

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 2 MARCH 1982

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUEENSLAND



Parliamentary Debates

[HANSARD]

Legislative Assembly

FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT—continued
(Third Period)

TUESDAY, 2 MARCH 1982

Under the provisions of the motion for special adjournment agreed to by the House on 2 December 1981, the House met at 11 a.m.

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. S. J. Muller, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr Speaker:—

- James Cook University of North Queensland and Townsville College of Advanced Education Amalgamation Bill;
- State Transport Acts Amendment Bill;
- Queensland Film Industry Development Act Amendment Bill;
- River Improvement Trust Act Amendment Bill;
- Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Act Amendment Bill;
- Brisbane and Area Water Board Act Amendment Bill (No. 2);
- Fisheries Act Amendment Bill;
- Industrial Development Act Amendment Bill;
- Coal Mining Act Amendment Bill;
- Queensland Place Names Bill;
- Stamp Act Amendment Bill (No. 2);
- Police (Photographs) Act Amendment Bill;
- Local Government (Queen Street Mall) Bill;
- Local Government Act and Another Act Amendment Bill;
- Local Government (Aboriginal Lands) Act Amendment Bill;
- Land Tax Act Amendment Bill;
- Gas Act Amendment Bill (No. 2);
- Driving Training Centre Bill;
- Companies (Administration) Bill;
- Companies (Application of Laws) Bill;

Companies (Consequential Amendments) Bill;
 Commonwealth Games Holiday Bill;
 Coal and Oil Shale Mine Workers (Pensions) Act Amendment Bill;
 Art Unions and Amusements Act Amendment Bill;
 Alfred Grant Pty. Ltd. and Other Companies (Distribution of Trust Moneys) Act
 Amendment Bill;
 Animals Protection Act Amendment Bill.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Tabling of Documents Relating to Casino Licences, Police and Prisons

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (11.6 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Rockhampton, the honourable member for Woodridge, the honourable member for Archerfield, the honourable member for Callide or any other member laying on the table of this House documents, statutory declarations or other proof that they claim to hold in relation to their allegations, innuendoes and smears regarding casinos, police, gaols or any other matter.”

In short, on behalf of the Government I am throwing out a direct challenge to the abovementioned members to put up or shut up, as we say in everyday language. This is their chance to save what is left of their credibility.

Last month the member for Rockhampton, Mr Wright, ran around proclaiming that he had documentary proof of illegal activities on the Gold Coast. I say to him, “There is the table right in front of you. Let us see the documents. Place them on the table.”

The member for Archerfield, whose credibility is generally nil at any time, said that he had documentary proof that Queensland’s gaols were “hell holes”. He told “State Affair” on Channel 7 that he would personally supply evidence to the Minister for Police. I say to the honourable member for Archerfield, “There is the table. Place your evidence and documents on the table.”

The honourable member for Callide claimed that he would prove allegations of a multimillion-dollar bribe over casinos. I say to Mr Hartwig, “There is the table. Let us see your documentary proof. Let us see your evidence.” Talk is cheap.

The member for Woodridge joined the chorus with his quota of smears and allegations. I say to him also, “There’s the table of the House. You have the opportunity to lay your evidence on the table.”

Finally, to the “temporary” Leader of the Opposition, who has been most vocal with his allegations and charges, I say, “I give you the same challenge and the same opportunity.”

I will watch those members with a great deal of interest, to see whether they accept my challenge. They are in Parliament; they are completely protected by parliamentary privilege. Hansard waits to record their documentary proof. If they do not present it or ask to table it, I myself will move that every document that they claim to have in relation to these matters be recorded in “Hansard”. I say to those honourable members, “You have made the charges. Now it is up to you to back them up.” It is no good their saying, “I heard” or “I think” or “Somebody told me” or “I read in the Press” or “It is reported”. That just doesn’t cut ice with me. I am lining them up before the public of Queensland to produce their evidence and to perform as they have been performing for the media in saying that they have concrete evidence. They should produce that evidence now. They can present it in this Chamber under parliamentary privilege, which gives them complete immunity from any legal action.

The people of Queensland are absolutely tired of the smear tactics adopted by Opposition members to grab headlines. They make sensational allegations but fail to produce the documents or the evidence to support them.

Today is their D-Day. Today, all business of the House is being suspended so that those honourable members have an opportunity to provide the documents and the evidence that they have been using. They have simply sought to grab headlines for political purposes. That is all they have sought to do. They have engaged in grandstanding to gain some political capital. Unfortunately, the media often publish the allegations and accusations of Opposition members without checking whether they are correct.

In moving this motion, I am saving honourable members the trouble of wasting the time of the House in moving censure motions. On this occasion I am trying to roll everything into one. I am giving them a full opportunity, without their going through all the usual procedures.

I have always been interested in comparing what the ALP says with what it does, because they are always so wide apart. For example, we never hear the Leader of the Opposition talking about the socialist Left, despite the socialist Left's having him and six other Opposition members marked for oblivion. They will be plebiscited out of this Parliament by next year. They know who I mean. Their crime is that they do not toe the extremist line sufficiently well, even though they try hard to go with the socialists, to support them and to back and further their objectives. As honourable members know, they are the Communists who are tied up with the Labor Party.

I shall now compare Labor's policies with its record. In New South Wales, there is documentary evidence of a connection between the Labor Government and organised crime. That is being revealed every day. For all the years that I have been in Parliament, the Labor Party has been mixed up with and has operated in that area. In New South Wales, there have been inquiries into land scandals, tobacco scandals, the Redcliff scandal and the local authority scandal. You name it, Mr Speaker, and the Labor Party has been involved in it. It is involved in the revelations that are coming out in the present Victorian inquiry. Organisations in New South Wales have been swindling the Government. They are the organisations that support and back the Labor Party; they are the organisations that the Labor Party backs. It is amazing that everyone else in New South Wales except Mr Wran can find where the casinos are operating.

The Government has not found similar operations in Queensland. If we had, as has been suggested by the honourable member without producing concrete proof, we would have taken action. The most interesting aspect of why Mr Wran's Government does not move to establish a legal casino in New South Wales is the rake-off that the Labor Party gets from the illegal casinos in that State. It makes one very suspicious indeed.

The Government has been criticised for the delay in announcing the successful applicant for the Gold Coast casino. Dr Edwards and his committee have taken every precaution and have moved gradually from point to point to make sure that the Queensland Government gets the very best casino in the interests of this State. I compliment them on their work and their efforts. We will not be rushed into making a decision simply because Opposition members say it is time that the Government announced the successful tenderer.

Today the Labor Party and the honourable member for Callide, who have been so freely and happily trotting around the State making accusation after accusation, have the opportunity to present their evidence. Let us see how they perform. It will be a most interesting exercise. I believe that at the conclusion of this debate they will stand condemned, as they ought to be, because they have no proof of the existence of any crimes such as the bribing of police and all the rest that they have tried to imply has occurred. I assure honourable members opposite that when any decision in relation to a casino is reached it will be made in the best interests of Queensland.

In summary, through this motion the Government has issued a challenge and given the Opposition the opportunity to substantiate its allegations on a range of matters that have been raised during the recess. Opposition members have the opportunity to substantiate the statements and accusations they have made. The people of Queensland want to see the proof; I and my colleagues on this side of the House want to see the proof! We know that there is no proof. We know that Opposition members cannot produce any evidence to give substance to their allegations.

I lay down the challenge to honourable members opposite so that the people of Queensland may know exactly the type of people Opposition members are and the way they operate in an attempt to try to gain some cheap political kudos.

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.16 a.m.): I whole-heartedly support the motion moved by the Premier, and I second it in the sincere hope that it will allow all honourable members to provide information that they say they have in relation to matters that have been the subject of innuendo and unfounded inference over the past few months.

When we embarked on the casino selection process it was decided to keep the public and the Opposition informed of developments on a factual basis. That was successful, but, unfortunately, over the past few weeks, for reasons unknown to most Queenslanders, the entire issue—along with other issues—has been clouded by widespread speculation based on rumours, guesswork, unfounded forecasts and leaked documents. The Opposition, as well as the Independent member for Callide, have made allegations on a wide range of matters concerning this and other issues, as has been indicated by the Premier.

The honourable member for Woodridge has even overshadowed his leader—that would not be too hard—by jumping on any titbit of speculation and attempting to build his own image through the media. As well as allegations—none of them proven—by other Labor members, including the honourable member for Rockhampton, the Independent member for Callide has gamely proclaimed recently that he would expose in this House corruption scandals over many issues.

Now is the opportunity for all members to either provide this information or take the consequences. They now have the opportunity under parliamentary privilege to make their allegations, produce their evidence and table documents without fear of legal action. As the Premier has indicated, this Government is committed to investigate such accusations, should they be expressed. I therefore urge members to ensure that in the future the standard of parliamentary debate remains high.

As far as the Government is concerned, we guarantee that all substantiated claims—if there are any, and I do not believe there will be—will be treated seriously, and if any evidence of malpractice is produced then it will be followed up. But if all Opposition members can produce is unsubstantiated innuendo and rumour based on what might happen or what they think could happen then they will stand condemned by the people of Queensland for their baseless allegations.

The people of Queensland demand, as they are entitled to, the utmost integrity and openness in government, and that is what this Government stands for. I repeat that this Government has committed itself to integrity and openness in government, and I will not sacrifice that integrity in relation to any matter that comes under my administration.

Mr D'Arcy: You haven't got any left to sacrifice.

Dr EDWARDS: We will wait and see, because there is certainly a lot to be suspicious about in some of the statements made by honourable members opposite.

This debate will give some Government members the opportunity to present some of the facts in our possession which could cause great embarrassment to some people. Therefore, an opportunity for debate is being given so that integrity and openness can be displayed.

As I said earlier, the casino issue that the Premier mentioned has been clouded lately by a great many unfounded allegations. From the way in which members of the Opposition and others have been acting, it would almost seem that they would like a decision based on political influence. I assure this Parliament that that will not occur. The decision on the North Queensland casino was based on merit, and I defy anyone to prove otherwise.

Mr Vaughan: It was predictable.

Dr EDWARDS: The decision was based on merit. It is wrong to base a decision on merit?

The decision on the South Queensland casino will also be based on merit, and I stake my reputation and integrity on that. A decision by any other means would not be acceptable to me, and I make that pledge to this Parliament.

Opposition members have made allegations that they now have an opportunity to substantiate. The credibility of Opposition members is now at stake, and they will have ample time to attempt to prove their bona fides. I look forward to hearing their comments.

As the Minister responsible for introducing into this House legislation relative to casinos, I assure the public that any allegation in relation to this issue has not caused the assessment program or the evaluation procedure to deviate from its proper course. On Thursday, I will chair an interdepartmental committee, comprising professional officers from various Government departments, to clarify certain aspects relating to the three final proposals. The material that will be presented to us will provide the basis for our decision. The committee will have information and it will be able to make a definite recommendation to Cabinet. The decision will be made by Cabinet and it will be made on merit, and if one can interpret the innuendoes being made in the newspapers by Opposition members, that is what Queenslanders and the Press are saying.

The assessment program is proceeding exactly as was planned from the beginning. The Government has not deviated from that course, and it will not do so. As I have said, the decision will be made on merit.

Mr Warburton interjected.

Dr EDWARDS: I am sure that the member for Sandgate will accept my recommendation in that regard.

Mr Warburton: Not really.

Dr EDWARDS: I would have thought that the honourable member would have done so.

In closing, I again call on the Opposition or any member of the House to produce the information that they claim to have to substantiate any allegations that they wish to raise in this Parliament. Any member who brings scuttle-butt into the House without substantiation deserves to be censured and condemned by this Parliament. The facts can now be put before the Parliament. If Opposition members are prepared to continue rumour-mongering and to give information not based on fact, they will be censured and condemned by the House, and I shall support such an action. If substantial evidence is forthcoming, I give a commitment that it will be investigated and acted upon.

I support the motion to give members an opportunity to substantiate any claims that they wish to make.

Mr CASEY (Mackay—Leader of the Opposition) (11.24 a.m.): This morning in the House we see the actions of a Government which, to use a good Australian expression, is on the nose. One could not use a better term to describe the Government. The Government is on the nose; there is a great smell round it at the moment. A smell of corruption is lying over the Queensland Government today. That is why the Premier and Deputy Premier have come into the Chamber on the first day of this important session and moved this motion, although the Business Paper contains many important pieces of legislation.

The Government has not been capable of making decisions on so many matters that effect the community. So what does it do? It reacts as it has done for so many years. It has said, "We are going to cop it. They will attack us. Let us go on the attack ourselves." I thank the Premier and Deputy Premier for moving and seconding the motion, because it gives the Australian Labor Party opposition the opportunity to mount the attack on the Government that it deserves. It gives the Opposition the opportunity to inform the people of Queensland of at least some of the many things that the Government has not carried out on their behalf. The Government's tactic will not work.

When the Premier rose to move the motion, he sang the same old song that I have heard him sing in the Parliament for about the last 13 years. If one goes through "Hansard" and reads his speeches since he entered this Chamber in 1947, one sees the same old song—that the Communist tiger, moving out of China, will take us over. If Queensland was not selling its wheat and sugar to Communist China at the moment, the rural sector of the State would be in a very bad position. But the Premier was the one who spoke about getting rid of the Socialist tiger. He continues with that same old song; but it has gone flat—almost as flat as the Premier is at the moment.

I do not know how the Government could be so stupid as to move such a motion at this stage. The Government is very vulnerable. It has lurched from mistake to mistake, it has tripped from bad decision to bad decision, and it has been in deep

water for some considerable time. It is in hot water, and it is struggling to stay together and alive. The granting of casino licences has brought the position to a head. We have seen Minister publicly attacking Minister in the Press, National Party members attacking National Party members and Liberals attacking Liberals. That has widened the division and the rift that already exists in the National/Liberal coalition.

This morning we have seen the Government act like a mad dog that is backed into a corner and does not know which way to go. All it can do is bark—or, in the case of the Premier, cough and splutter. That is all the Government has done in an effort to deceive once more the people of Queensland. It is, frightened, and it is trying desperately to hide from public gaze as many as possible of the matters in which it has been involved.

In April 1981 the Deputy Premier stated that the investigation into the casino applications would be open to public scrutiny. If there is to be any tabling of documents and if there is to be public scrutiny, let the Deputy Premier now table in the Parliament the final assessment of the interdepartmental committee, parts of which appeared in "The Courier-Mail" this morning, parts of which have appeared in other newspapers and parts of which the Deputy Premier, in the last few days, has publicly accused the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police of dishing out to the media. Let the Deputy Premier now table all of those documents in the Parliament so that the people of Queensland know exactly what is happening on this issue. The public wants to know who is telling the truth. Is it the Deputy Premier, or is it the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, who is now sitting in the Chamber quietly and serenely, which is a change for him? The people of Queensland should be able to decide where the truth lies through the Parliament, not through the secrecy of the Cabinet gang of 18 which tries to hide and cover up so many matters.

The Government has done that continually, and I could go on and on about many of them. Only yesterday it came forward trumpeting about what it would do for the Aboriginal and Islander people of the State. Nothing! That is what it has done for those people—absolutely nothing! All it has done is transfer the tenure from one type of reserve to a reserve of a different type. Instead of being under the control of the Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement it will be a reserve under the control of the Minister for Lands and Forestry, with the Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement Department still overseeing everything that happens on the reserve and everything that the black people of Queensland—Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders—do or say or want to do or want to say. Indeed, it will govern their whole future.

That is the sort of thing the Government is attempting to cover up through the motion it has moved in the Parliament. The Government should stand condemned, if for nothing else, for its treatment of Aboriginal and Islander people of this State. It stands condemned also for its treatment of all people in this State because of the great risk under which the Commonwealth Games is being placed—a sporting event that all Queenslanders are looking forward to and hoping to see comfortably, peacefully and quietly. If anybody has put the Games at risk, it is this Government by the way it has behaved and the type of legislation it intends bringing into the Parliament.

Look at the Government's industrial relations in the teachers' dispute. It is not an industrial dispute at all, as this Government is trying to make out. It is an endeavour by concerned groups in this State—groups that have received no satisfaction whatsoever from this Government—to ensure that their children, my children and the children of future generations are educated in adequate class-rooms with proper class sizes. It is no wonder the teachers of Queensland are jacking up and bailing up. Their action is a result of the Government's own report. It was not the Opposition's report; it was not the report of some outside body.

Dr Edwards: It was the Parliament.

Mr CASEY: It was a report formulated by this Parliament. The committee was controlled by the Government. It was chaired by a Minister of this Government and its report was brought back into the Parliament. Let me dwell on the interjection by the Treasurer. It was a parliamentary report. It was received and accepted by this Parliament,

and it is about damned time that he and the Government did something about implementing the recommendations contained in that report. That is just one example of the Government's industrial relations.

We know how the Premier has manipulated power disputes in this State. He will do it again this winter in an endeavour to keep industrial confrontation in the community instead of conciliation and co-operation for the betterment of all of the people of this State.

Let us look at the Iwasaki failure—another example of the type of legislation introduced by this Government. Iwasaki is the man for whom the Government pushed legislation through all stages in the Parliament right through one night, just because he was a friend of the Premier. What has happened? Absolutely nothing! The Treasurer, of course, was going to hold an inquiry into it, but didn't he back down as soon as the Premier blew into his ear-hole? He backed right down. He did a somersault because he knew, as I did, that all one had to do as an investigation was to go onto the Iwasaki site at Yeppoon with a copy of the agreement passed by this Parliament—I stress again for the benefit of the Treasurer that it was an agreement passed by this Parliament—when it would be obvious that Mr Iwasaki was not carrying out what he had agreed to do.

Take the man alongside the Treasurer—the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—and the amazing episode of the Chief Justiceship of this State of Queensland. That was a deplorable and degrading incident in the history of the judiciary of this State. It is one that will remain as a stinking, rotten smell, indicative of the way in which this Government has interfered so much and so often in the judiciary. It is something that will be felt for a long, long time. What happened when the Minister for Justice could not get his No. 1 man up? If the chosen horse doesn't win a race at least we like to see it run second. But what did the Minister for Justice do? He threw his choice to the wolves. He let him go. It was disgraceful conduct by the Minister, aided and abetted by his Liberal colleagues in the Parliament. The attitude of the National Party in that incident was absolutely deplorable, and was deplored by people throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. In my opinion the worst episode of that whole Chief Justiceship issue was the effort made by the Deputy Premier of this State to have the Governor of Queensland be the arbitrator between the National Party and the Liberal Party in the blue they were having on the matter. Shame upon the Treasurer for attempting to involve His Excellency the Governor in that way!

I refer now to the way in which the Premier's legal costs in the Sinclair affair were covered by Cabinet. The Premier deliberately defamed Mr Sinclair. Instead of accepting the punishment he received, the Premier has continued the litigation. He does not have the responsibility to accept the punishment for his actions. His financial obligations have been accepted by the Government. I warn the Parliament that the matter should be finalised before the Opposition takes office, because it will not pick up the Premier's bill.

Recently a distasteful episode occurred following a tragic accident at Mt Coot-tha. The Commissioner of Police and his officers dilly-dallied for days and days over the issue. The matter has passed through the Crown Law Office and there has been supposition as to what the decision of some coronial inquiry may be. That occurred since the Parliament adjourned in December.

The Premier has the hide to talk about a few isolated instances. Those members of the Opposition, who have indicated that they will tender documents, will certainly do so. By the time those documents reach the table, the Premier will be sorry that he has challenged those members of the Opposition to whom he has referred.

What has happened outside Queensland during the last few months? Queenslanders are finding it more difficult to purchase a house. What concern has the Government shown about interest rates? What positive action has it taken? It has stood on its old bandwagon and said that it has referred the matter to Malcolm Fraser. The Cabinet wishes to rush off and dine with him today. While in the public gaze those Ministers will say that they do not agree with Malcolm Fraser's policies because they are detrimental to Queensland. The Government has taken no positive action to alleviate the problems that do exist.

Mr Bertoni: Is this your farewell speech?

Mr CASEY: I would be very careful if I were the member for Mt Isa. I recently visited Mt Isa, and the people there are interested to know how the member for Mt Isa absconded from that city, and particularly with whom he absconded.

The Parliament should be discussing the interest rate problem. Interest rates are punishing home buyers in this State. That problem has not been relieved as a result of the schemes that have been undertaken—

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I make specific reference to members on the Government side. I warn the member for Toowoomba South under Standing Order 123A.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member for Toowoomba South does not contribute very much to the Parliament. That is probably the only way in which his name will appear in the newspaper.

The people of Queensland wish to know why it is possible for the New South Wales Government to bring forward a scheme to help first-home buyers. The Liberal Government in Victoria can bring forward a scheme in a different manner and help the home buyers in that State. The National-Liberal Party coalition Government in Queensland cannot initiate such a scheme.

I have already mentioned school class sizes. Despite the comments made publicly by the Premier and his deputy about the increase in the number of schoolteachers in Queensland, all that has really happened is that there has been a catch-up of the backlash of the last two years. There are no additional teachers in class-rooms. A visit to the class-rooms and a discussion with the teachers will reveal that in some classes teachers are trying to teach 35 to 40 students. They have been doing that for so long that they are sick of it. What does the Minister for Education say about it? What is he going to do about it? Is he prepared to sit down with the teachers, the parents and citizens associations or the parents themselves? No. He simply sits back on his butt and says, "We have made the decision."

There are so many other matters that the Opposition could speak about today. For example, we could discuss the high cost of living in country areas. If Liberal and National Party Ministers spent more time in the country areas of the State they would realise that conditions are very tough and hard there and also in the provincial cities. The people are struggling. They are faced with a cost of living that is even higher than that in the metropolitan area. Yet the Government does nothing about that state of affairs.

Evidence of all these situations is there, yet the Government is trying to duck it by moving this mangle little motion today. Those situations confronting the people of Queensland are the ones about which they are deeply concerned.

Look at the latest gerrymander, that of local government boundaries. Not one of the four major provincial cities involved—Townsville, Rockhampton, Toowoomba or Maryborough—sought the ward system. I make it quite clear: the Labor Party has no objection to the ward system. What we say is that it is the local authorities that have the right to decide whether or not they want a ward system. That right should not be given to some Minister who sits on his backside down here in George Street or on the Gold Coast. He does not have the right to impose the system upon local authorities that do not want it. It is for the local people in the cities involved to decide what they want.

That and a host of other matters are the ones that we should be discussing today. They are the ones that we could be talking about today; yet they are the ones that the Government is running away from by moving this mangle little motion in this Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the honourable member for Woodridge.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: Mr Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has not tabled any documents or produced any evidence to support his statements. To give him an opportunity to do so, I move—

"That the Leader of the Opposition be granted an extension of time."

Mr CASEY: The Premier may move that motion if he desires. However, I should like the Premier to point to any occasion on which I said I would table documents in the Parliament. I accept the extension of time moved by the Premier, and I say this: one of the tragedies in Queensland over recent years is that the State has been led by a man who is deliberately untruthful and who deliberately endeavours to deceive the public on all occasions that he possibly can.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. In saying that I am untruthful, the Leader of the Opposition is being unfair. I ask him to withdraw the statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The statement made by the Leader of the Opposition does not conform to the standards that should be maintained in any Parliament within the Commonwealth. On previous occasions I have referred honourable members to Standing Orders 119 and 120. In the past, because I believed that members on both sides of the House committed misdemeanours, I did not enforce the provisions of those Standing Orders. However, the present situation is getting out of hand, so, for the information of honourable members who have not recently read Standing Orders 119 and 120, I shall quote from Standing Order 119. It says—

“A Member shall not use unbecoming or offensive words in reference to another Member of the House.”

In this instance my judgment tells me very clearly that the reference made a few moments ago to the Premier was unparliamentary and offensive. Consequently, I shall ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that comment. Before I do so, I suggest that honourable members, in their own good time, read the provisions of Standing Order 120. I now ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the statement.

Mr CASEY: Mr Speaker, I accept your authority and your ruling. I will withdraw the word if you feel or if the Premier feels that it is unparliamentary. However, how can one member state that another is telling untruths in this Parliament if he is not allowed to say the other member is lying or is telling a deliberate untruth?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have asked for a withdrawal. Is the Leader of the Opposition withdrawing the statement, or is he not? I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

Mr CASEY: I make an unqualified withdrawal.

Mr Turner: You could say they misrepresented the facts.

Mr CASEY: I will say that.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Is the Leader of the Opposition withdrawing the statement?

Mr CASEY: Yes. I said I would do that. I will use the term used by the honourable member for Warrego. In saying that I should be tabling documents, the Premier is engaging in misrepresentation. As I said earlier, never in recent months or in recent years have I stated that I had documents in my possession that I would table. I have made accusations, I have repeated them today, and I will continue to make them for as long as Queensland has a Premier who is so personally greedy, selfish, and insensitive to the wants, needs and wishes of the people of this State.

Mr D'ARCY (Woodridge) (11.46 a.m.): I am pleased to have this opportunity to state the Opposition's case against the Government. I believe that I will prove conclusively that deception has been engaged in by various members of Cabinet as well as by the Government.

Mr Lester interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: The point is that the honourable member for Peak Downs has not been briefed or told what is going on. All that he knows about it is what he has read in the Press. The Press and the public believe that the Government has misrepresented the position in this instance.

There is little doubt that, originally, the people believed that at last there would be an honest decision, free of the problems previously faced by the Government in the making of arbitrary decisions in the casino issue. The people of Queensland are completely sick of decisions such as those on Tarong, the Chief Justice and Winchester South—decisions of the type that the Treasurer (Dr Edwards) said would not be made again. In the arbitrary decisions made by Country-Liberal Governments during the past decade—certainly in the past two years—there has been a deterioration in the standard of decision-making, and the Government has descended to the lowest possible level.

It was understandable that a meritorious decision might have been made relative to the casino applications. It was probably with that in mind that Dr Edwards put the integrity of himself and his party on the line. The people must be surprised at the thundering silence of Liberal Party back-benchers while discussions in Cabinet and in the media have been continuing.

I do not believe that even Cabinet was given full information on this matter. If it had been, a decision would have been forced at the meetings on either 16 or 23 February. I asked the Premier and Dr Edwards, prior to 23 February, whether a decision would be made. Both of them told me that they believed one would be. In fact, the Deputy Premier told me that a decision would certainly be reached.

Dr Edwards: A decision was reached.

Mr D'ARCY: If the Deputy Premier will be patient, I will outline my case.

Mr Sullivan: You are mumbling and no-one can understand you.

Mr D'ARCY: The Minister should keep quiet. I am sure that, before this matter is completed, he will have plenty of explaining to do about some of his friends. I think that he is a red herring.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr D'ARCY: I want to keep to the facts. Let us suppose that Dr Edwards believed that he would get an honest, straightforward decision. If this is to be the main area of debate, I am surprised that Dr Edwards's public servants are not here to back him up. They do not want to back him up. They realise that he has let them down.

A decision was to be made in September last year. It was considered to be all right for the Opposition members to speak with the public servants involved. We did not press the public servants in any way. The information that we received about the casino applications was genuine. As the chairman of the Opposition's casino committee—the honourable members for Sandgate and Port Curtis are the other members—I kept out of the Press. That, of course, was supposedly the original committee. We did not chop and change as the Government evidently did.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has made an allegation that the composition of the casino committee differed on a number of occasions. The reason why the Minister for Commerce and Industry attended meetings on two occasions was that the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts was absent in the country and unable to attend.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to accept that statement.

Mr D'ARCY: That statement has cleared up some points that we had intended to raise during question-time. It is good to hear that the Deputy Premier and Treasurer is sensitive about the membership of his committee, because he did not know what it was. On more than one occasion he told the media that he did not know—

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. The statement by the honourable member for Woodridge is not correct in any form whatsoever. I have at all times made it clear that the membership of the committee was I as Treasurer, the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police and the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts, but the Minister for Commerce and Industry attended two meetings because the Minister for Tourism was unable to attend.

Mr D'ARCY: I am very pleased that the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts appointed a proxy. It clears up the position of the Minister for Commerce and Industry, because nobody seemed to know exactly what position he was in. It is pleasing to know that he was just a proxy.

Mr Sullivan: I know what my position is.

Mr D'ARCY: At least the Minister has found it at last.

To return to the matter at hand, the situation was that at the time when the Government called applications it laid down no guide-lines whatsoever, and that was the only time we really criticised the Government. The lack of guide-lines was unacceptable. This was the major topic of conversation when my committee first met the Treasury committee. The matter of guide-lines was discussed in great detail, and we as an Opposition accepted that the guide-lines that the Treasury committee had formulated for the applicants were reasonable. At that time we were told that discussions would take place throughout the application period until a decision was finally made.

During that period the Treasury committee, led by Mr Hielscher, obtained background information from around the world regarding the credibility of various groups running casinos, and it came up with what it believed to be acceptable guide-lines relating to corporate structures, buildings, tourism opportunities and, more importantly, the safety of shares held by the public and other matters relating to the moral aspects of any casino operation. So we were reasonably satisfied that the casino committee and the Treasury committee were doing their jobs.

As I said, decision-time was coming closer. The Government had promised an announcement in mid-February, and then an announcement was made that a decision would be made on 16 February. That decision had not been made by 23 February. On 22 February, my committee again met with the Treasury committee. At that meeting it was indicated that there might be a delay. We were interested in clearing up a considerable number of points. Government members should listen carefully to what I am about to say, particularly those back-bench Liberals and Cabinet members who do not know the situation. All the points that have been raised by members about casino operations since that meeting had already been discussed with the applicants in great detail. They had obtained all the necessary background information. In fact, quite a few matters were changed with the applicants so that a final decision could be made.

Mr Simpson: How do you know?

Mr D'ARCY: Because we were told by Mr Hielscher and the other members of the committee, and that was not a breach of their Public Service oaths. The casino committee report was in the hands of Cabinet. It lay on the table.

Dr Edwards interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: Oh, Dr Edwards! Either the Treasurer is lying or they are lying.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I find those statements offensive, and I ask that they be withdrawn. I will then explain the situation.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Woodridge has been requested to withdraw his statement, and I suggest that he does so.

Mr D'ARCY: Mr Speaker, with all due respect, I cannot possibly withdraw the statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am not interested in the honourable member's "due" respects or any other respects that he may have in his mind. I have asked for an unqualified withdrawal of his comment. Is he prepared to do that?

Mr D'ARCY: Is it offensive to the Minister?

Mr SPEAKER: It is; he said so.

Mr D'ARCY: He did not say so.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member under the provisions of Standing Order 123A. He will either withdraw the comment or not proceed.

Mr D'ARCY: I withdraw the comment, but what I am saying is that the document—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have heard what the honourable member has said.

Mr D'ARCY: The document, which was the final assessment to Cabinet, was a printed document. It had been finalised at that time.

Dr Edwards: That is not what you said. You said that it was laid on the Cabinet table.

Mr D'ARCY: No. It was laid on the table—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Does the Treasurer wish to make a comment?

Dr EDWARDS: The point that I wish to make is that the honourable member said that the document was laid on the table of Cabinet. Then he said that either I was lying or the officers of my department were lying. I took offence at that statement on behalf of my officers and myself because the document had not been placed on the table of Cabinet.

Mr D'ARCY: I do not know what table it was placed on. It was certainly placed in front of us. I saw the document.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. That is not correct. The honourable member was not shown the details of that document.

Mr D'ARCY: I did not say that.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is a lot of nonsense going on now. An explanation has been made by the Treasurer. The honourable member for Woodridge either accepts it or rejects it. That is the option open to him. A few moments ago I gave him the opportunity to either accept the explanation given by the Treasurer and withdraw his comment or leave the Chamber. There is no need for further debate on this matter.

Mr D'ARCY: I withdraw the statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Then proceed. The matter is closed.

Mr D'ARCY: It is not closed in that we are talking about a particular document, which was a final assessment document arrived at by the Treasury officials. It was handed to the Treasurer and several other Ministers on that committee. It was taken by the Treasurer to Cabinet on 23 February of this year. Does the Treasurer accept that?

Dr Edwards: What?

Mr D'ARCY: He denied that a minute ago. I had to get that point clear to prove the rest of my argument.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. To clarify the point about the document to which the honourable member is referring going to Cabinet—it is true that I had my copy and the Premier had his copy at the Cabinet meeting. Indeed, we outlined the contents of the document relative to the casino in North Queensland. That was disclosed very fully to the other Cabinet Ministers.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Woodridge.

Mr D'ARCY: The point I made was that the document was a printed document. It was a final document. The committee made it clear to us that it had fully assessed the matter, finished its work and expected a decision from Cabinet. This is where the whole tale hangs. A decision was not made by Cabinet. I have documents that prove beyond all doubt that all the assessments were carried out by the Treasury committee. Those assessments were acceptable to us and, up to that point, must have been acceptable to the Treasurer's committee.

Dr EDWARDS: I move—

“That those documents be tabled.”

Mr SPEAKER: Is the member for Woodridge prepared to table the documents?

Mr D'ARCY: Yes, I am prepared to table them at the end of my speech. I wish to go into them in some detail.

The member for Sandgate (Mr Warburton) was present. One of the things explained to us by Treasury officials was the corporate structure. After a Cabinet meeting, however, the Premier said that one of the reasons why a decision had not been reached was that the corporate structure had not been agreed to.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr D'ARCY: It is all very well for the Premier to deny that, but it is in print.

The facts are that the Treasury committee set certain guide-lines and asked the companies to submit their corporate structures. The Treasury officials gave us the accepted guide-lines on that corporate structure. At precisely the same time on virtually the same guide-lines the application for the North Queensland casino was accepted.

Dr Edwards: That is not correct.

Mr D'ARCY: It is not worth arguing with the Deputy Premier. I ask him to listen to my argument. He can then try to refute it.

Obviously the Premier and the rest of the Cabinet were not fully briefed by the Deputy Premier on the ramifications of the document because, at the time the Treasury made a final assessment, the Deputy Premier said there was no preferred applicant. That is not what we were told by the Treasury.

Dr Edwards: That is not correct.

Mr D'ARCY: Everyone other than the Deputy Premier seems to know that there was a preferred applicant.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I was given a full brief by the officers concerned. I am absolutely amazed that the Opposition, which had the advantage of being briefed by officers of the Treasury for the first time in the history of this Parliament, has now chosen to break that confidence. The practice that I adopted is followed at the Federal level. I did the right thing. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has abused a privilege that will never again be offered under any administration of mine.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Dr EDWARDS: My point of order is that reflections were cast on officers of the department. At no place in the brief that officers returned to me were the merits of an application mentioned, nor was a recommendation made by them.

Mr D'ARCY: Because the Opposition did not wish to indulge in playing politics at any stage it did not ask about the merits of any application. Because the Government played politics and did not make a decision, this motion is before the Parliament and the Government is defending itself.

The next part of the document is vital. It either makes a fool of the Cabinet or proves that it was involved in the deception of the public of Queensland. If the Deputy Premier cannot glean from the report a preferred application, that is his problem. The Treasury committee recommended to the Cabinet that applications 1 and 2 should not be dismissed. In other words, although the final decision had been made it would leave the Cabinet and the committee in a position to negotiate on finer points, if there were any.

Dr Edwards: Clarification.

Mr D'ARCY: Why is the decision being held up? Why is the clarification occurring with the three applicants? The Opposition knows that it is a political decision. The Deputy Premier is well aware of that.

It is a shame that this Parliament has fallen into disrepute because of the Cabinet and the Government of the State. Deception was practised by the Cabinet, as was evidenced in the two Press conferences held after a decision was not made by Cabinet. The Treasurer and the Premier made totally conflicting statements. The Treasurer said that there would be no re-evaluation of the assessments. The Premier virtually said, "We might have a new site. There will be a total re-evaluation. They can all start from scratch and go back to the drawing-board."

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You have no need to worry. It will work out correctly.

Mr D'ARCY: The point is that the Cabinet had that recommendation from Treasury officials. The Premier was playing politics.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order to preserve the integrity of this debate. I am sick and tired of it. On no occasion—and when I table the documents in the House that will be proven—is a recommendation made in the report.

Mr D'ARCY: I am pleased to hear the Deputy Premier say that he will table the final assessment documents.

Mr Moore: He has said it a hundred times before.

Mr D'ARCY: He has not. He has qualified it with the statement that Cabinet would release them. It is obvious that the political furore that has surrounded this matter is forcing the Cabinet to make an honest decision. I am glad we are able to make honest men out of the Cabinet Ministers of this State. That is what it boils down to.

Mr Prest: They are getting new documents printed.

Mr D'ARCY: The fact of life is——

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. The statement by the member for Port Curtis reflects upon my character and I ask him to withdraw it immediately.

Mr Prest: Why don't you table the report that you have now?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Curtis will be silent. I take the point of order made by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and ask for an unqualified withdrawal of the member's comment.

Mr Frawley: He should apologise, too.

Mr SPEAKER: I am not interested in apologies. I am interested in a withdrawal. I ask the member for Woodridge to withdraw the comment.

Dr EDWARDS: I was referring to the member for Port Curtis. I take strong exception to his reflection and ask that he withdraw it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Port Curtis to withdraw his comment.

Mr Prest: I will withdraw those remarks. I will speak later.

Mr D'ARCY: I am a little concerned that this debate is becoming more and more of a circus, thanks to the Government.

Dr Edwards: Give us the facts.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Bring some facts.

Mr D'ARCY: I am bringing facts, and the Premier knows it. That is why there is such silence on the Government benches. The Treasurer is trying to defend his own position because his integrity is in tatters as a decision has not been made. He knows that. He has let down the Treasury officials. It is simply a political decision. Whether he believes it or not, that is what the people of Queensland feel. That is why the Government has taken this action in the Parliament today.

The cartoonists are the best political judges in this State. What do they say? Do they trust the decisions made to date? No. They know very well why decisions were not made. If one wants to trace the politics of this matter, all one has to do is follow its history through the newspapers. Look at the headlines from all over the State. They have not appeared in the last five minutes. The Deputy Premier said that the Minister for Local Government was an embarrassment to him and to the Government because of his predictions about the casino.

Mr Hinze: My mother used to say that, too.

Mr D'ARCY: Llew is saying it now. I hope he is not a mother figure.

The Government has received tremendous criticism over this matter. What has happened has not been necessary. The Treasurer spoke about the public servants in this State who have been on the committee. I have no complaint—nor has any member of the Opposition—about the reputation of any of those public servants. In fact, we could not have been more impressed. I wonder why the Cabinet of this State was not impressed. Were those public servants not fully briefed? Were they involved in the political decision that was being reached or connived at? We have to look behind this decision. Prior to a decision's being reached, Sir Roderick Proctor stated outright that he was concerned that a political decision, not a meritorious one, would be reached. We in Queensland have to be concerned about these political, arbitrary decisions. The State is sick of them. I might have said to the Premier privately that this should not occur in this State. His Government is misreading the mood of the Queensland people. Circumstances have changed. The Government cannot get away with the Tarongs and the Winchesters any longer, because, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, the people of Queensland are in different economic straits, brought on by the Premier and Fraser. They are looking for somebody to blame. They know that the Queensland Government is corrupt and they are prepared to blame the Government on this issue.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: This morning the honourable member for Woodridge was given an opportunity to produce evidence of corruption. He has presented no evidence of it. I ask him to withdraw that statement. I will not accept that statement, because it is completely untrue.

Mr D'ARCY: I withdraw the word "corruption".

The Opposition has highlighted the Government's lack of integrity. It appears that the only integrity that the Government has is that if it is bought, it generally stays bought. Obviously that is not the case in this instance, because the Parliament has been shocked by one institution in Queensland, if it can be called an institution. The Bjelke-Petersen Foundation has been a background to a political plunder of one type or another. It is an institutionalisation of the political pay-off system. It casts a pale over this Parliament.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member referred to a "plunder". Nobody is forced to make a donation to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation.

Mr D'ARCY: That foundation or institutionalisation has cast a pale over the decision-making of the Parliament. I personally object to and regret its occurrence. The Premier has spoken about political parties. If he wants to collect money for a political party, let him collect it in the same way that it would be collected by any other political party. In Queensland the political foundation and background of the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation indicate that funds are being contributed directly to the National Party for campaigning purposes. It is a shame that the Liberal Party associates itself with the acquisition of funds for that foundation.

In the past few days Dr Edwards, Mr Hinze and officers of their departments have accused themselves of leaking reports.

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police and his officers have not accused anybody of anything.

Mr D'ARCY: I withdraw that remark.

Out of the blue came the Muhl report. It was written by a town planner, Mr Arthur Muhl. The hapless Mr Muhl at first concurred with the official report. He then seemed to have second thoughts and rushed out a report on traffic problems, with the surprise conclusion, based on his mystical vision, that the Paradise Corporation should be the winner. While we await another vision, perhaps the Premier will suddenly see the light and make a decision.

Queenslanders will regret the casino episode for a very long time. It is unfortunate that the Government is being dragged into the mire on this issue, but it is typical of what has been happening within the Government. The Deputy Premier may say that a meritorious decision may be reached—

Dr Edwards: Will be reached!

Mr D'ARCY: The Treasurer has dilly-dallied. His integrity is in tatters.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. I have the highest integrity. I ask that the statement be withdrawn.

Mr D'ARCY: I withdraw.

The explanation of what has occurred in this instance is too late. The public of Queensland know what went on within the Cabinet. They can work out that the Premier and his deputy did not agree. They did not really know what the officers had said or what had occurred. That a decision was made on Townsville and not in relation to the Gold Coast is scandalous.

Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved. A great deal of power and influence is involved. Already Cabinet Ministers have disgraced themselves. They should resign. The people of Queensland no longer have confidence in their decision-making. The stage has been reached where some Cabinet Ministers—the finger need not be pointed—will have to stand up and ask what is going on in Cabinet.

I shall table the documents that I said I had. I do not have the final assessment documents, but I do have assessment documents that prove that the Premier should have known better when he gave his statement later to the public. He should have known that all those matters had been discussed, and finally discussed, with the committee. The documents involving legislation are already in preparation. The legislation is only a copy of the latest such legislation that is available in the world at present, namely, the legislation introduced by the State of New Jersey in the United States.

The Government has claimed that this whole matter of casinos would be "squeaky clean" and "whiter than white". I hope that is so. The Governor of New Jersey was re-elected on his "squeaky clean" legislation. However, within six months of his re-election one of the commissioners in that State was up on a charge and it was proved that he accepted a \$100,000 donation and was involved in graft relating to casinos.

Queensland is already giving the green-eyed gentlemen who come here from overseas and who are deeply involved in crime an opportunity to continue their activities here. The moral overtones of the present situation should frighten the Premier and the Deputy Premier. Those overseas people regard Queensland as a banana republic. They know that Cabinet cannot even arrive at a meritorious decision on all the facts presented to it by a highly reputable Public Service committee.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the documents referred to.

Mr HOOPER (Archerfield) (12.18 p.m.): In rising to answer the Premier's challenge, I realise that what I am about to say will be denied by way of a ministerial statement tomorrow. But that is the way of this coalition Government. It does not answer documented facts with facts; instead it gives the accuser a bucket, particularly when a member of the National Party bunyip aristocracy is involved.

In the early hours of Friday, 18 December 1981, Sir Edward Houghton Lyons, after attending a party at TAB headquarters, where he enjoyed the convivial company of the Queensland Police Commissioner, Mr Terence Murray Lewis, was intercepted on the South East Freeway for his manner of driving. He was intercepted by two officers in the Police Traffic Branch. It is well known that Sir Edward Lyons is a National Party appointee, chairman of the TAB, a trustee of the National Party and a knight of the realm.

Mr Powell: Wasn't he convicted?

Mr HOOPER: What an inane interjection! Everybody in Queensland knows he was convicted. If the honourable member for Isis cannot do better than that, he should go back to school.

As I was saying, Sir Edward Lyons is a trustee of the National Party and a knight of the realm. At the scene he intended to intimidate the two police officers by mentioning that he was a friend of the Police Commissioner. Because of the approach made by Sir Edward, one of the police officers then used the police radio to request the presence of an inspector. Incidentally, that request should still be on the police tapes—assuming, of course,

that the Police Department has not followed Richard Nixon's example and erased the tapes. I challenge the Minister for Police to produce the tapes immediately. Under the Police Act the police are supposed to keep the tapes for three months. What concerns me is that the three-month period elapses on 18 March. I challenge the Minister to produce the tapes immediately. It is passing strange that the Minister can sit in this Chamber and smile. I do not want to upset his tummy. I will not attack him today, but if he opens his big mouth, he is fair game.

No doubt the tapes will not be forthcoming. After refusing to undergo a roadside breath test, Sir Edward Lyons was taken to police headquarters where, at 2.30 a.m., a specimen of breath supplied by him was analysed by Constable Kathleen Rynders of the Breath Analysis Section. Shortly after testing the breathalyser instrument, she issued a certificate stating that Sir Edward Lyons had a blood alcohol level of 0.12. At 2.35 a.m., Sir Edward was arrested by Constable Carmichael. I repeat that statement. Sir Edward Lyons was in fact arrested by Constable Carmichael.

Now the action really hots up. We have two members of the Queensland Police Force doing their duty without fear or favour and a knight of the realm and prominent member of the National Party hierarchy under arrest. Obviously something had to give. The bench charge sheets were being prepared. The next step in the usual procedure would be to have Sir Edward charged but Sir Edward made an approach to his friend the Commissioner of Police on his telephone with the silent number. As a result of that approach, the Commissioner of Police, Mr Lewis, instructed Constable Carmichael to proceed no further with the matter. Judging by the silence coming from the Government side I would say that Government members agree with me that that was a disgraceful prostitution by Mr Lewis of his exalted position.

Mr Sullivan: What was your reading when you blew into the bag?

Mr HOOPER: Anybody can have a look at the result of my breath analysis. It was 0.038. The Minister can have a look at it.

Mr Sullivan: Somebody fiddled with it.

Mr HOOPER: In reply to that, I thought that the Premier would have issued instructions to a police officer to pick up a poor old derelict who had just consumed a flagon of port in Musgrave Park and swap my blood sample with his.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr HOOPER: Of course he would do it.

Constable Carmichael then threw the incomplete bench charge sheet into the rubbish bin. As he had been given an assurance by the Commissioner that the matter would proceed no further, Sir Edward, who is a supposedly upright citizen, National Party leader and knight of the realm, discarded his copy of the certificate. An honest police officer retrieved those documents, which are now in my possession. I shall table them after I conclude my speech. I have in my hand the triplicate copy of the breath analysis sheet which Sir Edward Lyons received from Constable Rynders after his breath test had been taken. I am accepting the Premier's challenge. I will table it. I have 10 copies for the media after I have concluded my speech.

By obeying the unlawful instruction issued by Commissioner Lewis, Constable Carmichael left himself open to be proceeded against for an offence under section 552 of the Criminal Code in that he wilfully delayed taking Sir Edward Lyons before a justice after he had been arrested.

Mr Frawley: Do you reckon Lewis would do that for me?

Mr HOOPER: I am sure he would not. As a matter of fact, a high-ranking policeman who shall remain anonymous said, "Terry was a bloody fool. I would not have done that."

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's language is unparliamentary.

Mr HOOPER: I beg your pardon, Mr Speaker. I was using "bloody" in the sense that it is used in the Bible.

As there was no intention of proceeding further with the matter, no action was taken until the parties involved learnt that their sweetheart agreement was about to be exposed in the Press. Commissioner Lewis and Sir Edward then concocted a story which borders on the ridiculous. In fact, the comedy duo Lewis and Lyons would be worthy successors to Morecambe and Wise on the ABC.

This story was a deliberate attempt to cover up the fact that the Commissioner of Police in Queensland, Terence Murray Lewis, and Sir Edward Houghton Lyons, a National Party bigwig, and knight of the realm, had committed a criminal offence under section 132 of the Queensland Criminal Code, namely, conspiring to prevent or pervert the course of justice. That offence carries a maximum punishment of seven years' imprisonment.

The story put out by Messrs Lewis and Lyons was that Sir Edward had an urgent business trip on the morning of 18 September and therefore action was to be taken by way of complaint and summons, as that was considered to be appropriate.

Unfortunately, that procedure should never have been followed as, on the morning in question, Sir Edward had actually been arrested and should have been charged then and appeared in court later that morning. I am sure that all honourable members are surprised that a man of Sir Edward's reputed business acumen would, with such an important business appointment interstate, be out boozing into the early hours of the morning. No wonder the story was greeted with hilarity by the people of Queensland. If that is the way Sir Edward runs the TAB, I can readily appreciate why the SP bookies are doing such a roaring business in Queensland.

Mr Hinze: Because you bet with them.

Mr HOOPER: No. As a matter of fact, the Minister is the one who bets with them. Now that the Minister has entered the debate, I must say that it is well-known on the coast that he is recognised as being, if I may use racing parlance, in the bag of some well-known SP bookies in Southport.

Mr Casey interjected.

Mr HOOPER: As my leader says, the Minister has protected a number of his mates who have been prosecuted for SP betting, namely, that fellow Dopson from Stanthorpe who sits on the Minister's trotting board.

Mr Prest: He got him on the board.

Mr HOOPER: That shows how corrupt this Government is, when the Minister in charge of racing puts a man with an SP betting conviction on the board.

Mr Moore: Tom Burns has got one.

Mr HOOPER: He is not on the board though, is he?

After the expose in "The Sunday-Mail" of 20 December 1981, a summons was hastily issued and Sir Edward Lyons was dealt with. But that is not the issue here today. The Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Doumany) was quoted in "The Sunday-Mail" as stating that he had ordered an immediate inquiry into the whole sordid affair. Why has that inquiry not been completed? I will tell the House why nothing has been done. The Minister knows as well as I do that any fair-dinkum inquiry would recommend that criminal charges be laid against Commissioner Lewis and Sir Edward Lyons.

Government Members interjected.

Mr HOOPER: That is true, and the Minister for Justice knows it.

An Opposition Member: He's not listening.

Mr HOOPER: He is listening all right. His posture is only a ploy; he is listening intently to every word I say.

Honourable members can imagine the Minister for Justice going to Cabinet with the news that he intended to proceed against the Commissioner of Police, Mr Terence Murray Lewis, a personal appointee of the Premier's, plucked from obscurity as an inspector at Charleville to be Police Commissioner of Queensland—a meteoric rise indeed!

Mr Hinze: Why don't you like him?

Mr HOOPER: I do not dislike Mr Lewis personally; it is just that I think he is a corrupt crook and should be booted unceremoniously out of the Police Force.

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. In defence of the Police Commissioner, I say that the term "corrupt crook" can hardly be attributed to Mr Lewis, and it is certainly undignified. I ask for a complete withdrawal.

Mr HOOPER: I put it to you, Mr Speaker, that there is no point of order. I did not criticise the Minister; I criticised the Police Commissioner.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I take the honourable member's point. He is technically correct but morally wrong.

Mr HOOPER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. You are much more efficient in your job as Speaker than the Minister for Police is in his.

I would like to know what Mr Lewis and the Minister for Police have against the Premier. There is a story circulating in journalistic circles at the moment that the reason why the Minister for Police has fallen out with the Premier is that he gave the Premier a casino document with one page missing. That is the story going around the traps at the moment.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: That is so stupid that nobody even replied to you.

Mr HOOPER: Fancy the Premier talking about anybody being stupid! It is quite obvious to most honourable members, particular those on this side, after listening to the Premier's speech here today, that he is in an advanced stage of senile decay; so he should be the last one to call anybody stupid.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Can you fly a helicopter?

Mr HOOPER: The Premier's flying a helicopter is an example of an accident looking for somewhere to happen.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr HOOPER: Don't lead with your chin, Joh; you're out of your class.

Mr Hinze: How do you reckon you would be on a push bike?

Mr HOOPER: How would the Minister be on a mule?

Proceedings should be commenced against Sir Edward Lyons, National Party bag man, trustee of the National Party and knight of the realm. If Mr Doumany and his fellow Liberals got a belting over the recent judiciary appointments, it would be nothing compared with what they would get over that suggestion.

I do not believe that Constable Carmichael should be held responsible. He would be acutely aware of the penalty for failing to keep within the guide-lines laid down for National Party supporters. I understand that, at the behest of Commissioner Lewis, another police officer, who is reputed to be a close personal friend of the commissioner, told Carmichael of the cock-and-bull story concocted by Lewis and Lyons. He made it abundantly clear that the story was to be supported. If it was not, then he, the commissioner's friend, would also become involved if there was any blow-up. In other words, fabrication was to become fact.

I have not yet met one person who believes that fabrication. The actions of the Government in attempting to cover up this matter by not ordering an inquiry are despicable and extremely corrupt. The Government has once again shown its contempt for the people of Queensland, because graft and corruption are endemic in the Bjelke-Petersen Government.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. We know the honourable member's reputation, which is nil, but he continually makes completely untrue and unfounded statements about graft and corruption in the Government. The honourable member has a reputation for making such political statements from time to time. I ask that he completely withdraw that statement, because I am not going to accept it on behalf of the Government.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Archerfield to withdraw the statement referring to corruption in the Government.

Mr HOOPER: I am certainly not going to quibble with you, Mr Speaker, but is that point of order in order?

Mr SPEAKER: It is.

Mr HOOPER: Mr Speaker, I bow to your ruling, and withdraw the statement.

It is a sad day for Queensland when a member of the Opposition has to rise in this Chamber and call for the resignation of the Police Commissioner. As I have already pointed out, Mr Lewis has broken his oath of office and no longer commands the respect of the people of Queensland or of the officers of the Queensland Police Force.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. I am not going to allow such allegations to go into "Hansard" without their being repudiated. The words that the honourable member has spoken about the Commissioner of Police are completely unjustifiable and undeserved. I want to record my attitude in "Hansard" and say how fortunate Queensland is to have a man such as Mr Lewis as the head of the Queensland Police Force. Because the honourable member is arrested from time to time, he does not like the police.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The Premier has already spoken in the debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr HOOPER: I have already called for the resignation of the Police Commissioner because he has broken his oath of office. He has lost the respect of the people of Queensland and of the officers of the Queensland Police Force.

It is with some sadness that I make this remark about the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General (Mr Doumany), because I have the utmost personal regard and respect for him. I was overseas with him. I think that he is a very poor politician but a very fine gentleman. As I said, it is with sadness that I suggest that the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General should also submit his resignation. As the chief legal adviser to the Government, he has shown that he is incapable of standing up to the Premier and his National Party roughnecks. As I said earlier, he was well and truly rolled in Cabinet over the appointment of the Chief Justice. His advice must count for very little in the halls of Government. He would not be game to take on two of the Premier's mates.

Recent events suggest that a royal commission to investigate the Queensland Police Force is urgently needed. Knowing the track record of the Government, I suppose that I am being a super optimist in saying that. If the members of the parliamentary wing of the National Party have nothing to hide they will support my call. A failure to support the establishment of a royal commission will in itself be a complete admission that they condone corrupt and illegal practices in the Queensland Police Force. Pending the setting up of a royal commission into the force generally, I demand that Commissioner Lewis and Constables Rynders and Carmichael be called to the Bar of this Parliament to answer questions on their action during the early hours of 18 December 1981.

As I have said, Commissioner Lewis has very little support in the force. He is propped up by the corrupt Right-wing faction in the Queensland Police Union.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, how long is the honourable member for Archerfield to be allowed to speak about corruption in Government circles? I ask the honourable member to produce the evidence of corruption. The Government will not accept all his airy-fairy statements as evidence of corruption in the Police Force or anywhere else. Queensland is lucky to have the best Police Force in Australia. Mr Speaker, I ask for a ruling in relation to the honourable member's use of these terms.

Mr HOOPER: In answer to the Premier, I have just cited a case of a National Party knight of the realm and trustee of the party trying to worm his way out of a traffic charge. I ask the Premier: If that is not corruption, what is?

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: What was that?

Mr HOOPER: I said the Premier was suffering from senile decay; it seems he is a little deaf, too.

My answer to the Premier's futile attempt to try to get Mr Speaker to stifle my expose of corruption in the Government and in the Queensland Police Force was to cite the case of a National Party trustee and knight of the realm trying to worm his way out of a traffic offence. If that is not corruption, I do not know what is.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: As events subsequently proved very clearly, that is completely untrue. Sir Edward Lyons is a very good friend of mine, a man for whom I have the highest regard and respect. I will not stand by and allow the honourable member for Archerfield to say that he tried to worm his way out of anything. The same procedure was adopted in his case as would apply to any other citizen. There is no doubt that the police record of the honourable member for Archerfield would make very interesting reading.

Mr HOOPER: I can see that I have really pricked a raw nerve of the Premier.

Many honourable members might wonder why I have not mentioned the role of the Liberals in this affair. For once I agree with the Premier and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, who are on record as saying that the Liberals have proved themselves to be irrelevant in the political processes of the State.

I wish to make a contrast between the principles of two noble knights of the realm. Sir Robert Mathers, the treasurer of the Liberal Party, has two drink-driving convictions. However, he has my respect, as he took his punishment like a man, unlike Sir Edward Lyons who squealed to the Commissioner of Police when he was arrested on a drink-driving charge. That is the difference between two noble knights of the realm—one is a man, the other a worm.

I am very pleased that the Premier has given me the opportunity to produce the documents. I am sure that when the Premier moved the motion today he thought he would catch the Opposition napping. Instead of that, he has finished up with egg on his face. Hopefully the more honest members of the National Party—there are not too many of them—will exert pressure on the Premier and the rotund Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police to have Mr Lewis brought before the Bar of the House to be questioned.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the documents referred to.

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (12.38 p.m.): I enter this debate rather proud that I am not affiliated with any political party. The people who are in the public gallery have gained a first-hand idea of the behaviour of the Parliament and how it conducts its affairs.

I have been singled out for some comment by the Premier. At the outset I say that I have never been charged with a drink-driving offence, as two or three knights of the realm recently have been. Nor have I been charged with SP betting. I was not mentioned in the Peel report, as some other members were. I am not, I suppose to my detriment, a donor to the Bjelke-Petersen Foundation, even though I was asked for a \$10,000 donation.

This morning it was said that I had made innuendos and accusations. I would like to take this Parliament back to almost 12 months ago, when on 27 March at about mid-day one Lindsay Hartwig was expelled from the National Party. Let us look at what happened. First let me pay tribute to the one Minister who had the courage to support my retention within the National Party ranks. He was a representative at the meeting of faceless men that day. I tell the Premier that the name Hartwig will stand comparison with the Petersens and Sparkes of this country. If I was guilty of innuendo, where was the Premier when I needed somebody to back up my nine or 10 years' service to his party?

I was accused of forming a new party. Let us get things in their proper perspective. On "Nationwide" I threw down a cheque for \$1,000, challenging any person in the State of Queensland to come forward with evidence that I was going to form a new party. That is what I was hung on. Absolute lies! Where was the Premier when those accusations were made against one of his fellow-men? He was found wanting. He did not have the courage to come forward and defend one of his true-blue supporters—and the Premier knows that I backed him many times.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You are right off the track. You don't know the history at all.

Mr HARTWIG: The Premier this morning made the statement that I had made innuendos. Now he has a tiger by the tail. He should watch that it doesn't bite him.

The Premier saw fit to let the Hartwig name—and the Hartwigs have been pioneers of this country—be smeared across the newspapers of this country. He did not defend me one iota.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: I would help you if I could, but you are beyond help.

Mr HARTWIG: In the Premier's defence, I must say that the president of the National Party said that he is only in his position "at our pleasure".

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Tell us the story you are giving to the newspapers.

Mr HARTWIG: That is coming as sure as night follows day.

I am trying to establish a fact. Prior to my departure overseas I was in the dining-room with Kevin Hooper, the member for Archerfield, when the Premier discussed ways and means of beating the Liberal Party.

Mr Hooper: Hear, hear! I am your witness.

Mr HARTWIG: If anyone wants to start slinging innuendos and accusations, I can sling them back. Let nobody underestimate my ability in that regard.

Let us get back to the casino issue. I am all for casinos. A committee was formed, I understand, to investigate the matter of casinos. The Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts was not able to attend and my good friend, Vic Sullivan, Minister for Commerce and Industry, stood in—and rightly so. He was the deputy leader of the party. There is nothing wrong with that. After all, we had to have somebody on the committee who had had a bet or two. I do not know about Dr Edwards. I do not think the Premier has had too many bets in his lifetime. The committee had to have one member who understood gambling. Cabinet Ministers have been globe-trotting. They visited Las Vegas. Who would want a casino in this State similar to those in Las Vegas? Why did those Ministers make an inspection of the casinos there? Tasmania has successfully conducted a casino since 1973. I have in my possession copies of the Tasmanian legislation governing the operation of casinos in that State. It has avoided most of the pitfalls. Those members fortunate enough to have visited the Tasmanian casino would agree that it is conducted in a very respectable manner.

Mr Frawley: You cleaned them up with keno three nights in a row.

Mr HARTWIG: Yes. I must say that I was very, very lucky.

Many meetings have been conducted to determine the successful applicant. I understand that the Minister for Police has made his investigations with a fine-tooth comb. However, it has not been decided who the successful applicant will be. I indicate to the Cabinet Ministers, the wise members of Government, that Queensland is losing perhaps

\$1m a week in revenue. Queenslanders are spending that amount each week on poker machines operating in New South Wales. I should like to know how the Premier would feel if he were a back-bencher, without any say in the decision-making of Cabinet. The Government decided to approve the construction of a casino in Townsville and there was no argument against it. If the people of south-east Queensland, including those on the Sunshine Coast and those in Toowoomba, Ipswich, and Redcliffe, want to visit a casino, they will have to go within a stone's throw of the New South Wales border. Queensland should be attracting an additional \$1m a week in revenue. The Government should be reversing the trend and encouraging people to spend their money in this State. Some sanity should prevail. The member for Auburn would know that a casino on the Gold Coast will do nothing for the miners in his electorate. The member for Peak Downs is not present, but I am sure that he would agree with that statement.

Many more millions of dollars will be put through poker machines in New South Wales if a casino is built within a few yards of the New South Wales border. Tourists arriving in Brisbane and wanting to visit a casino will be forced to leave Brisbane and travel 60 or 70 miles to a casino on the Gold Coast, within a stone's throw of the New South Wales border. They will probably go over the border and spend their money on poker machines in New South Wales. Is that what Queensland wants?

I am sorry to see the Premier leaving the Chamber, as I have a very important document to table.

An intolerable situation existed for the inimitable Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police.

On 22 February he angrily denied claims that he was involved in renegotiating the financial backing of one of the short-listed casino applicants. He said that a smear was being placed on his character and that, because he was sworn to secrecy, he had no chance of refuting statements that had been made against him. However, he angrily denied that there had been a renegotiation. Two days later, on 24 February, an article written by Peter Morley in "The Courier-Mail" stated, "The three Gold Coast casino licence finalists would be able to renegotiate their bids, the Premier, Mr Bjelke-Petersen, said last night." That was two days after the Minister for Police angrily denied that there would be any renegotiation. The Minister for Police is one of the leading men on the casino committee, yet two days later the Premier overruled him.

Here is the document. It contains proof that it was given to a certain applicant, or leaked to a certain applicant, long before the short list was prepared.

Can honourable members see the danger in a renegotiation with applicants? I did not come down in the last shower; I have been around for a while. The onus is on the Government to prove that that document was not leaked. I shall table it.

An Honourable Member: What is it?

Mr HARTWIG: It is a short list of applicants and it deals with the main points of their applications.

Mr Frawley: Will you give me a copy?

Mr HARTWIG: It will be on the table.

Can honourable members see the implications? Is it any wonder that the Minister for Police is being rubbished and all types of rumours are floating around? No-one would renegotiate tenders, unless there was a very good reason for renegotiating; he would re-call them. Blind Freddy knows that. A renegotiation of tenders will do no good for the credibility of Cabinet.

I am sorry that the Premier is not here to listen to what I am saying. I am an Independent member who is untainted by political pressure or by any political party. I can speak openly and I can tell the public the truth. The Government has the onus to prove that that document was not given to one of the applicants before renegotiations took place.

In the best interests of all Queenslanders the Government should start afresh with the casino issue. It might even be a good idea if the Government followed the example set in Tasmania, where the whole issue was put to the people.

I am a member of Her Majesty's Parliament; I am one of 64 members who are never consulted about Cabinet decisions and who are not aware of those decisions until they appear either in the Press or on TV. This House contains many knowledgeable members, so why couldn't the Premier have come forward and said that he would take the whole casino issue to Parliament so that it could consider first of all whether Queensland would have casinos and, secondly, where any such casinos should be located. Surely we as members of Her Majesty's Parliament have the right to consider such an important issue.

In yesterday's "Australian" the Premier was reported as saying that nobody takes any notice of me any more. The Premier should be careful. If people do not take any notice of me, they could well be forgiven for not taking any notice of him.

As was highlighted in the House this morning, no statement has been released concerning the police episode at Mt Coot-tha. Surely the people, who pick up the tab for the wages of police officers, are entitled to know whether they have police protection or whether police are away at some location where they should not be. Surely the people are entitled to an explanation. How many weeks have gone by since that episode?

Was the appointment of the Chief Justice a parliamentary decision? It was not. In my opinion, Cabinet has erred in many ways. I am adamant that, because of the continued doubt in the people's minds, the Government should recall applications. I will table this document. The onus is then on the Government and the Cabinet to prove to the Queensland people that the document did not reach an applicant's hands prior to the appointment being made.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the documents referred to.

Mr R. J. GIBBS (Wolston) (12.56 p.m.): This debate gives members of the Opposition an opportunity to lay before the House any documentary proof they have. I will take the opportunity to outline the documentary proof that I have been able to gather and which I believe indicates a distinct link between one of the casino applicants, namely, Paradise Corporation, and a senior Minister of this Government whom I will name later.

Mr Hinze: You whistle and I will point.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: The Minister can do what he likes. By the time I have finished whistling he will have lost so much weight dancing round the Chamber that he will look like the fairy that he did not want to be.

On two occasions over the past couple of months I have travelled to Melbourne to speak with various business people and others who have connections with Mr Eddie Kornhauser, one of the prominent applicants for the Gold Coast casino. I have a signed document comprising several pages. When I have concluded my speech, I will table it. The document is signed by a former Melbourne businessman and concerns some of the dealings that he had with Mr Kornhauser. The document reads—

"If I had to pick a date on which, to quote Emil Kornhauser, 'my destiny was sealed,' it would be 20th September, 1976.

I was then indebted to Kornhauser in the sum of \$2,300,000, a temporary loan arranged for me by Rex Davidson, the Assistant General Manager of the A.N.Z. Bank. I also had an obligation to pay Kornhauser by 1st December, 1976, the sum of \$275,000 as a fee for that loan, in addition to the interest I was to pay on the \$2,300,000.

On 20th September, 1976, Kornhauser attempted to coerce me to transfer \$100,000 illegally to his brother-in-law, Harry Stang (Betty Kornhauser's brother) in the United States, by using the Pizzey import facilities then available to that company. Kornhauser asked me to call at his office at the Chevron Hotel, Melbourne. He commenced by telling me how much he had 'helped me' with the acquisition of Pizzey and how he was going to 'help me further' in the future. He wanted me to do him 'a favour'. He took that day's date sheet from the date pad on his desk and wrote the name of Harry Stang and what I presume to be his business and banking address. A photocopy of both sides of that sheet is annexed to this page."

At the conclusion of my speech, I will table that photocopy of the sheet that happened to be on Kornhauser's table at that time. This man also wrote—

“Kornhauser told me that he had a project in the United States and that his brother-in-law required the money immediately. I refused to be involved. Although I appreciated his help in the acquisition of Pizzey”

Mr Kornhauser required this gentleman to indulge in illegal activities by transferring money out of this country without the permission of the Reserve Bank.

In Melbourne some two months later, I spoke to a number of people who are prominent in the Jewish community, and my comments are not a slur on those fine people. I was told that, at present, Kornhauser is involved in a front organisation in Melbourne supposedly for the Free Israel Movement. He makes large cash donations to that organisation. The money is sent overseas. In other words, it is dirty money raised through illegal fund-raising activities. The money is then sent back to Australia by his brother-in-law, Harry Stang, with a generous amount of interest, usually 25 per cent. He sends the dirty money out of Australia and brings it back clean, pays no tax on it, and claims 25 per cent interest as a taxation lurk. This is the sort of person that the Government is seriously considering for a casino licence on the Gold Coast. There is no better opportunity for the laundering of dirty money than a casino.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 3 p.m.]

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I had explained to the House how Mr Kornhauser through various bogus establishments in Melbourne, namely, fronts for the Jewish cause such as the Free Israel Movement, had made cash donations in the vicinity of \$100,000 each and had sent the money overseas to his brother-in-law, Harry Stang, who then returned the money to Australia as a loan at a generous interest rate of approximately 20 per cent to 25 per cent. That enabled Kornhauser to collect illegal moneys in Australia on which he paid no tax, have it laundered overseas and then have it returned and use the interest lurk as a taxation dodge.

At the conclusion of my speech I will name the person who supplied this document to me. The document continues—

“In between 20th September, 1976, and 1st December, 1976, Kornhauser made repeated attempts to get me to transfer \$100,000 to Stang. By 26th November, 1976, it was obvious to him that I was not going to do him ‘the favour’ he wanted. He then demanded \$100,000 in cash. Relations between us were not good. I gave him two cheques for \$50,000 each, drawn on my account in the A.N.Z. Banking Group, payable to cash, dated 26th November, 1976, (Chq. No. 937798) and 1st December, 1976, (Chq. No. 937797), and at Kornhauser's instructions handed these cash cheques to Rex Davidson at his private office at the A.N.Z. Bank, on the twelfth floor of the Stock Exchange Building in Collins Street, Melbourne.”

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: Why don't you tell us the other side of the story?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I will accept that inane interjection from the Premier. If there is another side of the story, he has a responsibility to put it before the Parliament. I am quoting from a document that has been given to me in good faith by a person who was prepared to sign it, have it lodged in a safe, secure place and who is prepared to back it up. So far, the Premier has said nothing. The document continues—

“As I handed the cheques to Davidson, I asked him what Kornhauser was going to do with all that cash. Davidson casually replied that ‘Kornhauser is sending the money overseas on his pipeline.’

Those cheques were cashed by Jack Kornhauser—”

that is the brother of our friend on the coast—

“on the nominated dates. The A.N.Z. branch had to scurry around to find notes of \$50 denominations which was all the Kornhauser would accept. I believe that those funds found their way to the United States through ‘Kornhauser's pipeline.’ I believe that no permit was obtained by the Kornhausers to transfer those funds to the United States. I also believe that this transfer is merely the tip of an iceberg.”

The author goes on to outline Kornhauser's money-lending activities. The document continues—

“He describes his main occupation as that of a hotelier and he likes to portray his money lending activities as investments. His money lending transactions are based on a formula that understates the interest with a finder's fee up front—”

an illegal transaction, I might add—

“and always in cash (he has presumably to find himself to get the funds.) If you were to add the finder's fee and interest together, you would have the practice of usury.

The following are some of my transactions with him:

a) In 1972, Kornhauser lent me the sum of \$100,000. The interest rate of 5% was stipulated in the loan agreement. Originally 9% was the agreed interest rate, but he decided that it was too high and asked me to reduce the interest rate to 5%. The agreement is in my possession. A procuration fee equal to firstly 15%, but later increased to 19% interest per annum was paid to him in cash in advance. This made a total interest rate of 24% per annum. From what I now know about him, I believe that the 19% interest, like all other interest payments made to him subsequently, as procuration fees, have not been declared as income.

b) On 29th January, 1976, Kornhauser lent me \$100,000 for a period of three months. Again a procuration fee had to be paid. It was \$10,000.

He added that to the principal sum to be loaned to me, giving me a cheque for \$110,000. Subsequently, I delivered to him \$10,000 in cash as requested by him.

Kornhauser, or his brother Jack, have stated in their affidavits that they are not practising money lenders. The loans he made to me are not isolated incidents. There are many more that could be described. I have in my possession, for instance, a standard form of agreement used by Kornhauser for his money lending transactions, which he personally gave me to copy for my borrowings from him.”

I quote again from page 14 of the document headed “Your Destiny is Sealed, Alfred.”—

“On the 25th May, 1979, after litigation had commenced by both sides, I had a telephone conversation with Kornhauser who was at his development project at Surfers Paradise. It lasted about an hour. In that conversation he said to me, ‘I am going to teach you and Barbara a lesson you will never forget. I have retained the best legal brains in the country to destroy you, Alfred. I have written an open cheque. I will write off everything I have in Pizzey's to bring you down. And if that does not succeed, I will get two hit men from Entebbe to put you away. Your destiny is sealed . . . ’”

I quote further from page 21 of the document, headed, “Why We Keep Our Whereabouts Secret.”—

“This is due to the numerous death threats that have been levelled against us. These have not been only the isolated threat made to me by Kornhauser personally on 25th May, 1979. . . There was an employee of Kornhauser who menacingly followed us. My wife and I have incontrovertible proof of that. There were numerous death threats made to us on the telephone; although our telephone number was unlisted, it was known to the Kornhausers. A mutual acquaintance of Kornhauser and myself, seeing me in Sydney just before legal proceedings commenced in June, 1979, hailed me with the comment, ‘What are you doing here, Alfred? Kornhauser has a contract out on you.’”

As I said, the documents I am quoting from will be tabled at the conclusion of my speech. I shall now quote from the report's foreword, titled “The Kornhauser/Davidson Disaster.” It says—

“The enclosed memorandum has been restricted to facts capable of being proved, either by documents or by independent evidence of third parties. The only exceptions to this rule are the conversations between Kornhauser and myself.

That my version of these conversations is factual and correct is substantiated to the logical mind by auxiliary and ancillary evidence and documents which are enclosed or referred to, and which could have no other purpose or justification."

It is signed by Alfred Zion and is dated 1 July 1980.

I believe that what I have laid before this Parliament is a very clear indication of the total unsuitability of this gentleman, representing the Paradise Corporation, to be granted a casino licence on the Gold Coast. I believe that it is a mockery and a downright disgrace that the Government has the hide to even allow a person with that type of background to actually advance to the stage of being one of the top contenders for the casino licence. If any evidence were required of his closeness to the National Party and his connection with the Premier and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, it was provided by the reaction of both of those gentlemen in the Parliament today, who have sprung to his defence through interjections and by other means. I call on the Deputy Premier to table in this Parliament handwritten notes which I believe he made when taking direct extracts from Victorian police files which will substantiate much of what I have said in the Parliament today and which I believe the Treasurer has in his possession.

Mr Moore: How would you know that?

Mr R. J. GIBBS: Never mind how I know. I have reasonable sources. I believe that the Treasurer was shown these files and hand-copied them himself on his last visit to Melbourne and that they are now in his possession. I have also received information that Kornhauser, since I last named him in Parliament last year and referred to his association with the notorious underworld criminal Abraham Saffron, has said in interviews with various people that he has had no contact with Saffron since the royal commission hearings in the early 1950s. That is a blatant lie. If Dr Edwards has the integrity to put the evidence before this Parliament, it will be found that Kornhauser and Saffron are partners in a substantial hotel in Western Australia.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: You are completely out of date.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I am not out of date at all.

Regrettably, the Opposition received very little notice of the introduction of this debate into the Parliament today. If the Premier had nothing to hide, and if he indeed was not worried about what the Opposition could table in this Parliament, I could have made available to the Parliament a list of companies which shows quite conclusively the link between people such as Saffron and Kornhauser, the person I have named in this Parliament today, Harry Stang, and also our friend from Sydney who operates the many illegal bingo machines in clubs throughout Queensland, our friend Jack Rooklyn. Those persons are all tarred with the same brush and they are connected with it up to their eyeballs.

I am not given to repeating private conversations in this Parliament. Because I do not believe that the conversation occurred in the private sense, I feel no compunction about repeating it before this House. The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police will recall the day that Parliament adjourned on 2 December last year. When he was sitting in a corner in the media room he turned to me and said in the presence of a number of journalists, "One day you will come to me and say, 'Russo, I was wrong about that Kornhauser fellow. He is really a very nice man. I was completely wrong. He is quite honest.'" Why would he make such a comment if there was not some connection between him and Kornhauser? That is not the type of comment that is made unless a friendly relationship exists with another person. The evidence I have put before the Parliament today shows quite clearly the total unsuitability of that gentleman for a casino licence on the Gold Coast. The way in which the National Party has handled the casino applications and the way in which it has defended around the traps throughout town the reputation of Kornhauser is, to say the least, a disgusting disgrace. Because of the serious implications that have been revealed, it is high time that the Federal Government and the Federal Police investigated Kornhauser's activities on an Australiawide basis.

I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police to deny in the House this afternoon that quite apart from the fact that he visited Harry Gordon at Queensland Newspapers and spoke to him about a fair go for Kornhauser, an offer was

also made to Queensland Newspapers to buy into Paradise Corporation in order to lend a further aura of respectability to those particular persons. The Deputy Premier has a responsibility to table in this Parliament any documented evidence in his possession emanating from his visits to Melbourne, particularly concerning the Kornhauser application.

The casino issue is not the only issue at stake this afternoon. The Government has challenged the Opposition to prove allegations and statements it has made. Following the documentation I have put before the House, I call on the Government to take the matter a step further. It should stop whitewashing in a number of other areas. A number of my colleagues have reported the disgusting incident involving two police officers at Mt Coot-tha some weeks ago.

The Opposition has acted in a proper manner. As the Opposition's spokesman on police, I deliberately refrained from making statements to the media concerning that incident. As both of the male persons involved are police officers, they are entitled to a fair and unbiased investigation by police. When the report on the incident was made public it revealed negligence on the part of the police administration and the Minister. The facts surrounding the incident have not been made available to this Parliament.

I ask the following questions: Will the Minister for Police make available to the Parliament the full text of the police report to the Crown Law Office? If not, why not? What was the designated route of Constable Cunning and Constable Poole's mobile patrol on the night of the fatality? Did their route include the entrance to the Parents without Partners clubhouse in Gilchrist Avenue, Pipp's night-club in the city and the slopes of Mt Coot-tha? Over what period was Constable Cunning and Constable Poole's mobile patrol car parked on Mt Coot-tha? When was the last contact between the mobile patrol car and police headquarters before the fatality occurred? How often is contact normally made between police on a mobile patrol and police headquarters? Is the Minister concerned that some police officers may be absenting themselves from patrol duties to carry on the type of frivolous activities that took place on Mt Coot-tha? What was the extent of the injuries to Constable Cunning, and to Constable Poole, if he suffered any? Did he lose consciousness at any stage after the accident? In view of the fact that members of the general public who are admitted to hospital in a far worse condition than that police constable, and who have been on the verge of unconsciousness in hospital, have been subjected to blood tests, why was no blood test carried out on the constable who was driving the motor vehicle? Is there any truth in the rumour of a massive cover-up within the Police Department, one involving people from this Government? Was a blood test in fact carried out, and were its results not made known because they conveniently disappeared when taken to police headquarters? Was an autopsy carried out on the dead woman? If not, why not? If so, what was the cause of death? What else did the autopsy reveal?

Parliament has not been given the answer to any one of those questions, nor has the information been made available to the people of Queensland. If the Minister for Police and the Commissioner of Police are desirous of ensuring that the Queensland Police Force retains any semblance of respectability, they have the responsibility to make the facts known.

Go 10 yards outside the gates of Parliament House and ask the first person in the street what he or she thinks of the police investigation into this incident. How could anyone have anything good to say of an investigation carried out by a person such as Kevin Lindsay Dorries, who has had a bad reputation over the many years that he has been in the Police Force? I make no apology for saying that. I regard Kevin Lindsay Dorries as one of the worst police officers in Queensland at the present time.

Police should not investigate police. A proper committee consisting of a person possessing forensic expertise, two top, honest policemen, a Crown Law officer and another person possessing relevant expertise should be set up to conduct a proper and impartial investigation into the affairs of police in Queensland.

Finally, I return to my point concerning the appointment of the Chief Justice. What a shocking and disgraceful debacle that was! The career on the Bench of Mr Justice Douglas, a man of high integrity, has been crucified because of internal party politics between the National Party and the Liberal Party. It is relevant to say that the Liberal Party has the responsibility to ascertain whether one of its Ministers in this Parliament—he is not presently in the Chamber, so I shall not name him—reported to the Premier that in 1972 a postal vote returned from overseas by Mr Justice Douglas revealed that he had voted

for a Labor candidate at that time. If that is the case, it is a shocking indictment of the polling officer in this State. It is a shocking indictment of the Government, which could be accused, quite fairly, of poll-rigging if that is the case, because it means that a person's vote is no longer secret. I believe that that information was conveyed to the Premier by one of the Liberal Ministers in a deliberate attempt to undermine the integrity of that party when it tried to ensure that the most senior person was appointed to fill that position.

Government members should not claim that Opposition members are not able to come up with facts and figures to prove what they say. What I have said today shows gross and hypocritical impropriety by the Government. The Government is on the nose. I do not apologise for saying that it is corrupt, rotten and in its death throes as a Government in this State.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the documents referred to.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (3.21 p.m.): When the Premier introduced this motion this morning, I realised that he was using smart political tactics. Honourable members must realise that that is to be expected on the first day of a sitting. But when I examine those tactics, I wonder why he used them. Was it done simply to outmanoeuvre the Opposition's motion to endeavour to censure the Government on all of the activities surrounding the casino applications? Was it an attempt to force Opposition members to release prematurely information that the Premier, Ministers and some members knew that we were gathering? Was it—and this is the important one—a desperate effort by certain influences within Cabinet to prevent further inquiries, to so pre-empt us and create difficulties that our further inquiries would be frustrated? I am speaking not only of our inquiries and media inquiries in every State but also inquiries from people at the Commonwealth level. It amazed me the night I saw the Deputy Premier on television saying that he knew nothing about Federal police involvement in this matter. It is not my intention to try to delve too deeply into that matter, but I was surprised when he said he knew nothing about the involvement of the Federal police.

Dr EDWARDS: I rise to a point of order. The Federal police are not involved in any aspect of the investigation into this matter. Their only involvement is as a direct result of a request for information by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police and the Commissioner of Police.

Mr WRIGHT: I am pleased that the Deputy Premier has said that, because officers from the Federal Police Department are sitting in the public gallery. I wonder why they are here unless they are interested in what members have to say. I feel that the Deputy Premier is wrong in this instance, as he has been wrong in so many instances lately.

Dr Edwards: We will see how right you are.

Mr WRIGHT: I intend to demonstrate that, but I do not intend to get caught up in releasing all of my information so that the Premier or anyone else can ensure that nothing further is done about the matter.

Some weeks ago I received a telephone call from a person on the Gold Coast who said that a minister there wished to speak to me. I received a second phone call and the person explained in some detail some of the allegations—

Mr Hinze interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: The Minister should keep out of it. Napoleon met his Waterloo; the Minister will meet his Delanus.

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. I have to clear this point up. The member said he was contacted and told that he had to meet a minister. It was a minister of religion; it certainly was not me.

Mr WRIGHT: If the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police wants to deny any association with religion, that is all right by me. I certainly do not mind his making such a denial.

When the information was given to me by this person during the second phone call, I said that I wanted to meet the people who were making the allegations. In fact, this was to be arranged for a week-end a fortnight from then. I was most surprised when, on a Tuesday afternoon a week later, a young reporter, I think representing "The Courier-Mail" on the Gold Coast, rang me and was able to tell me that I was involved in an investigation on the Gold Coast. He said that he had been told a number of things such as that a certain minister of religion down there intended to name a notable politician in the Cabinet and also a businessman involved in crime. He asked me what I intended to do about it. I then explained that when I first spoke to this reverend gentleman I asked him why he was coming to me. He then explained that he had gone through a fellow named Don McLachlan and that the information had been passed on to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer.

Dr Edwards: That was an anonymous letter.

Mr WRIGHT: Yes. I am glad that the Deputy Premier has made that point, because, whilst it was anonymous, that was the recommendation of a lawyer on the Gold Coast. I have spoken to that lawyer this very day. I had intended to meet with him, but because of the way this has been pre-empted, it had to be done by telephone. He explained that his recommendation was that it be done in an anonymous manner, simply listing the allegations. But the same reverend gentleman told me on two occasions he spoke personally with the Deputy Premier—

Dr Edwards: That was on the Friday.

Mr WRIGHT: That is right, on the Friday. Now I believe that the Deputy Premier has put it around the political traps that he simply received an anonymous letter which he screwed up and threw in the wastepaper basket, or something to that effect. I would like an explanation.

Dr EDWARDS: I again rise to a point of order. I am really getting a bit sick and tired of this. On no occasion have I made such an allegation. In fact, I received an anonymous letter which I passed on to the Minister for Police. I spoke to this gentleman on the Friday. He said he would come to see me. He has since written to me apologising for the behaviour of certain people, including the member for Rockhampton.

Mr WRIGHT: I realise that one has to be very careful when one calls a person a liar, but you, sir, are not telling the truth.

Dr Edwards: I shall table the letter at a later time.

Mr WRIGHT: I would like to see that letter tabled, because I have spoken to that gentleman this day and he is most embarrassed about the situation in which he has placed me. But he believes he did it for good reason—he was afraid for the safety of some of his informants. I want to see that letter signed by the Rev. Jim Christian tabled because I would be most surprised if it exists. Would the Deputy Premier please arrange to have it tabled first thing in the morning?

Dr Edwards: It is on its way down here. He apologised to me in the letter.

Mr WRIGHT: He may have apologised to the Deputy Premier—I do not know about that—but when the Deputy Premier says that he made such remarks, I would like to see it in writing. It will be a most interesting revelation.

But to come back to the things he did say, he said there was gambling on the Gold Coast. He listed a number of places where gambling takes place. He stated that one place was in fact run as a casino. He said that there was a shooting on the Gold Coast at one of these casinos (at a place called High Surf) that was covered up. He went on to talk about difficulties that certain builders and business people were having in obtaining finance, and said that one person received \$100,000 as part of a special commission for services rendered over a deal of \$1.6m involving a company called Dane-ford, and I have been able to give that name. No doubt these things will be investigated later on, because information has been given to the Federal police.

He also went on to say that there was a type of link with a Minister of the Crown—I will not use his title at the moment—and a prominent businessman. I asked him would he please meet with me and give me this information, and he said he would. As I started to explain, on the Tuesday afternoon this reporter rang me, and he knew the lot. He asked me what I intended to do. I said, "Well, if Dr Edwards does not use it then I am prepared to take it to the Parliament." I said that I would see them on the week-end. The young reporter said to me, "Can I come to the meeting?" I said, "Look, I don't mind. You seem to know it all anyway. Yes, if Jim Christian says it is OK, I am quite happy about it." Members can imagine my surprise when, at 6.45 a.m. on Wednesday, I received a phone call from a radio reporter telling me that this was on the front page of "The Courier-Mail". I told her straight out that what I intended to do was exactly what I had told this young reporter, that I would use the information Jim Christian would document for me. Jim Christian now says he cannot give me any information because the people who were giving it to him are under threat. He has given me these names and I am prepared to give them to the Treasurer. Regrettably, I am not prepared to give them to the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police.

Mr Moore: Why not?

Mr WRIGHT: I am not prepared to go that far. I am prepared to talk about the matter further with the Treasurer.

I know that an affidavit is to be presented to the Federal Police about the \$100,000 commission that was obtained by a person for a \$1.6m deal on the Gold Coast.

I shall refer to some of the other things that were said. Once this story appeared in "The Courier-Mail", I was advised that a secret or special report had been acquired or requested by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police—he can deny it later—and that it was going to destroy the opponents of the Kornhauser group. I asked, "What is the report?" I was told, "I cannot tell you, but there is a report." That was over three weeks ago.

Last week I received another telephone call suggesting that I should try to speak to a Mr Muhl. I endeavoured to do so by ringing the Local Government Department, I spoke to a couple of officers there and asked them whether they knew anything about a Muhl report. By the way, this happened last Tuesday—four days before the story broke publicly. I spoke to a senior officer in the Local Government Department. He simply told me that what I was seeking was classified information and he could make no comment. I contacted people in the media with whom I was working and they said that they had already followed up my original recommendation about a secret report "to do over", in this instance, "the Jennings group", and that they had further information that was linked with the Local Government Department.

On Thursday I was not surprised to find that the Muhl report was being bandied round the place and that an admission about it was made on the Friday. Again, a further accusation was proved. Some three weeks before there was any evidence about the Muhl report, the information was given to me. It was given to me at the same time as Jim Christian spoke to me and said that there was a special report "to do over the Jennings group". It was rather surprising that Mr Muhl, who was the author of this report, should do such a thing.

This very day I have spoken to a person who is linked with the Jennings group who said that the same Mr Muhl had told a member of Jennings that they were head and shoulders above the other casino applicants. The way it was put to me three weeks ago was that a "kill" report had been prepared and obviously that occurred, proving the validity of the original allegation.

The other point that was made to me concerned gambling. The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police rang me; I pay him the courtesy of saying that he did ring me in my office in Rockhampton. I told him that I was not prepared to release anything to him at that moment because it was like complaining to Caesar about Caesar. I went on to explain to him that his own police officers were involved. At that time I gave him details about three places where casinos or gambling dens were operating on the Gold Coast. Nothing was done. The very next night one of those places was operating as a gambling casino on the Gold Coast. One begins to understand why people do not want to go to the Minister or to the local police officers.

A casino operated at Unit 23, Cavill Court, at the corner of Cavill Avenue and Orchid Street, Surfers Paradise. There were two blackjack tables and two other tables in the corner. The internal walls had been pushed out so that the operations could be on a rather large scale. There were bars on the windows so that no-one could enter the premises. Another casino was operating on floor 21 of the Condor. Another one was operating at the Shades Restaurant at Broadbeach. There were four blackjack tables and one manila table. There was another one at what is called the Moorings apartment and one in the High Surf unit block, which is a very interesting one, because that is the same place in which there was a shooting by a southern operator who came up and felt that he was getting done over by a dealer. A local reporter went to the police about the matter. They denied that such a shooting took place and that they were investigating it. However, when the reporter was able to show the police on the Gold Coast that a shooting did take place they admitted that a shooting had been investigated. They now deny it. Is it any wonder that people do not want to go to the police on the Gold Coast?

Again we have very clear evidence. It has not been denied; it has been proved by "The Courier-Mail". It indicates that gambling was taking place on the Gold Coast. The Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police has been told about it, but he has done nothing, nor have his local police officers. One would have to be blind or wearing blinkers not to know that gambling is taking place on the Gold Coast.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: Is the honourable member doubting the authenticity of "The Courier-Mail" report? The fact of the matter is that this information was not followed up by the police. Gambling has taken place. The Treasurer can deny this if he wishes, but his words to Mr Christian were to the effect, "Yes, I believe that there is some basis for your allegations about the gambling and I am following them up."

Dr Edwards: What I said to him was that if there was any basis it would be followed up. In fact, there is an investigation into all aspects of it.

Mr WRIGHT: There is an investigation going on. Is that investigation complete?

Dr Edwards: I am not the Minister for Police.

Mr WRIGHT: It is no wonder that I agree with the member for Wolston when he said that we should have someone else to investigate the problems in the Police Department. This ought not to be the position.

The other point that was made concerned rorts.

Mr Borbidge interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: I ask the honourable member to be patient.

The other one was the commission for a special \$1.6m deal. Once the affidavit has been given to the Federal Police I would like it to be presented to the Parliament. It will be available, but members will have to wait for it. My involvement resulted from a telephone call. I was most embarrassed and somewhat put out when this same Reverend Jim Christian told me that, because of the threats to various people who had advised him, he could not deliver the goods. He said he had statutory declarations and told me that the lawyer sat in on some of the inquiries. I now know that the prostitute with whom he was talking and who gave him information has spoken to the Federal Police, as has the gentleman who is able to substantiate the \$100,000 commission, if one can call it that, given to the person involved in the \$1.6m deal.

The issue is one of association. Last year claims were made about Mr Kornhauser and his relationship with a fellow named Saffron. All sorts of denials have appeared in the media and the Premier, and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police have denied that there is any link at all between Kornhauser and the criminal groups involved in organised crime in this nation. I regret to advise that there is a very, very strong link. I have in my possession a highly classified and secret document—

Government Members interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: Honourable members opposite will have the opportunity to see it. I will table it.

This is an internal document prepared by the South Australian Police Department. It commences—

“Known and suspected involvement in South Australian business by Saffron and Farr.”

A Government Member: How did you get it?

Mr WRIGHT: I am not prepared to divulge that.

Government Members interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: Do Government members want that information so they can go and crucify them? Do they want me to release it so they can get after them? Of course that is what they want! I have spoken to the Federal Police about this matter and they are well aware of the document.

A Government Member: You wrote it.

Mr WRIGHT: That is all I would expect from the bald-headed member for Windsor. The document states—

“Abraham Gilbert Saffron born 6th October, 1919 and currently residing in Sydney, New South Wales is involved both directly and indirectly in numerous businesses in this State. Although all his businesses are apparently of a legitimate nature, there is little doubt that they are used as covers for illegal enterprises such as drug dealing, prostitution and laundering money.

A large proportion of persons employed by or associated with the Saffron/Farr organization have criminal records. Saffron has been unusually fortunate in his brushes with the law in New South Wales in that he has been charged with twenty-six criminal offences but only convicted of three of these charges.

Saffron's first known business involvement in this State was in 1971 when the La Belle Night Club opened for the first time as a licensed strip-club after being extensively modified from the old Bay Canew Night Club. At the same time the Saffron/Farr organization also bought the Castle Hotel at Edwardstown and the Elephant and Castle Hotel on West Terrace, Adelaide.”

The document goes on to speak about a Mr Peter Farr who is in fact a Mr Peter Farrugia. It is an internal police report on the activities of Saffron and speaks about his criminal activities throughout the nation for a long time. It lists the various hotels, motels, gambling institutions, night-clubs and restaurants that he is involved in. It then goes on to mention the sex shops. It states—

“The Saffron/Farr Organization have direct connection with a sex shop trading under the name of The Private Book Shop. It is believed that they also have a financial interest in a group of sex shops which trade under the name of the Love Craft shops.”

It goes on to list a number of those. The report also says—

“There is little doubt that this shop is being used as an outlet for drugs obtained from Sydney. Drugs have been located in these premises by officers from the drug squad. Persons who have been in the position to observe bank deposits made by Gilles believe that the amounts deposited are far in excess of expected normal receipts for a business of this type.

Recently a fire occurred at these premises and at the time of the fire the occupants appeared under the influence of drugs.”

It goes on about weapons that were also found. It then continues to list the various massage parlours and other involvements in this field that the Saffron group has. There are some 15 pages of this outlining the other businesses.

I will come to some of the conclusions, although there is another section on drugs. The report's conclusion states—

“The Saffron/Farr organization employs persons over whom it has some hold. It no doubt pays public officials in return for certain 'favours' and once having received money from this organization, these persons cannot sever connections with the organization for fear of exposure.

Although most businesses run by the Saffron/Farr organization have a legitimate appearance and are capable of making satisfactory profits while operating within the law, there is little doubt that a significant percentage of crime in this State (South Australia) stems from this organization and its employees."

It talks about a number of activities also involving the theft of Qantas Airways' tickets and how that was on an international basis.

The addendum states—

"Information to hand is that the Saffron/Farr organization have an interest in the professional wrestling which is held in each State of Australia."

So there is an involvement in Queensland, at least as far as the South Australian police are concerned. It continues—

"Overseas bouts are arranged and there is a suspicion that this may afford an opportunity for drug smuggling."

Again, that is a police report that clearly shows an international, national and State link of crime. This is the same Abe Saffron who has a link—had a link and has a continuing link over some 30 years—with a Mr Kornhauser. There is then the link that Mr Kornhauser has by total association, by admission, with a Minister in this Chamber who was prepared to go to bat to a newspaper company and to place pressure on others to ensure that the Kornhauser group was granted a casino licence.

Mr Speaker, there is a clear association. There is proof of criminality. There is evidence about the Saffron group. There is evidence from New South Wales reports that go back to 1950 of the link between Saffron and Kornhauser, and we have the modern admission of the link between the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police and Mr Kornhauser.

Mr Underwood: The Premier defended Kornhauser today.

Mr WRIGHT: I am surprised about the Premier's involvement. Although I do not like his political views—and I could probably get all the criticism in the world for this—I did believe that the Premier would stand by his principles on an issue like this. I will cop criticism from my own colleagues for giving him that bouquet. I cannot understand it, because my information is that what I have been told about the Kornhauser group was relayed not only to the Deputy Premier but also to the Premier.

Mr Bjelke-Petersen: A lot of rumours.

Mr WRIGHT: It may be rumour. I have wondered—and I say this with all due respect—what the Minister for Local Government has on the Premier. I have wondered about it because something is radically wrong. Something is seriously wrong when information is available in a Treasury report clearly showing that the Kornhauser application was so far behind that it should not have even been considered. That is why certain elements supporting the Kornhauser group determined that there was only one thing to do: if they could not get the Kornhauser application up on its merits, they had to largely destroy the Jennings application. That is the reason for the Muhl report. The sole objective of that report was to destroy Jennings. There is no other rational reason. The aim was to kill Jennings so that the Kornhauser application, regardless of its lack of merit, would still get the OK.

I am prepared to table this report. There will be further statements. However, I have discussed this letter at some length with those people involved with me, and the Government will wait and see what else there is to come. There is strong evidence of criminal involvement on the Gold Coast.

Deputy Commissioner Delanus of the Victorian Police Department is in possession of a report on an investigation carried out in Victoria. I have been informed that the Deputy Premier visited Victoria and had discussions with Deputy Commissioner Delanus. I ask that he deny or confirm that statement. I have been advised that if the Kornhauser group receives the nod, there will be a revelation of some substance from Victoria. That matter should be the subject of further inquiry. I call upon the Government through the Minister for Police to release the police reports that have been prepared on the various applicants. I ask the Deputy

Premier to release full documentation of discussions and any other information that he received when he went to Victoria and discussed the matter with Deputy Commissioner Delanus. I ask that no further decision be made upon the applications until that matter has been brought before some type of royal commission.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: Wouldn't you think that once the Labor Party wins government in Victoria in April, it would be very appropriate for us to approach the new Attorney-General there?

Mr WRIGHT: That would certainly be worth while. We do not have to wait very long. It is very easy for anyone in government to call the bluff. I am concerned about the motive behind it. Was it to outmanoeuvre the Opposition because a motion was pending; was it really to make us put up or shut up, as the Premier said; or was it an insidious approach to get the information out now to destroy the further inquiries that are being carried out by Federal police, Opposition members and the media groups who are determined to ensure that honesty prevails in the casino issue on the Gold Coast?

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the documents referred to.

Dr EDWARDS: I seek leave to table a letter.

(Leave granted.)

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the letter on the table.

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police) (3.47 p.m.): In reply to some of the accusations that have been levelled in the House this afternoon, particularly those serious allegations made by the member for Wolston concerning Mr Kornhauser, I would advise him that I do not think the police officers in the gallery are Federal police officers. They are Queensland police officers. If members of the Opposition cannot tell who their own police officers are, they do not have much intelligence. The member for Rockhampton said that Commonwealth police officers were seated in the gallery. The president of the police union, Col Chant, is there with a few of his members.

Mr Hooper: They will give the police union a good serve; they deserve it.

Mr HINZE: The honourable member thinks he is smart.

Mr Hooper: Have you ever read the "Woolloongabba Worrier"?

Mr HINZE: The honourable member can keep it up. At one stage the ALP had some friends in the Police Department; now they could be counted on two hands. I know that the honourable member has two friends or informers. I will name them shortly. In the honourable member's language, I think they are called "dogs".

I hope that the honourable member for Rockhampton will not be absent for very long. I continue to hear the nearest thing to the crucifixion that I have heard in 30 years of public life. I see a man being crucified. This afternoon I have heard a lot about Saffron, Zion and, of course, Kornhauser. The Opposition has tried to find some reason why the Queensland Government in the consideration of the applications for a casino in this State is doing something wrong in considering the application of Mr Eddie Kornhauser.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: What about when you told your own National Party branch on the Gold Coast that you had to give it to Kornhauser because your party was in debt to him for \$1m?

Mr HINZE: The honourable member is a liar.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: The Minister is a liar. He is the worst liar in Parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement.

Mr HINZE: I immediately withdraw it. I have made my point.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: I ask for an unqualified withdrawal of the remark made against me. I find it highly offensive.

Mr HINZE: I give the honourable member for Wolston an unqualified withdrawal. Does that make the honourable member feel better?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister to continue with his speech.

Mr HINZE: The honourable member is not a liar?

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HINZE: Let me get back to this accusation. Because I have so many accusations to answer, I do not want to spend too much time on it. I cannot let the name of Kornhauser be dragged down into the dust as the result of a statement by a man named Zion, who deliberately set out to destroy the Kornhauser family.

A few years ago, Kornhauser came to Queensland, and he is now a successful businessman in the Surfers Paradise area. He made an application for a casino licence. Then accusations came forward from all of his opponents, all of the people who believed that they could find something wrong with him.

I first heard of those accusations over 12 months ago. I had never heard of these men Saffron or Zion, nor do I want to know anything about them. They have not made applications for casino licences, and there is no reason why the Queensland Government should give consideration to them. If they are down in Victoria or New South Wales, they can stay there. The Queensland Government is dealing only with applications for casino licences in this State.

On hearing of those allegations, I asked the Police Commissioner to begin inquiries. As far back as nine months ago he came to me and said that he could not find anything wrong with Kornhauser. Here is the complete file. I am prepared to—

Mr Davis: Table it.

Mr HINZE: Wait a moment: I am prepared to allow the Leader of the Opposition and any other member who wishes to peruse all the documents to do so in my presence whenever they wish to.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: You've got me.

Mr HINZE: OK. Incidentally, I want to teach the honourable member for Wolston a lesson in politics. Before he entered Parliament there was an Opposition member named Sherrington. In the lift in the old building a member of the National Party said something to him in confidence. Mr Sherrington betrayed the confidence that was placed in him; in the House he repeated what was said to him in the lift. The member for Wolston acted in a similar fashion today.

It is true that prior to the Christmas recess I said to him upstairs, "Some day you will come to me and admit that this man Kornhauser is not the type of fellow you think he is." When the honourable member sees these documents that I have and when he hears all the evidence—and if he is a fair Queenslander and Australian, as I believe him to be—he will in fact come to me and say, "Well, Russell, I think I have made a mistake." Only time will tell whether I am wrong. Be that as it may, I do not want to take up any more time on Kornhauser, as he can look after himself.

I challenge the member for Wolston and the member for Rockhampton to go outside Parliament and repeat the statements that they made here today. Frankly, I do not believe that they have the guts to do so. They are using this cowards' castle to try to destroy a man. I believe they have just about succeeded. If their purpose is to destroy entirely the application of Paradise Corporation, they have pretty well succeeded in carrying out the filthy job that they set out to do.

Having said that, I should like to reply to the comments of the member for Rockhampton concerning the Muhl report. Arthur Muhl is one of my senior officers; he is the chief town planner of the State. Like every other Minister in Cabinet, I

continually discuss matters of interest with my responsible officers. On one occasion after the compilation of the document that obviously has been leaked to everyone, I said to Arthur Muhl after it had come into my possession, "I think something is wrong somewhere."

He said, "What do you mean?" I said, "Have you seen the plans yet?" He said, "No." I said, "Will you talk to the architect and have a look at the plans and come back and tell me what you think?" A person would have to be stupid to say that I instructed Mr Muhl to carry out any nefarious duties on my behalf. A person would have to be stupid to think that the senior town planning officer of Queensland would stoop to doing anything like that. I say quite emphatically and clearly that if Mr Muhl wants to give me another report tomorrow, of course I will consider it. But again it was leaked and appeared in the Press.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr HINZE: I would not know who leaked it and, frankly, I do not care. I stand by everything Arthur Muhl gives me because I believe him to be honest and faithful and probably one of Queensland's best public servants. He cannot defend himself in this place or anywhere else, so I stand beside him. If I did not do that, I would not be worth my salt.

I shall now reply to the statements of the honourable member for Archerfield concerning Sir Edward Lyons. A fair-minded person, such as the honourable member for Archerfield, having gone through the same processes and having felt the same pangs—

Mr HOOPER: I rise to a point of order. I did not go through the same processes. I was charged with dangerous driving, not drunken driving.

Mr SPEAKER: I thank the honourable member for his clarification.

Mr HINZE: Let me say, "Much the same". The honourable member would have had a similar experience.

Prior to the Christmas recess, honourable members attended many Christmas parties. In company with the Premier, I attended one at the TAB at which I drank some soda water. I saw some members of the news media there enjoying Sir Edward's hospitality. Soon after that, they plastered him over the front pages of their papers because, after the Christmas party, I imagine at the invitation at one of my ministerial colleagues, Sir Edward came here. He left here and drove along the freeway.

The report I have received reads—

"At about 1.20 a.m. on 18 December 1981 Constable 1/C P. J. Carmichael of the Traffic Branch —"

Mr Scott: Where is that constable stationed now?

Mr HINZE: Contrary to what the member for Cook thinks, I guess that Mr Carmichael is still where he was. I certainly did not do anything about it. I would not send him up to the honourable member's electorate, because he would spoil him.

Sir Edward Lyons was charged in the courts of Queensland and paid his fine. Why are we discussing Sir Edward Lyons? Simply because of the obsession of the honourable member for Archerfield. Quite clearly the honourable member hates the police and Sir Edward Lyons; so much so that he has brought the case before this Parliament again and has wasted its time.

The report continues—

"Constable Carmichael . . . intercepted Sir Edward Lyons driving outbound on the south-east Freeway, Greenslopes.

Sir Edward was questioned and admitted having consumed liquor. He was conveyed to Police Headquarters.

At about 2.00 a.m. on that same date the Commissioner, Mr Lewis, received a telephone call at his home from Police Headquarters. He then spoke to Sir Edward who said he had requested to speak to him. Sir Edward said that he had to travel to Sydney early that morning for an extremely important conference."

Mr Hooper interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Archerfield has had his opportunity to address this Chamber. I ask him to desist from making comments while the Minister is addressing the Chamber.

Mr HINZE: The report continues—

“He asked if any arrangements could be made that would permit him to do so.

Mr Lewis then spoke to Inspector D. Squassoni and asked him to see what could be done to assist Sir Edward.

Sir Edward showed a reading of .12% on the breath analysing instrument and a certificate to that effect was issued. A copy was handed to Sir Edward and the original was held by the apprehending officer.

The apprehending Constable commenced to prepare a Bench charge sheet but when he and Sergeant 1/c Bracken were spoken to by Inspector Squassoni it was agreed that Sir Edward could be dealt with by way of summons. The Constable then placed the Bench charge sheet in a waste paper basket, together with Sir Edward's copy of the certificate. Sir Edward said that he did not require it as he did not doubt their findings. Sir Edward was told that he would be contacted later and he was then permitted to leave. A copy of Constable 1/c Carmichael's duty sheet is attached.

The incident was brought under the notice of the Honourable the Minister the following day, the 19 December 1981.

A summons was issued on the 21 December 1981 and later served on Sir Edward Lyons.

He appeared at the Holland Park Magistrates Court on 28 January 1982. Pleaded 'Guilty', convicted and fined \$175.00 plus \$20.00 costs in default 1 months imprisonment. Driver's license disqualified for four months.

Statistics for U.I.L. charges and Fail to supply specimen of breath charges for period 1975 to present attached.”

I will table the documents because Opposition members are trying to suggest that Sir Edward Lyons was treated differently from other people.

I will summarise the figures in this way:

Year	Cases Reported	Summonsed
1975-76	10 640	664
1976-77	11 467	705
1977-78	10 493	768
1978-79	14 061	776
1979-80	15 990	892
1980-81	18 509	904
1-7-81 to 31-12-81	9 901	490

The figures relating to the failure to supply a specimen of breath are much the same. However, I will table them for the consideration of honourable members opposite. The only point I am making here is that although an attempt has been made to convey to the people of Queensland that this Government, the commissioner and the Police Department were trying to treat Sir Edward Lyons different from anyone else, that is not the case.

Mr Casey: Did Sir Edward Lyons make a phone call to Commissioner Lewis from the Holland Park Police Station?

Mr HINZE: If the honourable member had been here, he would have heard me say that.

Mr Casey: What was the basis of his phone call?

Mr HINZE: It is in "Hansard" now; the honourable member can read it.

The next group of accusations I want to deal with have been made by the honourable member for Rockhampton. A famous relationship has been built up between Jim Christian and the honourable member for Rockhampton. After having read in the news media all the

poppycock about illegal gambling going on in my electorate and hearing all the allegations being made about top Ministers and top members of Parliament, my daughter rang me crying and said, "What's going on down there, Dad?" She thought I was involved.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

Mr HINZE: I ask Opposition members to take their time; there is plenty more to come.

I got on the telephone to this chap Christian. I said to him, "Mr Christian, I don't think I have ever met you." He said, "Oh, yes, you did. You opened our church on the West Burleigh Road." I said, "Yes. Now I can recall having met you. What is the relationship between you and Wright?" He said, "I made that public statement. Wright got on the phone to me and wanted to know all about it. He wanted to come in on the deal." I think the term that he used was "Get in on the grouter." I then rang the member for Rockhampton and said, "Look, you are a responsible member of the Queensland Parliament. If there is something wrong in Queensland, if you don't want to tell me about it, surely you should go to the police." He said, "I can't do that because I went to your predecessor, Ron Camm, and went up a dry gully. So, under these circumstances, I certainly won't come to you. I have told everyone not to go to the police." I said, "Those are not statements that you would expect from a responsible person." However, it is not for me to tell the member for Rockhampton what to do. I am only relaying faithfully to this Parliament what actually happened. The honourable member did not send me any names.

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I did not say that I had sent them. I said I told him in that conversation. I realise that he may not have listened to everything I said. I told him that I did not want to go to Caesar about Caesar. I read out to him slowly and precisely a number of places where casinos were operating at that time. The Minister made no comment. He did not say he would close them down. He did not do anything. I did say to him that I would speak to him later.

Mr HINZE: I thank the honourable member.

Let us have a look at the accusations that have been made by the member for Rockhampton and a minister of religion in the Gold Coast area. I ask honourable members and the people of Queensland: Who would be the most reliable to inquire into the illegal gambling or prostitution that might be going on in this State. The Police Force, which has been set up specifically to do the job, or a minister of religion or the member for Rockhampton?

A list of names was sent along and I duly received that list from the Deputy Premier. There were about 11 names on it. I did not want to mention the names, because once they are mentioned everybody in the street where these places are located will look up at them and say, "There is a brothel or a gambling den up there." But the member for Rockhampton conveyed them to me and added a beautiful little bit at the bottom. He said that a bloke by the name of Don goes round all these places—

Mr WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I did not convey anything to the Minister in writing with reference to "Don" or anything else at the bottom.

Mr HINZE: Either the honourable member or Mr Christian conveyed them to me through the Deputy Premier.

Dr Edwards: An anonymous letter.

Mr HINZE: Yes, at the bottom of the anonymous letter was a nice little bit, which said, "There is a chap down the coast that goes round them all and collects \$1,000 a week. His name is Don." The only Don I have ever heard of is that bloke in "The Godfather".

Dr Scott-Young: And Don Lane.

Mr HINZE: Yes.

Mr Frawley: When the Labor Party was in power, one of the bagmen went to the Albert Street and Margaret Street brothels once a week to collect its share of the take.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will not stand for any more of this nonsense.

Mr Prest interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Port Curtis under Standing Order 123A.

Mr HINZE: I confirm the comments made by the member for Caboolture, because the late Johnno Mann told me. However, I will not be like the member for Wolston and spit on a dead old mate—a colleague and a friend with whom I used to have a drink every now and again.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. I point out that the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police is not a friend, drinking mate or colleague of mine.

Mr HINZE: I was not referring to the honourable member for Wolston. I spoke about a late friend of mine. He should not put himself up on a pedestal.

I have another police report which states—

“Following your instructions attention has been given to several places on the Gold Coast with a view to curbing the incidence of unlawful gambling. From inquiries made it would appear that the persons involved are very limited in number and are well known to each other. It would appear that these persons are engaged in playing card games—”

such as coon-can—

“amongst themselves and it is thought probable that they do include other persons from time to time. The games include manila and red aces (which is a form of poker) and I believe that on a lot of occasions whilst the games are accompanied by high stakes, there is no evidence of a percentage of the stake being taken by a particular person. Hence the unlawfulness of any game cannot be established.”

The plain facts of the matter are that ethnic groups such as Yugoslavs, Greeks or Italians often play cards in their own homes and invite some of their friends. Am I supposed to send my police in, knock the doors down and stop the card game? Honourable members opposite do not know the difference between a card game among a group of ethnic people who wish to gamble among themselves—something over which I have no control—and police protection for a Mafia-style gambling den.

In the interests of the people involved, I will again discuss this report with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr WRIGHT: I formally move that the honourable the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police table that report.

Mr HINZE: I will table it.

Now that the report will be tabled, the people named in it can lay the blame at the feet of the honourable member for Rockhampton if the public walk past their residence and say that it is a gaming house.

In conclusion, there is clearly a vast difference between these people who wish to have a game of cards and a police protected area, which is often referred to as a Mafia-type casino.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition if he referred to the incident at Mt Coot-tha?

Mr Casey: I referred to the way in which the whole matter was held up for so long.

Mr HINZE: I ask honourable members to accept my statement that the police did everything possible according to the laws of the State. Nobody can deny that a girl was killed and that two police officers were involved. But what am I or the commissioner supposed to do about that? The report I have states exactly what happened. I support this report, the Queensland Police Union and all the actions that were taken and accept full responsibility for them.

Donna Marie Ferguson died instantly from injuries received when she was a passenger in a police car driven by Constable Cuning when it overturned on Sir Samuel Griffith Drive, Mt Coot-tha. Preliminary reports received were to the effect that a car used by Donna Marie Ferguson and her companion, Elizabeth Ann Taylor, had broken down and Ferguson was being taken in the police car to obtain assistance. Subsequent inquiries by commissioned officers of police revealed this to be incorrect.

Inquiries established that Constables Cuning and Poole were rostered for mobile patrol duty from 10 pm to 6 am in the city area. They met the women by chance at about midnight and accompanied them, each in their own cars, to a shop at Windsor for coffee and then to Downey Park, Wilston, to drink the coffee. They then travelled as before to Pipp's night-club, obtained six cans of beer and a bottle of wine and went to a secluded area of Mt Coot-tha. Different versions have been obtained from Constable Poole and from Miss Taylor as to who travelled in which vehicle to Mt Coot-tha. At Mt Coot-tha the women and the police talked and drank for a time and then Ferguson and Cuning spent some time in the police car and Taylor and Poole spent some time in Taylor's car.

Mr Wright: Not playing coon-can.

Mr HINZE: The member for Rockhampton would know all about that. Those in glasshouses shouldn't throw stones.

At about 3 am they left the area. Cuning drove the police car and Ferguson accompanied him, Poole accompanied Taylor in her car. The police car overturned on the journey down the mountain. The complete file was forwarded to the Solicitor-General, who subsequently advised that there is no criminal offence which can be proved against either constable.

Constables Cuning and Poole were suspended from duty on 19 February 1982 and were charged with offences against the Police Rules as follows:—

Cuning:

1. Unfitness to continue as a member of the Police Force.
2. Absent from designated area of patrol (Windsor and Wilston).
3. Whilst on duty obtained liquor for consumption.
4. Whilst on duty consumed liquor.
5. Absent from designated area of patrol (Mt Coot-tha).
6. Carried passenger in police vehicle.
7. Through neglect damage caused to police vehicle.

Poole:

1. Unfitness to continue as a member of the Police Force.
2. Absent from designated area of patrol (Windsor and Wilston).
3. Whilst on duty consumed liquor.
4. Absent from designated area of patrol (Mt Coot-tha).
5. Made false entry in a log of patrols.

Both Constables Cuning and Poole have denied the truth of all charges and a departmental hearing will take place as soon as practicable. Arrangements have been made for the police file to be referred to the coroner.

Those are the matters coming under my direct control that there has been some comment on in the House this afternoon. I have tried to put to rest some of the accusations. I repeat that the Leader of the Opposition may peruse the police file on Kornhauser with me or with any of my police officers—or with any of his own members if he wishes. The reason I do that is simply this: the police are asked to keep police files. If I tabled them, who in the future would be prepared to give any information whatsoever to the police? That is the only reason why, on this occasion, I am refraining from tabling the file.

Mr Casey: I accept the offer.

Mr HINZE: I thank the Leader of the Opposition. At least we have one intelligent statement out of him today.

Mr Jones: That's unparliamentary.

Mr HINZE: I shouldn't have said that. I will withdraw the last bit.

Mr Speaker, that concludes my contribution to the debate on the motion moved by the Honourable the Premier. Those are the matters that I believe to be under my ministerial control.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table the documents referred to.

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier) (4.19 p.m.), in reply: In some respects it would appear that a great deal of time has been wasted today. On the other hand it has been made quite clear from the statements, allegations and so on of honourable members over a period of time that it was necessary for Parliament to set aside time to enable honourable members, if they had something—and they have not, of course—to bring forward their accusations and their documents. The Government took action to make that time available to honourable members.

It has been very interesting today, apart from the sheer waste of time, how honourable member after honourable member went round and round in circles talking about all sorts of things. They talked about things that had been printed in the Press again and again and about documents that were public documents to which everybody had access—they were quite open; there was nothing to them. In effect, they were trying to make a story out of nothing. There is not one skerrick of evidence or information that is of importance or value in relation to that question.

The Leader of the Opposition began his speech with great gusto. It was not very long before he spoke about Aborigines. He said that they had been given nothing. In fact, they have been given a great deal of land. Nobody else in Australia has been given land for nothing. The Leader of the Opposition referred to land rights. Opposition members are hypocrites. The Opposition does not believe in freehold. It will not give freehold title to white people, but it will give it to Aborigines. The Labor Party is prepared to give the Aboriginal people freehold land—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the floor.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition cannot escape from it. His policy is to give freehold land to Aborigines and not to give it to white people.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. The matter requires clarification. The Premier has misinterpreted the Labor Party policy on that matter. Our policy is inalienable freehold title for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island reserves.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Labor Party's policy is against freehold land.

Mr Casey: We do not want to be the landlords.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition has a short period of office before him. He has tried to make the most of it. He has gummed up the works completely. He referred to Yeppoon and Mr Iwasaki. Mr Iwasaki's project will be a very vital part of the tourist industry in this State.

Mr Casey: It is a long time coming.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The Leader of the Opposition has taken a long time to get to his present position, and he will soon be leaving it.

Mr Iwasaki will carry out the conditions and requirements that have been imposed upon him. The Leader of the Opposition referred to many matters that have nothing to do with the issues before the House. I gave him an opportunity to produce documentation of his allegations.

The member for Archerfield went round in circles. He rehashed everything that appeared in the newspapers concerning Sir Edward Lyons. There was nothing new; it was the same old story, the same hatred and bitterness towards the Police Commissioner and the Police Force. It is obvious that the honourable member could not conceal his bitterness towards the Police Force. He made accusations against Mr Terry Lewis, one of the greatest Police Commissioners that this State has had. I take my hat off to the

Queensland Police Force. It is the greatest Police Force in Australia. It looks after the honourable member for Archerfield whenever he has an accident. The police are always helping him out of trouble. He frequently needs their services, although he thinks he has grown up and does not need any help.

The honourable member is completely unfair in his continued attack on a man who has done so much for Queensland. Sir Edward Lyons is one of the greatest employers in the nation. He has approximately 25 000 people employed in organisations under his control. Sir Edward Lyons is a man for whom I have every respect. He has been a very good friend to me over a long period. I am proud to say that, even though he has criticised the Police Force.

I will defend our Police Force. It is second to none.

Mr Hooper interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! On numerous occasions I have warned the honourable member for Archerfield under Standing Order 123A, but he has been disinclined to accept my advice. I now ask him to withdraw from the Chamber.

Whereupon the honourable member for Archerfield withdrew from the Chamber.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: As to land rights for Aborigines—I remind the Leader of the Opposition of the situation in Canberra, where the people cannot get title in perpetuity to their land. They have a 99-year lease, and as time passes they are running out of time. Aborigines have been given a great deal of assistance. If some of their militant leaders were to be given at no cost to themselves all the land that they wanted and a bag of gold as well, they would still want more.

I turn now to the honourable member for Archerfield. He did not tell us about his own life and career, which would make a pretty seamy story. He very nicely bypasses his own story and his own actions and attitudes in relation to drinking and driving and smashing cars as well as all the rest of it. It is a very poor story indeed.

I shall touch lightly on the comments made by other speakers. The member for Callide (Mr Hartwig) criticised me very severely. On many occasions I backed him and supported him. I had also helped him. So it ill becomes him to criticise and condemn me. He was totally disloyal. It was because of his disloyal attitude to his party organisation and statements made by him that he was expelled from the party.

Mr HARTWIG: I rise to a point of order. I dare the Premier to lay on the table one item showing that I was critical of his administration as Premier of the State. I dare him to do it.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am not going into that. I could give illustration after illustration of his personally seeking to make capital out of me to his own advantage. He could not help it, and that is the unfortunate part. That is why he finds himself where he is today.

The member for Callide spoke at length on documents the contents of which are already known. He rehashed a whole lot of stuff that means nothing and implies nothing. None of the documents has any value or importance whatever.

Mr HARTWIG: I rise to a point of order. The Premier was absent this morning when I tabled a document and stated quite adamantly that Cabinet has the onus of proving to the people of Queensland that that document was not distributed to an applicant for a casino licence before renegotiation was asked for by the Premier on 24 February.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: The honourable member for Callide has made allegations of multimillion-dollar bribes and other things. The document tabled by the honourable member is nothing new; it is available to everyone. The honourable member is engaging in political propaganda as a means of trying to help himself, just as he has done so often before. He fell flat, and he will fall flat again in the very near future.

The honourable member for Wolston referred to police matters and to Mr Kornhauser. He spoke of this man on the Gold Coast, a man whose background I do not know. Many accusations have been made concerning him. Nevertheless, he has made a considerable contribution to this State. I say to the honourable member for Wolston that it is true that some of the matters that he referred to could be legal matters. However, they have nothing whatever to do with this question.

As to the men who supplied information to him, all I say to him is, "Tell the other side of the story. I happen to know a little bit about it from inquiries I have made." It is so easy to make statements and accusations in this House in an attempt to destroy people. The honourable member for Wolston should go outside the House and attack Eddie Kornhauser, and then see how he gets on. Let him go outside this House and try to attack Sir Edward Lyons, who is a very distinguished Australian and Queenslander.

Mr R. J. GIBBS: I rise to a point of order. As the Premier now has the floor, I challenge him to present the other side of the story.

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: There is nothing to debate today. The honourable members who have spoken today presented nothing new to the House. They trotted out the same old story which they have been throwing around for months on end. Not one of the matters they brought forward is of any importance or value. They produced no evidence. All they said was, "I thought", "I heard", and the rest of it, which they have been doing for so long.

Today the members of the Labor Party and the member for Callide have shown themselves up in a very poor light. They have shown themselves up for exactly what they are—opportunists trying to get some political kudos at the expense of individual people, organisations, the Government and the Cabinet. They have not been successful. They have destroyed what is left of their credibility. The people of Queensland will judge the Labor Party members, which is what the people are entitled to do. Opposition members produced nothing of any value to the Government.

Motion (Mr Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to.

PAPERS PRINTED DURING RECESS

Mr SPEAKER: I have to report that the following papers were ordered to be printed and circulated during the recess, in accordance with the resolution of the Parliament passed during the session of 1981:—

Reports—

- Financial Report of the Electricity Supply Industry in Queensland 1980-1981
- Queensland Cultural Centre Trust 1980-1981
- Department of Forestry 1980-1981
- Public Service Board 1980-1981
- Government Gas Engineer and Chief Gas Examiner 1980-1981
- Department of Aboriginal and Islander Advancement 1980-1981
- Department of Children's Services 1980-1981
- State Service Superannuation Board 1980-1981
- Queensland Probation and Parole Service 1980-1981
- Queensland Performing Arts Trust 1980-1981
- Queensland Art Gallery 1980-1981
- Trustees, Twelfth Night Theatre Building Trust 1980-1981
- National Parks and Wildlife Service 1980-1981
- Parole Board 1980-1981

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Reports—

- Registrar of Friendly Societies
- Gladstone Harbour Board for the year ended 30 June 1981
- Builders' Registration Board of Queensland for the year ended 30 June 1981
- Department of Works for the year ended 30 June 1981

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamations under—

- Queensland Marine Act 1958-1979
- Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1977 and the State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981

Orders in Council under—

- Metropolitan Transit Authority Act 1976-1979 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979
- Collections Act 1966-1981
- Money Lenders Act 1916-1979
- Supreme Court Act 1921-1979
- Industrial Development Act 1963-1979 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979
- Factories and Shops Act 1960-1975
- Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1980
- City of Brisbane Act 1924-1980
- Firearms and Offensive Weapons Act 1979
- Harbours Act 1955-1980
- State Housing Act 1945-1981
- State Housing Act 1945-1981 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979
- Financial Administration and Audit Act 1977-1981
- State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923-1979
- State Development and Public Works Organization Act 1971-1981
- Explosives Act 1952-1981
- Gas Act 1965-1981
- Electricity Act 1976-1980

Regulations under—

- Harbours Act 1955-1980
- Queensland Marine Act 1958-1979
- Land Tax Act 1915-1981
- Real Property Act 1877-1981
- Public Trustee Act 1978
- Companies Act 1961-1981
- Architects Act 1962-1971
- State Housing Act 1945-1981
- Local Government Act 1936-1981
- Local Government (Queen Street Mall) Act 1981
- Public Service Act 1922-1978
- Mining Act 1968-1980
- Explosives Act 1952-1981
- Petroleum Acts 1923-1981
- Workers' Compensation Act 1916-1980

By-laws under—

- Harbours Act 1955-1980
- Cairns Airport Act 1981

Ordinances under the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1980

- Income and Expenditure Account and Balance Sheet of the Coal Mine Workers Pensions Fund for the year ended 30 June 1981
- Report in pursuance of the provisions of Section 261 of the Queensland Marine Act 1958-1979.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Northern Casino Licence

Hon. L. R. EDWARDS (Ipswich—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (4.39 p.m.): I inform the House that following a close scrutiny of second stage submissions presented by the three remaining applicants for the northern Queensland casino licence and subject to police and corporate affairs checks into the background of the applicants, the preferred submission was that presented by Breakwater Island Resort Pty Ltd.

Second stage applications for the northern licence were received from Trinity Point Hotel Pty Ltd, Cairns Harbour Park Pty Ltd and Breakwater Island Resort Pty Ltd. Each of these applications was in response to comprehensive specifications contained in a brief-to-finalists document that outlined Government requirements and legislative intentions.

An inter-departmental officers' panel reviewed the three submissions by undertaking the following phases of activity:

- (i) Assessing compliance with the specifications contained in the brief to finalists;
- (ii) Summarising the quantitative data as presented in the submission;
- (iii) Determining the positive and negative aspects of each submission;
- (iv) Presenting an analytical synopsis of each submission.

The information gathered was collated into report form for appraisal by the ministerial committee and consideration by Cabinet.

Of the three northern applicants, the Breakwater Island Resort proposal was considered to be a strong, well-balanced and thoroughly attainable project that conformed more closely to the Government's requirements.

It indicated an imaginative design concept involving the formation of 17 ha of new water-ways and marina areas and 20 ha of reclaimed land upon which will be built a hotel/casino/convention centre of impressive design and size and a wide range of recreational and entertainment amenities.

The proposed design concept incorporates excellent master planning of all functions and comprehensive landscaping. It has the potential to integrate the various facilities into an international class tourist destination resort that will cater not only for domestic and overseas travellers but also for the community of Townsville and North Queensland generally.

The proposed corporate structure provides for a one-third Queensland public interest in the venture. The applicant parties are Drayton Investments Pty Ltd, a private company controlled by Sir Leslie Thiess, and World Resorts Pty Ltd, a subsidiary of Genting Berhad of Malaysia. Each applicant party will hold a one-third interest in the new public company to be formed to control and manage the project. Funding for the development is well-established.

Immediate negotiations will be entered into with applicant parties to finalise the terms and conditions of an agreement to be signed by the proposed casino licensee and this Government.

When the work is completed, I will present legislation, incorporating the agreement, for the consideration of the House. Separate legislation to cover the operational and control aspects of casino activity will follow.

Valuation of Land Act; New Zealand System of Valuation

Hon. W. D. HEWITT (Greenslopes—Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services) (4.42 p.m.): In my reply to the Supply (Estimates) debate on 27 October 1981 I advised that I had given an undertaking to local authorities throughout the State that I would be instigating an extensive review of the Valuation of Land Act, commencing early in 1982, and I gave a similar undertaking to Parliament. I forecast my intention to visit New Zealand, accompanied by the Valuer-General, Mr Haigh, to study the workings of the New Zealand Act.

Mr Haigh and I arrived in Wellington on Monday, 1 February this year, departing on the following Sunday evening. Discussions were held over this period with Mr M. R. Mander, New Zealand Valuer-General, Messrs B. C. McLay and H. Williamson of the Internal Auditors Department (Local Government), Mr T. M. McKewen, Secretary of the New Zealand Counties Association, Mr W. R. Storey, President, and other officials of the Federated Farmers of New Zealand.

I also had the opportunity to discuss valuations with the Honourable Jonathon H. Elworthy, Minister in charge of the Valuation Department and other members of the New Zealand Parliament with valuation experience. Towards the end of the week I journeyed to Palmerston North, through to Tauranga and eventually departed from Auckland. I had the opportunity to discuss valuations with local authorities in Masterton and Featherstone Counties and in the city of Palmerston North and also inspect regional and district offices of the Valuer-General's Department.

Matters of particular interest to me in the New Zealand system were:—

- (a) Valuation base
- (b) Frequency of revaluations
- (c) Valuation techniques
- (d) Concessional valuation based upon land use
- (e) Differential rating

(a) Valuation Base

The New Zealand Valuation of Land Act provides for three valuations to be determined for each property on:

- (1) The capital value
- (2) Land value (often referred to as site value)
- (3) Value of improvements

A local authority has the option to adopt a particular valuation base, for example capital value, land value or assessed annual value.

(b) Frequency of Revaluations

New Zealand has for many years generally adopted a five-yearly revision of valuation. To date, no attempts have been made to depart from the normal cyclic revision though there have been fairly rapid changes in market value.

(c) Valuation Techniques

New Zealand is in the forefront of the valuation profession with assistance to the professional valuer by the use of computer techniques. I found this study of interest as Queensland is moving into this field by undertaking a pilot study for the revaluation of Redcliffe city. It was an appropriate time to observe at first hand the methodology employed and to look at the problems that might be encountered in this relatively new technique.

Whilst Queensland's efforts are currently directed towards the making of urban valuations, New Zealand has advanced substantially in the use of the computer for effecting rural valuations.

(d) Concessional Valuations Based Upon Land Use

As with many other areas throughout the world New Zealand has found it necessary to introduce a concessional or deferred type valuation where the present land use is at a lower intensity than permitted as a potential use. Whilst Queensland has introduced measures to safeguard existing land use, a comparison with New Zealand proved useful and will be of benefit when these measures are fully examined.

(e) Differential Rating

New Zealand has provided for a wide diversity of differential rating systems for use by a local authority. My study of New Zealand's legislation and its practical application will be of assistance when considering whether differential rating might be used to a greater extent with valuations in Queensland to attain more equity in rating.

Specific guide-lines given to local authorities in New Zealand to assist in any adoption of differential rating are as follows:—

- (a) the use of property;

- (b) zoning under a district scheme;
- (c) area of the property;
- (d) the situation of the property in any specified part of the district, ward, or special rating area;
- (e) other distinctions in relation to the characteristics of a property as a council thinks fit.

I consider my New Zealand experience well worth while but the many facets of its system require detailed study.

With regard to the review of the Valuation of Land Act in Queensland, I have written to all local authorities and to many interested organisations seeking their views on the subject of valuation generally and requesting their submissions as to any necessary amendments to the Valuation of Land Act. When I am in receipt of these and have had the opportunity to study them, I will be in a better position to further advise on this matter.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

State Service Superannuation Scheme

From Mr Bird (16 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will remove all discrimination from the State Service Superannuation Scheme.

Funding of Nambour Lions Club Emergency Centre and Shelter

From Mr Ahern (19 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will continue funding by the Commonwealth and the State of the Nambour Lions Club Emergency Centre and Shelter.

Electoral Redistribution

From Mr Prentice (104 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will amend the Electoral Districts Act 1971-1977 to provide a uniform electoral quota for all districts.

Petitions received.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

A question submitted on notice was answered as follows:—

1. Government Charges

Mr Casey asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) What Government charges will have increased between State Budget day 17 September 1981 and 1 January 1982?

(2) What was the charge for these same services as at 1 January 1978?

Answer:—

(1 & 2) As I announced in my Budget speech, in accordance with the requirements of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, accountable officers of each department have reviewed the levels of fees and charges levied in respect of the various services provided by the Government and the necessary legislative and administrative requirements to give effect to the charges have largely been completed.

As the honourable member can no doubt appreciate, the very extensive range of services provided by the Government to the public, e.g., various court registries, the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, registration of business names, companies, etc., means that there is a corresponding extensive list of fees and charges levied by the various departments and I would not propose to list in detail each and every individual charge.

To complete the list necessary to answer the honourable member's question in detail would require many man-hours of work, and I do not believe such expenditure can be justified when the information is, by and large, readily available in official publications, namely, the Government Gazette.

Nevertheless, if the honourable member wishes specific information in relation to a particular fee or charge over a particular period, then I am sure the relevant Minister would be only too happy to provide it.

While there are claims in the media and in this House that the Government somehow acts furtively and secretly in relation to changes in the levels of the various fees and charges, I draw the attention of the honourable member to announcements in the various Budget speeches over the years which clearly indicate that the various fees and charges have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements of the Financial Administration and Audit Act and changes have been or would be implemented accordingly. It would therefore be completely wrong to suggest that the Government is not fully open in regard to these matters.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr CASEY: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Did the final report of Queensland's interdepartmental casino assessment committee reveal that in relation to the applications by—

(a) Paradise Corporation of Qld Pty Ltd, the proposal would bring about an overdevelopment of the site and its correction would require very significant redevelopment of the proposal;

(b) Robina-Majura Investments Pty Ltd, had flood plain problems and the committee was concerned about the management and ownership because of the extraordinarily high figures on which the commercial viability of the project was based; and

(c) Jennings Industries Ltd, presented the fewest difficulties and was also the most advantageous on all other counts, including site, finance, design and viability?

If such was the case, and as it clearly appears that the interdepartmental committee's report strongly favoured the application by Jennings Industries Ltd, why has Cabinet found it so difficult to make a decision on the granting of a licence on the Gold Coast using similar guide-lines under which it found it so easy to grant the North Queensland licence?

Dr EDWARDS: I would have thought that that matter was clearly answered in the previous debate. I do not intend to indicate whether those matters are in the report.

Mr Fouras: Talk about open Government!

Dr EDWARDS: The honourable member for South Brisbane has enough experience to know how Governments act. One of these days he might get some information. The performance of the Opposition in the earlier debate was abysmal. Everybody knows full well that the Opposition provided nothing substantive.

I reiterate that I have no intention of commenting on Press releases.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Dr EDWARDS: I wonder if it is worth while answering questions when one is continually interrupted. If it happens again, I will not answer any further.

Let me say for the third time that I do not intend to comment on Press reports of what is allegedly contained in an interdepartmental report. That matter is still under consideration by the Government. Matters will be clarified in examination with the participants at meetings that will take place over the next few days. The final reports will go to Cabinet in the near future and a decision will be made.

Let me say again, as I have said on numerous occasions, that there is no recommendation relative to one particular applicant or indeed that one surpasses all other applicants.

Mr CASEY: I direct a further question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—one that is in the past, if he does not wish to go into the future. I refer to his undertaking that anyone found to be lobbying for and on behalf of casino applicants would be dismissed from his position if he was on a Government committee or that the tender of the applicant would no longer be considered. In view of that, I ask: As the Minister for

Local Government has publicly compromised his position on the casino subcommittee through his approaches to Mr Harry Gordon, managing director of Queensland Newspapers—and they have been published in the paper and admitted on television by Mr Gordon—on behalf of a casino applicant, why has not the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police been sacked from the Cabinet casino committee?

Mr HINZE: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is implying in his question that I acted improperly. He is suggesting that the Government indicated that it would rule out any application when an applicant had made contact with the ministerial committee. I say here, so that it is clearly understood, that I called on Mr Harry Gordon—there is nothing unusual about that; I call on hundreds of people—believing, because of the information that came to me, that there was a possibility that the Paradise Corporation no longer wished to proceed and that Mr Kornhauser was giving serious consideration to withdrawing. Mr Kornhauser said he believed that he had been the victim of a scurrilous campaign—the type of thing we have seen in the House today—without any foundation. I repeat that time will tell.

However, putting that aside for the time being, I asked Mr Gordon to give the bloke a fair go. That is simply what I meant. If Kornhauser was leaving, if he was pulling out, for heaven's sake give him a fair go. I never on any occasion—and Mr Gordon would have to corroborate this—went along asking that the newspaper support the application. That is just too silly for words. If that has been suggested, I refute it.

I state to the House quite clearly that my part in this was a personal, private discussion with the editor of Queensland Newspapers, which incidentally, together with the Gold Coast newspaper "The Northern Star", has an interest in the applications. However, that does not matter, apparently. I just said, "Would you make sure that if this man does leave the State, he is given a fair go?" That's Russ Hinze. I don't deny it. If I believe that anyone is entitled to a fair go, I will get up and ask for it.

Mr CASEY: The first part of the question has been confirmed by the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police, and it will be noted that I made no improper suggestions in relation to the motives of the Minister. I refer to the Treasurer's comments regarding the lobbying for and on behalf of persons who were applicants for a casino licence. The Minister for Local Government has admitted that he made approaches for and on behalf of an applicant for a casino licence, as a man who was on the casino committee, which is supposedly an impartial body. I now ask the Treasurer: In view of those facts and the comments made by him today, supported by the Premier, why has not the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police been sacked from the casino committee because of his lack of impartiality?

Dr EDWARDS: I repeat that the Government will make its decision on merit. I have discussed that matter in detail with the Premier. Discussions will be held with the inter-departmental committee and me, as chairman, and the decision will be made by the Cabinet.

Police Reports on Casino Applicants

Mr CASEY: As the Premier has just stated that the final assessment will be made on merit, and that the remaining submissions for the operation of the southern casino licence by Jennings Industries, Paradise Corporation and Robina-Majura, will depend upon a police report—which places the matters in his hands—I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police:

- (1) Has that report been completed?
- (2) When will it be received by Cabinet?
- (3) Was every applicant submitted to the scrutiny of a police report? and
- (4) If so, what information is being sought in this second report that was not investigated originally regarding the applicants?

Dr EDWARDS: As the Minister responsible for casinos—

Mr CASEY: I asked the question of the Minister for Police concerning police matters. I seek an answer from that Minister.

Dr EDWARDS: As the Minister responsible for the legislation and the conduct—

Mr CASEY: Mr Speaker, I seek a ruling from you or from the Premier. Does this now mean that the Treasurer is acting as Minister for Police on those matters in this House as well? I asked the question of the Minister for Police. I directed the question to him. I expect an answer from the Minister for Police.

Mr SPEAKER: I am not clear on what the Leader of the Opposition is driving at. If the Treasurer wishes to make a statement that may throw some light on this subject, I am prepared to accept it. Furthermore, in the final analysis, I expect a response from the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police.

Mr CASEY: In view of your ruling that you were not quite certain of what I was driving at, I indicate that I asked the question of the Minister for Police. If the Treasurer desires to make a statement to the House on this subject, under Standing Orders he is quite entitled to do so at any stage. My question was directed to the responsible Minister. It related entirely to matters concerning his portfolio. I seek an answer from the Minister for Police. Following that, the Treasurer may do as he wishes.

Mr SPEAKER: Being in possession of that enlightening information in relation to the Treasurer's capacity, if the Treasurer now wishes to make a statement, I will hear him.

Dr EDWARDS: As the Minister responsible for the investigation into casinos and the receipt of all reports, I advise the Leader of the Opposition that all police reports were received by me about 10 days ago, as the responsible Minister, from the Minister for Police. Those reports have been examined by the Premier and me. Aspects of those reports relative to the North Queensland application were considered by Cabinet last Monday. No police reports are outstanding, and no further police reports will be considered by the Government.

Mr HINZE: The question has been answered adequately by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr D'ARCY: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: When did he first receive the final assessment of the casino committee from the Treasury? Further, in view of the statement that he has just read to the House, to the effect that a close scrutiny of the second-stage submissions showed that a third submission was presented by Breakwater Island Pty Ltd and that "immediate negotiations" would be entered into with the applicant parties to "finalise the terms and conditions of agreement to be signed by the Queensland Government and the licensee", I ask: Why was no decision made on both casino licences by Cabinet when a final assessment by the Treasury-led committee was made on both? The Treasurer stated in the House today that negotiations were still taking place with the successful applicant for the northern casino licence.

Dr EDWARDS: Sometimes I wonder whether, in addition to being deaf, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition ever went to school. As I have said very clearly, the matters relating to the northern application were clearly marked on the inter-departmental report so that a decision could be made on merit. That decision has been well received by most people in the community.

The inter-departmental committee raised some matters concerning the South Queensland applicants. I did not say they needed negotiating; I said that they needed clarification, and that clarification will be given in discussions over the next few days.

Relative to my statement today about negotiations with the successful application in North Queensland—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows full well from the briefing that has been given to him that we now have to negotiate the heads of agreement relating to all matters in the submission. Those heads of agreement are the matters to be dealt with in the negotiations that will commence with the successful applicant in North Queensland as soon as possible.

North Queensland Casino Licence

Mr D'ARCY: I refer the Deputy Premier and Treasurer to statements by Mr Metcalfe, reported in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" on Tuesday, 23 February, thanking Mr Bjelke-Petersen for the decision to be announced in the not-too-distant future to give

Townsville North Queensland's first casino. Also I refer the Deputy Premier and Treasurer to an advertisement in the same newspaper on the previous Saturday, thanking the Government for granting Townsville a casino. As Mr Metcalfe's statements were made before Cabinet made the decision on the northern casino, are not the relevance of Cabinet and the propriety of the Government in question?

Dr EDWARDS: The advertisement has just been brought to my attention. I know nothing about the advertisement. I am sure that the Premier would dissociate himself from such an advertisement as well.

Mr D'Arcy: I tabled the newspaper and drew it to your attention.

Dr EDWARDS: I said that it has been brought to my attention. In fact, I just received a full copy of it a few moments ago. I said I had seen the advertisement. I dissociate myself from it and I am sure that the Premier does. The decision was not made until the Monday and certainly, as far as I am aware, no decision was referred to any other person prior to that time. If Mr Metcalfe, whoever he is, expended that money on the advertisement in the newspaper, that is up to him, and he must stand by the action that he took.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr D'ARCY: I direct a question without notice to the Premier. After the Cabinet meeting last Tuesday which failed to make a decision on all of the casino licences, and a short list of applicants was determined for the Gold Coast casino, he held a Press conference in which he stated that applicants could change sites, that all applications were back to the drawing board, that the reasons for the delay involved problems with corporate structure, flood plains, traffic flows, etc., and that these had not been fully discussed by the committee and had also to be further discussed with the applicants. Is the Premier aware that these statements were denied by the Deputy Premier on the same day? Can the Premier inform Parliament of the true position regarding the Gold Coast casino applicants?

Mr BJELKE-PETERSEN: I suggest that the honourable member curb his impatience. He will shortly get the full facts. He does not need to worry.

ALP Policy on Mining Royalties

Mr SCASSOLA: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware that the Leader of the Opposition has said that a Labor Government would introduce a "new form" of royalty which, in part, would be based "on the profitability" of a mining operation? Is the imposition of such a tax not new but in fact the imposition on a section of the business community of another income tax which cannot be levied or assessed until profits can be determined?

Dr EDWARDS: I have read part of the statement of the Leader of the Opposition about the new ALP policy on mining royalties. It is the same old story on resource development that the ALP has peddled round this State and the Commonwealth for a long period. As I understand the policy—and it is very difficult to understand—there are two important aspects that must be brought to the attention of the people of Queensland.

The first relates to a flat tax. The Leader of the Opposition has not indicated that the present royalty level would be lowered, and from information made available and from questions asked of him in Mt Isa, I understand that he has given no indication that the present level of royalty would be lowered except in one or two instances related to the processing situation. But he then went on to say that, in addition to the basic flat tax, a royalty would be imposed on profits.

The Leader of the Opposition should know, and the companies and the people of Queensland should be informed, that it would be almost impossible to implement a scheme of that nature. It would be impossible to keep the accounts associated with such a scheme. The royalties would not be paid until 12 months after the coal had been sold, so the people of Queensland can see very clearly that for 12 months no

royalties would be paid over and above the flat tax. If Labor ever came to power the people of Queensland would be 12 months behind with the money they receive from royalties on resources in this State.

Furthermore, because there would be a fluctuation of royalties under a profit-based scheme there would be no escalation clause relating to cost increases. The Leader of the Opposition knows full well that many of the clauses that have already been negotiated are based on such a scheme, and to suggest that we should suddenly revert to a profit-based scheme would mean the renegotiation of all contracts currently operating in Queensland and could well mean the beginning of the end of coal-mining in this State. The Opposition's proposals would have the same effect as those implemented by their Federal Labor counterparts between 1972 and 1975, which killed resource development in Australia—something from which this Government has still not yet recovered.

One hopes that the Opposition will never have the opportunity to implement such a policy, because if it does it will mean the destruction of the coal mining industry in Queensland. I would ask the honourable members for Mirani and Peak Downs what they think of that policy. I know full well that it would do nothing but decimate the royalties received by this State and bring discredit on this Government, which has a high rating with the mining companies and the people of Queensland. Let me repeat that the resources belong to the people of Queensland, and the Government has to make a decision that will ensure the best royalty return to the State. The Leader of the Opposition made no comment on rail freights presently being charged—

Mr Casey: I did, you know.

Dr EDWARDS: The honourable gentleman did not. Figures that my department has already taken out show that company costs would increase while returns would decrease, so I believe that it is a preposterous policy that deserves condemnation.

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. For the benefit of the Treasurer, who is three miles off target, I will send him a full copy of the statement. It has been well received by the mining industry.

Criticism by Deputy Premier and Treasurer of Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police

Mr PREST: I ask the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police: Is he aware that as early as September last year, in Townsville, the Treasurer (Dr Edwards) described him as an embarrassment to the casino committee and criticised him for having made certain disclosures and predictions about where the casino licence might go? Did the Minister ever regard himself as an embarrassment to the committee? If not, why did the Deputy Premier regard him as an embarrassment?

Mr HINZE: The question is too silly to answer.

Class Sizes

Mr PREST: I ask the Minister for Education: As the Select Committee on Education in Queensland submitted a report commonly referred to as the Ahern report that contained recommended class sizes for schools, will the Minister have meaningful discussions with the Queensland Teachers Union so that an acceptable solution may be arrived at, firstly, on the implementation of the Ahern report on class sizes and, secondly, on the timing of the introduction of such acceptable class sizes in all schools? If not, is he aware that the ones to really suffer from this head-on clash between the Government and the union are the children? Is the Minister or the Government prepared to allow the children's education to suffer because of political pig-headedness?

Mr GUNN: As the honourable member has said, the select committee made recommendations. That is what they were.

The honourable member asked whether I will have meaningful discussions with the Queensland Teachers Union. The other afternoon I met the president of the union for two hours. All that he submitted to me was a one-page document, which had been drawn up by his union executive. It contained the conditions under which the union was prepared to talk. Those conditions were not acceptable to the Government or to the taxpayers of this State.

I have had meaningful discussions with the Parents and Citizens Association of Queensland and with the union on a number of occasions. Possibly the gentleman who gave the honourable member for Port Curtis his brief led him astray. Prior to Christmas I met with union representatives for several hours. There is no purpose to be served in meeting the union again because the document that I have in my possession sets out the conditions that apply only to the union and not to the Government. They would commit this Government to the expenditure of an additional \$120m a year for teachers' salaries and capital works. It is up to the honourable member to say whether the Government should take that money away from health, housing or welfare.

Last year Queensland had the best education budget in Australia. There was an increase of 16.9 per cent over the previous year. That budget was applauded by the union. As a matter of fact, it tried to take credit for the increase. The Government was able to employ an additional 621 teachers. So far this year the department has employed more than 1 100 new teachers. I can assure the honourable member that the Government is playing its part.

This is a plain, political exercise. If one looks at the make-up of the Queensland Teachers Union one sees that it is a home for unsuccessful ALP election candidates.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr GUNN: Linacre has tried so many times that he must be an embarrassment even to the ALP.

I say to the parents of children in Queensland, "Don't be used as political pawns. Your children are getting as good an education in this State as children anywhere else in Australia." That point was borne out by Dr John Keeves from the Australian Council for Educational Research. In his finding last year he said that in literacy and numeracy Queensland children lead Australia.

Mr PREST: Mr Speaker, I would like it recorded that the answer to that question was greeted with "Hear, hears!" from Government members.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr DAVIS: In asking a question of the Minister for Commerce and Industry I refer to the membership of the Cabinet casino subcommittee and ask—

- (1) Is the Minister a member of that subcommittee?
- (2) If so, when was he appointed and by whom?
- (3) How many meetings of the committee has he attended?
- (4) Has he received a copy of the final assessment document from the Treasury?

Mr SULLIVAN: (1) The Deputy Premier indicated my connection with the casino committee when he pointed out that on two occasions the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts (Mr Elliott) had already made arrangements to travel to the Gulf country to look at his responsibilities there. On one Saturday morning when it was convenient for the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police to look at the sites of the casino applicants on the Gold Coast, I volunteered to attend in the place of Mr Elliott.

(2) I have already indicated that because of Mr Elliott's absence I volunteered and Cabinet agreed that I should attend in his place.

(3 & 4) Yes.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr DAVIS: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer to explain to the House why Mr Muhl, after serving on the inter-departmental casino committee, signed the report which apparently mentioned a preferred applicant, then suddenly changed his mind and produced a report that strongly backed the Paradise Corporation of Qld Pty Ltd proposal? Does he agree that that about face by a senior member of the assessment committee indicates some confusion on the part of the Government and its advisers?

Dr EDWARDS: The only report that will be considered by the Government is the inter-departmental report, to which Mr Muhl was a signatory.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr DAVIS: In asking a question of the Minister for Environment, Valuation and Administrative Services I refer to allegations that the applications by both Robina-Majura Investments Pty Ltd and Jennings Industries Ltd for a Gold Coast casino licence contravene the Fire Safety Act, and a suggestion has been made that the application by Paradise Corporation of Qld Pty Ltd also does not comply with that Act. I now ask: Was a report on those and the other 23 applications for casino licences in Queensland compiled by the Minister's department and can he confirm that the final three applications for the Gold Coast licence do not comply with the Fire Safety Act?

Mr HEWITT: The professional services of fire safety officers are called upon daily in an advisory capacity. There is no reason why requests of that nature for professional advice should be referred to me. The matter was not referred to me. The officers gave their advice accordingly and I assume that their advice would have to be acted upon before a building permit was granted.

Promotion of the Queensland Tourist Industry

Mr BORBIDGE: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: With reference to the Government's decision to boost promotion of the Queensland tourist industry through the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and the widespread support for that initiative throughout the industry, can the Minister advise the House about details of and reasons for the special allocation of funds?

Mr ELLIOTT: The whole thrust of the corporation's exercise is the maintenance of our No. 1 position as a holiday destination in Australia. The first thing I should explain is that we will be promoting specific package flights and tours to particular areas. The next thrust of the exercise will be the promotion of the 14 different branches of the corporation, which are its front-line troops, so to speak. That is where we get the major part of our money from. In turn, the revenue generated by those offices is ploughed back into promotion. The purpose is twofold.

Mr Warburton: Why don't you do something for our own local people?

Mr ELLIOTT: We are doing something for our own local people. I will come to that.

The other object is to promote Queensland in the other States. We are doing this in particular through the holiday fair concept. Tomorrow we will be opening a holiday fair in Sydney. The object of the exercise is not just to promote Queensland purely and simply as the Gold Coast or the Barrier Reef, which many people have as their concept of Queensland. The various local operators, which my shadow spokesman referred to a moment ago, and regional operations in various parts of the State are able to display in great detail in the holiday fair what they have to offer. Believe me, what we have to offer throughout the State is most impressive. Holiday fair promotions, which we have undertaken in various locations throughout Australia, require a considerable sum of money. In the specific instance of the Sydney fair commencing tomorrow, we will be spending \$20,000-odd on television, Press and radio coverage.

To sum up in answering the honourable member's question—between now and about July we will be spending in excess of \$500,000. \$550,000 will be spent directly in advertising through broadsheet coloured displays in periodicals such as "The Australian Women's Weekly", "New Idea" and similar magazines. We will be running all types of Press advertisements. The whole object of the exercise is to maintain a positive outlook to ensure that we keep our share of the market. I place on record how much I have appreciated the support we have received from the Gold Coast in particular. The honourable member for Surfers Paradise has been very vocal about his own area and the concept of holiday fair and tourist promotion in general. Over the years probably no other area of Queensland has pushed tourism in Queensland more than the Gold Coast, and I commend him for it.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr YEWDAL: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: As the Paradise Corporation of Queensland Pty Ltd proposal for a casino on the Gold Coast has been described as imaginative, bold and memorable and a tremendous adjunct to Australia's tourist destination centre, what is the main objection of the Cabinet casino committee to that application?

Mr ELLIOTT: It has already been clearly indicated that the Treasurer is the spokesman on the casino committee. I have no further comment to make.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr YEWDAL: I refer the Deputy Premier and Treasurer to the Cabinet casino subcommittee and ask: How many copies of the final assessment report have been distributed by Treasury officers and to whom were they distributed?

Dr EDWARDS: I make it clear that it is not a Treasury subcommittee; it is a Government subcommittee. The inter-departmental committee encompasses all departments. Five copies of that report were furnished to me as Treasurer. One copy was sent to the Premier, one to the Minister for Commerce and Industry in case he had to attend in place of Mr Elliott, one to Mr Elliott, one to Mr Hinze, and one to me. Draft copies were available only to members of the committee. No other copies have been supplied.

Mr YEWDAL: By way of a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, I ask:

- (1) How many members are on the Cabinet select committee on casinos?
- (2) Who are they; when was each appointed, and by whom?

Dr EDWARDS: The original Cabinet decision in November or September 1980 was to establish a committee that would examine the possibility of the establishment of casinos in Queensland. It was decided at that time that the three Ministers who would make up that committee would be the Treasurer, the Minister for Police and the Minister for Tourism, whoever they may be at that particular time. That committee did not meet until after the election. The first meeting took place in late January 1981. Those members of the committee have been retained. Of course, the Premier is an ex officio member of that committee. When time has permitted, he has attended meetings. For reasons already explained, when Mr Elliott has been unable to attend meetings the Minister for Commerce and Industry has attended in his stead.

Tourism in Western Queensland

Mr TURNER: I ask the Minister for Tourism, National Parks, Sport and The Arts: Following the announcement yesterday of the introduction of junior Gooney Bird flights throughout Western Queensland as a means of catering for the growing tourist traffic in that region, will he indicate any other proposals that may be in the pipeline as a means of attracting even more tourists to Western Queensland?

Mr ELLIOTT: The Gooney Bird concept has been a very successful exercise for both the Queensland Tourist and Travel Corporation and Air Queensland, which was formerly known as BPA. The Gooney Bird flights began last year. They occupied approximately 16 days at a cost of \$1,900-odd. Many people criticised them and claimed that they would not be successful. The results speak for themselves. All the flights were fully booked. In fact, each flight had a waiting list of approximately 50 per cent of the aircraft's capacity.

Yesterday the member for Warrego, Mr Sid Williams of Air Queensland and I launched the junior Gooney Bird flights. They will carry people through western areas, particularly the area represented by the honourable member for Warrego. These flights will be as successful as the original Gooney Bird flights. This tremendous success will be due to the involvement of people such as the honourable member for Warrego and that wonderful band of persons who make up the Outback Tourist Association, which is based in Charleville. They have gone out of their way to try to make tourists welcome. Members of other tourist associations and other members of Parliament have done likewise. That is the concept that we have to push to get inland tourism going.

Some time in May I will be leading a tourist safari into western areas to promote tourism. We will be travelling through the Warrego area as well as other areas in an attempt to gain wider public recognition of the tremendous potential of inland tourism. In the Outback there is a great interest in looking at our past and in trying to rediscover, as it were, the real Australia. The Stockmen's Hall of Fame at Longreach, in Mr Glasson's electorate, and other projects will bring Outback tourism on stream.

I commend the honourable member for Warrego and those people who have been associated with all tourism projects in his area for their support and assistance. Tourists who make the flights are absolutely amazed at the hospitality and friendliness of western people, who dream up all types of attractions, such as guinea pig races, to capture the attention of tourists. I thank the honourable member for his question.

Applications for Casino Licences

Mr HANSEN: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Is he aware of a statement made by a criminologist, Dr McCoy—the real McCoy—that the scrutiny by Queensland Police of applicants for casino licences appeared to be limited and amateurish and that the Victorian and Federal Police apparently had carried out extensive investigations? Does he maintain that those investigations by Commonwealth and Victorian Police were carried out only at the request of the Queensland Police?

Dr EDWARDS: The statement made by Dr McCoy has been drawn to my attention. I find it very strange how a man such as Dr McCoy, who has never spoken to any Minister in this State, any member of the casino committee or the Commissioner of Police, could know what the Queensland Government has authorised or implemented in the pursuit of the investigation relative to police matters. I am perfectly satisfied that all information that has been available to any police in Australia or overseas has been made available to the Minister and me so that an assessment can be made. I totally reject Dr McCoy's statement and challenge him to state publicly the basis of his statement.

Labor Party's Land Policy

Mr KATTER: I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: Do the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition today, in which he demanded freehold land rights for Aborigines, mean that, under an ALP Government in Queensland, because the ALP's policy precludes freeholding, all of Queensland would be leasehold except the Aboriginal areas which, alone, would be freehold?

Dr EDWARDS: It is true that the Leader of the Opposition is being—

Mr CASEY: I rise to a point of order. Both the honourable member for Flinders and the Deputy Premier are deliberately misrepresenting Labor's policy. This misrepresentation is completely offensive and I ask that those comments be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I cannot sustain the point of order.

Dr EDWARDS: The Leader of the Opposition is being totally inconsistent in his statements on land policies. It is true that the record of the Labor Party in government speaks for itself in that at the end of the Labor Party's reign in 1957—a fortunate happening—over 97 per cent of the land in Queensland was held under leasehold. The Labor Party had made no attempt to provide for the freeholding of that land. It was a National-Liberal Government that gave leaseholders the opportunity to freehold their land, and recent legislative amendments have increased that opportunity.

The recent statements of the Opposition on Aboriginal land rights make it clear that honourable members opposite are inconsistent. I do not want to debate land rights with the Leader of the Opposition at this stage, but he has been shown to be inconsistent. His recent announcement was sheer political opportunism. If the Labor Party thinks that it can con the people of Queensland or the Aboriginal people it will be laughed at, just as the Leader of the Opposition is laughing now.

The Government's policy is to give the elected Aboriginal community councils the opportunity to act as trustees of reserve lands for as long as they wish. Special leases will be made available. That proposal has been welcomed by the majority of the people of Queensland and the majority of Aborigines. The Aboriginal people deserve the opportunity to act as trustees of their land and to conduct their own affairs. It is evident that the Labor Party's policy in this area is inconsistent. When I was speaking to some people at a sugar conference this afternoon, they indicated very clearly that the Labor Party has a forked tongue and that the Leader of the Opposition has the biggest forked tongue of all.

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

SUSPENSION OF SESSIONAL ORDER

Class Sizes Recommended by Select Committee on Education

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House) (5.46 p.m.): I move—

“That so much of the Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 10 March 1981 be suspended to allow the House to proceed to the consideration of General Business, Notice of Motion No. 2, standing in the name of Mr Shaw.”

Motion agreed to.

CLASS SIZES RECOMMENDED BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr SHAW (Wynnum) (5.48 p.m.): I move—

“That the Government formally adopt the principles regarding class sizes as recommended in paragraph 4/13 of the Third Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland as tabled in the House on Tuesday, 29 May 1979 and, before the adoption of the 1982-83 Budget, lay upon the table of the House a report showing the proposed timetable for the implementation of the recommendation.”

A great deal of publicity has occurred recently relative to the question of class sizes, and much of the campaign that has been waged and many of the statements that have emanated from Government members have served to confuse the issue rather than clarify it.

It has been stated repeatedly by Government members that to do anything to alleviate the problem of class sizes would cost millions of dollars and is beyond the realms of possibility. I submit immediately that the Government should have acted to overcome the present state of insanity that exists in the education system in which parents are threatening to take, and have in fact taken, their children out of the class-room.

Mr Moore: Where does that happen?

Mr SHAW: The honourable member should read the newspapers if he does not think that it has happened. Parents are so concerned that they have felt it necessary to take such drastic action. The Queensland Teachers Union is threatening to go on strike because of the deteriorating situation. I sincerely believe that all the problems could have been overcome had the Government been prepared to adopt the suggestions put forward by the Opposition in this motion.

The first part of the motion states—

“That the Government formally adopt the principles regarding class sizes as recommended in Paragraph 4/13 of the Third Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland”

What possible reason could the Government have for not accepting that part of the motion? I hope that after this motion is agreed to by the House we will have an ongoing commitment from the Government to progressively reduce class sizes, which is really all it would be doing.

Mr Gunn: That is what we have been doing.

Mr SHAW: That is not what the Government has been doing, and the Minister knows it. The situation with class sizes has been deteriorating for the last three or four years.

Mr R. J. Gibbs: This is the worst Education Minister that the State has ever had.

Mr SHAW: I shall take that interjection. If we relied on the figures provided by the Minister, we certainly would not know the position. He has repeatedly said in answers to questions that the department does not keep those figures because it is too costly.

Mr Gunn: I will give you the figures.

Mr SHAW: That will be something that we have gained. The Minister will have a hard job convincing the parents of children attending schools in this State that the situation with class sizes has not been deteriorating. I was told by one of the people involved in the p. and c. association of the Welcome Creek State School that every one of the classes in that school is a composite class.

Mr Gunn: There are composite classes in every one-teacher and two-teacher school.

Mr SHAW: The Welcome Creek State School is not a one-teacher school. The fact is that composite classes are being formed because there is a shortage of teachers. There are not enough teachers to honour the promises that this Government made about class sizes.

The next part of the motion states—

“That the Government . . . lay upon the Table of the House a report showing the proposed timetable for the implementation of the recommendation.”

That is not an unreasonable request. It means that the Government would have to come clean and tell us how long it will take to reach the goals that the committee has recommended. Perhaps the reason the Government does not want to do that is that it feels that the recommendation cannot be implemented within a reasonable time.

The Treasurer has said repeatedly that he believes in open government. There is no reason why the Government should not come clean and tell people whether it proposes to reduce class sizes and, if so, how long it will take to do so. If the Queensland Teachers Union will not listen to the Minister, certainly the parents in this State will listen to him if he comes out and says, “This is the situation: we have a problem but we will progressively increase funding and the number of teachers and maintain an acceptable level of class sizes. More importantly, we will do something about the increasing number of composite classes that are being formed in Queensland.” The situation with class sizes has been deteriorating year by year.

Mr Moore: We will spend money on hospitals first.

Mr SHAW: If the Government wants to spend money on hospitals first, it should tell the people that. It should say, "It will take us three years to overcome the problems that we have with the hospital scheme in Queensland. Then we will begin to reduce class sizes."

If that is what the Government has to do, the Opposition will accept it. At least the people of Queensland would know where they stood and when there may be some improvement in this matter. All that we have at present is insanity. The teachers are threatening to go on strike and the Premier is threatening to gather a Dad's army of retired teachers who, in fact, are not available. I am sorry that we have seen conflicting statements from the Minister about his intentions. In one of them he said that the Government would draw upon the pool of unemployed teachers. That is very interesting, because only last year the House was informed that there was no pool of unemployed teachers.

Mr Gunn: Who told you that?

Mr SHAW: The Minister did. I will quote it for him. In answer to a question he told me that there were no unemployed teachers, merely a list of teachers who were not available, but who were looking for second jobs. If they were not available then, how are they available now?

Where does the Government intend to get all these teachers? It is incredible, and only creates upheaval in class-rooms, for the Minister to say that the Government intends to get rid of the present teachers and replace them with temporary teachers, who presently have second jobs elsewhere. Does the Minister contend that that is a sane and sensible suggestion that is better than having even a small amount of time lost through strike action?

Mr Moore: If they are not prepared to do their jobs, we should sack them.

Mr SHAW: That suggestion has been made by several people.

Another suggestion is that the teachers are misusing the children. I do not intend to take up the cudgels on behalf of the Queensland Teachers Union. On many occasions I have argued against that body. In this instance it is a great pity that the Queensland Teachers Union is spearheading the campaign. The dispute lies between the Government, with its funding policy, and the parents.

Mr FitzGerald: It is political.

Mr SHAW: It is not party political.

Mr Gunn: Mr Schuntner is political.

Mr SHAW: It might be political from his point of view, but it is not from mine.

I do not understand why the Government insists on making education a party-political issue. What is political about the type of education children receive at school? The political parties do not have different opinions on that. It is incredible that the Government should try to keep this matter on a party-political level. It is not a political dispute at all. In the sense that the dispute is between the people and the Government, it is political. But, it is not a matter of party ideologies to the Labor Party except to the extent that it believes class sizes are important and gives that matter high priority. The Government has adopted the other stance. The motion calls upon the Government to state its policy rather than do what it has done in the past, that is to say that the matter has a high priority and that it intends to do something about it. But, year after year, nothing happens.

It is a pity that the issue has revolved so much around the Queensland Teachers Union, but the teachers have a right—in fact, a responsibility—to inform parents when they believe that something is wrong in the education system, or when they believe children in some classes are being disadvantaged. To that extent we should be grateful to the Queensland Teachers Union for waging a campaign on this issue and supporting the parents in such a way because, rightly or wrongly, parents look to teachers for guidance.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.]

Mr SHAW: Prior to the dinner recess I said that I thought it was a pity that the Queensland Teachers Union had been so much to the fore in this campaign, which rightly concerned the parents of the State and the Government. Nevertheless, there is no doubt in my mind that the parents of children attending schools in Queensland should be grateful to the union for the stand that it has taken and for the fact that its members have been prepared to put their own positions somewhat in jeopardy with the executives of the department and, indeed, with Cabinet, in their stand on behalf of pupils. I also said that parents expected this sort of service from teachers. They expect teachers to give advice. They expect to be told by them when there is something wrong in the system.

Since this campaign began, there has been a string of statements from Government spokesmen—from the Treasurer, the Minister for Education and the Premier—telling the people that this was an industrial matter. Indeed, the Treasurer said that the teachers should not use the children of this State for their own industrial gains. What are those gains supposed to be? Surely there is nothing for the teachers to gain industrially in this dispute. It is not about increased wages, longer holidays, shorter working hours or any other industrial matter. It is purely about the standard of education in this State. To suggest that the teachers have a selfish motive in this campaign is to do them a grave injustice. Government spokesmen have attempted to put forward the suggestion—of course, they want to see the debate revolve around this issue—that this is a matter of lazy teachers wanting to do less in the class-room. That is simply not true. In some instances, of course, teachers do not take the full interest in every pupil that they should. I am pleased to say that they are in the minority. I am sure that the Minister would support me in that. There is no advantage to those teachers in having a smaller class. If they are not going to do their work, they can not do it just as successfully in a class of 35 as they can in a class of 25. The class numbers have no bearing on it, except that if the numbers are low enough there is no excuse for their not giving children the attention they deserve.

The campaign by the Queensland Teachers Union and the parents and citizens associations would not have been so successful if parents had not already been worried and concerned about the issue. It is interesting to note that this debate has been brought on hurriedly by the Government on the first day of the resumption of the session—and I welcome it—after it has stood on the Business Paper for some 18 months. There is no doubt in my mind that when it was first placed on the paper Government members thought, "We will just leave it there and it will gather dust and die. There will be no interest in it. It will just fade away." Of course, that has not happened. Parents are worried about their children being in classes of such a size that the teachers are not able to give them the attention they deserve. It is a great pity that the Government has undertaken a campaign of teacher-bashing in an effort to divert the accent of this campaign from the real issue and engender some emotional response towards teachers. That is a predictable action on its part. The usual Government response to an issue that is causing embarrassment is to divert attention.

Sometimes, of course, an inquiry is instigated. That is what happened when the committee of inquiry into education was set up. It must not be forgotten that that inquiry was set up to divert attention away from the embarrassment that the Government was suffering at that time on the SEMP and MACOS issues. However, it backfired because the people involved in that inquiry tried to do a job in a sincere fashion. Many of the committee's recommendations have highlighted problems within the education system.

The Government has always tried to divert attention away from its problems. It establishes a confrontation in that area so that it appears that the Premier and the Government are taking a strong stand. From a public relations point of view, that has been successful in the past. However, that practice has failed in this instance because people understand the real issues close to home. They are not looking at the problems at the media level. They will not take much notice of the statistics and figures quoted by Government members. That information has been supplied to them by the public relations departments to prove that everything in the garden is rosy.

Parents will visit the schools that their children are attending and see at first hand the conditions that prevail. They will naturally be concerned about what they will see. The Government does not want to talk about class sizes and the standard of education;

it wants to talk about whether teachers are working or whether they are failing students. It wants to talk about the emotional matters that always appeal to a certain section of the community. That has been happening for 50 or 60 years. The Premier said that he does not want an investigation conducted into class sizes. He wants an investigation conducted into the quality of teachers. He is plainly changing the accent of the debate and introducing diversionary tactics to encourage people to talk about something that is not so embarrassing to his Government. The Government has avoided the real issues, namely, the declining pupil/teacher ratios and the problems in the class-rooms.

It is most unfortunate that conflicting statements have been made by the Minister for Education. He is trying to do a good job in a new portfolio. Many of his problems emanate from the Treasury, and that is borne out by what was said by his predecessor. Some two years ago he said that the system being used by the Treasury to allocate funds to the Education Department was faulty. He said that if the formula that had been adopted by the Treasury was to continue, more and more composite classes would be formed and that there would be a worsening teacher/pupil ratio in this State. He has been proved to be correct. That is why we hear so much concern expressed today.

The Minister said he was extremely disappointed that the Queensland Teachers Union was once again using schoolchildren as weapons in one of its campaigns. He also stated—

“Let me emphasise that the Education Department and not the Queensland Teachers Union allocates staff in this State.”

That is perfectly true; no-one can dispute that. But the statement is an example of the arrogance that has been adopted by the Government. It says, “We will tell you what you will get and you have no right to complain.” If parents complain about those issues, they are threatened with prosecution and retaliation from Government departments. The Minister for Education said that the Queensland Teachers Union was always quoting the recommendations of the Select Committee on Education.

He said—“It is interesting to note what the chairman of that committee, Mr Ahern, said when he tabled the report, namely, ‘The Government is not in any way trammled by the appointment of this committee. It can proceed with the decisions on any matter it so desires.’”

Nobody is disputing that. Thousands of people gave up their time—

Mr Moore: Their brains should be on tap and not on top.

Mr SHAW: They gave their recommendations to the Parliament, and we have a right to respond to them. I agree with the honourable member for Windsor who says that the brains should be on tap and not on top.

When the Government asks for recommendations to be made, it is not necessarily obliged to adopt them. However, if it does not adopt them, it is obliged to state why it does not adopt them and what it will do instead. My objection is based on the fact that the Government has not stated which recommendations it will adopt and which ones it will reject. It is quite fallacious for the Government to argue that a certain percentage of the recommendations have been adopted.

Let us assume that the first recommendation is that the Government allow the general public to have full access to its schools and that recommendations 2 to 10 set out all the precautions, such as the principal must be empowered to remove people and the principal or the p. and c. association must be empowered to impose charges where they see fit. Those latter recommendations take on a completely different meaning if the first recommendation is dropped. All the recommendations have to be looked at in toto. It is totally wrong for the Government to say that it has adopted a certain number of recommendations or that it has adopted more than 50 per cent of them. Such a statement gives a completely false impression.

The final paragraph of the Minister's statement says that the Government was proceeding as it saw fit. The Government, of course, has the right to do that; but the people, the Queensland Teachers Union and the p. and c. associations have the right to let the Government know that they do not view the matter in the same light as the Government.

Quite often the Minister claims that composite classes are OK and there is nothing necessarily wrong with them. The key word is "necessarily". Whereas in the past I agreed with that claim, I find it is becoming very difficult to agree with it these days. Composite classes are being used not for academic reasons but for economic reasons. They are being used purely and simply to maintain a reasonable upper limit—I use the word "reasonable" advisedly—on class sizes.

Composite classes are created in quite inadvisable circumstances. They are not acceptable when they consist of widely divergent groups. Composite classes are formed of Years 1, 2 and 5 or Years 1, 2 and 6 and so on. I am not a teacher, but if I was I would hate to be trying to teach a class such as that.

Composite classes are not all right when they consist of large numbers of pupils. I am advised that they should not comprise more than 25 pupils. Some people claim that they should not comprise more than 20 pupils. Yet some composite classes are made up of 34 students or even as many as 60. I know of one composite class containing 66 students. It is taught by two teachers. That is getting back to the 1950s.

Composite classes are not all right when students are in them year after year. Some pupils commence their school career in a composite class—there should not be any composite class in Year 1—and remain in composite classes until they complete their primary schooling. That situation is frightening. No wonder parents are expressing their concern.

I hope that the Minister can give me exact figures, but it appears that at present approximately one-sixth of primary school pupils in Queensland are in composite classes. I hope that eventually the Minister can tell me how many children are in composite classes this year. Because I assume it would be too early in the school year for the Minister to answer such a question, I have not asked it. However, it is estimated conservatively that one-sixth of the children in primary schools in Queensland this year are in composite classes. We do not know how many are in those composite classes that are totally unsatisfactory or how many are in their first year at school. I have reason to believe that a large percentage of these children are in their first year at school. How many are in the overcrowded classes that I am talking about? I think it was the Minister who said that it is purely and simply a question of money. Of course it is. It is a matter of whether the Government is prepared to give this matter a high priority.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr SHAW: Yes, take money away from somewhere else and allocate it to solving this problem. That statement is quite correct. However, that is not what I am debating tonight. The debate tonight is about whether or not the Government will make a commitment; whether or not it will say that it agrees with those recommendations and when it will do something about the problem.

Parents want to know when they will see some light at the end of the tunnel. They do not want to be told that statistics indicate that the position will improve. They want to be able to go along to a school and see no problems. They do not want to be told, "We are sorry, but four or five people have taken their children from the school so we will have to rearrange the classes because one of our teachers will have to go. We will need to have composite classes." When that happens, more parents say that they will take their children to another school and the process starts again.

The system of allocating teachers to schools needs to be completely revised. I do not have sufficient time tonight to go into that matter in depth, but there are a number of glaring anomalies in the system and they are exacerbating the present problems.

I join issue with a repeated statement by the Minister that there is no evidence that overcrowded classes cause any detriment to the children in them. That is no longer true. Several studies have been made. The most interesting one, which has been well publicised, was made by Professor Campbell. He was able to quantify the disadvantages and he said that about one month a year was lost by students in overcrowded class-rooms.

We all express concern at the time lost as a result of parents taking their children away from a school, but that concern pales into insignificance when it is compared with one month's learning a year being lost. If they lose only a few days by striking, it is no wonder that parents say that it is well worth taking some sort of action.

Experience indicates that if the teacher has more time to give to individual students, the students who need a little additional help benefit greatly. I am not referring to students who need remedial teaching but to those who have a small problem that can be rectified by a teacher's spotting it, isolating it and being able to give a little extra attention to it. That does not happen in the present situation.

Many people speak about classes of 45 and 50 when they were at school and, say, "It never done me no harm." The situation in those days was different. I can remember classes of that size.

I also remember being belted because I read faster than the other 50 kids in the class and finished up a couple of pages ahead. How ridiculous that was. By the same token, there were a couple of other things that I needed help with and I did not receive it. But there is a similar problem today; under the present system children are not receiving the assistance that they need. Government members keep saying how terrible it is that children who cannot read or write properly are applying for jobs. Many problems, if they exist to the extent that we are told they do—and I question that—can probably be sheeted home to the fact that teachers are not given the opportunity to give children the necessary additional attention that they deserve.

I reiterate that what the Opposition is asking the Government to do—what we have asked it to do during the 18 months over which this debate has continued—is to give a sign of good faith that will end the insanity that has occurred following the Government's unbelievable aggression in response to the union's quite reasonable requests. Although we could quite justifiably have asked that the committee's recommendation be implemented immediately, we have not done so. We have asked only that the Government give the people of Queensland a sign of good faith.

Mr FOURAS (South Brisbane) (7.37 p.m.): I am pleased to second the motion relative to class sizes moved by the honourable member for Wynnum. As he said, all that we in the Opposition and the parents and teachers of this State ask for is a sign of good faith, a timetable, an indication from the Government that we will not have to put up with our children receiving a standard of education lower than that in any other Australian State. What we are seeking is an understanding by the Government of this issue.

The Government brought on this debate. That is amazing because although, in the four years or so that I have been a member, many notices of motion have been given under the heading General Business, the Government has never allowed one of them to be discussed. During meetings conducted by any associations other than this Parliament, usually an agenda is discussed and then people are given the opportunity of bringing forward general business. This is the first occasion since I have been in this Chamber on which the Government has, of its own volition, allowed the moving of a motion on a subject that the Opposition wishes to raise. Of course, it has been done at the end of a day during which there has been a great deal of theatre, a great deal of political drama, because the Government wants this issue to merge with other issues in the news.

The Government has handled this issue in an appalling fashion. First, the Minister has made threats against the teachers—

Mr GUNN: I rise to a point of order. I have made no threats against the teachers. I ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Mr FOURAS: I withdraw. The Minister has indicated that teachers who go on strike are likely to be suspended. The Premier has also said that. But, worse than that, the parents of this State have been threatened with fines if, as a response to their commitment to giving their children the best possible education, they refuse to take them to school. The moment that the Government tries to fine one parent in this State it will bring the wrath of the community upon itself. The people will throw out the Government. I do not believe that the Government will be so stupid as to fine parents.

The Premier has suggested that the Government will bring out of retirement what the "Sunday Sun" calls "moth-ball masters" to take the place of suspended teachers. The Government must be full of geriatrics. I have never heard such an inane suggestion in my life. Fancy bringing out of retirement doddering 70-year-old teachers and expecting them to teach our children! That is appalling.

Again one sees a shocking example of what Government members think unionism is all about. There is no doubt that striking is a weapon of last resort. In the old days before unions and before people were able to organise themselves into a strong and united body, revolt was their only recourse against management. Honourable members have read about peasants revolting and being run through with sabres. Now there are unions. Teachers are striking to protect the rights of the children, not to obtain fatter wage packets. They are convinced that smaller classes will lead to better education.

Why are parents withdrawing their children from schools? It is not because they are politically motivated or feel that they have to belt the Government; it is because they are concerned. They know what is happening in composite classes. They know that their children cannot maximise their potential under this Government's policies.

It is important to look at some statistics.

Mr Moore interjected.

Mr FOURAS: The member for Windsor would like us to return to the old days when there were classes of 70, 80 and 90 children and when the prefects with big sticks were walking round to belt the children into submission. That is the sort of environment that he wants us to have. He talks about discipline and teachers being able to stand up to large numbers. He does not know what he is talking about.

Let us look at the statistics. The Queensland Teachers Union conducted a survey into class sizes. It received responses from 83 per cent of primary schools. The results are an appalling indictment of class sizes in this State, which is the issue on which the Government is running scared. That is why it is threatening to fine parents and to suspend teachers. I guess that the Government has to be scared. The community is waking up to what is happening in education.

The results indicate that 62 per cent of primary classes are in excess of the Ahern Committee's recommendation for single-teacher classes, that is, 25 for Years 1, 2 and 3 and 30 for Years 4 to 7. The survey found that 78 per cent of the Year 3 composite classes and 73 per cent of Year 2 composite classes were above the Ahern Committee's recommendation, that is, 45 for Years 1, 2 and 3 and 55 for Years 4 to 7.

The greatest concern of parents in my area who speak to me is composite classes. In most instances principals and the other members of the teaching profession do not want composite classes. In almost every instance composite classes are forced on schools for economic reasons. They are forced on schools because there are simply not enough teachers.

I remember reading in the latest journal of the Teachers Union that in Coolum there are 68 children in Year 1 and 75 children in Year 2. It would have been very simple to provide three teachers for each of those groups of children. But the Government decided to save one teacher. It formed two classes of Year 1 students, two classes of Year 2 students and a composite class for the rest of the children in Years 1 and 2. Some of those children are not receiving equal educational opportunities. A composite class was formed and the worst teaching environment was provided. Teachers are not being allowed to do the job that they have been trained to do. They are not being allowed to maximise the learning abilities of children. That is the cause to which teachers are rallying. The Queensland Teachers Union is not blackmailing parents over this issue; it is responding to a need in the community and it is about time that the Government realised that.

It is important that we look at the funding of education in Queensland. The latest statistics available on education funding are for the year 1979-80 and deal with finance made available through the Commonwealth Government Grants Commission. The report of that body shows that for that year Queensland spent \$1,008 per capita on primary education in Government schools. The Australian average was \$1,111. Queensland spent 8.4 per cent less than the average, and that does not take into account the decentralisation in the State or the small schools where the figure would be even less. Queensland should be spending 10 per cent more than the Australian average to give Queensland primary schoolchildren equal educational opportunities.

Mr Prentice: Does that figure include ancillary staff and school buildings?

Mr FOURAS: That is net current expenditure. It is a comparison on an equitable basis between all the States.

Every year for the last five years the Government has gone to the Grants Commission and received tens of millions of dollars so that it could provide services in every area equal to those provided in other States. However, when the figures are compared they reveal that the State Government spends more money than any other State in only one area, namely, police. More money can be found for more police in this police State but an equitable share for education cannot be found. Queensland ought to be spending well above the Australian average.

The 1979-80 expenditure figures on Government secondary education are much worse. Queensland spent \$1,685 per student in Government secondary schools. The Australian average was \$2,040. Queensland spent 17.4 per cent less per secondary school student than the Australian average. That is what the Government is running scared from and what it does not want the people to know. That is why it attempts to snow the electorate, to place red herrings in the way and to belittle all the reports that indicate that class sizes are very important in determining what happens to children.

I would be interested to hear the member for Toowong refute the figures that I have quoted and say that he is happy with the share of the cake that is going to education in Queensland.

The argument on class sizes is very much a commonsense one. Large class sizes are disadvantageous to both students and teachers. Obviously the reverse argument is that smaller classes present a better educational environment for students and teachers alike.

I now wish to quote from the 1978 and 1979 reports of Glass and Smith which appear in the January issue of the "Queensland Teachers Journal"—

"A clear and strong relationship between class size and achievement has emerged . . . There is little doubt that, other things equal, more is learned in smaller classes . . .

The effects of class size on classroom processes, pupil affect and teacher satisfaction are strong and consistent. On all measures, reduction in class size is associated with higher quality schooling and more positive attitudes . . . Reducing class size has beneficial effects both on cognitive and affective outcomes and on the teaching process itself."

The response to these findings by people who support the Government has been to belittle them. Those are the people who have been political, not the teachers or the parents. On the basis that the Government does not want to spend more money on education, those people have tried to belittle the irrefutable facts.

The Government wants to spend more money on infrastructure. It wants to spend more money on developing our resources. The Government skites about this resource-rich State, yet in matters that count—welfare and education—we are much worse off than any other State.

Let us look at what some people have said about the Glass and Smith report. Mr Phil Cullen, the Queensland Director of Primary Education, who reviewed the Glass and Smith study, referred to it as "the most comprehensive and careful review of research of class size in relation to pupil achievement and attitudes, instructional processes and teacher satisfaction (of recent years)." He went on to say—

"The Committee accepts this study as the most reliable and realistic research available. Furthermore, the Committee's observations confirm this view."

Despite such statements, despite recommendations from the Ahern committee, despite studies by the Schools Commission and despite studies by Professor Campbell and other people interested in education, we have a political attempt by the Government to belittle all this research and to belittle its conclusions and to say that actions by parents, actions by the Labor Party and actions by teachers are politically motivated. The facts speak for themselves. It is time the Government did a little more than engage in propaganda.

The Queensland Teachers Union has been belittled in debate by Ministers. One answer during question-time today mentioned that a great many Labor Party stooges are in the Teachers Union. An attempt was made to justify the Government's inaction. Government members sniggered when they heard that, because they are being hoodwinked,

too. They are not listening to the parents. They are not listening to the teachers. They will pay the price, because this issue will become very important in Queensland. We cannot afford to continue to spend about 10 per cent less than the Australian average on primary education in Government schools when we ought to be spending 10 per cent more. We cannot afford to spend about 17.4 per cent less than the Australian average on Government education when we ought to be spending at least 10 per cent more. We have to find the funds required.

We could do it in many ways. We have been bled dry by our free hospital system. In many ways, our resources are not being fully utilised. Of all the hundreds of millions of dollars we have been receiving from the Grants Commission to equalise the provision of services—it is realised that because of our size and decentralisation Queensland incurs greater costs in providing equal welfare, education and police services—none is being directed towards education. This State is further behind the other States in funding education. We all ought to be asking the Minister—and this is what the Labor Party is asking—not to say that he will not sit down and talk with these fellows. That is an easy way out. What he is saying is that he will not have a bar of the Ahern committee report. He says he does not want to talk about a program in the future—a program that is positive and will set down firm guide-lines about what will happen with class sizes in the future. The Minister for Education speaks with a great deal of pride about the 621 more teachers that have entered the education system this year. He says that that is a positive achievement. At the same time we are being told day by day that 5 000 people are flocking to Queensland every month because of our resources and other opportunities. The Government is responding with increased numbers of teachers because the class sizes are increasing. Unfortunately, I believe the tendency would be for class sizes not to get smaller. Possibly the position will deteriorate.

It is time the Minister got off his high horse and exhibited common sense so that within the Government there was a conciliatory approach both to the parents and to the teachers. There ought to be honest debate in the community. The Government ought to lay its cards on the table and say how it is not able to find all the resources it would want to meet the Ahern committee's recommendations in every area. It ought to be saying that it has a program and that it will make an attempt. It ought to make the program public. Teachers will not gladly lose faith and they will not take strike action because they want to misinform the community. They will not take strike action because they are politically motivated. I do not believe that there is one iota of truth in that suggestion.

If the member for Windsor wants to go back to the dark ages with classes of 70 with prefects swinging large canes, then he is entitled to do so. However, we want to provide an environment that gives our children the opportunity to maximise their potential, which is their right. The greatest resource we have is our children. It is not the coal, iron ore, bauxite or copper, it is our youth—the future of this nation. It is unfair to treat some children in a different fashion from others. The Opposition is concerned about giving everyone a fair go and equal opportunity.

The parents of the children attending the school at Coolum have complained about the conditions that exist there. They have expressed their concern to members of Parliament. I hope that when Government members vote on this motion moved by the Opposition spokesman on education they have regard to their conscience. If Government members do not support the Opposition on this issue, that fact will be circulated within their electorates to emphasise that they do not support the concept of the Minister's establishing a firm program, adopting firm guide-lines and implementing the recommendation of the select committee.

Mr Booth: Who will do the circulating?

Mr FOURAS: People are becoming aware of where they stand. Before the last election, concerned teachers and citizens called meetings of candidates and persons aspiring to become elected members of this Parliament. They asked those candidates for their policies on education. The teachers and parents of our community will continue to ask where their candidates stand on this issue. It is time that the Minister got off his high horse and gave us firm and positive guide-lines. The money could be taken away from the money allocated for infrastructure in mining towns. The companies that are ripping off our resources, such as Utah, should be taxed to provide money for an education system equal to that provided in the other States.

Mr MILLER (Ithaca) (7.57 p.m.): The motion before the House this evening moved by the member for Wynnum deals specifically with paragraph 4.13 of the Third Interim Report of the Ahern committee. It is necessary to spell out exactly what 4.13 says. Half of the people outside this Parliament would not be aware of the recommendation contained in that paragraph. Paragraph 4.13 states—

“The Select Committee accepts that, with large classes, teachers are unable to give individual attention with the frequency and depth which is desirable. This is particularly important in the first three years of schooling when the basic groundwork of literacy and numeracy is being laid. We therefore recommend that class sizes of 25 in Years 1, 2 and 3; 30 in Years 4 to 10; and, 25 in Years 11 and 12, are reasonable targets at which to aim, and targets which should be implemented as quickly as resources will permit. However, we recommend that the reduction of class sizes to the target level of 25 in Years 1, 2 and 3 should be the first priority. We believe that this recommendation should be implemented as a matter of urgency, even if, initially, it must be done at the expense of rather larger classes in the later years. It should also be noted that progressive reduction in class size is only one of a number of desirable improvements in education to be initiated as and when resources permit; and, although it is an important one, our recommendation is not to be taken to imply that we necessarily regard reduction in class size as the overriding priority.”

I wish that the Queensland Teachers Union would tell the people of Queensland the full context of recommendation 4.13 and not merely what the union wants to tell them. That recommendation does not mean that the Government has to reduce class sizes either this year or next year.

As a member of the select committee, I was very happy to support the amendments to the Education Act. However, they can be implemented only when it is feasible for the Government to do so.

What does recommendation 4.13 say? It recommends that class sizes in Years 1, 2 and 3 be reduced at the expense of rather larger classes in the later years. Has the Teachers Union come forward at any time and suggested that it co-operate with the Government? Has it said that it likes the idea of classes of 25 pupils in Years 1, 2 and 3 and that it will accept recommendation 4.13? Has it said that it will co-operate by having larger classes in Years 5, 6 and 7? No, it has not. There is a deathly silence from the Teachers Union on that specific point.

I see cars with a sticker on the back saying, “Teachers care”. I am not claiming that all teachers who have such a sticker on the back of their car are ALP members. However, in nine instances out of 10 on the other side of the rear window is a sticker bearing an ALP slogan of some sort.

Has the Government done anything about implementing the recommendations set out in 4.13? The honourable member for South Brisbane quoted figures. I want to do likewise. I claim that the Government is working to reduce class sizes, and I shall back up my claim by quoting figures.

I shall deal with the period from 1970 to 1982. In 1970, Queensland had 293 732 students and 12 172 teachers, or a ratio of 24.1 students to each teacher. In 1975, the State had 325 929 students and 17 126 teachers.

Mr Underwood: In the class-rooms?

Mr MILLER: In the class-rooms. Those figures represent a ratio of 19 students to 1 teacher. So over the period from 1970 to 1975 the ratio of students to teachers has reduced from 24.1:1 to 19:1.

I now turn to 1982 and quote approximate figures as official figures are not yet available. To the best of the Education Department's knowledge, this year Queensland has 368 600 students. The department knows that this year the State has 20 263 teachers. So this year the ratio of students to teachers is 18.2:1, which proves that since 1970 the Government has worked steadily to reduce the ratio of students to teachers.

Mr D'Arcy: Don't talk such garbage.

Mr MILLER: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition claims that the figures are garbage. I challenge him and the other members of the Opposition to prove that they are wrong.

Those figures exclude pre-school children and teachers and guidance teachers. They cover only the teachers working in a class-room situation.

I now refer to a school in my electorate at which there might be a strike next Thursday. I should like Opposition members to tell me if they support any teacher action at the Rainworth State School, where the class sizes are—

Year	Pupils
1	23
2	32
3	26
4	27
5	28
6	27
7	27

Only one class at that school contains more than 30 students. Judging by what the union has said, I would say that there will be a strike at Rainworth State School on Thursday because the Year 2 class has 32 children. The union is forgetting that the number of students in the other classes ranges from 23 to 28.

Mr D'Arcy: It should be two classes of 16.

Mr MILLER: That is the sort of statement that I would expect from an Opposition member. However, I am surprised that it comes from a former teacher. He must realise that the figure quoted by the Minister for Education this morning is correct. At least the Queensland Teachers Union agrees with the cost of employing the teachers, but disagrees with the cost of supplying the class-rooms for them. It did not seem to worry about that.

To implement the recommendations of the Select Committee on Education would cost the Government \$120m. There is no argument about that. The honourable member for South Brisbane said that he has been listening to the community. Let him go out into the community and ask the people if they want the Health budget cut by \$120m. He will find out that they do not. He will find out that the Government brought down a responsible Budget which is accepted by the people.

We must do something about this matter. The Queensland Teachers Union claims that Queensland has the largest number of big classes in Australia. When I was in Western Australia, I learnt that the Western Australian Government was the worst in Australia. I shall read this document into "Hansard" because I want the people who are interested in reading "Hansard" to know that the Western Australian teachers union believes it receives the worst deal in Australia. The Western Australian teachers union says—

"If West Australian parents join with teachers in a protest to the Government about the size of classes in our schools, the Government will have to listen.

Together we were able to persuade the Government to change its mind about cutting education funds. Now we must persuade it to give our children a better education by reducing class sizes.

Why can't our State Government do the same for our children?"

That is not the end of it. I support the claims by the Queensland Teachers Union that it is absolutely necessary to have 25 to a class in Years 1, 2 and 3. But what does the teachers union in Western Australia say? It wants parents to help it reduce class sizes in Western Australia to 25 pupils in pre-primary, 30 pupils in primary classes Years 1 and 2 and 33 pupils in Years 3 to 7. The Western Australian teachers union has placed an advertisement in a local newspaper asking parents to help reduce class sizes to 33 in Year 3. It is asking for the support of parents in reducing class sizes to 30 in Years 1 and 2. Yet we are told by the Queensland Teachers Union that it is vitally important to reduce the size of classes in Years 1, 2 and 3 to 25. If the Queensland Teachers Union really believes that, is the teachers union in Western Australia wrong, or is it taking a more sensible approach and saying, "At least we can strive for something that is possible." I wonder whether the Queensland Teachers Union really believes that it is possible to say, "Right, we want classes in Years 1, 2 and 3 reduced to 25." If it does, why does it not accept the challenge? The select committee recommended that for the time being class sizes in Years 5, 6 and 7 would have to remain larger than might be

desirable; but I have seen no move by the Queensland Teachers Union to co-operate in any way so that classes in Years 1, 2 and 3 can be reduced to 25. It is in the hands of the union.

There is talk about reducing classes to 25; but what was said by Dr Keeves, the director of the Australian Council of Educational Research, when he appeared before the select committee? He told the committee in no uncertain terms—and this appears in the report—that in reading and mathematics Queensland children have a standard higher than children in any other State. That assertion was backed up last year by the ACER people in spite of the fact that Queenslanders have been told continually that class sizes are smaller in southern States. Are the children of Queensland so bright that, although they are in large classes, children in smaller classes down south cannot compete with them?

Dr Keeves also made the point that Australian standards were comparable with those of all other countries in the western world. So, although I agree with the principle of smaller classes, there is no way in the world that I will support the Queensland Teachers Union in its irresponsible actions in an attempt to reduce class sizes in Years 1, 2 and 3.

Mr D'Arcy interjected.

Mr MILLER: I have told the people in my electorate—

Mr D'Arcy: I hope you have told them all, and the parents too.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will not tolerate persistent interjections. I warn the honourable member for Woodridge under the provisions of Standing Order No. 123A.

Mr MILLER: I am not frightened to tell the people of Ithaca where I stand; I have told them all along. In fact, half the schools in my area do not want smaller classes if they are achieved at the expense of the appointment of physical education teachers. I doubt that my electorate is the only one in Queensland that wants physical education teachers before class sizes are reduced to 25. I have taken members of p. and c. associations in my electorate to The Gap primary school to see what happens when slow learners receive help from physical education teachers to overcome their lack of co-ordination. When those children overcome their lack of co-ordination on the playing field, they then overcome their lack of confidence in the class-room. That is why I am not frightened to go into my electorate and say that I will not support the Queensland Teachers Union. I have told the union and I have told my p. and c. associations—

Mr Shaw: You will support the motion, though.

Mr MILLER: I will not be supporting the motion because the Teachers Union—

Mr Shaw: It has nothing to do with the Teachers Union.

Mr MILLER: I make it quite clear that I support the recommendations of the committee.

Mr Blake: We were beginning to wonder whether you were a member of the committee.

Mr MILLER: I remind the honourable member that I specifically read into my speech paragraph 4.13 of the third report of the committee, because that is what I stand by. I will not allow the Opposition or the Queensland Teachers Union to dictate to the Government about the way in which it spends its funds.

Mr Wright: And you want to get into Cabinet? Say something nice about Joh now.

Mr MILLER: I think that I have left my run a little late.

Now is the time for me to push once again for a new deal in education. I want a new system introduced into Queensland. I want that huge monstrosity in George Street broken down into councils.

Mr Vaughan: What? The old Parliament House?

Mr MILLER: For the edification of the honourable member, I am talking about the Education Department. Local councils in Queensland should have far more say in education matters. In fact, I would like to see the New Zealand system operating in Queensland. In New Zealand the councils make decisions on the hiring and firing of teachers in State

schools. They also make decisions on whether a school will be painted, whether an extra teacher will be provided or whether a class-room will be carpeted. In the high schools the board of school governors makes the decision on the expenditure of money. In that situation the problems can be isolated in a specific area.

I do not believe that all teachers want to go on strike. I believe that only a handful of teachers in each area want to go on strike. It would do the Government well to study the New Zealand system. I think that the Government should go one step further and allow the people of Queensland to choose whether they want their children to attend a State school or a private school. At the present time parents are transferring their children from State schools to private schools, where the classes are much larger, because they believe that their children will receive a better education in the private schools.

Parents should have the right to choose the school to which they send their children. If the Government spends \$2,000 a year on every child in our State school system, then parents should be given a voucher to the value of \$2,000 for each child so that they can send their children to whichever school they wish. If it costs any more, the parents would meet that cost. At least under that system parents could choose the school to which they sent their children.

Only last week-end we saw in King George Square a gathering of parents who are not satisfied with the education that their children are receiving in our schools. Why should not those people whose children attend private schools claim just as much money from the Government as do parents who send their children to State schools? In many cases those parents pay higher taxes than the average person. But when it comes to sending their child to a private school, they have to foot the whole bill.

Mr Moore: They have to pay twice.

Mr MILLER: Yes, they are paying twice.

So I would like the Government to consider this proposition: if the system of school governors for high schools and of school councils deciding the expenditure of finance in primary schools operates successfully in New Zealand, why cannot it operate successfully in Queensland?

I am sure that many other honourable members wish to speak, and I will be very happy indeed to hear what the Opposition has to say about paragraph 4.13 other than simply supporting the motion put forward by the Queensland Teachers Union to parents.

Mr UNDERWOOD (Ipswich West) (8.21 p.m.): I have listened to Government members this evening and also read Government Press releases in recent weeks. It is quite obvious that Government members and the leadership are quite out of touch with the aspirations of not only teachers and students but also the people of Queensland. In fact, this evening they have resorted to insults and threats in an attempt to crush the point of view of the people.

Mr Moore interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: If the ignoramus from Windsor will keep quiet, perhaps we can continue with a sensible debate.

The Government's approach to the whole matter has been miserable and spiteful. It has resorted to teacher bashing and p. and c. bashing. That is rather remarkable, because over the last three years the Government has put a great deal of pressure on p. and c. associations to raise funds for the State Government. Under the Government's policies, the funds available for school projects have decreased. Not all p. and c. associations are speaking out, but quite a number are. Because they dare to speak out in support of their children and the schools and what they believe are ways to improve the standard of education, they are belted and bashed by the Government. The standard tactic of the Government is to insult and smear decent citizens who dare to disagree with it.

The member for Ithaca said it is time that a sensible approach was adopted. I agree with that; but it is obvious to me, after listening to him, that he is quite satisfied with the Government's aggressive, miserable approach, which obviously has the

support of most back-benchers, both Liberal and National. Of course, the attack has been led by the master of irresponsibility, the Premier himself, with the acquiescence of the doormat Leader of the Liberal Party (Dr Edwards).

The Government has set its juggernaut on a course that will cause more disruption, disenchantment and disharmony in the education system. Because of that course and the actions and non-actions of the Government, the standard of education will suffer. The Government's attitude will cause more harm than any one-day stoppage or any series of one-day stoppages. When I hear the great concern expressed, both in the Press and from the Government benches, about one-day stoppages in one or two schools, I find it remarkable that Ministers, when they visit the 82 electorates of the State, do not hesitate to grant one-day holidays. Those holidays do not affect the education of the children; but if the parents or the teachers dare to stop the schooling process for a day or two, it is a disaster and children's education is destroyed. Anybody with a fair and reasonable mind can see the basic conflict there.

Mr Moore: It is the teachers who are looking for the holiday, not the children.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Obviously the member for Windsor has not been at very many schools recently when holidays have been granted. If he had, he would have seen the glee written on the faces of children. In fact, it is the teachers and quite a few of the parents who do not want holidays to be given.

This debate has come about not because of the pressure of recent weeks but because of the trouble that occurred some three years ago. At that stage outside minority influences were attempting to manipulate our education system. Some of the things being attacked were innovations introduced in an attempt to make our schools meet the modern-day needs of our children. I am speaking about SEMP and MACOS. Rona Joynér and the people around her—not that there were many of them—certainly caused great disruption to our system, and that disruption has been simmering below the surface ever since. We have seen it come to the fore this year.

A parliamentary select committee was formed. First the ALP was not to be represented. Then someone suggested to the Premier that it would be best to have on it someone from the ALP to keep them quiet. The committee was designed to take the heat out of the situation, with its report being slotted away in a pigeon-hole and forgotten forever. The time bomb of chairmanship was passed to a person who was out of favour with the Premier—one of his heir apparents, the member for Landsborough (Mr Mike Ahern). Unfortunately for the Government Mr Ahern performed very well. Perhaps the Premier should have given it to the member for Isis, when the recommendations would certainly have been slotted away in a pigeon-hole and forgotten forever. Fortunately, however, Mr Ahern has more substance than some of the other people on his side and he knew what he was about. I complimented Mr Ahern on the way he performed and the interest he showed in the problems raised by both parents and teachers when he was in Ipswich at a meeting attended by the three members for Ipswich, that is, the member for Wolston, the Treasurer and me.

The committee's report is recognised as an excellent document that departmental officers are using as a guide to their day-to-day activities, even though relatively few of the recommendations have been acted on by the Government. The document has created expectations not only within the teaching community and the education community but also within the community at large. Those expectations were created by this Government but they have not been fulfilled. The report was supported generally by the Government, but the department was not given the wherewithal to act upon the recommendations. Now, after having these problems brought to the fore, the community is very concerned about the standard of education within our schools.

The suppression of this issue by the State Government in the two years since the report was tabled in the House has created problems. The Government thought that it was tucked away nicely. However, like all strong forces, when an attempt is made to push it underground eventually it will surface when least expected in the most unexpected places. That is what has happened in the last couple of months. The matter is now out of the Government's control. The people of Queensland are gradually joining the movement and doing something about it. It has had a small beginning, but it will have a big ending. The Government will be forced to accept the motion we are debating this evening in the short or the long term.

Basically the motion says that people should be sitting round a table to sort out how best to improve our education system. One of the issues to be looked at and discussed in the report recommends that a program should be drawn up relative to the matter of class sizes.

The argument about composite classes as opposed to ordinary classes is a vexed one. The point raised by Government members and others is that composite classes have worked effectively in country schools for a long time. My teaching experience is very limited and I do not claim to be anything but an ordinary teacher. However, I do claim to be a parent and to have spoken to many parents and teachers who are concerned about composite classes in city schools.

When children go into a composite class after having spent four years in any ordinary class, their parents are concerned about the standard of education they are receiving. They want something done about the problem. They have not expressed that concern with any particular political clout, but the p. and c. associations, the Teachers Union and the Labor Opposition are showing the way to them. The movement is gathering force. Members on the Government benches do not appreciate the fact that there is growing disenchantment. The Government is relying on a general hostility that they believe to be throughout the community towards teachers. It is relying on that hostility to evade the miserable, spiteful attacks on both p. and c. associations and the teachers of this State, who do an excellent job towards shoring up the lagging finances of the State Government and keeping the coffers of their schools flush to such an extent that the day-to-day activities of schools, even though restricted in these days of National-Liberal financing, keep flowing.

The member for Ithaca said that most teachers involved in this campaign are ALP supporters. He implied that most teachers are ALP supporters. If only that were the case! I am afraid that is not the case. Once again, Government members are suffering gross disillusionment. The member for Mulgrave intimated that teachers and p. and c. associations do not care and that basically they were a group of Red Commy so-an-sos. Once again, that is the general concept of members on the Government benches, which illustrates that they misunderstand the current situation.

Mr Davis: You could say that the member for Mulgrave was a complete fool.

Mr UNDERWOOD: He has not been very startling in the House. The previous speaker said that Queensland has a teacher staff ratio of 1:19. That is a clear indication that he does not understand how that ratio is derived. It is a ratio that most people understand to be derived by including all those persons who are classified as teachers, not just teachers in the class-room, and dividing the total number of registered teachers employed in the Education Department into the number of students. That is how the figure of 1:19 is derived. Some groups of teachers may be eliminated. I do not know the origin of the member's figures. That figure does not represent the ratio of class-room teachers, as distinct from other classifications, to students in the class-room. It is impossible to compare the Western Australian situation with the Queensland situation. The Government in Western Australia and the Education ministry is run by the Liberal Party. In Queensland the National Party runs the Education ministry.

Mr FitzGerald: In other words, you believe it?

Mr UNDERWOOD: That conditions in Western Australia are worse than here?

Mr FitzGerald: The Western Australian class ratio.

Mr UNDERWOOD: I do not dispute the figures which indicate that they are probably worse here than there. I have no reason to say otherwise. Education spending in Queensland is the lowest per capita in Australia. That is a disgrace for the wealthiest State in Australia. Queensland is also the lowest spender per capita on health and welfare. There are three areas of growing demand within our community. Our style of social structure requires that more money be spent on them rather than less. The situation has worsened as a result of the new federalism policies adopted by the Liberal-National Country Party Government which has taken funds away from State Governments and passed the buck on to the ordinary Australian citizen to find extra funds to provide such things as health, education, welfare and roads. That is why the State Government has mooted a new fuel tax to pay for our road system. Where is the money going? It is going on ridiculous things such as old, worn-out aircraft carriers and into the coffers of the friends of the Federal Government.

In contrast, the Labor Party's policy is based on needs. The previous speaker referred to private and State schools. One thing that can be said about the Federal Labor Government's education policy, a policy that State Labor Parties throughout Australia adopted, was that it was a policy based on needs. Under that policy, schools and students who needed additional help were given it, not because of the colour of their tie or their heritage but because of their needs. Everybody had an equal opportunity in education. There was no favouritism.

Mr Scassola: There was incredible wastage.

Mr UNDERWOOD: There certainly was wastage in the State education system, because in Queensland the education funds were handled by an incompetent State administration. It could not handle the funds properly. As a result, class-rooms contain such things as audio-visual systems that have never been any good. The Queensland Government bought them and wasted money on them. Because of the Government's mismanagement, much of the money that should have been channelled into education, health and welfare was spent on the Government's pet projects that were of no benefit to the people. In fact, the Government misappropriated health, education and welfare funds.

Mr Frawley: When your crowd were in Government here in the 1950s, the most they ever gave——

Mr UNDERWOOD: Oh, the 1950s! Yes, I will agree with that. In those years education was poor in Queensland, as it was in every other State. The 1950s belong to a totally different age, and it is about time that Government members realised that. The 1950s were 30 years ago. A totally different philosophical approach was adopted in all spheres of government and community thought. It is time that the Government woke up to that. A crisis exists in the schools at present because the Government is still living in the Dark Ages. In the 1950s there was a different approach to the whole scheme of things throughout the community.

Government Members interjected.

Mr UNDERWOOD: Government members are having another lash at the teachers. The trouble with Government members is that they do not realise that most of the teachers in Queensland do a damn fine job and work very hard. Certainly, some teachers need a bomb under them; I am the first to admit that. However, in common with public servants, council workers and other people who get a caning from time to time, teachers are dedicated people and do a damn fine job.

Does any other Government member want to interject and engage in teacher-bashing? What about the p. and c. associations, which, incidentally, are reacting to the Government's heavy-handedness? In recent weeks the p. and c. associations have been bashed around the head. They raise the funds that the Government should be providing. It will not even give them sufficient funds to cover the cost of maintaining library stocks, having schoolgrounds mowed or of purchasing adequate sports equipment. They have to conduct chook raffles and cake stalls almost every day of the week just to raise money. That is especially so in the poorer areas.

I come back to the remarks made by you, Mr Deputy Speaker, during your speech. The Government will be forced into adopting a sensible approach. It will have to climb down from its hobby-horse and stop bashing the teachers and the p. and c. associations. The Government is mistaken in thinking that the p. and c. associations do not represent the parents of this State. The more the Government attacks the p. and c. associations, the more the teachers and parents will come to their aid.

If the Government dismisses or suspends teachers it will find that those teachers who are in limbo, as it were, and do not have any particular thoughts on this issue, or who are opposed to the current action mooted by their union, will rally around their fellow teachers and the p. and c. associations. The Government will find itself in a very grave situation, a situation much worse than the one that exists at the moment.

The reasonable approach that the Government should have adopted was to bring the interested parties together when the report was brought down two years ago and say, "What is the best way to tackle this problem? This year, as recommended in the report, we will look at Year 1, and we will look at another level the year after. We will do something about it."

It is trite to say, "Where will the money come from? Do you want us to take it from health or roads?"

Mr Tenni: What do you want us to do—tax the people more?

Mr UNDERWOOD: No. The people are already to pay an additional \$50m in tax this year to support the free hospital system because of the Government's policies. That money will go down the throats of the Government's friends and the people who pay into its coffers.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! Persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr UNDERWOOD: A sensible approach will have to be made to this problem. The Government will have to sit round the table with the people concerned and treat them with the respect that they deserve, not as people to be used, abused, ridiculed and treated with the miserable and spiteful contempt displayed by the Government over the past three weeks.

Mr SCASSOLA (Mt Gravatt) (8.42 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"Omit all words appearing after the word 'Government' and insert the following words—

'(1) Formally adopt the principles regarding class sizes as recommended in paragraph 4/13 of the Third Interim Report of the Select Committee on Education in Queensland, as tabled in the House on Tuesday, 29 May 1979;

(2) Progressively implement these principles as resources are available;

(3) Implement a scheme in the financial year 1982-83 whereby undesirably large classes are, where possible, reduced as and when they occur; and

(4) Continue to maintain the high standards of education being provided in the public and private school system.' "

The objects of the amendment are as follows: the first object is the adoption of a planned and gradual implementation of the principles of the Ahern report. I refer the House to the text of the relevant paragraphs of the Ahern report to which the honourable member for Ithaca referred earlier in the debate.

In the short term, the amendment seeks the removal of the difficulties that arise from time to time, particularly with respect to staffing. It refers there to the implementation of a scheme in the forthcoming financial year. It reiterates that there are high standards of education in this State and that those high standards ought to be maintained. It ought to be said that the Opposition has very conveniently overlooked the fact that Queensland does have high standards of education and that there have been very significant advances in education over many years in this State under the present Government.

The premise on which the relevant part of the report was based was that in smaller classes teachers are better able to give students instruction which would help them progress at a faster rate, and to give them individual help. I accept that premise. In a smaller class there is less pressure on teachers, there is more class-room space, and generally the teachers are able to give attention to all of the class.

The Ahern report said three things, in effect, and it is important that the House remember them. It said, firstly, that the class sizes at the levels indicated in the third report are important educational objectives—they are objectives—and there was no suggestion in the report that I can see which intimated or said that those objectives could be achieved instantly. On the contrary, the report made it very clear that the objectives were objectives to which there ought to be a gradual, systematic approach. The report also proceeded to say that those objectives should be implemented as quickly as resources permitted. It also said, in effect, that the levels of class sizes suggested in the report are guides only; they are not inflexible rules but guides, and I suggest to the House that it might take note of that particular point.

The approach of the Ahern committee ought to be contrasted with that of the Queensland Teachers Union executive, because there is a very real contrast and the approach is very different. The Teachers Union executive purports to support the Ahern committee in this area, but in fact it does not do that. It now says that class sizes should be

reduced instantly to the level suggested in the Ahern report, not gradually or in a planned way but, as is said in the journal, "We want it now—not tomorrow, but now." Secondly, it does not say, in effect, that the class sizes intimated in the Ahern report are guides only; they are treated by the Teachers Union executive as rigid limits above which one cannot go. The very real contrast that has to be drawn is that the committee pointed to those levels as guides, and they ought to be treated as guides.

My colleague the honourable member for Salisbury draws my attention to the fact that in the journal of the Teachers Union which was published recently there appears a rather large print article on this very question. We note that some of the people who put it together were not able to proof read very well, or spell, because the question is posed, "Is your school about to loose a teacher?" I do not know what "loosing" a teacher is.

If one accepts the approach of the Queensland Teachers Union that the levels of the Ahern committee are inflexible levels above which one cannot go, what does one do with the 26th or 27th child in a particular age group? Let us assume that there are 27 children in Year 3 and the inflexible rule is that there can be only 25 children in a class. What happens with the other two children? Does it mean that those two children are excluded or that there is a composite class containing those two children from Year 3? What do we do with those children? That just indicates how impractical it is to suggest rigid, inflexible levels.

It has been stated in this Chamber that teachers and parents have an important interest in class sizes, and I agree with that. Teachers and parents have an important interest in class sizes. Indeed, the Ahern committee made the point that that is one of the important objectives in the educational system. It also made the point that it is not the only one and that a balance has to be maintained. Parents certainly believe that the question of class sizes is important, and that is reasonable. Parents have an educational expectation for their children. All of us who are parents have an expectation for our children and want to see our children receive the best education that can be provided for them. The great majority of teachers have an important interest in this area because they are also concerned about the development of the children in their charge.

It has been pointed out in this debate that most teachers are dedicated, professional people who have a commitment to teach. They do not want to have any part of political controversy. They do not want to be put in the invidious position, as has been suggested to them by their union executive hierarchy, of making a choice between their professionalism, that is, their dedication to teaching, and the directives of the executive. Teachers and parents, that is, the people who are vitally interested in the education of children in this State, would be satisfied with a reasonable and continued improvement in class sizes because they accept the premise on which the Ahern report is based.

Mr Davis: I hope that you are not going to go your full 40 minutes.

Mr SCASSOLA: The honourable member never knows his luck. Members of the Opposition do not appreciate reasoned argument.

Teachers and parents would be satisfied to have some of the inflexibilities in the staffing system in our schools removed. The inflexibilities of that staffing system are a cause of a lot of concern, and they could be removed very quickly and easily.

I urge the Minister for Education to look urgently at this matter to see whether a scheme can be implemented in the next financial year in accordance with the third paragraph of the amendment.

A scheme could be implemented to provide assistance on a priority basis to schools that have difficulties in relating student numbers to staff numbers—where awkward student numbers mean that children in particular age groups do not fit evenly into the mathematical formula.

It comes back to the fact that the staffing scale itself ought to be a flexible tool in the hands of educational administrators, not an inflexible tool as is applied in some instances. Those staffing scales contain anomalies. For example, on my reading of the secondary schools staffing scale, schools with 1 000 or more students are disadvantaged compared to those with less than 1 000. If one looks at the staffing scale for primary schools, one finds that for some unknown reason—at least to me—between the numbers of 528 and 558 a school is entitled to 18 teachers, a principal and a local reliever. Before

the figure of 559 is reached, the general uniform jump is an extra teacher for every 30 or 31 students. Once the figure of 559 is reached, for some reason a school is not entitled to another teacher until it has 600 students. In that instance a school must have another 41 pupils before it is entitled to another teacher.

All those sorts of things create difficulties and problems. They create the majority of problems that occur in schools, and they ought to be looked at.

The word "staff" is interpreted very broadly. It is not interpreted in the strict sense of meaning people in the front of classes, but incorporates all sorts of people such as administrative and library staff. In that respect the scales are not very realistic and need revision. A system ought to exist so that imbalances in schools are located very quickly and adjusted. Children do not come to school in even package according to age, and the number of staff does not divide equally into the number of students.

The honourable member for Wynnum said that parents should be grateful to the Queensland Teachers Union for the stand that it has taken. He was really referring to the executive of that union. Why should parents thank the executive of the Teachers Union for inciting teachers to refuse to teach their children, for inciting teachers to refuse to adhere to their professional code of ethics—which I thought was to teach children—and for inciting teachers to refuse to do the very basic thing that they are trained to do?

I repeat that the vast majority of teachers in this State are dedicated professional people who want only to pursue their professional goals and concentrate on teaching children. That is what they are there for; that is what they want to do. They do not want to be put in an invidious position.

If one accepted the claims made by the executive of the Queensland Teachers Union and by honourable members opposite, one would be tempted to accept that there had been no advances in education in Queensland in recent years. Of course, that is not the case, because there have been very significant advances in education. I will cite just a couple of instances.

According to the information available to me, total expenditure on education in Queensland has grown from \$134m in 1972-73 to \$732m in 1981-82—an increase of 446 per cent. In the same period the number of teachers in State schools has risen from 13 400 to more than 21 000. In that time there have been a number of significant changes in other areas. For example, teacher aides have been introduced into the system. In 1974 there was not a teacher aid employed in Queensland. In this financial year there are 6 000 teacher aides, costing some \$25.1m. That deserves a comment. The Teachers Union executive now says that class sizes ought to be reduced instantly; that that is the overriding priority. In 1974 there was not a word of objection when teacher aides were introduced into the system. There was no suggestion then, "Government, you are not pursuing the right objective. You should employ more teachers."

Mr Hewitt: A suggestion of some small cut-back was strongly resisted.

Mr SCASSOLA: Precisely. When suggestions were made that there ought to be a minor cut-back so that additional money could be available to employ more teachers in class-rooms, they were strenuously opposed by the Teachers Union executive and others. Accordingly, the cut-back did not occur.

If my mathematics are correct, \$25.1m represents the salaries of about 1 200 teachers. I am not suggesting that teacher aides do not have a part in the system, but the point is that the Teachers Union executive now says that the overriding priority is the lowering of class size. When teacher aides were introduced in 1974, there was not a murmur; in fact, there was much jumping up and down when it was suggested that the system ought to be revised in a small way.

Mr Moore: They didn't want housing. They wanted it on their pay. As soon as they got it on their pay, they wanted housing.

Mr SCASSOLA: To say the very least, they suffer from a confusion of priorities.

It is quite clear that the Teachers Union executive—and I think one ought to draw a distinction between the vast body of responsible teachers in this State and the Teachers Union executive, which is seeking to incite teachers to take unprofessional action—does

not recognise that there must be a balance in the system, that there must be a balance in education and in the development of education. It is clear that the Teachers Union executive has changed tack in recent years.

Let us look for a moment at the position of the Teachers Union executive. As I have said, it says that the class sizes recommended by the Ahern committee should be mandatory, inflexible levels, and that they should be enforced now, instantly. Those are the two points that it makes.

All honourable members agree that lowering class sizes is a desirable objective and one towards which we ought to be working. The means by which that objective is pursued is quite a different matter. The executive of the Queensland Teachers Union is putting teachers of this State in an invidious position by seeking to incite them to lay down their tools—to lay down their pens—and refuse to teach children. The teachers are being asked to turn their backs on their professional ethics and training and refuse to do the very thing for which they are trained, that is, to impart knowledge to students. The Teachers Union executive finds it very easy to give directives and to give advice, because it does not have to make the hard decisions when ultimately the crunch comes. The hard decisions must be made on the class-room floor by the teacher who stands in that class-room. Does he follow the directive that he is given, or does he adhere to his professional ethics? It is quite irresponsible to put professional people in that position. Those people have a strong code of professionalism. Most teachers simply want to get on with the job of teaching and do not want to be pawns in a power game or pawns in a political game. As far as they are concerned, and as far as the parents of the children of this State are concerned, the children are the most important consideration. That seems to be lost on the executive of the Teachers Union; it seems also to be very much lost on the Opposition.

Mr Underwood: That is not true.

Mr SCASSOLA: It is true. The emphasis in the debate from the Opposition this evening has been on the Teachers Union, the Teachers Union executive and parents. Very infrequently have I heard any reference to the children of this State. The children of Queensland are the important consideration in this matter.

I commend the amendment to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): I call the honourable member for Rockhampton.

Mrs KYBURZ: I rise to a point of order. I sought to second the amendment, which I believe has not yet been seconded.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I take the point made by the honourable member for Salisbury. Although I do not believe that a seconder is necessary, I would rather that she seconded it. Therefore, I call the honourable member for Salisbury.

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (9.10 p.m.): I have a great deal of pleasure in seconding the amendment, of which the most important portion is paragraph 2, which states that the Government "progressively implement these principles as resources are available". This whole debate has been about resources and financial priorities. They constitute the most important part of the whole thrust of the debate.

At the outset, I am quite disgusted at the attitude of some members of the Queensland Teachers Union executive. I fully understand their cleverness in using both parents and teachers. I was shocked when a colleague told me that the executive was elected by only 48 per cent of all teachers. In other words, only 48 per cent of all State schoolteachers in Queensland voted for this union executive. That is not exactly a majority vote. I hope that in future union elections more teachers choose to vote.

In alluding to the union executive's campaign I used the word "cleverness". The union has capitalised on the natural fears of parents, who, if they are interested in their children's education, are concerned about the whole range of education issues.

The union is clever, because the concept of class sizes is easily and readily understood, regardless of the educational background of parents. They can relate to this issue, whereas they may not be able to relate to some issues concerned with the curriculum. That is probably because so many things change so rapidly over the years.

The union executive, in pretending that it is concerned only about class sizes, is being hypocritical. It has remained strangely silent on amendments to the Education Act which are the most wide-ranging and important amendments faced up to in this Parliament in the eight years that I have been here. They are in the interests of all teachers. However, I have not heard the union make one comment in support of them. It has allowed other people to take the running in delaying the amendments to the Act. Certainly I have had my say on that matter.

I am totally disgusted at the union's hypocrisy on those amendments. I intend to start telling teachers that they should be pushing the amendments to the Education Act, even though their union is strangely silent on them.

As long as class sizes remain on centre stage, other issues, such as teacher accountability, can be swept deliberately from the public's collective mind. Other people are certainly coming to grips with that issue. Accountability is the most important issue at all levels of education. I say "all levels" because, at last, university senates are starting to come to grips with lecturer accountability. No longer is it good enough to pay a lecturer simply to conduct classes; results are wanted. We will see that attitude filter down through all levels of the education system, as it has done abroad.

Not a word has come from the union executive about the swing away from public schools to private schools. Why is that occurring? Rightly or wrongly, many parents will say that it is because of the lack of discipline in public schools or because of their dislike for the attitudes of certain teachers in public schools. That is sad, because I am sure that a compromise arrangement can be arrived at between teacher and parent.

At one stage there was even talk of fining parents who did not send their children to school. I do not know who made that suggestion. I am not sure that it was not newspaper conjecture. However, whoever made the suggestion, it was a stupid and foolish one.

I must state a fact that differentiates the great majority of teachers from the executive of their union. I have already said that only 48 per cent of all teachers voted for the present union executive. No matter what some people like to think, most teachers really have only one concern, and that is to do the best by their classes.

I fear that some of the Premier's ill-informed statements have alienated some of the sensible teachers in our public school system. Because they are educated people, they resent being spoken down to. They are quite capable of reading between the lines in newspapers. I resent some of those statements and I know how some of my friends who are still in the system feel. They will not be spoken down to like 10-year-old children. They are not; they are teaching 10-year-old children.

Great play has been made of the figures in the Ahern report. Never mind all the other useful suggestions in that report! We had an enormous debate on that report. I certainly thought that it was an excellent one. At the time I congratulated each and every member of the committee.

The Ahern report stated that 25 per class in Years 1, 2 and 3 would be the ideal. That is what we are aiming at. I would say that 25 children would be the ideal in Year 1 and 2 classes at present. Frankly I think that, along with the pre-school system, they are the most important years of schooling in our education system.

Years 1 and 2 are the most underrated Years in our education system. The curriculum for the whole basis of our education is designed mainly by elitist educational professionals who, I believe, feel that secondary education is more important than infant or primary education. To have 25 children in Year 1 and Year 2 classes would certainly give every child an excellent start in those two all-important grounding years. It is very important that we work towards those low numbers in those two Years. Certainly, in Years 6 and 7, when children are more capable of working by themselves or in a group, the numbers can go higher.

The issue of composite classes is totally misunderstood. The Education Department and principals have not done a great deal to alleviate the fears of some people. Most teachers who have taught west of Brisbane know that composite classes are quite the norm. However, a 7/2 composite is totally unacceptable. It is not fair to expect a teacher to work out a Year 7 program, do the Year 7 work book, set homework and correct and mark it and also come down to Year 2 and do all that

is expected, particularly as, in Year 2, we are moving more deeply into the mathematics core curriculum where a great deal of concentration is needed. That is why Year 2 is very important.

Infant classes should never be composited with higher classes. That is a very unfortunate choice of composite. Where that has occurred in my electorate I have attempted to speak to the principal and express the fears of the parents. It is a very important issue. The number of composite classes in schools is growing but I can understand the reason for that.

It must be said that some teachers in our State school system have never taught composite classes. The reasons are many and varied. Firstly, the teachers are young and have not been in the system very long. Secondly, they have taught only in an urban situation and have not been exposed to country composites. Thirdly, they have been in schools where numbers have been buoyant, have never dropped and perhaps are even increasing. When the reverse occurs, and teachers have had experience, there is little to fear except in a situation such as a 7/2 composite. I certainly would not agree with that; in fact, it is totally unacceptable.

Other members have certainly mentioned the question of funding. I certainly agreed with the honourable member for Ipswich West when he said that when Federal special grants were made there was a great deal of wastage. I hope we never get back to the system of special grants for disadvantaged schools because there was a stipulation that the amount provided had to be spent by the beginning of June. The honourable member is probably aware of schools buying anything—15 listening posts—just to spend the money. Large amounts of audio-visual equipment were purchased just to spend the money. That is a ridiculous situation. It also occurs in the Health Department when a special amount is made available which the department is told has to be spent by the end of June. I do not believe that that money is spent wisely, and I hope that we never return to the system of special grants for disadvantaged schools.

I also decry, as I have in the past, the plethora of audio-visual equipment that we now see in schools. Some teachers seem to have forgotten that such equipment cannot take the place of a pupil/teacher relationship.

It is sad that some p. and c. members seem to think that if they buy yet another video-cassette recorder or yet another overhead projector they are doing the very best for their children. I am sure that they mean well, but books in a library are more important than video-cassette recorders. I do not think the Government should be subsidising this sort of "big toys for little boys" type of thing at a rate of more than one per school, because video-cassette recorders, as useful as they might be, are only occasionally useful whereas books in a library are useful every single hour of every day.

I now want to look at the enormous expenditure on education. I do not believe that there is a basis for criticism of this Government's expenditure on education. The total education expenditure has grown from \$134m in 1972-73 to \$700.9m in the 1980-81 Budget, an enormous rise of 356 per cent. Teachers strength in State schools has grown from 13 424 in 1972-73 to 20 572 in 1980-81, plus the extra 671 teachers allocated in last year's Budget, which gives us a growth rate of 58 per cent. Those figures speak for themselves.

The cost of education was referred to by most members who spoke in the debate on the Education Estimates last year.

The honourable member for Isis said—

"As at 1 July 1981, the average salary of a teacher was \$695.64 per fortnight, or \$18,149 per annum."

Mr Moore: \$18 an hour that is, for 1 000 hours a year.

Mrs KYBURZ: The honourable member may be right; I cannot do my sums so quickly. The honourable member continued—

"If one multiplies that by the total number of teachers in the State, one sees that a massive amount of money is involved. However, that is not the whole story. Up to 30 June 1981, Queensland spent a total of \$23m on teacher aides, or an average of \$7,245.85 per teacher aide. The costs increase. The average cost of a janitor/groundsman was \$11,579.39, and of a cleaner \$7,622, and the total cost of that ancillary

staff was \$8.3m for janitor/groundsman and \$29.1m for cleaners. Almost 90 per cent of the \$702m provided for salaries is completely committed, so there is very little room for the Education Department to manoeuvre."

Those figures speak for themselves. When I make my final comments I will be recommending that a ceiling be placed on the numbers of ancillary staff because the growth rate in that area is enormous.

I have here a very interesting booklet from the Education Department. It is an information statement setting out the assistance that the Government provides to schools. When one looks at the grants that are provided one sees that they are many and varied. For example, each and every primary school can receive a special purpose grant, a general purpose grant, an equipment and materials grant, a special equipment and materials grant, a zone allowance for equipment repair, a petty cash grant, a cleaning grant, an administration grant, an art grant, a safety check grant for audio-visual equipment, a reading material allocation, and an allocation in aid of school libraries. Those are only the special allocations for primary schools. The financial assistance is quite generous to pre-schools, considering that they have only a half school day. The grants for secondary schools are probably not quite as impressive as those for primary schools.

The booklet also refers to the subsidies that are provided to State schools on a dollar-for-dollar basis. It refers to the various things that p. and c. associations can purchase on a 50 per cent refund basis. I suppose that the p. and c. associations should decide whether things are important. The most important aspect of this whole booklet is that it indicates that every State school has access to these special grants. It also gives details of the various subsidies that are available to non-State schools, and those schools are growing in number.

One part of the Ahern committee report that I find very interesting is section 2.2 which refers to Queensland's supremacy in literacy and numeracy skills. It states—

"The Committee also invited the Director of the Australian Council for Educational Research, Dr John Keeves, to Queensland to present up to date information on literacy and numeracy standards in our schools."

Some members of the Opposition have said that because of a lack of teacher numbers and large class sizes the standards in Queensland schools have suffered. Frankly, I hope that those people will take the trouble to read the tables set out in the report. It points out that in all these areas, the reading comprehension performance of English-speaking country-based children, the percentages of students achieving mastery on the reading tests and sub-tests and the performance on writing tasks, Queensland children fared very well. In fact, the average percentage correct for reading comprehension performance alone was 71 in Australia, 72 in England, 72 in Scotland, and 67 in the United States. Dr Keeves did not carry out any tests in New Zealand. Taking into account all the other facts and figures, it appears that Queensland children fared quite well, and the people who constantly criticise our education system should note that fact.

Dr Keeves also said that the statistical evidence that he presented suggested that the reading performance of Queensland students was on a par with that of all other English-speaking students. Certainly the individual tests that he gave in those areas attesting to the reading skills indicated that students in Queensland were above the Australian average. I think that that is a very important part of the report, and I hope that every honourable member will take the time and trouble to read it.

The most important aspect of class sizes, that is paragraph 4.13 of the Ahern report, has been canvassed. However, paragraph 4.14 discusses the concept of streaming, which I am very interested in and which has not been canvassed in this debate. Paragraphs 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16 are very important because the Ahern report recommends that a consideration of streaming be once again made. It stipulates that there are two major arguments against streaming. The first is that streaming involves a selection, which is inaccurate. The second is that streaming serves as a means of social selection. However, it goes on to stipulate that if the administration is sufficiently flexible there should not be any problems in streamed classes. I believe that a very important part of the Ahern report has been overlooked. Certainly it is a part of the report about which teachers are now speaking because more and more wish to return to streaming.

I am using this debate to make some major recommendations to the Government on education, some of which are radical. However, the changes need to be made within the system. As in all other systems, the education system needs to be flexible.

My first recommendation is that major changes be made to staffing policies such as reviewing teacher/pupil ratios on an individual class-number basis instead of on a whole school-population basis. In other words, we should not say 500 divided by 35 equals the number of teachers that a school is entitled to. If a class falls below the given number the school should not lose a teacher, as has happened at some schools where a teacher has been lost if the number falls below 505. Flexibility within the system would result in far fewer difficulties.

My second major recommendation is to reintroduce streaming. The abolition of streaming was based on the egalitarian myth that was widely accepted within the Australian educational system 10 to 20 years ago. The egalitarian myth in education theory is based on the false premise of equal intelligence. I do not believe that all children have equal intelligence, or that all children are at an equal standard of development. Within every class-room there will probably be 20 different levels in each subject. Quite obviously that creates groups within every class-room. If there are to be groups within every class-room, why not reintroduce streaming and at least ensure that the children with difficulties get special help? The lower streams would have smaller classes and get extra attention while the students who were capable of being left on their own would be able to pursue their own goals. The children who were able to achieve would continue to achieve well and would not be held back waiting for the others to catch up, which is what happens now. A return to streaming would be far fairer for every pupil within the State system.

My third recommendation is that all open-area class-rooms must be able to be closed if the teachers so desire. Some teachers are not happy in open-area class-rooms. If a teacher does not get along with the other adult, it is a very difficult form of teaching. Some teachers who do not relish it have even applied for transfer because the school to which they have been posted is all open area. That is easily overcome by a system of bifold doors that can be drawn across. Every teacher should be able to decide whether the class-room should be open or closed. That would stop much of the animosity within some staff rooms. Certainly it would overcome much of the fear that some parents express about open class-rooms.

In my own electorate I have an older, traditional school, where there are smaller class-rooms than even half an open area, yet parents prefer to send their children to the old-fashioned rooms, as they call them. Therefore, I stipulate that my third recommendation is that all open-area class-rooms must be capable of being closed.

My fourth recommendation—and this is probably the most radical—is that a definite ceiling be placed on ancillary staff, including teacher aides. The growth of ancillary staff in our school system has been adequately canvassed in the figures I have mentioned from the Budget and in last year's Estimates debate. In 1974, which is only eight years ago, teachers made their own charts—most teachers, of course, have been taught to do that and are quite capable of doing it—and made the various toys and the teaching materials for use in the class-rooms. In those days, too, teachers mixed their own paints and put aprons on the children and did all the cleaning up, if it was necessary. Jobs were allocated amongst the class-rooms. Certainly those sorts of little responsibilities are very good for children of every age. There should be more of it. Ten years ago particular classes were allocated to the gardening—and that did not do them any harm either. Ten years ago particular children were allocated to various duties around the schoolgrounds, moving chairs and so on. However, quite frankly, if the executive of the Queensland Teachers Union is dedicated and sincere in its concern for extra teachers to be employed, there has to be a ceiling placed on the level of ancillary staff, and teachers will have to revert to the burden of mixing their own paints instead of our employing teacher aides to do it. Mixing paint, let's face it, isn't all that difficult; neither is making charts. If we need more teachers in the school system—if that theorem is agreed to—most certainly the cuts have to be made somewhere. As far as I am concerned there has been too much growth in ancillary staff and perhaps not enough growth in the number of trained teachers.

My fifth major recommendation is that in the State of Queensland, because we have had an enormous migration from southern States, we must take the lead in pushing for a more uniform education system throughout Australia. The massive interstate migration has brought

problems. It has brought not only unhappy children who think they are being put in the wrong grade but also parents who are quite convinced that their children are being discriminated against because they come from New Zealand or Victoria. They feel they are going into a lower grade. When the principals explain to them that they are simply not up to the development of the Queensland system in literacy and numeracy, it is obvious to them that they have to do a catch-up grade or go into a grade lower than the one they were used to.

If there were a uniform education system throughout Australia, there would not be these problems. Let us face it: it should not be so difficult from State to State. It is quite obvious that in a country where in every State English is spoken there should not be those difficulties that obviously exist in Europe. I can cite the instance of Switzerland, where I have taught. One has to be able to be bilingual and to speak not only French and German but also Italian and, in some areas, Romansh. We do not have that in Australia. One only has to be able to speak English. Still, we have this difficulty with interstate migration. That difficulty should not exist with New Zealand children either, because they also speak English. I feel very sorry for some of those children who come to Australia. Children who were in Grade 4 in New Zealand are only at the beginning of Year 3, if not at the latter stage of Year 2, development. Parents are very upset when that happens. If there was a move towards a more uniform education system, Queensland would for once be in the lead in the field of education.

The amendment is extremely important. I hope that all members support it, because it has much to commend it.

Mr SHAW: I rise to a point of order. Paragraph 1 of the amendment is exactly the same as the motion. I seek your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker, as to whether or not it is in order for an amendment to repeat exactly what is in the motion?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Miller): Order! I believe that the amendment is acceptable in its present form.

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (9.41 p.m.): When this amendment was moved, I asked myself "Why?" My first thought was that it was a vain attempt at the last moment to get the Government out of trouble. Although speakers from the Government side have attempted to discount the value of the motion put forward by the Opposition, it must be difficult for those who really believe in education and who are really concerned about the children in their own electorates not to support the principle that is being put forward.

This motion has been on the Business Paper since March 1981. The Opposition has been asking for 11 months that the Government formally adopt principles—not principles suggested by the Opposition, not principles that the shadow Minister for Education is espousing, but principles brought to this Assembly by a committee on which Government members had a 4 to 1 advantage. They are principles that have been concurred with by hundreds of educationalists throughout this nation. That is the first thing the Opposition asks. It asks for a formal adoption of the principles relative to class sizes as recommended in the Ahern report. Secondly, it asks that the Government show some evidence of good faith by stating that it will implement a program and laying down a timetable. That is simple and straightforward.

It amazes me that the members for Windsor and Ithaca should say that they will not support the motion and use as their excuse their attitude to the Queensland Teachers Union. Let us make a comparison, because an amendment brought forward by the member for Mt Gravatt is now before the House. As the shadow Minister for Education has said, the first part is similar to that proposed by the Opposition. The second part of the amendment—"progressively implement these principles as resources are available"—is what I would expect from those who do not want anything done. There is no certainty or action. It is left to persons who will determine, first of all, who receives the State resources. Officers of the department will then decide how those resources will be spent. That is what it says. It does not say "because of the important needs of children in huge classes"; it says "progressively implement these principles as resources are available". That is totally open to definition and completely at the discretion of not only the Treasury and the Government, but also, specifically, the Education Department.

The amendment continues—

“implement a scheme in the financial year 1982-83 whereby undesirably large classes are ”

One could ask: what is meant by “undesirably large classes”? I have heard Government members state that it does not matter how many children are in a class. I sometimes wonder whether they are products of an archaic system and think that because they had to put up with 50 children in a class, everyone else ought to do the same. If that is the attitude they are adopting, it is a great pity.

The fourth part of the amendment states—

“continue to maintain the high standards of education being provided in the public and private school system.”

What members of this Assembly will accept as “high standards” is open to debate.

It seems that this is a one-out effort by one member, who now has support of another member by way of a seconder, to try to get the Government out of some difficulty. There must be some thinking people on the Government side who appreciate that the Opposition is asking them to support a principle put forward by the Minister for Primary Industries (Mr Ahern) and a committee on which the Government had control. The Government cannot accept its own amendment because there is no clear timetabling. There is no promise or certainty.

I am not surprised that Government members have adopted the attitude displayed by them in this debate. What I am surprised at is that they tended to level their attack at the Queensland Teachers Union. As well, they adopted an anti-teacher attitude. One starts to wonder why.

Is it because they hated their teachers in days gone by? Is it because they have the idea that anything that is tagged with the “union” label must be opposed? I wonder whether National Party members adopt the same attitude when they talk about the Cattlemens Union. It seems that the moment the word “union” is mentioned in this Chamber the old Communist rag comes up or the thought that industrial might must be opposed comes forward.

It would seem that because some Government members had to put up with four walls and a blackboard during their school-days, or because they had to put up with overcrowded classes, they are willing to oppose anything that is positive or in any way is an initiative in this Assembly.

It seems also that their opposition is derived from their intellectual incapacity. However, there is no need for them to take it out on children today. There is no need for them to join with many others in the community who tend to cry, “We had to put up with this; so should everyone else.” I taught classes containing 55 students. I did not like it, but I did my job. It was unsatisfactory, and the children were the ones who suffered most.

The teachers have the greatest community responsibility of any professional group. We may not like a teacher; we may have something in our background that causes us to dislike him. Nevertheless, it is the teacher who can affect the ultimate achievement levels of human beings. It is the teacher who can determine what people will want to do and what people will be able to do. It is the teacher who can stimulate the desire for learning or deter it.

Recently I heard that a number of honourable members never read a book. Why is it that we who are supposed to represent the community simply have so many failings in our attitudes? We might conduct some type of survey of our own educational deficiencies, because each of us has been disadvantaged in some way. However, it worried me when I heard that some members of Parliament actually admitted that they never read a book during a year. I began to wonder: if that is so with members of Parliament, whose job it is to represent people and to keep up with new ideas and different approaches on a myriad of issues, what happens in the general community?

Is it any wonder that many people are content to sit and watch television for many hours each day? We need to stimulate a desire for learning. We need to encourage people to set their own goals and to try to attain those goals. It is the teacher who has the opportunity either to stimulate or to deter. It is the teacher who has the opportunity to

counter the negatives in our society, to overcome the domestic handicaps, to counter the anti-social influences. It is time that we recognised the important role played by teachers instead of knocking them all the time.

Let me come back to what this issue is all about—class sizes. The Ahern committee's recommendation set an objective that classes be reduced in Queensland and that in Years 1, 2 and 3 as well as in Years 11 and 12 they contain not more than 25 students and that in Years 4 to 10 they contain not more than 30 students. This Government has disregarded that objective.

Of the 362 000 students in Queensland, approximately 150 000 are in classes with enrolments above the tight maximums. Approximately 12 000 of those students are in classes containing more than 35 pupils.

The majority of practising schoolteachers, retired teachers, p. and c. associations and school principals are in support of the campaign for a lowering of class sizes. They are not necessarily in support of industrial action, but they are certainly in support of the campaign. However, despite the recommendations of the select committee, which was probably the most important select committee ever set up in this Assembly and one that was controlled by the Government, the Government has refused, regardless of requests, to endorse the principles that were enunciated and espoused in the recommendations.

I am surprised that the honourable member for Ithaca should pretend that this was an issue against the Queensland Teachers Union. I have known him for many years since my election to Parliament, and I am surprised that he adopted that view. I am surprised that he did not realise that the crux of the motion was an adoption of principles and the setting of some type of timetable. I am surprised that the Government has not simply adopted the principles and has not been prepared to sit down and talk in an endeavour to come up with some compromise. After all, it is the Government's recommendation. This Parliament accepted the Ahern committee's report. We adopted those recommendations in principle. Therefore Government members have no alternative but to stand by those original recommendations.

It is a reasonable request. No-one is asking the Minister to solve this problem overnight. No-one is asking him to find some sort of educational or financial magic wand that he can wave and, suddenly, throughout the State, have 360 000 children in classes with fewer than 30 students in some cases and 25 students in others. No-one is asking for that.

We are asking for a clear declaration of attitude. We are asking for a clear declaration of action. Any Government member who votes against the motion will be saying to his electors and his electorate generally, "I don't accept the principle that class sizes ought to be low. I do not believe that the Ahern committee recommendations are valid. I don't care if nothing is ever done to overcome this problem." If any Government member votes against the motion, that is what he will be saying. He will be voting in the negative. He will be voting against the principle, against an implementation.

This issue is not the policy of the Queensland Teachers Union. It seems that as long as Government members can find a tangent to go off at or someone to belt and beat they are happy. But that is not the issue. The issue is whether or not the children of this State are being given the maximum opportunity in the class-room in which they are being taught. The issue is whether the children of Queensland are being given the best education relative to our resources that we are prepared to apply or appropriate. The issue is whether or not we realise there are problems and whether or not we are prepared to try to alleviate them. The issue is whether or not the individual children in Queensland are being disadvantaged because of one problem—class sizes. It is whether the teachers, parents and students can expect a positive plan aimed at alleviating this problem, not because it will lighten the load of teachers. That is not the issue.

Teachers will not suddenly sit on their butts and say, "We have less work to do because we will be involved in more individual education." It is not so that Queensland can say, "We have the lowest teacher/student ratio and the highest statistical expenditure on education in this nation." That is not the issue. It is not so that the Department of Education can say, "We have the greatest appropriation in budgetary allocations in this State." That is not the issue. It is not whether the Government can say, in 1982, "We spend the most money on education." That is not the issue. The issue is

whether or not Queensland students are able to maximise their educational opportunities today, tomorrow, and in the weeks and years to come. The fact is that students are being educationally disadvantaged. The reasons are many. It is not simply class sizes; it is because of domestic circumstances over which this Parliament has limited or no control.

The other question is the standard of teaching, over which this Parliament does have some control. Over many years, this has been attacked. It depends on training, individual differences, individual attitudes and the professionalism of the teachers. It comes back to the question of teaching environmental factors, the standards and availability of teaching material and aids and, again, class sizes.

I make the point that this issue has not just arisen because of the Ahern committee recommendations, although they are the basis of the motion. One ought to read the comparative studies that have been carried out. I refer members to the study conducted by Professor Campbell of the University of Queensland. It was not done overnight. It was not done at a whim or because a Federal Government allocated a few dollars to a student to check out an aspect of education in Queensland. It resulted from three years of hard yakka. It will continue. Although it is not complete, we should look carefully at the results to date.

The main finding is that smaller classes result in more being learnt by pupils. It is as simple as that. That is the contention—that smaller classes result in more being learnt by pupils. The study says that there is a clear relationship between class sizes and quality of education. It reads—

“The economy-of-scale argument, which is applied to industrial products and assumes constancy of quality, is not applicable to education.”

It is not like setting up a machine and saying, “OK, because the first 100 000 products are the same the next 100 000 will be the same if we just turn up the speed of the machine.” It is not like printing newspapers when the operator knows that as long as he keeps up the ink content and watches the product and turns up the speed, the newspapers will all be identical. That is not the situation, and that is the main thing that Campbell says: the economy-of-scale argument that one can apply to all these other situations does not apply when it comes to the quality of education. He says that early data is providing a strong suggestion that when class sizes increase—in this instance from 26 to 36—less is learnt by the pupils. What are they there for? So that we can provide statistics in comparison with other States? No, so that they can learn and so that they can maximise their learning opportunities.

It is not only the Campbell study that puts forward these views; there is also the Smith and Glass study that has been conducted of all the previous research not only in America but throughout the world. Smith and Glass concluded that there is a clear and strong relationship between class sizes and achievement. They go on to say that there is little doubt, other things being equal, that more is learnt in smaller classes, and they found a strong relationship, especially in secondary schools, between the size of the class and that learnt. It goes on to say that this result is not affected by the subjects studied or the level of intelligence. Certain factors have to be considered in making comparisons. It shall depend on different pupils; it shall depend on different teachers; it shall depend on different teaching environments. Again this study was not an overnight observation. It was the result of an in-depth educational study that clearly shows a relationship between class size and what is learnt by children. The same goes for the Campbell report. Again, this is not some overnight observation; as I said, it has been going on for three years to date. They have been monitoring the learning behaviour of pupils before and after a particular class was changed in size, and the result is that there is a clear, significant relationship between that learned by those children and the size of the class. When we accept this—not just the Ahern report, not just the Campbell report but also the Smith and Glass report—we must agree that the researchers tend to put up a rather strong argument. I would like to read from one aspect of the Campbell report. The article states—

“The researchers measured the amount of time the pupils were working on the learning task set by the teacher (because ‘this is known to be the best index of how much a pupil will learn’), off-task and waiting.

The result was that in the large classes, 70 per cent of the class time was spent on-task (on the set learning task).

In the smaller classes, this increased to 81 per cent.

'Thus we conclude . . . with a decrease in class size of just under 30 per cent, the pupils who remain in the class spend more time on task and corresponding less time off-task,' the researchers said.

'A simple approach to calculating the educational significance of the class-size effects is to note that in one school year of 1 000 hours (200 days by five hours a day) a child in a class of between 35 and 38 pupils is likely to spend 700 hours working on tasks set by the teacher, whereas the same child in a class of between 25 and 28 pupils is likely to spend 810 hours on task.

'This difference of 110 hours is equal to 22 school days of the year.'

So what Government members are saying is that if they are not prepared to accept a reduction in class sizes within the ambit of the recommendations of the Ahern, Campbell and Smith and Glass reports they are prepared to disadvantage thousands of children in Queensland of their education opportunity by 22 days per year. If Government members are prepared to vote for that they should tell their electors what they have done. They are saying that they are prepared to stand by such an attitude, and they should be condemned for it. It is quite clear that there are many other factors in favour of smaller class sizes. The trend of modern education is towards activity-based methods. Teachers are being trained in this way, and older teachers are being encouraged to change their teaching habits, yet this activity-based program is not possible to the degree it ought to be in larger classes. Modern psychology accepts that each child receives personal attention. We keep talking about the need for individual attention to overcome individual difficulties and difference. That is less easily achievable if we have large classes. There is a need for constant interaction between children and their teachers, and this involves not only the teacher in front of a class but also the collection and marking of all children's work. I am sure that, as parents, members have often wondered why it is that some work has not been marked; why there have been mistakes from the teacher's point of view; why it is that that program did not seem to be completed and why it is that children can bring home projects that they have been asked to do that does not seem to be given due attention by the class but seems to be put away or shoved in a cupboard somewhere. Often there is no opportunity for that closer interaction that is necessary.

The need for specialisation can be met effectively only when there are smaller classes. In the larger classes it is not the teacher or the parents who are disadvantaged, but the slow learner, the slow starter, the day-dreamer or the child with learning difficulties. Indeed, the very bright and the very slow are disadvantaged. The child with emotional problems, the quiet child, and the shy, well-behaved child are disadvantaged. In other words, it is the child who needs individual attention who is disadvantaged. That attention cannot be given when a teacher has to try to contend with classes far above the recommended levels.

We have to help young people to keep up with the knowledge explosion. Children in our schools are also having greater difficulties with social changes. A young trainee teacher staying with my family in Rockhampton said that he has been allocated to a certain school in the city. He was told at the institute that at that school one in every three families has had some sort of domestic breakdown. I do not know how those figures have been gleaned, but obviously that teacher and any other teacher at that school will be confronted with all sorts of social problems.

There are also the difficulties with working parents. The whole point is that these children need special attention. If that special attention is to be given, the work-load in each class has to be reduced to give a lower teacher/student ratio.

I wonder why the Government has adopted this negative approach. Why has the Government adopted a going-nowhere stand on this issue? When the Government wants millions of dollars for racecourses, there is no problem. If it wants to spend millions of dollars on building another power-station, or if a certain person wants a power-station built in a certain area, there is no problem. But when it comes to meeting education needs there is never enough money. It is a matter of a Government member saying, "Let us deal with this problem as resources become available." What a no-going-anywhere approach! That is what we are being asked to accept with this amendment.

Mr Borbidge: Are you saying that a \$101m increase is nothing?

Mr WRIGHT: I am glad that the honourable member said that. I do not believe that the success of an education system can be measured in dollars and cents.

Government Members interjected.

Mr WRIGHT: Do Government members believe that they can measure the success of an education system in terms of dollars and cents? I am amazed. I hope that "Hansard" has recorded the laughter of Government members. They are espousing the view that they can measure the success of an education system in dollars and cents. What a ridiculous and inane comment! In the same way, the success cannot be measured in terms of a percentage increase in expenditure in the Budget, but that is what the Minister tries to do. He says how great we are going in Queensland because last year he increased the Education Vote by 20 per cent. Surely that is relative to what the system started with, to its demands and to the needs and priorities at the time.

The ultimate test is whether the prevailing disadvantageous situation is being eradicated. Is the Government prepared to eradicate the disadvantageous situation in hundreds of classes in our schools? Ultimately, a change can be effected by the expenditure of money, but the genesis of the issue is the attitude of the Government towards the needs of the children in our schools. It is the attitude of the Government towards sitting down and setting the overall education priorities. It is the attitude of the Government towards spending money on education priorities rather than on material projects.

It is difficult to measure results. We all accept that, but all we are asking here is that the Government make a start and adopt principles. The evidence is very clear that the Government needs to adopt the principles of the Ahern committee report. It needs to adopt the recommendations that have been put forward by the Campbell inquiry and by the Smith and Glass inquiry. I do not expect a magic wand to be used. Anybody who thinks that we can ask the Minister for Education to spend a couple of million dollars to overcome the problem does not understand the situation. The Opposition and the people of Queensland have a right to expect a declaration of support for the principles that have been espoused. The people have a right to expect proof of belief on behalf of the Government. That can be shown only by a clear declaration of an undertaking relative to a specific action timetable.

I conclude by saying that we have to put up with a disadvantage to children by default, which could be because of transfer or socio/economic problems, but we should not put up with disadvantage by design.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (10.5 p.m.): I whole-heartedly support the amendment because it contains the one element that genuine teachers and concerned parents have been looking for from this Government, that is a clear and unequivocal statement from the Government that it adopts the principles on class sizes contained in the Ahern report.

I hope that the Government will indicate its support for this motion and that it is carried unanimously by the House. Given that, then those genuine teachers and genuine parents will have what the Queensland Teachers Union alleges that it is after: an undertaking given by the Government in plain and unequivocal language that it accepts the principles of that report and that it will move towards their implementation. That is the issue for those who are concerned about the educational advantages of their children and who accept the proposition that smaller class sizes, in line with the report, will make a difference, all other things being equal.

There is no doubt in my mind that the vast majority of parents and the majority of teachers who have been involved in the class size campaign are genuine in their concern for children. That is why they have become involved. Of course they care about their children. As a parent myself and coming from a family of schoolteachers, I know as well as anybody in the House the importance of education to the future of the State and to the children in it. That is the real issue at stake that has been debated for months and months. That issue will be resolved by this House carrying this motion.

I am prepared to predict now that even the unanimous carriage of this motion by the House will have absolutely no effect at all on the Teachers Union organisers who are

attempting to bring the schools out on strike next week. They do not care that what they said they needed is now about to be given to them. The problem is that what they said to the parents and to their colleagues that they wanted is not what they want at all.

If one examines the organisers of this campaign one discovers really what has been going on in the Teachers Union and in the schools over the last few months. Who is organising it? It is not being organised by that poor unfortunate president of the Teachers Union, Mr Schuntner, who I firmly believe is a decent and honourable man and who looks to the benefit of education and of teachers. I have no argument with the president of the union. On many matters I do not agree with him—I think he is misguided—but I have no dispute with him whatsoever over his genuineness or his sincerity in his approach to his duties as the president of the union.

The problem is that Mr Schuntner has around him a group of people with whom he has been foisted and who do not share his aims and objectives. Let us have a look at the happy little gang who have been organising this class size campaign over the recent months. Despite what they tell parents and teachers, they have been organising this campaign since as early as last June. That was apparent from Teachers Union publications and journals and from work books that were distributed to activists on how to organise a campaign in class-rooms and schools. This whole exercise has been orchestrated and any person in the State who reads past issues of the "Queensland Teachers Journal" will find written in chapter and verse instructions to their members and the decisions of their council. Who has been behind it all?

The organiser of this group is an individual called Hamish Linacre, a failed teacher who has since diverted his activities into the Teachers Union. He is listed as the co-ordinator for the class-size campaign. Mr Linacre—and we will find this is a strange coincidence associated with most of these individuals who are in it up to their ears—has been publicly, proudly and strongly identified with the extreme Left-wing socialist Left faction in the ALP.

Mr FitzGerald: Has he ever stood for election?

Mr GYGAR: No, I don't think he has stood for election, but then again most of the others have.

Mr Powell: Yes, twice.

Mr GYGAR: That is right. Mr Linacre was the candidate in Fisher—twice for the ALP in Fisher and twice defeated. I am led to believe that Mr Adermann cried tears of blood when he left the electorate because he thought he was the best thing he had going for him.

The general secretary of the union, who is also prominent in this, is one Rockett, another defeated ALP candidate who decided to decamp from Townsville when his political aspirations were not getting him very far in that city. Who are the other industrial officers and individuals involved in this? Arch Bevis, Jnr is listed in the latest journal as the acting secretary. One wonders what happened to Rockett, but undoubtedly he is still there somewhere. Another well-known ALP activist, Mr Bevis is the former president of the radical Young Labor Organisation. We have others like Bob White—another twice-failed presidential candidate and a strong supporter of the member for Archerfield (Mr Hooper). Enough said about Mr White. One Barry Minter, the industrial officer for the Brisbane South district, seemed to think that his main job as a Teachers Union organiser is to go around spreading ALP propaganda through the schools.

Last but not least, the one who has been responsible for the propaganda organ that the union puts out is a David Hinchcliff. Mr Hinchcliff had all the right qualifications to be appointed as the editor of the Queensland Teachers Union journal, which he now is. His past work history showed the qualifications possessed: research officer to the ALP politician Ben Humphreys—this was at the same time as his wife was working for Mal Colston; then to Elaine Darling; and from there, having set up a wonderful track record as an editor of what, one might ask, he appears as the editor of the Queensland Teachers Union journal. One must pause to wonder what criteria were used for this interesting selection. I must praise Mr Hinchcliff, though. He is a talented cartoonist. I have seen his work in the journal. His work is first class. He draws wonderful pictures of painters and dockers and of Senator George Georges.

Mr Fouras interjected.

Mr GYGAR: The second good thing I would say about him is that he is a little bit better than one of his predecessors—one Janet Manson, who is a member of the Communist Party of Australia, which is some recommendation.

Let us have a look at the Teachers Union. I ask the member for South Brisbane to have a little bit of an open mind. Let us have a look at the last edition of the "Queensland Teachers Journal", this wonderful, professional organ of these professional teachers being run by the union for the unionists for education. Have a look at it. The headline is "Class-size bomb explodes"—a little bit of PR for their political campaign. There are a few ads on the second page and then we find on page 3 a large article by Senator George Georges, the bete noir of the socialist Left under the heading "Peace is (our) union's business". That is really relevant. That gives a big rap-up on the Australian Peace Council, which is well known to anybody who takes an interest in politics as being another front organisation for extreme Leftists. Have a look through this rag. Tell me what relevance this has got to the issue of education—the professional quality of education in this State which this union supposedly stands for. We have satirical cartoons, undoubtedly from the pen of Hinchcliff, critical of the Minister and attempting to ridicule the members of this Government.

We go on a bit further. There is more about class sizes. There is a little bit here about the Aboriginal land rights issue.

Mr FitzGerald: Is there anything about the PLO?

Mr GYGAR: No, I do not know whether we got that this time. We have an article headed "Dawkins delivers". This praises someone. Surprise, surprise! He happens to be Labor's Federal shadow Minister for Education. That is next to a cartoon of the Premier dressed as Simon Legree with a whip in his hand. Of course, there is no bias involved in that journal. It is a journal of the professional association of teachers. There is nothing bent about that lot—until one turns the next page and finds an article from that paragon of intellectual honesty, Professor Ted Wheelwright. I will not explore Mr Wheelwright's antecedents; they should be well known to most people.

That classic page of the journal is matched by about 10 column-inches of an article entitled "They are sailing . . . for peace", which urges all union members to make donations to a couple of Communists who are sailing out in the middle of the ocean on another of those funny peace crusades that one hears so much about.

The journal contains a few notes about the Teachers Union conference. There is a page about union dues, the teachers 11, the QTU executive and what a happy little collection they are, a page of book and theatre reviews, a little more about the union, and some letters are published on the back. Where is there one article referring to the quality of education in this State?

Because of frauds perpetrated by doctors, the AMA is one of the most maligned organisations in Australia. The "AMA Gazette", a magazine published by the dreadful money-grabbing doctors, is concerned with professional issues, issues of ethics, the latest surgical techniques, and equipment available on the market.

Where in the Queensland Teachers Union publication is there one contribution to quality education for the benefit of children in Queensland? That journal indicates the true nature of the organisers who are behind the class-size campaign and, unfortunately, many of the other activities of the Queensland Teachers Union. I deplore that that has happened, as would many other parents and teachers in this State. What was, and could again be, an honourable professional organ concerned about education has been turned into a political rag to suit the political aspirations and aims of a small clique that has moved in to take it over.

A Government Member: They are the socialist Left.

Mr GYGAR: Of course they are the socialist Left. They are pushing their own angles for preselection and advancement in the Teachers Union.

The journal goes to ludicrous lengths. If anyone is not convinced yet, I would invite readers of "Hansard" to peruse page 8 of the Teachers Union journal of 27 January this year. It is headed "Image conscious dockers are angels at heart". It is an article about what wonderful little chaps the members of the Painters and Dockers Union are. I was a little confused when I opened the publication. I wondered what that had to do with

professionalism in education and benefits to the children of Queensland. The journal contains an article about what wonderful chaps the painters and dockers are. It is curious that the Teachers Union journal tries to profess that the painters and dockers are "angels". Even the shadow federal ALP spokesman, Bob Hawke, dissociated the ALP from that organisation in Federal Parliament last week following the tabling of the interim report of the investigation into the painters and dockers, which showed these "angels" of the Queensland Teachers Union organisers to be murderers, standover merchants, thugs and thieves. It is very relevant and important to education. It is crowded in there amongst all those articles about educational quality. The parents of Queensland children can surely rest easily at night knowing that the lunatics that put out this sort of rubbish are in the class-rooms teaching their children! No wonder parents are worried about education! They have every right to be worried when they see that sort of tripe.

Let me make it quite clear: it is not representative of the vast majority of honest, decent hard-working and dedicated teachers in this State.

Mr Fouras: Are you talking about the moral majority again?

Mr GYGAR: I am not talking about a moral majority; I am talking about a decent majority of teachers who are in the teaching profession because they care about kids and have some sort of dedication to their task. What dedication does the honourable member think is demonstrated in the drivel to which I have just referred? It certainly does not demonstrate a dedication to children.

We are about to see an interesting exercise in Queensland. Even if this motion is carried, even if this commitment is made by the Government, the individuals who are responsible for that drivel will still be calling for a strike. Perhaps it is time that that did occur. If it did, we would then have a good chance of seeing who among those involved in this issue have a loyalty to the children placed in their care and who have a greater loyalty than that to the charge that they have been given by the State and, more importantly, by the parents. We will have an opportunity to see who among them will place a loyalty to socialist Left ratbags higher than a loyalty to the children who have been placed under their care. It will indeed be an interesting exercise next week.

Education certainly is not perfect in this State. I do not think I will live long enough to see the day when it is. It is not so perfect that it can be free from sensible criticism. However, such criticism must be levelled in good faith so that we can move towards the continual improvement and upgrading of education.

There was, and is, a valid basis for a campaign calling for a commitment from this Government to adopt the recommendations in the Ahern committee's report. I hope that tonight that commitment will be clearly and unequivocally given. That being the case, that campaign should end; it will have achieved its objective.

Let me move on to other fields of concern in education where a concentrated effort can be made by either lobbying or pressure, or in some other way, to get the Government to take action if those fields are valid and necessary for the benefit of the children of this State.

I am astounded to find that this professional organisation, the Queensland Teachers Union, has gone after the class-size issue like a fox terrier after a rat. From the way the union has behaved in recent months one would think that class sizes are the single, sole factor that has any determinant on the quality of education that our children receive. That is plainly false. Any parent will say that that is so, as will any teacher who has a genuine interest for the kids at heart.

There are many factors that go towards quality of education. For a start, there is the quality of teaching; next there is the training of the teacher. There are also the physical facilities at the school, the design of the curriculum and, most important of all, the dedication of the teacher involved. There is also the involvement of the parent in the education of the child.

Where have we seen the Queensland Teachers Union organising with vigour, enthusiasm and commitment on any of those issues or on any other issues that educational research has shown to be relevant to the quality of education that our children receive? For instance, where was the Queensland Teachers Union when the Williams committee reported in February 1979? It set out clearly what it thought about standards of education and what should and could be done about them.

To any genuine person, to parents who have a real concern and to teachers who care for the children under their control the passage of this motion with the support of the Government—I hope to hear the Minister giving his unequivocal support to the principles involved here—will mean that the class-size issue is dead as far as the quality of education is concerned.

What will carry on from here cannot be interpreted as anything other than a blatant, party-political campaign being pushed and urged by this collection of political opportunists who have flocked round the Teachers Union like bees round a honey-pot in order to push their own personal aggrandisement and the rather warped ideology that they represent in our community, an ideology with such little support that they simply are not game to stand for election flying their true colours.

I have great sympathy for Mr Schuntner, some of the vice-presidents of the Teachers Union and the vast majority of its members who have given their lives to education. They are very dedicated and work very hard. I know because I have seen the hours that my father and my brother put in as school teachers to do a decent, good job for the kids under their care. I feel sorry for them because they have had to put up with the tripe and drivel from Hinchcliff and Linacre and their cohorts who white-ant the Teachers Union and have turned it from a proud professional body into a mouthpiece for ratbag radical ideologies.

This motion will, I hope, close once and for all the debate on this issue. A commitment was asked for and I hope a commitment is about to be given. Let us now move on to other fields in which we can truly do something to improve the education of the children of this State.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (10.27 p.m.): Government members have been very good at quoting statistics. One of the problems in the education system in Queensland—it starts at the bottom and goes right through to the top—is that the Government, in this age of technology, considers that it can put children into schools like machines in a factory; that it can put so many children in class-rooms with so many teachers and turn out set products. Those children are like us. We are individuals and we must be treated as individuals.

Teaching is a profession, not a trade. It needs a certain amount of money. However, I agree with the honourable member for Rockhampton that money is not the complete answer. The Government would lead us to believe that it is. It is a big part of the answer, I agree, but it is one of the problems that the Government has got itself into because of its false economies.

The Minister emphasised the increase in the amount of money allocated for education. He referred to the additional money that will be spent on teachers and improvements in the education system. He would lead us to believe that that is the be-all and end-all, that that turns the Education Department into a god whom we have no right to criticise.

I wish to refer to "The Courier-Mail" dated 16 January 1982. It is a regular article that appears every so often. It is inserted by the Government as a propaganda exercise. I admit that there is a certain amount of truth in it. It deals with the increase in Queensland's population each month. It states that for the financial year our population increased by 26 097. That is an increase of over 2 000 a month. Some of the migrants would be children. If this has been going on for as long as the Government believes, why is it that there is a difference of 100 000 between the Federal and State electoral rolls? The result is that the Government's increase in education expenditure per capita is still the lowest in Australia. It is nowhere comparable with the increase in population.

Some of the funds for education come from the Works Department. On many occasions I have had to go to the Minister for Works and Housing whose department has to fund many Education Department programs. I am sure that he would disagree with the members who have spoken tonight who said that education is totally funded by the Education Department. It is not; it is funded—

Mr Moore: On your figures you claimed that education was the total spending, and we said, "Plus the infrastructure."

Mr EATON: Government members led us to believe that it is funded from the Education Vote when it is not. If the honourable member compares the increase in population to the increase announced in the Budget he will find that we have the lowest per capita spending in Australia. This is nothing to be proud of in the richest resource State in Australia, as was mentioned by the honourable member for Ipswich West. During election campaigns the Government says that Queensland is the lowest-taxed State, but Government members do not go round skiting about Queensland having the lowest per capita expenditure on health, welfare and education.

Mr Underwood: And the highest charges and fees.

Mr EATON: That is right.

In November last year I asked the Minister for Education a question regarding the grave shortage of specialist teachers in Far North Queensland. The Minister began his reply by saying, "I doubt that there is a grave shortage of specialist teachers in Far North Queensland. In fact, I doubt that there is a shortage of specialist teachers in Queensland." In the second sentence he even dropped the word "grave". At about the same time another member asked for two specialist teachers to be provided in his area. This is where I want to point out the false economy in the Government's planning for education. There are two speech therapists, two advisory teachers and an advisory supervisor for a creche and kindergarten in Cairns, and the Minister said that those teachers visit the Innisfail area regularly. But they are supposed to cover an area from Cardwell in the south up to Cape York and the Torres Strait to within 4 miles of the New Guinea border, and if those teachers visited the entire area regularly they would have no time to teach; they would be doing nothing but getting in and out of cars and aeroplanes. That puts the lie to the statement that they visit the area regularly. It is just a physical impossibility for them to do that amount of travelling and yet spend the necessary time in each area.

The Innisfail High School, with a pupil population of 864, commenced the school year three teachers short. The school has been making do with what is not even an apology for a library although the school authorities have been informed that it is hoped to build a new library this year. The department has been sending letters to parents saying that the project will be postponed, but I am sure that if one more such letter is sent to Innisfail the cries will be heard in Brisbane.

The stationing in Innisfail of one speech therapist, one specialist teacher and one remedial teacher would mean that no more overnight expenses would be incurred by teachers travelling from Cairns. Those new teachers could work in the Innisfail district, thus allowing the specialist teachers from Cairns to travel further north or west where they are desperately needed. I want to emphasise that point.

It is no good reducing the pupil/teacher ratio to 1:19. That will not solve the problem because there are no back-up facilities for specialist teachers. When specialist teachers in Far North Queensland visit schools they do a good job, but because of acute understaffing they have to say to the ordinary teachers, "You supervise this work until I get back."

Mr Gunn: So they should.

Mr EATON: But that takes them away from their normal school duties. If specialist teachers were provided the ordinary teachers would be able to devote their whole time to teaching pupils in the class-room. That is what they are there for, not supervising remedial teaching, speech therapy or other related matters. Therefore the suggestion by a Government member tonight that a reduction in the pupil/teacher ratio to 1:19 is not the answer to the problem unless back-up facilities for specialist teachers are provided.

Specialist teachers are still needed today, particularly in the early years. It is not much good trying to give a Year 12 student speech therapy; he should receive that in his first years at school.

Dr Lockwood: He should get that as an infant.

Mr EATON: That is right. It is the Government's responsibility to ensure that a student receives that therapy when he starts school.

To demonstrate how bad this situation is, and to make the point about the Government's false economies, I refer to people in Innisfail who are ordered by a medical practitioner to get speech therapy or remedial teaching for their children. The facilities are not available in Innisfail. They have to travel to Cairns to obtain treatment for their children. The Government has to pay their rail fares and taxi fares from the railway station to the special school. If the teachers were based in Innisfail, the people would only have to come into town or, if they lived in town, they would only have to go to the school to receive the remedial teaching.

The schools at Mission Beach and Flying Fish Point have demountable class-rooms. The population of these beach resorts has been increasing fairly rapidly over recent years. As soon as the Government has provided a demountable class-room, the increased school population has warranted additional accommodation. I am sure that the Minister knows from former members representing my electorate that the Education Department has been approached continually over the years to upgrade these schools.

The former member for Mourilyan spent considerable time in trying to acquire additional land for the East Innisfail School. This matter has been under way for three to four years, but so far the additional land has not been provided. First the Works Department was involved and now the Lands Department is being brought in. This project is being held up because of the red tape in the three departments. Because of the economic mismanagement of the Government in the Education Department and other departments, the Government does not have the money to acquire this land for the East Innisfail School.

I think the Government realises that there are disgruntled parents throughout the State. The teachers started the ball rolling and the parents joined them, not because they want to side with the teachers but because of the cause that the teachers are fighting.

The majority of parents in Queensland have a lot of common sense. They understand the problems that arise in rearing a family. There is no way in the world that parents would back radical teachers. The only reason why the p. and c. associations are backing the teachers is that they believe in the cause. They are concerned about the welfare of their children. They realise that if the Government allows the education system to deteriorate, as it has in the past, the children who pass through the education system will become nothing more than dole fodder instead of the future leaders of this State and nation. That is the point that I make strongly tonight.

Dr Lockwood: Dole bludgers?

Mr EATON: I did not say "dole bludgers"; I said "dole fodder" The Government has to pull up its socks in education and in other areas and try to create jobs.

Mr Moore: How many kids were in your class when you went to school?

Mr EATON: I went to school during the war years when all the able-bodied men were in the Army. There were lady teachers and old men teachers. In one year we had 76 children in my class.

Mr Moore: You are here, and you are quite well educated.

Mr EATON: I received no academic education. I had to do it the hard way. I learnt by experience. I have been guided by common sense and honesty.

Mr Warburton: You were not born with a silver spoon in your mouth like the member for Windsor was.

Mr EATON: No.

I had discussions with the Minister, and I admit that he listened to my story. Because of the additional money provided for education in the Budget, I thought that I would write to the Director-General of Education so that he could examine my claim to see whether it was just and make money available for the extra teachers and the other assistance that I had requested.

I sent a copy of that letter to the Minister for Education who took exception to my penmanship. In that letter I stated that I realised the problems of the Education Department and its reluctance to adequately staff the areas of Far North Queensland. The Minister took exception to my penultimate phrase, which mentioned the inadequate staffing of schools in Far North Queensland. He said that Innisfail and the rest of Far North

Queensland was staffed on a basis comparable to the rest of Queensland. If the rest of Queensland has the same staffing as Innisfail and the rest of Far North Queensland, the whole of Queensland is inadequately staffed.

The Government has let the standing of the education portfolio in Cabinet drop to where it is not given proper recognition. As well as the matter of funding, there is the Minister's responsibility. If departmental officers and the Minister are competent instead of incompetent, there should be enough people in the education system to inquire into the problems of education and initiate a program to alleviate or solve the problems in the Education Department.

I do not expect the Minister or the Government to solve the problems overnight, but after 20 years in office the Government's performance is a disgrace. The Minister will be judged not on what he is now doing but on the results in 12 months' time. For the past 12 months I have gone easy on him because he is a new Minister. I remind the Minister that the Government has had a number of Ministers for Education. In Far North Queensland the former Minister for Education and the present one are not very popular.

Mr POWELL (Isis) (10.42 p.m.): In logic there is the principle of the fallacy of the undistributed middle term. If one looks carefully at the speeches on education of members opposite tonight one will find that they have adopted that fallacy particularly well. I refer to the speeches of the honourable member for Rockhampton and the honourable member for Ipswich West, two people from whom I expected a far more academic contribution.

Simply put, the fallacy of the undistributed middle term means this, and the Opposition is saying this, "You have two ears; a baboon has two ears; therefore, you are a baboon." That is the type of logic that the Opposition has used to try to justify its stance.

Let us get back to taws. Surely an argument on education and an argument on spending—and, therefore, the worth of it—ought to revolve around the end product. Quite clearly members opposite have repeatedly said that the criterion is not the amount of money spent, yet during this debate they have espoused the argument that the Government does not spend enough on education. However, they have also said that money is not the criterion. That is quite true, but let us look at the amount of money that the Labor Party spent on education in Queensland when it was in power.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr POWELL: I waited for the laugh because I knew it would come.

Because money in terms of exact dollars means nothing on a comparison basis, I have used percentages. This year the Queensland Government will spend almost a quarter of its total Budget on education. If one looks also at the capital works program of the Works Department one sees that education expenditure represents more than a quarter of the State Budget. However, the member for Mourilyan, who has just completed his speech, said that the Government had placed education at the bottom of priorities. That is where the Opposition is completely wrong.

Mr Underwood: On education you are the lowest spending Government in Australia.

Mr POWELL: Once again the honourable member for Ipswich West interjects with his argument about money.

What priority did the Labor Government place on education? In 1956-57 the Labor Government spent 11 per cent of its total Budget on education.

Mr Eaton: What were the wages, then?

Mr POWELL: I am speaking about expenditure as a percentage of the total Budget. Wages have nothing to do with it. What the members opposite cannot come to grips with is that that was a Labor Government's performance.

Their performance tonight has proved another point that I made some time ago. When the member for Wynnum first brought forward this proposition to the Parliament, the Government decided that the proposed motion would not be debated at that time. We heard the member for Stafford tell us about the editorial staff of the "Queensland Teachers Journal", which was very interesting. I hope teachers read his speech very carefully because they will discover many things that they have suspected over a long time. That journal

had something to say about this matter. At that time I said that I did not support the debate's being proceeded with, because I did not believe there were enough members of the Parliament who could make a worthwhile contribution on a class-size debate.

What I said then has been borne out by members of the Opposition. They have not come to grips with the kernel of the argument. They should read the select committee's report—the whole thing; not just one sentence, as they are doing at the moment; not just one sentence, as the architects of the Queensland Teachers Union and the Queensland Council of Parents and Citizens Association are trying to force down people's necks. If they cannot spend their time studying the whole report, let them read 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 of the Third Interim Report. If they read those three paragraphs together, they will find the proposition that the select committee was putting forward to be entirely different from the proposition that Opposition spokesmen have been trying to put forward, because they find great difficulty in giving anybody any credit where credit is due. They have not been able to read, for example, what Dr Keeves had to say about Queensland education when asked by the select committee to comment. Other speakers tonight have referred to it, but I must refer to it again. It is in the select committee's report. Dr Keeves stated quite clearly that in literacy and numeracy Queensland schoolchildren performed equal to or better than not just the children in other States of Australia but those in the rest of the western world. Surely two of the bench-marks of the importance of education are that a person can read and add up. Surely the most important thing for any person is to be able to read and read for content. If he can read for content, he will succeed in life because he can find out what is going on. So clearly the major question is being avoided.

I can go along to any group of parents as a teacher and put the absolute fear into them that their children are not going to receive a good education. It is a simple thing to do—simple indeed—because all I have to do is stand up at a parents and citizens association meeting and say, "Look, ladies and gentlemen, I have 35 children in my class—35 of your children—and that is just too many. I can't handle that. I've got little Johnnie, little Freddie and little Mary over there. They are pretty slow learners, but I haven't got time to devote to them—I'm sorry about that—because that naughty bad Government won't give us enough teachers." That is all I have to say, and that is what is being said in schools throughout Queensland. Teachers are being used in a very dirty, grubby political campaign orchestrated not just in Queensland but throughout Australia by some far Left-wing people who are determined to bring down elected Governments in Australia.

I will turn to one school that has been mentioned here tonight, Welcome Creek, which is in the electorate of Burnett, represented by my colleague the Honourable Minister for Works and Housing (Mr Wharton). Let us have a look at the way the parents of that school were duped by this campaign orchestrated by the Queensland Teachers Union. When the figures on the actual enrolments for 1982 became available, it was obvious that the Welcome Creek State School was staffed one teacher above scale. These are the class groupings: Years 6 and 7, enrolment 23; Years 5 and 6, 22; Year 4, 21; Year 3, 14; Year 2, 21; Year 1, 14 and pre-school, 15. That gives a total enrolment of 115 plus 15 pre-schoolers.

I have one-teacher schools in my electorate with 28 and 29 students in seven grades. The people at Welcome Creek were whingeing because of the enrolments that I have just mentioned. As from 15 February, when the Education Department quite rightly took the one teacher away from that school, this was the result—and bear in mind that a one-teacher school does not obtain a second teacher until it passes an enrolment of 31 students, and it usually has seven grades at that stage—Years 6 and 7, 30; Years 5 and 4, 26; Years 4 and 3, 27; Year 2, 22; Year 1, 14; pre-school—an extra child turned up—16. The pre-school Year 1 teacher was taking the Year 1 class in the morning, comprising 14 children, and in the afternoon the teacher was taking the pre-schoolers, comprising 16 children. That school is staffed better than most one-teacher schools in my electorate and many one-teacher schools throughout this State. Not only is the person in charge of a one-teacher school the principal, where he has administrative duties, but also he usually has the problem of organising up to seven grades.

Clearly, in referring to the academic studies that have been made on this subject, the whole question of doubt has been avoided. For example, an examination of page 3740 of "Hansard", 19 November 1981, reveals a graph that I tabled in the Parliament

on that day when speaking to the Education Estimates debate. That graph indicates the relationship between achievement and class size that was drawn up by the Smith and Glass study. It shows that between a class size of 18 and 40 there is very little difference in achievement in percentile ranks. It is not until there is fewer than 18, according to Smith and Glass, that any improvement occurs. Of course, if one has a 1:1 teacher to student relationship, a better result ought to be achieved. However, the figures do not reflect that result.

Mr Shaw: You laughed at me when I said that.

Mr POWELL: I did not laugh at the honourable member when he said that. Of course, it is clear that with a 1:1 relationship a better result from the child ought to be obtained. The honourable member for Salisbury made a very valid point when she pointed out, and the member for Mourilyan agreed with her, that not every child's ability is the same. Of course, that is so. At age six years and five months no two children are expected to be exactly the same. Towards the end of the year, in any Year 1 class, where the average age would be 6 years and 5 months, a fairly wide range of ability would be found. The member for Salisbury is experienced on this subject, and that is why there was a difference between the contribution made by her and other members in the House. She mentioned the need for streaming. In a one-teacher school which has multi-grades, streaming must take place. The teacher cannot cope without it occurring. That is true open-area education. What is termed open-area education here in 95 per cent of cases is really team teaching and not open-area education. There is just too much nonsense spoken about the class size issue.

For example, if the cut-off point is 30, and 31 students turned up, what does the teacher do with the 31? Does he divide the class into two and have 16 in one and 15 in the other?

Mr Scott: That is a ridiculous argument.

Mr POWELL: It is not a ridiculous argument. The member for Cook does not understand what is happening in our schools because in some places an absolute cut-off of 35 is made. As soon as 36 students turn up, the class is changed into a composite class, which is arbitrary and stupid.

Mr Scott: They are already too high.

Mr POWELL: They are not too high. Thirty-five students is not too high in an average school in the middle grades. I defy anybody to show me figures—

Mr Underwood interjected.

Mr POWELL: The honourable member cannot show me the figures. He should look at the results of the experiments and research carried out by Dr Keeves. The results are clearly set out in the select committee's reports. They contain pages of tables. If the honourable member has enough brains to read them, he should do so. If he does read them, he will come to the same conclusion as Dr Keeves.

On the one hand, the honourable member is saying that Queensland has the largest classes and spends the least on education; on the other hand, he says that Queensland has the best results. What are we led to believe? I hope it is not what the honourable member would try to have us believe. Quite clearly the number of teachers in Queensland has improved. It is silly to compare what occurred 10 years ago with what is happening today.

Mr Underwood: You are comparing it with 30 years ago.

Mr POWELL: I was comparing percentages, the percentage of money spent by a Labor Government on education compared with the percentage that this Government is spending. The honourable member will find that the Labor Government spent half the total amount that this Government spent on education. I am, of course, referring to percentages; I am not talking about actual sums of money.

Mr Moore: He couldn't understand.

Mr POWELL: Perhaps I should give him a lesson on fractions or he could get out his box of rods to help him understand. Apples cannot be compared with oranges; apples must be compared with apples. That is why percentages are used in the argument.

The argument that is being put forward by the Labor Party is completely false. The argument put forward by some members of the Queensland Teachers Union and the QCPCA is mischievous.

On 19 November last year I tabled a document setting out the distribution of full-time teachers in State schools in July 1981. That table shows where the extra teachers are being placed. What would the Opposition have us do? Do members opposite want us to withdraw all the specialist teachers, all the instrumental music teachers and all the other specialist services that are being provided now but were not being provided previously, and put them into class-rooms?

Mr Underwood: You have been doing that.

Mr POWELL: Again the member for Ipswich West simply does not know what he is talking about.

Mr Moore: That's par for the course.

Mr POWELL: I am sure it is. This year the State Government has put more specialist teachers into schools.

Mr Underwood: The number is still less than it was three years ago.

Mr POWELL: It is not less than it was three years ago. The member should use percentages and not actual raw figures, because they do not tell a true story.

Do Opposition members want us to take out all the teacher aides, the 6 000 of them who cost \$23m? All the figures appear in "Hansard" in the speech that I made in November last year. Opposition members simply are not prepared to read it. If they want to argue they should read my speech on 19 November and try to argue against the figures that I tabled. They will not be able to do so.

Mr Underwood: You were in favour last year of getting rid of teacher aides.

Mr POWELL: I did not say that at all. Once again Opposition members simply cannot put up. This morning the Government gave them the opportunity to put up or shut up. They could not put up, they have not shut up, and it is no wonder that the people of Queensland are fed up with them.

The amendment is infinitely better than the motion in that it calls on the Government for action. It is quite clear that if that action is taken, Dr Keeves or any other person who conducts further research into the quality of education in Queensland will find that we are even farther ahead than we were before.

The honourable member for Salisbury was quite correct when she referred to infant grades as being the most important grades in a child's school career. When we get the numbers down to the recommended 25, the number of remediation problems that occur will be reduced because of smaller classes and better trained and more experienced teachers.

I do not want to delay the House any longer. I support the Government members who have spoken tonight and have exposed the fallacy of this campaign. The Queensland Government is not uncaring. It has an extremely proud record in education. That record is borne out by the hundreds of people who, with their feet, are voting for the Government by coming to Queensland each year.

The population in my electorate, particularly in the southern part of it, is increasing rapidly mainly because of people coming from New South Wales and Victoria. They have said to me, "You have a good education system here. Don't let them muck it up." I ask Opposition members to look at the criticism of the Victorian education system where death education, for example, is being taught in schools and is frightening the lives out of the children.

The people of Queensland support this Government because of the good things that have occurred. We have a very good education story to tell. I am very disappointed that teachers and children are being used as pawns in a very grubby campaign by some people who should know better and who have been defeated in many other places.

I conclude by saying that some time last year, in a speech in this Parliament, I criticised the actions of some parents and the member for Archerfield in encouraging children to stay away from one of the schools in his electorate. In time to come, when

those children grow older and start rebelling against authority, they will be rebuked by their parents, and probably by the member for Archerfield, who encouraged them to break the law by staying away from school.

Mr Scott: This is the greatest load of nonsense you have ever inflicted on this House.

Mr POWELL: Obviously the honourable member supports the breaking of the law. That is what he is doing if he supports the type of campaign that is being conducted in schools today. There are many ways of changing the law; breaking it is not one of them. I cannot condone it.

I go to every p. and c. organisation in my electorate, and others if I can, and point out to them that the class-size argument is fallacious and very open. I invite all people to read the comments made in this debate. I hope that they look at the figures that have been provided and, importantly, the figures that indicate that, in literacy and numeracy, Queensland children are as good as, if not better than, children anywhere else in the world.

Mr HARTWIG (Callide) (11.4 p.m.): We are dealing with a very delicate issue. Schooling today involves teachers, students, parents, teacher aides, janitors and groundsmen. The teachers in one-teacher schools in remote areas are doing a very good job.

Young people sent into the more remote areas of the State have a tremendous responsibility. I heard the honourable member for Ithaca making statements about average class sizes, and it was quite clear that he represents a metropolitan seat. I have 38 schools in my electorate, many of which are one-teacher schools in which one man teaches all grades up to Year 6, and even up to Year 7. It is a pretty difficult job, and they deserve full marks for it.

Every class consists of the bright students, the mediocre students and the slow learners, and I think that society itself has contributed to that situation. Children from rich homes who are well dressed and enjoy peace of mind have every chance of having knowledge imparted to them, while on the other hand many children from broken homes who would not know what a decent breakfast was and are given a 20c piece with which to purchase lunch face a real problem when it comes to learning. I do not think we faced that problem when I went to school years ago. We were all in the one class—we were all poor.

Mr I. J. Gibbs: That was in Labor days.

Mr HARTWIG: Yes, it was.

The Government must have been concerned about the situation within the Education Department and thought that there were shortcomings in the education system, otherwise it would not have appointed an all-party committee of inquiry headed by the honourable member for Landsborough. That committee travelled very extensively throughout the State. I heard them interviewing the State Director of Primary Education, Mr Phil Cullen, who said, "I don't care if my daughters can't spell as long as they grow up to be good citizens." That was the evidence of the State Director of Primary Education!

After interviewing a large number of people the committee wrote a lengthy report which was tabled in this House. I want to know what is wrong with that report. Admittedly it made some recommendations which the Premier found objectionable, particularly those in relation to sex education in schools. I believe that it was not well received because it contained those recommendations. Although the member for Landsborough is not in the Chamber, I think he would probably confirm that opinion.

I have listened intently to the debate this evening. The honourable member for Isis said that he was not concerned about reducing class sizes but that he was concerned about expenditure. Then he said he was concerned about the quality of education. I think he had two bob each way because he did admit that the smaller the class the better chance the individual student had. It was an admission by a member of the Ahern committee that class sizes should be reduced.

I have heard it said that if the level was set at 29 and if there were 30 children in a certain grade, there would be a composite class. Because the school at Marlborough is one child short of the 91 required for a fourth teacher, that school cannot get a fourth

teacher. I think that 31 children have to be enrolled in a class before a second teacher is provided. If there are only 29 children in a class, there is no way in the world that a second teacher will be provided.

I was concerned about the Minister's threat to prosecute parents who kept their children away from school. I was also concerned about the Premier's coming out and saying that he would employ retired teachers. I do not think that statements such as that bring credibility to any Government. They are pretty harsh words. I hope that this matter can be resolved on a suitable basis, because it is not good to keep young students home even for one day. The strike action is imprinted in their minds. They are tomorrow's citizens of this State and nation; and if a strike takes place they will always remember it. That is not good for the children and, as I say, I hope that a suitable settlement can be reached in this matter.

I understand that a secret ballot has been conducted. It frightens me to hear that teachers at 80-odd schools will strike. That is a terrible situation. Both sides have to give a little.

In conclusion, I wish to make some comments about school buses. The parents of 11 or 12 children in one part of the Roma electorate have to drive 15 or 16 miles each day to take their children to school. There is no money to provide a bus for them. The Government wants young couples to stay on the land, but they cannot get a school bus for their children. The parents on the Mt Nebo road north of Dingo have been refused a school bus. Those people are faced with tremendous costs in getting their children to school. The only alternative for these people is to throw up their arms and say, "We will go and live in the city." That is happening over the length and breadth of the State. It is a mammoth task to get a school bus run commenced or extended.

Mr Scott: Do you really believe that the Government supports policies of trying to keep people on the land?

Mr HARTWIG: If a school bus cannot be provided so that their children can be educated, people cannot stay on the land. Their children's education is paramount in today's society.

I refer to the amendment that has been moved. The second paragraph reads—
"progressively implement these principles as resources are available"

That is a really bureaucratic statement. It does not mean anything; it is too vague. It is nearly two years since the Ahern report was presented. Some of the members sitting here tonight paid a tribute to the member for Landsborough and the members of his committee for the work that they did; yet today they argued against the implementation of the recommendations in the report.

The fourth paragraph of the amendment states—
"continue to maintain the high standards of education"

The teachers in my electorate are very keen at all times to maintain a high standard of education. Teachers of today have a very great responsibility. There may be a few duds in the teaching profession, as there are in any profession, but I would say that 99.9 per cent of teachers do a marvellous job.

I hope that strike action can be avoided. Strike action is not good for the children or the people involved.

Mr PREST (Port Curtis) (11.15 p.m.): Today has been another sad day for the National-Liberal Government in Queensland. The failures of this Government since 1957 have been aired in the Parliament. We have heard what the Government intended to do but we know that it has done nothing.

This debate deals with a portion of a report presented to the House on 24 May 1979. That report was prepared by a committee of 12 people, five members of the House, six members of the public and a clerk of this Parliament. It has taken the Government the best part of three years even to discuss this very important section that deals with class sizes. The motion in the name of Mr Shaw has been on the Business Paper since this Parliament came into being in March 1981. Now some 11 months later we are debating the issue of class sizes.

The Government has moved an amendment to Mr Shaw's motion. However, I support the original motion because it moves that the Government lay upon the table of the House before the adoption of the 1982-83 Budget a proposed timetable for the implementation of the recommendation. Part of the amendment states that the Government should "progressively implement these principles as resources are available." That is only window-dressing and means nothing at all. Another part of the amendment states that undesirably large classes, where possible, should be reduced as and when they occur. That is another far-flung promise of the Government about which nothing will ever be done.

I support the Queensland Teachers Union. In fact, I was disgusted to hear the comments of the member for Stafford about members of the Teachers Union who do not have the opportunity to protect themselves in the House. I believe it is incumbent upon the Opposition to provide that protection. When a person such as the honourable member for Stafford (Mr Gygar) makes accusations against officials of the Teachers Union, that is a very serious matter. If a person lives in a glasshouse he should not throw stones. In today's "Courier-Mail" we see a reply to the honourable member for Stafford from Mr H. A. Gordon, Editor-in-Chief, Queensland Newspapers, which surely shows the type of person that the honourable member for Stafford is. Mr Speaker, I ask for the permission of the House to have the article incorporated in "Hansard".

(Leave granted.)

"ATTEMPTS TO SHACKLE THE PRESS

From H. A. Gordon, Editor-in-Chief, Queensland Newspapers, to the Australian Press Council

I read with mounting astonishment Mr Terry Gygar's complaint about a humorous column written by Lawrie Kavanagh for The Courier-Mail.

The column, which was not a news report, made the lighthearted observation that 'everyone I know who didn't come down in the last shower knows that most politicians, if not all, tell lies of varying degrees, whether to boost their image, grab a vote or to protect their own or their party's reputation.'

Mr Gygar thinks the effect of allowing this and similar articles to be published will 'contribute to the demise of Parliament and the democratic procedures we presently enjoy.'

With respect, it is almost as if Mr Gygar is in the business of writing funny columns himself.

Mr Gygar is obviously very sensitive. I hope it will not cause him too much pain if I make the observation that he belongs to a House of Parliament which has done more to contribute to the demise of the institution of parliament than any newspaper possibly could. It has contributed massively to public contempt for parliament, precisely because it has allowed democratic procedures to be eroded.

It was the former Speaker of the Queensland Legislative Assembly who announced that the House had become a cesspit, that it had never been lower in public esteem, that it engaged in 'hillbilly politics,' and that it was a sausage machine which churned out legislation with great regularity and insufficient debate.

The House to which Mr Gygar belongs has become identified with some spectacularly offensive language. It also is generally known to pay little heed to the conventions and traditions of Westminster.

Mr Gygar may not, of course, have been writing on behalf only of members of the Queensland Parliament. He makes no specific mention of them. It may well be that he has taken it upon himself to be the advocate for all members of parliament. This would be an ambitious undertaking.

Despite Mr Gygar's desire for the sensibilities of members of parliament to be respected, the fact is that historically they have not been—in Britain, the United States, Australia, France, Germany, Italy, Canada, New Zealand and many other democratic countries. For two centuries writers and cartoonists have been saying unpleasant things about politicians. Civilisation has not appeared to suffer as a result. Nor has democracy.

There are many members of parliament in Queensland who would dearly love to shackle the press. I have to confess that when Mr Gygar talks of the desirability of not 'allowing' this kind of article to be published, he worries me.

Mr Gygar indicates his general attitude to the press in his reference to Proposition 10 of the Council's statement of principles (which, like Proposition 2, was surely meant to refer to news reports, feature articles or serious pieces of comment rather than humorous or satirical columns).

He quotes the principle that when matter detrimental to the reputation of any group or class of persons is published, opportunity for prompt and appropriately prominent reply should be afforded. Then he adds his comment that it has not been 'the habit of this (The Courier-Mail) or any other newspaper to do so in the past.'

He thus manages to insult not only The Courier-Mail, but the entire Australian press, with a false, unsubstantiated statement which shows an ignorance of normal journalistic practice.

On the specific complaint, it seems to me Mr Gygar had three options:

The first was to write a letter for publication, spelling out his concern. I would not only have been willing to publish it. I would have loved to do so. For that reason I am puzzled at his suggestion that no right of reply was afforded. Our records indicate that it was not requested. The Courier-Mail could hardly have sought a personal reply, since Lawrie Kavanagh named no specific MP.

The second was to refer the matter to the Legislative Assembly's privileges committee, or its Speaker. If he felt genuinely that the dignity and prestige of parliament had been damaged, that would have surely been a proper procedure.

The third was to ponder Harry Truman's dictum, 'If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen' and reflect on whether he should continue to be a Member of Parliament.

He chose to complain to the Press Council, suggesting that the sensibilities of members of parliament and their families had been ignored, and that Lawrie Kavanagh's column somehow represented a threat to democracy.

I don't think he has much of a case. But the offer to publish a reply to the column in question remains open."

Mr PREST: What the Teachers Union is doing is not for the betterment of the teachers or of the union but for the betterment of the children of the State. We should have nothing but praise for the union. All I can do is condemn the Government for its lack of concern for the children of the State which it has shown by not entering into meaningful discussions with the Teachers Union in an endeavour to avoid a head-on confrontation. However, that is what the Premier is always trying to arrange. A recent newspaper editorial stated that the disturbing factor in this row is that the Government seems to welcome yet another chance to confront a union. I believe that that is a true statement. The editorial also stated that confrontation should not be the name of the game; it should be conciliation. I would like the Minister to take that aboard. It is not the first occasion on which I have asked for that. I sent a telegram again yesterday asking the Premier to meet the union and come up with a program for the implementation of recommended class sizes over a period of time. I am quite certain that what I have been asking for is what the Queensland Teachers Union has been asking for.

Because my time in this debate is limited I will not carry on at length. If the State Government is looking for confrontation with the union, I am certain that it will get it. However, what happens will not affect the teachers, the union or the Government to any extent. Those who will suffer most are the children, ranging from the tender age of 5 or 6 years right up to the last year in school.

Instead of causing confrontation with the union, the Government could conciliate. It should sit around the table and be big enough, or man enough, and have enough ability to talk and come up with a proposal acceptable to the Government and to the union that will be in the best interests of the children of this State.

The teachers in this State and the children have worked in accommodation that has not been acceptable and would not have been acceptable in other areas of Australia. But it has had to be put up with in Queensland. The children have been the ones to suffer because of the crowded class-rooms or the demountables they have had to put up with. The Minister will say that Gladstone has done quite well over the past 12 months. That is so. I appreciate what he has done, but before that the Government dragged its feet for years. It was

only through the action of the Teachers Union in the area and other representations made by me that we ended up getting the acceptable standard of accommodation that we now have in Gladstone. However, the Minister must not rest on his laurels.

I would like to point out to the Minister something that I have taken up with the Works Department in Bundaberg. I read from "The Gladstone Observer" of 26 February, which contained an article about the Clinton school—

"Children who arrived at Clinton for classes were set to work instead, shovelling silt from around classrooms struck by similar flash floods in three consecutive years.

Grade 6 and 7 classrooms were waterlogged by the deluge and torrents of muddy water which swept down the hillside at the back of the school, leaving a water-mark 200 mm high along louvres at the rear of the building. Both classrooms resembled a swamp at noon yesterday, although most of the mess had been cleared up.

An even worse fate was in store for Grade 2 children who arrived at school to discover every textbook used by them was sodden, and useless until they could be properly dried.

Grade 2 teachers told reporters they believed a blocked gutter had been responsible for water which flooded through the ceiling of their classroom, filling light fittings and inundating a storeroom."

That is only one school that I am responsible for. I would like something to be done. I hope the Minister will not allow another three years to elapse before the Government gets off its backside and does something to alleviate the problem.

I request the Minister not to sit back and cause confrontation with the union. Let him conciliate for the betterment of the children of this State.

Hon. W. A. M. GUNN (Somerset—Minister for Education) (11.24 p.m.): Unfortunately I have not been left a great deal of time to deal with all the speeches. I applaud the interest that has been taken. I have no doubt that this was a politically orchestrated campaign by the union. I refer to an article in the "Queensland Teachers Journal" of last year, in which one of the candidates for the presidency stated—

Mr Shaw: What date was that?

Mr GUNN: October last year. He said—

"And as if our union fees are not high enough, State Council is now attempting to impose a \$10 strike levy on every member."

That leaves in my mind the impression that they intended to go on the strike. There is no doubt about that.

Questions relative to class sizes are by no means new. On 2 February 1972 an article in "The Courier-Mail", under the heading "Teachers to control class sizes if Government does not", stated—

"The Queensland Teachers' Union would ensure that classes did not exceed 35 children if the Education Department did not, Mr. R. Costello said yesterday.

Mr. Costello, the union president, indicated this in an open letter sent to the Education Minister (Mr. Fletcher) yesterday.

The union could not stand idly by while deliberate unemployment was being created among Queensland teachers, he said."

They were not worried about the class sizes; they were worried about unemployment. At that time 22 per cent of classes in Queensland contained 35 students or more. Today that figure is 1.8 per cent. The union has never given any credit to the Government. An additional 621 teachers were employed in that year; 1 100 teachers have already been engaged so far this year. Last year the Budget allocation for education was \$702m. When the Budget was brought down, the Queensland Teachers Union tried to take credit for the fact that there had been a 16.9 per cent increase for education.

So much depends on the individual teacher that it is impossible to stipulate what the right class size should be. However, some points that were made by the select committee are of great importance. Many members have already referred to recommendations made by that committee. A great deal has been said about the Campbell report. Everything

was taken out of context. At the conclusion of the Campbell report it was stated that it would take five years to determine whether class sizes had any influence on literacy and numeracy.

Dr Keeves of the Australian Council of Education Research was mentioned. I was chairman of the Australian Education Council when that report was brought down. He stated that Queensland children were ahead in literacy and numeracy in Australia.

The Bullock committee stated that—

“... teaching groups should invariably be confined to a given size’ and that ‘schools should . . . be able to organise their classes in such a way that group size is matched to the needs of the work at any particular time.’

Much of the discussion on class sizes ignores the fact that classroom teachers have far more support today than ever before.”

Since 1972, 6 000 support staff have been employed. In 1972 the Teachers Union claimed that 35 students was the ideal class size. Today, 85 per cent of children have the benefit of pre-school education, and that figure is improving. Children in isolated centres are receiving education from itinerant teachers for the first time. We now employ approximately eight itinerant teachers who visit isolated areas. Satellite education in those areas is being considered. It is hoped to install that system within two years. In addition, the department hopes to have another frequency in School of the Air at Mt Isa.

The Government has contributed a great deal to education. The amendments are most acceptable because they carry on a policy that has been initiated since I became Minister for Education.

I thank honourable members for their contribution. My advice to parents is not to be used as political pawns in this exercise. I support the amendments.

Mr WHARTON: I propose to move that the question be now put.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is some dispute whether the member for Wynnum has a right of reply in the circumstances. The member for Wynnum has a right to reply to the amendment now. After the motion has been put he will not have that opportunity. I call the honourable member for Wynnum.

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—
“That the question be now put.”

Question put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 49

Ahern	Innes	Prentice
Akers	Jennings	Randell
Austin	Katter	Scassola
Bird	Knox	Scott-Young
Borbidge	Kyburz	Simpson
Doumany	Lane	Stephan
Elliott	Lee	Sullivan
FitzGerald	Lester	Tenni
Frawley	Lickiss	Tomkins
Gibbs, I. J.	Lockwood	Turner
Glasson	McKechnie	Warner
Goleby	Menzel	Wharton
Greenwood	Miller	White
Gunn	Moore	
Gygar	Muntz	<i>Tellers:</i>
Harper	Nelson	Kaus
Hewitt	Powell	Neal

Noes, 24

Blake	Jones	Underwood
Burns	Kruger	Warburton
Casey	Mackenroth	Wright
D'Arcy	McLean	Yewdale
Davis	Milliner	
Eaton	Prest	
Fouras	Scott	<i>Tellers:</i>
Gibbs, R. J.	Shaw	Hansen
Hartwig	Smith	Vaughan

Pair:

Bjelke-Petersen Wilson

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (Mr Scassola's amendment) stand part of the motion—put; and the House divided—

Ayes, 24

Blake	Jones	Underwood
Burns	Kruger	Warburton
Casey	Mackenroth	Wright
D'Arcy	McLean	Yewdale
Davis	Milliner	
Eaton	Prest	
Fouras	Scott	<i>Tellers:</i>
Gibbs, R. J.	Shaw	Hansen
Hartwig	Smith	Vaughan

Noes, 49

Ahern	Innes	Prentice
Akers	Jennings	Scassola
Austin	Katter	Scott-Young
Bird	Knox	Simpson
Borbidge	Kyburz	Stephan
Doumany	Lane	Sullivan
Elliott	Lee	Tenni
FitzGerald	Lester	Tomkins
Frawley	Lickiss	Turner
Gibbs, I. J.	Lockwood	Warner
Glasson	McKechnie	Wharton
Goleby	Menzel	White
Greenwood	Miller	
Gunn	Moore	
Gygar	Muntz	<i>Tellers:</i>
Harper	Nelson	Kaus
Hewitt	Powell	Neal

Pair:

Wilson Bjelke-Petersen

Resolved in the negative.

Amendment (Mr Scassola) agreed to.

Motion (Mr Shaw), as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Leader of the House): I move—
 “That the House do now adjourn.”

Small Business Interests in Major Shopping Complexes

Mr HANSEN (Maryborough) (11.49 p.m.): On 26 November last year this Parliament passed a motion moved by the Minister for Commerce and Industry, which read—

“That this House take notice of the need for effective self-regulation to protect the interests of small business in major shopping complexes and that the need for action to support such self-regulation be recognised.”

On behalf of the Opposition, I moved an amendment which, in essence, stated that the House should be better informed of the results of the inquiries that had been made into the practices and leasing arrangements in shopping complexes, that there was a need to propose some immediate action and that self-regulation would not be effective.

That has been proved to be right. At that time some members of the Government expressed reservations. They were prepared to accept that if under the free market the landlords outlawed certain obnoxious features specifically referred to by the Small Business Development Corporation, then by December 1982 something would be done. I believe that the original report of the Small Business Development Corporation, which the Minister refused to make public, was even more critical than the later recommendation of a joint committee.

However, there is evidence that no such moves are being made. At that time we were given assurances that if no moves were made by June 1982, then something would be done before December 1982. I am at present in receipt of complaints from tenants in the State Government Insurance Office arcade in Bundaberg that they have been asked for a weekly rental of a fixed figure or 10 per cent of their gross turnover, whichever is the greater. One of the things referred to in the report was basing a lease on gross turnover. I remember that some Government members said that the State Government Insurance Office could act as a guide to other landlords to introduce better leasing conditions. However, that does not appear to be happening.

I do not know if the Minister has the matter under observation but I hope that he uses the Small Business Development Corporation as a watch-dog to find out what is happening and to liaise between tenant and landlord. There is a need to remind both tenants and landlords that unless something is done to the satisfaction of both parties by June 1982, then the Government will act and the parties will not be left to self-regulation. The landlords are becoming like the proverbial prairie flower, growing wilder ever hour. The landlords should be reminded of the feelings of the Parliament and that action will be taken if they do not move to some sort of self-regulation.

Cost-rent Housing Associations

Mrs KYBURZ (Salisbury) (11.54 p.m.): I wish to deal with an aspect of a most important subject that faces many members in their electorates. I intend to speak on this subject at every opportunity because it is many-faceted. The issue is that of housing. The demands for new initiatives are many and varied and certainly some Government bodies are not prepared to take risks or to change policies.

Recently I presented a proposal to the Government, which was not accepted, for a new form of housing called cost-rent optional purchase housing. I do not wish to say that the Government should have accepted the proposal; I simply wish to explain that form of housing association to the House in the hope that perhaps some other body might wish to take up the proposal.

A cost-rent housing association is not a very difficult one to understand when one considers its purposes: to provide a co-ordinated range of programs to include low-cost housing, positive self-esteem courses, positive peer relationship skills, preventive health care and so on. In fact, a cost-rent housing association aims at a particular group of people, that is, low-income families who do not meet the criteria for home loans from the Queensland Housing Commission, for example, yet are unable to rent

from the Commission owing to a lack of rental stock. The whole aim of the association would be to move those families away from perpetual renting and into purchasing a home.

Obviously the association would have to tailor the rent to the income of those families. A cost-rent housing association would not only decrease the incidence of anxiety, poor health, depression and so on amongst people now unable to get housing but it would also provide a positive alternative inasmuch as home-ownership gives people a goal at which to aim.

The basic aims of a cost-rent housing association are to assist low-income families to develop those strategies of the sort I have mentioned to help in their future life and to give them life skills. It would also provide a means by which low-income families could develop a motivated and positive attitude towards life. People who do not have adequate housing and are shuttled round from caravan park to caravan park will obviously suffer, as will their children. A cost-rent housing association would primarily be concerned with the construction of affordable housing. The association itself would have to buy houses and rent them to families. Hopefully, after a stipulated period, the families would either move into the stage of purchasing or move out.

The secondary objective of the program is the development of personal and social skills, because so many of the social inadequacies of these families have been related to not only accommodation but also lack of social skills. Obviously there would be many components to such a cost-rent housing association and it would not be easy to set up. However, I do believe that with the various components of professionals that would go into such housing association, it would be possible. The work of the housing association would be based on the principle of a self-help agency. In other words, everyone involved in the cost-rent housing association—that is, clientele and management alike—would have to be involved in self-help programs. People would have to learn how to look after the houses, how to look after themselves and how to look after their children living in a group environment. It is simply not good enough to plunk people out in Housing Commission houses in outer areas and say, "Here, we are giving you a house to rent. Fend for yourself." Quite frankly, what we ought to be doing as often as possible is encouraging people out of renting and into purchasing. Even if that means tailoring the repayments to their income, we should be doing it far more. I urge the Government to consider wide-ranging systems for changes within the housing system.

Home-ownership; Safety in Motor Vehicles

Mr LESTER (Peak Downs) (11.59 p.m.): Before I commence on the main topic that I wish to raise, I would like to concur with the comments of the member for Salisbury about the great distress facing many Australian families who in the present inflationary circumstances can look forward to nothing but rental housing. That does not help to keep a family together or to give it a future. In many instances members of the family suffer severe illness. Quite frankly, I think that every Parliament in Australia should suspend all other business for approximately two weeks to deal with no item other than housing until such time as a solution is arrived at. Whether or not the proposal of the member for Salisbury is the right one, at least we would have people talking about it. The member for Salisbury has mentioned the serious problem confronting us, and that gives us an opportunity to think about it.

[Wednesday, 3 March 1982]

Most members of Parliament own a little more than their own homes. A severe problem affecting our community must be arrested. Even people in high income brackets are unable to meet the repayments on their homes. That is one of the greatest threats to ordinary family life in Australia. The divorce rate has reached an alarming figure, and one out of two marriages is breaking down. The housing problem is an added burden. I have mentioned the housing problem on many occasions and made many submissions on behalf of several distressed people.

Many modern motor cars are mobile bombs. Many of them catch fire following accidents, and the number of such fires has increased dramatically. There would not be one person in this House who does not know somebody who has been injured by fire following a car accident. Such accidents have occurred in Central Queensland. Within the last couple of months a number of horrific accidents have occurred in the south-east corner of the State, New South Wales and Victoria. Many accidents have occurred as a result of petrol tank explosions. The pipe from the petrol tank to the carburettor becomes faulty. The nut has worked loose and petrol has leaked onto the hot engine. In some instances a car being driven along the highway has caught fire. Surely car manufacturers can produce safer cars. The devices that are available to prevent fires in motor vehicles should be used.

Many cars have flammable materials behind the upholstery. Recently at Moranbah a gentleman, who was driving his motor vehicle along the highway, threw his cigarette out the window. The wind caught the cigarette and it lodged in some hessian behind the back seat, which caught fire. The driver could only stop the vehicle before it was fully ablaze. He was able to remove the seat from the car and avoid what could have been a very dangerous accident. We should take cognisance of those matters and do something about them. Many vehicles are not as safe as they should be. People are suffering serious injuries in almost every accident that takes place. The modern car cannot withstand the accidents that are occurring. In even the most ordinary accidents people are injured beyond recognition. I cannot understand why manufacturers do not improve the standard of their product. Many motor vehicles manufactured today are less reliable than those of 20 years ago.

Grievances of Owner-drivers of Concrete-carrying trucks

Mr WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (12.4 a.m.): I join this debate to call upon the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Main Roads to convene as a matter of urgency a meeting in Central Queensland or Brisbane involving the owner-drivers connected with the transportation of concrete in Queensland. A meeting is required very quickly so that the grievances that have been presented to me can be aired.

The crux of the matter centres around the fact that it is virtually impossible for owner-drivers to carry legal loads of concrete and stay in business. It has been claimed to me, and substantiated by a motor vehicle retailer, that all new vehicles that owner-drivers can purchase are heavy, and that once 5 cubic metres of concrete are placed on a truck, in addition to the 60 gallons of water it must carry, it is automatically over the legal limit of 20.4 tonnes.

The owner-drivers have claimed that it is impossible to buy a new truck that will carry the 5 metres of concrete that is normally required by builders and still comply with the Main Roads laws. They further claim that the price that they are allowed to charge, not on an open competition basis but as fixed by the Queensland road transport association, is, for a 5 metre load within 5 km, \$34 or \$6.80 a metre. If their income per load is reduced by \$6.80 they will not stay in business for long, not only because of the financial aspect but also, and perhaps more importantly, because no-one would hire them if they could carry only a 4 metre load. A real need exists to investigate the owner-drivers' claims that have been made to me and, on earlier occasions, to other members.

The Government should investigate the claim that the raising of the maximum weight limit will not create a safety problem. The owner-drivers claim that many of the older vehicles that are legal are unsafe and that a major inspection of them would reveal that when those vehicles are loaded their brakes, springs and chassis are not good enough. Furthermore they do not have the necessary power, but because of this one weight factor set by the Government through the Main Roads Department, they are legal.

The owner-drivers presented to me a special case pointing out that cement is a perishable item. With the added weight of the water and agitator it is a sheer impossibility for the vehicles to be within the law. If the owner-drivers cannot buy the vehicles that they require, and if they are unable to stay in business on a profitable basis because of some law, that law ought to be varied.

The matter of fines has been mentioned. The owner-drivers claim that they are set upon by the "scalies". Because the old trucks are the legal trucks, the "scalies" know them and let them pass, but they automatically stop a new vehicle. On one occasion an owner-driver was made to tip part of his load of concrete onto the side of the road. His vehicle was supposed to be overloaded. If that is not waste and stupidity, I do not know what is.

The owner-drivers have also claimed that often they are "apprehended" at the base of a hill. The persons who stop them know full well that it is very difficult for the owner-drivers to get their vehicles moving again on the incline. In some instances it is impossible for the trucks to get up the hill. I do not want to make a personal attack on any of the "scalies" in the area, but I wonder whether they are being used by the Government merely as revenue earners.

The whole issue is whether or not the vehicles, because of their weight, are unsafe. The Main Roads Department has an obligation to present evidence showing that new vehicles fitted with all the latest equipment, such as power brakes, are unsafe. Some type of testing should be carried out on older vehicles to determine whether they should be allowed on the roads.

The funny part about the whole matter is that a permit can be granted for a greater weight. I start to wonder whether the criterion used in Queensland is that if someone has the money to pay for something he can get it. A special permit can be obtained to carry a load in excess of the permissible maximum, otherwise it is illegal. One begins to question whether the whole issue centres on the safety aspect.

Some fellows have been fined as much as \$600 or \$700. One fellow was fined \$600 twice within two months. That took away his profitability.

If the Government is interested in helping the small businessman, it should have the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Local Government, Main Roads and Police convene a meeting in my area and talk to the fellows who have brought these grievances to me. The meeting could be held in any part of Queensland, for that matter, because I believe that the problem is not confined solely to my area. I ask that the issue be followed up by the Ministers to whom I have referred.

(Time expired.)

Aboriginal Land Rights

Mr PRENTICE (Toowong) (12.9 a.m.): As we begin this part of the session we find that certain issues have dominated media coverage. One such issue is Aboriginal land rights, so called, and another is the forthcoming Commonwealth Games. A number of people have put forward the argument that the Commonwealth Games could be dogged by demonstrations and be the subject of a boycott by certain nations in support of a call by certain persons for what they see as land rights for Aborigines in Queensland.

I look at that and at the general background of sport and politics throughout the world and the argument as it is raised. As I see it, it developed originally with South Africa, which has gradually become an international pariah, and perhaps rightly so, because of its apparently abhorrent policies to its indigenous people and its strange views on racial superiority.

My concern is how the argument developed. We have gone from that situation to a situation in which nations are required by certain other nations to demand that Governments should encourage their sporting bodies not to have contact with South Africa, and that they should actually begin to lay down laws and use their powers to prohibit individual citizens from exercising their rights. People may say that that view is perfectly correct. My concern is that those matters must be decisions made by individuals. In such matters, individuals should be prepared to bear the responsibility for their actions. Perhaps that is the situation as it is.

My real concern is this: If diplomacy or international politics demand that sport and politics be mixed, I would ask that both other national Governments and the Australian Government show some consistency. At the moment it is fashionable to talk about South Africa and the problems there. I hear the criticisms and I agree with many of the views as they are expressed, because the actions of that Government are totally abhorrent.

If we say that, because of what is done in South Africa, we should not play sport with South Africa and should have no contact with it, what do we say about Soviet Russia? What do we say, given its invasion of Afghanistan? On that occasion there was an Olympic boycott. But what about Czechoslovakia? What about the denial of human rights in Soviet Russia, as they stand? What about its oppression of minorities throughout the USSR? Where do I hear people saying that we should not play sport with Soviet Russia? To be consistent, we should be prepared to do that if we take that line.

I can go further and talk about Argentina and Chile and the things that come up time and time again; yet we hear nothing. A report of an International Commission of Jurists on the Philippines reads—

“Among the basic rights denied to the Philippines people were the right freely to elect their government, freedom of speech and of the press, the effective right to habeas corpus and the right to strike; freedom of movement had been severely limited and hundreds of detainees had been held without trial for up to 5 years.”

Should we play sport with the Philippines?

This argument has really become fashionable because it is fashionable to talk about South Africa. If we are to talk about sport we should be consistent. We should say, “We are not prepared to play sport with any country that denies human right or uses such barbarisms as we find in South Africa.” That consistency is something that our sportsmen have a right to expect. These days, it is totally selective, totally wrong, and it is an injustice on Australian citizens as much as on the world’s community.

(Time expired.)

Allegations of Pastor Jim Christian

Mr BORBIDGE (Surfers Paradise) (12.14 a.m.): I rise to comment on recent accusations by Pastor Jim Christian of the Gold Coast concerning organised crime in the area. It is fair that certain investigations that the honourable member for Southport and I undertook should be reported to this House.

The first we knew of the allegations made by Pastor Christian was an article that appeared in the “Gold Coast Bulletin” of 9 February which reads—

“Coast is under grip of organised crime. A Burleigh church minister says he has evidence that organised crime involving patronage by top politicians and police has taken control of the Gold Coast.”

The article also stated the Reverend Jim Christian of the Full Gospel Churches of Australia then went on to expound his views. Mr Christian said he had passed on the evidence to trusted politicians who told him that action would be taken.

Immediately after reading the article I contacted my colleague, the member for Southport, and it was decided that we would make contact with Pastor Christian. I did that immediately. A meeting between Pastor Christian, me and the member for Southport, was set up for the following morning in my office. At 9 a.m. the following day Pastor Christian arrived with his legal adviser. His legal adviser later requested that he remain anonymous. We had an interesting discussion for close on an hour, and I would like to record in this place some of the discussions that took place.

In response to a question Jim Christian said that he had never spoken to a member of Parliament representing the area. He said he had come across a lot of information which he had personally investigated. He said that he had passed this information on to Keith Wright because Keith Wright was a personal friend of his. I think in fairness to the member for Rockhampton I should also say that he has assured me that he has never met Pastor Christian. Pastor Christian continued to give us information but did not give us anything that could be taken to be evidence. We told him that we had to have solid facts, dates, names and places and we gave him the necessary assurances that they would be followed up. So Pastor Christian and his adviser assured us that they would go away, discuss the situation, get more information and then come back to us the following week. On 10 February 1982 in a conversation with the member for Southport, Pastor Christian advised that when he saw us the following week he would provide us with a list of places, names and statutory declarations which might be of assistance to us.

Basically, what happened is that the following week at a time that Pastor Christian had suggested to me was convenient, he failed to show. In fact, the meeting was set down for 9 a.m. At 9.15 I telephoned Pastor Christian and he merely said that he had no information and no evidence to offer us at that stage. He said he would not be proceeding further with the allegations that he had made in the Press.

The point I wish to make is that as local members the member for Southport and I did everything in our power to try to help this man. We gave him all the assurances that he required and told him that if he gave us any evidence it would be followed up. I do not think that we as local members could be expected to do any more than that. That was the one thing we had an obligation to do, and that was the commitment we made to him. That commitment still stands. It must be pointed out, however, that Pastor Christian did not honour the commitment he made to us the week before. He did not show up at the meeting and so we were left in a situation where allegations of a most serious nature had been made and no evidence was forthcoming.

It should also be recorded that Pastor Christian did issue an apology in the Gold Coast media. I also note that in a document tabled today by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer Pastor Christian has apologised to him. Those are the facts as they stand at the present time, but I repeat that the offer is still open if Pastor Christian wants to take advantage of it.

Motion (Mr Wharton) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.19 a.m. (Wednesday).
