

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 7 JULY 1989

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 7 JULY 1989

Mr SPEAKER (Hon. K.R. Lingard, Fassifern) read prayers and took the chair at 10 a.m.

PETITIONS

The Clerk announced the receipt of the following petitions—

Carriage of Bicycles on Electric Trains

From Mr Burns (455 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to enable bicycles to be carried on electric trains.

Bus Services in Tingalpa/Belmont Heights Area

From Mr Burns (419 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take action to license the Brisbane City Council to provide bus services in the Tingalpa/Belmont Heights area.

A similar petition was received from Mr McKechnie (2 signatories).

Roadworks in Beaudesert Shire

From Mr Lingard (14 signatories) praying that the Parliament of Queensland will ensure that the Minister for Local Government investigates the finance ratio for roadworks in Beaudesert Shire to achieve better road standards.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**Report of Ministerial Task Force on Services for People with an Intellectual Handicap**

Hon. C. A. SHERRIN (Mansfield—Minister for Family Services) (10.03 a.m.), by leave: It is with great pleasure that I hereby lay upon the table of the House the report of the ministerial task force on services for people with an intellectual handicap in Queensland.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the document on the table.

Mr SHERRIN: Honourable members may recall that following a Cabinet decision in July 1988, a ministerial task force was formed and was asked to consider the principles on which services for people with an intellectual handicap should be based, and to consider how these principles should be reflected in service provision. The task force was also asked to draw up a proposal for development of services involving the community and the Government over a five-year period.

The calibre of the task force's report, entitled *A Place for Everyone*, is due in no small way to the ability and dedication of the chairperson, Mrs Beryce Nelson, the member for Aspley. Mrs Nelson, whose reputation for advocating for the rights of people with an intellectual handicap is well known throughout Queensland, worked extremely hard along with other task force members and they are to be congratulated on their efforts in producing a report of this quality.

In carrying out its work, the task force went to great pains to consult extensively with the community throughout the State. It has been extremely heartening to see the high degree of community participation in the work of the task force, with 239 submissions being received. The task force's report is comprehensive, and its thrust is directed at the

extension of existing services to providing the best possible range of services to people with an intellectual handicap in Queensland.

It has been pleasing to witness a revolution in attitudes towards intellectual handicap in the Western World in recent years. Societies now appreciate the obvious: that people with an intellectual handicap have the same feelings, the same needs and the same hopes for a full life as people without a handicap. This theme is clearly reinforced throughout the report. Because of the extent of consultation and research which has been undertaken by the task force, the findings of the report will, I have no doubt, contribute to producing further measures to improve services for people with an intellectual handicap and providing support for their families.

The report of the task force has been examined in great detail by Cabinet and the Cabinet Budget Committee. Some of the recommendations of the task force have substantial budgetary implications and will provide a framework for the Government's Budget initiatives in this area over the next five years. There are many areas of potential action which do not involve large sums of money, and my department will be looking at these closely and quickly.

Many recommendations require further consultation, and consultative bodies will be quickly established for this purpose. In particular, the ministerial advisory council will be formed forthwith.

I regard the task force report as a very important statement on service direction for people with an intellectual handicap and have issued instructions for all honourable members to be furnished with a copy as soon as possible. I commend the task force report to the House.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.06 a.m.): A copy of a motion has been circulated in my name. I seek leave to move that motion without notice.

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

AYES, 25

Ardill
Braddy
Burns
Campbell
Casey
Comben
De Lacy
Eaton
Goss
Hamill
Hayward
McElligott
McLean
Milliner
Palaszczuk
Scott
Smith
Smyth
Underwood
Vaughan
Warburton
Warner
Wells

Tellers:
Mackenroth
Prest

NOES, 53

Ahern	Lickiss
Alison	Littleproud
Austin	McCauley
Beanland	McKechnie
Berghofer	McPhie
Borbidge	Menzel
Burreket	Muntz
Chapman	Neal
Clauson	Nelson
Cooper	Newton
Elliott	Perrett
Fraser	Randell
Gamin	Row
Gibbs, I. J.	Santoro
Gilmore	Schuntner
Glasson	Sherlock
Gunn	Sherrin
Gygar	Simpson
Harper	Slack
Henderson	Stoneman
Hinton	Tenni
Hobbs	Veivers
Hynd	White
Innes	
Katter	
Knox	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	FitzGerald
Lester	Stephan

Resolved in the negative.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR**Senator Margaret Reynolds**

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Senator Margaret Reynolds, who is the Minister for Local Government and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister for the Status of Women. I welcome Senator Reynolds.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

GENERAL BUSINESS—NOTICE OF MOTION No. 1

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.17 a.m.): I move—

“That Notice of Motion No. 1 standing in my name be called on for immediate debate.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Liberal Party to seek leave to move a motion.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.18 a.m.): I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

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

AYES, 35		NOES, 43	
Ardill	Scott	Ahern	Littleproud
Beanland	Sherlock	Alison	McCauley
Braddy	Smith	Austin	McKechnie
Burns	Smyth	Berghofer	McPhie
Campbell	Underwood	Borbidge	Menzel
Casey	Vaughan	Burreket	Muntz
Comben	Warburton	Chapman	Neal
De Lacy	Warner	Clauson	Nelson
Eaton	Wells	Cooper	Newton
Goss	White	Elliott	Perrett
Gygar		Fraser	Randell
Hamill		Gamin	Row
Hayward		Gibbs, I. J.	Sherrin
Innes		Gilmore	Simpson
Knox		Glasson	Slack
Lee		Gunn	Stoneman
Lickiss		Harper	Tenni
McElligott		Henderson	Veivers
McLean		Hinton	
Milliner		Hobbs	
Palaszczuk	<i>Tellers:</i>	Hynd	<i>Tellers:</i>
Santoro	Mackenroth	Katter	FitzGerald
Schuntner	Prest	Lester	Stephan

Resolved in the negative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (10.23 a.m.), by leave: I have been handed a copy of the *Gold Coast Bulletin*, which on page 2 claims—

Sir William Knox: What date?

Mr SIMPSON: The date is Friday, 7 July.

The article claims that, at the election of the Speaker, two members voted against the Government and it names me as being one of them. That is not correct. Even

though it was a secret ballot, I indicate that I voted for Mr Lingard. I find that that——

Sir William Knox interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will continue with his personal explanation.

Mr SIMPSON: I wish to put on record that the statement contained in that article is not correct.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs CHAPMAN (Pine Rivers) (10.24 a.m.), by leave: I have been maligned in the same way as Mr Simpson. I object most strongly to any newspaper printing anything in that way just because that is how it feels a matter ought to be construed. How we voted in the election of Speaker is a matter for our own conscience. It is a private matter for the members concerned.

I object most strongly to these people making assertions about the way people vote in this Parliament in a secret ballot. I believe that what has happened has made the editor of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* take into account what he believed should have happened. I object most strongly to the printing of that belief in the paper.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

Cyclone Damage to Structures on Beach Areas in Burdekin Electorate

Mr STONEMAN asked the Minister for Land Management—

“With reference to the extensive damage created during cyclone Aivu and, in particular, damage caused to structures located on permits to occupy on or adjacent to beach areas of my electorate I ask him the following in order that permittees and the general community can be made aware of the situation that now applies—

(1) What is the position of those people who suffered extensive building damage in relation to repair or replacement?

(2) What is the conversion process of those permittees who wish to upgrade to a more secure tenure?

(3) What is the availability of land or possibility of successful application of permits to occupy?

(4) What are the alternatives available where no continuation of the permit to occupy process is possible?”

Mr GLASSON: (1) All permits to occupy are subject to a condition allowing the Minister to terminate the permit to occupy at will.

(a) Adjacent to the town of Wunjunga and its environs—on 14 April 1989, I released a press statement cautioning the holders of permits to occupy located within the Beach Protection Authority’s recommended buffer zone and below the recognised tidal surge zone of 2.7 metres against unwisely spending money on their structures in contravention of the conditions of permits to occupy.

On 18 April 1989, the Land Administration Commission approved that 40 permits to occupy, located in the abovementioned zone, be terminated due to the damage caused by cyclone Aivu to the structures of each of these permits. The permittees were advised that their permits to occupy would be terminated as at 30 April 1989 and that it was necessary for them to clear all debris, rubbish and other material from the permit area at their expense.

I have received several applications from former permittees for the reinstatement of their permits to occupy. Each application has been refused.

The Land Commissioner, Townsville, will be inspecting the area during the week commencing 31 July 1989 so that a report can be furnished on the current status with regard to the removal of improvements on the 40 former permits to occupy.

(b) Other areas of the honourable member's electorate—the Land Administration Commission's policy is that, provided the permit to occupy is not located within a Beach Protection Authority zone, it has no objection to the repairing and/or rebuilding of the improvements, provided that all construction is carried out in accordance with the conditions of the permit and requirements of local authority by-laws.

(2) Permits to occupy are not capable of conversion to freehold. However, provided an area is already held under permit to occupy, and is located outside the Beach Protection Zone, the Land Administration Commission would investigate an application by a permittee to relinquish his permit with a view to obtaining a special lease thereover.

(3) No land is currently available for lease, purchase, or permissive occupancy in the town of Wunjunga at present. The Land Administration Commission is currently considering two proposals to make allotments available, that is, the development of about 30 lots on Beachmount Hill and the development of about 20 lots on the sandhills south of the town of Wunjunga.

However, cyclone Aivu caused a tidal surge which inundated the area for development to the south of the town. Accordingly, departmental officers have been requested to proceed with development of the higher land only at this stage. Any application for a permit to occupy in the Wunjunga locality would be refused.

(4) There is no alternative. If the permit to occupy is located adjacent to the town of Wunjunga, and has been terminated, the former permittee must ensure that his improvements are removed from the subject site.

Failure to do so will force the Land Administration Commission to take action under sections 372 and 373 of the Land Act, which involves legal action to recover Crown costs incurred in the removal of any unauthorised structures, improvements, works or things.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Review of Electoral Boundaries

Mr GOSS: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to statements by the Deputy Premier on radio this morning in which he attempted to justify the Government's policy of deliberately delaying electoral reform, and I ask: does he share his deputy's view—contrary to recommendations of the Fitzgerald report—that another body, a boundaries tribunal, would take up to 12 months to complete a redrawing of electoral boundaries after a review was completed by the recommended electoral and administrative review commission, or does he stand by Mr Fitzgerald's recommendation that changes to electoral boundaries should be implemented by legislation "without delay" following the review by the proposed commission?

Mr AHERN: The issue is quite clear in that the interpretation that the honourable member has given to the Fitzgerald commission's report is Labor's view of the matter. A fair reading of the recommendations implies that a review by the electoral and administrative review commission should first take place. That is what is proposed. I have made inquiries of the director of the implementation unit of the department who has worked closely with the Fitzgerald commission. He has advised me that the whole process of review should be carried out in an unhurried manner. The legislation that is being prepared for Parliament will be ready for the parliamentary sitting on the date that I have suggested.

It is obvious that a review of the zonal system must take place, but that is a question for the commission itself to determine. After its recommendations are in place, the matter can be further considered by the Government. It is a matter for the commission

to make its recommendations to the Government in regard to timings, mechanisms and so on after it has conducted its hearings, which is consistent with the recommendations in the report.

Proposed Electoral Boundaries Tribunal

Mr GOSS: I ask the Premier: is there any reference to a proposed boundaries tribunal in the Fitzgerald report, the draft electoral commission legislation or any other communication received from Mr Fitzgerald?

Mr AHERN: The honourable member has had an opportunity to read the Fitzgerald report, and I have read it also. He would know that a broad opportunity is given to the commission to make recommendations. In any review mechanism a number of options are available and there is no restriction on the recommendations which might be made. There are a range of opportunities available.

Mr Goss: Is a boundaries tribunal one of them?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to address the previous question.

Mr AHERN: I will gladly do that. The honourable member has asked me to put some restriction in the legislation, on the options available to the commission; but there is a broad range of options available.

Statements made by Member for Stafford on ABC Program *World Today*

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Premier: has his attention been drawn to statements made by the honourable member for Stafford on the ABC program *World Today* in which he admitted to head-counting with his ALP colleagues over the issue of the election of the Speaker?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr AHERN: I know that some members are very sensitive about this matter, and the members of the Liberal Party have some explaining to do. On yesterday's *World Today* program one of their key people let the cat out of the bag.

Mr Elliott: Moore and Tuckey did that.

Mr AHERN: The honourable member for Cunningham has asked if Tuckey did that, but the honourable member for Stafford is a poor man's Wilson Tuckey. Instead of using an iron bar, he uses marshmallow.

I will quote from the transcript of yesterday's *World Today* program where the honourable member stated—

“As I said we were voting for Lin Powell and the Labor Party said so are we and naturally then we said oh well how many blokes are you going to have voting and how many are we and what's going to be the result.”

There is no doubt that that consultation was going on all the time and the Liberal Whip was clearly one of the facilitators in this conspiracy. It is clear from the transcript of yesterday's *World Today* program that this organisation was occurring with a view to assisting the former Speaker in this matter. The honourable member has acted in the role adopted by Wilson Tuckey and John Moore in the Federal arena, although he is obviously nowhere near as competent.

Disciplinary Action against Member for Woodridge

Mr FITZGERALD: I ask the Premier: is he aware of comments made yesterday by the Opposition member for Windsor calling for the castration of the Opposition member for Woodridge, and can he advise if this operation is likely to be successful?

Mr Goss interjected.

Mr AHERN: The Leader of the Opposition is very sensitive about this issue, and I can understand it, because he has decided to back down on his earlier demand that the endorsement of the honourable member for Woodridge be withdrawn. Clearly the factions have had——

Ms WARNER: I rise to a point of order. I do not believe that the question asked by the member for Lockyer is in keeping with the Premier's ministerial responsibility. The matter is full of conjecture.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I understand the term "castration" very well. The question is in order.

Mr AHERN: Obviously there has been some question of political castration, but it is not the member for Woodridge who is facing political castration; it is the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr WELLS: I rise to a point of order. Under Standing Orders, questions put to Ministers have to be within their area of responsibility. I am not sure if castration is within the province of the Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. The answer has been completed. I call the member for Ipswich.

Use of Ministerial Expenses by Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry for Fraser Island Holiday

Mr HAMILL: In asking a question of the Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry, I refer to his use of publicly funded credit cards. I now ask: did he holiday at the Orchid Beach resort on Fraser Island in 1985? Was he accompanied by his wife and son? How many days did he spend on the island and were he and members of his family flown to the island by Government jet? Did he meet another Cabinet Minister at the resort? If so, who was the other Minister? Was the bill for the holiday by the Minister and his family paid for with his ministerial American Express card?

Mr MUNTZ: As I have previously stated, all of my expenses have been audited correctly. At no time have I holidayed on Fraser Island.

Mr HAMILL: I thank the Minister for his explanation. Obviously Mr Fitzgerald did not accept the same explanation.

Railway Department Advertising Campaign

Mr HAMILL: My second question also relates to matters pertinent to the Fitzgerald inquiry. In this case I refer to the Minister for Transport and the concerns of the Fitzgerald inquiry about the Government's expenditure on media services. I now ask the Minister for Transport: what is the cost of the saturation newspaper and television campaign being conducted by the Government surrounding the commencement of electric rail services from Brisbane to Rockhampton?

Mr McKECHNIE: Queensland Railways is a commercial undertaking——

Mr Hamill: And also a Government department.

Mr McKECHNIE: As I was saying when I was rudely interrupted by the Opposition spokesman, Queensland Railways is a commercial undertaking which has an advertising program designed to increase business. The cost of the campaign is a hell of a lot less than the Federal Government spends on similar programs.

Establishment of Queensland State Bank

Mr STEPHAN: In asking a question of the Premier, I refer to the financial position of the Victorian State Bank and the likelihood that it will suffer financial loss. I now ask: what is the position with the establishment of a Queensland State bank?

Mr AHERN: The possible establishment of a bank in Queensland pooling some of the resources that are owned by the people of Queensland is still under active consideration by the Government. I want to draw to the attention of honourable members the Australian Labor Party's policy here, which is modelled upon the Victorian ALP State Bank. Today's newspapers carry stories about calls on the Victorian Treasurer, Rob Jolly, to resign after the State Bank loss. Owing to unwise investments in that State, the bank is now facing very substantial losses.

Mr Innes: \$100m.

Mr AHERN: I would think the honourable member's figure is a gross understatement. The amount is much, much more than that.

It must be clearly understood that what Labor is prescribing in this State has suffered a very bad experience in Victoria.

Interim Commission on Fire Services

Mr STEPHAN: I ask the Minister for Police and Minister for Emergency Services and Administrative Services: what progress has been made by the interim commission on fire services, which was established after the Government's recent Green Paper reviewing these services?

Mr COOPER: The interim commission is working well. Since the report was received, it has met about seven times. The members from the urban brigades, the auxiliaries, the rural fires and the fire-fighters' union are working extremely well together in very close harmony. This morning I attended a meeting with them. The review process is proceeding and draft legislation is almost ready. Hopefully it will be ready for the September sittings.

Establishment of All-party Committees to Implement Fitzgerald Recommendations

Mr INNES: I ask my question of the Premier. As he will have read the Fitzgerald report, he will have seen throughout reference to consultation with other political parties on certain appointments and on the acceptability of the advice of certain commissions. He will also have noticed, of course, that all-party parliamentary committees are necessary to approve the personnel of the proposed commissions as well as to oversee the commissions themselves. I now ask: why have we not had proposed to the Parliament at its first possible sittings the structure and timing for the appointment of the select committees that should be in place to arrive at the appointment of the personnel to the commissions, advertisements for which apparently have already been placed?

Mr AHERN: If the honourable member had read all of the report in detail, he would be aware that the State Government made available to the Fitzgerald commission very considerable resources, one of which was the assistance of the recently retired Parliamentary Counsel, Mr Leo Murray, under contract. That was so that the Fitzgerald inquiry itself could have an input into the actual legislative recommendations that would be coming forward. Those legislative recommendations are not included in the report but are under preparation by inquiry staff, including Mr Fitzgerald himself.

After consultations with Mr Peter Forster, it is my understanding that it is envisaged that the select committee procedures will be enshrined in the legislation itself. The honourable member is suggesting that we ought to proceed ahead of the actual inquiry and establish some mechanism that the Fitzgerald inquiry itself did not foresee. The Leader of the Liberal Party is saying it is something that we must proceed to establish

as a committee of the Parliament just by resolution of the Parliament, when it appears that the recommendation is that it should proceed under legislation. There may well be very good reasons for that.

The Government has accepted the recommendations in the report. It is consulting with the person nominated by the commission to head the implementation unit. The commission has indicated a certain timetable and procedure for putting everything together. The Government is acting in accordance with that timetable and procedure.

National Parks and Wildlife Service Logo

Mr INNES: I direct a question to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. One has read reports issued from the Minister's department that the reason why the National Parks logo has been dispensed with is that a survey was carried out which found that people confused that logo with a feral cat. It is not putting too fine a point on it to say that many people absolutely disbelieve that; they believe either that the survey was not done or that, if a survey was done, it was an improper survey. I ask: is the Minister prepared to say that the survey was carried out? Is he prepared to publish the survey in this House or publicly in the next few days?

Mr MUNTZ: The honourable member has been grandstanding on this minor issue for some months trying to grab a headline. Some weeks ago, I confirmed that the logo for the National Parks and Wildlife Service would not be altered. It was never my intention, or the intention of the Government, to alter it.

I believe that a survey was carried out, although I cannot confirm that.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr MUNTZ: To my knowledge, the survey was carried out and it reflected the suggestion by the honourable member. Nevertheless, there was never any intention by me or my department to change the logo. That is still the position.

Alleged Queensland Police Union Involvement in Corruption

Mr PALASZCZUK: In directing a question to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Public Works, Housing and Main Roads, I refer to his statements when Minister for Police in which he attributed blame for corruption in Queensland to the Queensland Police Union, and I refer specifically to his claim—

“The union complained about the Police Minister, complained about morale but were content to see corruption flourish.

It was pointed out to me that corrupt police in the past had manipulated the Police Union in taking action against Police Ministers . . . as a disruptive diversion aimed at supporting corruption.

I believe the same forces motivated the Police Union campaign against me.”

I ask: when he was Police Minister did the Deputy Premier take any action against the police union elements which he claims assisted corruption? Has he advised the current Police Minister of the names of any of those elements within the police union?

Mr GUNN: I did not have to tell the new Police Minister who they were. He found out pretty quickly. I stand by what I said yesterday in this House. This morning, I have received many calls. Those people have said two words—“Spot on”.

Decriminalisation of Prostitution

Mr PALASZCZUK: I direct my second question to the Minister for Health. Recently, the proprietor of a Brisbane escort agency called for the decriminalisation of prostitution to permit regular testing for AIDS and other diseases. As prostitution in Queensland has been confirmed by the Fitzgerald report, I ask: will the Minister consider taking a

submission to Cabinet to decriminalise prostitution, or legalise it, to provide compulsory screening for AIDS? If not, how does he propose to screen prostitutes forced underground as revealed by the Fitzgerald report?

Mr I. J. GIBBS: The Fitzgerald inquiry did not make any positive recommendations about prostitution. As it is obvious that the honourable member has not read the report properly, I advise him to do so. The Government's policy on prostitution is clear. It will not alter it.

Environmental Concerns of Marymount College

Mrs GAMIN: I place on notice the following question to the Minister for Environment, Conservation and Forestry—

“I draw the Honourable Minister's attention to an approach that has been made to me by more than 1 000 primary and secondary students of the Marymount College at Burleigh Heads.

These students have done a wonderful job and gone to great lengths to investigate aspects of the threats facing our environment. They have signed a detailed request to me seeking information on what steps are being taken by the Queensland Government Minister to address many of these concerns.

In particular, I ask the Honourable the Minister what steps are being taken to—

- (1) Protect and conserve our wonderful forests and replant where necessary;
- (2) minimise industrial pollution;
- (3) remove pollution from our waterways and oceans;
- (4) conserve energy and promote the use of alternative energy resources; and
- (5) recycle waste products.”

Mr MUNTZ: Mr Speaker!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister may answer the question.

Mr MUNTZ: I take the question without notice. Some days ago, the honourable member discussed with me the matter of the request from the students of the Marymount College. I commend them for their enthusiasm and their involvement in various conservation and environmental issues, particularly in pollution control. I also commend the interest of the member for South Coast in that school and all other high schools on the Gold Coast.

I have listed the areas of concern in the request. I seek leave of the House to table them and have them incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the following document—

Answer—

(1) The Crown Forest Estate of Queensland, some four and half million hectares including 168,000 hectares of plantations, are fully protected and their conservation is guaranteed. Sound management practices adopted by the Department of Forestry include the progressive upgrading of fire fighting equipment and detection mechanisms; environmental controls to restrict site damage and soil erosion; pest and diseases control by quarantine regulation; wildlife conservation; timber productivity and recreational opportunities for the general public.

The Department of Forestry recognises the important role trees play in alleviating land degradation problems. Rural landholders are encouraged to consider tree planting as well as retaining areas of native vegetation on their properties.

In conjunction with the Education Department and the Timber Industry, the Department of Forestry has placed the award winning Fored Program into all secondary schools in Queensland including Marymount College, Burleigh Heads.

(2) & (3) The Queensland Government has had a programme in place to minimise industrial pollution and to clean up the State's waterways and ocean waters since the early 1970's. In recent years, these programmes have been reinforced by drawing together all the agencies responsible for fighting pollution and for managing the environment into one Department—the Department of Environment and Conservation.

As part of the existing requirements, those persons and industries who wish to discharge wastes into the environment must hold a permit to do so, and these permits impose strict requirements to treat wastes to a standard which avoids damaging our precious environment.

Such early action in this area has been of great benefit to the State, because we have avoided many of the problems now being faced in other parts of Australia and the world.

(4) The recent publicity given to all matters relating to environmental protection, conservation of resources and the recycling of wastes is welcomed as it will assist both the Government and Local Authorities in their endeavours. Fundamental changes will need to be made by all members of the community to effect savings. It is expected that such changes will be gradually phased in with public education programs being undertaken.

(5) I have been in contact with representatives of recycling industries in Queensland with a view to recycling waste paper generated by Government Departments and to encourage Government Departments to use recycled paper as stationery wherever possible.

Arrangements have already been made for my Office to use such paper, with the Department of Environment and Conservation following when stocks permit re-ordering.

The Department of Environment and Conservation is in the process of producing a comprehensive publication on recycling, how it affects the individual and listing recyclers and the material they handle.

Establishment of Public Register of Political Donations

Mr HAYWARD: I direct my first question to the Premier. In accordance with the clear recommendation of the Fitzgerald report at page 138, where he states that evidence indicates that there is an urgent need to consider establishing a public register of political donations—I emphasise “urgent”—I ask: when does he propose to implement such a register?

Mr AHERN: Obviously, someone else has done the honourable member's research for him. He has not read the recommendation, which is for a review by the electoral and administrative review commission. The Government has adopted the recommendations. They appear in the report, and I refer the honourable member to them.

Claim by Premier of Political Interference of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen in Fitzgerald Inquiry

Mr HAYWARD: In directing a second question to the Premier, I refer him to his past assertions that his predecessor, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, attempted to end the Fitzgerald inquiry at the time he attempted to sack a number of his Ministers in 1987. I also refer the Premier to the fact that he has consistently failed to justify publicly his claim of attempted political interference in the work of the commission by using the excuse that he had placed the matter before Mr Fitzgerald. I ask: in the light of the fact that Mr Fitzgerald's report states that he did not investigate that specific allegation, will the Premier now provide all details to support his most serious claim? In particular, will he table the evidence that he claimed to have provided to Mr Fitzgerald?

Mr AHERN: May I say that Mr Fitzgerald has dealt with the matter very well.

Cessation of Operations at Queerah Meatworks

Mr MENZEL: I ask the Premier: is he aware that the Queerah Meatworks near Cairns may be about to cease operations and the land sold to Japanese or other developers? In view of the shortage of land for public purposes in the Cairns region, will the Premier consider the purchase of that land by the State Government? Will he also consider not extending the special leases on the area and reserve the area for public purposes?

Mr AHERN: The honourable member has rightly drawn this matter to my attention. I will certainly consider the matter. I am aware that there is a shortage of public land for community services generally in the Cairns area. I know that the honourable member's representations are well-intentioned, and they will receive serious consideration.

Destruction of Mangroves by Cairns City Council

Mr MENZEL: I ask the Minister for Mines, Energy and Northern Development: will he investigate the fact that the Cairns City Council has destroyed mangroves? I understand that the present council gave an undertaking that, if elected, it would not destroy mangroves. Will the Minister have a friendly discussion with the Mayor of Cairns and impress on him that he should not destroy the environment, even though he is a good Labor man? In addition, when the Minister has that discussion with the Mayor of Cairns, will he warn him that if he persists in bulldozing—

Mr Scott: He said he is going to sue them.

Mr MENZEL: Order! I am sorry, Mr Speaker, but I think it is important that the member for Cook hear the rest of my question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I thank the honourable member for Mulgrave.

Mr MENZEL: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

As I was saying, when the Minister has discussions with the Mayor of Cairns, will he warn him that if he persists in bulldozing the mangroves around the Cairns area, Mr Pat Comben may castrate him as a punishment for breaching ALP policy?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think that the word has been used in a frivolous fashion. I call the Minister.

Mr TENNI: I thank the honourable member for his concern in relation to the effect that the Mayor of Cairns and his alliance team are having on the mangroves at the northern end of Lake Street in Cairns.

A very serious incident has occurred in Cairns. I have referred it to the Honourable the Minister for Primary Industries in order that he might take whatever action that at law is necessary.

Mr De Lacy interjected.

Mr TENNI: It is no good the member for Cairns trying to protect his socialist colleague up in Cairns.

The fact is that the Mayor of Cairns and his alliance team went to the people of Cairns on the understanding that they would build no more high rise, that they would not destroy the mangroves—particularly those in wetland areas—or allow any other environmental destruction in the Cairns region.

In fact, the Mayor of Cairns is quoted in the *Cairns Post* and has been heard on 4CA saying that he had a permit to destroy these mangroves. He said that they were not mangroves; they were only regrowth mangroves. I ask you, Mr Speaker: what is the difference between a regrowth mangrove and a mangrove? As far as I am concerned, they are all mangroves, and they are in a wetland area which is a very sensitive environment and the breeding-ground for banana prawns, crabs and fish in that area.

In my opinion and in the opinion of the sensible people of Cairns—which does not include members of the alliance team—the fact is that the Mayor of Cairns deliberately told an untruth to the people of north Queensland. He does not have a permit under section 71 of the Fisheries Act to destroy those mangroves. Therefore he deliberately lied to the people of Cairns, both in the *Cairns Post* and on 4CA. It is surprising that a man in the position of Mayor of the city of Cairns would attempt to do that.

Once again, I thank the honourable member for Mulgrave for raising this matter. He can be assured that I, as the Minister for Northern Development, did have that job

stopped straight away and that fisheries inspectors and patrol officers in Cairns under the control of the Minister for Water Resources and Maritime Services inspected the scene. A report has been sent to his office in Brisbane, and in turn will be forwarded to the Minister for Primary Industries in order that the necessary action may be taken.

All I can say is that if what I am saying is correct—and I believe it to be correct because I have personally inspected the area on two occasions, on the ground and from the air—then I would expect the alliance team to first of all pay the fine as issued by the court at the time and for the Mayor of Cairns and the aldermen who are members of that alliance team to resign—and only one alderman was not a member of that alliance team—because they have deliberately misled the people of Cairns.

The only other thing I want to say is that this exposes the greatest hypocrites in this State. I refer to Dr Mansfield, Peter Martinuzzi, Dr Leslie Clark and all of those so-called specialists who fight and scream and yell every time a mangrove is knocked down but who are suddenly very, very silent. Dr Aila Keto, Liz Bourne and all the others have allowed two to three acres of mangroves—both regrowth mangroves and senior mangroves—to be totally destroyed. They have not opened their mouths. They are the biggest bunch of hypocrites who ever walked on God's earth and they should go and hide their heads in the mudflats.

Route 20, Environmental and Social Impact Study Carried Out by Sinclair, Knight and Partners

Mr SHERLOCK: In directing a question to the Minister for Main Roads, I refer to the environmental and social impact study carried out by Sinclair, Knight and Partners into Route 20 and to the genuine concerns, fears and even panic among some residents about property values and their life-styles, which have been aggravated by this now more than 14-month review. I refer also to the decision to extend the review period until 30 June, which was last week, and the subsequent delay in the council's recommendation. I urge the Minister to assure residents that the Main Roads Department will make the decision about the future of the road as soon as possible. I ask: will he give that assurance and can he forecast when that decision will be made?

Mr GUNN: I am in no position to forecast anything. A special transport committee, which comprises the Lord Mayor of this city, the Minister for Transport and me, has been established. Ample opportunity has been given to citizens to object or to agree. In due course I will be taking a submission to the transport committee, of which the honourable member's colleague the Lord Mayor is a member. I will let the honourable member know what we do on that occasion.

Occupation of Queensland Housing Commission Houses in Keperra and Mitchelton Areas by Non-army Families

Mr SHERLOCK: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister for Housing. The Deputy Premier is no doubt aware that in various parts of the suburbs of Keperra and Mitchelton houses owned by the Queensland Housing Commission are leased to the Australian army and that many of those houses stand empty. In view of the severe shortage of rental housing and the long waiting-list for Queensland Housing Commission homes brought about by the Federal Labor Government's gross mismanagement of the economy, I ask: can he inform the House whether some of these army houses that are currently unoccupied can be made available to non-army families?

Mr GUNN: It has been very difficult to get the Federal Government to the table on this matter. There are actually 3 600 houses leased by the Defence Department in Queensland. The Defence Department wants to keep half of them. They were built by the Housing Commission and rented out to defence personnel at a very reduced rental.

Mr Mackenroth: Who paid for them?

Mr GUNN: The Queensland Government paid for them.

\$75m is owing on those houses. The Government is now dealing with the Defence Department. It has taken a long time to bring it to the table.

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr GUNN: It is our money. The Defence Department is offering us 1 800 of those houses if we will take half of the debt, which is between \$35m and \$38m. The Government is considering that proposition. A conclusion has not been reached on a price. The Queensland Government is very interested in those houses. Although there is a housing waiting-list in Queensland, it is only about one-third of that in New South Wales and Victoria. The Queensland Government is doing its best. As a matter of fact, it is doing its utmost in that area. Until the Defence Department puts a price on those houses, the Queensland Government can do nothing about it.

Fuel Prices

Mr ELLIOTT: I ask the Premier: is he aware that fuel prices in Queensland, particularly in provincial and country areas, have risen in recent times relative to those in New South Wales and Victoria? As this State has continued its long-standing practice of not implementing a fuel tax, consistent with its low-tax objectives, I ask, firstly: is that a fair situation for the fuel-consumers in provincial and rural areas? Secondly, I ask: will the Premier reinforce the concern being expressed by consumers in those areas?

Mr AHERN: Honourable members will be aware that in States in which a fuel tax does apply, which is everywhere else but in this State, as part of it there is a wholesale price control arrangement at refinery. That is determined by the State Government agencies to ensure that the taxing which then applies is applied fairly. As there is no such fuel tax in this State, accordingly there is no attendant control of price at refinery.

From time to time the Government has been concerned that what may be happening in this State is that the lack of control arrangements in Queensland may be leading to a situation in which the wholesale price is floated up to take account of the tighter pricing arrangements in the other States. I have been concerned about that. Queensland is a free-enterprise State and a low-tax State. I would be very concerned if there is an effort being made to exploit that situation. It is of vital importance to our users here that every effort be made to keep the price competitive and as low as possible and that no advantage is taken of the absence of similar legislation of a controlling nature that applies in other States of Australia. I will, therefore, have consultations with the representatives of the supply companies to seek their assurances in this regard. It is a vital issue to industry in this State and one about which I share some concern with the honourable member.

Mice Plague on Darling Downs

Mr ELLIOTT: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: will he inform the House and the farmers who are currently experiencing a devastating mice plague on the Darling Downs of the current status of the research and monitoring program in relation to that mice plague? Will the Minister also, together with his colleague the Minister for Land Management, ensure that funding is forthcoming for that urgent program?

Mr HARPER: The honourable member rightly identifies the responsibility of my colleague the Minister for Land Management in the matter of research and in the matter of chemicals that are available to help primary producers overcome the devastation that is often caused by mice plagues.

Mr Comben: It poisoned the birds. The mice are still there. It didn't work, did it?

Mr HARPER: If the honourable member opposite understood the environment and had experienced a mice plague, he would recognise the extreme seriousness of the

position. It is a fact that in the recent mice plague no chemical was totally effective. At the request of industry organisations, this Government was prepared to make monocrotophos available for a short period in an attempt to overcome the problem, but that is not the answer.

I must pay tribute to the research work that is being undertaken by organisations other than those under the control of the State Government. Whereas research efforts are being undertaken at the Alan Fletcher Research Station within my own department, for some time the CSIRO has been carrying out research in an attempt to overcome the problem of mice plagues. I believe that an efficient method of forecasting the possible onset of mice plagues has been developed. In fact, recently the CSIRO nominated that the plague to which the honourable member refers would occur. That research body seems to be more efficient than some of our weather-forecasters.

There is not a lot that farmers can do to prevent plagues other than to get rid of the habitats that encourage the breeding of mice. Certainly a need exists for some form of chemical or natural control. Perhaps a natural control could be developed.

I pay tribute also to the work that is being done by the Queensland University of Technology, which recently expressed concern about funding—an issue which touches on the core of the honourable member's question.

I am sure that the State Government will continue to provide funding for the research that is carried out both by my department and the Lands Department. The Ahern National Party Government is to the fore in Australia in providing rural research, and it will continue to do so. The problem of mice plagues will continue to be addressed.

I bring to the attention of industry organisations the need for them to continue to fund the research efforts that are being undertaken by other instrumentalities, particularly the Queensland University of Technology. It would be a shame if the excellent work that is being undertaken by that institution were to come to an end before it reached the results that are so very close.

I give the honourable member an assurance that my department and the Lands Department will continue to provide research funding. I commend the work of other instrumentalities to those rural organisations that are concerned about this issue.

Alleged Misuse of Ministerial Expenses

Mr SCOTT: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to his repeated claims that allegations of misuse of ministerial expenses, particularly the claims by former National Party Minister Don Lane, were being investigated by the Fitzgerald inquiry.

In the light of the fact that the Premier's claims have been shown by the Fitzgerald report to be false, I ask: does the Premier now intend to establish an independent review into the Lane allegations against his former Liberal and National Party colleagues, or does he plan to leave a cloud over the heads of those past and present members of this House?

Mr AHERN: The honourable member is completely wrong in his assertion. My statements prior to the release of the Fitzgerald report were proved correct. I refer the honourable member to the commissioner's statements, with which I strongly concur.

Training of Aboriginal and Islander Police

Mr SCOTT: I ask the Minister for Police: during the time that he has been the Minister for Police has he tried to find out why his predecessors constantly opposed the proposition that the Police Department should take responsibility for the training and administration of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander police? Does the Minister believe that the department should have that responsibility? Will Aboriginal and Islander people now have to await the findings of the royal commission of inquiry into Aboriginal deaths

in custody before an urgently needed training program is implemented and the responsibility for Aboriginal police is removed to where it should be, namely, with his department?

Mr COOPER: I have no comment on the question of my predecessors except to say that I support them in everything that they have done along the way.

As to the Police Department and Aboriginals—quite a number of Aboriginal police are being trained by the Police Department. There will continue to be close liaison between Aboriginal police in the communities and the Queensland police force.

Proposed Rezoning of Fitzgibbon

Mrs NELSON: In directing a question to the Minister for Local Government, I draw his attention to significant concern that is being expressed publicly by residents of Carseldine, Zillmere, Fitzgibbon and Bridgeman Downs in the Aspley electorate about a proposed all-or-nothing rezoning plan for the suburb of Fitzgibbon, which has the potential to deny citizens their normal rights of objection.

I ask: will the Minister assure this House that he will scrutinise closely the proposal when it comes before him for approval and take into consideration fully all of the views of local residents before any final approval is given to the Brisbane City Council to proceed with that complex proposal?

Mr RANDELL: From my past experience with the honourable member, there is no doubt that she knows her electorate in very minute detail. Her constituents are fortunate to have such a member who works so hard for them.

I assure the honourable member that, if an application for rezoning is received from the Brisbane City Council, I will ensure that my officers consider it in the most minute detail, as they usually do with most applications.

Use of Government Aircraft to Return Member for Manly to Parliament

Mr COMBEN: In directing a question to the Premier and Treasurer, I refer to the use of the Government jet to fly the member for Manly from his holiday in the Northern Territory to Brisbane. I ask: what was the cost? Who authorised the flight? Was the return flight booked by the Premier's Department and on what basis does the Premier justify his decision?

Mr AHERN: Labor members are disappointed about this matter because they have been clearly outmanoeuvred. There was clearly a conspiracy going on between the Opposition members and they have been outdone on this one.

The answer to the honourable member's question is quite clear. The cost of the visit was about \$10,000. I personally authorised it. The arrangements were made for the honourable member's return in accordance with the normal entitlements of members.

Mr Mackenroth: It was the deal that was done.

Mr AHERN: There were no deals done.

I ask the honourable member to direct to his own leader some questions of his own in relation to this whole matter. As he has expressed public concern about the actions of one of his own members in relation to this whole episode, he might ask for an appropriate punishment, because it appears that the only punishment that will lie on the member for Woodridge is that he will lose the position of caucus secretary. The position of caucus secretary itself is a punishment. To be removed from it is a promotion—a reward. As a matter of fact, it is the promotion before one makes it into the shadow Ministry of the Labor Party. It is my understanding that he is the next shadow Minister for the Environment.

Mr COMBEN: I suspect that I am fairly safe.

Trinity Point Project

Mr COMBEN: I ask the Minister for Mines, Energy and Northern Development: in view of his commendable new-found interest in mangroves and the wetlands, about which we have heard today, does he now oppose on the Cairns foreshore the Trinity Point project, which will destroy massive areas of seagrass and other wetlands as well as the local amenity? Or is he just being hypocritical?

Mr TENNI: This just goes to show that the member for Windsor never gets out of his little cocoon down here in Brisbane. If he went up north he would not need a knife; the crocodiles would do the job for him. He would end up talking with a squeaky voice for sure.

The fact of life is that there are no mangroves on the mudflats in Cairns, full stop.

Adoption of Queensland Treasury Corporation Guide-lines by New South Wales Government

Mr HENDERSON: I ask the Premier: is he aware of moves by the New South Wales Government to change the operating guide-lines of that State's Treasury Corporation to match those of the Queensland Treasury Corporation? How do these moves fit in with the criticism levelled at the QTC by the Liberal Party in this State which claims that the QTC is a massive socialist enterprise unworthy of a true free-enterprise Government?

Mr AHERN: I draw the attention of all honourable members, particularly that of the Leader of the Liberal Party and the member for Redcliffe, to the decision of the New South Wales Government in relation to T Corp, which was announced yesterday. T Corp is to take on exactly the same role as that undertaken by the QTC in Queensland. That decision is totally right and appropriate.

In the past the decision was made to bring together the borrowing capacities of the State to ensure that the benefits of the increased borrowing horsepower were passed on to the State's borrowers through its statutory authorities. Now those powers are to be expanded to give a greater role on the investment side. The investments in New South Wales will be pooled with a view to enhancing their investment-earning potential so that the State's superannuants and others will receive a greater return through the trust and special funds.

New South Wales is following the Queensland model. As other Governments look at the tremendous benefits which will lie in better investment strategies and borrowing strategies, the Queensland model will be the forerunner of other models throughout Australia.

I ask all honourable members to attend at a press release, which is to be issued later today, under the name of the Queensland Treasury Corporation and others, in which an announcement will be made of a major investment by the Queensland Treasury Corporation in Queen Street, Brisbane. The announcement will outline the purchase by QTC of a large property from foreign interests. In other words, we are buying back the farm and at the same time looking after the investments very, very well.

Project Pay Packet

Mr HENDERSON: I ask the Minister for Employment, Training and Industrial Affairs: what role are TAFE colleges playing in contributing to the enormous success of Project Pay Packet?

Mr LESTER: I think honourable members will recall that yesterday I gave a very comprehensive answer about all of the good things that Project Pay Packet has done. In fact, it is about time that we started "talking up" Queensland and not talking it down, as seems to be the present idea of many people. It is about time that it is realised that this year more than 7 000 new apprentices have been employed. That is an increase

of approximately 2 000 over last year's number. During the past year the number of traineeships increased by 1 000. In comparison with last year's figures, unemployment has been reduced by almost one and a half per cent.

Furthermore, Queensland has many good things going for it. It is cheaper to buy homes in Queensland than anywhere else in Australia. Queensland's climate is very, very much better than elsewhere. Queensland has an AAA rating, which is better than that of the Commonwealth. In fact, Queensland is a State that we can be terribly proud of. It is about time we started to "talk up" the State and speak about all of the good things that are being done in this State. Let us get on and do the job and be proud to be Queenslanders, instead of knocking the State.

Appointments to Electoral and Administrative Review Commission

Mr BRADDY: In directing a question to the Premier, I refer to the recommendation of the Fitzgerald report that the parliamentary select committee for administrative and electoral review, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party should be consulted by the Premier before he makes appointments to the electoral and administrative review commission, and I ask: will he undertake to properly consult the committee and parliamentary leaders, as recommended? Will he undertake to ensure that those consultations will be carried out in such a way that he does not use his numbers in this Parliament to appoint members to the commission who do not have the confidence of all members of the select committee and the parliamentary leaders in this Parliament?

Mr AHERN: As I have indicated on many occasions, Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations will be followed.

Appointments to Parliamentary Judges Commission; Consultation by Minister for Justice and Attorney-General with Opposition

Mr BRADDY: In directing a question to the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I refer to his undertaking to Parliament that he would consult the shadow Minister for Justice and the Liberal spokesman for Justice before making appointments to the parliamentary commission of inquiry into the conduct of Mr Justice Vasta, as he then was, and Judge Pratt; to the Minister's subsequent failure to keep his undertaking; and to his failure to consult those honourable members, and I ask: will he explain to the House the reasons for his failure, or that of his Government, to carry out his undertaking? Will he apologise to the House for the contempt he showed to the House through the breach of his undertaking?

Mr CLAUSON: I have been awaiting the opportunity to answer the question by the honourable member, because he knows full well what the situation was.

Mr Braddy: Why didn't you answer it yesterday?

Mr CLAUSON: Yesterday in this House, I explained it to him.

Because of the dilatory and persecuting attitude adopted by the Federal Government towards the Queensland Government in relation to north Queensland rainforests and the World Heritage Commission, and the attitude that has prevailed, it was necessary for Mr Muntz and me to go overseas at that time to ensure that Queensland received a proper hearing before the World Heritage listing committee. Mr Braddy, that buffoon on the Opposition side, has been continuing to attack me over this issue.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will withdraw the word.

Mr CLAUSON: I withdraw the comment, but I might point out that Mr Braddy has had a very good explanation of this point. When I left, I had contacted the gentlemen

concerned to serve on the commission, as he well knows. Mr Austin had been informed of that. It was very belatedly that he knew that he had all these people who were prepared to serve. Mr Braddy knew.

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

Mr AHERN: I rise to a point of order. Yesterday during question-time, in reply to the honourable member for Sandgate, I indicated that I would provide certain information. I apologise to the House that that information is not yet to hand, and indicate that it will be made available today before the House rises.

REPORT OF FITZGERALD COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Debate resumed from 6 July (see p. 5662) on Mr Ahern's motion that the House take note of the report, to which Mr Goss had moved an amendment.

Mr MACKENROTH (Chatsworth) (11.26 a.m.): The Fitzgerald inquiry was set up originally to look into corruption payments to police which were enabling gambling dens and massage parlours or brothels to continue operating. It is history now that what was meant to be a quick six-week look at these allegations, simply to get the heat off the Government's back, grew into something that the Government lost control of and became undoubtedly the most in-depth look at corruption this nation has ever seen. Unfortunately, one area that I believe was not covered adequately at the public sittings of the inquiry was corruption within the Government itself. Later in my speech, I intend to outline one land scandal which exposes the Liberal and National Parties in Government to be just as guilty of corruption as the people identified in Mr Fitzgerald's report.

Much has been said since the start of the Fitzgerald inquiry about the expose by *Four Corners* titled *The Moonlight State*. Certainly, this proved to be the catalyst for the inquiry. However, I consider that more recognition should be given to Phil Dickie of the *Courier-Mail* and that recognition should be given to the late Kevin Hooper, member for Archerfield, for the tireless campaigning he did against corruption in this State. It was interesting to watch a 1981 edition of a *Nationwide* program in which Kevin Hooper outlined almost all the matters which appeared in the *Four Corners* program. Many of the matters which were raised in evidence at the inquiry are matters which Opposition members of Parliament have raised in this Parliament over the past decade—matters which fell on deaf ears. Opposition members were berated and called mud-slingers and any other names Government Ministers could think of—both Liberal and National Party Ministers. I also believe that the Queensland media stand condemned for their failure to adequately investigate stories raised in the Parliament.

Perhaps the average working journalist has not got the time to fully investigate matters, but I believe the media organisations in general have an obligation to allocate journalists to investigate stories further than just reporting what an Opposition member says and the Minister has denied. With a system that has operated as it has, is it any wonder that Government Ministers believe they can get away with whatever they like? Mr Fitzgerald also agrees with this when he states in section 3.9.1 of his report—

“Unfortunately it is also true that parts of the media in this State have over the years contributed to a climate in which misconduct has flourished. Fitting in with the system and associating with and developing a mutual interdependence with those in power have had obvious benefits.”

One would hope that the courage shown by Phil Dickie and his editor, Greg Chamberlin, in fully investigating stories which led to the inquiry will be the start, and only the start, for journalism in Queensland.

As I have said, stories of corruption in the Queensland police force have been raised in this Parliament for the past decade. As we now know, this corruption not only existed, but flourished, under firstly a National/Liberal Government and then a National

Party Government. One must never forget the members of the Liberal Party when these matters are considered in historical terms, because they sat in Cabinet and also held the Justice portfolio, but never once raised their voices in opposition to what was happening.

Part of section 2.2.5 of Fitzgerald report states—

“On 15 November, 1976, ten days after Herbert and his co-accused had been found not guilty, O’Connell was invited to Queensland House in London to meet the then Queensland Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, the Hon. William Daniel Lickiss, M.L.A.

Unknown to O’Connell, on that day Lewis had been appointed an Assistant Commissioner and Whitrod had resigned. O’Connell told Lickiss that corruption and sectarianism were rife in the Queensland Police Force and that, unless needed measures were taken, public confidence would continue to erode. He also told Lickiss of his concerns about particular activities and officers, including the so-called ‘rat pack’. Lickiss indicated to O’Connell that he would convey O’Connell’s concerns to Bjelke-Petersen, and O’Connell understood from their conversation that his return to Queensland would not be required.”

Corruption in the police force should never have reached the proportions it did, but it was allowed to go on by the Government, and for that both the Liberal and National Parties stand condemned.

How could Governments which themselves were corrupt take action against a corrupt police force? After all, the former Premier, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, had politicised the police force and, in effect, made it into his own personal army. Whenever he wanted an election issue, he turned the force against the citizens of this State so that he could have law-and-order issues. For example, the Springbok tour in the early seventies, the right-to-march issue in the late seventies and the SEQEB dispute in the mid-eighties were all issues in which the police were used as the Government’s private army. The only difference between those incidents and what recently happened in China is that no-one was killed.

As I have said, the inquiry grew from a six-week inquiry into a two-year extravaganza. Unfortunately, I do not believe that the inquiry got fully to the root of the problem that exists in this State—that is, corruption within the Government itself. Although three former Cabinet Ministers did give evidence before the inquiry—all of whom have since been forced to resign from Parliament—a lot more Ministers past and present should have been investigated and brought before the inquiry. In this regard I believe that the Fitzgerald inquiry has let down the people of Queensland. We are all aware of the 14 past and present Ministers named by Don Lane as having misused their ministerial expenses. Mr Fitzgerald chose not to bring those Ministers before the inquiry, a decision I believe to be wrong. Since then Mr Ahern has refused to table information relating to expenses of these Ministers. Once again we come back to allegations, followed by denial, and then end of story. In instances like this the media should put pressure on the Government to provide information, but its members do not, and if the Opposition raises the matters again, it is told that it is raising old stories. The fact remains that allegations were made which have not been investigated, and the only proof offered is the Ministers’ own undertaking that they are incorrect. This is not good enough.

Not only did the Fitzgerald inquiry not investigate the Lane allegations but also I believe that a lot more information relating to corruption in Queensland that was given to the inquiry was never publicly released. In any consideration of what corruption or cronyism is, one needs to consider them both. Corruption is taken to mean that someone receives money or some other benefit for doing something, or not doing something, whilst cronyism means decisions made favouring an individual or friend. In the area of Government, both corruption and cronyism cost the tax-payer money. Usually the Government pays more for services or goods than necessary or pays a lesser amount for inferior goods, both leading to a situation of higher costs for the tax-payer.

Today, I will outline an example of this form of corruption or cronyism which has cost the tax-payers of Queensland money. I will outline how the Queensland Housing

Commission paid 200 per cent more than was necessary, through Cabinet intervention, for a block of land. In order for members to fully understand what I am talking about, I will explain the purchasing procedures of the Queensland Housing Commission. When land is offered to the Housing Commission, usually by a real estate agent, staff of the land division check their records to see if the land has been offered previously and turned down. If not, they check with the rental division records, and, if demand is established in that area, they proceed with an evaluation of the land offered. A number of staff visit the site or scrutinise plans, including the land-inspector, valuer, town-planner, architects and engineers. Their assessment is noted on a standard form and passed to the manager of the land division for determination. If he recommends purchasing, he forwards it to the commissioner to consider the political implications of purchasing, and if there are none, he issues directions to proceed with a formal offer to purchase. If successful, a submission is prepared for executive approval, which normally is given as a matter of course.

The deal I will outline was not just a matter of course, for reasons which will become apparent as I go further into the sordid details. On 2 October 1980, Ray White Nundah wrote to the Queensland Housing Commission offering for sale 10 properties, including one in Melton Road, Toombul, comprising one acre 32 perches at a cost of \$70,000. An assessment of this land was undertaken, and on 5 October the manager of the land division recorded that the Queensland Housing Commission would purchase at \$65,000. On 9 October, a letter was forwarded to Ray White offering to purchase the land for \$65,000 subject to executive approval. On 15 October Ray White sent back to the commission a signed acceptance form to sell the land to the commission at \$65,000. On 3 December 1980, the commission advised Ray White that the Housing Commission could not proceed with the purchase of the property as it could not obtain Executive approval. Therefore, one would assume that Cabinet was not interested in purchasing this land. That was not so, as I will outline.

Cabinet was not interested in purchasing at that price; it wanted to pay more. As soon as the Housing Commission sale fell through, a company called PYC Properties Pty Ltd entered into a contract to purchase this property from the original vendor for \$65,000. The directors of PYC Properties Pty Ltd are Kevin Anthony Miller and Jakob Delonga.

The sale was completed on 17 February 1981. In late February 1981, the Minister for Housing, Claude Wharton, directed the Commissioner of Housing to purchase the property. A proposal to sell the property was forwarded to the commissioner by Willmore and Randell Pty Ltd. The only difference between this offer and the one made four months previously by Ray White was that the price had risen from \$65,000 to \$330,000.

The manager of the land division refused to process the offer and demanded an explanation. He was informed by the commissioner that it was not the Minister for Housing but another member of Cabinet who was applying pressure through the Minister to purchase the property. When he still refused to process the offer, the manager, land division, was threatened with a charge of disobeying a direction from a senior officer. The manager said he would welcome such a charge as he would not change his professional valuation from \$65,000 to \$330,000 in such a short space of time.

The matter was then dropped until November 1981, when the manager, land division, went on annual leave. The acting manager was then directed by the commissioner, at the direction of the Minister, to process the offer. However, after checking with the land office, the land officer informed the agent that the property would not be purchased. Once again we see public servants prepared to put their careers on the line in the face of threats of charges being laid against them.

The owners, PYC Properties Pty Ltd, then applied to the Brisbane City Council for site approval to build units on the land. With this approved, once again the land was offered to the Housing Commission. One must remember that the Queensland Housing Commission does not need site approval from the Brisbane City Council, so that should

have been no consideration whatsoever. This time the price was \$250,000, and the agent handling the sale was Countrywide Real Estate.

Once again the Minister directed the Housing Commission to purchase the land. At that time the commissioner was Stewart Hall. He directed his staff to process the offer, with the result that the commission purchased the property for \$180,000. There can be no explanation other than corruption at the highest level of Government when Cabinet intervenes and stops the purchase of a block of land by the Housing Commission for \$65,000 and then, through manipulation, forces the commission to purchase the same block for \$180,000.

I seek leave to table a series of documents which prove every point I have raised here today.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr MACKENROTH: The documents include the offer to sell from the various real estate agencies, the original offer to purchase, the acceptance of the \$65,000 offer, a note from the commissioner, Norm Hitchin, dated 1 December 1980 advising "do not proceed further", a letter dated 3 December 1980 to Ray White advising that the commission could not proceed with the purchase as it could not obtain executive approval and a series of documents relating to the purchase of the property at \$180,000. There then is no doubt that this whole deal has a greater stink to it than Luggage Point.

The then Minister for Housing, Claude Wharton, acted corruptly. Whether he acted on his own behalf or on behalf of another Minister, his action cost the tax-payers of this State \$115,000. From looking through the tabled documents, one gets the impression that there is no answer other than corruption.

The case I have outlined requires more than a simple denial by the Government. It deserves, and should get, if the Premier, Mr Ahern, is honest about accountable government, a full and open inquiry in which the former Minister was made to account for his actions and in which the public servants who handled this deal could come forward and tell all they know. Without this, Mr Ahern will be just as guilty as his predecessor of covering up corruption.

It has been interesting over the past few days to watch Mr Ahern pleading with the media to be given credit—to use his expression, "brownie points"—for the Fitzgerald inquiry. It is also interesting to watch him attempt to divorce himself completely from previous Governments. Mr Ahern, in the allocation of brownie points, has fared poorly. His arguments defy logic. He cannot take the credit for the inquiry and divorce himself from the previous Government.

The simple facts are that the commission of inquiry was set up by the Bjelke-Petersen Government and, as a member of that Government, Mr Ahern can take some credit for being embarrassed into setting up an inquiry. However, as a member of that Government, he stands condemned for his failure to act on the O'Connell inquiry, the Lucas inquiry and the Sturgess report.

Mr Ahern was a Cabinet Minister in the Bjelke-Petersen and National/Liberal Party Governments for eight years and has been a member of Parliament for 20 years. The most damning indictment of his credibility will be his back-down on electoral reform in this State. If Mr Ahern wishes to be judged on the basis of brownie points, on a scale of one to 10, he scores minus 10.

I wish to deal with some specific matters raised in the Fitzgerald inquiry report. The first is the issue of Mr Ron Redmond, the Acting Commissioner of Police. I do not want to go into matters relating to the period before he was appointed to that position, but I wish to compliment him on the job that he did during the 18 or 20 months that he has acted in that capacity. He did a very good job in very trying circumstances. Mr Redmond and I had a number of run-ins during that time. He was the Acting Commissioner and I am the Opposition Police spokesman. I do not agree

with some of his decisions and I think that he has acted unfairly to me, but overall he has done a very fair job. He had a very difficult job to do. The implied criticism in the report that he should not be the commissioner when one is appointed probably should not have been there, because throughout this year Mr Redmond made it very clear that he intended to retire as soon as he could after 30 June. Earlier this year, I attended a police union conference at which Mr Redmond stated quite clearly that he would be retiring from the police force as soon as he could after 30 June. I do not believe that Mr Redmond in any way intended to apply for the position of interim commissioner. I believe that he has always had the intention to retire.

However, I wonder about some other members of the force. An article in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* dated Wednesday, 5 July, states—

“The Gold Coast’s most senior policeman has slammed the Fitzgerald report as disgusting.”

The article refers to Regional Superintendent George Seib, who said—

“A lot of Fitzgerald’s so-called reforms are great in theory without being necessarily of any value.

What it is, is a report by a barrister whose thinking is towards Labor politics. People must realise that the lawyers are on one side of the fence and we’re on the other.”

What a ridiculous statement! Fancy a senior police officer of the Queensland police force saying that Mr Fitzgerald’s report favours the Labor Party. It is quite ridiculous. He claims that lawyers are on one side of the fence and police are on the other. That also is ridiculous. Lawyers represent people in court. I do not believe that a lawyer goes into court saying, “I know that this person is guilty, but I am going to try to have him proved not guilty.” He goes there to represent the client and to put forward the client’s case in the best way. Lawyers uphold the law in this State in the finest traditions. The police force also should follow those traditions.

When promotions are being considered for police officers, if Regional Superintendent George Seib—who quite obviously is not a Labor supporter—is considered for promotion, the matter should be referred to the “supercop” from the Fitzgerald inquiry. Queensland does not want police officers with warped views, such as Mr Seib, being promoted to the top of the police force.

An Opposition member interjected.

Mr MACKENROTH: No, I will not belt Mr Cooper today. I will do that on the next occasion I speak.

A matter that should be examined quickly from the Fitzgerald report concerns the training of police officers. The report has identified clearly that the training processes in place are not adequate. When people apply to join the police force, they are given an aptitude test. At present, the Queensland police force uses a 1954 model aptitude test that was used by the British army. I am told that even the British army has updated its aptitude test. However, the Queensland police force has persisted with it over the years. The first matter to be considered should be the updating of the aptitude test.

Queensland needs a new police force. The majority of officers are good, honest people who are trying to the best of their ability to do a good job. In the past two years they have worked under very difficult circumstances, bearing in mind all the media reports, the Fitzgerald inquiry and the fact that the administration of the force has been hampered. At present, instead of there being eight assistant commissioners to administer the force, there are only three. Those people have been placed under great strain.

I hope that the Queensland police force in general takes the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report to mean that the Government and the Opposition, who have supported in principle the report, are not out to get individual police officers or to make a system that will be bad for them if they want to do the right thing. We are out to create a police force that will be good for the people of this State and which will be

good for police officers who want to do a fair and honest job. I hope that the majority of officers take that on board throughout the lengthy procedure that is necessary to implement the full recommendations. It will take a considerable amount of time, but I hope that we get co-operation from them.

I do not agree with all the recommendations made in the Fitzgerald report when it is read literally. It is ludicrous to expect to put every member of the CIB in a uniform. At present, the police believe that every officer will be in uniform. Honourable members know that at present, because the Government cannot find funds, police uniforms cannot even be replaced. I do not know where it will get the money to put all the detectives into uniform.

It is obvious that police officers who work in the CIB, of necessity, will need to be in plain clothes. One would not expect that undercover policemen who are inquiring into drug deals would be allowed to grow their hair long and grow a beard and then be asked to wear a uniform. That would be ridiculous. It would be ridiculous to expect a uniformed detective to enter a hotel bar looking for SP book-makers in operation. The members of the police force who are promoting that idea are taking the written word to the extreme and the ridiculous.

At times, detectives will need to be in plain clothes. I support the theory that the visible presence of police prevents crime. I think that that is what Mr Fitzgerald is getting at.

I heard a media report in which it was suggested that corruption would stop if police were put in uniform, because the police who were named as being corrupt did not actually wear a police uniform. That is a ridiculous theory to adopt. The simple fact is that the people who were corrupt were the people who were in a position to be corrupted. They were in a position in which money could be paid to them. As I have said, I believe that there is a need to have as many police in uniform as possible. However, there will be times when the police will not need to be in uniform. One can go through the report and pick out a number of instances in which those sorts of analogies could be drawn.

One thing that I personally do not agree with in one of the recommendations is not giving police the right to appeal against unapplied-for transfers, because, as this report mentions, and as honourable members have witnessed over the past 10 or 12 years, unapplied-for transfers have been used against good, honest police. I believe that Mr Fitzgerald is wrong when he states that there should be a system whereby police cannot appeal against transfers. I believe that there should be a system whereby police who are given unapplied-for transfers—which can be given when it is believed that someone wants to complain about something that someone is doing—have some avenue of appeal.

In the very short time that I have left, I wish to raise another matter that arises as a result of the inquiry. I refer to staff for Opposition members. At page 124 of his report, Mr Fitzgerald states quite clearly—

“Without information about Government activities and research staff to properly assess it, the opposition party or parties have no basis on which to review or criticize the activities. Without information, there can be no accountability. It follows that in an atmosphere of secrecy or inadequate information, corruption flourishes. Wherever secrecy exists, there will be people who are prepared to manipulate it.”

On page 125 of his report, Mr Fitzgerald states—

“In 1988 legislation was enacted establishing a Parliamentary Service Commission, on which the Opposition is represented. This is a suitable vehicle for the provision of the necessary resources and facilities for members of Parliament and may help improve Parliament’s ability to perform its role.”

I am a member of the Parliamentary Service Commission, which I believe has been a very good body for this Parliament. However, I believe that the members of that commission need direction from the Government as to the employment of further staff.

The report does not state that the implementation of this recommendation should happen today. However, I do not believe that it should happen after the next election.

I think that the Parliamentary Service Commission needs a direction from the Premier, Mr Ahern, to immediately put in place the employment of staff for Opposition members and back-bench members in general, who should be allowed to employ on their pay-roll staff to assist them in carrying out their duties. That direction can come today from the Premier. If it is a decision that is to be put off until the end of the year, I state quite clearly that I believe that that would be a very bad course of action to take. The Government can give that direction to the commission today so that it can take the necessary action.

Mr STEPHAN (Gympie) (11.56 a.m.): I join this debate on the Fitzgerald report bearing in mind the two years of open inquiry that have been held and bearing in mind the two years of open discussions that have been held in all sections of the community. It is interesting to note that after those two years the Opposition is dwelling to a very large extent on the matter of electoral reform. It is also interesting to note that the four-zonal system is the brain-child of the Labor Party and is one that it is now trying to disown.

When one examines electoral boundaries around the country, one realises that there are variations and tolerances in setting electoral boundaries in other States. One also realises that some of the other States and, indeed, the Commonwealth do not have one vote, one value, and that there is a 10 per cent variation.

At the last election the Federal Labor Government received approximately 45.5 per cent of the overall vote. The combined vote of the Liberal and National Parties was approximately the same—45 per cent. As a result of that 45.5 per cent, the Australian Labor Party gained 86-odd seats, whereas the conservative forces gained only 62. If the Labor Party really believed that a one vote, one value system should be instituted in this State, it would be applying it in the States in which it is in Government.

I draw the attention of honourable members to the position in Western Australia and Tasmania. In Western Australia, for example, at the last election, the Labor Party gained 43 per cent of the vote, whereas the Liberals and Nationals gained 47 per cent. That is hardly what one would expect if the Australian Labor Party really believes what it is saying and is really genuine about this one vote, one value system.

Queensland has a zonal system in order to provide representation in the far-flung parts of this State. I suppose it is difficult for some members of the Opposition to understand that there is far more to Queensland than the south-east corner and provincial cities.

Mr Smyth: Cut it out.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member says, "Cut it out."

Members of the Opposition talk about a gerrymander, but they do not realise that the far-flung parts of this State need and deserve representation that provides the incentive for production and is equal to the representation that people receive in cities and major provincial towns.

Mr Vaughan: They don't get the representation now.

Mr STEPHAN: They will get less representation if members of the Opposition get their way and two representatives in western Queensland, for example, are reduced to not even one.

Mr Vaughan: But those electorates are not getting that representation now.

Mr STEPHAN: I am not sure that the people of Nudgee are getting adequate representation, either. One can ride around some of these city electorates on a push-bike. I suppose the member for Nudgee can ride around his electorate on a push-bike very easily. It can hardly be said that the same can be done in electorates in other parts

of the State. The ability of constituents to be able to contact their elected representative and to pass on their thoughts to their elected representative must also be taken into consideration. If they have to travel hundreds of miles to see their elected representative, it will not be what the honourable member wants.

In the last couple of days a conspiracy was obviously occurring in this House with the election of the Speaker. We saw the reaction of Opposition members. Even their own party colleagues could see through what they were doing. Some Opposition members did not even turn up for the vote. If they had any control or influence, one would think that the Opposition would have had at least all its members in this Chamber to vote on the election of Speaker. However, that did not happen. As far as support is concerned, that did not look very good.

It was suggested that since the tabling of the Fitzgerald report insufficient time had been provided for it to be studied. A couple of months ago legislation was introduced to enable the distribution of the report before its actual tabling in the House. That, too, was criticised and ridiculed by members opposite. One gains the impression that Opposition members are looking at a negative aspect rather than a positive aspect in the running of this State.

Mr Mackenroth referred to Mr Hooper and the high esteem in which he now claims Mr Hooper was held. If he was held in such high esteem, why was he sacked by his own party from the position of Opposition Police spokesman? Although he occupied that position for 12 months or two years, he was removed from that position. Later he was given another shadow portfolio. The fact remains that Mr Hooper was removed from the shadow Police portfolio. If Mr Hooper was held in such high regard, I question why that action was taken by the Labor Party against one of its own members.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: The Opposition did not have confidence in him then. Obviously Opposition members were frightened about what he was saying. They said, "We will distance ourselves from Kev Hooper and what he is doing."

Mr Hamill interjected.

Mr STEPHAN: The honourable member is taking aspects of the report to suit himself. He is not taking any notice of what his own colleague was saying at that stage.

Although I do not have time to go through all aspects of the Fitzgerald report, I note that it states—

"...the Inquiry was a genuine search for the truth and that difficult and controversial decisions, such as the publication of evidence or the granting of indemnities, were made in good faith and with the public interest in mind."

The granting of indemnities resulted in widespread observations and claims. Had indemnities not been granted, I wonder whether any information would have been forthcoming. After the inquiry had been in operation for a couple of months, comments were circulating throughout the community that we would get as much out of the Fitzgerald report as we got out of other reports and investigations that were held, which was very little indeed. It is surprising what information will actually flow when encouragement is given. Without that encouragement, I am sure that the information that was obtained would not have been forthcoming.

The Fitzgerald report further stated—

"This report endeavours to identify the major problems. It refers to issues which show the need for the introduction of new structures and systems, and revision of the old ones, as foundations for reform. The focus and the tenor of the report is to ventilate the problems and recommended approaches and mechanisms...to prescribe solutions to complex problems..."

That gives honourable members an idea of what can be expected and what we would wish to do. We can look to the future with a bit of faith and confidence.

The report stated—

“Another recurring theme is the need for a free flow of accurate information within a society. Such a flow of information is needed if public opinion is to be informed. Public opinion is the only means by which the powerful can be controlled.”

That is certainly an indication of what public opinion can and will do and what results from it. The report continued—

“It must be remembered that not all the people who make up the institutions or groups which have been investigated are guilty or responsible for what has occurred. For example, this report is not meant to convey that all police are untrustworthy. The considerable assistance given to this Commission by dedicated police officers is proof of that.”

In this State there are many genuine police officers, as there are many genuine officers in many other areas of control in Queensland, who are going about their duty with a great deal of faith, courage and understanding. They deserve the respect that they are receiving at the moment. The report continued—

“Nor should all or even most bureaucrats, ministers, journalists and other individuals be distrusted because of the faults of the organizations in which they work. The conscientious members of these organizations and of the community in general constitute the hope for the future.”

An open inquiry was conducted. The openness of that inquiry was most evident. The inquiry has been very forthright. If the inquiry was not as open as it was, we would not have got down the track as far as we have gone at present. The inquiry began as a journey into the unknown. The report states—

“This Inquiry could not have proceeded without public confidence, co-operation and support. The power of some of the individuals involved, and the type of issues raised were such that it would have been impossible for the Inquiry to have succeeded without public confidence, co-operation and support.”

Commissioner Fitzgerald concluded—

“One of the most effective pieces of false propaganda used against the Inquiry, perpetrated by the media, the accused and some lawyers who should have known better, was that ‘most’ or ‘much’ of its evidence was ‘hearsay’.”

Anyone who knew the amount of time spent in preliminary discussions and carrying out investigations would realise that that was not the case. Certainly a great deal of preliminary work was done. The investigation was carried out with a great deal of back-room knowledge.

The report stated—

“Criminals abused the information they gained, as they did other privileges . . . So far as possible, steps were taken to lessen the disadvantages of openness.”

I suppose that some people were convicted before they were proven guilty because someone may have made a comment against them.

I turn now to the Public Accounts Committee. Mr Fitzgerald stated—

“There are however, two aspects of the Act which could be reviewed.”

Mr Fitzgerald was referring to the Public Accounts Committee Act and mentioned that Ministers have the ability to veto any investigations.

Section 22 of the Act states—

“The Committee is not authorized to require the production to the Committee of any information . . . where that information has been—

- (a) certified by a Crown Law Officer to be information which, if it were sought in a court, would be a proper matter in respect of which to claim Crown privilege;

or

- (b) certified by the responsible Minister of the Crown, with the approval of a majority of the Ministers of the Crown, to be information such that its disclosure would be against the public interest.”

Mr Fitzgerald spoke about investigations that can be vetoed by a Minister, but the Act mentions “information”. Investigations cannot be vetoed and will proceed under the Act. That section of the Act will not stop investigations. However, it might prevent the disclosure of certain information that is determined not to be in the public interest. That the Public Accounts Committee is working well is indicative of the way in which the Act is drafted and the community support that it receives.

From time to time police come under quite a lot of criticism. Mr Fitzgerald has suggested a restructuring of the police force. I take this opportunity to compliment the police for the way in which they have conducted themselves during these very difficult times.

As to special duties, Mr Fitzgerald states—

“If duties presently performed as ‘specials’ are essential to ensure public safety or control traffic, they should be performed as part of normal police work. If the duties are not considered essential, the Department should charge fees for services performed.”

Last week in the media criticism was levelled at police who were carrying out special duties without the requisite knowledge. The community has more respect if a policeman is performing traffic duty rather than someone else. For that very reason I believe that special duties police are performing a splendid task.

I turn now to counselling, in which police also do a splendid job; although it is understandable that police are not too keen about being called to attend domestic arguments.

I compliment the personnel of the Juvenile Aid Bureau who give advice and support to young people who run into difficulties in their own homes not through any fault of their own but because of circumstances in which they find themselves. In the future a great deal of community support will be given to the Juvenile Aid Bureau, which will establish an office in Gympie in the near future. I look forward to the support that that organisation will give to young people in my electorate, particularly on week-ends and at nights when they seem to find nothing better to do than to run amok in various parts of the city.

I turn now to resignations from the police force. It is interesting to note that Mr Fitzgerald states that—

“Between 1980 and 1987 the resignation figures for serving officers were fairly stable at between 60 and 70 a year.”

Only during the past year has that figure increased. However, the number of people re-entering the police force has increased also.

We must look ahead on the positive side to see what this great State has to offer.

Mr Smyth: Changed electoral boundaries.

Mr STEPHAN: I am not sure whether Opposition members want to look on the positive side. The honourable member does not appreciate the changes in electoral boundaries that have been made by his Federal colleagues. The Labor Party wants to rig the boundaries. That is what Mr Hawke has been doing and that is what happened in Western Australia.

We must look on the positive side. Queensland has lower taxation and no fuel tax, which makes a big difference in encouraging people to come to this State. Queensland has a 7 per cent annual population growth rate. Last year, Queensland, which has only 17 per cent of the national population, accounted for 22 per cent of the national employment growth. The Opposition does not appreciate that growth. People come to live in Queensland because they receive support.

Mr Smyth interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! I remind the honourable member for Bowen that he should not be interjecting from other than his usual seat.

Mr STEPHAN: It does not really matter, because the honourable member does not know what he is talking about.

Opposition members do not like the positive side of Queensland. It is obvious that they do not like to see growth in Queensland or what it has to offer to the other States. People from Victoria and South Australia are coming to Queensland because of what it has to offer. The resultant increase in population and production makes a big contribution to the rest of Australia and allows Queensland to lead the way, which it will continue to do for a long time to come.

Mr BEANLAND (Toowong) (12.15 p.m.): Firstly, I congratulate Mr Lingard on his being again elected Speaker of this House. I wish him well.

Since the release of the Fitzgerald report we have seen a man, a Government, unspoil by mediocrity. I think that highlights what has happened over the last few days. In fact, in a total of 11 minutes we witnessed the report's introduction into this House by the Premier. The Premier has said that the report is his platform, his reform, his guide for the future and that it is his report. We all know whose report it is. We all know who commenced the inquiry. It was Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen and his Government which commenced the inquiry, not Mr Ahern's Government at all.

In the last few days we have witnessed a further gulf between the actions and words of this Government. Members were given some 48 hours in which to consider the report and two days in which to debate it. Nothing much has changed since then except that the Government knew apparently two weeks ago that certain matters were to come before the House and that the Speaker would then make certain suggestions in such a way that would perhaps provide the Government of the day with an opportunity to sack him. That is exactly what happened. In this place and elsewhere the Premier has indicated clearly that he knew some two weeks ago what was to happen.

Yet in the last couple of days all we have heard about is conspiracy. When I hear talk of conspiracy I am reminded of Mr Angelo Vasta's remarks about conspiracy, and I think Mike Ahern's remarks about conspiracy can be put into the same vein: they are desperate men in desperate times; they care but not for the truth.

Since the commencement of the Fitzgerald inquiry and the presentation of the report to this place, nothing has changed. It is still business as usual. It is worth noting that, last year, under the Ahern Premiership, approximately 15 per cent fewer questions were asked in this House than were asked under the reign of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen during the previous year. That means that members of this Parliament had much less opportunity to question the Ministry and to put it to the test, which is one of the fundamental features of the Westminster system. It is little wonder that Mr Fitzgerald makes a scathing attack upon the Executive arm, the Government itself and the manner in which the Government treats Parliament.

The Fitzgerald report should have been introduced and allowed to lie on the table of the House for a week so that all honourable members could sit down, examine it thoroughly and carefully and then, with considered views, return to this House to take part in the debate on it. But that has not happened. That sort of thing rarely happens. That is the reason why this place is not the effective forum that it ought to be. That has been clearly highlighted by Mr Fitzgerald on page 123 of his report under the heading "The Political Context".

In that section he highlights in great detail that "Parliament must have sufficient resources to enable it properly to research topics and evaluate Government proposals. Parliament can easily be prevented from properly performing its role by being denied time and resources." Time is one of the most important elements in the debate on this report. Mr Fitzgerald's words apply to what is happening in relation to that.

The Premier has said a great deal about the fact that the Government will set up the commissions that Mr Fitzgerald has suggested and that in the near future, on 29 August, the electoral and administrative review commission will be set up. It is fine to set up commissions to review such things as the zonal gerrymander.

I was interested to hear the statement by the member for Gympie, Mr Stephan, about the gerrymander. He compared the four-zonal gerrymander system that exists in Queensland with the way in which the electoral systems operate in other States. There are of course a number of significant differences. One of the most important features of the zonal gerrymander is that it entrenches a political party in power. It enables one political party to win 15 to 20 seats before it even goes to the polls. It is no use the honourable member's raising these points, because one of the very fundamental features that Mr Fitzgerald points out in his report is the way in which a zonal gerrymander system operates. The boundaries can be rearranged in a number of ways to give a political party all sorts of results.

The Labor Parties in other States have adopted some of the other systems. In New South Wales the Labor Party adopted an electoral system that required the Liberal and National Parties to gain 52.7 per cent of the vote in order to win office. In Western Australia, 53 per cent of the vote was not enough to overtake the gerrymander that the Labor Party in that State put in place. However, that is a different style of gerrymander from that which operates in this State, where there is an entrenchment of one political party in power. I suggest that the member for Gympie re-read carefully the sections of the Fitzgerald report that relate to the zonal gerrymander system.

It is clear that consideration should be given not only to the commissions but also to the appointment of all-party committees. There is no reason why the all-party committees cannot be appointed immediately. The Leader of the Liberal Party has highlighted that and made the point over and over again that while this House is sitting today those committees ought to be appointed so that they can examine every aspect of the operations of the commissions, including the placing of advertisements, which is vital and which can be an important consideration in assessing the applicants who apply for appointment to them.

One notices that, after being battered in the media and in public, generally, the Premier has decided to support the gerrymandered electoral system's being examined by the electoral commission. He has indicated that the Government will abide by the report of that commission.

The next very important matter that must be raised is the type of personnel who will be appointed to the commissions. The appointments are, of course, very vital to the outcome. It is to be hoped that a broad cross-section of people from fields totally removed from the political sphere, as suggested in the recommendations, will be appointed. Mr Fitzgerald refers in his recommendations to the members being selected "to find a balance of people from academic, public or private administrative, legal, and industrial backgrounds." Unless the Government adheres to that recommendation, again it will come to grief because of its own follies.

Quite clearly, it is time for the Government to look very closely at these recommendations, as well as various other facets of the report. Mr Fitzgerald has gone into great detail in the section on financial controls and interests. He very significantly highlights a point that has been made time and again by the Liberal Party in this Parliament, that a more strengthened role should be given to the Auditor-General, particularly when it comes to ministerial expenses and audit responsibilities. Of course, audits of ministerial expenses have not been carried out. In the past, ministerial expenses have not been tabled in the Parliament, despite requests made by members of the Liberal Party. Obviously, Mr Fitzgerald took note of notice of motion No. 25 that appears in the business paper under the name of Mr Innes, the Leader of the Liberal Party. The very point that for many years ministerial expenses have not been tabled as they ought to have been is mentioned in the report. Mr Fitzgerald is highly critical of drawing

ministerial expenses, cash advances and so forth. The role of the Auditor-General should be strengthened, and he should be given improved powers for internal auditing.

Although Mr Fitzgerald did not make a recommendation in relation to the function of internal auditing, nevertheless he sets out the following statement on page 135 of the report, which reads—

“The internal audit approach is a well accepted element of the control and evaluation processes necessary for the effective functioning of departments. It complements the role of the Auditor-General by providing a cyclic programme of review and improvement action which is in turn able to be reviewed by the Auditor-General’s officers during their audit investigations.”

No recommendations have been made by Mr Fitzgerald in relation to internal auditing, but it is quite clear that under the new arrangements that have come into place, some departments have not fully set up internal auditing procedures. I believe that, in accordance with what the Liberal Party has been requesting, there should be a return to the Internal Operational Audit Service so that a centralised, internal auditing operation is in place. Centralised control is vital if the trouble that this Government has found itself in recently—people being brought before the courts for taking funds that belong to the State—is to be avoided.

Mr Forster, who was the Director of the Internal Operational Audit Service, has been given a very creditable approval-rating by Mr Fitzgerald, who has praised him on a number of occasions. Mr Forster is the very person who was in charge of that internal audit service and he should be still carrying out that service. The service was axed by the Government because it had found other ways in which to undertake audit processes, which should have been strengthened earlier. I look forward to that matter being taken up by the Government to strengthen the internal audit procedure. Problems associated with ministerial expenses have already been mentioned. A call has been made for the tabling of those expenses.

The report highlights land deals as a source of very spectacular transactions that perhaps involve some corruption. The practice of ministerial rezonings is clearly tied up with those transactions, yet the Government maintains a business-as-usual attitude. In spite of the fact that Mr Ahern went as far as stating that he had fears of corruption within local government councils, no local authority has been chastised by the Fitzgerald report. Certainly questions might be raised by people such as I in relation to the handling of accommodation and travelling expenses in a Labor council such as the Ipswich City Council. Perhaps questions could be asked about the advertising expenses incurred by the Townsville City Council. Although those matters have been raised previously in this House, the Government has seen fit not to pursue those inquiries with the councils concerned.

Mr Stephan: I thought Sallyanne Atkinson was looking for ministerial rezonings.

Mr BEANLAND: I think the member for Gympie is rather confused. Obviously, he is not quite sure what ministerial rezonings are all about.

Pages and pages of the report highlight the way in which this Government uses ministerial rezonings to further the interest of the National Party. Local authorities have stood up very well to the test applied by Mr Fitzgerald, and I believe this Government is trying to take the heat off itself by smearing and casting aspersions on local authorities. It is very unfortunate that the Premier has tried to make out that local authorities are in some way involved in land deals. Local authorities in Queensland have a very fine record of which all Queenslanders can be proud.

In recent times, the Government has shown that it is still carrying out ministerial rezonings. One is presently being undertaken at Biggera Waters on the Gold Coast, which is the area in which many of the transactions referred to by Mr Fitzgerald have occurred in the past. No reason has been given for this Government’s rezoning of the Lewis Land Corporation land. The Minister or the Government has not indicated that the Gold Coast City Council could not handle this rezoning. If one looks closely at the

rezoning, one cannot help but notice that Gibbs Holdings Pty Ltd—a company in which Mr Ivan Gibbs, a member of this Parliament, is involved—has some land adjacent to the land owned by the Lewis Land Corporation which has been subjected to this ministerial rezoning. It may be a coincidence and there may be all sorts of reasons for this ministerial rezoning, but not one reason has been put forward by the Minister.

There can be no justification for it, because time and time again the Gold Coast City Council has indicated that it is able and capable, and is prepared to look at the proposal in great detail. I am sure that the council would give consideration to certain aspects of the rezoning for this 80.5 hectare site that is owned by the Lewis Land Corporation. However, the Government is not prepared to leave it to the council. It is concerned that the council will not proceed because of real town-planning considerations. In fact this rezoning will have the effect of throwing out large portions of the Gold Coast town plan. Because of all these factors—and no doubt other factors that the Government does not want to make public because they could be very embarrassing—the Government is now proceeding with this ministerial rezoning.

This is not good enough. These are the very points that Mr Fitzgerald has raised over and over again. The Premier has learnt absolutely nothing from the Fitzgerald report. In spite of the fact that two years has gone by and \$24m has been spent, the Government of the day is still proceeding in the same underhanded manner as it has proceeded in the past. No doubt problems will continue to occur in the future, because this rezoning involves 47 uses and it will change a huge area of the Gold Coast. It will be crippling to small businesses, it will have a very detrimental effect upon residential areas of the coast and it will change the character of large sections of the area. At one stroke of a pen it will wipe out the whole operation of the Gold Coast City Council town plan. This matter is of grave concern to all members of Parliament and the community at large, but, even after all the rumours abounding about Mr Gibbs' land and other people owning land in the area, it appears that the Government intends to proceed.

In his report Mr Fitzgerald talks at great length about self-funding and how the Government can improve many facets of law and order and crime detection by making them self-funding. The Premier has not spoken one word about this matter. For example, Mr Fitzgerald recommended that stamp duty be increased on all motor vehicle policies and that the funds so raised be made available for use in combatting motor vehicle theft. He also recommends that there be an increase in household and business insurance policies. Everyone is aware of the windfall that the Government has received from stamp duty in the last nine months due to amendments to the Stamp Duty Act. There is no need for the Government to use Mr Fitzgerald to tax the citizens of this State once again. It has already done that, and the additional revenue that will allow these parts of the Fitzgerald report to be put in place is already flowing in, although Heaven help us if we end up creating a criminal justice commission that employs 1 000 people, as has already been suggested.

It is relevant to note that in the last financial year revenue from stamp duty increased by \$213m over that for the previous financial year. Revenue received from land tax has increased by \$43m in the first nine months of the last financial year compared with the figure for the first nine months of the previous financial year. Revenue from pay-roll tax has increased by \$47m. The State Government is acquiring a windfall of funds that will enable it to implement large sections of the Fitzgerald report without the Premier turning up at Budget-time and increasing these taxes on the citizens of this State to enable the Fitzgerald report recommendations to be put in place. I highlight the point that Mr Fitzgerald has not made any recommendations, but in his report he pointed out how self-funding can take place.

It is very disappointing that, after all this money has been spent, the issue of drugs has not been tackled. Drug-trafficking leads to large-scale criminal elements and powerful criminal organisations taking over. I believed that, because of the enormous amount of

manpower that was made available to the inquiry, the drugs issue would have been taken up at the outset.

In his report Mr Fitzgerald highlights how organised crime hampers investigation simply through its sophistication and the laundering of its money, so that it can become legitimate. The organisers of crime have access to professional advice and, if organised crime is to be tackled in the manner outlined in the report, it can be tackled only at a price to civil liberties and our individual rights. Already the issue of telephone-tapping has been raised. That will occur more and more in the community if professional, organised crime is to be tackled in the way recommended in this report. This matter must be handled with a great deal of care so that McCarthyism does not occur in this State. On a few occasions this has already happened through the media whilst Mr Fitzgerald was conducting his inquiry. On the way through a number of innocent people have been smeared and possibly accused of committing crimes of which they are completely innocent. That highlights the importance of being extremely careful when putting into place the powers of any commission into organised crime.

I wish to touch quickly on a couple of facets of the report, particularly the part that highlights misleading police statistics. The report states—

“Unfortunately, the level of community awareness about the seriousness of the crime prevention and control problem has been masked by the nature and presentation of Police Department statistics in recent years.”

That highlights the fact that the Ministers of the day have not pursued these reports as closely as they might have and that the information contained in the reports that have been tabled in this place by Ministers has been misleading. This raises a number of serious questions. What other reports tabled in this House have been equally misleading? Over recent times, crime and law and order have been such vital issues, so the statistics are particularly important. Of course, the Government has been trying to play down the issue and the Opposition has been trying to play it up. However, it has been the people in the community who have been suffering while this has been going on. The Government has been using these misleading statistics to its own benefit.

Quite clearly there is a close correlation between these misleading statistics and the role that the police have played. The police always like to play up the relationship between the number of crimes that have been detected and the number cleared up. In so many areas, those statistics mean absolutely nothing at all, as we are now finding out. The crime rate has been sky-rocketing and police detection and prosecution have been falling behind markedly. In recent years, in relation to crime detection and the actions of the police, clearly the Government has been on the wrong track.

I call on the Minister and the Government to pay a great deal more attention to this matter. After all, Mr Fitzgerald highlighted the need to get police back onto the beat, the need for police to be out there in the community patrolling, and the need for more local police stations so that people can see that the thin blue line is out there on the job and so that other people will be deterred from going around from suburb to suburb and from street to street committing the offences that occur every day and that have been highlighted in the Fitzgerald report. It is Mr Fitzgerald who believes that this is what is required; it is not what the Government wants, which is the abolition of local suburban police stations, just as over recent years there has been the abolition of police patrols—men on the beat—and fewer and fewer patrols in vehicles. The number of police per head of population has been decreasing, and decreasing markedly.

These things that have been highlighted are of enormous concern to the community. These are the things that affect people, that affect everyone's constituents day in and day out. They want to be able to go home and know that their place is secure and in the same condition as they left it. They do not want to get home to find they have been robbed, that there is still someone in there or that they will be bashed when they walk in the front door. Although this has been highlighted in the report, it is something for which the Government does not have an answer. The Government has to acknowledge the fact that over recent years it has been guilty of neglect.

The bottom line of the whole report highlights the abolition of the four zonal system and the need to set up a commission of inquiry to bring down a report. Mr Fitzgerald makes the point over and over again that the current electoral zonal system is the bottom line of his report. That is the reason he made it the very first recommendation.

Mr Newton: It has nothing to do with corruption.

Mr BEANLAND: He made it not recommendation No. 8, 9 or 10, but recommendation No. 1. He said—

“There is a vital need for the existing electoral boundaries to be examined by an open, independent inquiry as a first step to the rehabilitation of social cohesion, public accountability and respect for authority.”

He is speaking of the very problems faced by this State—not just problems contained in the report, but problems that have to be faced by this Parliament to get back respectability which, by the Government’s own actions, particularly in the last 48 hours, it has lost. So it is terribly important to rectify this State’s zonal electoral system and get back respect for Parliament and respect for the members of this House. With a proper redistribution and a proper electoral system, that will certainly flow.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (12.43 p.m.): I have a great deal of pleasure in standing here to support the Government for the presentation of the Fitzgerald report and to say quite frankly and in the most unambiguous terms possible that I am proud to be a member of the Ahern National Party Government, which is one of the few Governments in Australia and, indeed, in the world which has had the courage to set up such a commission of inquiry. It is unique in the sense that, not only has it had that courage but also it has had the guts to take the inquiry’s recommendations and say, “We will implement them.” The Government has given that undertaking to the people of Queensland.

I can stand here today with a great deal of pride indeed and say that that is a great thing for Queensland and for Australia because, of itself, it will challenge the rest of Australia to do the same thing. If they do not do the same thing, well could the Australian people and the media ask, “Why not? Why aren’t they prepared to do that? Why aren’t they prepared to parade themselves in public, warts and all? Why aren’t they prepared to give a commitment to reform?” The reason is that they are scared out of their wits. During the course of my contribution to this debate I will canvass that point in great detail.

After looking at the report and hearing the comments in this House, I have concluded that there is a new trinity: the Bible, the Koran and the Fitzgerald report. Each one of them is almost infallible. According to some members who have spoken in this House, everything in this document is so untouchable that it ought to be inscribed for all eternity in stone around the walls of this place. The fact of the matter is that this report has several major flaws and I intend to deal with several of them.

When honourable members are considering and debating a report that comes in the form of recommendations to a Parliament, they have to ask themselves four questions. The first is: are the basic assumptions on which this report is built correct? Is it defective in any way? I intend pointing out to the House that there are four major defects in this report.

Mr PREST: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

Mr HENDERSON: The second question that has to be asked is: what lessons can we learn from past royal commissions? Why is it that 27 out of 30 royal commissions conducted in Australia in recent times have come to nothing? Honourable members should consider the tremendous expenditure on resources, people, talent and time. Those 27 royal commissions have had no impact whatsoever. We should ask ourselves why

that has occurred. Do we have to reinvent the wheel every time? When we are dealing with royal commissions, how do we avoid past mistakes? I intend to deal with that point.

I turn now to the third question. When we have a report which provides a blueprint for reform, we must ask ourselves if we have the resolve, the resources, the purpose, the vision, the skills and the integrity to implement it.

The final question is: what must we do to ensure that the report is implemented?

I will now deal with each of the questions that I have asked the House. One of the most remarkable statements that I have read in a long time was made by the Leader of the Opposition. Because it is one of the most extraordinary pieces of rubbish that I have ever read, I will draw it to the attention of the House. He was talking about redistribution, and he said—

“That is very important, because in the heart of that plea lies the only hope that this State has for good government, and in good government, based on good and honest electoral laws, lies the only hope for an honest, respected and efficient police force, for a Justice Department that does its job without fear or favour instead of doing its job in the shoddy way that Fitzgerald says in his report . . .”

We must ask ourselves the fundamental question: what is the relationship between corruption and electoral systems and electoral laws? In order to answer that question, we must find somewhere in the world an electoral system, an electoral boundary or a government form in which corruption does not exist and follow that model. We can search churches, Governments and homes. It does not matter where we go; where there are people, there is corruption. I am not proud to stand in this Parliament today to say that it is found even in the churches. We do not want to set up a theocracy here, because it is probably as bad as a democracy.

No matter what electoral system is used, corruption exists. It is impossible to get an electoral system without corruption. Therefore, one must say, as an empirical statement of fact, that corruption is not a derivative of an electoral system. It has nothing to do with an electoral system.

Mr Elliott: It is a derivative of immoral people.

Mr HENDERSON: That is right; it is a derivative of people.

We could redistribute the entire world and corruption would still exist. We could introduce one vote, one value and corruption would still exist. I have in my hand the reports of 30 royal commissions. The first one is the royal commission into the Hamer Government in Victoria, which was elected upon one vote, one value. It is a massive indictment of corruption within the Victorian police system. To read in chapter 7, pages 50 to 59, of the report what the police got up to would cause the rest of my hair to fall out of my head and also that of other members in the Chamber.

Mr Veivers: And it was cleaned up by Doug Jennings.

Mr HENDERSON: Yes. Honourable members should read the late Doug Jennings' speeches to this Parliament to ascertain what effect one vote, one value has on corruption. It has no effect.

Absurd and nonsensical statements have been made in this Parliament that somehow or other we will wave a magic wand across Queensland, redistribute the boundaries, and immediately corruption will disappear. Those statements are nonsense of the highest order. It is unworthy of any member of Parliament to speak such unmitigated rubbish in this Parliament.

Mr Newton interjected.

Mr HENDERSON: A minute ago, the honourable member for Toowong made exactly that statement.

The fact is that we will rid the world of corruption when we change basic human nature. It has nothing to do with Governments. As my good friend the member for Southport pointed out last night, the United States of America and Japan are not run by altar boys, wine-servers and choirboys; they are run by the Mafia, the teamsters, womanisers, corruption experts and so on. That is what they are, and that is under so-called fair electoral systems. I have never heard such absolute nonsense in my life as the statement that somehow or other this whole report is built upon an electoral redistribution and that when that electoral redistribution takes place, that will be the end of corruption. Rubbish! Utter, complete nonsense! The fact of the matter is that the electoral system has no relationship whatsoever to corruption. Corruption is a product of people; it is not a product of electoral systems.

The next thing that honourable members have to ask themselves when dealing with this particular report is: how much understanding does it show of the basic Westminster system of government that we have in this country? On two occasions at meetings at which I have been present, the Premier has asked the question: where did Mr Fitzgerald get the model that he talks about in this report?

I suggest to honourable members that they read the speech that the Leader of the Liberal Party made last night in this Chamber. I suggest that he made points in that speech that they would find are very, very worthwhile reading. The fact of the matter is that this State operates under a Westminster system of government, and people were prepared to lay down their lives and fight over centuries to evolve that system of government.

The greatest threat to the Westminster system of government is in this report, and that was pointed out by the Leader of the Liberal Party. This is a very, very subtle and clever attempt at changing the Westminster system of government in very many ways. It suggests an almost total abdication of the basic principles of ministerial responsibility. I suggest again that honourable members read the speech of the Leader of the Liberal Party and take note of the comments that the Premier has made, of which I am aware.

The fact of the matter is that Mr Fitzgerald is talking about a United States congressional model, with its basic system of committees and so on. It is not a Westminster system at all. I warn honourable members that we are going to tinker with that system at very great peril indeed and I say that we ought to think carefully before we start down a track that some of us feel is probably the wrong track to go down. That is not to say that the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry should not be implemented. What I am saying is that they should be introduced with caution and we should show a willingness at least to be aware of the fact that there are pitfalls in what is recommended in this report.

I was also interested to hear the speech by the member for Mount Isa last night. He said that the basic structures that Mr Fitzgerald recommends could need a staff of about 1 000 people. Can honourable members imagine that juggernaut running wild in Queensland?

Mr Simpson: A bureaucratic nightmare.

Mr HENDERSON: Yes, a bureaucratic nightmare of the highest order; but then again, I am aware of the fact that Mr Fitzgerald probably has a commitment to that.

The next thing that I wanted to draw to the attention of the House is a very interesting interview with Bob Bottom that I saw on television. I think it was on the *7.30 Report* on Tuesday, 4 July. That report was devastating in its penetrating analysis of the criminal justice commission that is recommended in this report. The fact of the matter is that we are not going to get criminal justice at all unless we are very, very aware of the intrinsic weaknesses within such a commission. I urge every honourable member to watch that interview that appeared on television. It was extremely incisive in terms of its analysis.

Mr Simpson: A separation of powers.

Mr HENDERSON: That is right.

Mr Simpson: Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen was accused of not knowing what it was and now Fitzgerald is saying, "Ah, we've got to have the politicians controlling the whole thing."

Mr HENDERSON: Yes, the whole thing, no independence at all.

Mr Simpson: Going the other way.

Mr HENDERSON: Yes, in exactly the opposite direction.

I want to draw to the attention of honourable members a fourth shortcoming in this report, and that is the fact that it singularly fails to address the most important problem in our society, which is drugs. I realise that there are reasons for that; I am well aware of them. However, if the report has failed to address the problem of drugs, what about the issue of pornography? It is worth while reading Mr Fitzgerald's comments.

I seek leave to table a series of documents that are grossly obscene and indecent, yet are available today in Queensland. Mr Fitzgerald does not address this problem. I seek leave accordingly.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr HENDERSON: Those issues are not addressed in the Fitzgerald report. I think that the children of Queensland are going to suffer infinitely more damage from reading this outrageously indecent material than from anything that has come out of the Fitzgerald inquiry. This is a greater danger and infinitely more threatening to the future welfare of this society. I hope some honourable members take the time to look at these documents. I have got an envelope full of them, and that is just a sample.

Another question that I want to ask is: what can we learn from past royal commissions? Do we have to keep reinventing the wheel? How do we avoid repeating past mistakes? Once again, I draw the attention of the House to the folder that I am holding in my hand which Mrs Nelson has rather kindly lent to me. Why is it that 27 of the 30 royal commissions that are mentioned in these documents have virtually come to nothing?

I ask honourable members to think about the Costigan royal commission. The documents relating to that commission were tabled in this Parliament less than three years ago. Do honourable members remember the things that that royal commission uncovered in relation to the Painters and Dockers Union? Do they remember the inquiries into Norm Gallagher? Do members of the Opposition want the Government to inquire into the Waterside Workers Federation, the murderous activities of the Painters and Dockers Union and so on? Do they want to be reminded of Goanna—who Goanna was and what he has done? What did that royal commission come to? Absolutely nothing! That royal commission was just a phantom royal commission, a Clayton's royal commission, which has probably had very little impact on the Australian scene.

Why is it then that so many royal commissions apparently fail? Why is it that, despite the enormous expense and resources that are incurred in conducting them, they never seem to come up with any significant changes in Australian society? I remind honourable members that these documents contain some of the most noble, far-reaching reforms suggested anywhere in Australia, from New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and the Commonwealth—all operating under one vote, one value systems. I invite honourable members to look at all of these documents in my hand. Has not corruption thrived under one vote, one value?

Those 30 royal commissions, which resulted in the creation of the greatest job-creation schemes that one could find anywhere in the world, all occurred under a one vote, one value system. Honourable members need only look at all the jobs that were created as a result of those royal commissions. That takes me back to what I was saying

about there being no relationship between electoral systems and royal commissions. Why have these royal commissions failed? There are three reasons, and I have examined them very carefully. The first reason is that politicians are pre-eminently creatures of survival.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

Debate interrupted.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Defamation Action by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen against Mr Warburton

Hon. M. J. AHERN (Landsborough—Premier and Treasurer and Minister for State Development and the Arts) (2.30 p.m.), by leave: In the House yesterday, the honourable member for Sandgate raised a matter relating to the defamation writs taken out by the former member for Barambah. He drew attention to a remark by Mr Fitzgerald on page 120 of his report that a writ had been taken out against the honourable member at public expense.

An examination of files held in my department has revealed that, on 10 September 1986, Messrs Morris Fletcher and Cross, solicitors acting for the then Premier, the former member for Barambah, wrote to the secretary to the Premier detailing current actions that they were prosecuting on his behalf.

Included in that list of actions are three marked with an asterisk—

“* 3373/86 Johannes Bjelke-Petersen v Neville George Warburton.”

Is that the honourable member?

Mr Warburton: That’s me.

Mr AHERN: The other actions are—

“* 3374/86 Johannes Bjelke-Petersen v Australian Broadcasting Commission

* 3375/86 Johannes Bjelke-Petersen v Brisbane TV Limited.”

The solicitors state—

“So far as we are aware the only actions in the list set out above for which the Premier has said that he would personally bear the costs are the three actions marked with the asterisk, all of which actions relate to allegations concerning the settlement by the Premier of a previous defamation action against Channel 9.”

My department has confirmed with Messrs Morris Fletcher and Cross yesterday afternoon that Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen is responsible for meeting the costs associated with the action involving the honourable member for Sandgate. This has been confirmed again this morning and they will be looking to him to bear all the costs involved.

REPORT OF FITZGERALD COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Debate resumed.

Mr HENDERSON (Mount Gravatt) (2.32 p.m.): Before the luncheon recess I was dealing with the basic question of why it is that of the 30 royal commissions and commissions of inquiry that have been held in Australia in recent times, very few of them have been implemented by Governments. I pointed out that the first reason of all is that it comes down to a basic question of survival. The fact of the matter is that many royal commissions have really touched at the hearts of Governments and they have therefore backed off them. They have said, “No, we cannot implement these. They might cost us government. They might cost us the Treasury benches of this State.” My whole speech to this Parliament today is summed up in a simple statement: if people are condemned to damnation for doing the right thing, then no-one will ever do the right thing; evil will certainly triumph.

I am proud of the fact that in relation to the Fitzgerald inquiry the Ahern Government has said, "We are going to implement its recommendations regardless of the cost and regardless of how it threatens us. We are going to do it." The Premier has given that undertaking and that commitment. I believe him. I am proud to stand here and be one of the persons who will implement the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry. We are determined that we are going to succeed. If the public of Queensland at the next State election should condemn us for righteousness and doing the right thing, you mark my word, Mr Deputy Speaker, no Government in Australia in future will have the guts to face up to the real issues of corruption. No-one will ever do that, because he knows that his survival will be threatened.

The next reason for the failure of royal commissions is that they cut too close to the bone. I find it interesting that royal commissions have inevitably touched upon union power, such as the Costigan royal commission into the painters and dockers and the inquiry into the Builders Labourers Federation. Why do we not have an inquiry into the Transport Workers Union, the Liquor and Allied Trades Union and other unions? Inquiries are not conducted into those unions, because they come too close to home. That is why Labor Governments back off many royal commissions and why they cannot face up to them—because they threaten their very base.

Mr Stoneman: The ETU.

Mr HENDERSON: The ETU and other unions.

The other reason why royal commissions oftentimes fail is that Governments simply do not want them to succeed, so they do not give them the money and the staff to succeed. To the great credit of the Ahern Government in this State, a commitment has been given that this commission of inquiry will succeed. We are prepared to place our Government on the line to the people of Queensland. We are prepared to resource the commission and we are prepared to cut close to the bone. We are not going to back off anything. The Premier has given that commitment. Mark my word—we will succeed in doing it. The people of Queensland will appreciate that.

The third question we must ask ourselves is simply this: do we have the resolve, the resources, the purpose, the vision, the skills and the integrity to carry out the recommendations of a royal commission? To all of those questions I say, "Yes, we do." Let us look at them. Do we have the resolve? Honourable members heard the Premier stand in this House and say, "We will do it. We promise the people of Queensland that we will do it." And we will do it! Do we have the resources? The commission of inquiry was financed to the tune of \$21m. It has been allowed to continue. The Government is resourcing it—it is financing the inquiry. We are determined that it is going to succeed.

Do we have the purpose or the vision to do that? Yes, we do, because the Premier's vision of Queensland is a vision of excellence; it is a quality Queensland, not a corrupt Queensland. It will stay that way. We are determined to press on. Queensland will not just be the most economically sound State in Australia, it will be the best State on every issue. We have that as part of a vision of drive.

Do we have the skills? We recognise in Queensland that we will have to get the very best people to do the job. That is why we are looking throughout the world. People are being brought in. We are saying, "This is the job. We want the right people to do it and we are determined to do it." And we are going to do it!

Finally, do we have the integrity and the honesty to do it? Even the Leader of the Opposition has admitted that Mike Ahern is an honest man and a man of integrity. He has given the people of Queensland this commitment. "We are going to do it" are the words of an honest man, a man of integrity.

The Queensland Government says that it has the resolve, it has the resources, the purpose and the vision so that the people of Queensland will receive the skills that are needed. The Queensland Government has the integrity to do it, and it will be done.

The fourth question that must be asked is this: what do we have to do to get started? The first thing that must be remembered is that a journey of a thousand miles begins with but a single step. The day after the commission of inquiry was announced, we got under way. We put our car in top gear and away we went. We were determined to implement the recommendations. The Government recognised that the inquiry could not be carried out overnight. The ultimate hypocrisy in this House is to hear the criticism of members of the Opposition condemning the Government every time they believe that the Government is rushing legislation through the House. Members of the Opposition are now crying, "Rush it through. Bring it in. Here is the timetable. We are going to set the agenda for you", and so on. What hypocrisy! What nonsense!

The Queensland Government is going to do the job with thoroughness and purpose. It is not going to be rushed into anything, whether the Leader of the Opposition rushes into the Chamber with a timetable or not. The Queensland Government is going to do it so that it is done properly. That does not necessarily mean that it will be done slowly; it means that when it is put in place it will be the right way of going about things. The Queensland Government will get it right.

I want to summarise what I have said today under seven points. First of all, there is no relationship whatsoever between electoral boundaries and corruption—none whatsoever. Corruption exists under every electoral system.

Secondly, I wish to mention the so-called one vote, one value system that Opposition members are harping about as if it is feeding time at the Currumbin bird sanctuary. Let me look at that particular system. In Tasmania under the Hare-Clarke proportional representation voting system, which is presumably fair, the Labor Party governs with only 34 per cent of the vote, but the Liberal Party, with 46 per cent of the vote, is in Opposition. In Western Australia, the Government has 43 per cent of the vote, but the Liberal Party, which has 47 per cent of the vote, is in Opposition.

Let me look at the famous Hawke Government. At the last Federal election in July 1987 the Labor Party got 49.87 per cent of the vote and won 86 seats. However, the Liberal/National Party coalition, which got 45.84 per cent of the vote, won only 63 seats. Is that fair in accordance with the principles that Opposition members talk about? What rubbish!

Mr Gately: They want to disadvantage people in country areas.

Mr HENDERSON: That is right.

In New South Wales, which supposedly has a one vote, one value system, the Greiner Government needed about 53 per cent of the vote to win the election. There is no such thing as a fair electoral system. It is fair only if the people who are involved in it make it fair. My Government has given a commitment to the people of Queensland and has laid its cards on the table.

Mr Gygar: You are going to get 39.5 per cent next time and govern, are you?

Mr HENDERSON: As usual, the Stafford high-flyer is interjecting. Yesterday, the member for Aspley dealt with him rather well.

The third point that I wish to make is that this Government must be careful and must think. Fools rush in where angels fear to tread. Opposition members want to set the agenda for the implementation of the Fitzgerald report. They are preaching independence one moment and then wanting to do everything themselves the next. They call that independence but I call it intrusion. They have the hide to say, "We will set the program, draw up the dates and do it our way." My Government is treading carefully to avoid many of the mistakes that could be made.

Fourthly, I am very disappointed that the Fitzgerald inquiry did not deal more fully with the question of drugs and pornography. Today in this Parliament, I tabled some documents that I hope members will peruse so that they can see the grossly obscene material that can be bought today in this city.

Fifthly, we must learn our lessons from the past. We must have the guts to go on. The Ahern Government has done that.

Sixthly, in the midst of all of this there must be a resolve to do the right thing. The Ahern Government has resolved to implement the recommendations that are contained in the Fitzgerald report.

Finally, when all of the recommendations have been implemented, we will say, "Let's go!" I am excited by the prospect of being part and parcel of the exciting journey down that path. My Government will succeed and will be the Government after the next election. It will be part and parcel of the cleaning-up process of this State. That is an exciting thing of which to be a part.

Mr Gygar interjected.

Mr HENDERSON: The honourable member said that before the last election, but I am still here.

If people are condemned to damnation for doing the right thing, no-one will ever do the right thing. I am very confident that this Government will triumph at the end of the year and will be seen to have had the courage and the guts to do the right thing. I am excited to be a part of it. I am proud to be a member of the Ahern Government, proud to support the Fitzgerald inquiry, proud to support the Premier's motion and proud that Government members had the courage in the first place to do the right thing by Queensland and to put their jobs on the line. The people of Queensland will respect that.

As I have said, I am proud to support the Premier. Under the present circumstances and the difficult times in which we find ourselves, I am even more proud to say that I am going to march behind the Premier the whole way and that my Government will do a good job in the process.

Mr De LACY (Cairns) (2.44 p.m.): I take this opportunity of welcoming students from the Nambour State High School. This week in this House there has been a lot of theatre. Unfortunately, on the afternoon when those students have come to watch Parliament, I think that the theatre is nearly finished.

I welcome the Fitzgerald report, as does every member of the Labor Party. We see it as a vindication of years of trying to expose corruption in this State. I realise that many members of the media are slapping themselves on the back, beating their chests and saying that they brought about the inquiry. Admittedly, to a certain extent the *Four Corners* program *The Moonlight State* and certainly a couple of articles written by Phil Dickie in the *Courier-Mail* proved to be the catalyst that caused or shamed the Government to introduce the Fitzgerald report.

For the past one or two decades the Labor Party has been making claims of corruption. Ten or 12 years ago, the late Kevin Hooper could have written a book about the main aspects of corruption, which have now finally been outlined in the Fitzgerald report. The Labor Party feels that it has been vindicated in the report and that all of the things that it has been saying over a long period are right.

Over the years, members of the National Party have taken the exact opposite stance to that of the Labor Party. Every time that Labor Party members highlighted an element of corruption, the National Party said that they did not know what they were talking about and that they were wrong. Justice will always come to the forefront if we wait long enough. The fact is that the Labor Party was right and the National Party was wrong.

I was amused to hear the Premier and Mr Henderson take credit for the Fitzgerald report. The Premier claims that he was responsible for the inquiry. However, the inquiry was announced under the Premiership of his predecessor, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. In one breath the Premier is prepared to accept something that was introduced by Bjelke-Petersen but in another he has a completely new Government that takes no responsibility

for the crime and corruption that flourished under Bjelke-Petersen's Government. The Premier cannot have it both ways.

Mr Henderson, who likes to claim some academic ability with a series of letters after his name, brought about as much academic integrity to his speech as the National Party Government has brought to the whole business of government in this State during the past decade or so. If he does not understand what Mr Fitzgerald has said about the link between a corrupt electoral system, a corrupt Government and a total corruption of the institutions of society, he does not understand what the Fitzgerald report is all about.

It worries me that most members of the National Party Government really have not got the message. They do not understand what Mr Fitzgerald is trying to say. Mr Fitzgerald is a master of understatement. Because he went to the trouble of directing the first recommendation at the need for electoral reform, there is a powerful message there, but that has not sunk home to the members of the National Party.

Mr Henderson and just about every other speaker on the National Party side said that corruption is just the same in New South Wales, Victoria and everywhere else and that the Queensland Government was the only Government that had the courage to do something about it. If honourable members opposite really believe that the deep-seatedness and the breadth of corruption and the way in which it has pervaded all of the institutions of society in Queensland exists in New South Wales, Victoria and everywhere else, they have not understood this report. It is not the same down there. Of course there is corruption in those States; there is corruption everywhere. Probably the only right thing that Mr Henderson said was that it is people who are corrupt.

Mr Hayward: It is endemic.

Mr De LACY: Exactly. It is endemic in every institution in society. It has been caused because of the corruption in the electoral system and the corruption in the Government. That has pervaded all of the institutions of society. If honourable members deny the magnitude of that problem, then they deny Fitzgerald's main message. For half of his speech Mr Henderson spoke about how Fitzgerald was wrong. He said Fitzgerald was wrong in trying to say that the electoral system is responsible for all other kinds of corruption. He also said he was wrong about a number of other matters. But in the end he beat his breast and said that Fitzgerald is right and he will clean out Queensland.

One aspect of the Fitzgerald report causes me a little bit of concern and some apprehension. I know that many people in the community wanted scalps nailed to the wall and that they are disappointed that there are not enough. But there is another side to that, too. Before the inquiry, many innocent people, about whom nothing has been proved, were mentioned adversely. Many of them, of course, received a lot of media coverage. It seems to be a fact that when the allegations were made they received substantial media coverage but when the denials were made, very often they were tucked away deeper in the newspaper, or wherever it was reported, or very often there was no mention of them at all. Many people in Queensland have been accused but they have never really been exonerated. That has affected some people more than others.

As an example of that, I refer to one of the persons who was named in the inquiry's terms of reference, Vince Bellino, who is or was a constituent of mine in Cairns. He was mentioned in the terms of reference together with Gerald Bellino, Antonio Bellino, Vittorio Conte and Hector Hapeta. The inquiry was commissioned to inquire into whether or not these people "were directly or indirectly concerned with or involved in the use, keeping, management or control of premises" which were involved in prostitution, unlawful gambling or the sale or disposal by any other means of illegal drugs. The inquiry was also asked to inquire whether those same people were involved in corruption with politicians and police and whether or not they made corrupt payments to political parties.

The inquiry has now finished. I have no special brief for Mr Bellino as a person; I am not sure that I have even met him. The inquiry really has destroyed his life. He

has lost a lot of money, his home and his business, which employed 40 to 50 people, and he has certainly lost his reputation. He has been accused of being a Mafia godfather, of growing marijuana, of being a hitman and all sorts of things. He claims he is innocent. As far as I know, nothing occurred in the whole inquiry that substantiated any of those allegations. He told me that he made available——

Mr Menzel: You said you hadn't met him.

Mr De LACY: No, I spoke to him by telephone just the other day.

Mr Bellino claims that he made available for the inquiry 20 years of tax records. I am not aware that anything has been proved in relation to him. He and his family were waiting with bated breath for the release of this report in the hope that he would be exonerated and that once again he could hold his head up high. When he received a copy of the report he saw no mention of himself apart from what appears in the appendix, which sets out the terms of the inquiry. He has not been exonerated; he has not been implicated. There is nothing at all about him in the report. He is left up in the air. In everybody's eyes he is still a guilty person. He and his family received this report with profound disillusionment. In the interests of fair play, most of us ought to feel some sympathy for him.

What will he have to do now? Will he have to wait for a further two years for that knock on the door when a summons will be issued and charges laid against him? It may well be that if charges are laid he will be better off. If charges are never laid, what happens to him? Does he live the rest of his life in that grey area with everybody thinking he is guilty but nobody ever having proved it? Does he have to live with everybody making statements but nobody having said that he is innocent?

He believes that he is entitled, either now or at some time in the future, to some sort of a letter which will state that he is innocent, that is, of course, unless some charges are laid against him and he has to appear before the courts. I suggest that those who are summonsed and charged and who appear before the courts are probably better off than Mr Bellino is if no charges are laid against him. I know that in a number of his discussions before the release of the report Mr Fitzgerald addressed that matter. He said one of the penalties that will have to be paid is that some people will in fact be hurt, but that it needs to be done in order to cleanse our society of the corruption that exists in it.

On page 8 of his report Mr Fitzgerald said that people "are entitled to have it clearly stated that this report makes no adverse finding against or finding in favour of any person". He said that—

"... the community would be badly served by any unnecessary departure from the fundamental presumption of innocence to which each citizen is entitled unless and until tried and convicted."

He further said—

"Every person who was adversely mentioned in evidence before this Inquiry ... is innocent unless and until proven guilty in a court or other appropriate tribunal ..."

That may well be, but in Mr Bellino's case that is not really enough because in most people's eyes he is guilty. Particularly those people who were mentioned in the terms of reference ought to have been mentioned in the report and either cleared—exonerated— or implicated and an indication should have been given whether charges will be laid and what form they will take. I appeal to the Attorney-General to particularly address the ways in which people who are adversely mentioned but against whom nothing of substance was proved can be given official clearance.

I now want to refer to some aspects of the police insofar as that matter affects far-north Queensland and Cairns in particular. This report contains some very valuable information as a result of an analysis of the resources of manpower of the police force. The effectiveness and efficiency of the police force is also analysed. That is really what

it is all about. For many years the report will provide a good reference for people who are interested in the administration of justice and law enforcement in Queensland.

Page 225 of the report contains an analysis of the police numbers and resources, and I draw attention to those statistics. Mr Fitzgerald has used what he calls the Eric St. Johnston ratio, which is a widely recognised basis for studying police-to-population ratios in Australia and other parts of the world. On the basis of that analysis, he has shown that in the far-northern region, there are 301 police officers whereas there ought to be, on the basis of the Eric St. Johnston ratio, 505. Currently 194 police officers are stationed in Cairns, but the adjusted number ought to be 315. In other words, Cairns has only 60 per cent of the number it requires, based on that widely accepted ratio.

I draw to the attention of honourable members that the number of police officers—194—has been the same for approximately the last 15 years. Even though social conditions have deteriorated in a variety of ways and the population has virtually doubled over that period, no substantial increase in police staffing has occurred. I see the honourable member for Mourilyan in the Chamber. In Innisfail, the current police presence is only 53 per cent of the recommended ratio.

However, even that low ratio in Cairns is deficient in important respects. It takes no account of the particular difficulties encountered in policing a region. I put it to honourable members that areas surrounding Cairns are probably more difficult to police than others because of the large itinerant population. At the moment it is in the throes of rapid development. Many of society's structures are breaking down and the area attracts many visitors from overseas, so there are a number of new people in the town. I think it is no secret that the Cairns area has more social problems than other, more stable areas of Queensland. Therefore, Cairns ought to have a higher ratio of police to population than other parts of Queensland.

When the subject of police-to-population ratio is discussed, tourists are not taken into consideration, more particularly at this time of the year which is the height of the season. At any other time, the population of Cairns is at least 20 per cent higher because of tourists. My plea today as the member for Cairns is what it always has been—that is, more police.

Mr Burns: You ought to have some policemen who can speak Japanese.

Mr De LACY: As the member for Lytton says, perhaps Cairns ought to have some policemen who can speak Japanese because it is getting to the stage that Japanese people own the place.

Another aspect of the report that is worthy of mention is what has been referred to as police culture and the insidious way in which this culture developed to lead police to regard themselves as being above the law. The manner in which police have treated the public with a great deal of arrogance and contempt is spelt out in great detail on page 200 and subsequent pages of the report. Cairns has always had difficulty because it is considered an ideal place for pre-retirement leave for superintendents of police. The last place they are sent to before retirement is Cairns. I suppose it was regarded as some sort of idyllic tropical outpost where police superintendents could live, have a drink down at the local hotel and take it easy before they retired. That has been the case for a long period. I am not picking on the current superintendent.

Mr Burns: Some of them were running brothels up there, too.

Mr De LACY: That is right. Cairns received considerable mention in events revealed before the Fitzgerald inquiry. While the inquiry was on, the regional superintendent was Superintendent Cal Farrah, who subsequently admitted to being involved in corruption. Superintendent Kevin Dorries was accused of corruption but died before the charges could be tested. Cairns also has Sergeant Vern Timms, who received national notoriety because of his racist comments in *People* magazine, and I believe that he is still there.

Yesterday the member for Mulgrave defended Kevin Dorries and said that he thought he was pretty straight. I must admit that I do not share the honourable member's

opinion. In my opinion, he epitomised the arrogance of the police which led officers to think that they were not part of the public service. On a number of occasions when I criticised the police—and, as honourable members would know, I do not do that idly but, rather, advisedly—he would make a statement in the local media and criticise me in a very partisan and political way. I believe that that was improper and it is an issue that has been addressed by Mr Fitzgerald. Superintendent Dorries believed he was part of the Government and not a public servant whose responsibility it was to look after the people of Queensland. The police force cannot be seen to be a political arm of the Government.

Mr Hayward: That probably explains Mr Menzel's adulation of him.

Mr De LACY: No, I think that, because of his relationship with Inspector Dorries, to Mr Menzel it appeared that Dorries was a straight cop. I guess that is indicated by the comments he made yesterday when he informed the Parliament that, after he reported an illegal casino operating in the area, Superintendent Dorries closed it down immediately. However, it opened again soon after. Mr Menzel telephoned Superintendent Dorries again and, again, it was closed down. That proves what was going on. The only time he closed the casino down was when a person of influence in the community rang up. If he had been a proper policeman, it would never have opened. He knew it was operating, I knew it was and the honourable member for Mulgrave knew it was.

Mr Menzel: I didn't know it was until somebody told me.

Mr De LACY: Sure. What the honourable member is saying is that he was not gambling at the casino. Well, nor was I.

Mr McElligott: Till the bells rang.

Mr De LACY: That is right. Everybody else in Cairns knew what was going on.

I wish to address the problems associated with watchhouses. I believe that throughout Queensland watchhouses are an absolute disgrace. They are the forgotten area of law-enforcement problems. The prisons have been reviewed and recommendations have been made in the Kennedy report; the police and judicial system have been well covered in the Fitzgerald report and perhaps by the Vasta inquiry; but nobody ever thinks about or looks at addressing the problems associated with watchhouses. They are a grey area; they are in no-man's land. People who are in watchhouses are not in gaol; they are not before the court; nor are they free in society. They appear to have no legal or human rights at all.

The irony is that the majority of people in the watchhouse have not been convicted of any crime. By law, they are innocent until proven guilty. Many of them are never found to be guilty; yet their conditions, legal rights and treatment are far less than if they were convicted prisoners in gaol. Not only are the conditions subhuman but also the treatment handed out to prisoners—and their families, by some police officers—is absolutely reprehensible. Although I believe that that situation applies throughout Queensland, Cairns is the worst example.

The watchhouse in Cairns is an absolute indictment on Queensland society and certainly an indictment on the Queensland Government. The watchhouse buildings are grossly inadequate. Obviously, circumstances will be improved when the new courthouse, police station and watchhouse complex is built, but when will that take place? Estimates of two, three or four years' time have been made. The recent opening of the Lotus Glen prison may reduce the pressure on the Cairns watchhouse, but the prison is also understaffed. The inmates have no rights under the law. Moreover, the attitudinal problems of police are reflected in the worst manner at the Cairns watchhouse.

I have stated very often that policemen in this State have been their own worst enemy, and I will give the House a couple of examples. Earlier this year a constituent of mine, a Cairns businessman, was asked to visit the Cairns Police Station at 5 p.m.

When he had not returned home by 11 p.m., his wife telephoned the police station — it happened again at 3 a.m.—and was told that no information could be made available. On phoning once again at 5 a.m., she was told that her husband had been charged with assault and would be appearing before the Magistrates Court later in the day. When she asked if she could take in some clean clothes for him for his court appearance she was told, “No.” In the mean time the apprehended person had requested permission to telephone his wife during the night and was told by the watchhouse supervisor, “I don’t feel like letting anybody use the phone tonight.” The defendant was also denied the right to telephone a solicitor in the morning prior to attending court.

Mr Hayward interjected.

Mr De LACY: That is exactly right, and I will come to that in a moment.

It would surprise most people in Queensland to know that by law a person charged by police has no right to ring a solicitor. Under the present system, visits, telephone calls or the delivery of personal effects such as clean clothes and food such as fresh fruit to “prisoners” are only allowed at the whim of the watchhouse-keeper—and in Cairns they are mostly denied. It is disgraceful and totally inappropriate in a modern civilised society.

I will give the House another example. I was visited by a person called Ted Eyles, who was not a layabout sort of a person. He showed me his bank book. When he arrived in Cairns he had \$200,000. He was looking for a business. He was apprehended and charged with drink-driving and had a blood alcohol level of .07. He was subsequently sentenced to 14 days in the Cairns watchhouse. The stipendiary magistrate specified that he serve the sentence in the watchhouse, although I do not know why. He was booked on a Tuesday just outside the Commercial Hotel and his unlocked car was parked in front of the hotel from that Tuesday until Saturday. He spent all of the first four or five days trying to get somebody to do something about his car. He asked if he could make a telephone call and he was told by the watchhouse supervisor to go and get “expletive deleted”. That is the response he received when he had still only been charged.

Subsequently he was sentenced and during his 14 days in the watchhouse he was confined to an eight-man cell with four two-man bunks. At one stage there were 32 men in the cell and the blankets had not been changed for weeks. He was given no towel for four days and he was locked up with murderers, armed robbers, deviants, assault merchants and many other types of people. At one stage a 17-year-old was in the cell who was there as the result of a warrant for the non-payment of \$100. There is no segregation; everyone is in together. This man was five days without a toothbrush or a change of underpants and he said the food he was given would not have fed an Ethiopian refugee. Those are his words, not mine. He was given one scoop of baked beans at night-time and every lunch-time for the 15 days he was in the watchhouse he was given two Vegemite sandwiches. The watchhouse-keeper is paid reasonably well to supply the food, but that type of food would not meet any of the nutritional requirements laid down by any authorised body that I am aware of.

He was charged with drink-driving. In the morning when he appeared before the magistrate he had no shoes, because they had been taken away. He was bare footed, handcuffed and he had no soap, no towel and no clean clothes; nothing at all. Honourable members can imagine what he looked like the next morning when he appeared before the magistrate. Obviously the magistrate looks at a person who has been charged and decides whether he or she is a fit and proper person, and impressions count. The man said that the cell was overcrowded at all times. One detainee sat upright and did not lie down for the whole 14 days.

At 8 p.m. on a Friday night the drunks were tipped out of the drunk tank into the cell and they took all the blankets. The people already in the cell could not argue with them, but after only four hours the drunks left. Very often the toilets did not work and there are no windows and no air-conditioning in the Cairns watchhouse. It must be

remembered that Cairns is in the middle of the tropics. There is no exercise yard and the recreation yard was only opened twice in the 15 days that the man was at the watchhouse. He said that nits, scabies, bed sores, ringworm, bed lice and pubic lice were rampant in the watchhouse and the attitude of some of the policemen left a great deal to be desired. They had the arrogant attitude that they are dealing with the scum of the earth and treated the detainees accordingly. Parents and mothers of young kids who were on remand or who had been sentenced to go to Stuart prison for several months would visit to give them clean clothes or something to take away with them, but they were not allowed access. They would be asked to leave the items at the watchhouse and told that the items would be given to the detainees. I have been told that items have been left for three or four days and then thrown away in the rubbish bin.

Mr Smyth: Never delivered.

Mr De LACY: Yes, that is right, they were never delivered, unless someone else saw the items.

At times relief staff would come to the watchhouse. I have been told that some of the older police were very good indeed—but otherwise telephone calls were not allowed and things were not brought in for the prisoners. At times a 22-year-old policeman is on duty and there are 60 or 70 people in the watchhouse.

However, women are even worse off. I have heard stories of 11 women confined overnight in a three-bed cell, two in a single bunk and the rest on blankets on the concrete floor. There are no fans, air-conditioning, clean clothes, showers, bed linen, exercise or visitors. In the middle of a hot, tropical summer the women do not get showers unless one of the watchhouse-keepers is there because the women have to be taken away to shower elsewhere. For five weeks one Aboriginal girl had no change of clothing at all. No tampons are available for them.

Time is running out and I have a letter written by the community development officer of the Cairns Regional Community Council. She is a great person who goes to the watchhouse and looks after the women. She takes them things and makes sure that they are all right. I understand a copy of this letter has been sent to the Minister for Justice and a copy came to me. Before lunch I asked Mr Row for permission to have this letter incorporated. He has had a look at it and it has not been published. I seek leave to have this letter tabled and incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the following document—

CAIRNS REGIONAL COMMUNITY COUNCIL

President:

Secretary:

Box 6432,
Mail Centre
CAIRNS, Qld. 4870
Telephone: (070) 51 9627
or 53 3465
27 February, 1989.

Dear Sir/Madam,

One really questions the worth (if any) of the Kennedy Report to prisoners in the Cairns Watchhouse. The inquiry will improve considerably the lot of prisoners who are fortunate enough to reach a jail, but for the people who are awaiting placement in a jail, or are on a remand or serving out a warrant, their term in the watchhouse is hell.

In some cases (especially for women as there is a shortage of women's accommodation in Queensland prisons), prisoners are held for up to 4 or 5 weeks in the watchhouse.

These people do not receive legal and human rights which reformists have, over the years, fought to secure. Now this may not sound too tragic, but when you are placed in an unventilated, concrete room, which contains only a shared, not too private toilet and washbasin, and a few

bunks (some without mattresses) the Kennedy report becomes a joke. The legislation does not cover watchhouses.

To my mind what makes it more of a mockery is the fact that many of the prisoners have not yet been to trial and by law are innocent until proven guilty.

In my capacity as Community Development Officer for C.R.C.C. I visit the women prisoners and also take messages out for the men.

I applaud the honesty of the police officer who spoke up about the conditions there and support his comments. The place is a disgrace. It robs prisoners of their basic human right to personal hygiene (no decent soap, tooth care facilities, clean clothing and soiled bedding). For women it's worse, they must wait for the keepers to find time to be taken for a shower and if time can't be found then no shower!

I am informed that the food is terrible and not too plentiful and I seriously doubt if it would meet the nutritional standards set down for prisoners. The womens cells are downstairs and the far end one has no ventilation what so ever. Keeping in mind the fact that we live in the tropics, and there is no sign of a fan or air-conditioner, on one night last week, 11 women were locked up in that end 3 bed cell, 2 to a single bunk and the rest on a blanket on the concrete floor. I'm sure this article will offend a lot of people, and its meant to. Who's to blame?

Do we blame the police? No! They are just doing their job, and I'm sure watchhouse duty to them is almost as stressful and frustrating as it is to the prisoners.

They have their duties to perform and the fact that they are almost always over crowded and are 4 men understaffed means that its not surprising that their time and tolerance are sometimes stretched.

Personally, I have always found the more senior officers to be most obliging and can excuse the younger officers reactions as inexperience and uncertainty, in an insidious situation.

Is it the prisoners fault? An answer I always get is, "Well it's their own fault, they're in there".

This may be so in most cases, but where is the Aussie sense of fair play? The law clearly states "innocent until proven guilty" and as to the degree of guilt? Well, thats another story. I mean—a month of these conditions for defrauding D.S.S. or driving whilst disqualified? The worst type of offender gets a lot better treatment in jail than do the watchhouse prisoners. I believe that the punishment must fit the crime, but in all honesty I can't condone this sort of treatment of any fellow human being.

The system is to blame.

The present system where by the watchhouse keeper has sole authority as to who and how often you get a visitor, when you get a shower, what he thinks your entitlements are, is ludicrous.

A prisoner in jail gets; clean clothes, exercise, nutritional meals, decent soap, toothpaste and brush, bed linen, beds, shower, TV, adequate ventilation, defined visitation entitlement, writing paper, tobacco, shoes and socks and access to medical and personal consultations and a degree of privacy.

The watchhouse prisoner has none of the above luxuries.

If this was the degradation of the environment or a racist issue, there would be a massive public outcry, but because it concerns police officers and offenders (though some are technically innocent), it is an unsavory and unpopular topic, and we the public allow the problem to persist with our apathy and "It would never happen to me" attitude.

I urge all of our local members to give urgent attention to the watchhouse facilities and conditions, both for keepers and kept alike. Even if the plans for the new facilities are in place, we are still looking at a minimum of 2-3 years before the building will be completed.

Cairns watchhouse needs to have either airconditioning or fans installed for the comfort of both officers and prisoners: More police assigned to the Cairns force to alleviate the staffing shortage: An alternative to the overcrowding problem sought by the implementation of; Muirhead Inquiry (that public drunkenness not be an offence, Kennedy Inquiry (that 17 year olds not be put in jail) and by increasing use of bail and use of summons; and by expediting the provision of new police station and watchhouse, suitably equipped to handle the population explosion the Cairns region is experiencing.

LYNNE MULLER,
C.D.O.

Mr De LACY: There needs to be an increase in the number of staff at the Cairns watchhouse and an improvement in the attitude of the police. A new complex should be constructed as quickly as possible, but in the mean time fans and air-conditioning should be installed. The magistrate should be stopped from specifying incarceration in the watchhouse, but most importantly the law should be investigated insofar as it relates to people in watchhouses. A whole range of reforms should be introduced so that these people are recognised as human beings, as well they ought. As I said at the outset of my speech, many of these people have not been convicted of any crime and never are convicted.

Time expired.

Hon. C. A. SHERRIN (Mansfield—Minister for Family Services) (3.14 p.m.): Corruption, if it is not dealt with, will grow like a cancer. It will spread and it will develop further. Down through the ages no society has been immune or could claim not to have been affected to some degree. Always some men will fail to live up to the expectations of their fellow-man. What sets basically healthy societies apart from those that are flawed is how the Government of the day reacts to the problem when the nature and dimensions of it have been made clear.

Corruption can be beaten if the action taken to overpower it is firm, decisive, fearless and continuous. Action must be firm and decisive because the task, by its very nature, is tough and potentially intractable. It must be fearless, because the risk of short-term harm to the way people view their Government and its institutions, because of the tough decisions and the self-examination that must be undertaken, is great and open to misinterpretation by politicians, the media and society at large. Action must be continuous because temptation can never ever be removed.

There are plenty of precedents to show that many Governments in many nations have done too little, too late, or worse, nothing at all, even when the problem has been made all too clear. In this debate a number of honourable members have highlighted very clearly the problems of corruption in Japan, the United States and other places throughout the world. It is certainly not unique to Australia.

Instead of stamping out corruption, many Governments have simply allowed the perpetrators to adapt by adopting half-measures or by attempting to sweep the issue under the carpet. Examples of this too-little, too-late approach, or worse, the nothing-at-all approach, are legion around Australia. There have been over 30 royal commissions or judicial or Government inquiries into criminal activities or corruption—nine in New South Wales, five at the Commonwealth level, one in Tasmania, two in Western Australia, seven in South Australia, five in Victoria and one in the Northern Territory. Unfortunately, all of those royal commissions in the other States and at the Commonwealth level have added up to nought.

We have seen tens of millions of dollars spent at the Commonwealth level into royal commissions into drugs, and there have been no convictions at all. With shocking regularity in the last two decades, royal commissions have come and gone in Victoria and New South Wales. Nothing of any significance in the way of an integrated corruption control or its elimination has emerged from any of them. This has not been the fault of the commissioners, but rather the fault of the Governments in those States, which have not had the courage to respond properly or the foresight to set terms of reference that enable commissioners to really get stuck in and come up with meaningful, worthwhile reforms.

If a Government is fair dinkum about coming to grips with corruption and if it is determined to meet the issue head on and crush it, it must have great faith in the weapons it brings to bear and the courage to carry the process through to a proper conclusion. Such a Government must believe in its obligation to the future. It must have faith that what it is doing is in the best interests of the public and the best thing to do, and the only thing to do, if it is truly committed to stamping out corruption and to enforcing high standards in private and public life.

This is the course that the Ahern National Party Government of Queensland has unswervingly, unselfishly and courageously embarked on. No Government in the history of this nation has undertaken a more thorough, more fearless, more wide-ranging, more open examination of the whole issue of corruption. No Government in the history of this nation has given a wider, more detailed series of undertakings to set and maintain new standards for public officials, elected or appointed, and law enforcement agencies and their officers. Our Government's commitment to achieving this end has been total since it took the decision to institute the Fitzgerald inquiry into corruption more than two years ago. Unfortunately, our opponents now cynically suggest that this commitment was not voluntary, but was in some way forced. They are suddenly paragons of virtue, veritable knights in shining armour. They are hypocrites and have been judged to be hypocrites; the Fitzgerald inquiry has convincingly shown them to be so.

The commissioner makes it very clear that Labor was the party that had been in power for many years, and remained in power for many years, at the time when corruption was institutionalised in sections of the Queensland police force. The Liberals, who now claim to be the moral guardians, along with their mates and fellow coalition-in-opposition partners, the ALP, traditionally have filled the Ministries dealing with justice and the administration of criminal justice in coalition Governments. Neither party has any right whatsoever to be holier than thou. The corruption problem that is now being crushed for the benefit of all Queenslanders deserves the unstinting support of all the Queensland community. It ought not be a political football. Currently, however, their behaviour is such that the Liberal/Labor coalition parties need to be reminded that it took a National Party Government, in power in its own right, to face the tough decisions and launch an all-out war on corruption in this State.

Can anyone believe that, if the Liberal Party or the Labor Party had been in Government here in Queensland, it would have had the courage or the commitment to establish, support and implement totally the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry? I certainly do not. It is the members of this National Party Government who have earned respect from the Queensland community—and praise from the commissioner himself, Mr Tony Fitzgerald—because of their commitment to helping him beat corruption. That commitment was made so obvious and so often during the past two years. He especially praised Premier Mike Ahern, Deputy Premier Bill Gunn, and Police Minister Russell Cooper for the degree of co-operation that they so consistently and unstintingly provided him and his inquiry.

Let us now remember very clearly the roots of this inquiry. Compared with their eventual spread, they were very small. This spread occurred because of the determination of this commissioner, Mr Fitzgerald, and of this National Party Government to get to the bottom of the corruption issue and settle it once and for all.

Mr Gygar interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: This inquiry began, basically and pretty simply, with concerns about police taking bribes from the vice industry. It developed into a total war on corruption wherever it was found. There has not been at any point any attempt to shirk the issues at all.

Mr Gygar interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: We extended the terms of reference for Commissioner Fitzgerald not once, but twice—not grudgingly, but willingly. Whatever facilities Mr Fitzgerald sought, he got, and he got them quickly.

Mr Gygar interjected.

Mr SHERRIN: Whatever he wished to delve into, his hands were totally free. When he said that he needed more time, he got that, too. From the very beginning,

Mike Ahern has said consistently, constantly and very importantly that the Fitzgerald report would be implemented——

Mr Gygarr interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Alison): Order! The interjections by the honourable member for Stafford are becoming tedious and repetitious.

Mr SHERRIN: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr GYGARR: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What is the honourable member's point of order?

Mr GYGARR: My point of order is that two days ago in this Chamber Mr Speaker made a ruling that the reading of speeches in the Chamber would only be acceptable under a very limited number of circumstances. This is clearly not one of those circumstances, and the Minister is reading his speech in defiance of the Speaker's ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member that there has been a change of Speakers. There is no point of order.

Mr GYGARR: I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What is the honourable member's point of order?

Mr GYGARR: My point of order is that it is the accepted procedure of the Parliament that the rulings of past Speakers carry forward unless they are specifically overruled by an incumbent. I seek your ruling as to when the present Speaker, Mr Lingard, overruled the ruling of the former Speaker, Mr Powell.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! My understanding quite clearly is that those instructions have been overruled. There is no point of order.

Mr SHERRIN: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. I can well understand why members of the Liberal Party, who are represented in all too few numbers in this most important debate today, have something to be ashamed of.

When the report was handed down, the Premier told Queenslanders that Cabinet agreed unanimously with his assertion that every single recommendation of Commissioner Fitzgerald should be implemented with the greatest possible speed. Those are quite obviously the actions of a determined and fearless Government—actions that are unmatched in this country. The promised process of implementation is well under way, and this Government will see the job through to its conclusion.

The massive recommendations of Mr Fitzgerald are too numerous, too detailed and too well known because of the openness with which this whole process has been carried through to warrant repeating here today. Indeed, they are so numerous that it would simply be impossible to do them justice in a single speech. However, three central recommendations should be mentioned. The first is one that has led the Opposition to make quite a number of ridiculous statements and assertions in its bid to make political mileage out of this report.

Mr Fitzgerald recommended the establishment of an electoral and administrative review commission, which will have as its principal job—but by no means its only job—the task of reviewing the zonal system of electoral boundaries in Queensland. The Opposition would have it that this task could be completed within a matter of weeks. This is obviously sheer stupidity, a measure of the total lack of understanding by the Labor Party and the Liberal Party of the nature and the scale of the task that confronts the new commission and a slight on the importance of the rights of Queensland voters, wherever they may live.

This body will be asked to undertake the most comprehensive review of electoral boundaries in this State since the ALP established the zonal system in the 1940s. That

review is a massive and complex task, which will certainly involve the commissioners in a great deal of travel to seek and hear the opinions of a wide cross-section of Queenslanders, right up and down this huge State. There will not be, and should not be, a mad dash by single commissioners to every point of the compass in the space of a few quick weeks, as the ALP would have it, because it perceives that undue haste might be in its best interests. The Government is concerned about the best interests of all Queenslanders, not just Wayne Goss and his now-you-see-them, now-you-don't band of part-time politicians—when they are not asleep—and these will be best served by the careful and considered approach that this Government is determined to take on this most important topic.

Mr Fitzgerald has specifically warned about the dangers of hasty legislation——

Mr GYGAR: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House. Quorum formed.

Mr SHERRIN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

It is indeed an embarrassment for the Labor and Liberal Parties that in this most important debate five members of the Labor Party are present and only one Liberal is present to listen to it. I can understand the degree of sensitivity of the lone Liberal Party member in the Chamber during this important debate. The report very clearly indicates that corruption was reported to the then Attorney-General and Minister for Justice at the time and that absolutely no action was taken, proving the point that I very clearly made that it took the courage of the National Party to institute the inquiry, to give it the terms of reference that it deserved and required and to follow through the recommendations to the end. If today's Minister for Justice and Attorney-General was a weak-kneed, wishy-washy Liberal, this inquiry would never have been set up, would never have been resourced and would never have resulted in recommendations being followed through and implemented in full. That stands on the record. I will be circulating copies of this speech throughout my electorate of Mansfield, which has many, many conservative voters, and those Liberal supporters out there—few though they may be—can well hang their heads in shame. It is an unfortunate judgment that Commissioner Fitzgerald has passed on the performance of the Liberal Party in this State.

Mr Fitzgerald has specifically warned about the dangers of hasty legislation in his report, and that warning has been underlined by Mr Peter Forster, who was Commissioner Fitzgerald's nominee to head the unit in the Premier's Department which will oversee the implementation of Commissioner Fitzgerald's report. There will be speed but there will not be haste in this matter, consistent with the Government's proper approach to the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry.

In regard to the electoral boundaries review—I think that a contemporary Australian example provides further backing of the judgment of the Government that the process is quite properly a time-consuming one. There is the experience of the then Premier of South Australia, Steele Hall, in the late 1960s and the ongoing experience of the Federal Government. I hope that members of the Opposition and their like-minded advisers—few though they may be—on their silly proposed timetable of a few short weeks take note of that. It took Mr Hall more than 13 months to establish and achieve a redistribution from the time his electoral commission was formed.

The second major recommendation of Mr Fitzgerald worthy of mention is the proposed criminal justice commission. This commission, very simply, will be the principal tool in a constant process of upgrading of the criminal justice system. It will help the Government to establish in Queensland a society in which law and order will be a top priority, which is constantly and continuously being reviewed, and will carry on the magnificent work of the Fitzgerald inquiry day by day. That will be a marvellously beneficial flow-on from what is basically an anti-corruption measure; the most up to date and responsive criminal justice system in the country.

The third very significant recommendation of Mr Fitzgerald concerns the future of the Queensland police force. I am sure that all honourable members have felt concern

for the more than 5 000 Queensland police officers while a certain number of their officers, squads, and individuals—a very small number, thank God—have been shown to be corrupt by the inquiry and the investigations which it has led to and which will continue. The Government's concerns remain with those many honest men and women in the police force, and it pays tribute to them. The best tribute will be the new police force now rising from the ashes of the old through the recommendations of Mr Fitzgerald and the actions of this Government.

As with the criminal justice system, the benefits to the community of this development will be much more than simply a more honest police force; it will mean a much more efficient force. I am particularly pleased to note that the new Mount Gravatt police headquarters in the electorate of Mansfield has been recommended as one of the new southern metropolitan regional headquarters in this reborn and reorganised police force.

There is much more that could be said on other recommendations in the Fitzgerald inquiry and the ways in which they will most certainly contribute to a better, safer and more just Queensland. But I think it is sufficient to say that by the time the process of implementation of that report is completed, the new anti-corruption institutions of the Queensland Government will stand as a bright beacon to States throughout this nation, the Commonwealth, and indeed the whole international community. The Queensland Government will have provided a model, an example to the world, of how to deal with the problems of corruption in an integrated and thoughtful way. Queensland now throws down the challenge to the other States and to the Commonwealth Government to have the courage and the integrity to initiate their own Fitzgerald-type inquiries into corruption, for the benefit of their own citizens. Mr Fitzgerald specifically warned of the dangers of half measures. He told us that they could be worse than useless. There are no half measures in the Queensland Government's response. No Government in this or any other nation will have a more integrated, more holistic, approach to securing Government, and the institutions for which it is responsible, against the threat of organised corruption.

I am proud to be a member of the Ahern National Party Government that has undertaken this historic task. I look with great confidence and anticipation to being a member of the next Ahern administration as it completes the job which it began well before—that should be made clear—the Fitzgerald report was handed down. It is important that these additional measures are seen in the context of the Fitzgerald report, because they help underline the sincerity of this Government on the concept of accountability that is central to the whole anti-corruption battle. They were all in place in advance of the commissioner's report being presented to the Government. The pecuniary interest register, which requires politicians to declare their assets—or lack of them—is one. The Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee is another. It has made possible the scrutiny of the decisions of Government by a bipartisan group of parliamentarians.

Similarly, the Parliamentary Public Works Committee enables public scrutiny of the decisions of Government in spending tax-payers' money on capital works. These measures, coupled with the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report, will put the issue of potential large-scale corruption by public officials in Queensland off the agenda for generations to come. Our National Party Government started that process; the National Party Government will finish it.

Obviously, the program is so large that many parts will still be being tackled in the next term of this Government. There is no better reason for the people of Queensland to return the Ahern National Party team at the next election. If they do not, and as a consequence the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry become the responsibility of parties which have so far seen in them only an expedient means of attempting to make political mileage, no other Government in Australia will ever again attempt such action. That would be a disaster for all of us.

Mr CASEY (Mackay) (3.34 p.m.): Like most after-dinner or after-lunch speakers, I thought I would give honourable members just a little bit of humour. During my research for this speech I came across a rather interesting document. It is part of a

speech that was made by a member in this House on 5 April 1978 during a Matters of Public Interest debate. The member commenced his speech by saying—

“My purpose in entering this debate today is to raise a matter which I consider to be of great public importance. I call on the State Government to take legislative action to stamp out the prostitution that is occurring in this city and on the Gold Coast through the massage parlours, which have continued to operate despite the efforts of the Government . . .”

The speaker on that occasion was Mr Don Lane, the former member for Merthyr. The Fitzgerald inquiry report that we are discussing today certainly shows the method by which Mr Lane went about that task. It is rather strange.

Today I wish to confine my remarks to a particular person referred to in the Fitzgerald report. There are pages and pages of references to that person, starting on page 91 of the report. It is a story about one of the greatest hypocrites and one of the greatest crooks that this State has ever seen or ever will see. It is the story of a man who spent his parliamentary career acquiring personal power and personal wealth through his job as a member of Parliament. If this report was to be renamed, it ought to be renamed “How I did it my way, by Johannes Bjelke-Petersen”. The man who was Premier of this State for almost 20 years supervised all the activities that were referred to in the report. I know it has been said that back in the days of Labor and maybe back in the days of somebody else before the turn of the century a few things were happening with the odd policeman around the countryside and throughout the State at different times. In the 20 years that I have been a member of this Assembly, I do not think that I have ever received a complaint from a country publican having at Christmas-time given a carton of stubbies to the local policeman who has looked after the dregs of the town and thereby kept them away from the place. I do not think that anybody has ever been seriously worried about a worker going round and placing a few bob on his favourite horse with his SP bookie whom he could look in the face, rather than having to go down to the TAB and waiting for some sort of mechanical monster known as a computer to sort out his return for him, at the same time wondering whether it would be sorted out or whether the computer would break down, as it did recently. He knows that he will receive a fair return on his money from the SP bookie. Nobody is very worried about those little things that have gone on before. If this Government stays in office, those activities will go on post-Fitzgerald, after this report has been well and truly forgotten, gathering dust on the shelves, because the report certainly will not be implemented as it has been suggested it will be.

In that period of almost 20 years we saw the development of a great network of cronyism and corruption unparalleled anywhere in Australia. It occurred not only in the police force but throughout the public service and in the community, including the business community. In Queensland it continued to the extent that it was necessary to set up the Fitzgerald inquiry.

I intend to deal with several issues that should be addressed but which are not mentioned in the Fitzgerald report. The best example of how Bjelke-Petersen looked after himself, his family and his own interests is what happened with the Ten Mile property and the company Ciasom Pty Ltd.

I do not intend to be repetitious and mention what is contained in the report. The Ten Mile is a good property; there is no question about that. Because of the way in which he travelled constantly around this State, which is to his credit, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen knew that the Ten Mile was a good property. However, many honourable members have travelled around this State for a long time and also know the country well.

Honourable members would be aware that on many occasions in this House, the former Premier and I fought often about the situation at the Ten Mile, mainly because I knew as much about the property as he did. Whereas I could speak truthfully about the issue, Sir Joh tried to deceive this Parliament and the people of Queensland.

Before Sir Joh purchased that property the owner was in dire financial trouble because of approvals from the Rural Reconstruction Board that had to go through Cabinet. The owner had five mortgages over that property, the last of which was held by the Rural Reconstruction Board. Sir Joh learned that the owner was battling.

When Sir Joh's family interests acquired that property he discovered that stamp duty had to be paid on all five mortgages if the ownership of the property was consolidated into one mortgage. Quite by coincidence, on one of my plane trips to Brisbane a property-owner from that area asked me, "Has that legislation about paying stamp duty on second and further mortgages been passed?" The penny dropped, because that legislation was about to come before the House. Sir Joh made sure that that legislation was passed so that he was not required to pay that stamp duty. Although other people had to pay for property transfers, in that case someone walked away with \$1.45m in his hand.

The property was purchased in July 1982. In April 1982 the Chairman and the Shire Clerk of the Daringa Shire Council were summoned to Brisbane to see the Premier about what was happening in that shire. A statutory declaration that was presented to the Fitzgerald inquiry investigators while the report was being compiled indicates that the Shire Chairman said to the Shire Clerk, "What will we say when we get there—'We have come to see you because the local walloper said to.'?" That is very interesting.

In the early days of the transaction Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen flew to the area. Because there was no airstrip on the property at that time, the local policeman collected him at the airport and drove him to the property. Sir Joh had a look at the property to see if he wanted to buy it. The local policeman told the Chairman and the Shire Clerk that the Premier wanted to see them. What happened when they got there? One of the fellows said, "Joh got up from his desk, rushed around to us and said, 'Come in. Come in.' When we were seated he said to us, 'You've got to do something about that road up there.'" What happened after that is well known.

On 15 April 1982 a report was presented to the Daringa Shire Council on the activities of the Chairman and the Shire Clerk at that meeting with Sir Joh. They were told by Sir Joh to take the proposal to Mr Hinze, who would take action to have the road declared a main road. Obviously, the Premier had already spoken to Mr Hinze about this matter long before he had spoken to the shire council representatives. All honourable members know what happened after that. The next day the gazettal of that road was changed from a local road to a main road and the first \$600,000 was allocated for road-funding.

The transcript of the former Premier's evidence before the Fitzgerald inquiry shows that, when he was asked about that issue, he said, "I never had anything to do with the Ciasom people." He deliberately lied about his activities and perjured himself right up to the time when he appeared before the Fitzgerald inquiry. There is documentation hell, west and crooked to show clearly his long association with everything that happened in relation to that property. My colleague the member for Sandgate, Mr Warburton, will have more to say about that in relation to the Kokan property deal, which is the smelliest one of the lot in this report.

Mr Elliott: All bitterness.

Mr CASEY: The honourable member says, "All bitterness." I remember his bitterness when he was sacked from the Bjelke-Petersen Ministry because he revealed the story about those people who were promised an oil-drilling operation in the Roma district. When they did not get it, the honourable member kicked up a fuss. As a result, Joh sacked him from the Cabinet. Honourable members never saw anyone more bitter in their lives than the honourable member for Cunningham.

Mr Elliott: Your facts are not always good.

Mr CASEY: They are not far from the mark, just the same.

I now return to speak about the way in which Joh acted in relation to his family properties. He had boundary changes effected by the local authority so that he could

save himself thousands and thousands of dollars a year. The Laurinel school was built. All of us know the story of that school. It was attended by only five pupils, but it still remained in existence. As soon as that person went out of power, one of the first things that this Government did was to close down the Laurinel school and shift it, leaving just a few concrete blocks sitting on the ground.

The policeman out there received his reward. A new police station was built. It was a surprise at the time. The honourable member who represented that area and who was also a Cabinet Minister, Mr Tomkins, did not even know that a request had been made for a new police station in the area. Nevertheless, approval was pushed through. The first the local member knew about it was when construction began on the police station. It was a reward for what the police officers there did for Bjelke-Petersen in the period before he bought the property.

An application was made for electricity to be supplied to that area. Suddenly that area was promoted to receive rural electrification extensions. For the first time in Queensland a subsidy scheme was introduced for rural electrification for an area in which cross-arms were used. Normally the subsidy applied to what was called SWER lines—single wire earth return lines—that go from property to property on a continuous and circular basis. On this occasion the poles were erected and cross-arms were attached. People in the local area wondered why that was happening. They had not seen it before. They were asking, “What are these cross-arms for?” They were installed for three-phase power, which was required to be supplied in order for the next step to occur. The family applied for water permits and suddenly the Water Resources Commission installed a new weir, the Tartrus Weir, on the Mackenzie River, which was to supply water to the property.

When I started making a noise about this matter—and some sections of the press are also responsible for this—Mr Bjelke-Petersen, as he was then, turned around and said, “What’s Ed Casey talking about? The road through there is a short-cut to his property—he can go that way to Mackay.” Perhaps that is so if one wanted to go to Mackay from the Ten Mile property, but that is about all. Everybody who lives in that area knows that when the beef road scheme was designed the Dingo-Mount Flora beef road was built to the west of that area because it had to be away from the flood country. It was too expensive to build roadworks across the flood country and too much of it was inundated for long periods each year, such as this year, when the normal wet season returned.

All of those things were a deliberate deception of this Parliament. The Premier would tell members of the media something, they would write a story and then they would forget all about it. They should have been responsible for it. Not too many of them got in their cars and drove up and down the road and looked at the property to see who was being truthful—Joh Bjelke-Petersen or Ed Casey.

The media is now trying to take all sorts of credit for what happened in the Fitzgerald inquiry. Certainly, full credit is due to some people, such as Phil Dickie, who did persevere and pursue the matter, and to those editorial staff behind them who allowed him to pursue the matter. However, a few brickbats ought to be dealt out to people who swallowed the story or the seed—the corn, as Joh used to tell it, that he fed to his chooks in this place—while the sorts of things that Fitzgerald has mentioned were going on.

Today I want to tell only a few more stories to add to what has already been told to the Fitzgerald inquiry about what occurred in that particular area. In May 1982, just after the people from the Duinga Shire had been to Brisbane, I spoke to various people. They were aware then that Main Roads surveyors were looking at the road virtually straight away, which was months before the Main Roads Department became responsible for it and also months before the finalisation of the sale of the property.

In early 1982 Water Resources Commission officers were sent out there. The first time that any detailed report that a weir was being considered for the Mackenzie River was in the department’s annual report for 1982-83. The Department of Primary Industries

was involved in valuations in that area. The land resources branch of that department had to submit a report to the Water Resources Commission by the end of 1983, because it had to be presented to the Premier, not to the Minister for Water Resources. I know that some people might ask, "Why are you bringing out this information now?" I had this information documented and ready to present to the Parliament in the Matters of Public Interest debate on the Wednesday after the week-end on which the Minister for Water Resources was tragically killed in a tractor accident. As much as honourable members opposite like to say evil things about me from time to time, I am not such a bad sort of a fellow that I would make the accusations that I had intended to make against a person who was being carried to his grave. Nonetheless, in July 1984—and National Party members will be able to tell me whether I am right, because that was when they had their conference in Rockhampton—Sir Joh flew Mr Goleby out to his property so that he could have a look at it and to show him where he wanted the weir, how much water he wanted and how he wanted to use it on his property.

Mr Elliott: Whose property is the weir actually on?

Mr CASEY: The Tartrus Weir is actually on the property of Sir Graham McCamley, which is just north of the Ten Mile. As the honourable member would well know, if a person wants to get water from a weir, he does not build the weir on his property but upstream. He does not put it below the property and pump the water back up; whenever he possibly can he builds the weir upstream and uses gravity to supply the water to his property. That is the sensible way in which they are usually built. The story of the Ten Mile is partly in this report. I have referred to some other parts of it this afternoon.

I now move on to a few other matters in relation to Johannes Bjelke-Petersen. During 1982, I was at the centre of many problems being experienced by the Labor Party. At that time, I was about to reveal the purchase of the Ten Mile by the Bjelke-Petersen family and what was going on in the area in which the property was situated, to the detriment of other areas of Queensland that had a higher priority in Government spending. To the shame of members of Cabinet at that time who allowed all those types of things to take place—including the present Premier who had not long been a member of that Cabinet at that stage but who now talks about his vision of excellence and all the great things that he wants to do—there was criticism of me because I had a few years earlier, on behalf of the Labor Party, received donations from a poker machine lobby group to assist the Labor Party to carry out campaigning in Queensland. The story became public knowledge.

At that time, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen was in New Zealand. He was very upset because the dirty dealings in relation to his family property had been revealed by me. It is recorded that even before he came back to Queensland, certain procedures were put in motion. Although those procedures are not recorded in the Fitzgerald report, they were documented and presented to the Fitzgerald inquiry as the Terry Lewis diaries. If honourable members track the events of the period of April to May 1982, they will easily see from the diaries the conspiracy that was developing between Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, the Commissioner of Police in Queensland, Terry Lewis, and others in order to stop poker machines operating in Queensland. Events have proved that they took that action, not because of their lily-white attitude or a desire not to have those terrible machines in this State—certainly not—but because of the graft and corruption engaged in, in Queensland. They were getting a lot of money on the side from illegal casinos—the "joke" referred to by Mr Herbert and from other people. Of course, they did not want that to stop.

If honourable members read through those Lewis diaries, they will find absolutely unbelievable the way in which the former Commissioner of Police and Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen were in such close contact. That small ALP political donation was very trivial compared to donations that were revealed in the Fitzgerald inquiry to have been made to Kaldeal and other organisations directly associated with the National Party. The information relating to the ALP donation was all properly documented in bank files and was never run away from. The information was all open and available. That donation

was never hidden in a brown paper bag—unlike the donations that supposedly were delivered to former Premier Bjelke-Petersen's office in \$50,000 and \$60,000 lots.

Mr Hayward: That was only the brown paper bags they could remember.

Mr CASEY: That was mere chicken-feed compared to the others.

We now know that there was contact through Lewis and Don Lane with the Bally Corporation, which was a rival of the poker machine lobby that had contacted me. More significantly, Bally is the manufacturer of the in-line machines that were being made available on the quiet and were totally illegal in Queensland at that time. The Bally Corporation was making a fortune out of this deal and, of course, they also paid a fortune to a man by the name of John Herbert, to one of his friends, Mr Lane, and also to Sir Terence Lewis and various other people who were in on the "joke" at that time. Is it any wonder that they had two police inspectors investigate me? Is it also any wonder that at that time two senior detectives from New South Wales carried out a similar investigation?

Recently Mr Innes was going crook because, while he was in this Parliament, the special branch inspected his files to find out what he was all about. In my case, it was a major operation in an attempt to see whether a charge of bribery and corruption of a member of Parliament could be pinned on me, under section 60 of the Criminal Code. Mr Deputy Speaker, I will tell you this: within a very short time, former members of this Parliament will be charged in relation to those matters, but I certainly will not be among them. The investigators found out that there was absolutely nothing with which they could charge me.

I rose in this Parliament and challenged Bjelke-Petersen to charge me if he thought I had committed an offence. He was not prepared to do it because he could not do so. The major investigation had shown that there was no foundation whatsoever for the allegations that had been made against me. Despite that, it was used politically against me in this State and in this Parliament. My endeavours to defend myself in this Parliament were stifled by those members of Parliament who supported the Government of the day and stood behind Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

It is now obvious that he was simply trying to hide his own corruption and his dirty, filthy involvement with the Commissioner of Police in these dealings. The Lewis diaries reveal that Sir Terence Lewis also discussed the matter with Sir Edward Lyons, as well as with the former Mr Justice Angelo Vasta. The New South Wales police who carried out the investigation have since been found to be among corrupt police officers in the New South Wales police force. It was also discovered that when they undertook a raid of an organisation in New South Wales, only files that related to the Labor Party were taken in spite of the fact that files relating to the Liberal Party and the National Party in this State were lying adjacent in the filing cabinet at that time. It was also revealed that they were accompanied by Queensland police on that raid and during the investigation. Incidentally, some of those investigating officers publicly dissociated themselves from comment that was widespread in the community. They were absolutely amazed that the information became public and told me that they had absolutely nothing to do with it. I was accosted by media people who had in their hands documentation that came directly from a police investigation. Those documents were deliberately leaked to the media to try to embarrass me. Those police officers were there because there was contact between the then Commissioner of Police and the former Premier of this State, who were deliberately forcing these inquiries so that I would be politically embarrassed. Incidentally, a member of the Labor Party was also mentioned at the same time, but he will keep.

These are just some of the ways in which power was used in this State to control the system and maintain political power and corruption. Even if the former Premier was not using this power completely for his own purposes, he was certainly using it for his own personal power. The Police Ministers of the time went along with him. The Police Minister at that time, who was in constant discussion with Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen,

was a fellow by the name of Russell Hinze, Esquire. In a very short period it will be evident from the trials that will begin in the courts of this State that what was good for the goose was good for the gander. If the man at the top was able to get away with these things, then a few other people thought that they could get away with them, too.

Comments have been made in the Fitzgerald report about Bellino. Much has been said about Bellino and information has been given about his association with a man by the name of Larry Hoins.

Mr Hayward: Was he a National Party candidate?

Mr CASEY: He was a National Party candidate and a National Party stooge in far-north Queensland for a long period.

A few short years ago I was contacted by Mr Hoins, who at that time was in fear of his life. He had information that he wanted to give to me about the corruption that was going on at the time when I made the allegations in early 1980 at the drug inquiry, for which I was castigated. Now I have been proven to be absolutely correct, dead right and spot on in every word I said in this Parliament, publicly and to the inquiry. Hoins contacted me and I said that I would listen to his story. He said it was a story of corruption and he actually wanted to sell it to the party. I said to him straight away that if I paid him for the story, I myself would be corrupt if I accepted it. I told him that if he wanted to give me the information, he could do so, but if he did not I was not interested in talking to him. I have not seen or heard of him since. At that time fellows like Hoins had so much information but were running for cover because of the strong, powerful force that was ready to crush them in Queensland.

One other story relates to the famous mining proclamation when the former Premier, Sir Johannes Bjelke-Petersen, endeavoured to get exemption from mining for his land. The Fitzgerald report refers to the matter and comments upon it. However, the Fitzgerald report does not tell the story. I can tell the story because at the time I was the Leader of the Opposition and Mr Warburton raised the matter in Parliament for and on behalf of the Opposition. After denials were made, Mr Warburton and I drove my car all around the Bjelke-Petersen properties armed with maps. We examined every aspect of every property owned by the Bjelke-Petersen family. We then made a surprise call on the mining official in Nanango. He showed us his books and the areas where companies had been drilling. One week-end Bjelke-Petersen almost went off his brain because, as we saw when he flew home, there was a drilling rig on the property situated across the road from his property. People were drilling and finding coal, and Bjelke-Petersen was fearful that they would try to mine underneath his property. The next week, as soon as he got back to Brisbane—although Mr Camm, the Mines Minister, was away in the north—Bjelke-Petersen began to implement the mining proclamations.

Mr Warburton knows the story, and, if he has time, he will tell the House a little more about the matter later on. The matter is raised in the Fitzgerald report, but the reason for it is not given. I have now told the House the reason for the first time. In this Parliament Petersen tried to say that it was rich soil property, but the bottom end of his land had coal under it and that was proved when a drilling rig began drilling only 1 chain across the road from his property.

Time expired.

Mr ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (4.05 p.m.): No honourable member who was in this House during the years that are documented in this report can run away or suggest for one second that he or she was not in a position to have seen some of the things that were happening and done something about them.

Mr Hayward interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is very true.

The matters contained in this document started in the days of the Labor Government and went right through all of the Queensland Governments; that is, from the first

conservative Government, the Country Party/Liberal coalition; to the National Party/Liberal coalition after the Country Party became the National Party; and finally the National Party in its own right. Over the last few months the members of the Liberal Party have been pontificating and setting themselves up to be holier than thou. They are trying to convince the community that what is desperately needed in this State is a coalition Government. They say that people really cannot trust these National Party people because they were the ones who presided over this corruption. The members of the Liberal Party say that obviously the members of the National Party are very nasty people and the community must put the Liberal Party back in coalition. That is an interesting proposition, because if the members of the National Party are so nasty, I do not know why the Liberal Party wants to be in coalition with us. Perhaps the members of the Liberal Party are prepared to be in coalition with us if we are only a little coloured or tainted, but their arguments fall down when one considers why they feel that they can do that when in fact most of the real problems documented in the Fitzgerald report occurred prior to the bust-up of the coalition Government. That is very hypocritical.

Mr Casey: They held the Justice Ministry at the time.

Mr ELLIOTT: It is funny that the honourable member should mention that, because at the moment I have the Fitzgerald report open at page 41. On page 41 it mentions the fact that the Honourable Bill Lickiss, who at that time was Minister for Justice, was in London and had a discussion with Mr O'Connell. He was very clearly told that corruption was rife. What I am asking is: what did Mr Lickiss do about that? Did he sit on his hands, or did he do something about it? I did not stand up here this afternoon to be totally critical or to point the finger at particular people; however, although I can stand most things, I can't stand hypocrites. All of us, but particularly those of us who were in Cabinet at the time—Mr White, myself and the others—should have asked some questions. We had eyes. If it were obvious to us, we should have been doing something about it.

At one time I took a phone call from a gentleman who said that he would meet me in the park. I went off to the park at the appointed time to meet this gentleman.

Mr White: Was he a fairy?

Mr ELLIOTT: No, he was not a fairy. It was not that sort of a meeting at all.

I went to the park at the duly appointed time but, surprise, surprise, no-one was there. I had been given a contact number and I phoned this fellow and asked him what happened to him. He said, "Oh, I got frightened." That was the nearest I got to having anyone actually give me any information. What he told me over the telephone was very generalised. He did not want to talk on the phone, but he wanted to tell me something about the police.

None of us came down in the last shower of rain. It was obvious to all of us that there were some problems in the police force, but it was very hard to put a finger on just what was wrong and what could be done about it. Cabinet Ministers were pretty busy trying to look after their own problems.

Mr White: You had to have the proof, didn't you?

Mr ELLIOTT: That is right. Without the proof, it was pretty difficult.

I am not pleased that those who were presented with evidence and were in a position to be able to do something about it did not do so, but there is little use in standing here today, looking back over our shoulders and saying that all of those people were culpable because they did not stamp out all of these practices.

What is very important for all of us to do is to stand here and accept the fact that we believe that this inquiry was worth while. It is the most far-reaching inquiry that this nation has ever seen. It cost us \$24m. If the end result of the inquiry is that we finish up with a State where people are very, very nervous about putting their hands behind their backs or doing anything else that can be seen to be corrupt, then in my

opinion the \$24m was well spent. I support it whole-heartedly. That does not mean that I go through this document and I say 100 per cent that I support, and am committed to giving carte blanche to, every recommendation.

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am not locked into anything. I am not prepared to stand here today and say that I am locked into every recommendation in the report.

I listened with great interest to the speech of my colleague from Mount Gravatt, Mr Ian Henderson. Much of what he said was spot-on. All of us should read his speech. Some of what he said was very much to the point. If some of the recommendations in this report are followed, we will be going away from the traditional Westminster system which, I would hope, we all sincerely believe in.

Mr Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: Obviously the honourable member has not read it properly.

I do not necessarily agree with the establishment of the various committees and commissions that are recommended. I would argue against a complete commitment to going along that particular track. That does not say that I do not support what Fitzgerald is trying to do. He has done a fantastic job. It was the most difficult job that anybody in Australia could be handed. I take my hat off to him. Just because I think he has done a fantastic job does not necessarily mean that I have to prostrate myself on the floor and say that I will go along with every last little recommendation in the report. That does not follow and, honestly, I do not think that he would expect reasonable people to do that.

We all have different opinions and we are entitled to them. All honourable members in this place have their own minds and the ability to get advice, which is what this document is. It is legal advice from a trained legal person who has been through all of that evidence and who has listened to all of the goings-on. I concur with most of the recommendations. I am prepared to accept them and I think we should implement them. I do not want to go back over the ground that Ian Henderson traversed in his speech. It would be well worthy of anyone's time to sit down and read what he said, because there is a lot of soundness in it.

The other side of this whole exercise is that for some unknown reason, but probably because they think they can gain some political advantage out of it, the Labor and Liberal Parties are trying to hang their hats on the issue of corruption, which was also mentioned by Ian Henderson. I do not believe that electoral boundaries play a part in corruption.

Mr Hayward: You're kidding, aren't you? You've got to be joking.

Mr ELLIOTT: If that is so, the States and countries which have implemented good electoral boundaries should have little or no corruption. That does not hold true.

If honourable members look at the matter realistically, they will realise that corruption comes down to people—people with a lack of morality, people in whom greed overrides all other things.

Mr Simpson: They can be bought.

Mr ELLIOTT: They can be bought—exactly! The first time a police officer accepts a minuscule amount, he is just as culpable—it may not be as profitable—as a person who uses a high position and influence to make a million dollars out of a land deal. In those instances, the morality of the action is the same. A person could claim that he was misled, and well he may have been. However, it boils down to the fact that people must maintain high moral standards. Different people have different standards. It is easy to be moralistic and point at people and say, "Your standards are not up to scratch." However, that is not a valuable exercise.

With all the money, time and effort that has been put into the Fitzgerald inquiry, I am disappointed that Labor and Liberal members, in an attempt to score political points, have put the emphasis that they have on the question of electoral boundaries.

Mr Warburton: It is because corruption starts at the top; that is the point he is making.

Mr ELLIOTT: I know what the honourable member is saying. If one follows the argument through and looks at the other States, one sees that it cannot be sustained. Compared with what has happened in other States, corruption in Queensland is equivalent to a Sunday school picnic. Regardless of boundaries or electoral systems, corruption still flourishes.

Mr Hayward: You mean Governments change and the corruption keeps going on?

Mr ELLIOTT: I am not just saying that. The idea that corruption will be stamped out by changing the electoral system in this State is rubbish. The honourable member could not give me any analogy that would stand up in reasoned debate and allow one to come to that conclusion. I will not go on with the point. It has been expounded and demonstrated very ably by the member for Mount Gravatt.

Members of this Chamber should not be attempting to score political points; they should be setting aside their political differences and working towards stamping out corruption in this State. Regardless of which party we belong to or where we sit—the left, the right, or the centre—all honourable members who are fair dinkum should be interested in stamping out corruption of all sorts in this State. If we are not, we should not be here.

Mr Warburton: I can't see much evidence of that occurring in this place, when Ministers won't answer questions.

Mr ELLIOTT: Does the honourable member think it was easy for Government members to live through the period of the Fitzgerald inquiry? He should walk down the street in his own electorate and note the cynicism of the public towards parliamentarians in general. The Fitzgerald report has made life very difficult for members of Parliament. It has made it even worse for their families, who are the people for whom I feel sorry.

We were elected to Parliament. We were aware of the old adage, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen." It is not compulsory to be here; we can give it away tomorrow. I will cop the heat, the flak and everything else, but I am not impressed when it flows through to my family. The families of members have nothing to do with the political ramifications of the Fitzgerald report.

It has not been easy to live through the Fitzgerald inquiry. Because I am not in a Labor electorate, I cannot see how the public reacts to Labor members and how they are affected. However, I know the reaction that is in my electorate and in the circles in which I travel.

If we do not put politics aside and get behind the recommendations of the report and try to implement reforms which will have lasting effects, we will be damned by the public for ever.

Mr Palaszczuk: How about an all-party committee to help?

Mr ELLIOTT: The Government has already instituted those sort of committees.

Mr Palaszczuk: Electoral reform?

Mr ELLIOTT: If honourable members were honest, they would accept that the Government has made a start in the area of accountability.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: That would be an idea. We are not talking about quite as much reform as that. He likes reform, but he is not as keen as that.

Mr Palaszczuk: You have not answered my question.

Mr ELLIOTT: We have not got that much time, so let me get on with it.

If honourable members wonder about the root causes of the public's scepticism about politicians, when I reveal what has occurred recently in this nation they will understand why the public are sceptical.

While the Federal Government has been in power between 1983 and 1989, interest rates on housing loans have increased from 12.5 per cent to 17 per cent; the prime rate has increased from 15.5 per cent to 19.75 per cent; and the interest rates on overdrafts that most of us are experiencing have increased from 14 per cent to 20.75 per cent. The Bankcard rate has gone from 18 per cent and 21 per cent up to 23.4 per cent. That does not make anyone very happy.

Government spending has escalated. The high-spending doctrine continues ad infinitum. The Federal Government is not going to cut back its spending but it expects the tax-payers to cut back on their spending.

Labor has rabidly and massively increased Australia's level of international indebtedness. In June 1983, Australia's gross foreign debt was \$36 billion. By May 1989, it had hit \$126 billion.

Mr Hayward interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member should worry about his own speech.

Labor has lost Australia's top-ranking international credit rating. It is the first Australian Government that has managed to do that. In 1988-89 excise revenue will be \$9.6 billion, compared with \$6.8 billion in 1982-83. Between January 1976 and February 1983, unemployment averaged 6.1 per cent. Between March 1983 and April 1989, under Labor, it averaged 8 per cent.

Mr Hayward: Turn it up!

Mr ELLIOTT: The honourable member may not like it but those are the facts.

Mr Hayward: That is a complete distortion.

Mr ELLIOTT: These are the facts.

What did Whitlam say? He said, "No child will live in poverty"—

Mr Austin: That was Hawke.

Mr ELLIOTT: That is what is called a Freudian slip.

The number of people living in poverty has increased under the Hawke Government. According to the Melbourne University social policy research unit, about 12.5 per cent of the total population, or 1.9 million people, were living in poverty in 1982-83, compared with about 15 per cent, or 2.4 million people, in 1985-86. These are the problems that face our society.

Labor's tax cuts are worthless. They are totally offset by increased indirect taxes and by people moving into higher tax brackets, that is, bracket creep.

Mr Hayward interjected.

Mr ELLIOTT: I am sure the honourable member knows all about bracket creep.

After 1 July 1989 anyone earning \$35,000 or more will be paying the top marginal tax rate of 47 per cent. That is what people are upset about. In 1983 Mr Hawke promised that there would be no new capital gains tax. He broke that promise on 19 September 1985. These are the things that people are upset about. The First Home Owners Scheme is another example. More and more families are being forced to have both parents in the work-force because they cannot make ends meet.

Mr Hayward: You were saying unemployment was going up before.

Mr ELLIOTT: I did not say that. The honourable member misinterpreted what I said.

Quite frankly, these are the reasons why people are cynical. I think it ill behoves any honourable member to stand up in this place and say that any particular group of people was directly responsible for corruption. As I have said, what we have to do is get behind this document and try to implement measures that will be practical and will resolve this problem. If we do not do that, history will most definitely show us in a very bad light.

I am sure that many other honourable members wish to take part in this debate. However, I want to point out that I can stand many things but I find hypocrites very hard to take. That is why I made mention of the fact that on page 41 of the report Mr Fitzgerald states that Mr Lickiss was made aware of the problems. It is not good enough for members of the Liberal Party to try to suggest that it is all the fault of the National Party and that all that has to be done to solve the problem is for the people to put the Liberal Party back in coalition with the National Party to keep an eye on it and everything will be okay. That is not the answer at all.

Mr WARBURTON (Sandgate) (4.27 p.m.): At the outset I want to make some general observations. Mr Elliott has just completed his contribution. I can understand that honourable member's reaction and the reaction of his constituents to the Fitzgerald inquiry. Quite frankly, why would they not have that reaction? When one examines the evidence that came out over a long period of time, one finds that it was people like the Bjelke-Petersens, the Hinzes and the Lanes who Mr Elliott can thank for the problems with which he is confronted at present and the adverse reaction of his constituents. That is where the answer lies in respect of the problems confronting members of the National Party today. The evidence showed conclusively that it was their people who were involved in corruption. I am not suggesting that there were not others; of course there were others. However, the fact is that the evidence that came out of the Fitzgerald inquiry pointed to those people of trust in our community who, quite frankly, let the community down. That is why the people are at a low, and I can understand why they are upset with politicians generally; but they are more upset with those people in whom they placed a hell of a lot of trust over a long period of time.

It is a fact that cronyism breeds corruption and, frankly, until those who have gained positions in this State as a result of cronyism are flushed out of those comfortable positions that they currently hold, corruption will continue to flourish. You can have all the Fitzgerald reports in the world, but that is the truth and that is the fact.

Honourable members will know from their reading of the report that there is a reference to police culture. Mr Fitzgerald says clearly that in many cases positions of power and influence were allocated to the wrong people. However, that statement of fact does not apply only to the police force. It applies to many of those boards, authorities and organisations in which the National Party Government has appointed its cronies to positions of power and influence. I agree with the flushing out of those in the police force who were wrongly allocated those positions of power and influence but, for Heaven's sake, let us take action right across the board. The National Party Government and the coalition before it put people into positions not because of their ability, dedication or honesty but because they voted the right way.

What I am saying is the truth, and all honourable members know it. Do not let us stop at the police force. If there is a flushing-out process, let us go all the way. As I indicated, whether it be hospital boards, marketing boards, trusts or committees where those cronies have been installed—we know them; we know that they are there—it would seem that the present Government should act in respect of that matter straight away. I have some doubts because I feel that the Government might stop short of touching that area of corruption. I would have to suggest that only a new Government would be able to make a contribution in that regard.

On 8 June this year, during the debate on the Appropriation Bill (No. 1), honourable members will, I am sure, recall that I referred this House to notice of motion No. 33 on the notice paper standing in my name. Now that the Fitzgerald report is available, I believe that that notice of motion should be read by all honourable members. In his report Mr Fitzgerald covered the issues in my notice of motion very admirably. Honourable members will recall that paragraph (5) of the notice of motion called on this Parliament to instruct the Government to take all steps necessary to ensure that the Premier, Mr Ahern, Don Lane, Russ Hinze, Bjelke-Petersen and all those other Ministers who were members of Cabinet in 1986 pay their own legal fees and costs awarded against them in respect of those defamation actions which they initiated, as individual members, against members of the Opposition.

Honourable members will also recall that on 8 June last I made particular reference to the \$68,233 legal costs that Premier Ahern and others had been ordered to pay. We are all very much aware of the fact that Premier Ahern, who currently wants the world to believe him to be completely accountable and completely honest, put his hands once more into the public till to pay his share of those legal costs awarded against him.

Mr FitzGerald: Goss said he was an honest man.

Mr WARBURTON: I will say it openly in this Chamber that I have some disagreement with my leader on that issue. I believe that my leader said that Mr Ahern was honest in the context of a comparison with other people.

Mr FitzGerald: He didn't qualify it.

Mr WARBURTON: I am saying to the honourable member now that I have an opinion different from that of my leader. As a private member, I am entitled to believe that the Premier of this State is not honest. That is my position.

Last Monday, the day on which the Fitzgerald report was officially released, Premier Ahern claimed that nowhere in the report was the Ahern Government impugned. He claimed that, as distinct from the Bjelke-Petersen Government, nowhere in the report was the Ahern Government impugned in any way. In other words, the Premier claimed that neither he nor any of the members of his Government has been called to question or challenged in the Fitzgerald report. On this occasion Premier Ahern is being deceitful. It seems that he is making a desperate attempt to divorce himself from that Bjelke-Petersen regime. The era in which he was a Minister has got the better of him. He has resorted to being deceitful. In the light of the type of debate that is taking place today, that is a shame. The report clearly shows that Premier Ahern and 10 other Ministers in the present Cabinet were partners in a number of Cabinet decisions that were taken in 1986—decisions which saw them issue writs, which Mr Fitzgerald describes on page 119 of his report as “useful weapons to silence critics, a method known for many years and engaged in by police officers such as Parker, amongst others”. I am sure that Premier Ahern was delighted to read that Mr Fitzgerald put him in such illustrious company.

Let us examine some of the comments concerning these defamation actions which are contained in the report and about which for some time the truth has been difficult to extract from Ministers of this Government. We are told that Cabinet documents showed that, at a Cabinet meeting held on 3 March 1986, a policy was adopted which allowed Ministers who were criticised in connection with their official duties to bring actions for defamation, and that public funds would be used to pay the costs.

At that time, Premier Ahern was the Minister for Industry, Small Business and Technology. He now wants the public to believe that neither he nor his Government colleagues have been brought to task by Mr Fitzgerald. How does he then explain that esteemed gentleman's comment—

“... a search of Cabinet records had failed to reveal any written submission or any formal record which explains the basis for the adoption of such a policy. The policy is impossible to reconcile with the reasonable exercise of free speech by ordinary

citizens and by the Parliamentary Opposition on the frequent occasions when Parliament is not sitting.”?

Mr Fitzgerald was saying that a policy which Mr Ahern and 10 of the other Ministers who are presently in the Cabinet firmly embraced in 1986 “is impossible to reconcile with the reasonable exercise of free speech”. And the Premier has the gall to suggest that the report lets him off squeaky clean! That is far from the truth. He and his Government have been impugned by the contents of the report.

On 4 March 1986, the day after the first Cabinet policy decision regarding the writs, the report notes that Bjelke-Petersen issued five writs for damages for defamation at public expense. Within a week he issued a further writ on the same basis and, with all the other Cabinet Ministers at that time, including Mr Ahern, individual writs were issued against the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Tom Burns. We learn from the Fitzgerald report that a Cabinet meeting held on 6 June 1986 decided that legal costs incurred by a Minister required the Crown Solicitor’s certificate to say that the costs were reasonable. I cannot see a great deal wrong with that. However, not surprisingly when one looks at the complete lack of accountability that Opposition members have become used to from members of the National Party, a meeting of Cabinet on 30 March 1987 decided that future accounts submitted by private solicitors acting for Ministers in defamation actions would be paid provided that those same private solicitors certified that their own fees were reasonable. Does Premier Ahern, who helped make that decision, really want members to believe that such an open cheque-book approach is evidence of accountability? Of course, it is not. Those solicitors were certifying that their accounts were correct. It is unbelievable, but it is contained in the Fitzgerald report. That was the secret minute of the Government of which Mr Ahern was a part.

As to my comments concerning that \$400,000 pay-off from Bond to Petersen, which was the subject today of the Premier’s ministerial statement—at page 120 of his report Mr Fitzgerald states—

“On the following day, Bjelke-Petersen issued another writ against Warburton at public expense.”

Today the Premier has clarified that position. After some inquiries with Morris Fletcher and Cross, the Government’s solicitors, it would now seem that Bjelke-Petersen is required to pay his own costs in that matter. That seems to be a bit of fish of one and fowl of the other.

Only a fortnight ago the Premier said that, because of his participation in the Bjelke-Petersen regime, he had some obligation to dip into the public purse to pay costs that were ordered against him. However, today this House was told that the Premier’s old adversary—the man whom he threw out of office—can pay his own costs, which will amount to something like \$30,000. As part of the expenses that I incurred in defending that action, I will be endeavouring to redeem those costs. No damages are involved. I lose on the issue.

Having read the transcripts of Bjelke-Petersen’s evidence before the Fitzgerald inquiry, I can understand how it would be easy to misconstrue what Bjelke-Petersen meant by what were, quite frankly, pretty garbled responses. I am not being critical of Mr Fitzgerald for suggesting that that was a publicly-funded action. Based on Bjelke-Petersen’s evidence, it would be easy for Mr Fitzgerald to determine that that was the case.

It is now clear that Mr Ahern intends to make fish of one and fowl of another. However, on page 120 of his report Mr Fitzgerald provides another insight into the previously secret and sordid arrangements that were entered into by that famous ministerial class of 1986. Mr Fitzgerald states—

“While the Cabinet policy enabled a Minister to sue at public expense provided that the proceeds were paid to consolidated revenue, it left each Minister free to choose whether he would sue at his own expense and retain any damages which he was awarded.”

What is not explained in that famous minute is: when was it incumbent upon a Minister to make that choice? No decision about that was ever made. If Mr Fitzgerald had been advised that Petersen was publicly funded in his now defunct defamation action against me, which arose out of my criticism of that \$400,000 pay-off—and this is the point that I felt was correct—then some decision to change had been made by the Ahern Government. I must admit that at one stage I felt that the pay-off was part of the retirement deal. Obviously, it was not.

It seems that the arrangement was so loose—and I ask honourable members to listen to this—that if, during the final stages of an action taken out by a Minister, it was evident that he or she was sure to win, that Minister could pay his own legal fees and reap the financial benefit. That is a beauty!

Incredible as it may seem, a strange situation existed in which Ministers were able to use public funds—as they have done. Whereas the Premier was prepared to announce today in this House that, as far as Petersen is concerned—as far as that one writ is concerned—he can go and jump in the creek and pay his own expenses, I did not hear any reference by the Premier to a withdrawal or a suggestion of a withdrawal of that rather insidious Cabinet decision in 1986 that saw this whole sordid affair commence and created political thuggery and intimidation like nothing that I have ever witnessed.

Within a few short weeks Bjelke-Petersen will be required to pay further legal costs as a result of other discontinued defamation actions against Opposition members. I understand his bill in connection with my claim for costs will amount to something like \$30,000. The Minister for Transport, Mr McKechnie, is in the very same boat.

The Fitzgerald report shows that the National Party Government, through the Justice Department, has already spent in excess of \$200,000 from the public purse to initiate and pursue writs that were taken out by those members who were Ministers in 1986 against some Opposition members who were prepared to criticise what have now been found by Mr Fitzgerald to be insidious and improper activities by certain people.

During the June debate on the Appropriation Bill, I said that the Premier's honesty and accountability were being put to the test. Events show that the Premier has failed on both of those counts.

On page 143 of his report Mr Fitzgerald said clearly—

“If members of Parliament (including Ministers) choose to resort to legal redress”—

and this could not be any clearer—I will repeat it—

“If members of Parliament (including Ministers) choose to resort to legal redress, it should be at their own cost just as any damages recovered would be to their personal material gain.”

I have great satisfaction in standing here today and saying, “That's what I've been saying for at least two years.” That is the point that I have been trying to put across to honourable members in this place and to Queenslanders generally. It is very, very pleasing to see that a person of the standing of Mr Fitzgerald agrees whole-heartedly with the contributions I have made on this matter. In fact, Mr Fitzgerald is saying that Premier Ahern's action in using money from the public till—money that did not belong to him—to pay not only the legal fees incurred during the initiation and pursuit of those writs, but also in recent times those legal costs ordered against him, is improper and wrong.

Today I again call on the Premier to redeem or redress the position. It is not beyond him. As I have indicated, that decision, which was made some time ago in Cabinet, can be rescinded today, if the Premier desires. If he wishes he can turn himself into an honest person by redressing the situation and paying his own bills. Let him put the money back into Treasury—the money that he has taken out to pay his own accounts in respect of this matter. That is the true test that will be applied to this Premier and to the other 10 members of the present Ministry who were Ministers in 1986 and who participated in this political thuggery.

Mr Fitzgerald is saying that Premier Ahern's action in using that money is wrong, wrong, wrong. He is also saying the same thing about Bjelke-Petersen, Hinze, Lane, Wharton and Turner. All of them have left the place. We are paying their bills, too. They are no longer members of this Assembly. Mr Fitzgerald accuses them, too, of improperly using public funds.

As a result of what is contained in section 3.10.3 on page 143 of this voluminous report, Premier Ahern is placed in a position of putting up or shutting up. In this report he has been impugned and he has to react. He cannot stand in this Chamber and say, "But that was yesterday. I am interested in tomorrow." Mr Ahern is involved in the events of yesterday and tomorrow. He should be prepared to stand up and perform. He should be honest and proper and redress the wrong that has been outlined by Mr Fitzgerald.

Irrespective of those excuses that I expect will come from the Premier for not entering into the spirit of this report, he should realise that truly he is very firmly impaled on the Fitzgerald hook. Although he might argue that the improper use of moneys from the public till by himself and the other people to whom I have referred occurred yesterday, and that his interests lie with what is happening tomorrow—and to some extent I can understand that point of view—I want to know what he intends to do about tomorrow's bills, those "tomorrow" accounts that will be issued in respect of the legal bills to which I have referred.

Will Mr Ahern take Mr Fitzgerald's comment on board and shut the public till drawer? Mr Fitzgerald says it is right and proper behaviour to do so. Despite what the Premier may or may not decide, he has to live with the knowledge that Mr Fitzgerald's strong criticisms about publicly funded defamation actions are aimed directly at him. Mr Fitzgerald states—

"A parliamentarian's role to review and constructively criticize Governmental activity could be hampered by being inhibited from speaking out publicly by threats of claims for damages. This is particularly so if the defamation actions which result are funded out of the public purse."

That could not be clearer, could it? Mr Fitzgerald is saying that what has been done is wrong.

Now that the curtain is closing on this sordid affair, it is to be hoped that no Queensland Government in the future will involve itself at ministerial level in the type of outrageous behaviour that has been carried on by past and present National Party Ministers. Their participation in this sordid business is a blot that I do not believe will ever be erased.

Having read some of the transcripts from the Fitzgerald inquiry, I am somewhat surprised to note that the report has not addressed the issue—to any great extent, anyway—of Cabinet Ministers deliberately misleading the Parliament. The inquiry received evidence that both Bjelke-Petersen and the late Ron Camm, when he was the Minister for Mines in this State, lied to the Parliament. I will read the evidence in a moment. The matter about which Bjelke-Petersen was questioned by Mr Drummond during the inquiry—and some honourable members who were here in the late 1970s will recall this matter—related to the draft proclamation that I tabled in the House on 15 April 1980, which would have had the effect, if carried through, of exempting Petersen lands in the Kingaroy district from the provisions of the Mining Act. When questioned about this matter in Parliament by myself and the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Ed Casey, both Petersen and Camm denied emphatically any involvement. They denied emphatically that they knew anything about it. On 16 April 1980 Camm said—

"I indicate to the House that if a draft proclamation was prepared, I had no knowledge of it . . . it certainly was never taken to Cabinet."

On the following day, 17 April 1980, Bjelke-Petersen said—

"I can assure this House that it was never my intention to have such a proclamation made."

Even in evidence before the Fitzgerald inquiry Bjelke-Petersen claimed to have had no connection with the preparation of that draft proclamation. At the time when I first raised the matter in Parliament in 1980 and tabled the actual draft proclamation, I had to be content with what I was being told. There was an absolute refusal to carry out any investigation into what had occurred. Fortunately, it has been left to the Fitzgerald inquiry to get to the truth and show that strong evidence exists indicating that Ministers of this Government have deliberately misled the Parliament. I regard that as being one of the sources from which corruption develops. Although other people might disagree, I think that the day Ministers act entirely responsibly and do not mislead this Parliament—the day that they answer questions even though they know they are pinned to the wall—will be the day that will herald the end to corrupt activities at this level. Only then will people be able to see that.

During the evidence, Mr Drummond produced a declaration—would honourable members believe—submitted by Mr John Brett who was a former under secretary of the Department of Mines. In that declaration, John Brett states that Bjelke-Petersen personally approached him by telephone in early 1980 and asked if it was possible to exempt Petersen land from the provisions of the Mining Act. Brett told Petersen that it was possible. Shortly afterwards, Petersen phoned Brett with the real property description of the Petersen lands and said, “Go ahead.”

Mr Brett said in evidence that he raised the Petersen request with the then Minister for Mines, Ron Camm, indicating that the move was politically dangerous. Camm agreed, but nevertheless directed Brett to proceed in accordance with Petersen’s wish. Brett’s evidence shows that the draft proclamation was prepared by the chief clerk of the Mines Department. The draft was printed by the Government Printer and Brett gave it to Camm prior to a Cabinet meeting. Of course, the rest is history. The revelations in Parliament at that time prevented Bjelke-Petersen getting away with having his lands exempted from the provisions of the Mining Act. It would have been a unique situation, especially when compared with the position of an ordinary person in this State. However, that is what he was after. He denied any knowledge of it.

Mr Brett, however, was obviously prepared to make that declaration to Mr Fitzgerald. He has indicated clearly that the former Premier of this State, whom many honourable members understandably revered and looked up to, stood in the Parliamentary Annexe and deliberately lied. He said, “I don’t know a damned thing about it.” I remember that he stopped me in the corridor and said, “Warburton, you don’t know what you’re talking about.” I said, “We will see.” Mr Brett provided information to the Fitzgerald inquiry showing that the former Premier lied and that his Minister also lied.

I simply make the point that from my point of view it is unfortunate that in Mr Fitzgerald’s examination, matters concerning the responsibility of Ministers to the Parliament and the people of Queensland were not addressed in the way I really thought they should have been. Again I make the point that if Ministers whom I believe hold the key to the destruction of parliamentary corruption are not made to accept their responsibilities, and if they are allowed to involve themselves in lies and deceit, there is truly little chance of having other than a corrupt system. This Parliament is where it will all start. Honourable members kid themselves if they think differently.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I am very sincere in all that I have said on this occasion. If the Government had been free from corruption and had responded to the ominous findings that had emerged from time to time, things might have been very different. What honourable members have now is a Premier who has been a member of this Government since 1968 and a Cabinet Minister since 1980. He is trying to pretend to this Parliament that he did not belong, during that long period of decay and decadence, to a Government. Clearly, he did; and he should be man enough to admit it in a manner similar to the way in which Mr Elliott stood in this Parliament today and said, “Yes, I was there.”

It is true to say that the Liberals were also there. What he said about the Liberal Attorney was true. What he said about one Liberal Attorney being spoken to in the

1970s by a Scotland Yard man named O'Connell—who indicated clearly that sectarianism and corruption were rife in the police force and that if something was not done about it, the whole force would suffer—was also true.

Mr LICKISS: I rise to a point of order. The remarks made by the honourable member for Sandgate are not true. I find them offensive and I ask for them to be withdrawn. What he is saying is that what has been stated by a particular person is in fact correct. Evidence before the commission will reveal that the information before the commission was incorrect, which was proven in cross-examination. I ask that those remarks be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Burreket): Order! The honourable member has asked for those remarks to be withdrawn.

Mr WARBURTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, could I explain something? At no stage did I mention any name. I said that the transcript of Fitzgerald inquiry evidence shows clearly what Mr Elliott said—that a Liberal Attorney spoke to a Scotland Yard person named O'Connell. Mr O'Connell is reported as saying in evidence——

Mr Lickiss: That is what you clearly said.

Mr WARBURTON: That was all I said. I did not mention the honourable member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I rule that as no honourable member's name was mentioned, there is no point of order.

Mr SIMPSON (Cooroora) (4.59 p.m.): I rise in this debate on the Fitzgerald inquiry report to mark the fact that the Queensland Parliament is different from other Parliaments throughout the world. All Parliaments have their strengths and weaknesses. Churchill said that although the Westminster system is not perfect, he believed it was the best of the lot.

In this State, it is necessary to have legislation or rules presented by the Government. It is the responsibility of members of the Opposition to examine the legislation and criticise it; they can also try to show fault in it; and, if they can agree with parts of it, they can do that, too. It is the primary responsibility of both the Opposition and every other member of this Parliament to look to the good government and well-being of the citizens of this State. It is also the responsibility of each member of Parliament to uphold good government, either directly in relation to individual electorates or collectively throughout the whole of Queensland.

Anyone who has not had the opportunity to read the Fitzgerald report in some detail and is depending upon the media for the information might be tempted to think that this report is some form of a bible written by a god. I am pleased to see that Mr Fitzgerald does not go quite that far. On page 357 of his report Mr Fitzgerald states—

“This Commission is not a replacement for the democratic process, but an adjunct to it.”

It must be remembered that the Bjelke-Petersen Government introduced this inquiry in Queensland and the present Government has supported the continuance of it. The report continues—

“It is not infallible”—

in other words, the Fitzgerald inquiry is not infallible and can make mistakes and some of those mistakes have been pointed out during this debate—

“or omniscient”—

in other words, set itself above everyone else and is not a god—

“and has had limited time to consider many complex topics. The Commission has no mandate to impose its opinions on the community.”

Under the Westminster system it is the responsibility of members of this Parliament to make the rules and laws of this State and that includes the implementation of the recommendations relating to the way elections are carried out in this State.

I return to the prime requirement of this inquiry, which was to broadly investigate corruption in Queensland, but more particularly to investigate prostitution, illegal gambling—there is both lawful and unlawful gambling in this State—and the sale of illegal drugs. When one looks at the report under a microscope, one finds that it does not refer to the taking of illegal drugs, only to the sale. Therefore, the inquiry was only concerned with the big-time Mr Bigs and little Mr Bigs. That sounds like a contradiction, but I mean the drug-pedlars and not the users.

Mr Lee: Hansard will fix it up, don't worry.

Mr SIMPSON: No, if I say it that way it will probably end up in the right position, that is, somewhere in-between. There is very serious corruption and there are many illegal operators in the community, and some are bigger than others.

The other matter to be investigated was the misconduct of the police force and payments made to political parties. It has become clear during this debate that the cause of this corruption is not the system—however well it may be devised—it is not the Government, or the political boundaries. Several people have telephoned me and expressed concern about the Fitzgerald report and said that it all comes back to the question of electoral boundaries. I have told them that one of the southern boundaries of my electorate is shared with Brian Austin's electorate and have asked them what part of the boundary is corrupt. This puts the spotlight on electoral boundaries. The honourable member for lost horses—what is his electorate?

Mr Menzel: Windsor.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, that is right, Windsor.

The honourable member for Windsor shakes his head. People use cliches such as "gerrymander", but they do not bother trying to find out what it means. This comment applies also to a lot of the media who glibly use the expression. Lately I have noticed that Jana Wendt has been using the term correctly by calling it the "so-called gerrymander". By definition, a gerrymander means rigging the electoral boundaries so that the Government remains in office for ever.

Mr Comben: So what have we got? If it's not a gerrymander, what is it?

Mr SIMPSON: I hear the cries from the ALP Opposition.

In his report Mr Fitzgerald has cleverly used journalese and has reported in the third person. He has stated that the general public have a concern for the electoral system because of the gerrymander that the Opposition is crying about. This concern relates to the zonal system, which could include weightage.

Mr Comben: Malapportionment.

Mr SIMPSON: Weightage.

Mr Comben: Malapportionment.

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member can include malapportionment so that he understands it. I will define it so that both those terms can be understood. The method is to vary the number of voters in an electorate who are represented by a member of Parliament. Therefore the number of voters in electorates do not have to be equal.

Mr Comben: That's not a definition of a gerrymander.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, it is.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Burreket): Order! The honourable member for Cooroora will continue with the debate.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, I will.

The interjections from the members of the Opposition lock them into their position. The Opposition has referred to the present zonal and/or weightage system in Queensland as a gerrymander. That is a lie. This Government did not introduce it. I will go back to the definition of "gerrymander". It is to rig the boundaries in such a way as to stop in office for ever. When the Labor Government that introduced this system lost office, the gerrymander was finished—QED, finished. No logical person alive could argue with that. That is what happened. Some people say to the Government, "Have you not changed it?" The answer to that is, no, it has not been changed.

Mr Prest: They have been changed three times since I have been here.

Mr SIMPSON: That has become a lie. As laid down in the Act with the zonal system and with weightage the boundaries must change regularly to provide for population growth.

Mr Stephan: The Labor Party wants to get into power with 43 per cent of the vote, just as their Federal colleagues do.

Mr SIMPSON: I am coming to that.

Mr Comben: You said the gerrymander will keep anyone in power for ever. How could we have had a gerrymander before 1957, if we lost power? Therefore, we did not have a gerrymander.

Mr SIMPSON: The member for Windsor cannot even hold on to the reins of a horse, let alone understand how this electoral system works.

I say again that the definition of a gerrymander is to rig the boundaries so that a Government will stop in office for ever. When it lost office under that system, it ceased to be a gerrymander. So I have put that to rest; there is no gerrymander in Queensland. If they wish to pursue the question of weightage—

Mr Comben: Malapportionment.

Mr SIMPSON: If the Opposition wishes to pursue malapportionment as a separate item—

Mr Comben: We do.

Mr SIMPSON: The honourable member does. Before, he did not, but now he does. Therefore, I will go into the new arena, that is, malapportionment or electoral weightage. That is where we find that the Labor Party is completely out of kilter with the rest of the Westminster world, where there is the weightage—electoral apportionment—

Mr Comben: Malapportionment—"mal" meaning bad—mala fides, malevolent, malapportionment.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, but by using "mal" the honourable member is putting a comment on "apportionment". He is talking about malapportionment. I am not talking about that. That is where my definition of weightage is correct, because that is what varies the numbers. The honourable member is saying "mal" apportionment, meaning the apportionment is bad.

Mr Comben: Yes.

Mr SIMPSON: That is where the honourable member is wrong.

I will return to the Westminster system. Instead of kings having the power and ruling—there are variations of that today, with totalitarian Governments—that right has gone to the people. Now the people make the rules. Because of the number of people in a State, they cannot all meet in one place, so they send a representative. In a Westminster system, it then becomes critical and crucial that that representation has

some degree of equality. It can never be made perfect. Because of the variation in the opportunity for equality of representation, electoral weightage is found in Britain, from where we take our example, the United States, Canada and other parts of Australia. That variation in the opportunity for equality of representation is caused by a whole number of things, but generally it is constituents' ability to have access to their representatives and vice versa. That can happen because of terrain, the size of the area to be looked after and so forth.

Let me look at that. In Britain that weightage is four to one; in America, five to one; in Canada, eleven to one; and here in Queensland, two and a-half to one. In Queensland the weightage is due for review again and it will increase to three to one. The member for Windsor wants to use the term "malapportionment", but those figures show that the weightage in Queensland has too flat a level of variation. With the political objectivity of the member for Windsor, he wants to have the so-called one vote, one value, which of course is wrong.

I will consider the Federal system, which has malapportionment on too flat a level, with a variation of only 10 per cent. The Federal system has been rigged cleverly by the use of words and Labor's numbers in the House to a point that the Act states that the electoral commission must project an equal number of electors in each electorate in three years' time. That means that any electorate that is a growth area has to be gerrymandered—in other words, the shape of the electorate has to be altered—in order to put a non-growth area with it. That brings about electorates that stretch from Beenleigh to Warwick, an example of gerrymandering of the worst type.

The other big thing in determining the shape of an electorate and being fair as an electoral commissioner is to look after community of interest. Surely a member of Parliament should look after people with a similar community of interest. The Australian Electoral Commission gives no consideration to that whatsoever. Our own commissioners do not give enough consideration to it. I have raised it several times. At the last redistribution I said to the commissioners, "If you intend to cut 10 000 people off me because my electorate is over quota, do not cut Nambour in half, because the community of interest of that township will be lost."

Mr Comben: What did they say?

Mr SIMPSON: They listened to that. The boundary goes right around Nambour so that the community could be left together. However, that did not occur at Alexandra Headland, Caloundra or Caboolture. Although the first two were later corrected, Caboolture was not. Ultimately there comes a time when that community of interest cannot be kept together, but the commissioners should try harder to do so.

The theorists and academics have examined the two-party preferred system. They say, "With that system, what chance has the Opposition of getting rid of the incumbent Government?" The matter was raised in the Fitzgerald report. Mr Fitzgerald made his comments based on the adage that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. That is partly true. If a Government thinks it cannot be beaten, it will be laissez-faire and prone to corruption.

I will discuss a two-party preferred system. The Opposition claims that Queensland's system is a terrible system. In Queensland, the ALP would require 51.2 per cent of the vote to be elected to Government. Opposition members claim that that is most unfair, that it should be 50 per cent. Ideally, it should be 50 per cent. To get rid of the Federal Government under the corrupt Federal electoral system, the Opposition requires 52.3 per cent of the vote. Mr Bowen and the Australian Electoral Commission offered to implement the Federal electoral system in Queensland. However, in the referendum, the people of Australia said, "No, we want to keep the present system in Queensland." The Federal system is twice as bad as Queensland's system. If Queensland's electoral system is related to corruption, as has been suggested—I believe it is hog-wash—the Federal system is twice as corrupt.

In New South Wales, the Greiner Government, in coalition with the National Party, required 53 per cent of the vote to get rid of Labor's gerrymander. That puts the figures into perspective.

I return to my fundamental point, which was referred to by the honourable member for Mount Gravatt. Corruption is the temptation of an individual, not necessarily the system. I do not doubt that the system may help, but the figures I have produced prove that the electoral system in Queensland is not to blame.

Mr Hayward: What causes corruption?

Mr SIMPSON: The individual.

Mr Hayward: Do you mean incompetence?

Mr SIMPSON: It occurs when an individual accepts a consideration, money, position or benefit. It does not have to be money; it can be promise of advancement or a better standard of living. It is a matter of degree.

People say that corruption is terrible. The report reveals a person who confessed to taking \$3m over 20 years. When one considers the large amounts received in one year from drug-dealing, one realises that \$3m is chicken feed.

Mr Menzel: What did Fitzgerald do with Herbert, anyway? He's still living in a penthouse.

Mr SIMPSON: I take the honourable member's point. Herbert is living in the lap of luxury and is protected. I appreciate why that happened.

Fitzgerald indicated that corruption exists in Queensland. I do not hesitate to say that a similar degree of corruption exists throughout Australia. The incidence of corruption in Queensland compared with that throughout the world would rate three or four on a scale of 10. Honourable members have heard of the corruption that occurs in Latin America and parts of Europe.

I return to the question of corruption of individuals. Corruption is a temptation for all people. Sometimes the system tends to make it the norm. Tipping is a form of corruption. It is not widespread in Australia; I hope it never will be. In overseas countries where tipping is widespread, people may not realise that they are paying money for favours, but that is what they are doing. They regard it as small-time corruption and do not worry about it. The local policeman goes to the local pub, asks for a six-pack and does not pay for it. People might say, "That is not a big deal, it is only a six-pack." I do not believe that is the case. Whether the amount involved is small or large, the practice is wrong. It progresses from there into the big time of organised crime and ends up involving large amounts of money such as the \$3m to which I referred. Those aspects need to be examined.

The Fitzgerald report referred to prostitution. The other big bloke who used to be in the National Party said, "You can't stamp it out; it's the oldest profession. It is in the too-hard basket. Perhaps we should legalise it." In his recommendations, Mr Fitzgerald does not go that far. However, it is National Party policy to legalise prostitution.

I turn to the matter of pornography, which is a spin-off from prostitution. The member for Mount Gravatt, Mr Ian Henderson, referred to that. The report contains a similar response and states that it is widespread. I draw the attention of honourable members to what happened in South Australia. The members of the South Australian Government were soft on pornography until it bit them, and it bit them in the form of child pornography. Mr Fitzgerald says, "Oh, pornography is not so bad, but child pornography is no good." Legalisation is suggested as a cop-out or a soft way to handle it.

The same suggestion is made in regard to illegal drugs. That really frightens me. Of course, the Government has legalised the handing-out of free syringes. That is crazy.

Mr Comben: No, it isn't. It saves our young people from death.

Mr SIMPSON: That is not supported by scientific fact. I do not want to go into that, but it follows that people will be handing out free drugs as an answer to the drug problem, and that is implied in this report.

Surely one of the major matters that the commission should have examined is the drug problem. I am told—and I have to accept assurances from the Government—that this problem, which is a terrible thing, is being attended to but that it is being attended to quietly. That is all right, as long as it is being done. However, it should be remembered that Mr Fitzgerald has said that the drug problem should be discussed publicly, even though he kept secret his own findings in that regard. I rate the drug problem as being more important than all these other things. So, most of the commissioner's time has been taken up with this problem, but he cannot tell anyone about it. I hope that he succeeds.

Misconduct in the police force has been highlighted. However, on balance, most of our policemen are good guys and are resisting the temptation to engage in misconduct and corruption. That is what must be remembered.

When I listened to the media reports on the Fitzgerald report last Monday night, I found that the emphasis was on corruption in Queensland and how terrible it was. If an overseas visitor had switched on a television set in Brisbane that night and listened to the broadcasts, he would be convinced that the quicker he got out of this country, the better.

I point out that muggings are common in other parts of the world. Honourable members who have been to New York, Los Angeles or, for that matter, parts of Canada and Europe know that Queensland does have law and order and it does have a police force that works, in spite of this corruption, thank God.

I turn to the issue of payments to political parties. It was mentioned in the report because of evidence that was given at the inquiry——

Mr Schuntner: What about corruption in Cooroy?

Mr SIMPSON: What about it?

Mr Schuntner: Wasn't it corrupt behaviour on your part in getting a list of the parents of students at the Cooroy school? That's corruption.

Mr SIMPSON: I wondered where the honourable member leaked that information from. He should not mislead this House——

Mr Schuntner: You got it in the Cooroy newspaper.

Mr SIMPSON: Yes, the Cooroy newspaper does have it.

Mr Schuntner: Straight from the Minister's office.

Mr SIMPSON: As Mr Fitzgerald has said, it is the responsibility of members of Parliament to acquaint their constituents with truthful information. I believe that he was spot-on there. That is one of my responsibilities. Of course, the poor old Liberal teacher opposite, who has been spreading rumours in an attempt to mislead and create public disquiet, does not like it. I was in fact writing to the parents of the students at the school about the safety of their children and what the State Government was going to do to improve that. The honourable member is claiming that I, as an elected representative, should not do that. The honourable member is obviously going against the recommendations of Commissioner Fitzgerald.

This report contains a challenge to everybody, including members of Parliament. As I have said, it all gets back to the individual. I do not want to sound corny, but it really is up to individuals to set an example by being pure, honest and Christian. Members of Parliament must set an example and make it plain that they will not have

a bar of corruption, that they will not have a bar of taking money for favours, that they will do their job and represent all their constituents equally and fairly and that they will use their influence equally throughout their electorates. I believe that that is something to which honourable members should give consideration as this Parliament tries to find a solution from the recommendations that have been made by Mr Fitzgerald, some of which I believe are worthy of consideration and implementation——

Time expired.

Mr WHITE (Redcliffe) (5.29 p.m.): The Fitzgerald report provides, to my mind, a marvellous blueprint for public life, not only in Queensland but also throughout this country. It is well presented in a cogent, coherent, sensible form which everybody can understand. It contains an excellent analysis of corruption in this State and provides a solution for Government in a modern society that balances the requirements of efficiency and accountability.

All honourable members understand that a Government cannot legislate morality and can never completely legislate honesty. However, a lot can be done to discourage and prevent dishonesty and corruption.

The recommendations clearly highlight the failure of the Queensland version of the Westminster system—some of us know it as the “Axe-minster” system—and, while suggesting a return of significant powers to the Parliament, it recognises that failure. We all have to accept that the Westminster system has failed, particularly in a modern society.

The structural changes suggested are meticulous about the existence of checks and balances, but no more so than in the creation of the new commissions and parliamentary committees. The commissions will be extraordinarily powerful. The select committee on electoral and administrative reform and the criminal justice committee will have very widespread and extensive powers similar to those of an intelligence and security committee of the Senate or the American committee on foreign affairs. Thirdly, an all-party committee will monitor the costs and workings of ministerial media activities and Government activities and advertising.

The powers given to those committees are almost revolutionary and highlight a significant movement of power from the Executive to this Parliament. I think that all honourable members, irrespective of their party allegiance, would welcome that change. Over the years we have seen a significant removal of the power and authority of this place to the Executive of the day. The report is welcomed by the Liberal Party and is a clear vindication of the efforts made by my colleagues and former members in this place, particularly since the late seventies.

It should be placed on record in this debate that the Liberal Party has paid an enormous price in its endeavours to clean up the Government, as highlighted by the events of 1983. It should also be remembered that it was Bruce Bishop and Peter White who in the late seventies first raised the issue of corruption on the Gold Coast. What happened to them? They were ridiculed in this place, put down and disparaged. Finally, in a dirty, grubby political deal—a preference deal—between the National Party and those hypocrites of political virtue, the Australian Labor Party, the people in the Labor Party put two of the best members in this place out of business. No two people could have stood for political morality, electoral reform and decency better than Peter White and Bruce Bishop. The crumbs in the Labor Party——

Opposition members interjected.

Mr WHITE: The members of the Opposition cannot even get two of their members out of bed to vote, so they should not talk to me about any arrangements.

The Fitzgerald report has rightly emphasised the deep-seated corruption in Queensland. It should be remembered how far members of the Labor Party have sunk. They sold out their so-called principles by giving their preferences to the Bjelke-Petersen regime. They danced with the devil. Why did they do it?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr WHITE: They wanted resources; they wanted press secretaries; they wanted secretaries. In 1983 and again in 1986 they sold their party out. Look at the resources that the Labor Party received in those years!

I do not intend to labour the point, but I refer honourable members to the public statements of Lindsay Hartwig, who spilled the beans on the Joh plot to get rid of the Liberals, and to the Labor Party's treachery in that affair. Nobody remembers more than I do the dreadful lies and outrageous dishonesty during the 1983 State election. The Fitzgerald report is littered chapter and verse with the deals done to fund the media blitzkrieg of the elections in 1983 and 1986. The incredible sums of money extracted from companies signify the necessity to implement immediately Fitzgerald's recommendation for a register of political donations. We have gone too far and it has to be put in place as quickly as possible.

I firmly believe now that things are so bad in Queensland that the sooner we move to public funding, the better. Some of my Liberal Party colleagues may not agree with that, but it has become so bad that it must be considered. Things have become so bad that we have learnt of the mystical bags of cash appearing in a Premier's office without any adequate explanation being given as to who provided the money. And what about the favours commonly known in the commercial world as Joh's tit-for-tat deals—"You cough and we approve."? What about the blackmail of companies that honourable members know were told, "If you want to get on in this State, you have to cough, and if you support the Liberal Party or the Labor Party, you can hardly expect to get an approval. You have to be outside."

Many respectable companies have made it known that it was not only inadvisable to be seen or to be associated with the Liberal Party but it was death to getting a fair go in this State, and, more particularly, to getting Government work on the basis of merit and not on the basis of patronage or corruption.

I move now to the issue of the pecuniary interests register. What do we have in this place? What a charade it was when the legislation was introduced. I told honourable members that they would regret it and that they would be just a joke. I said that all their names and details of their interests would be published in the media. That has happened. Mr Fitzgerald highlighted the conflict between private interests and public duty. He did that very well. Finally, in his report he said—

"... it is unsatisfactory that details of the financial interests of members of a Minister's immediate family are not available for scrutiny in appropriately controlled circumstances."

The way to go is to have a private register of members' interests, those of their wives, their families, their companies, their trusts—the whole lot. If serious allegations of corruption or maladministration are made, there must be a trigger mechanism so that the Clerk of the Parliament or some other appropriate person can make that information available.

Mr Schuntner: That is what the Liberal amendment sought to achieve, I believe.

Mr WHITE: Mr Schuntner has rightly pointed out that it was an amendment that the Liberal Party tried to have accepted at the time.

The only reason that the register was introduced was to have some sort of political symbolism. But what about the other key players in this State? What about the chairmen of the various statutory authorities, the chief executives and the heads of major Government departments? What sort of accountability will there be for those people? What about some of the deals that those people have been involved in? What about the extraordinary wealth that some of them have accumulated in a very short space of time? Many of those people—particularly the key chief executives and chairmen—have far more power than has almost any member of this House, except for the Ministers. Those people

should be accountable and their interests registered in the same way as the interests of Ministers and other members of this House should be registered.

I turn now to the very interesting subject of ministerial expenses. What Mr Lane has said has been well publicised. On page 17 of his report, Mr Fitzgerald says—

“Major examples of issues which continue to smoulder or may be reignited by some future rake-over include . . . Ahern’s disputed assertion”—

about the activities of Bjelke-Petersen, ministerial expenses and the allegations of Mr Lane. Mr Fitzgerald says—

“True or false and intentionally or otherwise, this position has many advantages for (Mr Lane): a denial of corruption, acknowledgement of conduct which, even if illegal, apparently was considered not to put his huge superannuation at risk, revenge upon those who had been actively or passively involved in his downfall, and the setting of a monumental and hugely politically sensitive task of investigating the activities of a number of other Ministers over many years.”

Mr Fitzgerald continues—

“All of those Lane named as participants in activities similar to those which he says he undertook have denied his assertions by statutory declarations.”

On page 136 of his report, Mr Fitzgerald recommends that thorough and detailed guide-lines be laid down and that the Auditor-General be empowered to conduct detailed audits of expenditure at least yearly to ensure that those guide-lines are followed.

In respect of Mr Lane’s allegations about the media—the media were like a pack of jackals at the Fitzgerald inquiry. They did not wait or give anybody the courtesy of a reply or to see what statements would be made by other people. They raced off with their headlines and photographs without giving anybody mentioned the opportunity to respond. Later, when responses were made, either they played them down or failed to report the statements. That was the absolute pits.

The late John Herbert has been dead for many years and Fred Campbell has been out of this place for a decade, yet they have been mentioned in the report. It is bad enough when people such as myself and others are mentioned, but at least we can defend ourselves in this House.

The people mentioned in the report have made submissions to the inquiry. My Liberal colleagues and I have co-operated freely with Mr Fitzgerald. I welcomed inquiries from the Taxation Office. Furthermore, I requested that the Auditor-General carry out a retrospective and detailed audit of all my ministerial expenses and cash advances.

Today in this House, I call publicly upon the Taxation Commissioner to institute an investigation into all Ministers, past and present, from the Premier down. If it is good enough for those members who have been named by Lane, it is good enough for everybody. I call upon the commissioner to treat everybody in the very same way and not to isolate those people who have been mentioned by Mr Lane. Firstly, that investigation by the commissioner should cover the legitimacy of parliamentary expenses in respect of deductions and claims for expenses incurred in carrying out members’ parliamentary duties. Secondly, it should deal with the income treatment of ministerial expenses including any amounts advanced to Ministers or paid on behalf of Ministers. Thirdly, in respect of ministerial cash advances—I suggest that the commissioner pay particular attention to the utilisation of cash credit accounts, which I understand were established by some Ministers and regularly topped up.

I wish to make it clear that there is nothing wrong with claiming for legitimate expenses and nothing wrong with cash advances, provided that those advances are used correctly in the normal and legitimate activities of running a Ministry. The workload on Ministers is incredible. I doubt very much whether many Ministers would have the time to get involved in the nitty-gritty. They rely on their staff, the permanent heads of their departments and the accountants within those departments. Frankly, when I was a Minister I would not have had a clue about those things. I was too busy getting on

with my job. I would say that the same would apply to the overwhelming majority of the colleagues, both past and present, with whom I had the privilege of serving.

Let me deal with the politics and media treatment of the matters flowing from the Fitzgerald inquiry. The member for Murrumbidgee—that sanctimonious substitute for an Attorney-General who speaks repeatedly in this place about fairness, equity and natural justice—has embarked upon a deliberate campaign to smear by innuendo the good names and reputations of as many people as he possibly can. All honourable members know that that is a purely political move to try to discredit individual people and the parties that they represent.

On page 8 of his report, Mr Fitzgerald said—

“Innocent persons incorrectly subjected to inaccurate media reporting justifiably expect their names to be cleared.”

Mr Fitzgerald stated further that he would also have created an immediate class of people against whom neither an adverse nor a favourable finding could be made. That would have left open the unjust implication in some cases that they were at least under suspicion. I suggest that Mr Wells digest that. As St Augustine has been quoted by Mr Wells, it would be appropriate if he were to heed St Augustine’s words and make himself pure before he gets himself into further embarrassment and disrepute, particularly as he is a person who has substantial legal qualifications and who expects people to take him seriously. He is a wimp; he is a fraud. In my view, he has carried on quite improperly.

If people are found to have done the wrong thing, they should be dealt with in the proper place and not placed on trial by the media. Let me deal with what should happen. Firstly, let the Taxation Commissioner get on with the job, because after all that Commissioner Fitzgerald has done, the Taxation Commissioner will be the great beneficiary from people who are mentioned in the inquiry as having done the wrong thing.

Secondly, Fitzgerald’s recommendations should be taken further and the Government, the Parliament or the Public Accounts Committee should direct the Auditor-General to carry out a detailed retrospective audit and investigation of all Ministers, past and present, and, for that matter, all members of this place.

Thirdly, I can only repeat the previous statements that my Liberal colleagues and I have made: I do not care who does the job, as long as somebody gets on with it so that the cloud hanging over the people mentioned and those not mentioned can be lifted and that the public of Queensland know the facts and not the smear promoted by Mr Wells and some other people in the Labor Party.

In recent times, much has been said about political espionage, phone-tapping and things of that nature. In the concluding part of my speech I thought I would touch briefly on that and make the point that two days ago the former Speaker, Mr Powell, made allegations about his phones being tapped. Mr Menzel has asked questions in this place about phone-tapping. Recent revelations in the *Bulletin* highlighted that, on instructions from the former Premier, Mike Evans’ phone was tapped.

Fourthly, I recall the admissions by Mr Hinze that the former Premier instructed him to compile a dirt file on former Liberals Peter White and Bruce Bishop. Fifthly, there were further revelations that the former Premier asked the special branch to compile a dirt file on Angus Innes, because he regarded him as being a significant political challenge to him.

Sixthly, in my case, in 1983 I was advised by Telecom that my phones were tapped. I note from the Fitzgerald report that this subject does not appear to have received much attention, if any. However, bearing in mind the serious allegations made and revealed in the media and the Parliament, I think it is now time that an investigation be carried out and that steps be taken to avoid the possibility and abuse of phone-tapping in the future. Frankly, I do not know whether my phones were tapped. I was told and warned that they were. During the election campaign my phones made all sorts of funny noises, which remarkably disappeared after the election. It makes one really wonder.

Furthermore, not only should the role of the media in participating illegally in the dissemination of details of private conversations be condemned, but also action should be taken to strengthen the provisions of, firstly, the Federal Telecommunications (Interception) Act and, secondly, the Queensland Invasion of Privacy Act. As all honourable members know—it is a matter of public information—recently, my car phone was tapped by Channel 9 and Channel 9 saw fit, illegally, to disseminate that information. Later on that was taken up by other elements in the media. That is wrong. It is illegal. It was embarrassing to me. Many honourable members thought it was quite funny. Mr Deputy Speaker, if that happened to you, I would suggest that, apart from the illegalities of it all, you would be a little bit upset about it. Channel 9 and that masquerading reporter Warren Clarke, who disappeared for a while but I see that he is back on the scene, eagerly promoted the material and made it available to other elements in the media. Those people should be condemned. Mr Bond has enough trouble. One would have thought that something would be done to at least introduce some code of ethics within the media.

My solicitors have pursued the matter, and they will continue to pursue it. If it is possible to prove a case against Channel 9, I intend to prosecute. That is my only chance. The problem is that it will be expensive to take legal action. Shortly, I will have to make a decision as to whether or not I will have to make a substantial contribution. I am probably in a better position than some other people. But what chance does the ordinary member of the public have?

Honourable members: None at all.

Mr WHITE: He has no chance at all.

That whole episode is wrong; it has to be exposed. At the time Channel 9 skited about it. Its legal people just brushed aside the views that my solicitors provided to them.

Apart from aspects of direct corruption in the police force, many other matters have to be considered. As I said, honesty and morality will never be legislated, but everything possible should be done. Mr Fitzgerald has made some very good suggestions in that direction. I say all of us should take a thorough and proper approach to this report. Inevitably, public disputation will occur over his recommendations in respect of electoral redistribution, but I do not think there is any great difference of opinion relating to his other recommendations. As Mr Innes has suggested and promulgated in the media, a tripartite approach should be adopted. If necessary, the good offices of Mr Fitzgerald could be prevailed upon to be an honest broker in these matters.

Let me also say that great care should be taken to balance the rights of individual citizens with some of the implications inherent in Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations. As my colleague the member for Stafford pointed out, the recommendations relating to the criminal justice commission are far-reaching and imply substantial invasion of individual rights. They give free rein to invade the privacy of those in Government, in the private sector and in the media, and of the average citizen.

Very powerful rights and significant powers are given to the commission. As members of Parliament, we should be careful to ensure that, in our anxiety, we do not go overboard and create not only great fear but also opportunity for invasion of privacy when setting up another bureaucratic empire that may get out of control. Those of us who have been members of this Parliament for some time know the great difficulty involved when a department becomes so big that it is out of control.

I must say that I am concerned about recommendations expressing Mr Fitzgerald's views on the absolute privilege of members of this Parliament. All honourable members would recognise that in the past some members have abused privilege, and that some continue to do so. Not the least among them was that former bodgie member for Rockhampton, Mr Wright. I can well remember when he cooked up a nice little deal with the former Attorney-General—that wimp and emasculated gentleman, Mr Harper—and rose in this Parliament to embarrass both me and the Liberal Party. He made

allegations that the Liberal Party received \$200,000 as a political bribe and that a crook by the name of Penklis had sewn it all up. The National Party Government at that time thought that was great until it was discovered that Penklis had also referred to Mr Austin when he was the Minister for Health—the man known as “Sid Vicious” these days—and to a former Deputy Premier, Dr Llew Edwards. That is the type of gross abuse that occurred.

What did the media do? No notice was taken of the fact that they were told that it was all a pack of lies. Two years later, when Penklis was prosecuted in the courts, found guilty and sent to gaol, he apologised and completely withdrew the allegations that he had made against members of this Parliament, namely, Edwards, Doumany, Austin and White. The media did absolutely nothing. That paragon of virtue, the *Courier-Mail*, put my photograph on the front page because of an incident involving the Redcliffe Hospital. Although that newspaper received all the documentation and knew jolly well what the position was, absolutely nothing was done. That is the type of conduct that has to stop. That is why I mention the matter of parliamentary privilege.

A balance has to be struck. Really, what it gets down to is the integrity of the individual member of Parliament.

Mr Hayward: Don't you think we should also have a pecuniary interest register for journalists?

Mr WHITE: I think the stage has been reached when the interests and associations of people in the media should be placed on the public record. After all, they are part of the fourth estate. They are not prepared to become members of Parliament and cop the crow. They are not prepared to stand for election. They pontificate in their protected castles, but take no responsibility. They point the bone at people who are members of this Parliament. After all, none of us is perfect and we do not live in a perfect world. None of us is infallible. However, most members of this Parliament try to do the right thing. I acknowledge also that the fourth estate also attracts some wonderful people such as Phil Dickie, Chris Masters from the ABC, Dempster and company and Koch. Although they have given me plenty of trouble over the years, I recognise that they are good people.

Unfortunately, there are a lot of crumbs in the media who are too lazy. They survive on leaks and have done so for years. They are basically lazy and curry favour with individual members. Before his death, a journalist who was employed by the *Sunday Mail* mentioned to me that he was sorry that he had printed some of the leaks that embarrassed me and other people. I will not mention his name, but merely indicate that he was a prominent reporter for the *Sunday Mail*. Honourable members can work out for themselves the person to whom I refer.

All honourable members know that this treatment happens; that it is cheap and dishonest; and that it should stop. I return to the point I was making about Mr Fitzgerald's views on parliamentary privilege. I will not allow people to take away the absolute privilege of members of Parliament. I will fight that move to the end. I will even put up with some of the abuse that many members put up with. I am not trying to elicit sympathy in relation to this matter, because all members of Parliament cop crow and get on with the job. If we lose absolute privilege—which has been a time-honoured part of parliamentary life—this Parliament will be the sadder for it. More particularly, the people we represent will suffer because, after all, many matters are raised in this place and action is taken as a result. For example, many frauds are also exposed. On balance, I believe that Mr Fitzgerald is wrong in relation to parliamentary privilege.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr HOBBS (Warrego) (7.30 p.m.): Tonight I have pleasure in taking part in this debate into all aspects of the Fitzgerald report. This is a very important time for Queensland, and everyone has waited a long time for this report to be issued.

I wish to refer to the matters that Mr Fitzgerald and the people of Queensland really want to have addressed. I can say unequivocally that no thanks can go to the opposition parties, because, as was seen last Wednesday, their platforms seem to be disruption, double standards and untruths. Honourable members can assist in making Queensland a much better State by implementing these recommendations.

I wish to refer to the report and to the efforts made by this Government to improve all standards throughout Queensland. The disruptions that have occurred in this House are no better than the corruption of Parliament, and this is exactly what happened last Wednesday. The Liberal and Labor Parties formed a coalition and disrupted Parliament. There is no doubt in my mind that senior members of both parties conferred on the matter.

Mrs McCauley: The "GLIB" party.

Mr HOBBS: Yes, that is correct, the "GLIB" party.

Mr Henderson: Goss, Lyons, Innes and Bjelke-Petersen.

Mr HOBBS: Yes, that is correct.

The Queensland Government recalled Parliament in good faith to debate the Fitzgerald report and the people of Queensland expected us to do exactly that. Unfortunately, that was not to be and disruptions occurred that were not in the best interests of Queensland.

I turn now to consider the matter of double standards. Mr Goss and Mr Innes have been shouting from the rooftops about the horrors of rushed legislation. One only has to refer to the *Hansard* of the previous sittings of Parliament to find that day after day they referred to legislation being rushed through the House. It is a case of double standards right down to the very T, because suddenly it becomes okay for legislation to be rushed through the House that will set up a commission that will hold hearings, redraw some of the electoral boundaries—if necessary—notify electors and in some cases call nominations, and all this is to happen within three months. Obviously the opposition parties have no conception of distance. This is a typical case of double standards which the National Party Government will not tolerate and it is of no help at all when it comes to the administration of a better Queensland.

Mr Henderson: They also want to be independent, but they want to tell us when to do things.

Mr HOBBS: That is correct.

Mr Fitzgerald has been trying to uncover all the untruths and yesterday the leaders of the opposition parties both in the House and in the media were trying to put blame on the Premier and Government for the fiasco that occurred and the eventual downfall of the previous Speaker. Most honourable members in this House know what happened. The planning was obvious for all to see, as were the actions of members; the grins, winks, crossing of fingers, suggestions and the media presence in the House and over at the annexe. Why was the media running around on the 23rd floor of the annexe? They were also in the lifts and the gallery. Apparently everyone knew about it except us. It was a conspiracy formed by the opposition coalition. The Speaker resigned and there was a sudden change of heart. If someone resigns from a position on moral grounds, one would think that he would then leave, but suddenly the former Speaker wanted to be part of it again.

Mr Ardill: You've missed the bus.

Mr HOBBS: We have not missed the bus; this is all part of it.

Mr Vaughan: We've had the election of the Speaker. It's all over; it's all finished.

Mr HOBBS: This is corruption of Parliament. Unfortunately the honourable member for Nudgee was not here for the beginning. I am referring to the outcome of the Fitzgerald inquiry, the disruptions of Parliament, double standards and untruths.

It is a web of intrigue, suspicion and mistrust. The majority of members came to this House to debate the Fitzgerald report and were faced with disruptions. Instead of providing reasonable debate and Opposition views on issues concerning Queensland, the Leader of the Opposition instead chased elusive phantoms around the corridors of Parliament. He seeks them here, he seeks them there; in fact he seeks them everywhere. He seeks them in Heaven, he wished them in hell, he was even seeking them in the stairwell. He saw two yesterday, he seeks five today; those darned elusive Labor infidels.

Mr Vaughan: I'll bet you wrote this. All his own work.

Mr HOBBS: That is correct; it is my own work.

Mr Fitzgerald is only human and, like the rest of us, he has his strengths and weaknesses. His report has its strengths and weaknesses. The first strength lies in the recommendations to clean up the Queensland police force with a view to giving the public confidence in the force. The second strength is to bring corrupt police to justice. The third strength is to review the administrative methods of running this State and bring to justice those people who have not acted in accordance with acceptable standards.

There are many more recommendations in the report that are strengths, but there are weaknesses. One of the main weaknesses concerns the lack of information on the drugs issue. I was under the belief that an investigation of the drug industry was one of the main terms of reference of this inquiry, but Appendix 2 of the report, which sets out the terms of reference, shows that only half a page was dedicated to the drugs issue.

A reading of what Mr Fitzgerald has said about drugs shows that he thought the issue was too hard and should be referred to the Commonwealth Government. To me, that raised a few questions. I read on and found implied support for commonly used drugs. I thought I had read that somewhere in a Labor Party policy statement. That made me wonder a little more. I went on to look at what he said about prostitution, which was also part of the early terms of reference. Only one page has been devoted to this issue. He said that, for the overall benefit of the community, it may be better to control and regulate and not just prohibit prostitution. I raised my eyebrows at that. What can one deduce from that? One could predict that the Valley would become an up-market Kings Cross.

Mr Fitzgerald made a scant reference to pornography, which he also put into the too-hard basket. The commissioner said that child pornography should remain as a serious offence. By hell, it certainly should! The report does not cover many aspects of this subject. I have here some documentation that is available through some music shops throughout this State. They are examples of the types of things that Mr Fitzgerald should have been addressing. They are absolutely vulgar. I wish to table them.

Whereupon the honourable member laid the documents on the table.

Mr Ardill: Why should you be appraising that rubbish?

Mr HOBBS: If the honourable member looks at the articles, he will find that they are disgusting. They are all to do with prostitution and pornography. These things are all part of the one operation. He should have looked at them.

A quick summary of what I have so far seen in the report is that the use of some drugs can be allowed, prostitution can be controlled and regulated and adult pornography is okay. As I pointed out, this report has some strengths and some weaknesses.

The Government is prepared to have a shot at stamping out corruption in Queensland. With some of the guide-lines from this report, it will certainly be able to do so. The Government is prepared to establish the electoral and administrative review commission and the criminal justice commission in a real effort to try to do the right thing

so that the people of Queensland will be able to see at first hand how these problems can be addressed publicly in order that they can have confidence in the future.

What electoral boundaries have to do with corruption is difficult to understand. A while ago the member for Cairns, Mr De Lacy, certainly assured the House that the electoral system is the cause of corruption. How he can come to that conclusion is a bit beyond me. From that assumption, one can presume that Canada and the UK are corrupt and that Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia are not corrupt.

Mr Alison: The Australian Government must be corrupt, too.

Mr HOBBS: That is right.

Mr Alison: They have a bigger discrepancy than we have.

Mr HOBBS: That is right. The member for Maryborough is saying that the Federal Government has a one vote, one value system, which is supposedly a fair system and that, therefore, it falls into the same category.

The States I have just mentioned, that is, Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia, have lost billions of dollars in recent scandals, yet they have this supposedly fantastic one vote, one value fair system. So I fail to see the connection there. Other members have covered this topic very well and to dwell too much on it would be to go over the same ground. However, I wish to raise a few little points before I conclude. Firstly, I reject totally the Labor and Liberal coalition policy that our boundaries are unfair. The critics have no concept of distance or remoteness. My electorate is the same size as Victoria. Under the system proposed by the opposition in coalition, it would more than double in size. Is that fair? It certainly is not fair!

Mr Vaughan: Ask the member for Barambah——

Mr Stephan: I'd like to see him riding a push-bike around your electorate.

Mr HOBBS: The member for Nudgee would get lost out there. In fact, he would get lost on the way to Charleville. He probably would not even make it. Even if he hopped on the train, he would not be able to stay on the rails.

I remind members that Queensland has no Upper House, a circumstance which I support. However, a reasonably weighted electoral system is some security for the people of Queensland and offers a guarantee of reasonable representation without their being dominated by a centralist Government.

In referring to the electoral and administrative review commission, I point out one of the weaknesses of the report. Mr Fitzgerald states that there should be a five-member commission, one member an academic, one from either public or private administration, one a lawyer, one from the industrial arena and a chairman. Somewhere along the line he forgot about a representative of the people who live on 90 per cent of the land mass of Queensland, those very people who produce an estimated 85 per cent of the export income of Queensland. Surely those people deserve some recognition in the report.

Mr Ardill: Those people out there are different from all the poor people.

Mr HOBBS: Why would it not be reasonable to have a representative of those people on the commission?

Mr Ardill: How do you know one of them doesn't come from there?

Mr HOBBS: Mr Fitzgerald referred to an academic, a public or private administrator, a lawyer, a person in the industrial arena and a chairman.

Mr Vaughan: The chairman might come from there.

Mr HOBBS: The chairman might not necessarily be from there.

Mr Fitzgerald has not addressed the problem properly. He has forgotten a large group of people in a vast area of the State. Because of that, we must study the report carefully.

Over a period of years, 30 costly royal commissions have been conducted in Australia. Honourable members might speculate as to the effectiveness of those royal commissions. However, at last, the Queensland National Party—to the betterment of Queensland and the other States of Australia—is prepared to make a genuine attempt to clean up corruption. It is an unpalatable move, and the Government needs the support of all Queenslanders. If the Government cannot obtain support in its move to clean up corruption, no other Government in Australia or in the Western World will ever carry through an inquiry such as this to the fullest extent.

Mr Campbell: It's got our support; it hasn't got your support.

Mr HOBBS: It has our support. The Government has the power and, at the end of the day, it will make the decision. The people of Queensland will support the Government on this issue. At the end of the day, we will end up with a far better State with better conditions in which to live. At present, we have the best State.

Mr Campbell: And the poorest people—the lowest paid.

Mr HOBBS: The poorest people, be damned! If that is so, why do so many people want to come to Queensland? Why does Queensland have the highest population growth in Australia? Queensland creates 30 per cent of the jobs created in Australia.

Mr Campbell: You're bringing elderly people up here to retire, and many young people are leaving Queensland.

Mr HOBBS: That is rubbish. A cross-section of people are coming to Queensland—the people who want to retire, the people who want to work and the people who want to go on the dole. Surely they knew that the sun was here before this. They are coming to a State which has lower taxes.

Mr Campbell: For who?

Mr HOBBS: For all Queenslanders. The ABS statistics make it clear that Queensland is the lowest-taxed State, and it will be the least-corrupt State as well.

Mr Ardill: Here, have a loan of my copy.

Mr HOBBS: I have a copy of that report.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Row): Order! The Chair has some sympathy for the mood of the Chamber. Nevertheless, the Hansard reporters also have my sympathy. It must be difficult for them to record the person speaking when so many others are interjecting. I ask the Chamber to come to order.

Mr HOBBS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

If the other States of Australia had the guts to do what the Government has done in Queensland, their reports would be three times as big as the report that the member for Salisbury is waving around.

Mr Austin: What about the Brisbane City Council when he was a member?

Mr HOBBS: That is correct.

Mr ARDILL: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the House has impugned the city council, a council of which I was a member. I take strong exception to it. There was no corruption in the city council during the time that I was there; it was completely clean. I ask that he withdraw that comment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders provide for the withdrawal of comments in the Chamber that are offensive to members. However, I cannot think of

any Standing Order that covers the situation raised by the member for Salisbury. There is no point of order.

Mr HOBBS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The honourable member certainly is in deep water.

With regard to the Fitzgerald inquiry and the attitude that the Queensland Government has taken, I am proud to be part of a Government that is prepared to bite the bullet and to implement as many of the recommendations as it can. However, it must be made quite clear that the report contains recommendations and suggestions. Mr Fitzgerald stated that many issues need further review and further study.

Mr Vaughan: The Premier says "lock, stock and barrel".

Mr HOBBS: Yes, and that will be done on those issues. However, throughout the report, Mr Fitzgerald said that further study and review was needed.

I have faith in the people of Queensland. I am sure that they will allow the Government to carry out this very difficult task.

Mr EATON (Mourilyan) (7.52 p.m.): I congratulate Mr Fitzgerald on his report. I think that he did a great job. I have listened to discussions that have taken place outside this Chamber in regard to what was expected to be in the Fitzgerald report and what was actually in it. I have analysed the report. I think it all comes back to complacency on the part of the present Government.

Mr Fitzgerald brought things out into the open by unexpected means. He granted indemnities, which disappointed me when I first heard about them. However, I have read his reasons for doing so. He wanted to bring everything out into the open. I think that the results prove that Mr Fitzgerald's decision was correct.

I want to emphasise the fact that in his report Mr Fitzgerald has placed the onus on us, as parliamentarians, to see that his recommendations are implemented in the manner in which he intended when he wrote that report.

People have waited for the Fitzgerald report for a long time. It was not as sensational as some people wanted it to be or expected it to be. People wanted Mr Fitzgerald to do the dirty work for the Government. They wanted him to bring down a report that would say, "Gaol this fellow, gaol that fellow, charge this fellow." As I say, people wanted Mr Fitzgerald to do the dirty work. However, it is an ongoing thing, and it is in this Parliament that Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations are going to be carried out, correctly or incorrectly. If they are carried out correctly, the Fitzgerald report will be hailed as a great success. If they are not carried out correctly, we parliamentarians will be the ones to blame because we, as parliamentarians, are the ones to blame for making the Fitzgerald inquiry necessary. This high-flying Government, which goes around preaching high moral values, Christian values and so on, is to blame.

Since this Government came to power in 1957, with all the great morality and Christian beliefs that it espouses, all the things that Christians and people with moral values are opposed to have propagated and flourished. This Government ignored the claims and the accusations about brothels, gambling casinos and pornography.

The Government commissioned a report called the Sturgess report into the mistreatment and sexual abuse of young children and young people in their teens in Queensland. It was a very descriptive report; it was a very damaging report. What did the Government do? The Commissioner of Police said that he did not even read the Sturgess report. I believe that the Minister for Police should have had enough nous to initiate investigations into all the allegations that were made in that report.

I am going to compare the accusations and claims that were being made a few years ago about police corruption and the problems that were created for society by the mismanagement of this Government with the present position in regard to lands where the same thing is happening. A member of the Opposition—Mr Hooper—told the Government about these allegations and they were totally denied. The Ministers did not

have enough initiative to find out whether those allegations were true or to put pressure on the Police Commissioner and other people to find out.

What the Police Minister could have done was give those accusations to the Police Commissioner and tell him he wanted a report. The Minister did not get a report, and nothing was done about it. He should have told the Commissioner of Police that he wanted a report within 30 days, that he wanted the names of officers who could not find these brothels and casinos so that those officers could be put on the spot. The police who were mixed up in the corruption were the police who were denying the accusations and saying that the brothels, the gambling casinos and the pornography did not exist. Blind Freddy could see that they existed.

I can remember going to the airport early one morning in a taxi. I saw a big group of people coming out of a building onto a footpath. I said to the taxi-driver, "Oh, they must be going home late from a party." He said, "Oh, no. That's one of those gambling casinos that don't exist." Apparently everybody in Brisbane knew where they were and what they were. The Government kept saying that they did not exist. Ministers were making ministerial statements in the Parliament and saying that they did not exist. Now the Government is having to acknowledge that these casinos and brothels did exist and is saying that it was too hard to get the evidence. I believe that is an indictment of the Government and shows complacency and its inability to properly govern the State of Queensland.

I turn now to the position in regard to land. I am aware that it was mentioned only in a small section of the Fitzgerald report. However, I am going to quote some parts of the report which signify the importance of what I will say later in my speech and the evidence that I am going to put forward.

The present Minister for Land Management, who at one time was the Police Minister, denied that casinos and brothels existed. He did absolutely nothing. He believed every Tom, Dick and Harry who said what he wanted to hear. He did not want to take the trouble to show a bit of initiative and get a few people besides the police to make inquiries. There must have been somebody out there in the community who could have interviewed people and provided the Minister with information. However, the Minister just listened to what he wanted to hear. He did not want to take on the hard work of going out and trying to find out whether these accusations were true. He could have gone and interviewed some of the people who were affected.

At page 89 of his report, under the section headed "The Asian Businessman", Mr Fitzgerald states—

"In September 1986, Bjelke-Petersen was introduced to an Asian businessman by another prominent member of the National Party. Prior to that time, the businessman was a stranger to Bjelke-Petersen. They discussed investment in Queensland, and spoke for about 10 minutes of the businessman's interests in cocoa plantations and his desire to invest in hotels in Queensland.

At that meeting, the businessman handed Bjelke-Petersen a bag containing \$100,000 in cash and said, according to Bjelke-Petersen, '... we want to help the party. We're interested in the way you operate'.

Bjelke-Petersen did not disclose the donation to the National Party, and it was deposited into the account of Kaldeal on 29 September, 1986. That was the first amount paid to Kaldeal.

Bjelke-Petersen later met the businessman again, and directed his secretary to telephone the Land Administration Commission"—

and I emphasise that—

"on the subject of North Queensland land which was suitable for cocoa growing.

The effect of his evidence was that he did not otherwise act to assist the businessman, and was not asked to do so.

Prior to meeting Bjelke-Petersen, the businessman had made a donation of \$15,000 to the National Party on 3 March 1986.

At about the same time as he met Bjelke-Petersen, he made another donation of \$100,000 to the National Party on 22 September 1986.

Subsequently on 30 June 1987, he donated a further \$50,000 to the National Party."

I emphasise the fact that the report states that the former Premier's secretary telephoned the Land Administration Commission. One can see the effect of those telephone calls. The big land sharks and the fast-buck merchants are moving into north Queensland. They are receiving privileges and being granted concessions by the Land Administration Commission. The Government has been told about that, but it has done nothing about it.

Tonight I will provide the name of a company and supply evidence of how such companies operate. The company to which I refer belongs to the Emanuel group. A \$2 company is formed and its representatives go round and look at land, such as a cane farm, or any agricultural or pastoral land. Wherever the company has an opportunity to obtain a large area of land, it works out its value. Let us say that in round figures the land is worth \$100,000. The company goes to the land-owner and says, "We will offer you \$150,000 for a two-year option. We will pay you \$25,000 deposit." Nine times out of 10, because the land is worth half that value again, the person takes the \$25,000 deposit. The company allows the land-owner to carry on his usual business. The company goes away and sells the land for half a million dollars. In some cases land is bought for \$1m and sold for a lot more. In fact, one property on Cape York was purchased by the company for \$500,000. The company now has that land on the market for \$5,500,000, because it is up near the proposed space base. That is the way that company operates. Once it obtains some leasehold land, it then tries to freehold it, if it can be converted. In the example that I have provided, the land is a pastoral lease and at this stage the company has not attempted to convert the lease to a grazing homestead lease so that it can be later converted to freehold.

Company representatives have been round to owners of properties on Cape York. I have friends who own properties there. While I cannot be sure that the Emanuel group is involved, people have been moving round and offering them two or three times the price that they paid for their properties. Offers of cash settlement on the spot have been made.

A recent article in the *Australian Financial Review*, under the heading "Emanuel continues land sale", stated—

"The Emanuel Group is continuing its \$400 million Queensland broadacre portfolio disposal with the sale of a large land tract on the Sunshine Coast for \$6 million.

The group's State manager, Mr Bryan Hartley, said the 3,200ha parcel was in the Lake Cootharaba area between the township of Kin Kin and Pomona Road.

Mr Hartley said the group had retained an area of about 800ha which comprised part of the original parcel.

. . .

Other sales of the former APM portfolio have occurred with individual buyers acquiring properties in the price range of up to \$100,000.

He said sales from the land rationalisation had realised about \$90 million.

The 77 properties initially offered for disposal comprised about 90 per cent of the company's broadacre holdings in Queensland.

The group has also been acquiring land holdings again with the purchase of two cattle properties, Dunbar and Laudham Park Stations, in north Queensland for a total of about \$9 million.

In April, the *Financial Review* reported the group to be finalising negotiations for one of its substantial northern land tracts.

The 940ha parcel, across Trinity Inlet from the Cairns city, is believed to be under contract for about \$34 million."

From that short article it can be seen that the company owns more than \$400m worth of land. It is buying and selling properties and wheeling and dealing. I spoke to the Minister about this matter. He said that the company is doing nothing illegal, so he knows the name of the company. He knows how it is operating. However, he is sitting back and doing nothing about it.

The United Graziers Association and the Cattlemen's Union are both concerned about the large areas of land that are being freeholded and taken over by big companies. Because Holmes a Court's take-over bid for Sherwin was successful, he now owns more than 1 per cent of the land mass of Australia. If Governments do not act responsibly to halt such take-overs, we will all be tenants in our own country. We will have to go back to what happened in the colonial days. If a person wants to take up land, he will have to go out and work for one of the big companies that own all the land. It is a disgrace to this Government, which has been in power for a long time. Although it claims to represent country people, it allows such take-overs to occur.

The relevant Minister shakes his head and says that he does not know how to handle it. He says, "We can't stop them because they are doing nothing illegal." The same circumstances apply in the cities in which there is an acute shortage of reasonably priced residential blocks. The average person cannot afford to buy land on which to build a house for his family. What should the Government be doing? It should be cutting up Crown land for which it has no use and making available residential blocks on a leasehold basis so that people can afford to pay the development costs and take a lease over that land. Later, when the family has grown up and the parents have no further family responsibilities, the land could be converted to freehold so that in their old age they have a little bit of contentment and the feeling of security that some people derive from owning a freehold block of land rather than having a leasehold title.

Instead of doing that, the Government is selling off the land to other people. This morning the member for Chatsworth referred to circumstances in which the Housing Commission could have bought for about \$65,000 an area of land that would have been very suitable in helping Queenslanders purchase their own residential block. However, what happened? The Housing Commission allowed another buyer to move in. Subsequently, the Housing Commission bought it from the new owner for \$180,000. It paid an extra \$115,000 of Queensland tax-payers' money.

A Government report last year revealed that the Government sold about \$12m worth of residential land at auction for freehold purposes. None of that money was put back into the development of residential blocks in Queensland. There is a shortage of land in my electorate. The Government sold 13.5 acres of riverfront land in my electorate for \$12,300. No-one can buy a block anywhere in Innisfail or within 100 miles of Innisfail for that price. What did the Government do? It does nothing to alleviate those problems.

Mr Austin: You are talking about the Lands portfolio now. What about the Fitzgerald report?

Mr EATON: I am saying that it should have been included in the Fitzgerald report. I referred to a passage in the Fitzgerald report. I know that he could not cover all the aspects that honourable members would have liked him to. An inquiry should be set up into land administration in Queensland. What has happened? All of the allegations that were made public to the Fitzgerald inquiry were made to the Minister for Land Management when he was the Police Minister, but he ignored them all. Examples of maladministration were given to the Minister by members of Parliament, the community, the Cattlemen's Union of Australia and the graziers' union.

The public is asking: who are the crooks? Are they the parliamentary members or the Minister for Land Management? The Minister should make a statement as to whether the officers of his department are operating off their own bat and are responsible for some of those scandalous deals or whether they are working under the direction of Cabinet, which means that the National Party Cabinet is approving those deals and making those officers do them. I cannot answer that question; only the Minister can. Someone has to account for those deals. The public is very concerned and upset about what is happening with the administration of land. It believes that corruption exists there. The Minister should exonerate his honest officers.

I am receiving letters that I would not be game to show people because I would be sued for defamation over some of the allegations that are made in those letters.

Mr Austin: Table them.

Mr EATON: When Parliament resumes I will table those letters. I will cut the names off. The Minister will be receiving copies of those letters. The Minister is known around the countryside as "Honest Bill". However, a large number of people in the community are laughing about that tag. They want to know who is responsible for those scandalous deals.

The officers of the Department of Lands are trying to do an honest job, but they are doing only what they are told. We must try to help those honest people, otherwise we will end up with a Fitzgerald-type inquiry into the administration of the Department of Lands.

Large construction companies are concerned about Mr Fitzgerald's comments that hundreds of thousands of dollars in donations were paid by some construction companies to the National Party purely because they received Government contracts. Those donations were agreed to before the contracts were awarded. Citra Constructions and EPT were just two of the companies that were named in the Fitzgerald report. They gave very sizeable donations to the National Party.

If the Government is to be honest and allow companies to tender for large contracts that will assist the development of Queensland, it must accept the lowest tender by the company that is most competent to do the job at that price. However, companies are upping their tenders for the simple reason that they know that when they get the job they will have to give a donation to the National Party. As a result, that forces up the prices of projects in Queensland. On many occasions it has prevented a project from going ahead simply because the company involved could not do the job for anywhere near the price at which the Government wanted the job done. The companies that tried to stay honest and tendered at prices that were so low that they had to be accepted by the Government went broke.

Some building societies have gone broke. One from Western Australia was allowed to operate in Queensland, and the Government did nothing about it. Subcontractors on large projects in Queensland have gone broke because they have been forced to cut prices. They cannot compete with the large companies or they have been forced to operate on a shoe-string. This Government must return to open tendering. I hope that the Public Accounts Committee will be able to bring the Government to heel on those issues.

Many city and country members have one secretary only. Those secretaries are overworked. To enable members to service their electorates better, one additional person in each electorate office would be a godsend. The Government owes it to the people of Queensland to allow members to service their electorates as adequately as possible. I know that all members in north Queensland would appreciate one extra staff member in their offices. I have heard many city members say that very thing. On many occasions members are required to leave their offices to investigate complaints and meet with deputations. While they are absent their secretaries are inundated with work. Many members work late into the night and on week-ends—seven days a week. The public is

paying for that. Whereas members feel that they are doing their best, they are limited in what they can do. They cannot fit more than seven days' work into seven days. As a result, the public is suffering.

I was pleased that, in his report, Mr Fitzgerald said that, if extra staff was allocated, electorates could be serviced far better than they are at present. It is up to the Government to find the funds so that all members throughout Queensland can better service their electorates.

Mr Comben: Take one from each of the Ministers' offices.

Mr EATON: If a couple of journalists were taken from each Minister, we would be right. There might even be some left over.

Mr Austin: Can you tell me why the report didn't talk about the Leader of the Opposition's press secretary? It talks about Ministers' press secretaries.

Mr EATON: Mr Austin is in a position in which he can command extra staff for a short period. Other members cannot do that.

Mr Austin: I am Finance Minister and I can command nothing.

Mr EATON: The Minister is a poor Finance Minister if he cannot get additional staff. I would not admit that if I were him.

Mr Austin: I have got to set an example.

Mr EATON: It is a very poor example.

When the Sturgess report was released, it was a great indictment on the complacency, ignorance and the lack of initiative by this Government. The Government could have done something about that. An article in the *Courier-Mail* at that time revealed that one of its reporters, Tony Koch, went to places such as the House of Pretoria and carried out investigations. Detectives and policemen who were supposedly brilliantly trained to detect crime and undertake research work and catch criminals did not know of the existence of such places, even when those places were placing advertisements in the paper which indicated their phone number and where they operated from. That is how good the Queensland policemen were. They could not catch those involved even when the paper carried advertisements with a telephone number. That was the case with brothels also.

Mr Ardill: The Police Minister couldn't find them, either.

Mr EATON: The Minister for Police could not find them. Yet the police would go out and catch the poor old worker who was driving home with a blood alcohol limit of .07.

After tonight the Fitzgerald inquiry will be ongoing. It is the few crooks at the top of the police force who were mainly responsible for what has occurred. People living in country areas mix with their neighbours and they receive a great deal of feedback from the police. As members of Parliament, we receive complaints about the police in our local areas. Luckily, we are able to talk to them and sort most of the problems out at that level.

I want to emphasise the effect that this inquiry has had on the police force, not just on the policemen themselves. I have not met one honest policeman who was concerned about or was not happy with the Fitzgerald report. The inquiry has also had an effect on the families of police, their kids who go to school, their young children in the community and their wives when they attend functions and other social meetings. The inquiry has created so much controversy that it has had an effect on them. The police force could lose some good policemen for the simple reason that, although the policemen can cop it, their families cannot. They have to suffer with their families. That is the hardest thing that any family has to put up with. As men, we can take a lot of

flak, and in public life one expects it. But when one's family suffers it is a different matter.

I can cite an instance in relation to World Heritage listing that involved me. People were ringing my home and abusing my daughters with filthy language. I know what it is like and I know the effect that it has on a person's family. I sympathise with those policemen. Over the years corruption has been allowed to occur. Tonight on television a report showed 82 young constables who graduated today from the Queensland Police Academy. I know young people. I have friends who have undertaken that training and I have older friends in the police force.

For the first 12 months the young constables are on probation and they are keen to do a job. They are trained to do a job. They are sent to a station and they are faced with situations such as, "Old Charlie Brown, he is a good old citizen. You have got to let him go." That is the young police officer's initiation into the system. As he progresses in his career he proceeds to a wider field, and if he happens to have the right contacts, he gets into a rut of corruption. People wonder how that happens to those young people. That is how it starts. They lose confidence in themselves and they feel that they are banging their head against a brick wall. For many young police it is the beginning of the end.

If the police force can be cleaned up and returned to the way that it was in the old days, it will be much better. In those days, the young officer would be placed with a senior experienced officer so that he could learn the ropes and understand the problems. Today the system is different. Many policemen are sent from the city to country areas and they are unaware of the life-style and what happens in those areas. Good lads are also being brought from the country areas to the city and they face the same problems. They are placed in a city station and they find themselves in a new environment with which they have to cope.

The policemen of the future will only be as good as they are trained to be in their younger years. I feel sorry for those 82 young constables who graduated today into an era such as exists now. I hope that they have received the correct training. I have been informed that they have not received the proper training that they need to go out into the world and to handle all sorts of problems.

Recently there was the sad case of the young police officer who was shot while he was doing his duty. The young police officers will find themselves faced with a situation that will arise out of the blue. They will have to remember the training they have received and weigh up the circumstances in which they find themselves. Unless in their first 12 months of probation they receive that fathering by an older and experienced policeman who has a bit of common sense and knows how to administer and handle a situation, they will find their job difficult. The law does not have to be administered to the letter. In suburban and country areas a lot of tolerance is needed, and policemen have to show a bit of give and take. The young police officer attends the academy, he graduates and he has a certificate that says he is qualified and trained in law.

Mr Newton: You had to learn the hard way.

Mr EATON: We had to learn the hard way, yes.

However, police today should be given a better grounding. I have found that the worst type of policeman is the son of a policeman, particularly if he is a senior officer such as a sergeant or an inspector. The young officer has seen the benefits that his old man has received over the years and he thinks, "That's the job for me—a policeman. People will bring me cartons of lager. I won't have to pay for anything. I can get holiday pay and all those sorts of things." That is where it starts.

Recently there was the shocking scandal in Toowoomba involving police footballers. Yet a few years ago the Queensland police football team visited Innisfail and one would not have found a better behaved sporting team anywhere in the world. The whole community, including myself, took their hats off to them. The team were invited back

for a second year. They behaved in the same manner then. The way that those police boys behaved in Innisfail, Cairns and the other places up north that they toured just did not gel with the evidence and the accusations that arose from the incident in Toowoomba. I feel that there was a break-down in the police force somewhere. I have been informed that the behaviour of the police was acceptable until the inspector, or whoever was in charge, went home. Those police who toured the north were a credit to the police force. A team such as that would be welcomed back any time. In fact, I understand that there are many good sporting people in the police force who I believe the police force could better use for public relations.

Mr BURREKET (Townsville) (8.23 p.m.): I have read the Fitzgerald report and I certainly support the recommendations contained in it.

Mr McElligott: Lock, stock and barrel?

Mr BURREKET: I have already stated publicly that I support the report.

While listening to the speakers this evening, one heard comments such as, "What is corruption in Queensland when you look at New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, and South Australia?" I want to say that although those considerations matter, they are not the most important factor. The important feature of this report is that there is recognition of corruption.

Queensland now has the opportunity to lead the way and show other parts of Australia that this Government is prepared to accept the recommendations of this report, attack corruption at its base and, in particular, make sure that political manipulation of corruption does not happen any more in Queensland. I believe that most of the recommendations of this report will have that result and that Queensland will be much better off.

I will comment briefly on the matter of police. This is an area in which I differ with some of the comments made by Mr Fitzgerald. He makes particular reference to the fact that all policemen should wear uniforms all the time. Surely he did not mean that detectives and undercover men should be wearing uniforms because, if ever police were to become frustrated in their duties, it would be if they were always seen in uniform. I disagree with the comments made by Mr Fitzgerald in that respect.

Another matter particularly mentioned in the report is that superintendents should not be driven to or from work at night-time. I cannot see why it was even mentioned. I regard the position of superintendents as parallel to that of senior businessmen in the community. For example, most senior council officers are either driven to work and home again, or they are allocated a car. I know that that is what happens in most businesses that I have been associated with. I query Mr Fitzgerald's raising that particular matter.

I am very pleased and proud to note that the investigation of corruption in Queensland did not mention the city of Townsville. On behalf of the people of Townsville—in particular members of the police force—I am pleased to know that they came through the report unscathed.

Once before I used the words "squeaky clean", and I believe that that expression suitably applies to Townsville. I thought that the term fitted because of Townsville's isolation, but Cairns lies further north and is possibly more isolated. The inquiry revealed that in many instances, corruption there was quite dreadful. Again I say that I am proud of Townsville and proud of members of the police force, who do a damned good job.

It seems that Mr Fitzgerald has not looked deeply enough into what it takes to be a policeman. It is the worst public job in any society. A policeman deals mainly with the dregs of society—criminals and prostitutes—and with domestic violence. When an accident occurs and people are spattered all over the place or trapped in vehicles and dying, who is first on the scene? It is the local policeman. If a disaster of any type occurs, who other than the local policeman is called first to the scene?

The public and the neighbourhood are protected seven days a week, 24 hours a day, by the men in blue, whose role is given insufficient recognition. Most people go home and go to bed at about 9 or 10 o'clock. They go out to work and walk the streets in complete freedom. The only reason that they are able to do that is because policemen are constantly looking after the interests of the public in Queensland and in most other States. I understand that in Kings Cross and other areas of New South Wales, it is becoming very difficult for pedestrians to walk the streets at night-time.

Mr Ardill: It might be like that in Townsville, but it is certainly not like that in my area.

Mr BURREKET: It is certainly not the situation in Townsville.

I urge the Minister and those who are responsible for restructuring the police force to accept that more time has to be given to the recognition of what is involved in being a policeman. It is a difficult job, which is one of the reasons why police officers stick pretty well close together. Recently a young policeman was called to a domestic incident and was killed—another instance in which the policeman was first on the scene.

Approximately 18 months ago, I was a member of a delegation to the Minister of Police seeking the issue of bullet-proof vests. In discussions held with the Queensland Police Union, one of the matters raised was the availability of vests. I went straight back to Mr Gunn, who was at that time the Minister for Police, and asked him where the police force stood on that issue. Mr Gunn told me that many months before he had given approval for the police force to buy the vests and that he and the Acting Commissioner had been to America, Germany and England to pick out the particular vest that was best. I was told that the reason for the delay in providing those vests was because police officers themselves were carrying out stringent testing, which had delayed procurement. Incidentally, the police force finished up with the very vest that Mr Gunn has recommended.

It is certainly the case that, on behalf of the police union, I have expressed concern. The other day I had a disagreement with the President of the Queensland Police Union, Mr O'Gorman. I respected what the union had said at that earlier meeting and attempted to address their concerns. It subsequently came to my attention that the police themselves delayed purchase of the vests. I believe that bullet-proof vests should be made available as soon as possible and issued upon graduation to every police officer. Every police officer would then be responsible for his own vest throughout his career.

This report is all about corruption. Mr Fitzgerald refers in particular to corruption at State Government level, but there is corruption at other levels of government as well. The implication in the report is that corruption is happening only at State Government level. It certainly is not. There is a lot of corruption at the local government level. For example, recently a new deputy town clerk was appointed to the Townsville City Council. The Opposition aldermen, that is the two Liberals and the National Party and the Independent aldermen, were precluded from a whole series of interviews for the position of deputy town clerk. It became a public issue. Nevertheless, the then Mayor of Townsville, Mike Reynolds, would not let these aldermen become involved in the selection of the deputy town clerk. A new deputy town clerk was duly selected and, lo and behold, he was none other than an ex-staff member of a Federal Labor Government politician. What a surprise!

In addition, the Townsville City Council recently appointed a new director of parks and gardens and—surprise, surprise—none of the Opposition aldermen were involved in the selection.

Mr Clauson: No consultation?

Mr BURREKET: That is right, there was no consultation; none at all.

I subsequently discovered that the new director of parks and gardens is the same person who was a lecturer at the New England University and who wrote a paper on rainforests and the importance of Queensland giving all of its land over to World

Heritage listing. That report was accepted by the ALP members of the Townsville City Council, and only a short time later that man was appointed as the director of parks and gardens on a salary of approximately \$55,000. Again there was no consultation.

In addition, there are the abuses of privilege by politicians. One despicable example is the conduct of the honourable member for Townsville East, Mr Smith, who has continuously reviled a particular businessman in Townsville for no other reason than he happens to be a known National Party supporter or helper. Recently Mr Smith attacked a man by the name of Sid Dart, who operated a business in Townsville and gave out inspection certificates on motor cars. Mr Smith berated Mr Dart here in Parliament for abuses and illegal documents that he was issuing. The Transport Department then took cognisance of those complaints and investigated them. Mr Dart was taken to court and all the charges concerning the particular instance raised by Mr Smith were thrown out. Not only were the charges thrown out, but also the department was chastised very soundly by the magistrate for bringing such ridiculous charges in front of him. Mr Smith gave the example of an old man of 82 years of age who bought a car. He apparently watched the car for two days and claimed it was not taken over to Mr Dart's garage for inspection. What in fact happened was that the old gentleman lived a mile away. There was no way that he could see the car. In fact, I have proof—contrary to what Mr Smith said—that the car was taken to the garage and properly inspected. Those are the kinds of grubby things that come out.

What is even more scurrilous were the comments made last night in this House by Mr Smith. He made some serious innuendos about the fact that I own a building in Townsville that is used as a bingo hall. Mr Smith has again abused his power and privilege and taken advantage of the fact that he is a member of Parliament. He has made scurrilous, unfounded accusations.

Mr Smith: Do you own it, or don't you?

Mr BURREKET: The honourable member has had his turn; tonight it is my turn. He made the accusation that somehow or other Cabinet made a decision which benefited me in regard to bingo operations. The matter was raised once before and I refuted it at that time. I refute it again; but I will go further and say that, although I am the landlord, I have nothing to do with bingo. I do not care what is in that building. I have a lease with the Red Cross, which is the tenant. The Red Cross operates the bingo and can operate what it likes. As the owner of that building I gain no advantage. The honourable member is an absolute grub. At the time the accusation was made that somehow I was being given some protection from Mr Clauson or the Cabinet because of the decision that was made. I wrote a number of letters on behalf of the table tennis association which was operating bingo. This is the association to which Mr Smith referred. I wrote to the Minister on behalf of that association to try to obtain some permits for it. I can produce evidence to show how I tried to help the association.

Mr Smith: Did you ever post the letter?

Mr BURREKET: I am sure that the Minister would confirm that fact.

Mr Clauson: I was unyielding.

Mr BURREKET: I thank the Minister for his response. I am prepared to show the documents to Mr Smith.

I did everything I could to help the table tennis association. The statements made by Mr Smith last night were wrong. He talked about the table tennis association spending hundreds of thousands of dollars. It made an application to spend \$50,000. I ask Mr Smith: why is it that the Townsville City Council constructed a nice bitumen road right next to the building where the table tennis association holds bingo? Did it have anything to do with Alderman Ehrmann, who is a Labor Party alderman on the council who sells bingo tickets to the table tennis hall? Is there a connection there? Why did they get a beautiful road there when there are hundreds of streets in Townsville desperately in need of kerbing and channelling?

Mr Clauson: Corruption!

Mr BURREKET: Corruption—absolute and utter corruption!

I reject completely those scurrilous allegations. In my years on the Townsville City Council I noticed much misuse of council funds. In the time I have been in this place I have heard constant attacks by the ALP against the State Government and the Premier for using tax-payers' funds to promote the electric train that goes to Rockhampton—I am really disappointed that it does not come to Townsville—but members of the ALP, particularly Mr Smith and Mr McElligott, forget that the Townsville City Council spends an enormous amount of money promoting itself. But that is different, because it is made up of Labor Party people. What I have found out is that there are two groups; there are us and the Labor Party. Anything the members of the Labor Party do is all right, but if we do it, it is wrong.

Mr Gygar: The National Party does not work on that principle, of course.

Mr BURREKET: No.

I said before that I do not in any way support corruption. I am disappointed to have found that corruption exists in Queensland. I said before: let us not blame everybody else; let us not say corruption is worse somewhere else; let us say we recognise there is corruption and set a good example in Queensland by removing that corruption and hopefully other Australian States will follow suit.

As I am speaking about political corruption, I will speak about our good friend from Thuringowa, Mr McElligott. I remember when he was working with the university—I think he was picking up roses and rakes—and became Deputy Mayor. Lo and behold, the Townsville City Council created a new position of paid Deputy Mayor, which gave him something like \$20,000 a year plus, plus, plus—honourable members know what I mean. That is not corruption, that is just good common sense using rate-payers' money! When Mr McElligott stood for election to State Parliament, did he step down from his position of Deputy Mayor and take three or four weeks off to promote himself? No, he did not. He was still paid by the good rate-payers of Townsville and we saw many political advertisements. Who paid for them? And they talk about corruption!

Now I will detail what happened with the water board. There are different types of corruption, and I am speaking about political corruption. When this House decided to establish a water board for Townsville and Thuringowa, who should try to stop that and stop his own people in Thuringowa from getting a say in water distribution but the good old member for Thuringowa? He did that because he was told to toe the party line and support that corrupt ALP-dominated Townsville City Council to stop the formation of that water board. That is what he did. In this House he spoke against it. He denied support to the people whom he represents and supported the Townsville City Council.

Mr Gygar: It sounds rather like the Townsville Harbour Board, doesn't it?

Mr BURREKET: Yes.

The Federal Government will not extend the Townsville airport. Everybody needs that improved facility. Public meetings have been held but, because the Federal Government does not want it to happen, what does the good old member for Thuringowa do? He opposes it! He gives no reasons. What he is saying is that the Federal Government does not want it and he will support that Government. That is corruption in another form.

Mr Smith: Oh!

Mr BURREKET: The problem is that honourable members opposite do not understand.

Now that the matter has been raised, I will mention another form of corruption and refer to the former Mayor of Townsville, one Mike Reynolds. In this place Mr Warburton has a phobia—a mania—about defamation actions and accuses the State Government of dipping into the bin. What does he think about the fact that the good old former Mayor of Townsville used rate-payers' funds to defend himself in a defamation action?

Mr Campbell: To defend himself, but not to attack other people.

Mr BURREKET: He attacked somebody else. He was taken to court and the rate-payers of Townsville had to pay for his action. How is that different from the accusations that have been made in this place? Why should the former Mayor of Townsville get rate-payer protection?

Mr Campbell: We have never denied the right for Ministers to protect and defend themselves.

Mr BURREKET: That is not the story the Opposition tells.

I want to bring to the attention of the House a matter that concerns a former member of the Townsville police force, one Senior Constable Pyke, a very well-known Labor Party supporter and well known to be very active in Labor Party circles in Townsville. It has come to my notice that former Senior Constable Pyke protected some prominent ALP politicians in Townsville. I am now gathering the details and expect to report back to the House on that.

Mr Smith: I wouldn't go too far on that one.

Mr BURREKET: I will worry about that.

No form of corruption is acceptable. If we are to be fair dinkum and to do what we can to stamp out corruption, that should be applied at all levels of government.

I shall speak finally on electoral boundaries. Whilst I support the need for some sort of good, hard look at the present electoral system, I am concerned about the impact on northern and western Queensland. The zonal system, which was established by the Labor Party, was designed to protect the interests of the people out west, that minority group who make this State tick over. Where does the wealth of Queensland come from? The mineral and rural wealth comes from western and northern Queensland. Very little of it comes from down here.

When the Leader of the Opposition gets involved in the redistribution issue, he must remember to look after the interests of people up north and out west. Those people also want a say in what happens in government in Queensland. If the one vote, one value system is introduced, our voices in the north and west will be wiped out. I strongly oppose that.

Mr ARDILL (Salisbury) (8.46 p.m.): A year ago in this House, I said—

“Eventually the people of Queensland will come to realise that the cause of all this corruption is the political system of this State. Heinous as the zonal system is, it is not the principal problem preventing responsible representative Government; it is simply the lack of equal numbers within the zones and throughout the State which provide the National Party with its mantle of safety and perception of invincibility. Within the same zone is the massive electorate of Cook, which has 50 per cent more votes than the other ‘remote’ seats of Roma and Balonne. The Country Zone is the first line of defence in the National Party’s war against democracy. Within a mantle of 22 pocket boroughs”—

it is now 23—

“which the Westminster Parliament abolished in 1832 but which have survived in Queensland until 3 September 1988, the National Party has been able to sit on its hands for 20 years, with the connivance of some Liberal Party leather-seekers, and preside over the stench of corruption which is only now coming to light.

In Queensland, the Westminster system has not been allowed to work.”

The State election later this year, which ostensibly is to elect a member in each of the 89 State electorates, is in fact a campaign about the representation in only 34 electorates. Of the State's 89 seats, because of the gerrymandered boundaries, 55 seats are entirely predictable, and most are rock solid for the present parties holding those seats. Of those 55 rock-solid seats, 26 are held by the National Party, 26 by the Labor Party and only three by the Liberal Party. From this it can be seen that the gerrymander works most heavily against the Liberals, who can never amount to a force in government until they have the courage to eliminate the present undemocratic electoral system. That is exactly what Mr Fitzgerald is now proposing be done.

Mr Fitzgerald said—

“A fundamental tenet of the established system of parliamentary democracy is that public opinion is given effect by regular, free, fair elections following open debate.

A Government in our political system which achieves office by means other than free and fair elections lacks legitimate political authority over that system. This must affect the ability of Parliament to play its proper role in the way referred to in this report.

. . .

The fairness of the electoral process in Queensland is widely questioned. The concerns which are most often stated focus broadly upon the electoral boundaries, which are seen as distorted in favour of the present Government, so as to allow it to retain power with minority support.

. . .

There is a vital need for the existing electoral boundaries to be examined by an open, independent inquiry . . . It should be allowed to do its task unfettered by pre-determined restrictions.”

We all know the restrictions that were placed on the last redistribution of electorates, and we all know the personally selected chairman of that committee who drew up the ridiculous boundaries that we have today.

It is very clear from the speeches in this House in the past two days that there is a total misinterpretation of Mr Fitzgerald's criticism of the political system. Fitzgerald was not merely criticising the National Party, or the police; he was criticising an entrenched corrupt political party and system.

The perception of invincibility of the National Party has brought millions of dollars into National Party coffers. It has brought about a climate of fear in the minds of public servants, businessmen, journalists and, most importantly, policemen. It has brought about the feeling of hopelessness and futility in the minds of even those who could not be covered.

Mr Hynd: Are you reading all of that, Mr Ardill?

Mr ARDILL: No, I am not reading all this. I certainly am referring to copious notes. If I have the opportunity to do so, I will read a number of extracts into the record, because they are quotes from Mr Fitzgerald and from other people involved.

Fitzgerald has spelled out in great detail that these practices have strangled the normal structure of democratic society. Many people have criticised the scope of the inquiry as decided by Fitzgerald.

Mr Henderson: Look up, look up.

Mr ARDILL: Does the honourable member want to put some further nonsense in, above what he has already said today?

That criticism of the scope of Fitzgerald's report is not justified. Fitzgerald has made out a comprehensive statement of evidence that the democratic structures in this State have been destroyed. He has clearly demonstrated that the political system is the means by which the destruction has occurred.

This corrupt system was the catalyst and example which facilitated police crime and lawlessness. Mr Fitzgerald examined the police structure and culture and finally puts forward the correct structure and suggestions to bring the State back to a democratic system. That was his duty, and he has done it. The fact that we had to have an inquiry, after taking away the civil rights and liberties of this State, is an indictment on the Queensland system. I hope that the Premier's flippant demand on other States is not taken seriously. The members of the Ahern faction are all trying to tie in other States. Yesterday, even Minister Katter tried to do that.

Mike Ahern cannot claim credit for starting the inquiry. It was started by Bill Gunn, virtually by mistake. When he realised that he had been conned along with every other Police Minister since Minister Hodges was sacked by his evil overlord, it was a defence mechanism.

Bjelke-Petersen—that second-level puppeteer whose modus operandi was to appoint a thief to catch a thief and thereby increase his power over both—consistently placed corrupt or inept or weak people in positions of great importance so that he could manipulate them. He then protected them and ignored all their peccadillos, crimes and atrocities, as they protected him. I will talk more about that later.

The present Premier cannot claim credit for the inquiry, nor can he claim absolution for the sins of his former leader and his colleagues and the web of corruption and vice that existed throughout his time in Cabinet and in this Parliament. The following statement was made by Mr Fitzgerald in relation to the present Acting Police Commissioner—

“It reflects no credit on Redmond that, on the most favourable interpretation, he remained ignorant of the problems . . . over the period which included extensive controversy . . .”

Despite Mr Ahern's reliance on the statement in regard to collective responsibility on page 6 of the report, it applies equally to the present Premier.

Why was no action taken in regard to the O'Connell inquiry in 1975? Why was no action taken in regard to the Lucas inquiry in 1976? Why was no action taken in regard to the horrifying Sturgess report in 1985? No action was taken by Mr Ahern and no action was taken by the Police Ministers, including two Ministers who are still members of this Parliament.

Mr Henderson: Who were the Justice Ministers?

Mr ARDILL: That is a good point. The Justice Ministers are equally culpable. Despite the fact that everyone seems to be homing in on the police, the Justice Ministers were equally criticised by Mr Fitzgerald.

Mr Henderson: Weren't they Liberal Ministers?

Mr ARDILL: Yes, they were.

The section of the report headed “The Evidence” consists of 100 pages and is obviously a section that many members of the National Party have not taken the trouble to read or, if they have, they do not understand it. The report is a horrifying document. Unfortunately, I have had personal knowledge and experience of some of the problems outlined in the report which Mr Fitzgerald has unearthed from the slime. However, the section headed “The Evidence” still horrified me.

Mr Fitzgerald has set out the way in which police dishonesty commences, spreads and flourishes. It was there under an entrenched Labor Government, as it was under the Playford Government and other Governments elsewhere in Australia. However, the

cosy camp-fires of those days became a bush fire under a Premier who knew almost nothing of democracy, democratic institutions and ordinary Australians, and cared even less, but who knew all about his own profit. He had a succession of weak or corrupt Ministers—and Mr Ahern will not produce the evidence of which was which—whom he could use to his own benefit, the benefit of a corrupt police force and Justice Department and the succession of cronies who staggered to his door with bags of money.

Mr Fitzgerald has set out all these facts for everyone to see, even those who totally supported the old regime. Mr Fitzgerald has set out in clear language under headings such as “The Unknown Donor(s)”, “Citra”, “Other Donations” and “The Ten Mile” what the system was. They are not titles from a medical journal, from Mills and Boon, or from Penguin; nor are they to be confused with the “Joke”. They represent the political corruption which was an example for police and public servants to follow. Many were common knowledge in the community but, because of fear in the community, they were never investigated or responsibly reported in the media. They treated that as a joke.

Some of the funds went into National Party coffers: \$250,000 from Citra, \$90,000 from EPT and \$165,000 from the unknown donors. Kaldeal, the Bjelke-Petersen slush fund, received \$824,000 at the time that Citra received contracts. These were \$2.5m for the Bundaberg Maternity Hospital—which, incidentally, was \$65,000 over estimate—five highway jobs totalling \$18.5m and, of course, Stage 2 of the railway electrification. Citra also shared Stage 4 for \$25m, which was at least \$5.8m over estimate at the lowest level and \$7m over estimate at the highest level.

EPT looked like missing out on Stage 1 of the electrification project to Citra, which was fourth from the bottom of the list, I might mention, and a non-conforming tenderer until a \$90,000 donation from EPT put it above its rival in the list. It also received a bonus of from \$5.8m to \$7m in the fourth stage of electrification. Railwaymen should be interested in where the money goes while they are suffering from redundancy and downgrading.

Apart from unspecified amounts which may have found their way into Kaldeal, Bjelke-Petersen, Ciasom or other pseudonyms and apart from \$400,000 which Alan Bond thought would make his Queensland operations viable, the public service and the people of this State also made some hefty donations. In mid-1982 Ciasom Pty Ltd, a family company of the Bjelke-Petersens, bought the Ten Mile near Duaringa for \$1.45m. The financial borrowings did not go well because of currency fluctuations and other problems. The European Asian Bank set out the Queensland system in its report for a loan application by Bjelke-Petersen. The report states—

“... we think we have to go along as this would open further avenues in Queensland. I am told we will be approached first for Queensland Government and semi-government finance requirements. If this application does not find your consent we believe that it would affect negatively our business in this State...”

When Ciasom acquired the properties, the road from Duaringa was only a track. It was an unconstructed track and subject to flooding. It was gazetted as a State secondary road immediately after that. \$1.5m was then spent on the road. A further \$1m was subsequently spent on the back road to Apis Creek. Where on earth is that? Somewhere out beyond the back of Marlborough. It is a place where the population is three or four people.

In addition, a weir was built on the Mackenzie River at a cost of \$4m. To be fair, this sort of treatment was not reserved only for the Premier; it was also the right of selected cronies of the National Party.

What is the significance of this misuse of Government funds? It is the reason why our education system, our health system and our police system are funded at a lower level than that in any other mainland State. It is the reason why we do not have anywhere enough teachers, nurses and police. All that is neglect and negative. What is even more serious is the vicious personal assault on ordinary people in Queensland.

There are people in our gaols who have been wrongly convicted. Some were the victims of verballing, which was widely practised even by police who were otherwise not corrupt. This highlights the problem of police culture which Fitzgerald identified and discussed in detail. The big problem was that corrupt police knew that they were untouchable. A great deal of criticism has been levelled at honest police and other people who failed to take action. It is quite obvious that many people did not do so because they knew that it would prejudice their own prospects. Senior police and coalition politicians fall into that category. Even at the lower level of police and public servants and in the wider community the main reason for inaction was fear, hopelessness and shame. Uncontrolled power must never be allowed to take place again in this State, and it will not occur under a fair electoral system. This can be prevented.

As Fitzgerald said, a Government's activities cease to be moderated by concern when there is no possibility of losing power. My only criticism of Fitzgerald is that he does not extend that to the judiciary, the justice system and the community at large. Politicians are no different from the members of the general community, as they are part of it and most are truly representative of the community.

As I stated at the outset, the National Party fails to understand that Fitzgerald is not criticising the National Party because it is the National Party; he is criticising the corrupt regime which grew up in this State under a dictator, Ministers and senior public servants who appeared to be unassailable, supported by the National and Liberal Parties. Over the past six years this has occurred under the National Party alone. The National Party allowed the corruption to proceed, victimising ordinary people, bankrupting people who failed to enter into the corrupt system. It corrupted people who had no wish to be corrupted and people who did not understand what was happening. They just did not understand. That is clearly the situation today on the Government side of the House. Government members still do not understand what was happening.

Fitzgerald has set out a blueprint for the future which some Government members say should be adopted lock, stock and barrel. It is clear that those people will not proceed with that proposal. It is quite clear that they have no intention of proceeding with it.

What is the future? The people of Queensland have a clear choice: they can elect a Government which can ignore the cronies and supporters who have been part of the corrupt system—the ALP is the only party that can form that Government—or they can return the National Party, incorporating weak, inept and even previously corrupt Ministers, or those who feared to challenge the system at least. It is clear that those people would still have to contend with their past, with the puppeteers at the top and the untrustworthy and incompetent subordinates who are still there. Many National Party members still do not understand, as I said, or accept the facts which Fitzgerald has established. They have no intention of eliminating the gerrymander, which is the root cause of the problem. There is no way that they intend to put the Fitzgerald recommendations into place before an election. There is also no way they can be relied upon to do it after the election. The Liberal Party cannot win the election, nor can it influence the National Party after another gerrymandered election.

If the Labor Party wins the election, the people also win. A fair and equal redistribution means that the public can then decide who they want to govern them. At the end of each term the people can dismiss the Government if they do not perform. That is the democratic system that only the Labor Party can implement.

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (9.07 p.m.): Commissioner Fitzgerald has presented Queensland with a comprehensive program of reform measures to wipe out corruption within the electoral, administrative, law-enforcement and justice systems in this State. I congratulate him and the people who were involved in his commission on the work that they have done. After two years' exhaustive investigation, the keynote recommendation in his package is electoral reform. He made it No. 1. Clearly, the commissioner sees the gerrymander, which this Premier defends and wants to continue, as the focus of the stinking corruption that has spread through Queensland,

reaching deeply into the heart of the National Party Cabinet itself. I agree with the commissioner. How the hell can Premier Ahern pretend to be an opponent of crime and corruption when he wants to fight against it by beginning with yet another dishonest, corrupt State election? This Government cannot con Queenslanders any longer that it has a lock, stock and barrel commitment towards Fitzgerald if it does not act swiftly, positively and honestly on his No. 1 recommendation to bring electoral integrity to Queensland before a further election is held.

Mr Sherrin: Are you dropping this one?

Mr BURNS: No. I do not distribute speeches in my electorate. I make them on street corners when I need to tell people in my electorate what is happening. I meet and talk with people in the street. I do not worry about handing out printed material that has been recycled through the House.

Just to recap on a bit of history—Joh was headed for Canberra. Old Bill Gunn imagined himself as the next Premier, so a piece of window-dressing in the shape of a police inquiry seemed desirable provided that it achieved nothing. The trouble started when the inexperienced suburban conveyancer who poses as the Attorney-General in the Government stumbled into the appointment of Fitzgerald as the commissioner.

At that time the Government tried to find another National Hotel commissioner. It tried to find another Harry Gibbs. However, Mr Clauson had had no experience in town. He had been down at Wellington Point, so he picked a fellow who was honest, wanted to do the job and wanted to expand the commission, and he asked for the power and authority to do that.

Suddenly the Bjelke-Petersens, the Gunns, the Aherns and others found themselves trapped into the type of fair dinkum inquiry which they never intended in their wildest dreams. That was the last thing that they wanted. The Fitzgerald inquiry, as we now know it, occurred despite the best efforts of the National Party to avoid it.

What arrant nonsense it is for Premier Ahern and his deputy to claim now that they discovered Fitzgerald. What arrogant nonsense it is for them to claim that they are somehow responsible for the inquiry and that Queenslanders should be grateful to them for it.

I can remember the Attorney-General saying that the inquiry would take six months. I remember Bill Gunn saying that the terms of reference would go back only five years. The end result was that they were trapped into a situation in which the commissioner demanded—and the Government was forced—to go back further. It did not take six weeks or six months; it took two years. The tax-payers of Queensland have been forced to contribute \$24m to expose an evil and rotten form of Government that successive conservative administrations have inflicted on this State. The tax-payers of Queensland coughed up that huge sum of \$24m to expose horrendous crime, horrendous police corruption and horrendous political corruption that the National Party—and for a long period the Liberal Party—tolerated and, I believe, encouraged and assisted.

Now that Fitzgerald has reported that, Queenslanders want value for that money. They expect to get rid of the kind of smelly, dirty Government that they have suffered under for far too long.

What is the response from Mr Ahern and the others who were lock, stock and barrel behind Mr Fitzgerald before last Monday? Before the Fitzgerald report was presented, Bob Sparkes—who is not even an elected member of Parliament—had ruled out electoral changes even if Fitzgerald proposed them. Fancy Queenslanders, who have just spent \$24m, being told by that non-elected gangster Sparkes, who has a worse public image in this State than James Finch or Hector Hapeta, what they can or cannot have.

Mr Newton: Come on!

Mr BURNS: Yes, he has. I believe that Sparkes is more hated than James Finch or Hector Hapeta.

There is no reason whatsoever, except for the purpose of stalling on the part of the Government, to hold up genuine electoral reform. The Australian Electoral Commission has just completed a door-to-door canvass of the State. Its information is available to State authorities. Therefore, our State electoral rolls either should be in their best possible condition or in the process of being upgraded and, as such, ready for an early exercise in electoral review.

For almost five years the independent Australian Electoral Commission has been accumulating data on the Queensland electoral system at Federal level. I am certain that the material relating to boundaries and other factors would be available to our electoral review commission. Surely in such circumstances there is no legitimate reason—except National Party delaying and dodging—why we must wait until late August to debate a relatively simple piece of legislation to set up—

Mr Sherrin: Do you know how long it took Playford to do the review in South Australia?

Mr BURNS: Playford was a gerrymander general. He was the greatest operator of the gerrymander that this country has ever seen. Don Dunstan in South Australia was receiving 51 and 52 per cent of the vote but he was losing. The honourable member cannot use Playford as an example. Well, I suppose that the National Party could use Playford as its example at any time. He is the sort of bloke that it would use. In fact, if Playford were alive today, the National Party would get him here as the independent commissioner to draw up the new electoral boundaries.

That relatively simple piece of legislation should be introduced into this Parliament.

Mr Newton: Neville Wran would do me.

Mr BURNS: Neville Wran would have done this Government. There is no worry about that.

We should not have to wait until late August to debate a relatively simple piece of legislation to set up an independent, impartial electoral and administrative review commission. In fact, we should get Commissioner Fitzgerald to run it. I am confident that this Parliament could responsibly deal with such legislation within the next week if the Government had the will to bring it forward for deliberation.

Mr Clauson: You don't believe it yourself. You are laughing.

Mr BURNS: There is the old suburban conveyancer. He is the fellow who made the mistake. When there is a fair dinkum redistribution, when the National Party loses Government and when the crooks are caught, he will be the one whom the National Party will blame. Being an old back-yard solicitor from Wellington Point, Mr Clauson did not know what was going on in the big city. He did not pick an old liar like Harry Gibbs; he picked a decent, honest commissioner in Fitzgerald and the inquiry got away from him.

No-one believes that Commissioner Fitzgerald very deliberately would have named electoral review as his No. 1 recommendation if he did not believe that the present system was lousy and needed drastic changes.

For the past few weeks all that National Party members have said is that they wanted to implement every recommendation in the Fitzgerald report. However, during the past two days National Party members have been saying, "There is something wrong with these recommendations." Already the Government is backing away. It does not intend to implement Fitzgerald's recommendations lock, stock and barrel. All along the line Government members are starting to talk about interstate or somewhere else. They do not want to talk about electoral reform, which Mr Fitzgerald said was No. 1, because that will put the National Party out of Government; it will stop it from winning with 30 per cent of the vote. The National Party does not want to implement Mr Fitzgerald's recommendations. It will find ways to delay and procrastinate. There is no worry about that.

No-one could possibly believe that the commissioner would name electoral review as his first priority in the fight to eliminate corruption if he was content to see yet another election held unfairly and corruptly. The real question, as I see it, is the fitness and enthusiasm of this Government to implement the Fitzgerald report in the manner in which Mr Fitzgerald obviously believes that it should be implemented. Where else but here would such a vital report for the immediate future of Queensland be in the hands of Ministers who themselves are under investigation by the Taxation Office on the suspicion of avoidance and evasion?

Mr Austin: You didn't write this speech.

Mr BURNS: Yes, I did. I wrote the lot of it. In fact, I went through the Minister's file and I wrote down all the things that he was in favour of. I am speaking against them. He has never been in favour of any decent, honest, reliable thing in the days that he has been a member of this Parliament. I listed all the things that Mr Austin was in favour of and I was automatically against them.

Where else but here would such a vital report to clean up corruption be at the mercy of so many people who are seen to be political——

Mr Austin: Did you see Jana Wendt's program tonight?

Mr BURNS: I did. I thought that the honourable member was the balding bloke who was interviewed at the end of the program. He looks like him. He is a dead-set ringer for him. I liked the bit where he said that they remembered—no, I had better not say that.

For almost 20 years in Government the present Premier saw nothing, heard nothing and said nothing. I reckon the best political cartoon that I have seen in years is the one depicting at one end of the table Mike Ahern with the corks in his ears, wearing a blindfold and the slab over his mouth, and at the other end of the table in a police uniform is Russ Hinze wearing dark glasses, Joh with the hat and corks, and prostitutes and massage parlours and casino lights all around. Poor old Mike was sitting at the end of the table with the plugs in his ears because he saw nothing and he knew nothing, all the way through 20 years as a Government Whip and as a Minister of the Crown. When all this was going on, poor old innocent Mike saw nothing. As Russ Hinze said, he was so innocent that he demanded that a bitumen road be built up to the door of his father's property. I think that is the property that was sold recently for big money. That is innocent Mike.

Earlier tonight Mr Hobbs spoke about how he supported the report. He never once spoke about how he got the policeman in Mitchell into trouble because he had the——

Mr Austin: Temerity.

Mr BURNS: No, not "temerity". He set up radar traps and breath tests to catch the people in those areas who were going to National Party meetings. Bill Gunn went out there while Hobbs and others berated the policeman, who had to sit there and cop it. I understand he is to be transferred from Mitchell. Yet Mr Hobbs had the hide to get up tonight and speak about how he supports Fitzgerald and anti-corruption measures in the police force itself.

Our friend Mike Ahern talks about how he supports anti-corruption measures. Mike Ahern forced the Transport Department to issue a licence as a driving-instructor to a fellow who could not back in a straight line. The transport officer went up from Brisbane, tested him and said that he could not reverse in a straight line. The rules stated that if he could not pass the driving test he could not be issued with a licence. Mike Ahern told them to change the rules. Good old honest Mike. He would not do anything corrupt at all. I wonder how many people that instructor will teach who will kill people on the road. That is what has to be remembered.

Mr FitzGerald: I have had an employee who was given a parking test by a police officer who tested him on an impossible back with a semitrailer.

Mr BURNS: This is not a police officer——

Mr FitzGerald interjected.

Mr BURNS: I allowed the honourable member to interject; he should now listen to me. It was a Transport Department officer who went up to Caloundra, asked the bloke to back down a straight road, and he could not back straight. The law says that if a person fails the test he cannot be given a licence to be a driving-instructor or a driving-tester. What happened? That bloke complained to Mike Ahern, who forced the department to give him a licence. He had the rules changed so that that does not happen again. That is the truth. That is a fact of life. I have a copy of the report on his driving. Mike Ahern or no-one else will deny that.

The National Party talks about honesty and decency and all its other concerns. It has been involved in corruption in this State for 20 to 30 years. All these things have occurred because the Government is so arrogant. As Commissioner Fitzgerald rightly said, it has occurred because the Government has the boundaries to protect it. The Government thinks it will never lose office. The reason why the Lewises and the Murphys thought they would never get caught was that they said, "As long as we can keep old Joh and the National Party there, they will protect us." The system was based on a gerrymander. They knew they would be protected and that they would be kept in the police force. While they were kept there, they could do the things they wanted to do. They could do what they liked—and they did.

When Hooper said day after day that illegal gambling was being conducted in the Valley, can honourable members believe that Russ Hinze could stand here and deny that it existed? Evidence was given in the Fitzgerald inquiry that Russ Hinze was driven around and shown the ruddy places but he still came into this place and lied to this Parliament—lied deliberately to the Parliament. Can honourable members believe that Bill Gunn could tell us that there was no prostitution in massage parlours? Could honourable members really believe that? I think he thought people were down there in the massage parlours studying the pictures on the walls. I wonder what people in Bubbles Bath House were paying 60 bucks for a "short time" for. If there was no prostitution in massage parlours, what were they paying 60 bucks for? Tell me. I am innocent. I do not know. I do not know what they would have paid 60 bucks in Bubbles massage parlour for if there was no prostitution there. Just explain it to me. I am a poor, dumb bush boy who came down to the city and I have no idea.

Quite frankly, I see Mike Ahern as the present Ron Redmond of the Queensland Parliament. If Mr Fitzgerald had a bit of guts he would have said the same about Mike Ahern as he said about Ron Redmond—retire him early.

Mr Ardill: You pinched my script. I said that.

Mr BURNS: The honourable member says that I pinched his script. I always look for quality when I pinch anything.

The former leader of honourable members opposite, the one who they all wore "Joh for PM" T-shirts for, the one who they patted on the back for 20 years, called the Premier "Dead-on-his-Feet Mike". As far as I am concerned, he still is dead—and not only on his feet. When it comes to Fitzgerald or any other issue, the Premier and the National Party he leads have enormous credibility problems. Frankly, the Queensland tax-payers who have paid for the Fitzgerald inquiry do not believe "Too-tough Mike". He is too inconsistent and too weak. This Premier, who wants to conserve the northern rainforests with a chain-saw, asks the people to accept that he is a greenie.

Government members interjected.

Mr BURNS: Yes, he does. He is "Chain-saw Mike". His idea of conserving rainforests is to turn them into boxes. He wants to cut them up, put them in bundles and stack them in sawmills. He says that people will be able to drive past and see the rainforest—stacked in the shed after it has come out of the sawmill.

After counting the votes in 1978 to give Iwasaki the real estate rights to Queensland's Capricorn Coast, the Premier told members of this Parliament that he was worried about guide-lines for foreign investment. After that, he whipped off overseas to tell the Japanese to come and buy the place. He did. Deny that he did not do that.

I could go on and on with examples, but the question is whether these Government Ministers and Government members, who have presided until recently over corruption——

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr BURNS: I have a lot to say, so shut up for a while.

Are those Government members who presided until recently over corruption, and who closed their eyes to organised crime, the right people to now correct those abuses and the disgraces and obscenities that have been perpetrated against community life in our State? As I said, some of the Ministers evaluating this report are being investigated by the taxman for what can only be presumed to be cheating in regard to ministerial expenses, electoral allowances and other parliamentary allowances. Moreover, the Minister for Primary Industries—to name just one other Minister—twice recommended Angelo Vasta for the Supreme Court bench. Also in 1986, he deferred the reference by Queensland to the National Crime Authority of a probe into mafia activities in this State.

Of course, there is then the Minister for Health, who was once the Minister for Mines and Energy. Page 102 of the report refers to the multibillion-dollar Winchester South coal lease and states how the Theiss Company gained this prize contract over 31 other tenderers with the help of the present Health Minister. According to Mr Fitzgerald, who is never doubted by the Premier, this Minister put a four-page submission to Cabinet backing Theiss on the basis of nothing more than the departmental secretary's making notes of his "evaluation preferences and impressions" on a rough working sheet. I might add—need I add?—what happened to this rough working sheet that determined such a competitive contract in relation to this multibillion-dollar resource? Would honourable members be surprised to learn that this rough working sheet just happened—Fitzgerald tells us—to have been disposed of by the Mines Department under secretary as waste paper. He threw away a recommendation for a multibillion-dollar lease of coal and it went into the waste-paper basket.

I have been told that this week six major companies went to see the Premier and Minister for Finance and told them that, because of the poor standing of the State at present, many thousands of jobs would be jeopardised.

Mr AUSTIN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is obviously telling untruths to the Parliament. This week, I have not had time to see six major companies. I have been busy stitching up these blokes in the House. What he has said is untrue. I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member will withdraw that comment.

Mr BURNS: I will withdraw that remark. Is it the case that Theiss Contractors and people such as White Industries have not been to see the Minister for Finance and have not expressed their concern about jobs in this State? Well, they are telling people that they have expressed their concern about the lack of credibility of this Government at present and the problems that they are experiencing with jobs. They are saying that outside in the industry, and they are saying that if the Government does not come up with some public works contracts——

Mr Austin: That is not what you said the first time.

Mr BURNS: All right. The Minister for Finance wants to dodge the issue and play with words, as he always does. The fact is that he now admits that those industries are concerned.

Mr Austin: I'm not.

Mr BURNS: Yes, he is. The Minister said that that was not what I said in the first place. He is beginning to play with words. He knows and I know that the major industries in this State are concerned about the performance of the National Party Government. He is the Finance Minister, and if he does not do something, up to 7 000 jobs in the area of public works will go down the drain as a result of his poor performance. Those companies cited that as the cause of their lack of confidence in the Queensland Government.

The Minister for Health, in common with Mr Harper, and also in common with two former Police Ministers who watched corruption survive and expand—along with “Dead-on-his-feet Mike” and others who are the subject of taxation inquiries—have so many shadows over their heads, yet with their inglorious records are still members of this Government and will pass final judgment on Fitzgerald.

I could trace the past for ever. The type of Government that the present Premier and other Ministers enjoyed—characterised by cash advances, credit-card entries that no-one can yet see, surrendered options, forgiven or forgotten loans and funny little men who sneak past security guards to drop off cash bags of money in the Premier's personal office—moves the Premier to say to the Federal Government and other State Governments, “Hold the same type of inquiry.” It is amazing that no-one asked them their name when they dropped off these bags of money. That is the way that the National Party ran the business of Government. Blokes walked in past the Executive Building security guards, who must be the worst security guards in Australia, with bags of money in their hands. They went past the security guards to the lifts and went up 11 storeys. They left the money on a desk; someone counted it and then sent it to the National Party. They did not say, “Oh, this is unclaimed money for the Queensland Government. This is something that we should give to the police because this money has no particular owner.” I understand that there is a law that specifies stealing by finding money. Recently a bloke named Theo Morris was charged with stealing by finding. If Joh Bjelke-Petersen found half a million bucks in a brown-paper bag on a counter in his office and took it all for himself, why was he not charged with stealing by finding like the other fellow was? I understand that he found approximately \$6,000 in a hotel room on the Gold Coast. That was typical of the National Party.

Mr Fitzgerald has clearly given the people of Queensland a written document setting out everything that the Opposition knew to be true and everything that people had been saying for years, yet Premier Mike says to Canberra and the other States, “Hold the same inquiry”. I ask: where could the other States drum up a scenario anything nearly as sleazy or grubby to produce anything nearly as dramatic or colourful as the National Party in this State? How would they ever find characters like Joh, Lane, Hinze, Bill Gunn and the rest of the scroungy bunch? Many of this tainted group are still running the State and are able to have the last say on Fitzgerald. That is the danger that I foresee.

The people Fitzgerald is critical of are the people who will be making the decisions. It is no wonder that the commissioner wants safeguards. The Fitzgerald report is a thoughtful report. It is not revolutionary and would not be considered even anxiously reformist in any State other than Queensland. In Queensland, when Commissioner Fitzgerald refers to fair boundaries, honest policemen and honest tendering processes, it is regarded as a radical document. In any proper democracy in the world and in any proper Westminster State of the world, it would simply be regarded as a normal document and an accepted process, but not in Queensland. It is revolutionary only in Queensland where for so long the National Party, with the aid of the Liberal Party, has allowed democratic practices and rights to slide criminally and contemptuously behind the rest of the free world.

The Premier's trumpeting that Commissioner Fitzgerald's report somehow reflects confidence in his Government is sheer misrepresentation. On page 371, the commissioner states that the Premier's new Public Accounts Committee legislation should be reviewed

already because it is restrictive. The new vision is already in trouble. The commissioner wants the new pecuniary interests register for members widened to include spouses, which is the case for Federal representatives. Again he is attacking the decision of the Ahern Government. The Labor Party suggested both provisions at the time these matters were under consideration.

Mr Fitzgerald wants freedom of information, which the Ahern Government refused when it was raised here by my colleague Deane Wells. Again this very fundamental right was recommended by the Labor Opposition. Mr Fitzgerald does not display any confidence whatsoever in the Ahern Government. Far from it. He takes as many matters of electoral and administrative procedure outside the control of the National Party bandits as he possibly can.

On page 332 of the Fitzgerald report is the heading "Lies". That section of the report states that a person lying to Parliament, as the Premier did early last month in reply to a question I asked——

Mr Austin: That's not true.

Mr BURNS: Yes, he did.

That person should face not only parliamentary privilege, but also a criminal offence. This week's scuttling of a very competent Speaker by a vindictive National Party does not resolve the original issue. That the National Party got square with Powell does not resolve the issue that I raised. The National Party was not game to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee. I still want to know if Premier Ahern lied to the Parliament when he answered my question. I say that he did. I ask: did he lie again to the media, after I produced a personal memo from him, by saying that the honourable member for Isis, who was then Education Minister, conspired with him in a sneaky campaign to embarrass their own Government on Cabinet policy? Mr Powell says that the Premier lied. He still says that the Premier's frantic and false excuse for misleading Parliament is wrong.

Mr Austin: You were a part of a conspiracy and you didn't even tell your leader.

Mr BURNS: No. In the light of what happened the other day, the honourable member could not make the charge of conspiracy stick in a million years. What sort of a conspiracy would it be when the Opposition could not even get its members to come across the road or walk from one side of Parliament House to another? If that is conspiracy, the honourable member ought to see me when I get fair dinkum! The honourable member must give me an opportunity. If the members of the National Party think that that is conspiracy, they are the greatest mob of mugs that I have ever met in my life. Would the honourable member like to buy the Sydney Harbour Bridge? I own the Sydney Harbour Bridge, I have shares in casinos around the world and I have raffle tickets in the Indian and Pakistani raffles and in the Irish sweepstakes. They are last year's raffles, but the tickets are all right. If the honourable member wants to buy them he can come and see me later, because he will fall for anything at all. The members of the National Party are a piece of cake; they are a con man's dream.

Iwasaki was an old Japanese con man and Mike Gore, a bloke who could not sell second-hand cars on the Gold Coast, conned this Government. Second-rate con men from all around the world came to Queensland and were given Queensland land, rights to operate casinos and do whatever they like. This bunch of dills——

Mr Innes: Dr Oskar.

Mr BURNS: Yes, Dr Oskar was a classic. All the Government members supported this project. Joh went down to the city square and said, "I've got this hydrogen car. All you have to do is add water." When he said to the bloke, "Get the car key and start it", the bloke said, "I've left the key at home." Here we are 10 years later, and he still has not found the key. When the Opposition raised the matter in this House all the National Party blokes supported Shrian Oskar and the oil-seed plant. These "honest"

brokers from the National Party have the hide to say that they have been running the State in the interests of the people of Queensland for all these years. What a joke!

Then there was Milan Brych, the cancer man. I could go on and on. The scandals of this Government amount to a Gilbert and Sullivan operetta. If Gilbert and Sullivan were alive today, this National Party Government would be on the stage and it would be a classic. People would come from around the world to see for fun what this Government has been doing seriously.

Mr Innes: What about Wiley Fancher?

Mr BURNS: Yes, Wiley Fancher was going to have a catfish farm in north Queensland. He was the Tennessee crook who got Joh and all these smart National Party Ministers and headed up north. What will we hear next? The next thrilling instalment will be interesting.

Patrick Field was another one, and then there were all the phantom projects; people who were going to make seven million jobs here and build steel-mills. Do honourable members remember the railway line from one side of Australia to the other? They had dreams. It was a place for great dreams—nightmares, wet dreams, any old dream at all. It was a circus.

Mr Fitzgerald has said it all. He has proved in this book to the people of Queensland what the Opposition has been saying for years; that this Government is a mob of cowboys and a lot of crooks. They are people who have done very, very well out of this place whilst ordinary people's kids have been taught in tin sheds at school, whilst our hospitals do not have enough nurses and whilst there are not enough policemen. This Government has been bludging on the workers. Every time the workers went into a court to get a wage rise, the Queensland National Party was against them all the way. The SEQEB workers stood up for their rights, and this Government took away their superannuation and threw them to the wall.

When the Labor Party is elected to Government at Christmas-time, it will give those workers their superannuation back and will treat the workers of this State better than this Government ever thought they could be treated, because it is about time. The decent, ordinary, honourable citizen who lives in this State must get his share; not the Iwasakis, the Milan Brychs, the Shrian Oskars, or anyone else.

Debate interrupted.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Mr M. H. Lavarch, MHR

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have been advised that the Federal member for Fisher, Mr Michael Lavarch, is in the gallery and I welcome him to the Chamber.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

REPORT OF FITZGERALD COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Debate resumed.

Mr GYGAR (Stafford) (9.37 p.m.): Mr Speaker—

“It is now generally accepted that openness and accountability have been missing from the political process . . .

Sooner or later there must be a major overhaul and the longer it is postponed the more drastic and expensive it will be, both in terms of money and in terms of social disruption and loss of community standards and freedoms.

. . .

Individuals who work in institutions in need of reform must recognize that checks and balances and changes in attitudes are necessary . . .

There are many ways in which the agenda for reform could be delayed or subverted by political or bureaucratic opponents.”

They are not my words; they are the words of the man who, after seeing the events of the last week, must be the most disappointed Queenslander of them all. They are the words of Tony Fitzgerald, the man who lived a dream that Queensland could actually be reformed. After the reactions of the Queensland Government, my God, how disappointed the man must be!

Before I go on to that, however, one person deserves a special mention, that is that truly evil individual, Lewis, the disgraced and discarded Police Commissioner. It is obvious that many members of this House and many members of the public have not yet read pages 48 to 63 of Commissioner Fitzgerald's report. It is a sad, sorry litany of evil at work, about the destruction of the Bureau of Criminal Intelligence so that corrupt police could not be tracked down, and about Jeppesen and how he was bricked by fabricated evidence and destroyed to clear the way for the total corruption of the Licensing Branch. It is also a sad story of the refusal of the Queensland Police Union to support him.

It is also a story of Hicks, the head of the Criminal Intelligence Unit under Whitrod, and a plan of engineered and perjured evidence, overseen by a Police Commissioner who transported a prostitute to police headquarters in order to stand over her and pressure her into perjuring herself so that another honest policeman could be removed from a position of power in this State. It is also about Lorelle Saunders, who unfortunately happened to witness some of these events. What happened to her? She went to gaol for 10 months on perjured evidence given by other members of the police force under the supervision of Lewis.

This total organisation and supervision of the ring of corruption that consumed this State by this man should be read by every Queenslander with horror and with a determination that it should never, ever, under any circumstances, be allowed to happen again. I hope that this evil, vicious and despicable man, complete with his convenient memory, will meet his just deserts.

In the consideration of this report, there are many ways and many tactics by which it can be subverted, and we have seen them all this week. The first thing to do is to stand up and say that it will all be done. That is basic. The Government said, “Lock, stock and barrel, we will do it all.” The next step is to start to cast a few doubts on it, to say, as Mr Henderson did, that they are merely recommendations and suggestions that have to be taken on board and considered. There are no three bibles. I hope I correctly paraphrase Mr Henderson's turgid drivel; there is not the Bible, the Koran and the Fitzgerald report. “Lock, stock and barrel”—but then again, maybe not.

At that point, slightly more open criticism is launched into. The report is called, as the member for Currumbin did, the work of a kangaroo court. When someone praises Mr Fitzgerald, a Government member interjects by saying, “He's just a Labor supporter.” “But we are going to do it lock, stock and barrel.”

Mr Palaszczuk: Who said that?

Mr GYGAR: The member for Currumbin, Mr Gately, interjected in this House and said that not more than 10 minutes ago.

Mr Palaszczuk: He has just got back from Chicago.

Mr GYGAR: Obviously he has been studying the form.

Then the Government downgraded its effectiveness by saying that all these royal commissions are a waste of time. Its members produced from the script turned out by the back-room boys the same old arguments. Is it any coincidence that a succession of members in this House—all, by no coincidence, members of the same party—have been trotting out a line of argument and sheafs of papers quoting how many royal commissions there have been and how useless they really all were? Do they say that because they

want us to support the Fitzgerald inquiry? Of course not! They want his report to be grouped in with the same old bunch. The implication is that this report is pretty useless, too, that it is impracticable and maybe we should not do anything about it.

The fourth thing to do is to deny that Queensland is any different. Government members stood and said that all the other places are the same and that they should hold inquiries. The implication, of course, is that there is nothing happening here that is not happening elsewhere, so why should we worry? It is the old argument, "Sure, we are a bit bent, but so is everybody else, so let us roll with the punches." "But, mind you, we're going to implement it lock, stock and barrel." Yet, they say they will do that even though they are only suggestions, even though he is just a rotten Labor supporter running a kangaroo court, even if it has just been like all the rest of all these useless, hopeless royal commissions and even though they are all a bunch of crooks on the other side, anyway.

Then the Government really came to the closer. After the audience was conditioned, it went for the most staggering hypocrisy of all. Its members stood up and said, "If you don't vote for us—even though we are a bunch of crooks—nobody else will ever engage in reform." It is rather like a junkie coming in and saying that if he is not given the keys to the drug cabinet, nobody else will ever come in to be rehabilitated. Of course, they support the letter of it and subvert the spirit in every way possible.

If this is a great new era for Queensland, after the events of last week, God help us! It is business as usual in Queensland, despite the breast-beating and the wheel change—I am sorry, I have misinterpreted the Government's stand; there will be no change, because it never was them. I mean, this is the Ahern Government. Thirteen of them are the same members of Cabinet who were in the Bjelke-Petersen Government, of course. But then again, they all knew nothing, saw nothing, heard nothing and were involved in nothing—not since 1983.

Even on the most appallingly naive assumption that they were not in it, let us look at how things are different. Let us look at the things that were criticised and the things that are still going on. The Deng Xiaopings of Queensland are hard at work rewriting history, but they cannot rewrite the history of the last week, because too many witnesses are still left alive. One must wonder if they will go the way of Hicks, Saunders and the rest eventually.

Let us look through a few facts. The commissioner made a statement about political propaganda and the use of the tax-payers' funds to subvert the democratic process. Has one Government advertisement been removed? We still have the Quality Queensland campaign running full blast. We still have a program that even my eight-year-old daughter asks me about when she sees it on television where a smiling Premier with a helmet one and a half sizes too small emerges on the television and says, "Invest in Queensland." She asked, "Aren't we in Queensland?" If the Government wanted to run the advertisement in Melbourne and Sydney, I could understand that. Why is it still being run in Queensland?

The Government is not entirely stupid, because every Sunday night on Channel 9 at 5 minutes to 6, before the news, we used to get this appalling rendition of National Party propaganda—drivel—paid for by the Queensland tax-payer.

Mr Campbell: We still get it.

Mr GYGAR: We get it even worse now. The ratings revealed that everybody was changing channels when the advertisement appeared. It was a simple problem for the Government. It did not take off the program; it put it on every channel, at three times the cost. The Government spends more on that National Party rip-off of the Queensland tax-payers' money in that one program than is spent in the entire State of Queensland on drug education. Yet, today, members of this House condemned Fitzgerald because he did not address the drug problem.

The commissioner talks about restrictions and subversion of the parliamentary process. What have we seen this week? We have seen a blanket restriction of debate of

the most important report received in this Parliament since World War II to two days—rammed through.

The Government says that it has changed. What else do we see? The Government aircraft was launched on a \$20,000 mission—not for the benefit of Queenslanders; not for the benefit of any individual in distress or dismay. The Government was quite happy to spend the tax-payers' money for the private, partisan, political purposes of the National Party. And it tries to tell us that it has changed! If ever anyone was disgusted with Queensland politics in the past, the events in this House on Wednesday and Thursday morning should have convinced them what a cesspit this place really is.

Mr Clauson interjected.

Mr GYGAR: I am getting ready, Mr Minister, for when the Deng Xiaopings of this world start to rewrite history. I will make no conclusions; I will merely state a series of facts that were observed by all the members present in the House.

Fact: the member for Brisbane Central was apparently off somewhere and needed to be recalled. He was in northern New South Wales, was found, turned his car around and drove back.

Fact: Mr Integrity, the man who would never tell us a lie, rises in this Chamber and goes on national radio and television and says, "The Victorian police were used to hunt down the Labor Whip and put him on an aeroplane to Brisbane." I make no conclusions about integrity, honesty or anything else; I merely state fact.

Fact: Sid Vicious is strolling up and down the corridors with his usual smirk saying to all the boys, "Listen fellows, don't worry about this one. We've got it all sewn up. Wait till you see the margin; it will knock their socks off. It's bigger than you would ever believe." Most people merely said, "Oh well, it is a standard old tactic—a bit of bravado, try to scare the boys back into line."

Mr Austin: Gee, you've got a good imagination.

Mr GYGAR: They are facts. The Leader of the House can make his own conclusions from them.

Fact: the Government aircraft is launched to pick up a former member of the Labor Party and bring him back. However, the people who were involved in it said that no deals were made. They said that they just thought they would bring him back out of the goodness of their hearts and in the interests of democracy—the same way, of course, that they immediately launched a jet to pick up Mr Davis!

Fact: Mr D'Arcy, who is well known and on the public record as having been the spy in the Labor caucus for many years, reporting both to the Premier and to Mr Hinze—

Mr Austin: And to you.

Mr GYGAR: No. That is incorrect. Let us stick with the facts.

Mr D'Arcy, a man who has business associations with Mr Yewdale, who is an old-time friend and business associate also of Mr Ivan J. Gibbs, is not there when the bells ring. Suddenly, after being seen in the House not three-quarters of an hour before the vote, he does not quite make it.

All I can do is repeat the words of the honourable member who was flown back from the north when, having asserted that no deal was made with him, he said, "I was wrong. There was a deal made tonight. It is just that I wasn't involved in it."

This is the Government that tells us that it is full of all the integrity in the world and that it will not misuse public funds any more. Yet we see the processes of Parliament subverted; we see public funds being used for the private purposes of the National Party; we see the public purse being plundered to pay for the advertising for the corrupt

Government to try to remain in power. Nothing has changed in Queensland except the name on the Premier's letterhead. Nothing, unfortunately, has changed.

Commissioner Fitzgerald, of course, realised all these things. He saw that the basic fault underlying all of the problems that were being experienced in this State was that the Government was not a Government of law. It was not a Government in which objective standards were used to judge public performance. It was not a Government in which open, accountable government was available to the people, in which Government actions could be seen and examined in the light of day. It was a Government that was run by people. It was a Government whose basic philosophy arose out of the views of Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

I will give some credit to Joh Bjelke-Petersen. I fought with the old devil tooth and nail for 13 years, and I think I still stand as the only member of this Parliament who has had the Premier physically stand up and pelt a chair at him across a room, coupled with the accusation that I am a dangerous communist. Mind you, it was the same week that Mr Burns said that I was to the right of Genghis Khan. I figured that, with that sort of criticism, I must be doing fairly well.

Bjelke-Petersen was, in his own way, one of the most moral men one could meet. The problem was that the framework of his morality was not that which is currently accepted by the community. Bjelke-Petersen thought that in a Government of men the way to make the State safe was to place it in the hands of upright, virtuous and correct-thinking people. The only problem was that he thought the way to pick correct people—which Mr Fitzgerald alludes to in his report—was to find out whether or not they were National Party supporters, because if they were National Party supporters they had to be upright, righteous and correct-thinking people.

Mr Clauson: And if they were Liberals.

Mr GYGAR: No. The Liberal Party has had some real creeps. The Minister need only turn to the left and look at the bloke sitting next to him. He was once a Liberal. Members of the Liberal Party are not perfect by any means. We do not claim to be perfect. However, at the same time, this perception of Bjelke-Petersen left it wide open for the con men to go right up the middle.

How did Bjelke-Petersen tell if a person was a good person? If that person donated to the National Party, that person had to be a good person. That was the problem that Mr Fitzgerald perceived. His solution is to replace the Government of men with a Government of laws, a Government that does not depend—fruitlessly, as it has been shown, and naively, as it has been shown—on the fact that people given power will act with rectitude and correctness. He saw that the only way that these problems were going to be solved was if clear sets of objective standards were applied to behaviour at all levels and a system of checks and balances was instituted to make sure that those standards were properly complied with. That is the basis of the reforms of the Police Department which have been proposed.

I express great regret at the words of the Police Minister at today's police graduation ceremony, which were televised tonight and represent another back-off by the Ahern Government. At that ceremony, the Police Minister said, "All of these recommendations about existing structures must be talked out first. It is far too early to throw things out." We have come a dreadfully long way since 2 o'clock on Monday afternoon when all the recommendations were going to be implemented "lock, stock and barrel" as quickly as conceivably possible. We are now down to talking them out first because, "It is far too early to throw things out." Let us hope, for a start, that the great things that are proposed for the police force in this report will be carried out.

Mr Fitzgerald firstly focused attention on the police culture. This is perhaps the greatest challenge of all to the police force. I have been a member of a uniformed service. I was a member of the Australian Army for more than 20 years. There was an army culture, just as there is a police culture.

Mr Austin: They kicked you out.

Mr GYGAR: No, I was not kicked out. I was given two medals for long service——

Mr Clauson interjected.

Mr GYGAR: I have not got any interest in the words spoken by that individual. While I was fighting for my country, he was burning the Australian flag on the streets.

There is a culture in the army, just the same as there is a culture in the police force. It happens in uniformed services that feel that they are at risk and under threat. It is the stick-to-your-mates mentality. It is natural for those who face danger together and feel that they are surrounded by enemies or potential enemies, and that is going to be one of the greatest challenges of them all, because the Queensland police force, the Queensland Police Union and the Queensland Government have faced that challenge before and failed. That was at the bottom of the Whitrod experiment. That was at the bottom of the destruction of Whitrod and Hodges by all levels of police and Government in this State.

Whitrod's great sin was to try to reform the police force. Those activities which were targeted against him were sold as a benefit for members of the Queensland police force, when it has now become crystal clear and indisputable that they were in fact merely motives for people who had other interests. We have seen it happen once. We must not allow it to happen again.

The first thing that must be recognised, acknowledged and addressed in regard to the review of our police force is the severe shortage of manpower and equipment. If the Government just recognises that for once, that will by itself be a great advance. For the last five and a-half years the Government has been denying that there is any shortage of police in this State, while the number of men available has become fewer and fewer. They have become more overstretched, more overworked and less able to respond to community demand. That is why it has been necessary for Commissioner Fitzgerald to make such a great point of the necessity to return to preventive police force work rather than mere reaction to incidents of crime.

It is no fault of the policemen out in the field that they spend their time almost totally on reactive work. They do not have enough time to engage in preventive work. The Queensland police force is now acknowledged in a way that is undeniable by the Government any longer—Queensland is 2 700 police officers short.

Mr McPhie: Estimated by Fitzgerald.

Mr GYGAR: Estimated by Mr Fitzgerald. Does the honourable member dispute that?

Mr McPhie: I do dispute that.

Mr GYGAR: Again I draw attention to how "lock, stock and barrel, without any reservation" is now coming back to "but we dispute what he has found". The back-away process is gathering steam not day by day but moment by moment on the floor of this Chamber, from the Government, from its spokesman and from those who are parroting from their prepared scripts. This evening in this House we have been told that the police force is not short of manpower at all. Perhaps we will be told next that the police officers are not short of equipment, such as the bullet-resistant vests that we were promised would be provided with absolutely no delay two years ago and for which the tender documents were issued only this week.

We have been talking about community policing, which of itself is one of the key elements of the reform of the police force. Again we still wait with bated breath for an acknowledgement by the Government that it now totally rejects the proposition in the Arthur Andersen report that the suburban stations should be closed and that they should be centralised into block houses, one per defined area in Brisbane.

For political reasons, the Government was forced to walk away from those decisions that it had previously made. I wait with bated breath for the Government to take the next step, to acknowledge that there will be increases in manpower at those stations and that their hours of operation will be extended so that they have a true capacity to engage in the preventive police work which will be the kernel of any change in the way that our members of the police force conduct themselves and the way that they interact with the Queensland community and become part of that community. Again, it is part of the police culture. When they are walking the beat daily and when they are in contact with civilians daily, we have a chance of breaking down that "them and us" barrier, which has been the root cause of so much of the trouble. Where are we going to get the 2 700 policemen when in this State we have a capacity to train only 450 a year?

Mr Fitzgerald proposes two eminently sensible, eminently workable and quite essential solutions. None of these, it must be emphasised, will be comfortable for those in the force who face perhaps the greatest challenge of them all. Those two methods are lateral entry and civilianisation. I predict that civilianisation will be the easiest of them, because there are numerous areas in the police force which cry out for civilianisation. There is nothing more foolish than to see experienced detectives and policemen sitting at desks, pounding away with two fingers on 50-year-old Remingtons trying to put out reports when the output of any dozen of them could be matched or beaten by a 17-year-old sitting behind a word-processing computer. It is nonsense that these resources and men have been wasted in that way for so long.

Mr Fitzgerald, however, has taken a step further than any member of this House would be even game to contemplate. He proposes such things as the police diving unit and the bomb squad be civilianised. I must admit that I was taken aback a bit when I saw those recommendations. When one thinks of it, divers are divers; they are not going to have to arrest anybody 30 feet down instantaneously. Members of bomb squads are experts in explosive ordnance. They are not going to go out to arrest the bomb; they are there to defuse it. They are skills and techniques that are not police skills and techniques but rather those of specialists drawn from other fields. That will be a traumatic time for police, particularly for those police who have devoted so much of their careers, often their own time and at their own expense, to develop skills which they thought were valuable and a great adjunct to the police force. They deserve to be congratulated on what they have done. Regrettably, they must understand that if we are going to get the numbers of police we need, those positions must be civilianised.

The lateral entry issue is one on which I pass a challenge to the Police Union and to the members of the police force to address aggressively, competently and confidently. Queensland has some terrific police who can hold their own anywhere in any company. They have nothing to fear from lateral entry; rather, they face a new and more exciting challenge in their police work. Nobody is going to try to replace firm, experienced detectives with somebody from outside business. Much of police force work at the higher levels, as it is everywhere else, deals with managers. It makes no difference whether Lee Iacocca was brought in to run Chrysler, General Motors or American Airlines. Because the man was a manager, he could have done them all. The same is true with our policemen. Our experienced members of the police force have learned the skills and techniques of management and have nothing to fear from lateral entry.

The next three years will be tumultuous for the Queensland police force, but they are not times of threat, they are times of challenge and opportunity. Those police who face it in that way will do credit not only to themselves and to the State but also to the uniform that they wear, which has suffered so much because of this necessary but sad inquiry which needs now to face the challenge of being truly implemented "lock, stock and barrel" to make sure that the events it discloses never happen again in this State.

Mr VAUGHAN: Mr Speaker——

Mr AUSTIN: Mr Speaker——

Mr SPEAKER: The Leader of the House.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (10.07 p.m.): I move—
“That the debate be now adjourned.”

Mr VAUGHAN: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the House.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (10.07 p.m.): I move—
“That the debate be now adjourned.”

Mr VAUGHAN: A point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! A point of order.

Mr VAUGHAN: Under Standing Order 107, I move—
“That the member for Nudgee be heard.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The——

Mr Austin: He’s too late, Mr Speaker.

Mr Vaughan: I’m not.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Austin: He is.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will put the motion moved by the Leader of the House. The question is that the motion by the Leader of the House be agreed to. Those of that opinion say “Aye”——

Mr GOSS: Mr Speaker——

Mr SPEAKER:—against say “No”——

Mr GOSS: Mr Speaker, a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I believe the “Ayes” have it.

Opposition members: Divide!

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 43	
Ahern	Littleproud
Alison	McCauley
Austin	McKechnie
Berghofer	McPhie
Borbidge	Menzel
Burreket	Muntz
Chapman	Neal
Clauson	Nelson
Cooper	Newton
Elliott	Perrett
Fraser	Randell
Gamin	Row
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherrin
Gilmore	Simpson
Glasson	Slack
Gunn	Stoneman
Harper	Tenni
Henderson	Veivers
Hinton	
Hobbs	
Hynd	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	FitzGerald
Lester	Stephan

NOES, 34	
Ardill	Scott
Beanland	Sherlock
Braddy	Smith
Burns	Smyth
Campbell	Vaughan
Casey	Warburton
Comben	Warner
De Lacy	Wells
Eaton	White
Goss	
Gygar	
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
McLean	
Milliner	
Palaszczuk	<i>Tellers:</i>
Santoro	Mackenroth
Schuntner	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr AUSTIN: Mr Speaker——

Mr GOSS: I rise on a matter of privilege, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition rises on a matter of privilege.

PRIVILEGE

Right of Member to Speak to Motion

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.15 p.m.): My matter of privilege relates to my right as a member of this House to rise and speak on the question.

Mr Austin: You took a point of order. You didn't rise to speak.

Mr GOSS: I rose to speak on the question.

Mr Austin: No, you didn't.

Mr GOSS: I rose to speak, and then I rose again on a point of order. I am entitled to do so. I refer you, Mr Speaker, to Standing Orders 115 and 132. I was entitled to speak and to receive the call.

Mr Austin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOSS: Mr Speaker ignored my rising and ignored that position. I wish to draw that to the attention of the House.

Mr Speaker, if this House is to function in a proper way, there will have to be a different approach.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question was that the debate be now adjourned. Honourable members, in future that question may be debated. I listened to a point of order that did not refer to a debate. The Leader of the Opposition jumped, but certainly the question had been put at that stage. That is my ruling.

Mr Goss: That is not correct.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! That is my interpretation and that will be the ruling.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is a second part to the motion. I have given my explanation. The Leader of the Opposition may adopt his strategy in the second part of the motion. I call the Leader of the House.

REPORT OF FITZGERALD COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Resumption of Debate

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (10.16 p.m.): I move—

“That the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for tomorrow.”

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.17 p.m.): If the business of the House had been conducted in the way that I argued, we would not have had to deal with this.

I rise to speak on the motion. If Government members want to drag it on, off they go. I rise to speak on this because it is a question of great importance to the House. I believe that it should be a question of importance to all members. It is certainly a

question of importance to members on this side of the House, if not to those on the other side, as to precisely what the Government's intentions are in relation to this adjournment, because they have not been made plain by the Leader of the House or any other member of the Government.

The Fitzgerald report is regarded by the public as a very serious matter warranting a serious and full debate. Up to the present time, the debate has been token and superficial. Nothing demonstrated that more clearly than the pathetic performance of the Premier who, at the commencement of the debate, spent 11 minutes delivering a four and a half page wishy-washy speech on the Fitzgerald report. Does that indicate any commitment to the report? Does it indicate any seriousness in relation to it? No! It is consistent with the strategy to undermine the Fitzgerald report and to undermine the whole strategy that has been outlined.

In raising this matter on behalf of the Opposition, I seek to have the Government address the question of the concern of members on this side of the House—certainly those in the Opposition—and the public as to whether or not a serious debate will take place. As honourable members opposite would well know, the Opposition has moved an amendment, which is published in the notice paper and which outlines a very detailed program as to how this matter could be debated properly and fully if this Government was serious about it. The Opposition seeks from the Government an indication as to when precisely this debate will be resumed, how long will be allowed for it and what the structure of that debate will be.

In particular, the Opposition maintains its demand that this House should sit next week to introduce and pass the legislation for the setting-up of the electoral commission so that the central recommendation of the Fitzgerald inquiry can be passed, and so that there can be no attempt by Sir Robert Sparkes and the machinememen who run this Cabinet to steal the election from the people of this State, who can see what the Government is up to. They can see through the Government's strategy. The people of this State want electoral reform. They want it before the poll is held. They do not want a bunch of crooks and spivs to steal it from them. They paid \$24m for this report. What are they getting? A token debate from a token Premier!

If there was any commitment, if there was any honesty, if there was any integrity on that side of the House, a substantial reply would be given, not just to this House but to the people of this State, as to whether the Government's intentions are serious and whether it is prepared to sit again next week and, furthermore—I will conclude on this point—whether other members of this House who have not spoken in the debate will be allowed to speak, and in particular whether the House will be recalled to address the particular questions of importance. I stress particularly those relating to the electoral commission, the administrative reforms and the reforms relating to the police force, which are a matter of grave importance.

If any members opposite observed tonight's news and discussed this matter with serving police officers, they would know that there is a grave crisis in the police force, one that needs to be addressed if that section of the report is to have any hope of success. What is the Government going to do? Will it run away from this Parliament, of which it is afraid, and go and try to make its decisions behind the closed doors of a management committee from which they can be ferried down to the Cabinet? Or will the Government have the guts to face up to the Fitzgerald report—and what the Government has done to this State—here in public, in the Parliament, in the people's House, where its performance can be scrutinised and people can see what it is really up to?

Mr BURNS (Lytton—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)(10.22 p.m): I rise to support my leader in his submission on this matter. Today the House was debating a motion from the Premier and an amendment from the Opposition. In that amendment the Opposition laid down some requests for debates on 6 and 7 July, 11 to 13 July, 18 to 20 July and 25 to 27 July. Effectively, the motion of the Leader of the House is that, if it suits the Government's convenience, the debate on the Fitzgerald report will resume,

at the earliest, on 28 or 29 August, which is the next sitting day that honourable members have been told about. In other words, the Government has effectively by-passed the amendment. Instead of engaging in debate so that the Parliament can make a decision on these matters, when the motion comes before the Parliament on its next day of sitting all these matters will have been by-passed. All the dates in the amendment will have been voided by the decision that is made tonight. This is a nice, quick strategy on behalf of the Government.

In his report, Mr Fitzgerald states as follows—

“Any Government may use its dominance in the Parliament and its control of public resources to stifle and neuter effective criticism by the Opposition.”

He addressed the role of Parliament. He referred to the rights of Parliament and the problems that this State has experienced as a result of a Government using its numbers in the Parliament to stifle opposition, stop people marching in the streets and stop people from having their say. The Opposition is saying that, after two years of investigation and the expenditure of all that money, on the day that people expect this Parliament to make a decision, having debated the report properly, this Government is using a smart trick to adjourn the debate to another day. The date the Government has in mind, as far as the Opposition knows, is the last week in August.

Adjournment of this debate till the last week in August simply delays the matter further and gives the Government another excuse for not undertaking electoral reforms before the election. Throughout today it has been made clear that this Government does not want to implement Fitzgerald's recommendations. This Government does not want to implement the recommendations lock, stock and barrel. It has not made that commitment. This Government's commitment is to playing tricks. This Government is up to the tricks that Fitzgerald cited in his report—dirty tricks. This Government is trying to stop this Parliament from doing its job, which is what this motion is all about.

The Opposition objects to that course of action. If this report cannot be debated in Parliament, it will be debated by members of the Opposition in the streets where people will know what this Government is up to. This National Party Government will not get away with this trick.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.25 p.m.): Last week, before the report was available, I publicly stated that the Liberal Party believed that this document was of such—

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr INNES: The Parliament has just been informed by the member for Southport that no-one is listening. I suspect that that is true. One of the tragic revelations during this debate is that the people on the Government side of the Chamber who should be most concerned with this report have neither the eyes to see, nor the ears to hear.

Page 123 of the report sets out the role of Parliament and refers to the central and crucial role of this Assembly. Mr Fitzgerald said that it had to work properly. He said that it had to be resourced and given time to enable people to be fully informed so that debate takes place. Probably more than two dozen members of this Parliament have not spoken.

Mr Hobbs: You wasted the time.

Mr INNES: Who wasted a day? The Speaker made a ruling that was supported by the Liberal Party. The Government wrongly failed to support the Speaker's ruling and that led to the loss of a day's sitting.

Arguably—and, I am sure, unwittingly—Mr Speaker might well have made a mistake because one of the effects of this adjournment is to make worthless the amendment moved by the Labor Party. The amendment moved by the Labor Party was to adjourn the debate to next week, which was indicated by the Liberal Party a week ago to be acceptable. We were not two-timing this Assembly. A week ago the Liberal Party said

that it would support the continuation of this debate until each member of this Parliament had his say, if he wanted to have his say.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr INNES: Members of the Liberal Party have to listen to contributions made by the honourable member's colleagues, no matter what they think about the quality of the speech. They do so because they believe it is the right of members of Parliament to speak in this debate, irrespective of whether the contribution is good, bad or indifferent. It is therefore the responsibility of Government members to listen to contributions made by Opposition parties whether they are good, bad or indifferent.

After two years' investigation and the expenditure of \$24m, if the Government cannot give representatives 30 minutes to say what they want to say on behalf of their electorates, members of the Government have failed to understand what Mr Fitzgerald has said.

Mr Veivers interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Southport!

Mr INNES: The complaint of repetition is made. The Liberal Party divided the report between different members so that whatever they wanted to say about matters they were interested in, they would be able to check the report and make a detailed response to the Parliament on specific issues. Members of the Liberal Party believe that it is important to analyse the entire document as soon as possible and place on the record the Liberal view of the whole report. The reason why it is so important to have the views expressed as soon as possible is that other people are beginning to take over the arrangement of the public's mind with regard to the debate and the merits of the report.

Probably two million people in Queensland have not read the report. I feel sure that Government members would have had requests for this document. I am unable to fulfil the requests made of my office unless I spend \$20 a copy. People are relying on public information to understand all the problems involved in the debate. The amateurs—those not directly involved—are taking over. The police union has a real interest and today it was taking over the issues. I heard a former Police Minister and the present Police Minister quite rightly adopt a different position, another view. They are entitled to do that. Members of this Parliament have a responsibility to contribute to proper public debate on this most important report. That is why it is important to analyse and understand the report and hit the straps early in the piece. There will be no point in coming back to this Parliament in two months' time when misinformation has taken over the debate, or when a chance for a wider spectrum of analysis has been lost because some particularly vocal minority or entrenched industrial group has taken over.

Now is the time to make the initial responses. It might well be in two months' time, after other people have had their say, that we modify them, but it is important that the people in this House read the document which I know the majority have not read.

Government members interjected.

Mr INNES: I will take bets on it. They rely on the pre-digested rubbish from the Cabinet or the Minister. Because Government members have lost the ability to think for themselves, the administration is in tatters.

Whichever view of history one takes, and irrespective of the accusations, honourable members have a massive problem on their hands which is reflected and detailed in the Fitzgerald report. We have a massive responsibility because we are the legislators. We preside over the allocation of resources and must make an intelligent, reflective response to this enormously important document. If honourable members vacate the field, they have abdicated the responsibility that Mr Fitzgerald says that they should have; a responsibility that none of us should need to be reminded that we have.

The buck stops somewhere. It stops in this Parliament. In some respects Cabinet and Parliament have failed. Honourable members must consider the criticisms that have been made about their responsibilities and, for God's sake, let us do something about it. This starts with intelligent debate and contributions by whoever wants to make them, whatever side of the House or part of the State he comes from.

Four members of my team wish to make a timely contribution today; not in two months' time. I know that the members of the National Party have been instructed to pull their names off the list. Their names were on the list presumably because they had something intelligible to say. However, in the interests of tactics and Government timing, their names have been pulled off the list. Was their contribution worthless?

Mr Tenni interjected.

Mr INNES: Once again the Minister for Northern Development makes a contribution. There could be an entire royal commission into him alone and it could last half as long as the Fitzgerald inquiry.

The Liberal Party strongly—and I will refrain from using the word “bitterly”, because that would not do any good—opposes the adjournment of this matter. The Liberal Party strongly opposes the fact that the amendment will not be put which might have allowed this debate to continue next week. This debate should continue next week to allow all members to make their contributions on behalf of their constituents, their parties or from their own individual point of view. This House should have sat with the prospect that honourable members would be properly informed about the mechanics of the implementation of the recommendations, in particular the ones referring to the structures of this House. If necessary, this House should debate who will form the select committees and how the select committees will be set up, because those committees must be consulted on the people who will be appointed to form the commission. The select committees have to be set up first. Next week the legislation or the motion could be before the House that would set up the two vital parliamentary committees. Their constitution should follow after the debate, and the legislation might take a few more days.

I do not believe or accept the Premier's statement—whoever told him—that the legislation cannot be ready before 29 August. That is an entirely politically motivated timetable. It is totally unreal, not in accordance with the vast resources that we know the Government has, and it certainly is not in accordance with the urgency of the problem of the systematic corruption that has been revealed by the Fitzgerald report.

Mr Hamill interjected.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (10.35 p.m.), in reply: The honourable member for Ipswich seems to be upset. He seems to believe that the only members entitled to speak in this debate are members of the Opposition.

I wish to expose the gross hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party in this debate on whether the debate of the Fitzgerald report be made an order of the day for tomorrow. As Leader of the House, I happen to have with me tonight the official list of speakers in the debate. The Opposition Whip has the list as well. I make no reflection on the Labor Party in this instance, but reflect on the speech of the Leader of the Liberal Party, who said that members of his party wanted to speak in this debate. After Mr Gygar, the official list shows Mr McLean, Mr Campbell, Ms Warner, Mr Ardill, Mr Hayward and Mr Eaton. Where are the Liberal speakers on the list? They are not there.

Mr GYGAR: I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the House has alleged that no list was prepared. In realisation that this matter was to occur, with due formality I passed a full list of Liberal speakers to the Government Whip and said to him, “I formally request that these members be included upon the speaking list.” If they did not appear on that list, it is not because they did not wish to speak. It is because of a

break-down in Government procedures, the like of which we are getting used to in this State.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will not take the point of order. I call the Leader of the House.

Mr Innes: Brian, look at your Whip.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Sherwood! I call the honourable member for Port Curtis.

Mr PREST: Speaking on behalf of the party, I just want to say that the reference to the number of speakers that we have waiting to speak——

Mr Austin: I didn't refer to yours.

Mr PREST: I am speaking about the list given to the Government Whip.

Yesterday, seven members of the Labor Party were given time to speak. Today we submitted seven names again, but there were also other members who wanted to speak. After Mr Ardill, we had Mr Scott, Mr Vaughan, Mr McLean, Mr Campbell, Mr Milliner——

Mr Gygar interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Stafford under Standing Order 123A.

Mr PREST: Other members wishing to speak were Mr Palaszczuk and Mr Hayward. Those names were given to the Government Whip to be put on the list. Even if the debate had continued all day Saturday and into Sunday, we still had more names of members that could have been submitted. Although we have 25 members present, in the last two days only 14 members of the Australian Labor Party have had an opportunity to speak to the debate on this report. We still had more speakers.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lockyer.

Mr FITZGERALD: I wish to speak to the debate this evening to correct some of the statements that have been made.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may make a point of order.

Mr FITZGERALD: No, not a point of order. I wish to speak to the debate.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I have taken points of order on the matter. There is no point of order. I call the Leader of the House.

Mr AUSTIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr INNES: I rise on a point of privilege.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I now call the Leader of the Liberal Party.

Debate interrupted.

PRIVILEGE

Procedure of House

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.41 p.m.): There is an untruth being intentionally or unintentionally perpetrated, the knowledge of which is in the hands of the Government Whip. On the record, a complete untruth has been said. It might be unwittingly. It lies in the hands of the Government Whip to correct it.

Surely we cannot be so barren in procedures in this House that a lie can stay on the record of the House. If it is capable of being——

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I will not take the point of privilege. I will not take a further point of order at this stage. I call the Leader of the House.

REPORT OF FITZGERALD COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

Resumption of Debate

Debate resumed.

Hon. B. D. AUSTIN (Nicklin—Leader of the House) (10.42 p.m.): Perhaps I can resolve the matter by saying that, if they are so sensitive about the matter, I will accept their explanation.

Mr Gygar: Don't accept it; withdraw.

Mr AUSTIN: Oh, turn it up! It is by the bye. The honourable member for Stafford does not seem to understand that we are merely adjourning the debate. We are not gagging the debate; we are merely adjourning it. Members of the Liberal Party came into this House to make a big play for the media. The member for Stafford jockeyed his name down the list hoping like hell that the Government would gag the debate so that he could walk out to the media and say, "They gagged me."

Mr GYGAR: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, the motion was moved by the Leader of the House. I have allowed debate on that motion. The Leader has now spoken again to that motion. I will now put the motion.

Mr HAMILL: Mr Speaker——

Mr SPEAKER: The motion is that the Leader of the House's motion be agreed to.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (10.43 p.m.): I move——

"That the member for Ipswich be heard."

Mr SPEAKER: I am on my feet.

Mr HAMILL (Ipswich) (10.43 p.m.): I move——

"That the member for Ipswich be heard."

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question is that the motion moved by the Leader of the House be agreed to.

Question—That the resumption of the debate be made an order of the day for tomorrow—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 43

Ahern	Littleproud
Alison	McCauley
Austin	McKechnie
Berghofer	McPhie
Borbidge	Menzel
Burreket	Muntz
Chapman	Neal
Clauson	Nelson
Cooper	Newton
Elliott	Perrett
Fraser	Randell
Gamin	Row
Gibbs, I. J.	Sherrin
Gilmore	Simpson
Glasson	Slack
Gunn	Stoneman
Harper	Tenni
Henderson	Veivers
Hinton	
Hobbs	
Hynd	<i>Tellers:</i>
Katter	FitzGerald
Lester	Stephan

NOES, 34

Ardill	Scott
Beanland	Sherlock
Braddy	Smith
Burns	Smyth
Campbell	Vaughan
Casey	Warburton
Comben	Warner
De Lacy	Wells
Eaton	White
Goss	
Gygar	
Hamill	
Hayward	
Innes	
Knox	
Lee	
Lickiss	
McElligott	
McLean	
Milliner	
Palaszczuk	<i>Tellers:</i>
Santoro	Mackenroth
Schuntner	Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Regulations under—

Real Property Act 1861-1988

Property Law Act 1974-1986

Building Units and Group Titles Act 1980-1988.

PRIVILEGE

Denial of Right of Member for Bundaberg to Speak in Debate on Report of Fitzgerald Commission of Inquiry

Mr CAMPBELL (Bundaberg) (10.48 p.m.): I rise on a matter of privilege. I have been denied my right to speak. For two years as Speaker, you made rulings of sub judice on the Fitzgerald inquiry so that we could not speak about it. Now that the Fitzgerald report is before the Parliament, I am denied my right to speak to it.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the Attorney-General.

Mr WELLS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you did not rule on the matter of privilege taken by the member for Bundaberg.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will sit down.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY CONTINUATION BILL

Remaining Stages; Abridgement of Time

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and Minister for Corrective Services) (10.49 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the Commission of Inquiry Continuation Bill from passing through all its remaining stages at this day’s sitting.”

Motion agreed to.

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 6 July (see p. 5564).

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (10.50 p.m.): The Opposition supports the legislation. It has also supported a suspension of Standing Orders so that this legislation could come on, be debated and be passed this evening without having to lie on the table of the House for the usual time before it is debated. It does so out of a positive spirit of co-operation in relation to any positive and substantive measures to implement the Fitzgerald inquiry report and to clear the way for the successful continuation of the work of implementing that report.

The legislation is in two main parts. Firstly, it provides for the continuation of the work of the commission until its work is completed and until the criminal justice commission can be established and become fully operative. The second major part of the legislation is contained in the last clause which provides a complete protection against liability for Mr Fitzgerald, Ms Wolfe and Mr Croke from any legal proceedings in respect of any act or thing done, or omission made by them, and a variety of other circumstances. This is something that, in other circumstances, would not have been necessary, but it is necessary and appropriate in this case.

Apart from preventing a situation in which certain people might try to take advantage of the absence of such a protection to complicate subsequent proceedings, we owe this to these people—particularly Commissioner Fitzgerald, but to the other members of his team as well—for the great job they have carried out and the great personal sacrifice that they have made in discharging their duties in respect of the Fitzgerald inquiry. I think that if honourable members think about the course of the commission of inquiry for any length of time they will appreciate the tremendous toll that it would have taken on the personal, family and professional lives of Mr Fitzgerald and his deputy commissioners. I think that they are truly owed a debt of gratitude by the members of this Parliament and the people of this State.

The Opposition supports the legislation. I have outlined the reason why it supports it. That is all I want to say. The Opposition could take the opportunity of this debate—because of its relevance to the commission of inquiry—to get members to speak at great length and to drag out the proceedings. However, the Opposition does not seek to be obstructionist. It does not seek to be opportunist in relation to this legislation. The Opposition is co-operating in every aspect that it possibly can to have the legislation passed promptly tonight and without delay.

As I say, the Opposition does not seek to take advantage of the opportunity that the debate on this legislation presents to prolong matters. In respect of the debate that has just been adjourned, the Opposition is simply seeking the right of other members of the Opposition who have not been heard—and it also supports the right of members of the Liberal Party who have not been heard and, for that matter, members of the National Party who will not be heard or will not be allowed to be heard—to speak. The Opposition seeks to have that occur not in some opportunistic way in the debate on this legislation but in the substantive debate on the Fitzgerald report which has been outlined in the amendment that I moved. That is how it should occur. What occurred in this place earlier this evening is a disgrace.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (10.55 p.m.): The attitude of the Liberal Party throughout the Fitzgerald inquiry has been that it will support legislation that is seen to help that inquiry to arrive at a speedy conclusion. Mr Fitzgerald's work having been concluded, there is nevertheless a need to continue the inquiry side of the structure that he set up under Mr Croke. The Liberal Party will support that also.

The last clause, which relates to immunity from action of the commissioner, is rightly identified as one with some unusual indications. It is an exceptional clause, and the Liberal Party supports it only for exceptional reasons. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, those exceptional reasons do include the fact that the participants, particularly

Mr Fitzgerald and Mr Crooke, have been through a nightmare, if you like, particularly in the early months of the inquiry.

It is very easy to forget now the enormous threat and the threatening atmosphere which prevailed until the first people rolled over, until the unspeakable was finally spoken, until, if you like, the devastating information was allocated around enough ears and out in the community that it became its own protection. There was the threat, of course, of somebody informing the commission, and as long as targets could be identified, there was somebody that the gun could be pointed at. That is why elaborate security precautions were taken in regard to the commissioner and in regard to key witnesses.

The sort of climate in which this inquiry started was one which was inhabited by people who had enormous amounts to lose, people who have shown their contempt for the law, people who are prepared to commit violent acts. Perhaps there are still things that need to be investigated. However, in the end, the public knowledge, the sharing of the knowledge among so many people, became the protection. I think the real point of the fact that these immunities had to be granted is that at the beginning of the inquiry there was a real threat and a real danger to the security of individuals.

The terms of reference of the inquiry were very specifically into allegations of corruption and a couple of peripheral things with regard to political donations. Mr Fitzgerald has seen fit in his report to inquire into many avenues of corruption which he thought to be so systematic that he found that the whole structure of society and administration in this State had to be examined. Frankly, the disappointing aspects, to which honourable members have already given expression, are highlighted by that one simple clause.

Why, unless you have enormous dangers created by corruption, do you have to take extraordinary steps to secure people's personal safety, and why do you have to introduce extraordinary clauses into legislation to make people immune from actions and other ways of, shall we say, terrorising them, short of personal violence? It is because of those facts that Mr Fitzgerald was led down avenues of extensive inquiry which ended up with him giving a recipe for the total cleansing of the State.

There are those of us who have kicked up tonight, those of us who have said, and will continue to say, that what is contained in the ultimate report is of enormous gravity. Mr Fitzgerald had personal knowledge of the threat to himself, his family and to others involved in the commission, and he found that there is a relationship between bad administration, slack administration and the breeding of crime and crime becoming so extensive that it can do the sorts of things that had to be guarded against at the beginning of the inquiry and the sorts of things that were revealed by the inquiry itself. So there is a relationship, and there is an urgency about starting on the process of reform because failure to do so perpetuates the violence and corruption at the other end which this commission was set up to start to address.

Our failure in this Parliament to urgently address these matters is to perpetuate a climate in which down at the other end the corruption and violence and threat to life and security exists. Insofar as we fail to take action tonight or tomorrow or next week or as early as possible, we are inclined to perpetuate the climate.

Mr Fitzgerald's work has come some way to put the focus on the baddies, to put the focus on the evil, to keep it at bay for some time, but the threat is there as long as we fail to whole-heartedly and urgently take the actions that we should be taking and should have started on today, next week and as soon as possible. In supporting this piece of legislation, which we support without resorting to other speakers, exactly as we have done at all times in the past when we have been called upon to do so by the Government we stand willing to co-operate with the Government on the urgent implementation of the recommendations of the inquiry.

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.01 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Logan and the honourable member for Sherwood for their contribution and support

in the debate on this legislation. The whole point of this legislation is that it recognises that implementation of the Fitzgerald report will be a long and ongoing process. To that end, this legislation extends the life of the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry so that Mr Gary Crooke, QC, can now stand in the place of Mr Fitzgerald and continue the work of that commission.

It is particularly important that the commission be able to receive information from various sources and be able to disseminate information to other sources which are important to the fight against crime in this State and, of course, Australia, particularly through the NCA, and to the Special Prosecutor's office.

The Leader of the Opposition made note of the final clause of this legislation, which is significant. I am pleased that the ALP in this House is prepared to support that clause, as it creates a situation in which one could say that civil liberties are eroded by its very inclusion. It is a clause designed, of course, to prevent the situation that occurred in New Zealand following the Mount Erebus air disaster. In that instance, the commissioner found himself in a most regrettable and unfortunate situation after the findings of the commission were made public. I thank both honourable members for their contribution to the debate. I commend the Bill to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Committee

Clauses 1 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Third Reading

Bill, on motion of Mr Clauson, read a third time.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. P. J. CLAUSON (Redlands—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.05 p.m.): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 29 August 1989, at 10 a.m.”

Mr GOSS (Logan—Leader of the Opposition) (11.06 p.m.): I rise briefly to make one point. I do not propose to divide the House on the question, but obviously from the comments that have been made previously in the debate tonight and the divisions that have been called, the Opposition expresses its very strong objection to the course of action being proposed by the Government, one which we believe is founded on a deliberate plan to delay the debate of this report and to delay the implementation of the primary and crucial recommendation, namely, that of electoral reform.

It is also a cynical tactic or trick to avoid having to debate the amendment and having to face the amendment which I moved on behalf of the Opposition and which would have provided for a full debate and for the House to resume next week. This Government is not just running away from the House; it is, sadly, running away from the Fitzgerald report.

Mr INNES (Sherwood—Leader of the Liberal Party) (11.07 p.m.): I reiterate the Liberal Party's objection to the adjournment. Interesting questions arise at this time of the year. It would not be unusual for Parliament to be prorogued between now and 29 August, with the consequences that follow from that. Indeed, we are getting into a situation in which some people suggest an election could be called after the Federal Budget. It would be interesting to know whether the Government is prepared to give any assurances about the prorogation of Parliament or the possible conduct of a State election. If any of those events follow, it means that there is a deliberate interruption

and impediment to the debate on and implementation of the Fitzgerald report. Obviously the Premier cannot do it now, because it would not be an appropriate response for him to give any assurances to the Liberal Party, the Labor Party or to the public on either of those two eventualities.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.08 p.m.

BILL ASSENTED TO AT CLOSE OF SESSION

The following Bill, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and presented for the Royal assent, was assented to in the name of Her Majesty on 12 July 1989—

Commission of Inquiry Continuation Bill.

PROROGATION

On 20 July 1989 the following Proclamation was issued by the Deputy Governor—

A PROCLAMATION by the Honourable John Murtagh Macrossan, Chief Justice of the State of Queensland, Deputy for and on behalf of His Excellency the Honourable Sir Walter Benjamin Campbell, Companion of the Order of Australia, one of Her Majesty's Counsel learned in the law, Governor in and over the State of Queensland in the Commonwealth of Australia.

[L.S.]

J. M. MACROSSAN

Deputy Governor

IN pursuance of the power and authority vested in me, I, John Murtagh Macrossan, the Deputy Governor aforesaid, do, by this my Proclamation, prorogue the Parliament of Queensland to Tuesday, the First day of August, 1989.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Government House, Brisbane, this twentieth day of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and eighty-nine, and in the thirty-eighth year of Her Majesty's reign.

By Command,

MIKE AHERN

God Save the Queen!