics. The honourable member for Flinders raised the issue of one teacher. Let us remember that there are 20,000 teachers in this State, and I believe that they will not think lightly of the honourable member for his broad and general attack on the teaching profession.

**Mr. KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. I most certainly did not make any attack on the teaching profession. I ask the honourable member for Rockhampton to withdraw that remark.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** To continue my speech I have to withdraw it; but I urge all members to read "Hansard" tomorrow morning and they will see that what I said is true.

I say also that teachers desire to be neutral in the classroom and I believe they are well aware of the danger of being involved in any sort of indoctrination.

The important fact is that the decision made by Cabinet ought to be reversed. Cabinet should bow to the will of the people that has now been expressed in the newspapers and by way of letters. They must also reverse the move away from community involvement in education. I am concerned at one report given to me by a principal that a memorandum has been sent out by the Education Department that groups cannot now use schools without ministerial authority. I should be very pleased if the Minister would explain that later because it is a matter of great concern that has been raised with me by many parents as well.

I say that this decision on SEMP stresses the need to take the education decision-making process completely out of the political

arena. It stresses the need to set up an education commission. It stresses also the need to redetermine the role of Parliament. Let us accept that the role of Parliament is to determine a broad framework of policy for the operation of the education system. Surely the actual decisions on types of books and resource material to be used in schools should be left to those who know best within the education system.

If any disagree, let them hark back to the Government's own guide-lines set in 1975 when this Government determined that responsibility for the selection of books and resource material should remain with the principals of schools. Why hasn't that guideline been adhered to here? I believe, however, that the argument is not about "Messagesways", MACOS or SEMP. It is about how that decision was made.

We need to accept that Parliament has a role to act as a watch-dog over the materials used in schools. That is surely the responsibility of every member of Parliament, but rash decisions on banning books and material and courses by Cabinet are certainly not the answer, because where do we go from here? As the Premier has a certain bent towards an issue, he bans something. Does it follow that because a Minister for Education or a Premier has a certain liking for gymnastics or history we suddenly give special emphasis to those courses in our schools over and above other courses? Let us hark back to the fact that that is what Hitler did when he took over in the 1930s. Or if the Minister for Education is a keen violinist, is he suddenly going to have thousands of young children in schools learning the violin? Is the personal view of the Minister or the Premier going to be forced on the people of the State, and certainly on the children of the State?

I stress the need for a review of the decision-making process, and I think this is the most important part of the terms of reference of the proposed select committee. It suggests here a review of the decision-making processes in education and the role of the community in this area. This is surely the most important part because the recent decisions prove that this has not been allowed to take place. I do not want to stop pressure groups from having their say. I believe they are part and parcel—in fact they are a vital area—of the political arena. But surely there has to be some system. When these pressure groups want to put forward a submission it ought to be properly processed and properly investigated. Matters should then be raised in this Parliament before any action is taken. We should determine the final destiny of education in Queensland.

I reiterate that I welcome the inquiry, but I also have a number of reservations and I would like to mention them briefly. I question the present ratio of Opposition members to Government members. While the

honourable member for Flinders gave the figures of 59 Government members to 23 Opposition members, let us accept the fact that in this Parliament the Ministers play no role when it comes to serving on committees, so in actual fact we have 25 National Party back-benchers, 16 Liberal and 23 A.L.P. So on that basis—

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr. WRIGHT:** But they do not serve, so Government supporters are basing their argument on a false figure and on that basis the ratio should be 2 National Party, 2 Liberal and 2 A.L.P. I could develop the argument of the difficulties faced by the sole member of the Opposition on a committee, the fact that there are no proxies and the fact that he could be isolated. I stress this because I believe that the final decisions of the inquiry could in fact be pre-empted. My hope, however, stems from the fact that we have the honourable member for Wynnum on the committee and I have seen the honourable members for Landsborough and Greenslopes in action before and at least I have some hope that they will be able to maintain the terms of reference and achieve the aims of the committee. But I am worried because of the utterings of the Premier. I refer to an article that I spoke about in the Parliament the other day. I am not going to have time to raise all the issues here, but members will recall that in this article the Premier said—

“The philosophy of education in Queensland must be geared to the service of our society and people, and it must never become the plaything of educators who seek to overturn or pervert education for their own narrow social objectives.”

We all agree. However, he goes on and says—

“Both SEMP and MACOS” (we will leave MACOS out of it for the moment) “were out of touch with Queensland standards and out-dated in a number of themes. In some instances, it was considered they were actually harmful to the educational process.”

Other points are raised in this article, too, and I have asked the Minister for Education to state whether this is the view of the Education Department and, in fact, the Government. I noticed that when he answered the questions this morning he very nicely side-stepped the whole issue. His reply was vague and guarded, but if this is the philosophy that this Government adheres to on education, can anyone honestly believe that members of the Government on the committee who desire to get into that Cabinet, and know that the Premier will finally determine whether they get there or not, dare to bring down any type of report that challenges or contravenes or contradicts the philosophy that has now been

expressed publicly by the Premier in so many of the media? Do members opposite honestly believe this is so? I certainly do not think so. I believe that the Premier has clearly stated the official attitude of his Government. I believe he has therefore pre-empted any report that might come from the inquiry.

The other aspect about which I am concerned is the composition of the advisory panel. I cast no aspersions on the present members, although I believe that a thousand people in this State could have filled the roles. I certainly question the role that the appointees will play. But I am amazed that the Queensland Teachers' Union and the Queensland Council of State School Organisations are not involved, and I am amazed also that teachers are not even mentioned in the actual motion. It speaks about inquiring into and reporting upon and making recommendations in relation to the system of education in Queensland and the extent to which it meets the expectations of students, parents and the community. What about teachers? Surely it is worthwhile inquiring into what teachers expect of an education system. After all, they are trained and they are skilled personnel.

I make the point, too, that the Queensland Teachers' Union and the Queensland Council of State School Organisations have years of experience behind them in all aspects of education and all educational issues. They would certainly be able to render positive assistance to members of the committee. They would certainly guarantee a balance in the advice given. I would ask that the committee of inquiry, which has the power to expand that panel, give special consideration to including a member from the Q.T.U. and also from the Queensland Council of State School Organisations. If the members of the committee have not read their terms of reference, I would refer them to paragraph 3, which says—

“That the Committee have power to appoint persons possessing special expertise and experience in the field of education to assist it in an advisory capacity in its meetings and deliberations;”

The third aspect of concern is that this inquiry should not be rushed, and I stress that. After all this time, when we have said that there has been a need for some such inquiry, when issues such as Radford have been raised, when we have this concern in the community as to numeracy and literacy skills, we cannot rush this report back to the Parliament. It has been rumoured that the committee is expected to return a report by June or July. I certainly hope that no pressure is put on the committee to restrict the right that is given to it in paragraph 8, which says that the committee reports back to the House at the conclusion of the work undertaken by it. It should be up to the committee to determine whether it believes that it has concluded its work.

Most of the other areas have been catered for. The committee is investigating primary, secondary, technical and further education, and there is also, fortunately, a very broad provision in paragraph 1 (h), which says "any other matter". That certainly allows the committee much-needed scope; and just as importantly it also allows the community the right to make submissions to the committee on many issues.

I wish the members of the committee well in their deliberations. I know that all members realise, as I do, that the task is not an easy one. They will have the eyes of every educationist, of every group interested in education, on them, and I would stress to them that they have a very important responsibility—a responsibility to ensure that the role and value of select committees is not diminished in the slightest degree. They must not be seen to be partisan; in fact, they must be seen to be totally non-partisan. They must be seen to be totally independent. They must be free from what I call "Premier pressure", and I hope, only for the sake of select committees in the future, that this will be so.

**Hon. V. J. BIRD** (Burdekin—Minister for Education) (10.38 p.m.): As Minister for Education in this State, I take the opportunity of speaking very briefly to the motion before the House. It is designed to set up a committee of inquiry into education. If I could be at all critical of the timing of the setting up of this committee of inquiry, perhaps I should only say that it should have been set up a little earlier. As Minister for Education, having had discussions with the Director-General of Education, with departmental officers, and with members of the Government, I have been aware for some considerable time of the tremendous changes that have taken place throughout the world. We live in a different type of society today and there have been tremendous changes in our very life-style, as well as technological and other changes. It is realised, of course, that the education system must keep pace with those changes.

We are well and truly aware that it is many years since a committee of inquiry looked at education in this State. But we are also aware that most of the countries in the Western World have had inquiries into their education systems. Great Britain and the United States of America have had inquiries into their education systems, as has New Zealand. I believe that most countries have looked very closely at their education systems to determine whether or not they were meeting the requirements of the changed society of today and the changes in the way of life.

I said before that my departmental officers have been concerned about this matter for some time, as have members of the Government. As the honourable member for Greenslopes said, my own parliamentary

Education committee endeavoured to carry out an inquiry into the education system of this State some two years ago, but it realised that without the required expertise and the back-up assistance that was necessary the task was completely beyond it. So it can be seen that we have been very much aware of the need for a committee of inquiry.

As Minister for Education for three years, I have travelled very widely throughout the State. I did this because I believed it was my responsibility as Minister for Education to visit schools and talk with principals, teachers, parents and students to determine whether or not the education system was in fact meeting the requirements of all persons concerned with education. We know that everybody in this State is involved in some way with the educational processes. It is as a result of those visits that I realised the shortcomings of our system. Whenever I have addressed meetings I have always said that we do not have the perfect education system in this State. If ever we sit back and say that we have a perfect system, I believe that that will be the time when education in the State will start to decline.

I have said that Queensland leads the field, and it is recognised throughout the length and breadth of Australia that Queensland leads the field in education. In fact, back-handed compliments have been made that Queensland was so far behind in its changes that it is now well and truly ahead of the other States in education. Perhaps that is right.

**Mr. D'Arcy:** I would be very much concerned if it were my department that was the subject of an inquiry, particularly if---

**Mr. BIRD:** I can only say that the honourable member would have a very closed mind if he could say that he would be concerned about a committee of inquiry into his department. It is not a committee of inquiry into my department at all. It is a committee of inquiry into education in this State. Most other countries in the Western World have seen fit to set up this same type of inquiry. I know that my Director-General and the officers of my department—in fact all those associated with education—welcome the opportunity at this time to have a committee of inquiry look at the education system in this State to determine whether it is meeting the requirements of all concerned with education.

We have heard criticisms, even in the Chamber tonight, from some misinformed persons of the people responsible for education. Those responsible for education cover a very wide field. They include people from the Director-General of Education down through the various directors to people who give their time voluntarily to serve on committees and boards throughout the State in an endeavour to give the best education possible to each and every student in Queensland. I know that everybody in the Chamber

will agree with me when I say that I have the utmost faith and confidence in all those persons (from my Director-General of Education right down to and including all those who give of their time freely) who ensure that we give a good education to the people of this State. I have nothing but the highest praise for the great majority of the principals and teachers in our schools. There has been criticism of some principals and teachers, but when we stop to think that 20,000 teachers are employed in the State Education Department we realise that there will be some who do not measure up to all the criteria that are applicable to good teachers or good principals.

This criticism of some of the teachers and principals is not mine alone; it is shared by people within my department and on the various committees. I refer, for example, to the Board of Teacher Education. In its report, which has just been presented to me, it indicates its concern about the professionalism and the preparation of some teachers. It says—

“The Board has commenced a survey of the preparation of teachers in colleges and universities for the teaching of reading and associated language skills at all levels of schooling. The inquiry was initiated in response to reports of alleged public disquiet about an apparent decline in the standards of basic skills in the schools.

“After initial interviews of a sample of first-year teachers to obtain their perceptions of their college training, the inquiry is being extended to college, university and school staffs. The views of interested and involved public bodies and private individuals will also be canvassed.

“The method of inquiry is calculated to initiate a self-examination by colleges of their reading programs and to have an immediate impact on the development and modification of courses.”

I am not going to blame anybody for any failings in the teacher-education system. If we look back at what happened in more recent times when we saw the sudden development of quite a few new teacher-training colleges, as we used to call them, or colleges of advanced education, as we now refer to them, we realise that the councils responsible for the running of those colleges had tremendous difficulties in finding suitable staff to work within them, and some of them were unfortunate enough to get some staff who left a lot to be desired. I am very pleased to be able to say that the majority of those who did not meet the expectations and requirements of the college councils have found other places of employment.

We know that a few years ago there was a desperate shortage of teachers not only throughout Queensland and Australia but also throughout most of the world. Because of that shortage we took virtually every

person who wanted to be a teacher, regardless of his ability and attitude towards teaching. It seemed to be the fashionable thing among far too many young people to want to be teachers, but unfortunately they soon found out that they were not suited to the teaching profession. The bonding system ensured that they stayed there. Many who would have liked to get out of the teaching profession were unable to do so because they were bonded to the department. They could not leave the department without repaying the bond. They felt they were bound, but they would be the first people to admit that they were not cut out to be teachers, that they were not so inclined. Unfortunately, they are caught up in the system today.

As I said before, it is nobody's fault. It was caused by circumstances that existed at that time. Thank goodness we no longer have a shortage of teachers. In fact, I suppose I could say that to some extent we have an oversupply of teachers. Everybody in this State can rest assured that in future there will be a more careful selection of teachers from those who want to enter the profession. Much more time can now be given in the colleges of advanced education to ensuring that the correct training is given to teachers.

Teachers, of course, are only part of the system. Nevertheless, as an earlier speaker said, they are a very important part of the system. I acknowledge that. Because they are the people at the work face of education, they must be well trained. They must be trained in all of the skills that are required to impart as much knowledge as is possible to each and every student throughout the State in the time that is available.

We are faced with another problem, which has also been raised this evening in the Chamber, in that every year we see more and more students continuing their education right through to Grade 12. Need I remind anybody in the Chamber that only a few short years ago State Scholarship was regarded as the ultimate in education in this State? Very few students sat successfully for Scholarship. For the ones who failed, it meant the end of education. For many of those who passed Scholarship it was also the end of their education. Very few went on to tertiary education or to higher education of some sort.

Times have changed, particularly in the past three or four years. Because of the unemployment position not only in Australia but also throughout the Western World and in most other countries, young people have opted to stay at school, knowing that that is the only alternative until they can find employment. I am the first to admit—and I am sure that each and every honourable member would agree—that of those students there are very many who are not academically inclined. In fact, an earlier speaker admitted that very many gain

nothing from staying on at school, particularly when they are forced to take board subjects. I am aware of the problems there. If they do stay on at school—and we cannot deny them the right of education in this State—we must give them subjects that will prepare them for other than a tertiary education. Not everybody can get into a tertiary institution, and we do not want everybody to proceed to tertiary institutions. We are well and truly aware that even today we have over-educated far too many people in tertiary institutions and they are unable to find employment in their chosen field.

Those are the problems to be faced. We are aware of them. We know that many other problems will be uncovered by the select committee. One member referred to the findings of the committee as being probably the end result of a grubby witch-hunt. I have no doubt in my mind that nothing could be further from the truth. I have the utmost confidence in the honourable member for Landsborough, who is the chairman of the committee. I have the utmost confidence in the other members serving on this committee whom I know personally. Judging by the remarks of the honourable member for Wynnum this evening, I do not doubt his ability to serve on the committee. I know that all the members of the committee will devote their utmost attention to the task before them, that they will take very seriously this job that they are being asked to perform, and that they will make findings of benefit to the education system in this State.

**Mr. D'ARCY** (Woodridge) (10.55 p.m.): After hearing the Minister more or less condone an inquiry of this nature into education in Queensland, I wonder why he has been the Minister for Education in this State for the past four years. We understand that this is to be an inquiry into the Department of Education—into the philosophy of education in this State. The philosophy of education, if that is what the Minister wants to claim it is, is the philosophy that has been administered by the department that he has run for four years and by the department that has been run by this Government for 20 years. If an inquiry by five members of this House is necessary, surely it is a witch-hunt into the Minister's ability to run his department. The Minister might laugh but it is his colleagues in this House who are laughing behind his back, even though they are sitting here like minions at the moment and not saying very much.

We on this side of the House know that we have not been given fair representation on the committee. Judging by my reading of the Press, we were given the representation we have, following the representations of the chairman of the committee and not of the Premier, to make things look a little better and to give the committee a little prestige, which it is not given by the Government or Cabinet.

The inquiry is being conducted into the Minister's department, whether he likes it or not. He stood up tonight and mouthed platitudes. He did not name any departmental officers, but he banded the name of the Director-General of Education around the Chamber. He did not tell us who had been giving him advice. In private, many officers have been denying that they have been giving the Minister the advice that he is taking to Cabinet. We want to know whose advice he is taking to Cabinet. He should get up and name those officers individually so that we know who they are.

**Mr. Bird:** What are you talking about?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** We are talking about SEMP, for example. The Minister spoke about an inquiry into SEMP.

**Mr. Bird:** Education in general.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Well, let us come back to SEMP. We are asking him about SEMP. The Minister should get up and tell us which of his officers recommended that SEMP be banned.

**Mr. Bird:** Don't be childish. You are being absolutely childish. You are coming back to one subject—SEMP—and we are talking about a committee of inquiry into education generally.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Now the Minister is changing the subject. He brought us back onto this subject. I am asking him to name the departmental officers who suggested—

**Mr. Bird:** If you display a little bit of sense in this House, I will be prepared to listen to you.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Bird:** Not one member here would agree with your sentiments.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** The Minister thinks that? He is way off the track. The present situation has developed around the inquiry and the MACOS and SEMP issues. I ask the Minister not to get me off the track. I will tell him what I think of MACOS in a moment. Not long ago, when the Minister was on his feet, he said he was able to take the advice of his departmental officers. He mentioned SEMP in particular. I want to know the names of the officers concerned.

**Mr. Bird:** And you mentioned MACOS.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** No. When the Minister stood up he mentioned SEMP. I want to know the names of the officers who gave him the advice. None of the officers in his department will admit, privately or publicly, that they gave him that advice. At present, the Department of Education is being run by a Minister who is not taking the advice of his departmental officers.

**An Opposition Member:** And he won't face up to it.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** That is right. He will not face up to the fact that he is not running the department on the advice of his officers.

**Mr. Bird:** Are you claiming that I am not working in co-operation with or not listening to the advice of the officers?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** I think I can quite safely say that. The Minister is one of the few Ministers for Education in recent times who can claim quite successfully to have the public, the parents and citizens' associations, the Queensland Teachers' Union and departmental officers against him on the issues. The Minister and his Cabinet definitely have these people against them at present, both publicly and in other ways.

Somebody mentioned MACOS. I heard the Minister say that this was introduced in Queensland only as a pilot scheme. But that pilot scheme was welcomed by the schools in which it was introduced. In some instances the Minister had a great deal of difficulty in getting it back. He almost had a rebellion on his hands in many schools. I spoke personally to many principals who had handled this scheme. It is used in many schools in Australia—150, I think, in New South Wales alone.

**Mr. Bird:** How many schools?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** One hundred and fifty.

**Mr. Bird:** Out of how many?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Quite a number. The point is that at least there is some sort of freedom in New South Wales. The Minister, through his department, has taken this freedom away from Queensland schools. We have not heard too much from the Liberals on this issue. The Minister, through his Cabinet, is purposely attacking his middle class colleagues of the Liberal Party through National Party philosophy on education and in other ways. The Minister is doing it constructively and purposely.

I return to the inquiry as a whole.

**Mr. Bird:** This is trash.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** The Minister waffled when he was on his feet. He talked about teachers and education—nothing to do with the subject at all. I am talking about the inquiry that this Parliament is authorising into his department. That is what this debate is all about tonight. There is to be an inquiry into the way in which the Minister is running education in this State. This inquiry would not have been necessary if for the last four years the Minister had been doing his job. If the Minister's leader had thought that there was accord between the Minister, his departmental officers, the Queensland Teachers' Union and the people, we would not be having an inquiry. The way he is behaving at the moment, we should be having an inquiry into every department.

**Mr. Greenwood:** Don't you believe in parliamentary committees?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** I definitely do, but this is not a parliamentary committee as such. It has been made very clear that this is an inquiry into a department.

**Mr. Bird:** Don't tell me that New Zealand and other countries that have had inquiries into their education systems have had them because they have had no faith in their Ministers for Education.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** They have not all been committees of Parliaments of which the Minister was a member. That is an important point in this issue. There have been inquiries into education by successful educationists outside the general sphere of education to at least assess the long-term aims of education. But this is not such an inquiry. This is a parliamentary inquiry under the Minister's very nose into his department. It is an inquiry that can only come up with a finding that the Minister is running his department efficiently or inefficiently. Obviously the Premier thinks that the Minister is running his department inefficiently. He thinks that the Minister cannot get on with his officers. That is what this inquiry is all about. We know that in the last 12 months, particularly the last few months, some of the decisions reached have not been decisions that have had the full support of the people of Queensland, the Queensland Teachers' Union or departmental officers. That is why the Minister will not name the officers who made the recommendation.

Government Members interjected.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Some of those interjecting ought to be worried when they see in print some of the things that happened in Boonah. That is certainly not a radical area or even a Labor stronghold. It is an area that must surely be regarded as National Party to the back teeth in the way it votes.

**Mr. Tenni:** It's got a Liberal Federal member.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Get back on your horse. At a meeting on 10 March organised by the Boonah State High School Parents and Citizens' Association a motion condemning the Government's decision on the SEMP material was passed 100 for and 10 against. Prior to this meeting the SEMP materials were displayed on Fridays and Saturday mornings.

**Mr. Powell:** All of them?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** That is a very interesting interjection.

We are talking about the inquiry and Government supporters must be starting to worry about these decisions. That is why the inquiry is being conducted. That is why

the Minister is under some sort of pressure. We are talking about the SEMP materials—

**A Government Member** interjected.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** The honourable member does not know what they are. He did not know what MACOS was and he does not know what SEMP is.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order and honourable members will refrain from persistent interjections.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** By its decision in recent times the Queensland Department of Education has virtually taken on the departments in other States. The Departments of Education in all other States have, in many cases, been a party to the development of the courses that we are talking about, particularly SEMP, but not so much MACOS, which was an American scheme. But the point is that SEMP is not a course either; it is material based on the Australian system, the Australian way of life. It was developed by the Australian education system, by teachers in New South Wales and by officers of the Education Departments of all States of Australia. The Minister's officers obviously had to resign from this committee in public protest at the fact that the Minister did not even tell them he was going to ban the SEMP material, even though he did not know what it was. One of the most interesting speeches I have heard about the SEMP material was made by the New South Wales Minister for Education—

**Mr. Powell:** He's a good lad.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** I thought he was, too—Mr. Eric Bedford.

**Mr. Powell** interjected.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** At least he has some educational qualifications, which is more than honourable members on that side have. He spoke about the SEMP material and said—

“By contrast, the SEMP project—or more fully the Social Education Materials Project—is not a course but materials to supplement existing resources to be used in many different courses.

“It is a national project of the Curriculum Development Centre conducted in co-operation with all State Departments of Education and the Headmasters Conference of N.S.W.

“SEMP was prepared after a survey which revealed deficiencies in the resources available to teachers for the study of society and personal development.

“The SEMP materials can be used in such courses as social science, history, economics, English, religious education,

home economics and personal development. They were prepared by educationists throughout Australia to assist teachers to teach such subjects more effectively.

“The Queensland State Government has taken the extreme step of banning the SEMP materials from the schools of that State against the advice of its Department of Education.”

I did not give the New South Wales Minister for Education that information; he must have obtained it elsewhere.

**Mr. Powell:** How would you know?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** The Minister said—

“It has taken this step, moreover, when the SEMP materials are largely unseen . . .”

That covers the interjection of the honourable member for Isis.

“. . . for the majority of them have not yet been published.”

**Mr. Frawley:** How do you know they're any good?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** We know the honourable member for Caboolture lives in the 19th Century. We know from his remarks in this Parliament that he spends most of his time crawling on his stomach to the Premier, which explains why he has no hairs there, and the rest of the time making stupid and inane interjections.

Going back to the Minister's statement—

“It (the Queensland Government) has taken this step, moreover, when the SEMP materials are largely unseen for the majority of them have not yet been published.”

That is still a fact.

“This action by the Queensland Government represents in my view a most improper intrusion of Government into the detail of academic policies. In totalitarian states it is the practice for the state to determine what should or what should not be taught in its schools but this has not hitherto been the practice in Australia and it is inconsistent with democratic concepts.”

**Mr. Katter:** That is the most extraordinary statement I have ever heard. What utter rubbish!

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Well, it may be, but it is a statement by the Minister for Education in New South Wales.

**Mr. Katter** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Flinders will refrain from persistent interjections or I will deal with him under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** The New South Wales Minister went on to say—

“The action by the Queensland Government moreover entirely misses the point which I mentioned earlier. The effectiveness of an education system depends on a three-way interaction between the community, the teaching profession and the Government.

“In this dialogue the teaching profession has the key role. It is a role of the teaching profession to identify the aims and methods of education and to articulate them clearly to obtain community support.

“A consideration of these current controversies brings us back to the professionalism of the individual teacher, the leadership of the teaching profession.”

I say to the Minister for Education that that is dead in this State. He is attempting to take away from the teaching profession in Queensland any status that it has. His action and the Government's action in overriding the department, the union, the p. & c. associations and the people is exactly similar to Hitler's action in Germany in the 1930s and action taken in Russia in recent times, when it was realised that the control of the education system and the media are the important steps in stifling democracy in any State. That is what the Minister is systematically setting about doing in this State. He has taken away the right of the people of Queensland to have a say in their educational system. The Minister's administration of his department is coming under scrutiny because he cannot get on with the officers of the Education Department in Queensland and he is having great difficulty in administering his portfolio.

The Opposition believes that the philosophy of education being espoused by the Government actually looks back to the 19th Century. Anyone who has studied education in that period will have read quotations indicating that it was intended to keep the people of the world in the dark as to educational progress because it was realised that in those days people would certainly overthrow a Government if they realised what it was about.

I think that the Minister for Education, in his administration of the Education Department which has led to the need for this inquiry, is creating tremendous pressure in the State of Queensland. Because of his neglect of his portfolio and because of his neglect of education in Queensland, the Minister is forcing the people of Queensland into a philosophical situation that will eventually cause them to stand up for their rights in a manner that he is not used to. He has subjugated the department; he has attempted to subjugate the union with bluff and fright; he has subjugated individual teachers.

**Mr. Bird interjected.**

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Don't start on that. If you want to talk—

**Mr. Bird:** You would have been right behind the union when it supported those who had been dismissed from my department for using drugs. That is about the only issue on which I have completely confronted the Teachers' Union.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Red herrings from the Minister. He wants to talk about individual teachers and what he is doing to teachers, and about subjugating teachers. When he speaks about individual teachers he is speaking about what he has done to teachers in this State on an individual basis, and he should be ashamed of that. We on this side of the House know, and as a teacher I know particularly, what it was like when A.L.P. members were defeated in 1974. How many of our teachers were allowed back? We saw the minute that went out because some Government members leaked it to us.

**Mr. Bird interjected.**

**Mr. D'ARCY:** We saw it. Admittedly, the present Minister was not the Minister. At the time the then Minister had enough guts to stand up and say that he did not approve of the minute to the effect that defeated parliamentarians on the Labor side of the House were not to be employed in their old electorates. In this instance we are looking at victimisation. Look at the victimisation of Mick Miller in Central Queensland. What about Bill Wood in North Queensland? This is an important issue. The Minister brought it up. He is virtually saying that teachers are not victimised in the way he is running the department. Bill Wood received a teaching appointment this year after the Federal election. He went back with a teaching appointment authorised verbally by officers of the Minister's department. When that appointment came down in writing, it went not to the department but to the Minister's office. The Minister personally sacked Bill Wood. The officers of his department asked why he did it. The Minister cannot say that Bill Wood did not have the qualifications. He had the qualifications to do the job in Bowen.

**Mr. Bird interjected.**

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The House will come to order.

**Mr. Bird interjected.**

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable gentleman will refrain from persistent interjections.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** Before Bill Wood came into this Parliament for a six-year term, he was principal of the Cairns Opportunity School, a specialist area.

**Mr. BIRD:** I rise to a point of order. The honourable member, if I may call him "honourable", has accused me of refusing to reappoint Mr. Wood simply because he had been a candidate for an election.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** That is not the assertion I made.

**Mr. BIRD:** That is the assertion the honourable member made. I ask why he should get any preference over those who left the education system to better their own educational qualifications?

**Mr. D'ARCY:** It is quite obvious that that is not the assertion I made. The Department of Education did re-employ Bill Wood after the election. That is the point I made. The department did re-employ him but the Minister sacked him after that. That is the point I make. Mr. Bill Wood was appointed as acting principal of a school in North Queensland, and then the Minister sacked him. He was working before the election. When the Minister gets down to that type of petty attack on individual teachers, is it any wonder that individual teachers in his department are worried? They are worried about the way this Government has carried on and is carrying on. It is a disgraceful situation.

**Mr. Frawley** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Caboolture under Standing Order No. 123A.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** It is a disgraceful situation when the administration of education in this State has reached such a low level. Those in every sphere—from the Director-General down to the lowest teacher and the parents and citizens' associations—are all frightened of the Minister. They are frightened of him and his department.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** That is exactly what is happening in this State. Let honourable members opposite ask the parents and citizens' associations. Obviously they do not attend meetings of those associations. They are frightened that if they do not concur they will not get new buildings. They are frightened that they will not receive consideration. They fear that they won't get dental clinics in their areas. The Government has almost none in Queensland, anyway, compared with the other States. But that is what has happened under this system. If it achieves nothing else, this inquiry into education should at least admonish the Minister for his job in the department and for not getting on with his own officers, the union, the teachers, the parents and citizens' associations and the people in this State. Cabinet and the Government which honourable members

opposite represent are not giving the people of Queensland the educational philosophy they want and need. The Government is forcing down their necks a philosophy that they are not prepared to accept. It is instilling into them a fear of the department. That is what has happened in this State. The Education Department has taken the big stick to every facet of education, and it is no wonder that an inquiry into the education system is called for. But I do not believe that the inquiry should be conducted by parliamentarians. If the Country Party wants to admonish the Minister it should do so in private. He is not capable of administering his portfolio.

**Mr. ELLIOTT:** I rise to a point of order. I find it personally offensive to have the member for Woodridge referring to the National Party as the Country Party. I ask him to withdraw the statement.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Woodridge.

**Mr. D'ARCY:** This inquiry is nothing more than an attempt by the Government to whitewash the Education Department. But in view of the way in which the Minister has administered his responsibilities, it is not possible for the committee, if it is fair dinkum, to whitewash the department.

**Mrs. KIPPIN** (Mourilyan) (11.22 p.m.): I rise to support the setting up of the committee of inquiry, but before I continue on that aspect I want to set one issue straight.

I do not think it is widely known in Queensland that over the past few years Mr. Wood resigned from the Education Department four times to contest a seat in Parliament. Sooner or later he has to work out what he is—whether he wants to be a teacher or a member of Parliament. I would also like to cite the case of my opponent.

**Mr. Casey** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Mackay under Standing Order No. 123A. I will not tolerate persistent interjections.

**Mrs. KIPPIN:** My opponent, Mr. Peter Moore, spent six years in this House, and before he entered Parliament he was a teacher. Within a matter of months of his defeat he was returned to a teaching job in Innisfail.

**Mr. Jones:** He didn't resign; he got leave.

**Mrs. KIPPIN:** All right, he got leave; but he became a member of Parliament and naturally had to resign.

**Mr. Jones:** Bill Wood was made to resign because he was in the Federal sphere. That is a different set of circumstances.

**Mrs. KIPPIN:** We have recognised that, but Mr. Wood should decide just what he is. A lot of people who have resigned from the Education Department have not been given back their former positions. In Mr. Wood's case, however, he was appointed back to the department and was then dismissed by the Minister. I would like to know who appointed him back to the department. I have the suspicion that it was John Rockett, who is a union organiser and has been a Labor candidate in Townsville for a number of years. I am quite sure that John Rockett engineered this to embarrass the Minister. This is something that has not been made public.

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I warn honourable members that I will not tolerate persistent interjections. The next honourable member who interjects, no matter which side of the House he is on, will be dealt with under Standing Order No. 123A.

**Mrs. KIPPIN:** To return to Mr. Wood—I am quite sure that we would find it was John Rockett who engineered this whole thing to embarrass the Government. When my opponent was defeated three years ago he kicked up an awful fuss, as Mr. Wood did, too. Only a few months passed before Mr. Moore was given a teaching position in Innisfail. I point out to the Opposition, as I did to Peter Moore at the time, that every teacher at the Innisfail school approached me saying, "We don't want to be transferred out of this area just to shut this fellow up and give him a job." So Mr. Moore had to wait until a position became vacant and when one did become vacant he got it. At no stage did the Government try to upset him. He returned to his teaching position after his defeat at the last election. He had enough sense to realise that, if he got out, he would not get back in. This is the fact. A lot of teachers have had to resign for different reasons and would like every chance to get back, too.

I return now to the select committee. It has been explained a number of times that the members of the committee and the advisory panel are very competent. I am sure that the final report will be a very good one.

As was indicated by the member for Landsborough initially—and it has been almost ignored in the whole of this debate—this is an inquiry into the whole of education—not an inquiry into SEMP and MACOS. I am sure that the committee will ensure that the inquiry does not degenerate into an argument about SEMP and MACOS, as this debate has done tonight.

However, as so much as has been said about SEMP and MACOS I would like to record some of my thoughts on SEMP. I will not touch on MACOS, because really its

banning was fairly well accepted generally throughout the community. There had been a lot of discussion on it. Most people knew what it was about. The main reason why there was such a fuss about the banning of SEMP was that the decision appeared to be a little premature. But there was a special reason for Cabinet's giving a decision on SEMP so quickly. The school year had started. A number of schools had ordered SEMP material. Cabinet realised that it had to give a decision on SEMP—either to ban it or to let it into the schools—before all the material reached the schools. A decision was made quickly and SEMP was banned, indicating to the schools that the material was not to go out. I understand also that, if any of the schools had paid out money to purchase SEMP materials, the Government was willing to sort that out for them. That was the reason for the early and quick decision on SEMP.

We have read that the headmasters and staffs of a number of private schools support the introduction of SEMP. It is all very well for private schools, because those headmasters have the choice of the teachers they employ. They have a much better control over their teachers than do the headmasters in public schools. In fact, the Queensland Teachers' Union has been fighting over a number of years for autonomy for their teachers, so that teachers could not be directed by the principal on what they teach; yet members of the Opposition have been saying, "We will let SEMP in because the headmasters can determine what is taught." Well, that just doesn't happen in practice in the schools.

As I have already indicated, I think that the Cabinet decision was a very good one. A number of members tonight have given opinions on SEMP, but in their speeches they have said, "We haven't really seen it, but we have been told." Well, I have seen SEMP. I have seen all the SEMP material available and I have spent a lot of time studying SEMP so that I as a parent—and also as a member of Parliament—can give a considered opinion on the SEMP material. In my opinion, some of the SEMP material is good, some of it is bad and a lot of it is of very, very dubious educational value.

**Mr. Wright:** What parts are you talking about? Please explain what you have said.

**Mrs. KIPPIN:** I have been given a time limit and I intend to honour that time limit.

The material of SEMP that I seriously object to is the material that deals with the family—the alternative life-styles—

**Mr. Wright:** That is a generalisation.

**Mrs. KIPPIN:** Of course it is a generalisation. Specifically I object to the films that accompany SEMP. In a lot of those films the tone was very bad; the grammar was bad; the parental attitudes were very bad. The

films were aimed at taking the children out of the home and away from parental guidance into the peer group of the schools. Even the people who developed SEMP did not really regard these films as acceptable.

The interesting thing is that at the time I was studying SEMP the whole National Party education committee also studied it. We came up with exactly the same decision as the Minister's committee. Independently, we arrived at the same decision. We also had to look at this decision from a political angle and we agreed that, while some parts of SEMP were quite reasonable, we should ban the lot of it until we can have a very good look at it and sort it out. This is what has happened up to date.

I have already mentioned the films. The language in them was very bad and the grammar was bad. The children's behaviour in school was bad. In a number of films, children in school uniforms and in school-grounds were smoking and exhibiting bad behaviour generally. It is not the sort of behaviour that we encourage in schools. While these films were designed to encourage discussion they romanticised alternative life-styles and children living outside the normal family unit. This is what I seriously object to in SEMP. I am not saying that this does not happen in life or that we do not see it on T.V. or in the newspapers; but there is no reason whatever to devote school time to learning about rubbish like that.

We will not teach the children to deal with situations such as that. Fancy explaining situations in divorce to 14 and 16-year-olds! A lot of them have not thought about marriage yet. It would be good material for marriage-guidance counselling but it is not suitable for the age group at which it is aimed.

I have already said that a lot of the material was of dubious educational value. The children would be much better off spending their time learning academic subjects which would equip them to find jobs later in life. If we give them their solid values and if they get solid values out of their homes, as well as guidance in school, they will be able to cope with alternative family life-styles or the problems they will face once they leave school.

There has been a lot of debate on whether the Government should enter into the field of education decisions. All I can say is that we are the only body of elected people directly answerable to the general public. Therefore it is our bounden duty to get in and determine educational policy in this State. If we do not do that, we will be neglecting what we have been put here to do.

Mrs. KYBURZ (Salisbury) (11.33 p.m.): I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the motion to establish a Select Committee on Education in this State. It is only by the

grace of God—the Whip—that I do speak. Never before have I had occasion to berate another member for practising discrimination although the majority are males. I do so now. It is because of the honourable member for Woodridge that I will have to gallop through a speech that I had prepared. He took my time and it is only because the Whip said so that I can in fact have 10 minutes to make my speech. I accuse the honourable member for Woodridge not only of taking my time but also of continuing with a lot of polly-waffle. He repeated the same thing again and again. I felt jolly angry because he was taking my time. That is why I asked the Whip if I could please speak following that honourable member. I objected to his using my time. I hope it does not happen again.

He now has the reputation of being the phantom member for Woodridge. He flits in and flits out, goes up to the Press room, and flies down again when he thinks there is some mileage to be gained. I am sorry to have to say this while he is absent from the Chamber. I am game to say it to his face and will happily do so later on and I will bet he will melt like a lollypop.

Unfortunately, many people in this State have not realised that there is nothing to fear from knowledge and that knowledge in itself is good, as long as it is put to the correct use. Before knowledge can be put to the correct use, we need the mental capacity, the physical well-being and the emotional well-being.

Paragraph 1 (d) of the motion reads—  
“a review of the decision-making process in education and the role of the community in this area.”

A lot of the things that have been spoken about tonight (I was going to say “raved” about but that would have been a little intemperate of me) dealt with that particular paragraph. In fact, if this committee is going to consider all of the things within its terms of reference, there is absolutely nothing for anyone to complain about.

I was the first to complain, I do believe, about the banning of SEMP and I now think that if this committee looks into all of these things it will come up with a report that will be consistent with the ideals and desires of teachers, parents, community leaders and members of Parliament. After all, if members of Parliament do bear the ultimate responsibility, which I think all members will agree we do, we must be prepared to bear the brunt of criticism. This is not easy. In fact, at times it is difficult as when one becomes a member of Parliament one soon learns that there seem to be a great many crackpots in the world. But, if people read the terms of reference, I cannot see how they could complain about them. To every person who has written to me I have written back saying, “There will

be an inquiry and if you do not avail yourself of the opportunity to put your submissions to it that will mean that you have either squibbed in the interim or you had nothing to say in the first place."

The debate on standards of education—I am speaking as quickly as I can—began right back in ancient Greece, the cradle of democracy. The debate on these standards started in ancient Greece because a dialect apart from pure Hellenic was gaining ground. That is where it all started and it has been raging ever since. There are certain reasons for such complaints. Some of them are rapid changes in society, in demography, in sociology and in our way of life. The fact is that we are moving ahead so rapidly that many people cannot keep up.

Another reason is lack of parental interest. People can get up and rant and rave about what parents want to see and what they want to do. There are a lot of parents who would not give a brass razoo to learn what happens in schools whereas there are many others who make a total attempt to involve themselves in the education of their children. There are also many who display an inability to keep up with what their children are learning. I have often stated that if parents become more involved in what was going on in schools, not only in day-by-day problems such as fund-raising, which toilet is blocked and heaven knows what else that p. and c. associations have to be concerned with, it would be a much better situation. Parents should be brought more into the schools.

In New South Wales schools have open days. In fact, there is now an open day once a term. That gives parents an opportunity to get into the schools, to get the feeling of the class-room situation and to have a look at all the equipment that is being used. I should like to see such open days in Queensland schools. There is nothing to fear from parents coming into the class-rooms. They would then have a better knowledge of what was going on and they would be happier with the education of their children.

The other reason for complaint about standards is peer-group catalysm. If one child—adolescent, most probably—is racing ahead with his education and the others are hicks, drop-outs, louts, corner-stampers and other types that I shall not go on to name, there is in effect a heavy weight on the child who is racing ahead. There is now in our schools teaching to the mean rather than teaching to the top group. We do not now have an at-risk style of teaching, as there is a move to remedial teaching for every little thing that goes wrong. I fear that in this situation the average class-room teacher cannot keep up with this peer-group catalysm.

Another reason for complaint is the effect of television on children. People will say, "That's a load of polly-waffle. Things were different 35 years ago. We sat round the

piano then and played and sang songs." Indeed things were different in those days. Now we have non-participatory leisure and children are used to being fed dialogue. They are not used to participating in dialogue. I think that that has had a great affect on education standards.

A lot of people cannot keep up with many of the innovations in education. But I must say that I have been extremely thrilled to teach in Queensland. One sees a child come to school in grade I with very raw knowledge indeed. In three or four weeks that child can read basic words and this is a delight to see. A lot of the people who rubbish the standard of education ought to realise that we are moving ahead in leaps and bounds. They ought to question whether it is they who are not keeping up. I support the motion because I believe that not only is it going to have a mollifying effect on a lot of the chronic complainers in society—they have their place although I will not say where that is—but also that a lot of people have a lot of good information to put before the committee. I hope that a lot of members of Parliament will, and I certainly shall myself.

**Mr. AHERN** (Landsborough) (11.41 p.m.), in reply: I want to briefly thank honourable members who have participated in the debate for their general message of goodwill and I also want to thank those honourable members on both sides of the House who refrained from speaking tonight in order that the motion might pass through the House. This is important from the point of view that the committee is anxious that the advertisements calling for submissions be placed in the newspapers as early as possible.

There are a couple of points I would like to make quickly. One is that most of the debate today has been directed towards Government decisions on education. I am anxious that from here on in their discussions of the subject honourable members segregate Government decisions from the parliamentary committee's work. It is important that that happen. The Government is not in any way trammelled by the appointment of this committee. It can proceed with decisions on any matter it so desires, and that is proper, but Government decisions and the conduct of the parliamentary inquiry are two completely separate issues. Government spokesmen will be commenting on the remarks made in the debate today concerning Government decisions, and honourable members and members of the public can make submissions to the committee.

I would again like to go briefly over the question of Crown privilege, which was raised in the debate. It was suggested that there was something sinister about its insertion in the motion. I would ask honourable members to look at other motions moved in

the past, particularly those relating to the Committee on Punishment of Crimes of Violence and the Committees of Privilege and Subordinate Legislation, and they will see that exactly the same term was used in those motions. It has worked well and there is no problem with it. It was not inserted at the request of the Government but by me, the Parliamentary Counsel and the Crown Law officers who were simply drafting the form of the motion. The Premier put it up to Cabinet. It is in the same form as previous motions and that is why it is there. There is no special significance to be attached to it.

A couple of honourable members have regretted the fact that the Queensland Teachers' Union and teachers are not well represented on the inquiry. I would remind honourable members that one member of the panel is a member of the Queensland Teachers' Union and that three members of the panel are teachers or former teachers. One member of the committee itself is a teacher.

I think the honourable member for Rockhampton said that the committee would be reporting at the conclusion of the inquiry. To set the record straight in that regard, I draw his attention to Standing Order 205, which provides that progress reports may be made from time to time, and it is possible that this will happen.

**Mr. Wright:** As long as you are not pushed into finishing it.

**Mr. AHERN:** There have been time limits placed on other committees appointed by the House, but there are none in this motion.

Some honourable members have referred to the need for confidentiality of some submissions that are made. In this respect I want to remind honourable members that evidence given before a select committee of the Parliament is privileged information. Should anybody misuse that information or use it to intimidate a particular person, he would be in contempt of the Parliament itself. The procedures and history of this particular matter are well documented in the literature, and that certainly is not going to happen. If any information given in confidence to the committee were divulged by a member of the committee, that also would constitute contempt of the Parliament itself. So, on top of those procedures which are well settled, I give my personal assurance that if anybody wishes to come before the committee and give confidential information, that information will not be divulged. It has not been suggested that it would be used by a member of the Government, and I cannot imagine that happening. I think honourable members opposite are dreaming. But in case somebody is nervous about it, I point out that that is the settled position and people can be confident about it.

Much of the criticism directed at the inquiry tonight has been quibbling. Most members have hailed the appointment of a Select Committee on Education and expressed

goodwill towards the committee, and I say on behalf of the members of the committee that we appreciate that.

In conclusion, I offer my thanks to the Minister for Education and his officers, who already have given the committee excellent co-operation. The Minister's officers are involved in a difficult area, but already the committee has had lunch with the Director-General and his departmental heads and the very first information that will come to the committee—and this is properly so—will be information and position papers presented by the departmental heads themselves. The Minister, the Director-General and his officers have offered full co-operation, and I think that should be greatly appreciated by all honourable members.

The Select Committee on Education now goes to its task, and I invite the co-operation and submissions of honourable members so that the inquiry will be worth while.

Motion (Mr. Ahern) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.48 p.m.