Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 3 DECEMBER 1963

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 3 DECEMBER, 1963

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumba) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTIONS

KEROSENE PRICES, TOWNSVILLE.—Mr. Coburn for Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

Is he aware that kerosene is being sold in ordinary bottles at the price fixed for kerosene in special containers and, if so, what action is proposed to be taken to (*a*) reduce the price for ordinary bottles of kerosene or (*b*) ensure that the special containers are used?

Answer:—

"I presume the Honourable Member is referring to Townsville. The packaging costs of kerosene sold in bottles at that city are at present the subject of investigation by the Commissioner of Prices. However, I would inform the Honourable Member the packing of dangerous substances is a matter which comes under the jurisdiction of my colleague, the Honourable the Minister for Health."

RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTION FOR WAYWARD GIRLS.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Has the Government any intention in the near future of setting up an institution for girls similar to the Wilson Hospital which at present cares exclusively for boys?

(2) If the Answer to Question (1) is in the negative, is it not important that girls should have the same integrated services as are available at the Wilson Hospital?

(3) What services are available for the rehabilitation of difficult girls and is there any system that could be introduced immediately to provide more frequent and consistent psychiatric, psychological and social worker attention for these people?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "The Government's policy is to provide services for both boys and girls who are involved in 'anti-social' behaviour. These services are provided by the Welfare and Guidance Branch of my Department, in collaboration with the State Children Department. The need for a residential institution for girls, similar to the Wilson Youth Hospital for boys is appreciated. This position is being met by 'Kalimna,' the vocational centre for girls at Toowong, the Home of the Good Shepherd at Mitchelton, and the Holy Cross Retreat at Wooloowin.

The activities of these Homes are devoted to training the girls in personal behaviour and social conduct. Rehabilitation Courses and training for suitable employment are undertaken and where necessary the education of the girls is furthered. These are under supervision of State Children Department. In addition to the abovementioned homes, the State Children Department runs 'Karrala' House at Ipswich, which accommodates the more difficult types. Girls placed in the care of the State Children Department for 'anti-social' behaviour receive the services of the Welfare and Guidance Clinic just as do the boys. They attend the Wilson Youth Hospital as outpatients and visits are made by the Welfare and Guidance Services to the homes where these girls are accommodated by the State Children Department. These services have been operating for some time, and with the close co-operation which exists between the Welfare and Guidance Services and the State Children Department, any girl in need of psychiatric and associated services receives prompt attention. I might add that a new Welfare and Guidance Unit will be constructed at the Children's Hospital, which will cater for both in-patients and out-patients. The following facilities will be incorporated in the Unit-Day Hospital, Occupational Therapy, School and Kindergarten. The staff will comprise psychiatrists, psychologists, social and welfare officer and teachers. Working drawings and specifications are nearing completion and it is estimated that construction will be completed early in 1965."

SURVEY OF GEORGETOWN-GILBERT RIVER AREA FOR CROP GROWING.—Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuantt onotice,asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

In view of the fact that no detailed survey has been made in the Georgetown-Gilbert River area for the growing of cotton and other crops, will he consider having a survey made in the near future?

Answer:—

"It is true that a detailed survey for cotton has not been carried out in the Georgetown-Gilbert River area, though the river section was examined in 1955 by officers of my Department with regard to its suitability for general crops with particular reference to tobacco. The Division of Land Research and Regional Survey of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation also recently concluded a survey of the area. I understand that a report on this work will be published shortly, and a decision regarding further surveys will be made when this report has been examined. It is known that an area of 40,000 acres of good alluvial soil occurs in a strip averaging half a mile in depth extending some seventy miles along the river from Prestwood to Strathmore. The soils have been described as 'attractive agricultural soils which resemble the Burdekin group of levee soils.' I am advised that these soils may be suitable for cotton growing, but irrigation would be necessary for high yields. Unfortunately for the greater part of the year the Gilbert is a dry sandy watercourse and the quantity of water available in the river sands is unknown. Owing to transport and marketing difficulties it is likely that at present tobacco is the only crop that would justify any more than a limited development."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1962.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1958.

The Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1962.

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1962.

The Petroleum Acts, 1923 to 1962.

Regulations under—

The Fisheries Acts, 1957 to 1962.

The Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1962.

The Apprentices and Minors Acts, 1929 to 1959.

Report of Dumaresq-Barwon Border Rivers Commission for the year 1962-63.

TRUSTEE COMPANIES BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a third time.

REAL PROPERTY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Dr. Delamothe, read a third time.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Dewar, read a third time.

VAGRANTS, GAMING, AND OTHER OFFENCES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Dewar, read a third time.

PROPOSALS TO REVOKE DECLARATIONS OF LAND AS RESERVES FOR STATE FORESTS AND RESERVES FOR NATIONAL PARKS

Debate resumed from 29 November, (see p. 1885) on Mr. Richter's motion—

"(1) That this House agrees that the proposals by the Governor in Council to revoke the setting apart and declaration as—(1) A reserve for State Forests of:—(a) So much of Reserve for State Forest R. 451, Parishes of Cooloola and Womalah, as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof described as Portion 10, Parish of Cooloola, shown on plan Cat. No. Mch. 2826, deposited in the Survey Office, and containing an area of about 3 acres 1 rood—and, (b) So much of Reserve for State Forest R. 278, Parish of Hercules, as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof commencing at a point bearing 306 degrees and distant one chain twenty-five links from the west corner of Section 3, Town of Woodgate, and bounded thence by lines bearing 306 degrees, fifteen chains fifty links and 36 degrees seven chains, by an Esplanade bearing 126 degrees fifteen chains fifty links and thence by a street bearing 216 degrees seven chains to the point of commencement, and containing an area of about 10 acres—and, (c) So much of Reserve for State Forest R. 318, Parish of Maroochy, as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof described as Portion 707, Parish of Maroochy, shown on Plan Cat. No. Cg. 2502 deposited in the Survey Office, and containing an area of about 21 acres 0 roods 20 perches—and, (d) So much of Reserve for State Forest R. 3, Parishes of Bowarrady, Caree, Moonbi, Poyungan, Talboor and Wathumba, as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof commencing on the shore of the South Pacific Ocean, at a point in the Parish of Moonbi, about forty-nine miles southerly from Sandy Cape on the northern extremity of Fraser Island and bounded thence by lines bearing about 283 degrees about forty chains, about 193 degrees about thirteen miles, about 283 degrees about thirty-five chains about 193 degrees about eighty chains and about 117 degrees about eighty chains again to the shore of the South Pacific Ocean and by that shore northerly to the point of commencement. Also, Portions 8 and 9, Parish of Poyungan, as shown on Plan Fs. 12, deposited in the Survey Office: Also, Portion 8, Parish of Moonbi, as shown on Plan Fs. 13 deposited in the Survey Office and containing in all an area of about 4,938 acres. (2) A reserve for National Park of:—(a) The whole of Reserve for National Park R. 3, Parish of Cannon containing an area of about 11,400 acres to enable a proposal for relocation of boundaries to proceed, which will increase the area of the National Park by 10,800 acres—and, (b) So much of Reserve for National Park, Salvator Rosa, R. 2, Parishes of Cungelella and Pluto as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof commencing at a myall tree marked broad-arrow over 2, being the east termination of the northernmost boundary of R. 2 National Park, Parish of Cungelella and bounded thence by Cungelella Holding south about seven miles thirty-two chains, by a line west about one mile sixty-four chains again to Cungelella Holding and thence by that holding north about seven miles thirty-two chains and east about one mile sixty-four chains to the point of commencement, and containing an area of about 8,640 acres, to enable a proposal to establish a more appropriate boundary to proceed which will result in a nett gain of 16,600 acres to the area of the National Park—and, (c) So much of Reserve for National Park R. 496, Parishes of Roberts and Numinbah, as is comprised in all that piece or part thereof described as Portion 37, Parish of Roberts, shown on plan Cat. No. Wd. 2757 deposited in the Survey Office and containing an area of about 89 acres 0 roods 22 perches, to enable a proposal involving exchange for about 124 acres 1 rood 39 perches of freehold land, to proceed—be carried out.

"(2) That Mr. Speaker convey a copy of this Resolution to the Minister for Local Government and Conservation for submission to His Excellency the Governor in Council."

Mr. HOOPER (Greenslopes) (11.15 a.m.): I rise to support the motion moved by the Minister for Local Government and Conservation. I wish to refer particularly to that part of the motion which deals with the Lamington Plateau. I shall speak briefly from personal knowledge of the area of 124 acres that it is proposed to resume in exchange for 89 acres.

The O'Reilly farm, which has been mentioned so much in the debate, was worked by my brother and me for 12 months, and I feel that I know something of the area. The national park, as we know it today, is largely the result of hard work on the part of the O'Reilly family. They pioneered the area, taking to Roberts Plateau everything necessary for the attraction of tourists. Prior to 1936 the O'Reillys, and Luke O'Reilly and Pat O'Reilly, whose area adjoins the land under discussion in this debate, went to this remote part of the Lamington Plateau by pack-horse, hacking their way up the sides of the mountains. With their bare hands they built roads and tracks extending for many miles.

This national park was developed by the O'Reilly family, who came to Queensland from the Blue Mountains area of New South Wales. It has been suggested by some hon. members that the Minister has the

right to resume the land without the payment of any compensation or the granting of any land in exchange. I want to make my position quite clear in this matter. I would not give my support to any resumption without an exchange of property. The area of 124 acres adjacent to Moran's Falls was originally, and still is, owned by the O'Reillys, who set it aside for development when finance became available. It is adjacent to Moran's Falls and gives free access to that beautiful part of Roberts Plateau. On the other hand, the 89 acres in exchange that the Minister recommends be given to Mrs. Marie O'Reilly immediately adjoins her property. She now works 110 acres. It might be said, "Well, she has made do with this 110 acres for a number of years and it should fulfil her requirements." That is true; but, for the benefit of hon. members, let me say that the Luke O'Reilly farm, now worked by Mrs. O'Reilly, has been worked in conjunction with Pat O'Reilly's property next door, and this made it a payable dairying proposition. However, Pat O'Reilly has disposed of his land and it is now the property of another owner. The development of this 124 acres has been Mrs. O'Reilly's dream, and she intended to develop it eventually.

I believe that the Minister's action in acquiring this area in exchange for 89 acres is timely, because the 89 acres is of no real value as a national park when compared with the 124 acres that he intends to resume. I say to our friends in the National Parks Association that this action will not damage the Lamington National Park in any way; in fact, it will improve it. Some of the access tracks from Pat's Bluff and Luke's Bluff, both of which are scenic spots, run through this property. The O'Reillys have given tourists and other people wishing to use the tracks the right to use the Pat O'Reilly and the Luke O'Reilly farms as thoroughfares over the years. I believe that everybody who knows the area realises that this proposal is the only fair solution to the problem.

Some of the area is under grass, as hon. members on both sides of the House have said. However, the grass is a mountain grass that is of no real feed value to stock. The area on which scrub has been felled on Roberts Plateau has been planted with artificial grasses such as paspalum, kikuyu, and subterranean clover. It is very rich pasture, and the stock that feed on those grasses will not touch the mountain grasses growing in the vicinity of Moran's Falls.

I commend the Minister for introducing this part of the motion. I believe that he is taking the wisest course, and I suggest to hon. members that they should support the motion.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (11.23 a.m.): My remarks will be confined mainly to Part 2 (c) of the motion. However, let me say first that I think the proposals relating to Parts (a) and (b) are also very wise.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the Chamber. It will have to cease.

Mr. MULLER: If land is suitable for national park purposes I believe that it should be set aside, and unless the land referred to in Parts (a) and (b) of the motion is taken at an early date, it may not be possible to take it at all.

As I said, I am concerned mainly with Part 2 (c), which has been the subject of debate and Press controversy during the last few weeks. I think it only fair that I should give the House the background to this proposal, because it really originated during my term of office as Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation.

The first move was made by the Beaudesert Shire Council, which must be regarded as a body of sensible men. The council gave the proposal very serious and careful consideration before referring it to me, and, following its request, I personally inspected the area twice and satisfied myself that the proposal was wise.

Let me say right now that I fully appreciate the vigilance of the National Parks Association, which has done a really excellent job. Its members are devoted to the interests of the association and are making every possible effort to retain land that is suitable for national park purposes. Nevertheless, I believe that some of them are so imbued with their responsibility that they perhaps carry their desires slightly too far.

First of all, let us look at the Lamington National Park area. I think it contains about 48,000 or 49,000 acres. It is mainly heavily timbered scrub land, and much of it is very difficult country and has been retained for national park purposes. Although there is some settlement in the area, one point that we should not lose sight of is that where we have national parks access should be provided to them in order that people may make use of them. If we can view them only from the air or the sea they are not serving the purpose for which they are intended.

A road to the plateau has been constructed over the years to get out the timber standing on freehold land and lands adjacent to the park. That road, after being used for timber purposes, has served as a very suitable means of access to this national park.

I repeat what I said a moment ago. What is the use of a national park if you cannot use it? The scenery around O'Reilly's Guest House is really beautiful. Access is gained by the road, and the tracks through the scrub can really be made use of. The guest house is serving a very important purpose in that locality, enabling the national park to be used as such.

The Beaudesert Shire Council saw need to gain access to what are known as Moran's Falls, which are close to the guest house. The portion of land in question has been described as an area of 124 acres 1 rood 39 perches. It is true, as Press reports mentioned some time ago, that portion of the timber and the scrub has been felled, but there is something more than that about this 124 acres of land. The scrub that has been left on it is on a steep mountain adjacent to the waterfall and it provides beautiful walking tracks and scenery, not only over that portion but over the lower land farther back. The people on the plateau and the local authority took all those points into consideration before they referred the matter to me.

I can assure hon. members that, together with the National Parks Association, I am very jealous of our national parks, and I give the members of that association full marks for all that they have done; nevertheless, there are circumstances surrounding this case that I am fully convinced make the proposal a wise one. The waterfall is there and walking tracks are already provided to it. The whole area combines into a picture of beauty.

In order to gain that piece of land it will mean the exchange of 89 acres 0 roods 22 perches now held by the Crown. Mrs. O'Reilly has a dairy adjoining this piece of land and the proposal is to give her 89 acres to increase the size of her small dairy, which at the moment, is not big enough to provide a livelihood. It will mean excising 89 acres from national park. It is true that it is a piece of beautiful scrub land on which there is a very valuable stand of timber. I should not like to make a guess at the value of the timber on it because one would have to go through it to estimate its value. It comprises timber of all stages, both young and older, but the proposal was that the Department of Forestry take the timber off the land before it is transferred to Mrs. O'Reilly. I take it that that is the position today. As far as I know, there has been no change. It is true that as a person on his way to the guest house travels on the road I mentioned a moment ago he goes through this considerable stand of timber, which is in a rich rain forest. I take it that the Minister will not clear the area any closer to the road than approximately five chains.

A person travelling to the guest house would not know that that 89 acres had been taken from the park, because there is so much of it there. With 50,000 acres of land, the transferring of 89 acres from the park to Mrs. O'Reilly's property would not be noticed. No-one would be any the poorer or any the richer. However, it would have the advantage that when a person got up to the mountain and used the walking tracks he would feel that he was in a national park. At the moment the visitors are trespassing. I know that a mouthful has been made of this matter. I read very carefully what was published about it in the Press. If anyone is to be blamed, it should not be the present Minister. I am the one who should be blamed because the proposal was started in my time. However, because of some slight hitch at the time, the land was not transferred. It should have been transferred long before the present Minister took over his portfolio. I am sure that the wisdom of this proposal will be appreciated by the people who live in the Beaudesert Shire, Mrs. O'Reilly and those associated with her, and the people who use the area for recreation purposes.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) (11.32 a.m.): Referring to Part 1 (d), I am pleased that action has been taken for the orderly settlement of the portion of Fraser Island involved. The beauties and attractions of that island have to be seen to be appreciated. It is a remarkable island, 90 miles long. I take it that the Minister's decision to open up part of the island for settlement in this way is a clear indication that the Government will resist any efforts that may be made by the Commonwealth Government at a later stage to have the island handed over for settlement by Nauruans. This is a matter that concerns Maryborough people very much, as the future of the timber industry in that city is dependent on the timber resources of Fraser Island. The growth of timber on this island is quicker than in any other part of Australia. Maryborough's main timber mills—Wilson Hart and Lambert Hynes—are drawing on the resources of this island to an ever-increasing degree. The timber supply from the island is dependent on the natural regeneration of the trees, and this regrowth is safeguarded by the Department of Forestry. As one part of the island is worked out it is closed to enable the natural regeneration of the timber to proceed.

Very beautiful features of the island, of course, are the many fresh water lakes, which are of considerable size. The lake that I know very well is about half a square mile in area. Because of the beauties of the timber reserves and the general natural beauty of the island, the future development of the island is certain to be remarkable. The island is some distance from the mainland and is reached mainly by boat, so there may be a drawback for some time in its development. There is now a landing field on the island so that people can get to it by air, and there is quick transport to the other side of the island.

Of course, matters of hygiene and housing standards will be for the local authority to decide. The area under discussion contains about $7\frac{3}{4}$ square miles and, considering the extent of the island and the type of country where this development is to take place, I agree that it will not interfere with the timber reserves on the island. I am indeed pleased

that there will be some orderly development of the area so that progress can take place in an orderly manner. I hope that the Minister will not allow this land to be converted to freehold at a later stage, and that he insists that the provisions relating to mainland areas where land can be converted to freehold after some time will not apply to the land on the island.

I am sure the people of Maryborough generally will be pleased with the Government's decision and I am sure that they will also be pleased if this is to be regarded as an indication of the Government's attitude that the island will not be handed over to the Nauruans. This matter was very topical earlier in the year. The people of Maryborough also sincerely hope that this land will not be converted to freehold.

There are other spots on the island which may later call for development. There is a remarkable beach some 40 miles from the subject area where there is a well-known picturesque spot called Indian Head. Anyone who has been to this side of the island is aware of the magnificent coastal scenery at this place. People who get allotments in this area have the advantage of an excellent beach which is quite trafficable and it is possible to travel long distances from the beach to beauty spots. As a result of this proposal there will be many advantages for the people of Maryborough and also for people from other parts of the State who may establish holiday homes in the area.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.38 a.m.): Last week when the Minister gave notice of his intention to introduce this motion I called "Not formal" as is customary with proposals of this kind, because that is the only way the Opposition has of finding out what is entailed in such a motion. I was not present on Friday last, but the Deputy Leader of the Opposition queried some aspects of the matter whereupon the Premier was kind enough to make available to him the file concerning this matter. Appreciation of the Premier's action was expressed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I now confirm that we appreciate that gesture which enabled us to examine the file and see exactly what is proposed. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition consulted with me this morning and, following a perusal of the information made available to him, he believes that there does not appear to be any reason to object to the proposal.

There was one matter affecting some studies that officers of the C.S.I.R.O. were desirous of undertaking and it was claimed that the particular area that it is proposed to excise was the only area where these studies could be carried out. That contention is resisted by Mr. Trist. If Mr. Trist and Dr. Webb of the C.S.I.R.O. advise that there is other suitable land I should like an assurance from the Minister that he will make it possible for these studies to proceed.

Mr. Richter: All they have to do is make the request.

Mr. DUGGAN: That is simple enough. Can the Minister confirm that there are other areas that are suitable for these purposes?

Mr. Richter: Yes, there are.

Mr. DUGGAN: That is the only point I wanted to raise—whether there were alternative areas available that would enable the studies to be carried on along parallel lines with those now being pursued. The Minister has indicated that there is such land and he has also indicated by interjection that all that the department concerned has to do is to make application and approval will be given. So that removes any possible ground for objection.

Before resuming my seat I should like to join the hon. member for Fassifern and express a very brief word of appreciation of the National Parks Association. They are a very vigilant body. While a Government that might have plans to make some alterations or to surrender some lands may at times feel somewhat annoyed at what it believes to be the unwarranted or unjustifiable views of this body, I think the people of Queensland are indebted to them because they are a dedicated band of men and women constituting the National Parks Association. They spend a good deal of their own money in advancing the aims and objectives of the association and they act as watchdogs in these matters. I think all Governments, when they know there is a vigilant organisation in the community acting in quite an objective way on these matters, are more likely to take notice of their views and representations and I think it would make them rather reluctant to take steps that, in the absence of such views, they might, irrespective of party affiliation, be prepared to make. So I am grateful for the work being done by the National Parks Association. I do not think anyone could criticise or castigate them for very properly drawing the attention of members of the Legislature to these proposals in order that they might be the subject of very close scrutiny. In this instance I do not think there is anything to cavil at; but the history in other countries shows that people who become complacent and fail to take an interest in these problems very often find, perhaps to the regret of later generations, that valuable opportunities have been lost as a result of people not bringing before the attention of the authorities the scenic grandeur or the beauties or other advantages that might lie in land that is owned by the nation.

With those observations, I thank the Premier for his courtesy and the Minister for his acknowledgment of the points we put forward on behalf of the Opposition.

Motion (Mr. Richter) agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Hon. A. T. DEWAR (Wavell—Minister for Labour and Industry) (11.44 a.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961, in certain particulars."

The Act was the subject of exhaustive examination and consideration before its introduction in 1961. Generally speaking, it is operating very satisfactorily; this is borne out by the almost complete lack of industrial trouble since its enactment.

The amendments now proposed are only of a minor nature. The first amendment relates to Section 136, dealing with the power of inspection by union officials. This section gives power to an industrial commissioner, the registrar, or an industrial magistrate, to authorise any officer of an industrial union of employers or employees to enter any place or premises, etc., wherein or by means of which any person carries on a calling in respect of which such union is registered. It is also bound up with Section 126 (1), which provides that an officer of any such union holding such authority may inspect time and wages books.

"Officer" is defined in the Act for the purpose of disputed elections, and it is essential that the present definition be retained for the purpose of those provisions. However, the definition at present excludes such persons as permanent or temporary organisers, industrial officers, and so forth, as it was determined by the Industrial Court, on appeal by both the United Graziers' Association and the Australian Workers' Union, that such officers are, in effect, paid employees of employer and employee unions, and are not elected officers in accordance with the definition contained in the Act.

It was never intended that this provision should exclude the class of officers mentioned. Therefore, it is proposed to amend Section 136 to provide that such authority may be issued to any officer as defined in Section 5 of the Act, or a bona-fide employee who requires to make, in the course and for the due performance of his employment, any entry mentioned in Section 136 and any inspection mentioned in Section 126.

The amendment will enable an officer or bona-fide employee of an industrial union whose normal duties necessitate his entry to premises, etc., under the provisions of Section 136, or his making inspections under the provisions of Section 126, to be lawfully authorised to do so. This amendment has been sought by the United Graziers' Association, the Australian Workers' Union, and the Federated Clerks' Union.

Section 97 provides, amongst other things, that in every case where an employee has left the employment of an employer, without being paid in full, and the employer has been unable, during a period of 30 days after the termination of employment, to make such payment because the whereabouts of such employee are unknown and he cannot be found, such employer shall pay the full amount to the nearest clerk of petty sessions to the credit of such employee; and the receipt of the clerk of petty sessions to any employer for moneys so paid shall be a good discharge to the employer to the amount mentioned in such receipt.

It will be observed that under this section the employer may discharge his obligation only by the payment of unclaimed moneys to a clerk of petty sessions. An industrial inspector at present has no authority to collect unclaimed moneys which he may discover in a time and wages book are due to an employee whose services have been terminated and who has not been paid his full entitlements, nor has he any statutory authority to collect unpaid wages on behalf of an employee, whether or not the employee be still in the employment of the employer.

Mr. Bromley: Once they are paid to a clerk of petty sessions, how does an employee who cannot be found get the wages due to him?

Mr. DEWAR: It then becomes part of our job to try to find him. I shall clear that point up later.

Departmental files contain evidence where an employer refused to pay to an industrial inspector wages on behalf of employees whose services had been terminated, and who had departed without collecting wages which were due to them.

As the law now stands, the inspector could not lawfully demand that the unclaimed wages be paid to him. The lawful procedure was for the employer to pay the moneys to the nearest clerk of petty sessions.

In the event of a prosecution for a breach of this subsection, the magistrate, upon conviction of the defendant, has no statutory authority to order that the unclaimed moneys be paid to the clerk of petty sessions, as he has in the case of unpaid wages.

It has been the practice for a great number of years for inspectors to collect arrears of wages owing to employees from employers and issue the employer with a general purpose receipt from their official receipt books. The amount collected is then paid to the accounts branch in Brisbane or to the credit of the inspector's collection account in country centres, and a cheque is drawn for the amount involved and either posted or paid to the employee concerned. It has been found from experience that this is a most satisfactory method of ensuring that employees on whose behalf arrears of wages have been assessed receive their entitlement. It has been found that, in some instances, the amount of wages due to an employee or employees has been entered in the time and wages book and signed for but has never been paid.

It was only on 29 July this year that I approved of legal proceedings being instituted against an employer in a provincial town close to Brisbane for failing to pay to his three employees arrears of wages totalling £207 4s. 2d., which amount was assessed by an industrial inspector some little time previously. Had the industrial inspector been armed with the statutory authority, he could have collected the arrears of wages at the time of his original inspection and thus ensured that the employees had their legal entitlements. The employees concerned have now been paid.

Generally, the employer does not hesitate to pay the arrears to the inspector when requested to do so; but, on the other hand, there are instances where the employer refuses to pay arrears of wages to the inspector and reserves the right to pay the employees himself. In order to protect the interests of employees, it is proposed to amend Section 97 to provide that employers shall, upon demand, pay to an industrial inspector unpaid or unclaimed wages due to employees, whether or not the employees are still employed or their services have been terminated.

To avoid conflicting with the discretionary powers given to industrial magistrates in ordering defendants, upon conviction, to pay arrears of wages, the industrial inspector's authority to collect arrears of wages has been limited to six months, except where the services of an employee have been terminated.

The section also prescribes that the clerk of petty sessions shall deal with unclaimed moneys collected in respect of wages in the same manner as that in which moneys held by him in trust for litigants are prescribed to be dealt with. Actually, what occurs is that the clerk of petty sessions holds the money to the credit of the employee for a period of three months and then remits it to the Treasury. It is now proposed that the actual procedure of disposing of the money by the clerk of petty sessions or the industrial inspector be prescribed in the Act. Instead of the present prescription, it is proposed to amend the section to enable such moneys to be paid to the employee or remitted to the Department of Labour and Industry to the credit of the employee.

It is proposed, therefore, to amend the final paragraph of Subsection (7) of Section 97 by prescribing that the receipt of an industrial inspector or a clerk of petty sessions to any employer for moneys owed by him on behalf of employees shall be a good discharge to the employer to the amount mentioned in such receipt. It is an offence under Subsection (7) for an employer not to pay to the clerk of petty sessions, to the credit of an employee, any unclaimed wages that may be due to him; but upon conviction for this offence, provision is not made in the Act for the magistrate to order the payment of unclaimed wages.

A proposed further amendment to the subsection will vest in the industrial magistrate mandatory powers, upon conviction, to order the payment of all moneys the subject of the offence.

Because a considerable number of complaints have been received from the Shop Assistants' Union, and also from the Retailers' Association, in regard to the advertising of the sale of non-exempt goods outside the prescribed trading hours, much thought has been given to steps that may be taken to prohibit this form of illegal sales promotion.

There is nothing in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961 to prevent the advertising of this type of illegal trading, and the advertisements appearing in the Press and on television and radio are extensive, it was thought desirable that the Act should be amended to cope with these activities.

It is considered that Section 87 of the New South Wales Factories, Shops and Industries Act contains the answer to this problem, and it is proposed to adopt this section and insert it in the Queensland Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961. However, Subsection (1) of the section is to be modified to include "any occupier of a factory and/or shop in whose name is published and any person who publishes any such statement". The New South Wales section refers only to any person who publishes or causes to be published any statements, etc.

Action was taken in the new Act in 1961 to endeavour to prevent discriminatory action being taken against an employee by a union in preventing him from joining such a union, notwithstanding that fact that he has the appropriate qualifications and is not of general bad character.

Section 47 (1) of the Act prescribes that all persons who are, by the nature of their occupation or employment, of the callings in respect of which an industrial union is

registered, have the appropriate qualifications, and who are not of general bad character, shall be entitled to be admitted to membership of the union, and to remain members thereof and enjoy all advantages of membership, so long as they comply with the rules of the union.

On 26 September 1961, the late Mr. Justice Brown delivered a judgment in an application by a notice of motion by two persons for an order that the said two colliery employees be admitted to membership of the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union of Employees in acordance with Section 47 (1) of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961.

Mr. Newton: An employee has always had that right of appeal to the court.

Mr. DEWAR: That is quite right; but that does not go far enough, as I shall explain.

In his judgment, His Honour declared that each of the applicants was a person who, by the nature of his occupation or employment in the callings in respect of which the respondent union is registered as an industrial union, had the appropriate qualifications, was not of general bad character, and was entitled to be admitted to membership of the respondent union, and entitled to remain a member thereof and enjoy all the advantages of membership, so long as he shall comply with the rules of the union. However, there is no provision whereby any such declaration may be enforced.

Last year, an employee who was employed under a State award by a meat company wrote to the then Minister, and called to see the Chief Industrial Inspector on three or four ocasions regarding the failure of the A.M.I.E.U. to issue him with a union ticket. He had refused to reduce his tally of boning, and had failed to remain at a lunch-hour meeting after the starting signal had been given. The union accepted his fees, but would not issue him with a union ticket. He was allowed to attend union meetings, but was not allowed to exercise his rights as a union member at these meetings. The grounds for refusal were that he did not possess a union ticket, irrespective of the fact that he had paid his fees. The union delegate on the job refused to accept his fees, but when they were due he forwarded them to the office of the union at the Trades Hall, but they were never acknowledged. The other men at the works did not refuse to work with him, but he was looked upon as an outcast.

As the Act now stands, it is not possible for the department to do anything to enforce the union to issue him with a ticket and, in addition, it would be futile for him to follow the stand taken by the employees concerned in the application before the late Mr. Justice Brown.

It is, therefore, further proposed that an additional subsection be added to Section 47, prescribing that any union which fails to admit to membership any person who is entitled to membership in accordance with the provisions of Subsection (1) of this section, and upon payment of the subscription required by its rules, fails to issue such person with a union ticket shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty of not less than £50 or more than £250.

The reference to the union ticket is included by reason of the fact that a union could accept fees, as in the case of the A.M.I.E.U. which I have quoted, and advise a person verbally that he is a member, and still deprive him of means of proving his membership.

A further amendment to the Act is also proposed in relation to Section 113 of the Act, where it is proposed to add a further subsection to the provision.

Section 113 (4), as contained in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961, is identical with Section 61 (3) of the repealed Acts.

Subsection (2) of Section 61 of the repealed Acts is not included in Section 113 of The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961, and in fact has been omitted.

Prior to the introduction of the Act of 1961, all prosecutions for breaches of awards in respect of the payment of wages were issued under the provisions of Subsection (2) of Section 61 of the repealed Acts.

Under the existing Act, Section 97 (1) is relied on for prosecutions in respect of breaches for short-payment of wages, which section, inter alia, prescribes that all wages shall be paid in full in money and, except for deductions mentioned therein at the price or rate so fixed.

The present Act also lacks statutory authority to proceed against an employee who receives from an employer a lesser amount than that prescribed by any award or industrial agreement.

The present subsection (4) of Section 113 and subsection (3) of Section 61 of the repealed Acts provide only for the prosecution of an employee who, in pursuance of an express or implied agreement with an employer, receives a lesser remuneration than that to which he is entitled under an award. It is further provided that no prosecution shall be initiated under this section without the leave of the court.

There is on record that an employee complained that he had been short-paid in wages by an employer. This complaint was proceeded with before the industrial magistrate, who awarded the complainant arrears of wages amounting to £166 6s. 6d. and £8 witnesses' expenses.

Later, another complaint was received that the same employee was working at a lesser rate of wages than that prescribed by the

award, but on this occasion it was not possible to obtain sufficient evidence upon which to institute legal proceedings.

The employee was making it a habit of working for less than the prescribed rate of wages and then lodging a claim for the arrears at the conclusion of his employment and, in the absence of subsection (2) of Section 61 of the repealed Acts, it was not possible to institute legal proceedings against the employee for breaching the award.

To institute proceedings for a breach of subsection (4) of Section 113 it would be necessary to prove that there was an express or implied agreement. Therefore, it is now proposed to re-insert subsection (2) of Section 61 of the repealed Acts in Section 113 of the present Act.

The inclusion of the repealed subsection will then permit legal proceedings to be taken against employees who deliberately work for a lesser rate of wages than that prescribed by the award. It will also provide a clearer basis on which to institute legal proceedings against employers who pay to their employees a lesser remuneration than that prescribed by an award than the section under which proceedings are presently being instituted. I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (12.2 p.m.): Many of the provisions of this amending Bill will be acceptable to this side of the Chamber, but there are one or two on which we should like to reserve judgment, one on which we should like clarification, and possibly one which we will not be very happy about.

The Minister prefaced his remarks by saying that, generally speaking, the Act had been operating satisfactorily since its introduction. Without canvassing the point in any great detail I want to say that one of the things that the industrial movement of the State justifiably feels extreme resentment about in regard to the amendments two years ago referred to by the Minister is the removal of the power previously vested in the Industrial Commission to award bonus payments. Quite rightly, that has caused a good deal of industrial discontent. I would not have felt quite so resentful had the Minister of the day prevented the Commission from making any downward movement in bonus payments, but it seems to me to be a very vicious piece of legislation that provides that prosperity bonuses cannot be awarded by the tribunal especially established for the purpose of determining these matters, yet at the same time gives it the power to reduce the bonuses. I do not think there is any element of British justice in that. Apart from industrial justice, I think it lacks elementary justice. Because of that principle there was a very prolonged strike which had disastrous consequences to everybody concerned—the unions, the men involved, and the employers who were, to some extent, temporarily affected. It is very difficult for unions when powerful, wealthy organisations such as Mount Isa Mines Limited are involved because they can withstand a siege for a long period of time. Unlike perishable commodities such as potatoes, fruit, or other foodstuffs that deteriorate when stored, their product does not deteriorate to any extent, if at all. Consequently, they can face up to a long period of disputation knowing that there commodity does not deteriorate because of exposure to the elements.

Mr. Hughes: You don't think they would want that; they would negotiate.

Mr. DUGGAN: They have not. They have refused to negotiate. Consultations have taken place between the industrial unions and the management of Mount Isa Mines Ltd., and the management have said, "We will not negotiate." I think that is tremendously unfair and I certainly think that the Government should take the appropriate steps to restore the status quo as it was before 1961.

This company has been fantastically successful and it is well to remember that a Labour Government gave the initial guarantees to this organisation. At that time the then Opposition—which is now reflected in the present Government—criticised us and said we were gambling on a hole in the ground by giving these guarantees. While the company was becoming established we gave very generous freight concessions on the basis of the system that I am referring to now. They were granted on a prosperity basis; we laid down minimum charges for when the prices of zinc and lead fell to certain levels and if the price rose we were to share in the prosperity of the industry by getting an increase in the freight rate. The company was not very happy about that but it became a part of our railway freighting policy at the time. When those steps were taken I was attacked by certain sections of the community for giving such a concession to this great industrial enterprise. I mention this matter to point out that Labour has not been unsympathetic to the development of this organisation.

As I pointed out originally, in any enterprise of this kind nature has deposited certain mineral wealth in the ground and it takes geologists, geophysicists and other people to find the wealth; it then requires the technical know-how of people to extract it and men who are prepared to risk their health, and sometimes their lives, in working in the mines to win the wealth; it requires the management to provide the machinery and other scientific means for getting the maximum return from the product of the mines to be sold on the world markets and, in order to get the requisite equipment, it is necessary for shareholders to put in some money. So we have management, capital and labour; we have the classic illustration of these three components which are necessary in modern society to operate an enterprise of this nature. I believe that the three of them are entitled to recognition; no-one

could say that any one is more important than the other. Without the means for buying the machinery, the trucks, and all the other equipment the mine could not be worked, and, with all the trucks in the world, unless there are men to mine the wealth it cannot be won and it cannot be removed from the site to the markets of the world, and there must also be successful and efficient management to co-ordinate these factors satisfactorily.

It seems extraordinary to me that since this industrial dispute the shareholders in the company have been able to get a bonus of three shares for every two held. No-one could say that there has been any restraining hand in that direction. I am not canvassing the merits or demerits of that matter except to say that the company has declared a tremendous bonus issue since this industrial dispute, in the ratio of three for two held at that time. This has been of tremendous financial benefit to the shareholders but, unless the management acquiesces, the workers are prevented from having their side of the case determined. Can anybody tell me that there is justice in that procedure? I do not think there is. The men are entitled to have this very important industrial grievance rectified.

Mr. Windsor: Why not make the men shareholders?

Mr. DUGGAN: For all I know, there may be some merit in that suggestion. The point is that it is a very lopsided arrangement. There cannot be industrial justice unless the point is recognised. I hope the Minister will take a more realistic view of the matter than his predecessor did. I am quite convinced that pressure was put on the Government responsible for the insertion of the provision. I regard it as one of the most retrogressive steps in industrial legislation taken by any Government in the last 25 years. It set up a special body to determine these things; it tied its hands in making improvements but left it completely unfettered in reducing benefits. No-one can tell me that that is industrial justice or the sort of industrial law that should operate in a British democracy. I am surprised at such an attitude and I want to register at this early stage my strong criticism of the operation of the Act in so far as it relates to the withholding of power from the Industrial Commission in the granting of bonuses.

I think in the main the other matters are desirable and I commend the Minister for introducing them.

The first is the decision to recognise a temporary officer of the union and give him access to books. I can only express the hope that the failure to give this recognition earlier was an oversight when the Act was orignally drafted. I have enough sense to know that very often, with every good intention in the world, parliamentary officers, including the Parliamentary Draftsman, fail to anticipate certain developments. I think from memory that several of us quibbled at the time about the alteration but I do not suggest it was intentionally done. Anyway, action is now being taken to rectify the matter and it seems a very desirable step.

The steps that are being taken to amend the existing provision relating to the recovery of money seem also to me to be desirable. I feel in these cases, where it is obvious that an industrial inspector observes that there has been some breach on the part of the employer, procedure should be available for the prosecution of that employer. If that power is lacking now, the matter should be remedied as quickly as possible. It is not much good getting a judgment from a stipendiary magistrate for the recovery of wages if it is not enforceable. So I think the action being taken to permit enforcement is very desirable.

I should appreciate from the Minister, in his reply or on the second reading, a little more information about a request by the Retail Traders' Association and the Shop Assistants' Union relating to advertising the sale of non-exempt goods outside the prescribed trading hours. The Minister proposes to amend that provision and the way he outlined the proposal led me into some measure of confusion on its implications. Does it mean that a television advertisement at 9 o'clock at night of Napro hair dressing or Aspros or Palmolive soap will be prohibited because the advertising of those non-exempt goods is outside the prescribed trading hours? Or does it relate to the purchasing of these commodities?

Mr. Dewar: That is correct.

Mr. DUGGAN: I should not imagine it dealt with the mere advertising of the goods. One may read an advertisement in a newspaper on Sunday morning or Sunday night or any other time and it would not be regarded as illegal. I should not think a television advertisement would be any more illegal. The way the Minister outlined the provision it seemed to relate to advertising. I think a practice was developing in New South Wales particularly in regard to motorcars and land. I do not know what range of commodities the Minister has in mind here. I should not think the Shop Assistants' Union would be very much concerned with the sale of land. I do not want this quoted against me—sometimes people like to take what you say out of its context in "Hansard" and quote it against you—but I should not be averse to the practice of selling land at week-ends, because, if the land is situated some distance from where the person lives, obviously the week-end is the only time his wife can take him along to view it. Any ordinary person wanting to buy a block of land at the seaside could not take time off during the week to inspect it unless he sacrificed a day's pay. I should not think that that sort of purchase would cause the unions much concern. I think that they are probably adopting a defensive line in the fear that the range of articles

might narrow till it reached commodities that the unions rightly feel can be adequately sold during the prescribed hours of trading. I should like the Minister to be kind enough to indicate the nature of these non-exempt goods. I accept the fact that it is only the actual selling that is involved.

Concerning unions not accepting applicants for membership, I should like to know to what extent the Minister or his officers have had dealing with the unions. I should like to feel that in these matters the unions were consulted. The Minister has recited what appear to be the facts of a case concerning a person who was not prepared to reduce his tally and returned to work when the whistle blew during the course of a lunch-hour meeting. For doing this, he was allegedly disciplined by his union, which was the A.M.I.E.U.

I know, of course, that some unions can be very harsh in the application of their rules, and no-one wants to see undemocratic rules operating, whether in unions or other organisations. If the Chamber of Commerce or the Chamber of Manufactures had some oppressive rules, I am certain that even the most militant unionist would want to see that they were not applied autocratically against the public interest. I do not think anyone would suggest that trade unions should have power beyond that.

This matter has special significance in the operations of industrial unions in whose domestic affairs I do not think there should be undue interference. If the Minister can produce evidence that in these or any other cases there has been gross discrimination, I think the Committee would be entitled to pass judgment in the matter. I feel that this could well have been a case in which departmental officers could have ascertained the views of the unions. If the officers thought that the unions were grossly unreasonable, they could then have recommended to the Minister that some action be taken. I do not think that any intelligent unionist would want any conflict with the Government or the court on this matter.

The hon. member for Belmont said by interjection that the present law provides access to the court. The only argument against that course might be that some unions, or even an applicant for membership of the union, may possibly feel that the cost of appealing is a little high.

Mr. Dewar: These men did appeal to the Court, and it found that they were fit and proper persons. There is nevertheless no provision to make the unions accept them.

Mr. DUGGAN: I should like to hear some more from the Minister on that matter.

I do not know whether this is a novel procedure or the re-insertion of an old principle, and I refer now to an employee deliberately working for less than the prescribed rate of wages and, on resigning or being dismissed, suing the employer for the difference in wages. The fact that the Minister has had to introduce an amendment to the Act to provide protection for employees through their unions indicates, I think in the most eloquent manner possible, the value of industrial unionism. Many people think that these things flow freely through the generosity and magnanimity of employers. I think that in the main we have fairly enlightened employers today, but the fact that the Minister had to cite an example to justify the amendment proves that there are still employers who are not prepared to see that industrial justice is done to employees.

I use this opportunity to focus attention on, in particular, the young people, who do not know the problems, trials, and tribulations of early unionists. They think today that unions are merely fee-gathering organisations that do nothing for their members and perform no useful purpose. Some benefit may flow from the Minister's words in this instance, because in some measure they do stress the importance of unions.

In days gone by, a person who had a family to feed might accept a certain wage because of the economic conditions prevailing at the time. For instance, during the depression people often contracted to build houses on a labour-only basis. Advertisements of this type appeared frequently during the depression: "Person required to build house. Materials provided. Tenders invited for labour only." Let us assume that the wage of a carpenter was then about £10 a week. A man might offer his services to build a house—the job might take six weeks —for £40 or £50, because of the intense competition. That is the reason why industrial laws and courts were established to protect people from exploitation. We now see a slight resurgence of that sort of thing, although it is much more difficult to detect than it was previously.

There is no reason why employers should refuse to accept the minimum wage prescribed by an award of the Industrial Commission and try to force a person into accepting an industrial agreement under which he will work for less than that minimum wage. If a man willingly accepts a wage such as that he cannot be regarded as other than an industrial scab, and I do not think he is entitled to very much protection. On the other hand, if, as the Minister says, a person accepts those conditions and then uses the Department of Labour and Industry to try to obtain the difference between what he has been paid and what the award lays down, and then accepts new employment under the conditions that obtained previously, I do not think he is entitled to very much protection, either. It is almost like forcing a person to join a union, allowing him to receive the benefits that union advocates may get for him, and then having him refuse to pay his share of the cost of the action taken.

Mr. Dewar: That was in the old Act.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am glad that there is further justification. We hear everything that is wrong with Labour legislation, and it is good to know that some of the principles originally brought down by Labour Governments are being re-enacted. Now that the Minister is in such a generous mood and is acknowledging the desirability of some sections of Labour legislation, I suggest that he might amend the section dealing with bonus payments and make the Bill a very desirable one.

The Bill is like the curate's egg—good in parts—but I should like the Minister to be good enough to reply to one or two of the points that I have made. Other hon. members on this side of the Chamber who have had a good deal of experience in the industrial movement will no doubt speak in greater detail on some of the suggested amendments.

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (12.23 p.m.): As did the Leader of the Opposition, I listened with interest to the proposed amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. It seems strange that, only a few days after the Minister told us that there was no need to worry about the recovery of arrears of wages or unpaid wages for workers, we now have amendments being introduced to make sure that the position is covered better than it was when the Minister spoke on that occasion.

I believe that some of the proposals outlined by the Minister are quite good. It is true that a number of trade unions in Queensland employ industrial officers and accountants, and officers of the department who have had as much experience as I have had know that when one goes out to recover unpaid wages one has not only to check the wages book but also to check the time book from a particular job against the wages book to see just what has been paid and what has not been paid. So I should say that this amendment would be of great assistance to the trade unions.

On many occasions when matters of this kind are raised they become custom and practice and are accepted by the employers. I could go on to a particular job with my industrial officer and demand the right to inspect wages books, and the employer would agree. In some cases, one could go along, as in the old days, and be refused that right, but I think the average employer co-operates if a complaint is received about a short payment of wages, or penalty rates, or travelling time, or whatever the case may be. The fact that the industrial officer or the union official will have the right to go out and check time and wages books will be a big improvement on the present position where it is not written into the law.

The other point about which I am concerned is that raised by the hon. member for Norman. I do not know where we fell down in the past on the question of recovery of unpaid wages by the officers of the Department of Labour and Industry, but if my memory serves me correctly, wherever there has been a recovery of unpaid wages, whether as a result of a complaint by an employee or a trade union, the practice has been to contact the union and state that on such-and-such an employer's job there was such-and-such an amount of wages due to the following personnel and that they would be pleased if such personnel were notified that the department had such amount of unpaid wages in hand. The usual procedure is then for such people to contact the Department of Labour and Industry and for the department to write out and forward a cheque, as the Minister stated.

On the question of moneys being paid in to the clerk of petty sessions, I suppose that that would be quite satisfactory to some trade unions. Judging by the Minister's introductory remarks, it is quite evident that it is satisfactory to the Australian Workers' Union, which caters for seasonal work. When somebody checks a time and wages book and finds that there has been a shortage in payment of wages, it is quite convenient that the amount should be paid in to the clerk of petty sessions and probably held until the next season commences. They know that certain people will return to that area because they have followed the industry in that area for many years. But in the case of, say, the building industry, where numbers of people come from southern States and even from as far as New Zealand, when arrears of wages are paid into the clerk of petty sessions they may be held for a very long time, and I think there should be some avenue by which these outstanding amounts could be advertised. The fact that the Department of Labour and Industry or an industrial inspector has collected certain amounts and that they are held by the clerk of petty sessions should be advertised.

From time to time the Australian Workers' Union advertises in its journal that certain amounts are being held by the clerk of petty sessions as arrears of wages that have been collected. It also advertises, where certain arrears have been collected by union officials, that such amounts are being held by a particular branch of the union.

While the provision may be satisfactory to some unions it is not to others, and I am sure that the Minister will explain how he intends to meet the case of people who move around, not only within this State but from this State to others. I should like him to explain how they will be contacted and paid their arrears of wages.

Another point that concerns me is that I have noticed in this Chamber recently that a certain amount of direction of labour is being undertaken by the Government, or at least it seems to have in mind certain directions. I went through the Industrial Development Bill very carefully. Certain subclauses in that Bill seem to apply to the direction of labour—providing that it may be directed from one job to another. Now we find under this Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation

and Arbitration Act the subject of the admission of members to unions is raised. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, we hope that this matter has been discussed with the unions or that the department has taken into consideration the rules of unions on the admission of members. These rules are not merely rules drawn up by union officials. All rules or amendments to rules have to be agreed to by the membership of the unions in a ballot, and then approved and registered by the Registrar of the Industrial Court.

I raise this point because the Government could be treading on dangerous ground if it has not been taken into consideration. The unions do not merely insert rules in their own rule books. The Registrar has the right to reject any rules if he thinks they are not in the interests of the membership of the union. That applies particularly to craft unions. I take my own union as an example. Going onto a job a person might be picked up by one of the State organisers. He might be asked, "Are you new on the job since I was last here? Are you a member of the union?" Possibly that person would reply, "No." The present policy is that once a person obtains a job, within 14 days he must apply to join the relevant union. We usually find that after explaining the position people do not object to filling in the necessary cards so that they can be considered for admission into the union. On a particular night the applications would be considered after the applicants had been interviewed by a sub-committee of the branch committee to ensure that they had the qualifications laid down in the rules registered in the Industrial Court. In the case of my union an applicant would be asked, "Have you served an apprenticeship? Have you any proof that you have served an apprenticeship as a carpenter and joiner?" Or he might be asked, "Have you any proof that you did a post-war rehabilitation course?" We did accept quite a number of members under that scheme, right up to the end of the Korean War. An applicant might be asked, "If you cannot produce any of those qualifications, can you produce any qualifications at all to show us that you have in some way endeavoured to attend a technical college to gain the knowledge you would require to be a carpenter or a joiner?" In many instances applicants have these certificates. All these things are taken into consideration.

On the other hand, it is true, as was pointed out by the Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, that craft unions have refused membership to people because they have not had the necessary qualifications to satisfy the committee carrying out the tests. Most of the tests are not practical tests; they are merely theory tests. If a person wants to join a craft union and he claims to know the craft of that union, he should be able to answer the questions on theory put to him. If a person is refused permission to join the union because the committee is not satisfied that he has the necessary qualifications, he can then apply to the Industrial Court to have the matter determined. I know of several cases that have gone to the Industrial Court, where the examination of the person to ascertain whether or not he has the necessary qualifications has been very similar to that carried out by the trade union. Then, having satisfied itself, the court gives a decision for or against. I do not know of any instance in the building industry where it has been decided that the applicant should have been accepted by the union. However, we must remember that power is given to the Court—although I do not know that this is contained in the Act—to issue industrial tickets which give the man protection on a job whether he is a member of the union or not. Such a ticket gives him the right to work alongside a member of the union but it does not give him any right to attend a union meeting or to have any say in the union's affairs. I do not know if that provision operates today.

We on this side of the Chamber believe that some of the measures will be beneficial to the trade unions and their members. However, they will probably be beneficial to the employers as well. I have always found that employers are willing to co-operate when something is being done to clear up a problem that has existed for some time because there has been no law covering it. You would know, Mr. Hooper, that on a number of occasions where a practice has been operating it is generally accepted.

I am somewhat concerned about certain measures brought before us. It seems that there is some direction behind them. It will be a very bad day for the trade-union movement if the Government does not take all aspects of the various matters into consideration before it introduces legislation. I appeal to the Minister, just as my Leader did, to consider the interests of the unions on this matter of membership, whichever way the intention may be in the Bill. I hope the Government has considered the unions and their rights because, after all, union rules are registered with the Industrial Court. If anything is to be done concerning membership, I should hate to see the day when it overrides something already registered with the court covering the interests of the trade-union movement and its members.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (12.38 p.m.): I do not intend to reiterate what my Leader and the hon. member for Belmont have said about the general principles involved. I believe that many of the provisions mentioned by the Minister can add to the strength of the Act. I, too, am concerned about forcing unions to accept members. People could get the idea that they can force a union to acept them as members, yet

they will have no responsibility to that union. I believe that the strong industrial trade unions in Queensland have helped to keep industrial peace in the State. If the industrial unions were regarded as weak by many employers they would try to take away conditions that have been won over the years and then there would surely be unrest. It is necessary to have strong industrial unions to maintain industrial peace in the State, and we can have strong industrial unions only if they are made up of men and women who firmly believe in the principle of unionism and that they must contribute something towards maintaining and improving their conditions. It is true that we have people who are members of a union but who do not take any active part in its affairs. They complain about paying their membership fees. They complain about having on occasions to listen to union speakers. Although they do these things, they do not do anything deliberately to upset the routine or affect adversely the normal welfare of their fellow members. If they do not wish to take an active part, that is their right. But I cannot fall into line with those who deliberately set out to do things that are not in the interests of the members generally. We all know it is commonly considered in the industrial movement that a person who deliberately sets out to break union conditions and rules is a "scab". Those people know full well that, when the union makes decisions, they are made in the interests of the great majority of members. We also know that those people are the first to want to accept the conditions won by the union. So I have no truck with those who deliberately set out to work away from the general principles of unionism and run to courts or someone else for protection when they have to pay the penalty.

The Act at present contains one or two terms on which I should like the Minister to give the official interpretation. One such expression is "not of general bad character". Does that refer, for instance, to criminal activities? A man could have been in goal for any number of reasons and yet industrially he could have a good character. Just because a person has been to gaol does not mean that industrially he is not a good member. He can abide by union decisions; he can pay his contributions, and can add greatly in debate to the welfare and progress of the members, yet we could have another person with no criminal charges against him, who has committed no offence against society, but from the point of view of the union and its members he could be of generally very bad character in the industrial sense. So I should like the Minister to give us his interpretation and I hope to obtain from the court its interpretation of what is entailed in the description of a man or woman "not of general bad character."

We must realise that the rules of the unions are gazetted by the Industrial Commission and, when a union sees fit to expel a member it does not do so offhandedly or lightly. It does so because that person has deliberately broken away from some action or recommendation set down by the union as properly constituted. I can remember, when the former Minister for Labour and Industry introduced this legislation, he went to great lengths to tell us that it would ensure positively that the conduct and control of a union would not be left in the hands of one person, that from that day forward unions would be controlled by the majority of the members. If that argument was true then, any person who breaks away from those things breaks away from the decision not of one man but the members of the union as a whole. So it is most important to consider it from that point of view.

The Minister said that the judge could demand that a union accept a member and then, once that happened, that this legislation would ensure that the union would in fact accept that member. What I want to know is: what happens when a calling is such that more than one union can have preference for membership? This can happen with many people in skilled trades. An electrician working in the railway can join one of two or three unions. Because the Electrical Trades Union decides that an electrician is, in accordance with its rules, not acceptable to it, or he has been expelled from that union, will the judge demand that the Electrical Trades Union accept him as a member? Will it be demanded that another union, perhaps the Queensland Railway Maintenance Union, take him? If they decide, as did the Electrical Trades Union, that they do not want him because of his bad industrial record, is the court going to decree that the Queensland Railway Maintenance Union has to take him? We must make sure that we are not going to force a man onto a union when there is another union, to which he has equal preference in membership, which would take him if he were a good type of member. We must look at this legislation generally and not only in the light of the two examples given by the Minister. At this stage we do not know the full details associated with them. I hope they will be made known before we are called upon to pass judgment on this matter. I point out to the Minister that in many cases more unions than one cover the calling of many tradesmen. Under those conditions, let us make sure that harsh treatment is not meted out to one union compared with another.

So far as the other provisions of the Bill are concerned, I am prepared to let them wait till we have been able to study them in detail.

Hon. A. T. DEWAR (Wavell—Minister for Labour and Industry) (12.46 p.m.), in reply: I am pleased at the reception that the Bill has had. The Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Belmont indicated that in the main they are in agreement with it.

The Leader of the Opposition requested some information about advertising. The Bill is concerned only with advertising that creates the impression that illegal trading can be carried on. Many of these advertisements draw attention to the fact that, for example, one can obtain a demonstration of a lawnmower by ringing a telephone number on Sunday mornings. That is encouraging illegal trading, and is the type of advertising that we propose to stop.

Mr. Davies: Does it relate to those advertisements appearing in newspapers, too?

Mr. DEWAR: It applies to Press, television, and radio advertising, and binds not only the person inserting the advertisement but those providing the medium used. It applies only to non-exempt goods and not to things such as land.

Mr. Houston: Will they be listed in the Act or covered by regulation?

Mr. DEWAR: There is in the department a list of exemptions. It applies only to non-exempt goods.

I think all will agree that, no matter how these things are viewed, a person who deliberately sets out to get some advantage by working for less than the prescribed rate and then has the shocking gall to report the employer with whom he made the arrangement commits a despicable act, and one that I do not think anyone in a decent society would accept. We propose to deal with the situation as it was dealt with under the former Act. I do not know how it came to be deleted.

The hon. member for Belmont indicated that I spoke at great length on how workers were fully protected, and this amending Bill is making that protection a bit more complete. What I said last week was that the proper Acts protecting the wages of workers were the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and the Wages Act, not the Contractors' and Workmen's Lien Act. I repeat that. This Act is being further improved and, if other defects are found in its protection of workers' rights, it will be amended again next year. This Act and the Wages Act are the appropriate ones to protect the workers.

Mr. Newton: You gave us an assurance the other day that the present Act covered the position.

Mr. DEWAR: I was merely indicating that those are the Acts under which action is taken.

The hon. member for Belmont was concerned also about arrears of wages. If the person concerned cannot be traced, the C.P.S. normally pays the amount to the Treasury Department, where it is held in trust. If that person turns up six or 10 years later, he can still claim the money.

Mr. Wallace: What action is taken by your department to try to find him?

Mr. DEWAR: It becomes a matter for the C.P.S. and the courts to trace him. It goes outside the realms of the Department of Labour and Industry. If an industrial inspector or an industrial magistrate retrieves the money and it comes through the Department of Labour and Industry, the usual steps are taken. It is not difficult to determine to which union a person would belong, and we notify the relevant union. Most unions have their own union journals, and they advertise in them that the money has been recovered. I do not know how much of the money does not eventually find its way into the hands of the persons concerned, but I should say that it would be infinitesimal.

The question was asked whether we had discussed with the unions making it mandatory for the unions to accept certain people as members. The answer is "No." I take the view, as do my officers, that, under the Act as it now stands, a person who has been refused admission to a union and who considers that he is a fit and proper person to be admitted by virtue of his training and his calling, and who is not of generally bad character, has access to the court to have himself so declared.

Mr. Newton: That is true. There must be some judgment.

Mr. DEWAR: In my view, if we provide that the court has power to so declare a man, it becomes quite ridiculous if a union can thumb its nose at the court and say, "We are not going to accept him anyhow, no matter what you find." That is exactly what can happen. It is not happening in many instances.

Mr. Wallace: But it does happen when people deliberately set out to flout the union rules and by-laws.

Mr. DEWAR: That is not the case I am posing. I am saying it is wrong in principle if a person satisfies the court that he is a fit and proper person that the union should refuse to accept his membership.

As I want to allow the Minister for Education to introduce the Educational Memorial Funds Declaration Bill before 1 o'clock, I shall deal with any other cases at the second-reading stage.

The hon. member for Bulimba raised the point that a man might be the subject of a demarcation dispute because he may be eligible to join a number of unions. He would have to establish to the satisfaction of the court that he had endeavoured to join a given union and that his application had been refused. He would then have to prove to the court that he was a fit and proper person by virtue of his calling and was not of generally bad character, and convince the court that he was entitled to that membership. Once he nominated the union that he wished to join, surely it would be up to the union advocates to prove that he was not a fit and proper person. I do not see any difficulty

there. The case would be argued before the court, as would any other case involving an industrial matter.

I think that covers the main points that were raised. I am grateful to hon. members for their acceptance of the Bill, which is along the right lines, and I commend it to the Committee.

Motion (Mr. Dewar) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Dewar, read a first time.

EDUCATIONAL MEMORIAL FUNDS DECLARATION BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education) (12.55 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to declare the trusts upon which the following funds shall be held, namely—the William Forgan Smith Bursary Fund, the Sir Charles Lilley Scholarship Fund, the Honourable T. J. Ryan Memorial Fund, and the Robert Funnell Memorial Fund."

The State Scholarship examination, which has functioned for almost a century, was held for the last time in 1962. Over the years certain bursaries, prizes and awards of distinction were based on the Scholarship examination. Many of these have been awarded for over 50 years and have become part of the education tradition of this State. With the abolition of the Scholarship examination, the conditions governing these awards are no longer applicable and it has become necessary, in four cases, to provide that such awards be continued under new conditions. It could have been done, perhaps, by lengthy legal process in the court but it is much simpler to make the new conditions by legislation.

Dealing first with the William Forgan Smith bursaries, two bursaries, provided from the income derived from a trust fund, have been awarded, under certain conditions, to students in attendance at primary and secondary schools in Mackay and Mirani electorates, one on the basis of the Scholarship examination and one on the basis of the Junior Public examination. It is now proposed that both bursaries be awarded on the basis of the Junior Public examination under new conditions.

In connection with the Lilley Medals, two medals have been awarded each year to commemorate the name of Sir Charles Lilley—one to the boy and one to the girl who obtained the highest marks in the Scholarship examination. The medals have been provided from the income derived from a trust fund, supplemented by a grant from the State.

It is proposed that the award should now consist of one medal, and should be made to the candidate who obtains first place in the Senior Public examination under conditions as prescribed in the Bill.

Mr. Duggan: Have you laid down these conditions or have you consulted someone connected with the families?

Mr. PIZZEY: We consulted the Public Curator, who is one of the trustees, and we consulted any living relatives of these people—in fact, all the people concerned. Consultations continued, backwards and forwards, over quite a long period, and they are in complete agreement with all these conditions.

Dealing with the Hon. T. J. Ryan Memorial Prize, this prize, in the form of a medal, commemorates the name of the Hon. T. J. Ryan and has been awarded each year alternately to the boy or the girl who gains the highest place in the Scholarship examination. The medal has been provided from the income, supplemented by a State grant, derived from the Hon. T. J. Ryan Memorial Fund.

It is proposed that this medal be based on the Junior Public examination under conditions outlined in the Bill. There will be one medal, to the top person in the Junior of the opposite sex to the one who wins the Byrnes Medal. If the top person in the Junior is a boy the Ryan Medal will go to a girl; conversely, if the top person is a girl, it will go to a boy.

The last one is the Robert Funnell Memorial Medal. This medal was awarded annually to the student who obtained the highest mark in the Scholarship examination from certain specified primary schools. Those schools are in the Brisbane electorate. It has been provided from the income arising from the Robert Funnell Memorial Fund. It is now proposed that it be awarded on the basis of the Junior Public examination to a student from the secondary schools in that electorate, instead of the primary schools.

The Bill is a simple one. It merely seeks to provide new conditions under which the awards mentioned may be continued.

Mr. DUGGAN: (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 p.m.): Because of the abolition of the State Scholarship examination, some action is required by the authorities on these funds established in trust. The Minister has satisfied my queries regarding consultation with the trustees and, where necessary and possible, the relatives of those in whose memories the funds were established. In the main, I think that the recommendations which have flowed from those consultations, and which are reflected in the proposed legislation, seem to be desirable.

I should like very briefly to pay tribute to the memory of those gentlemen. Perhaps Mr. Funnell was not as well known as the

other gentlemen whose memories were perpetuated in this way, but nonetheless he was an indomitable fighter for his electorate. The fact that the benefits have been restricted to the children of parents residing in the electorate of Brisbane shows the esteem in which he was held. The other gentlemen all played a very prominent part in the development of the State.

It is a very good thing that funds and endowments should be established in this way from time to time, and that in distributing them we pick out people of particular merit. The Minister will be the first to acknowledge that there is a growing tendency in many directions to curtail the prospect of determining the ability of girls and boys by the abolition of examinations. The very fact that this Bill is being introduced following the decision to abolish the Scholarship examination is an indication that at the concluding period of primary school education it is not now deemed necessary to have an examination along the lines of those that have been held now for almost 100 years. Only yesterday I attended the Church of England Boys' School speech day at which function Mr. Norman Connal, who for many years was the principal of that school, was guest speaker. He is probably one of the most entertaining speakers in Queensland even though he is now quite an elderly gentleman. Although he can entertain with some of his humorous asides, invariably his humour contains a good deal of common sense. He pointed out yesterday that he hoped that this tendency to abolish examinations would stop at the State Scholarship examination. He mentioned that it had been urged in some circles that the Junior Public examination should be altered or restricted in some way and expressed the hope that that would not be done. He pointed out very properly to the gathering that when persons were to undergo a surgical operation they invariably wanted to know that the surgeon was qualified and had passed all his examinations, otherwise he might not be able to pick out the difference between the gizzard and the liver. Those were the terms he used.

I personally am not questioning, debating, or wanting to debate the controversial aspect of the abolition of the Scholarship examination. I do not think it is proper to do that here. Educationists seem to think it is desirable to abolish that examination. Nevertheless, I hope that there will be retained some adequate method of assessing the abilities of these students. After all, examinations do act as incentives. I realise that one of the reasons for the abolition of the State Scholarship examination was the suggestion that teachers were concerned only with getting examination results, but conversely it might be that with the abolition of the examination the same teachers could let up a little in the intensity of their efforts. That is something which perhaps everybody feels will not happen, nevertheless it could well happen when there is no longer that need to achieve good examination results.

My main purpose is to indicate my approval of the measure, and particularly to express appreciation of any action that is likely to be of benefit to students who show particular ability. Because of this measure of assistance they may be able to gain advantage. It is hoped that all boys and girls in the community will have an opportunity, notwithstanding the financial limitations of their parents, to serve society and we should do everything possible to see that they can. The Minister may reply that Commonwealth scholarships, State fellowships and so on are a move in that direction, but, as he well knows, they do not go nearly far enough. This is a common-sense arrangement. I pay a tribute to the memory of these notable public men and those who were responsible for the provision of the funds. I think the Minister has done the sensible thing.

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education) (2.21 p.m.), in reply: I join with the Leader of the Opposition in paying a tribute to these great Queenslanders, particularly to one who was so closely associated with education. The more scholarships that we can induce people to provide, either by trust funds or endowments, the better we will like it. Compared with some of the other States, Queensland is not very well endowed in education although in recent years more and more people have contributed funds for this purpose.

The abolition of the Scholarship examination, which necessitated the changes in the conditions of awarding some of these medals, was due for many reasons. It was the end examination when the natural thing for a child to do was to leave school at the age of 14. When 70 or 80 per cent. of the children were leaving school at that age, as the Leader of the Opposition said, we had to have some assessment or some standard whereby their qualifications could be judged, and the Scholarship was always looked upon as the end examination of the primary-school system. We now hope that the primary school will not be the end of schooling—and it will not be, because the compulsory school-leaving age is 14, and very few children will be leaving the 7th grade at the age of 14; the children will have to go to high school and we are hoping to raise the school-leaving age to 15 within a year or so and then the Junior will be the end examination for the great majority of children; most of them will go into employment after sitting for the Junior. But each year more and more of them are continuing to the Senior. Instead of the Scholarship examination being the end examination for most children, the Junior examination has replaced it.

The Leader of the Opposition may rest assured that the Government will never

dream of abolishing the Junior examination, as has been suggested in some quarters. It has even been suggested in the same quarters that the Senior be abolished. I do not know what yardstick we should measure the children by when considering them for employment or for further education. There has to be some objective assessment that is fair to all children when they are competing for positions in the Public Service and the commercial world. If each school issued its own report and made its own assessment it would be very difficult for any organisation such as the Public Service to appoint in order of merit if the children were assessed on differing standards, and it would be very difficult for outside employers to assess relative merits.

Examinations have their weaknesses and the ability to pass certain subjects in examination is not the only criterion of the quality of the person; other matters have to be assessed by interview, or on personal record cards or by discussion with teachers. Some people do it by references or by asking to be referred to certain people, namely the local clergyman, the head teacher of the school, the local M.L.A. or a person who knows an applicant's character, industry, and integrity, and all those attributes that cannot be assessed by examination. At least by maintaining an examination at the end of a normal school period for the majority of children, we have a reasonable, objective assessment that gives them all a fair go when they are looking for employment in the community.

I do not think there is any more I need say at the moment. When hon. members receive a copy of the Bill, they will see all the details in the schedule and set out in the Bill will be the conditions under which the awards will be made.

Motion (Mr. Pizzey) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Mr. Pizzey, read a first time.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (2.28 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

In introducing the Bill I explained the principles very fully and they were discussed at some considerable length. I might remind those hon. members who are in the Chamber at the moment that the need for the Bill arises mainly from the fact that certain parts of the statutory law associated with industrial development are included in the Labour and Industry Act, while that Act also contains other provisions governing the activities of the Department of Labour and Industry. It is in those circumstances that the primary purpose of the Bill is to repeal those parts of the Labour and Industry Act that are not now appropriate to the activities of that department, and to re-enact broadly similar provisions, with adaptations to meet the new circumstances of the carrying on of those activities within the functions of the new Department of Industrial Development.

As I explained also at the introductory stage, in the course of re-enacting these provisions fairly extensive revisions have been made both as refinements in drafting and to improve the working of the Act. These revisions generally have been found to be either necessary or desirable in the light of experience gained during the 17 years since the enactment of the Labour and Industry Act of 1946. However, as I mentioned, there are no basic changes in the principles that might be regarded as being inherent in the law. The Bill generally has already been fully discussed at the introductory stage.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (2.30 p.m.): It is true, as the Minister pointed out, that there was a fairly lengthy debate on the introduction of this Bill. The Minister and those who followed him on the Government side chided me and other Opposition members for being a lot of knockers and adopting an irresponsible attitude to the subject. I feel it desirable that there should be some clarification of those things.

I thought that I clearly indicated to the Minister, both in my speech and subsequently by interjection, that the Opposition feels a strong responsibility to encourage secondary industries in this State. We could take that attitude not only for the benefit of Queensland but perhaps for the selfish reason that industry requires workers, the majority of whom vote for our party.

Mr. Windsor: Not necessarily.

Mr. DUGGAN: I think the figures support that contention. Apart from purely selfish reasons, which alone are sufficient to gain our support, hon. members on both sides will acknowledge that there is a desire by all parties to advance our State, even though we may follow different routes to the same end. I want to say quite categorically, if the Minister requires any assurance from me, that we will do all that we possibly can to facilitate the establishment of new industries here. The well-being of all is wrapped up in that situation.

It is true that at the introductory stage I did produce a great deal of information of a factual kind, concerning claims made by the Government, which nobody has effectively refuted. The whole gravamen of my charge was this: how sincere is the Government in pushing on with this work of development, seeing that those who occupied the ministerial post similar to that now

held by the Minister for Industrial Development for the last six years failed to achieve those things that the Minister now considers to be desirable? Those sentiments were expressed by his predecessors during the last six years, and there have been many contradictions in Government policy on this matter. Surely if people are to have faith in the proposals of a Government it must be able to say, "We have stuck consistently to this or to that."

Whilst naturally we on this side are disappointed at the result of the election held last Saturday, I think it can be said in all fairness that Sir Robert Menzies stuck to what he intended to do, and the people accepted it. I think that it was an unwise acceptance, nevertheless there was no ambiguity in the Prime Minister's statements and no-one can say that he turned a somersault in his attitude. People have an appreciation of those things, and if this Government has consistent principles to which it adheres it must take the credit or blame for the results of them.

I pointed out, as I have a right to do in Opposition, that there were inconsistencies and contradictions in Government policy, and all I got for my pains was a succession of speakers, after the Minister invited the co-operation of the Opposition, who engaged in invective that certainly was not conducive to the spirit of co-operation that the Minister sought to establish.

Mr. Munro: Have you any examples of that invective?

Mr. DUGGAN: Yes, I have some. The hon. member for Clayfield and the hon. member for Nundah, when they started speaking——

Mr. Munro: I take it you are referring to the Minister?

Mr. DUGGAN: No, not particularly. The Minister made only one or two statements. As a matter of fact, that is the only thing in his speech that I could take exception to, as he described my speech as a "commendable, thoughtful, and wise contribution", or something like that. I do not want to waste time on this point, but I have marked the passages in "Hansard" and a perusal of it will show them. I do not know whether this is part of the Government's policy, but when something nasty has to be said the saying of it seems to be delegated to three or four members on that side of the House. They seem to relish the opportunity of trying to "rubbish" the Opposition.

Mr. Munro: I am sorry. You started off very well.

Mr. DUGGAN: I am merely pointing out to the Minister that I, personally, would welcome the opportunity of assisting to create a climate that is conducive to industrial development, I will respond to the Minister's challenge if he is prepared to say, "We will start off on this from now, 1963, and forget what has gone before." Some of the things that I said in making my survey at the introductory stage were probably conditioned to some extent by interjections. I know that one is not obliged to be diverted by interjections, but they seemed to set the tone of Government thinking, at least on the part of back-benchers opposite. As I said, if the Minister wants to create the right climate for industrial development, I, personally and on behalf of the Opposition, am prepared to help him with that task. But it does not help in getting Opposition co-operation when hon. members opposite rise in their places and attempt to "rubbish" the Opposition and refer to them in derogatory terms as people who have done nothing but lay a dead hand on the progress of the State. The statistics that I quoted showed that under Labour production was higher, and I showed the number of factories that were in operation and the number of factory employees.

Mr. Ewan: Speaking of invective, you must have been horrified by the action of some of the Ministers in your party when you were in Government.

Mr. DUGGAN: In reply to the hon. member's interjection, all I can say is this: that when one is on one's feet, one is responsible for what one says, not for what somebody else says. I make due allowance for something said in the heat of the moment, probably in a highly emotional atmosphere, but I am not one who believes in hon. members' making spiteful contributions. I have probably given a Roland for an Oliver on many occasions, and I have probably received one on many occasions, too.

Mr. Ramsden: You have often been rude to me.

Mr. DUGGAN: I assure the hon. member that the personal references that I may have made were not made in a personal way, to use an Irishism.

I said that industrial development was tremendously important and that Queensland had geographical disadvantages. The Minister has virtually confirmed that statement. One plank of the Labour Party's policy that I think was very fair but had a retarding effect on economic development to some extent before the introduction of uniform taxation was the differential company tax that operated in Queensland. The then Premier, Mr. Forgan Smith, laid it down very definitely that there would be a graduated rate of company tax depending on the rate of profit earned by companies. The principle was established for personal income tax, but the Federal company tax made no differentiation between private and public companies. There was a flat rate of tax on public companies and a flat rate of tax on private companies, but in individual income tax there was a differential scale based on the income of the taxpayer. As I said, Mr. Forgan Smith laid down that policy, and he also laid it down that if a

company was prepared to re-invest in Queensland portion of its unappropriated profits, it would be levied a lower rate of tax. He needed a good deal of revenue to devote to the development of this vast, sparsely-populated State, and I admit that the tax was just. However, conversely, when companies had to pay a tax of 5s. in the £1, rising to 8s. or 9s. in the £1, against a flat rate of 2s. 6d. in the £1 in Victoria, naturally there was an incentive for them to establish their plants in Victoria. That was one circumstance prevailing at that time, and there were also many others.

However, greater industrial development has taken place in the southern States because of the greater concentration of population there. Production today requires big markets, and transport costs involving heavy vehicles and long distances can be uneconomic. Large industrial undertakings must be established in areas that can absorb their massive production, so we in Queensland are under certain natural disadvantages.

Perhaps another very great disadvantage that is not fully appreciated by some people is that during the war years the whole of the resources of Queensland were concentrated on finding accommodation and facilities for service personnel. The whole of our resources in tradesmen and materials, and everything else, were channelled into providing military camps, hospitals and depots, and they were mostly in forward areas. In contradistinction to that, in other parts of the Commonwealth it was possible to have munition annexes built. That applied particularly to South Australia, and where they were built it was necessary to institute a housing programme for the accommodation of the personnel required in those munitions and service undertakings. That housing was provided and when the war ended those States did not have the housing problems that we had here. In addition, they had immediately available, for manufacturers and others, factory accommodation right on their doorstep. Those factors tended to help those States.

I had some experience in Toowoomba associated with the Southern Cross foundry, which employs anything between 1,300 and 1,500 men. They came to me during that period of building restrictions seeking to build a factory worth about £200,000. There was some reluctance on the part of my colleagues to agree to the proposal, but I realised that once a building costing as much as that was established it would subsequently be difficult for that firm to go elsewhere. That company has spent many hundreds of thousand of pounds and it has been able to retain competitive production although it is at the disadvantage of being over 100 miles from the seaboard. It sells its products in other parts of the world, such as South-east Asia, in competition with those of other countries, as I say, despite transport disadvantages.

After the war, South Australia, enjoyed that advantage of having had these munition annexes established and, those facilities being available, the operators remained there and expanded. Many things that are not at all political in nature affect this matter; they are either geographical or brought about by population problems or defence considerations.

They were some of the factors operating against Queensland. It was indeed unfortunate that we had the defence line of thinking, sometimes called the "Brisbane line", which precluded the building of factories during the war, at places like Townsville. No doubt if some of those factories had been established at Townsville during the war they would still have been operating there today.

Every country today seems to be clamouring for industrial development. A Singapore Trade Commission is in Brisbane at the moment. Its members want to get know-how more than anything else. They do not want capital; they want know-how to establish factories in Singapore. The leader of that delegation is supposed to have said in an interview that the reason they chose Australia was that population problems in our two countries were similar. In America they have to produce for 180,000,000 people. In Singapore they have to deal with 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 people and their problems are similar to ours, and it was most desirable that they come to a country with similar problems.

All of these countries are pressing for recognition. Sometimes the Minister may think we get rather cynical, but we had an indication of that from the Premier when he said, in regard to the Malaya Trade Fair, that he felt that Queensland was not making enough attempt to exhibit its industries. I do not want to canvass that subject again, but I felt that that was not the first time that has applied. Then we had the Minister for Mines saying the same of the Hong Kong Fair. I think there was only one Queensland industry that had a display at the Hong Kong Fair. There may be good reasons why Queensland was not represented at that trade fair. This Bill may be designed for the purpose of mobilising the forces of the State for doing exactly that, but how far can the State go? It is all very well setting up a very extensive and expensive secretariat. There is no doubt that the powers proposed to be conferred upon the Director-General of Industry are very considerable; the Bill shows that conclusively.

I do not want to deal with individual clauses at the moment, but under clause 7, the functions and duties of the Director-General of Industry are certainly far-reaching and extensive. I hope there will be no unnecessary duplication. It seems to me that he is obliged to obtain reports on all sorts of situations dealing with overseas trade, primary industry, and

so on. Much of this statistical information is collected by the Department of Primary Industries and other departments. If it is only a matter of getting some standardisation of form for the forwarding on of this information, I do not suppose one can cavil very much about that. If it is to be channelled into this new department I hope that there will not be duplication of these collecting machines. With this great body of information being sought, I hope that it will not take a Bachelor of Economics to understand the forms. In Toowoomba the other day the Chamber of Commerce asked for a simplification of Government forms. That is something that is very dear to my heart, and although steps are being taken to reduce the volume of unnecessary requirements in some of them I still think they could be made much simpler. These are tremendously important powers and I want to know what is to be the relationship between the Director-General of Industry and the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works. If we have a strong Director-General of Industry and a strong Co-ordinator-General of Public Works it could quite easily swamp the Co-ordinator-General's department. In other words we would get the same battle in Queensland as in Canberra between the Right Hon. John McEwen and the Board of Trade, and the Treasury, which resulted in different policies being put forward on the part of the Government.

It would seem that this could become a very powerful department because its powers seems to be virtually unlimited. It seems to have overriding authority to go anywhere it pleases. As the hon. member for Bulimba, with whom I have been discussing the Bill, points out, some of the phraseology of the Bill is quite new to parliamentary drafting. I shall deal with that point in more detail at the Committee stage.

Wherever the Director-General thinks fit he has power to do certain things—whatever state of mind he may be in and so on. It seems to me that he certainly has some extraordinary powers. He has power to seek information ranking with the power to make inquiries under the Commission of Inquiry Acts, 1950 to 1954. He has this power to seek information of a confidential nature in regard to figures of industry and so on. I do not know what oath of secrecy the departmental officers will have to take, but I think there is provision for the Director-General of Industry to ask for all sorts of confidential information regarding industry. I do not know how the security of that information will be safeguarded. I do not think that the Minister himself would want information of this kind generally released. It seems to me that these things call for some sort of explanation.

The Minister said, "Why don't you be constructive in these sort of things and make suggestions?" At the present time it is not easy in a State that has a limited allocation of funds to know precisely what can be done about special inducements. I can recall the time some years ago when the British Motor Corporation, which subsequently set up at Waterloo in New South Wales, approached the various State Governments to see what inducements they could offer that organisation. I remember the late Mr. Hanlon telling us—I forget the year; it was about 1951—that at that time it would have involved £40,000 a year subsidy to the British Motor Corporation only to pay freight on the vehicles south of Brisbane which normally would flow from production, say, in Sydney. Naturally, many of the existing industries here would have been somewhat aggrieved to think that a new industry should get some competitive advantage under the proposal and there was no guarantee where it would stop. Assuming that production was in Sydney, it was estimated that the subsidy on vehicles freighted back to Melbourne and Adelaide would be £40,000. It could well be, with increased population and increased production of motor vehicles, that the subsidy may have jumped to £100,000 of £120,000 for one industry.

How far can we go in giving freight concessions of that kind? Experience shows that the use of the word "decentralisation" is just like the use of the word "Mesopotamia" after the first World War; it is a very much abused word. Everyone talks about decentralisation. I suppose, from a strategic point of view, that if our population was much greater than it is now there may well be very great advantages to be gained from decentralised industry. However, from the point of view of those operating the industries, there are many disadvantages. In Toowoomba we have some clothing manufacturing industries and they feel the blast of competition pretty keenly. The Brisbane manufacturer gets his cloth from the boat into his warehouse, but the Toowoomba manufacturers have to pay freight on the cotton or woollen goods from Brisbane to Toowoomba, pay the same wages as in Brisbane, and pay freight on the finished articles to Brisbane or elsewhere in the Commonwealth. They must have greater efficiency or better labour relations, or have some other advantage to justify their establishing an industry in the outside areas.

That pattern is typical throughout Australia. During the war, the Westinghouse people established a very big factory in Orange, which, as we know, is 300 or 400 miles from Sydney. Many people were demobilised in that area and a large work force was available. They have had to pay freight increases in recent times on the many thousands of refrigerators and other electrical equipment they produce and, as well, they have to pay freight on the raw materials from Sydney which many other manufacturers do not have to meet. The Bruck mills went to Wangaratta in Victoria at the express desire of the then Government of that State. They were given special freight

conditions as an incentive to go there, but when the agreement expired they had to pay the normal freight rates. That made it very difficult for them to compete with Melbourne firms.

It is not easy for a State Government to find sufficient funds to subsidise industry in decentralised areas and it is not desirable or possible for this State to compete, by way of subsidies, for an industry to come here. It is very difficult to draw a line of demarcation. There are some things we may be able to do. I do not want to be offensive in this matter—the Minister's integrity is not involved—but this statement affects the former Minister. I do not think it is politically desirable for the Minister in charge of industrial development to become a director of a land development firm engaged in the provision of sites for industry. I do not think that Mr. Morris would be guilty of any impropriety in this matter, but I do not think his action was correct. When a Minister negotiates an agreement, pushes a deal through the House, and gets Cabinet approval for a large tract of land to be developed for industrial purposes, he should not then become a director of the firm. As I said, I do not for one moment cast any doubts on the integrity of the former Minister, but I think that the practice is undesirable.

I raise this matter because there may be some merit in the Government having large areas of land available in the industrial zone and I suggested in our policy speech that I thought that with this department the Government could well go one step further. I pointed out also that I was not terribly happy about the number of Ministers involved. With all due respect to the Premier, I suppose he has the right to obtain information from other ministerial departments. This is his prerogative. It affects other Ministers, and therefore it may be necessary for him to do something along those lines. But after all, under this measure we are getting the same thing. Under the powers with which it is proposed to clothe him when the Bill becomes law. the Director-General can go into every other department and get the same information.

At the end of World War II, Holland, which attracted a tremendous amount of American capital, set up what was virtually an anti-red-tape department. This was able to tell every prospective industrialist just what the position in industry was. It had all the statistical information on hand, what the taxes were, how much could be remitted in dividends, what the power rates were, what forms were necessary, and so on.

If the Government intends to go as far as this, it might well consider ultimately putting into operation, in consultation with the Brisbane City Council, a co-ordinated plan to enable any industrialist contemplating setting up to ascertain from the Director-General of Industry, or whatever the officer is called, exactly what is offering. As it is, he could be told that an area in Wacol was a suitable industrial site and that it was to be sewered. He could buy the land only to find out that reticulation for sewerage was not provided for in the current Budget and that it might not be done for five or six years. It might be argued that such an industrialist should have gone into the matter more carefully. It seems to me to be a good idea to set up a body with general powers, incorporating the facilities of the Brisbane City Council and the department, and having full information in a co-ordinated plan of all projected works, such as sewerage, roads, and reticulation of electricity from the S.E.A.—indeed, all related matters—so that, when someone comes up here to set up industry, all the material information will be readily available, all the statistics on availability of land, its proximity to transport, the number of houses likely to be in the area, whether it is suitable for intensification of housing, and so on. That would be a positive contribution and it would not cost the Crown very much.

The conventional type of argument is that such a matter would be easy for the Commonwealth or a State with sovereign powers. In such circumstances it would be easy to say, "We will not apply tax for five or six or seven years." Or, "We will let you remit the whole of your profits over a certain period as long as the sum is not in excess of a certain amount." As I say, that sort of thing can be done in countries with sovereign powers; but I do not think individual State Governments can make very positive monetary inducements to settle prospective industries here. However, in the matter of information on power, transport, sewerage, water and perhaps the provision of houses, a great deal of good can be done.

I should like to have a more detailed discussion on some of the clauses later. As this stage I should like to repeat what I said in the beginning. The Minister is very anxious to secure the fullest co-operation, as is only fit and proper. I said on television last Saturday night that I personally regretted that a country like Australia very often finds party-political disputation entering into matters of defence. I do not think we can afford the luxury of party-political disputation on defence. It would be a great thing for Australia if we could get political unanimity on defence and on matters of industrial development. I am just as anxious as anybody else to lay the foundation for that. I hope it will be admitted that the Opposition's approach is courteous and constructive and that others will not use the opportunity constantly to refer to us in a derogatory way, or that co-operation will not be forthcoming. On the other hand, if the basis for it is there, I agree that it is a good thing for people coming here to feel that the climate is favourable. I say unreservedly that no Government can claim that it will be in power for any particular period of time. No-one would have imagined

in his wildest dreams that there would have been such a change, for example, in 1957. The results in some electorates last Saturday were a surprise to supporters on both sides of the political fence. Sometimes events happen quickly, and three, six, seven or 10 years is not a long time in the life of a State. These changes do come, irrespective of what Government is in power.

I think that all people interested in the long-term development of the State and the nation realise the need for political stability and a welcoming hand to those interested in industrial development, irrespective of the political colour of the Government. I have always been strongly for industrial development. I may have offered criticism, which I think was justified, at the introductory stage; nevertheless if hon. members go through the pages of "Hansard" and recall my actions over the years they will realise that no-one is more keen than I am to see this State develop industrially. I believe that a greater intensification of development in secondary industries combined with our primary industries will be a good thing for the State and the nation.

There are some points that I should like clarified at the Committee stage. One relates to the powers of the Director-General. It is Clause 7 (3) (c), which reads—

> "with respect to the relationship of real wages to productivity, and methods whereby it may be practicable to adjust wages to productivity;"

That may merely relate to a desire to have some sort of bonus or incentive payments, but it may cause some disquiet in industry if interpreted to mean that, if prices for primary commodities were depressed, arbitrary action could be taken to reduce wages. Thoughts like that could cause real concern in the light of what has already been experienced following the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act that relate to the granting of bonuses at Mount Isa. The industrial section of the community can be pardoned for wanting an explanation of these things. I like to see what is to happen written down plainly in black and white. We know that sometimes there are differences between Ministers' explanations and legal interpretations given by the court. We found that out during the reign of the previous Minister in respect of certain information that he gave here.

This provision may be merely an indication of the Minister's desire to increase wages if incentives are justifiable and can be given, which is a constructive approach, although incentives have to be looked upon with perhaps some measure of suspicion. On the other hand, if it is a medium for possible reduction of wages, naturally it will cause some disquiet.

To repeat what I said earlier, if the Minister indicates that he wants to start afresh and asks for the co-operation of all, and if this legislation is a reflection of that desire, the Opposition will be happy to afford every possible measure of co-operation.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (3.4 p.m.): Because I may have something to say on the wording of the Bill or of some of its clauses, I do not want that to be taken as indicating in any way that I or any of my colleagues are against the growth of Queensland or the taking of any action that would ensure speedy development. There are two completely different things involved. To advocate development of the State and try to obtain it is one thing; to pass legislation is a completely different thing. After all, we are discussing here a piece of legislation brought in to achieve a certain object. Although the Opposition—I will say it quite openly—and the Government desire a certain result, it is a matter of opinion whether or not this Bill will achieve it. For that reason, I wish to examine the legislation and express a few thoughts on its possible effects.

In my opinion, this Bill is the most important piece of legislation brought down during this session. In fact, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been brought down since I have been a member of this Assembly. It contains four far-reaching provisions. Each is separate in in itself, but taken in conjunction they go a long way towards taking the pulse of the State and investigating the innermost workings of our industrial development. They will have far-reaching effects on the personal lives of the people of Queensland.

The first provision allows the State to make advances and to give guarantees to assist industrial development in any part of the State. The second provision allows the State to become an industrial land developer and landlord. These two provisions are set up as part of the functions of the corporation known as the Minister for Industrial Development of Queensland. The third provision allows the Director-General of Industry to become an industrial investigator with far-reaching powers, and the fourth, I believe, gives the Governor in Council almost dictatorial powers over all the people of the State. Of course, the Minister may deny that any or all of these provisions are contained in the Bill.

If we compare the Bill with the legislation that it is designed to repeal and consider whether the powers contained in it are or are not desirable, we must take first the powers of the corporation to make advances and give guarantees. I think that the Minister will agree that this is a carry-over from the old Labour and Industry Act. As that Act has been in existence for many years and we have not received any very serious complaint from anybody that he did not receive assistance when he desired it, I suppose we must agree that it is in the interests of Queensland to again include a similar provision. In my opinion, to encourage industry here by making advances or giving guarantees is desirable. Without

going into a long rigmarole of past history, it is true to say that some of our giants of industry in Queensland are here only because of the assistance given to them by past Governments because of the great faith they had in the industries and the people associated with them.

Mr. Davies: The hon. member for Ithaca would know that.

Mr. HOUSTON: I think the hon. member for Ithaca would agree that the development that has taken place over the years in the industry in which he is engaged has been brought about by assistance and encouragement from many Governments. We should always remember, in condemning Government departments and former Ministers, that many of the senior departmental officers today are men who occupied similar positions under former Governments, or who, if they are not the same men, were at least trained by those men. I believe that the principle of giving guarantees and making advances has brought about a substantial amount of development.

With regard to the second part, the land developing, there again, by making the land and the industrial buildings available we have been able in the past to assist many industries that were starting off. To save time I do not want to go through the whole of the industries concerned. At the introductory stage I pointed out that the industrial development of Queensland prior to this Government's coming to office was certainly as fast as it has been in any period since. Without going back and arguing one way or the other, I think it will suffice for me to say that there has been encouragement of industry in years gone by and I welcome the encouragement being given at present.

Mr. Windsor: Your Government did a good job at Rocklea.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is right. I wanted to refer to the Rocklea area, because I think our experience there has given us an insight into some of the problems associated with a Government's developing such land and providing such buildings.

One of the things about which I am concerned is that, as the Bill states, the Government intends to hand over the freehold of these sites to the people who occupy them. In the past, we have seen a great many takeovers of various industries by southern and overseas firms; they took them over not with the idea of further developing them but with the idea of closing them down because they were competing with their activities in other States or in other parts of this State. As a result, that industrial land and those buildings have become available for sale to someone else. I do not think that the Government, in its desire to assist industries coming to this State, would be foolish enough, on the one hand, to let these industrial sites to industries, and, on the other hand, charge them such high rents that they will turn away because overhead costs are too high.

I assume that the idea behind these industrial sites is that they be leased or rented at a figure that will allow overhead to be kept to a minimum. But at the same time, when they are made freehold we do not want the freehold prices to be such that, immediately they are freeholded, it will allow of their re-sale at a magnificent profit. I suggest that the freeholding of these industrial sites should not be proceeded with, that they should remain there for developmental purposes and be used accordingly.

When an industry first comes here and is given a site it naturally will not require, at the start, a very large property. We should allow it to establish itself in the buildings provided and, when it sees fit to further develop, I believe it should then obtain its own site for development and allow the original site to go to someone else who wishes to develop.

I know it can be said that many hundreds of thousands of pounds might be spent on a site and that it would be then wrong to take it away from the company concerned, but a line of demarcation must be drawn somewhere and I do not think State finances should be used to make large profits for companies that see fit to come here.

Mr. Windsor: Another point of view is that when a firm puts a large amount of money into machinery and plant, it likes some security for the future. I should not like the Government to put them out of business by demanding high rents and that sort of thing.

Mr. HOUSTON: I appreciate that point.

I do not want to enter into an argument on the relative advantages of leasehold and freehold land. Suffice it for me to say that I believe land should be retained as leasehold because, as I said before, I do not believe that any land should be used purely as a profit-making commodity. I quite appreciate the point that when a company pays a large sum for machinery and equipment it is entitled to certain protection; but I do not see any reason why the terms of agreement to lease should not be such as to stop any problem in that direction. The hon. member should not lose sight of the fact that when the land becomes freehold it can be rated at such a high value for rates and land tax purposes as would make it untenable in certain circumstances.

Mr. Windsor: He does not have to get off the property. It is his and he can stay there.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is so, but the hon. member must agree also that there are companies that get large tracts of land which are subsequently taken over by other companies. When the original site is no longer required it is sold at quite a substantial profit.

Mr. Davies interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member for Ithaca is quite worried about that problem. He himself had to shift from his original site to an outlying area.

I do not want to name the company concerned because its principals are still in Brisbane and they are quite respectable people, but there was a company that started manufacturing stoves in Queensland. That company did pretty well. It had property and so forth. Once it got onto its feet, because of competition it was taken over by one means or another and the whole show closed up, including the refrigeration section. The people who had worked and slaved, after putting all they had into it, both their money and their labours, received nothing out of it. They finished up on the scrapheap and others got the advantages of their labour. It is for those reasons that I sound a note of warning. It is not the legislation itself; it is the administration of it. I believe that the provisions should be there, but I am not happy about the freeholding provisions.

Mr. Windsor: When these big companies take over, humanity seems to go out of their heart. It is just business, business, business.

Mr. HOUSTON: I quite agree. If the hon. member for Windsor keeps going along those lines, he will be asking us to issue him with an A.L.P. ticket. I commend him for his thoughtful contribution.

The third provision, covering the powers of investigation of the Director-General of Industry, establishes a new form of the old Bureau of Industry, but with more powers and greater scope. Powers are given to the Director-General of Industry far in excess of the powers of the old Bureau of Industry or its Director, the Under Secretary of the Department of Labour and Industry. We should have a good look at the extra powers given to the Director-General of Industry or any of his officers, because the Bill lays it down that he can delegate authority. Under the old Act the powers and functions of the Bureau were to acquire and disseminate knowledge concerning economic conditions in Queensland. When the Minister introduced the Bill he did not condemn that provision; he merely said it was not put into effect, or that it was not used to the extent that it should have been.

Under the Bill the functions and duties of the Director-General of Industry shall be to review continuously the industries of the State for the purpose of ensuring that the labour and material resources of the State are used throughout the State, and to their full extent, and in the manner best calculated to promote the growth in population of the State, and its industrial development, and the prosperity and welfare of its people in all parts of it. In other words, the purpose of the old Act was to acquire knowledge while this provision of the Bill is designed not only to acquire it but also to ensure that labour and material are used to their full extent. There is a great difference between those two principles. The first is the acquiring of knowledge of Queensland—its potential; its particular industries, their wages and conditions, profit and efficiency; and the potential form of future industries; in other words, the requirements of the people, a knowledge of where they are getting their present commodities, and the demand for local production. They are all things that are necessary. It is knowledge that we require so that as a State we can pass on the information to those who seek it.

The latter part concerning the powers of the Director-General and ensuring that they are put into effect is a different kettle of fish altogether, particularly as in another part of the Act there are far-reaching effects. I ask hon. members to look at some of the statistics that may be obtained under this section—and we must not forget that they may be required under the Commissions of Inquiry Act, which gives the Director-General power to demand knowledge of certain things if he cares to comply completely with the Act. He can demand from any industry, or any source in the State, the income derived by various classes of people. He can also inquire about the efficiency of any particular industry. Indeed, for the income of certain classes he must have access to the private wages books and so on of the various industries. How he will ascertain the income of people in the salaried income class, which is divulged only to the income tax people, is not quite clear at present. It is true that through the Commissions of Inquiry Act power is given to him, and I believe that if he wanted to he could demand that someone tell him exactly what his income is.

I do not think it would be such a bad thing to compare the difference between the income of the wage plug and the income of many people in other walks of life. I am sure it would prove conclusively that the person on wages is certainly on the wrong end of the income ladder. It might help the Industrial Commission to see how badly treated some of the tradesmen and near-tradesmen are. It has been the cry of the tradesmen for many years that employees in the trades and callings and other classes of employees below the trade callings, namely, tradesmen's assistants and labourers, receive remuneration far below that received by other people in the community. If that information is to be used in the interests of the worker I do not suppose we would have much complaint against it.

We must also bear in mind that much of the information obtained will be highly confidential. I do not think it will be in the interests of developing industry in this State or attracting industry to this State if those in industry think that this information to be obtained from them under compulsion may be used for any purpose at all, without any safeguards for secrecy. I was wondering

why the penalty of £50 that could be imposed on any officer of the department for divulging information obtained in the course of his duty was excluded from the provisions of the legislation under consideration. I wondered why the Minister did not see fit to include this provision to safeguard the integrity of the officers of the department and the interests of the firm concerned. Perhaps the Minister can give a reason for that.

In the last provision an overall power is given to the Governor in Council. The Minister may claim that it does not provide such a power. If he does, I think he should look closely at the wording, because on my interpretation it gives the Governor in Council power to use information that he has gained. We must remember that the Director-General is to be given power to make all kinds of inquiries and obtain information from many sources. As it is also provided that the Director-General shall give this information to the Minister so that he can ensure industrial development in Queensland and work for the welfare of the people, and later in the Bill another clause gives the Governor in Council power to do such things as will be in the interests of the people, it makes us wonder what the tie-in is. I hope the clause was not inserted to permit the direction of labour in any shape or form. We know that previously in times of unemployment there has been a suggestion that the unemployed, when they go to the various employment bureaus for sustenance money, have been told, "If you pack up your gear and travel out to some far-flung country town you will find a job," and if they have refused to go because of home commitments and the like, they have been taken off social service benefits. I hope the Minister will not use the power under the Bill to direct people to those places where he believes industrial development should take place.

Only a few weeks ago I was reading in the Parliamentary Library some accounts of the rise in power of dictators in years gone by. It is remarkable how Hitler in particular used normal means to obtain information and then turned it to his own ends for achieving the power that he eventually attained.

Although the Minister will deny, of course, that any of this information is there for any such purpose, I think we should bear in mind that this legislation is going on the Statute Book as a completely new Act and one that will eventually have far-reaching effects on Queensland. It is no good crying if at some future date a Minister misuses the provisions. So I suggest to the Minister that he make known to the House the purpose of that clause, what it is hoped to secure through it. If he does not do that, we will have our own thoughts on the matter.

I do not want the Minister to think that I am personally attacking him; but others may interpret the Bill as I do. I prefer to have the point cleared up so that in future, when something is said or done in connection with the legislation, it can be said, "That was the Minister's interpretation. You knew about it. You accepted it. Therefore you have no complaint." Or, on the other hand, it can be said in truth, "That was not the Minister's interpretation of it and the matter shall be rectified." I know the Minister for Industrial Development was not responsible for the introduction of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, but we still have very sorry recollections of what followed our accepting everything in that measure at its face value.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (3.29 p.m.): It is not my intention to speak at any length on the Bill. I want to indicate that it is almost a commendable effort on the part of the Government to encourage as far as possible the growth of secondary industries in Queensland. If carried through to a logical conclusion, and a very efficient conclusion, it could have some beneficial results, particularly in view of the fact that, over the past five or six years, we have seen a great deterioration in industrial growth in Queensland, not only from the lack of adequate attention by the Government but also as a natural follow-on from the trends in industry throughout the Commonwealth.

We are in a very difficult position with industrial growth. Our markets are a long way off for great expansion of secondary industry and we have suffered greatly from our failure to process much of the food that we produce in Queensland. For that reason it has become very obvious that, with the development of automation in industry, the level of employment has deteriorated. It is now lower than it was in years past, although productivity has not decreased comparably with that reduction.

One of the most unfortunate features is that in the past five or six years much manufacturing industry has been taken over by southern firms. Local plants have been closed and production transferred from Queensland to the South. That is one of the big problems to be faced, and I believe is confronted by some of the clauses of the Bill, particularly those covering the duties of the Director-General of Industry. An attempt is made to deal with the reduction in industrial growth.

Another feature has been the monopolising of the retail trade in Queensland by southern interests. Through the taking over of some Queensland manufacturing industries and the monopolising of our retail trade, we have felt the impact of the decrease of industrial expansion in secondary industries, and the failure by most of those in the retailing industry in Queensland to purchase many commodities produced in Queensland.

It has been clearly indicated in the past months that, whilst we have been gradually increasing production in primary industries,

much of that production has been exported and subsequently imported back to Queensland in manufactured form. Whilst the population has increased by 120,000 in the last five years and the retailing trade has increased its sales to a great extent, our manufacturing industries have remained stationary. They have not increased in conformity with the increased sales by retailers following population increases.

That in itself poses quite considerable problems. Whether sufficient power is reposed in the Director-General of Industry to deal with this position, only time will tell. There is a general appreciation, not only from this side of the House, that if we are to have the necessary development in Queensland our processing industries must expand at the same time as primary industry is expanding. They go hand in hand, and it is good to see co-ordination between primary and secondary industries.

Some powers are given to the Director-General to make recommendations to the Minister on many of the problems with which primary industry will be confronted. I cannot, however, see any great appreciation of one of the most serious problems that we have in the growth of processing industries in country areas. Certainly there is something in the recommendations to the Minister by the Director-General on the decentralisation of industry. At the same time, there is not sufficient appreciation of one important factor. The Director-General has power to co-opt the advice and experience of public servants in the Government departments of the State only in relation to the duties that he possesses. In past years I believe many Government departments have restricted the growth of industry by jealously safeguarding the responsibility within their administrations. The State Transport Act, for example, is controlled by the Minister for Transport, and railway freight rates come within his administration. He is concerned not so much with industrial expansion in the State as with an arithmetical attitude in deciding whether increased revenue justifies the granting of freight rebates.

Let us take as an example—I believe it is rather a good example—the opening of the brigalow lands and the probable increase in grain production in Central Queensland. That area is quite a distance from any railhead, and transport costs will probably be high. It may be necessary to wait for six or seven years before cattle production becomes an ecomonic proposition. During that period, it is essential that the settler should have some other industry to enable him to maintain his living standards. There is a restriction on the transport of grain by road transport, so the distance from the farm to the railhead may make it impossible for him to produce sorghum or wheat. The Director-General of Industry, under the power conferred upon him, could investigate —I am using this only as an example— whether the normal restrictions under the State Transport Act should apply in the particular area. Recommendations made by him to the Minister could lead to an increase in grain-growing.

It is all very well to include a provision in the Bill giving the Director-General power to make recommendations to the Minister, upon which I suppose Cabinet ultimately decides. When a Director-General is appointed—in other words, a supervisor over and above all the ramifications of governmental administration—I believe he should be given additional powers enabling him to decide whether restrictions placed upon an industry should be lifted. It should not be merely a matter of reference to the Minister; it should become binding immediately on the Government department concerned.

Recently the South Brisbane Gas & Light Company Ltd. and the Brisbane Gas Company Ltd. applied to the Railway Department for a reduction in rail freights on coal from Rosewood to Brisbane so that they could produce gas at a price that would enable them to expand their production. In other parts of the State reductions in the freight on coal from the mine to the production centre had been agreed to, and the application by these two companies was a reasonable one. In other parts of Australia, particularly in New South Wales, the by-products of oil are being utilised in the production of gas and the use of coal for this purpose is declining. Although the application by these two companies indicated that they wished to continue using the coal resources of the Rosewood area, the Railway Department rejected it. Later, after further consideration and an appeal to the Minister, it was approved. In the meantime, over a period of a month, the companies had to consider whether they would change over from coal to another fuel source such as liquid gas, which is being imported, or some other by-product of oil. This would have had a detrimental effect on the level of employment in the coal-mining industry and would also have resulted in a decrease in railway revenue.

I believe that many of the problems that confront the Government as a result of restrictive actions by Government departments could be overcome if the Director-General of Industry was given overriding authority. I am not attempting to be political in this matter because I believe it has been going on for a number of years, both in our time as a Government and in the past six years. Many decisions by individual Government departments do not give adequate consideration to their effect on industrial expansion in this State, whether in primary industry or in secondary industry. In the powers proposed to be granted to the Director-General in this instance there is some hope of this disadvantage being overcome.

Perhaps there should be an extension of the powers of the Director-General beyond those being granted to him under this legislation. If we are going to call him a "Director-General" I believe he should be placed on the same level as the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, a man who co-ordinates the whole of the activities of Government departments. This would provide an opportunity for co-ordinating the whole of the activities of the Government service and may prevent our lagging further and further behind the other States. Such a man, by co-ordinating the activities of all Government departments, could enable industries to expand in this State.

I appreciate that we are not expanding at the rate that is necessary in order to keep pace with our growing population and growing labour force. Unless we do expand we will lose our skilled labour to other States, where continuous employment is ensured. In Queensland at present there is always the possibility of at least some unemployment during the year. In addition, our manufacturing industries are always threatened with a take-over from the South. The Government will have to do whatever is possible to assist in the expansion and growth of industry in order to provide for continuous employment for our growing population, not only for skilled labour but for unskilled labour, too.

During the election campaign we had what I thought was a very good plank in our platform. We envisaged the establishment of a Secondary Industries Board that would organise the whole of our industrial growth, both primary and secondary. There is the possibility of doing a great deal in this way in many country districts of Queensland. I know that the Minister appreciates that primary industry has just as important a basic function in industrial growth as secondary industry has. Some way must be found to encourage processing industries to decentralise and establish plants in districts where food is actually produced. In Western Australia, the Government from time to time calls tenders for the development of the mineral resources of that State. Where the existence of iron or bauxite or other mineral deposits is established, the Government of Western Australia from time to time advertises on a world basis and calls tenders for the development of such deposits. I can see no reason why there should not be a similar advertising and calling for tenders in respect of many of our primary industries. If we cannot encourage the growers to form co-operatives among themselves and establish industries for the processing of the food they grow, surely, by advertisement, we could encourage the growth of private industry in these areas where it at least has an opportunity of finding a market.

In much of our co-operative activity in Queensland co-operatives have been dependent to a great extent on the assistance they have received through Labour policy, and whatever is socialistic about that policy has been, to some extent, carried on by this Government. One of the greatest handicaps to the development of that type of activity has been the failure of the co-operatives themselves to find markets that would enable them to sell the goods they have produced. In many instances, private industry has a greater opportunity of locating the necessary markets.

I believe that under a system of tendering, where you have a big industry in a large centre of production—tea, sugar, peanut-growing, citrus-growing or any other type of primary industrial development—it would be possible for the proposal to be advertised, and that whatever assistance could be given by the Government should be indicated at the same time. The Government itself should intervene in the particular district where the opportunity exists for the processing of foodstuffs by way of advertising or calling tenders —whatever expression may be used for it— and ask industry to establish itself within that area, at the same time indicating what steps the Government is prepared to take, or what money it is prepared to spend, in the development of that industry. There is provision here for a complete survey to be made of the economics of a new industry starting in any district. There is provision for a survey to be made of the available labour and materials—what facilities are available for the transportation of the goods and the available markets. That is all part of the duties of the Director-General of Industry. By a system of advertising whether such facilities are readily available and by some degree of immediate governmental intervention based on the reports of the Director-General, if we could not get the co-operatives interested we should be able to attract private industry. Only in that way can we hope to maintain a decentralised population.

Many of these difficulties have confronted us in the past, but they were not so readily visible. Many of the difficulties have been caused by mechanisation of the primary industries. The growth of unemployment is mainly attributable to this trend. In the sugar industry, one of the greatest employers of labour right from the cutting of the cane to the shipping of the sugar, thousands and thousands of people have been displaced by mechanisation. At all times we must find alternative industries to absorb the unemployment so created. Unfortunately, in the last five or six years the Government has failed to do this; it has failed to realise the existence of this creeping paralysis that has been spreading over Queensland. Why else have we been lagging in population growth? Why else has our industrial expansion been getting further and further behind that of the other States? It was all because the Government failed to realise one important feature of industrial growth—the need to attract other industries to absorb the unemployment created by mechanisation. This problem applies in all parts of the Commonwealth. It will continue to apply, indeed, in all parts

of the world. Wherever automation in industry has occurred it has created a serious problem.

In the last two or three years we have heard a great deal about the shortage of skilled labour in Australia. It is only because of the growth of mechanisation that this shortage has come about. More skilled labour is required now than five or 10 years ago. It is impossible for a Government to cope fully with the problem of industrialisation unless it fully realises the problems posed by mechanisation and plans for the future. This legislation is an indication that there is some semblance of a realisation on the part of the Government of the real necessity to compete with other States and to expand production and grow industrially in all phases.

I hope the legislation will not be such as to create a sinecure for the Minister but that it will result in expansion to a greater extent than I can see at the present time. I hope that the powers reposed in the Director-General will be fully undertaken by him, and that his reports and recommendations will be considered by the Government. I hope that once his reports and recommendations are made to the Minister it will not become a matter of bartering between the various Ministers in charge of different departments.

One of the greatest handicaps to full industrial expansion in Queensland would be harsh restrictive measures imposed by one governmental department which has a lack of appreciation of what is required to attract industry to the State. A director-general should have an overriding power over many government departments to ensure, as far as possible, every possible encouragement for industry to come here.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (3.51 p.m.), in reply: I welcome the very harmonious reception of this Bill in its second-reading stage compared with the more critical or, I might say, suspicious reception given to it at the introductory stage. I feel with respect to persons that if you meet a person who may not be well accepted when you first meet him, but after getting to know him better you accept him as being quite good, it may be said that generally he is quite a good type of person. The same principle applies to Bills introduced in this Chamber.

It is a remarkable feature of this Bill that it was accepted during the introductory stage in a manner which I would regard as unfriendly, but, as the debate proceeded, and hon. members had an opportunity to study the Bill, the response has become much more friendly and I am very happy about that. I particularly welcomed the statement by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon to the general effect, as I interpreted it, that he agreed with the objectives of the Bill. I do not want to misquote him but I think he indicated that the Opposition generally would be prepared to work towards what might be regarded as the basic objectives inherent in the legislation. This is very important. I have emphasised on a number of occasions that if we are really to completely succeed in our objective of attracting industries and more industries to this State, we have to satisfy them that the Government at present is prepared to help them in every reasonable way, and also that if an alternative Government takes over and runs the State at any time it will not be unsympathetic to the objective of this legislation. I think all persons in this Chamber would accept that as sound.

Mr. Hanson: Do you believe in controlled capitalism, then?

Mr. MUNRO: I do not think the hon. member's interjection is relevant and I do not propose to answer it.

During the course of the debate I was invited to do two things. First, the hon. member for Bulimba invited me to give interpretations of various clauses so that members of the Assembly would know what was expected. I do not propose to indulge in the pastime of giving off-the-cuff interpretations of clauses in the Bill. The general procedure in the drafting of a Bill is for certain directions to be given to the Parliamentary Draftsman, and we rely largely on his skill to give effect to those directions. We study the Bill and if we think that the language used in the Bill is not clear we ask the Parliamentary Draftsman to have a look at it. My experience is that the Parliamentary Draftsman does a very good job. Therefore I ask hon. members, in relation to this Bill and in relation to legislation generally, to judge it on the basis of what is in the Bill itself. Do not judge it on the basis of what people say about it, and particularly—I do not want to be political—do not ever judge it on the basis of what Opposition members say it is.

Mr. Houston: That's getting nasty.

Mr. MUNRO: I do not want to make this personal to this Parliament; but I say, in relation to any Parliament, for heaven's sake do not ever judge a Bill by what members of the Opposition of that particular Parliament say about it, because that judgment generally is not very effective.

Mr. Houston: We do not act that way, if you do.

Mr. MUNRO: To an extent, I apply the same principle to myself. Do not take this Bill on the basis of any assurance that I might give you. Study the language of it and if you feel, on your study of the language of the Bill, that it is not a good Bill, then you are entitled to say so. If, after the debate, you come to the conclusion that the Bill is inherently bad, then exercise your right of voting against it. But I feel that that will not happen.

The second invitation was implied rather than explicit. It was more or less an invitation for me to continue and repeat the arguments, largely of a political nature, that we engaged in for two days of the introductory stage on the basis of whether we have or have not succeeded in our policy of developing industries in Queensland. I am not going to say anything more about that simply for this reason: I think the average thinking man, as he goes about his business, as he travels throughout the State, as he goes down the street, as he looks around the skyline of Brisbane, can see for himself. I do not need to use any salesmanship on this subject. I simply invite the people of the State to observe what is happening in the State and I further invite them to observe what will be happening during the next two or three years. I do not ask that this Government be judged on the basis of anything I may say in this House in the course of this debate. All I ask is that we be judged on the basis of results. If during the next two or three years we fail in the trusts that have been reposed in us and if we fail in our responsibilities, then the members of the Opposition will have the opportunity of being critical.

I shall deal now with what might be regarded as minor principles of the Bill. The Leader of the Opposition used a word that I did not quite catch. I am sorry he is not in the Chamber because I am sure he could correct me. I am not sure whether he said that the work of the Department of Industrial Development would be expensive or whether he said that it would be extensive. If he said that the new set-up would be expensive, then he is quite definitely wrong because what we are proposing to do we propose to do at a very moderate cost. Up to the present the additional costs of the sections that have gone over to the new department are virtually nil. They will increase to some extent as the years go by, particularly when the Director-General takes up his duties. Even then, any of those additional costs will be extremely small in relation to the vast importance of the responsibilities that the new department is to undertake.

If I heard the Leader of the Opposition correctly when I thought he said the duties of the new Department would be extensive, then he is dead right, because they will be very extensive and very important. At the same time, so far as there were references to powers of the Director-General of Industry who is to be appointed, those powers substantially are not new powers.

As I explained at the introductory stage, there have been some revisions and refinements in the wording, but substantially the powers of the Director-General of Industry will be those, under the present Act, of the Bureau of Industry. I think it is perhaps relevant to the principle of the Bill to explain why we felt it better to have a Director-General of Industry than to continue the Bureau of Industry, which was set up under the Labour and Industry Act of 1946. There is no doubt that if top public servants had nothing else to do but be members of the Bureau of Industry, it would have been an excellent body. Its weakness was that it consisted substantially of, not quite all, but a considerable number of the top men of the Public Service. Each had very definite responsibilities in his own department. If a committee of some kind is to be set up to do a particular job and it is desired that its members devote considerable time to it and do it well, it would be a bad administrative practice to appoint half a dozen general managers and say to them, "We ask you to do this job." Each of those general managers has a full-time job elsewhere.

Part III of the 1946 Act—this is one of the parts to be repealed—provided that the Bureau was to consist of the Minister for the time being, the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, the Director of the Bureau, the Under Secretary of the Treasury Department, the Public Service Commissioner, and the Chairman of the State Electricity Commission of Queensland. No doubt they were all very competent men, but the Bureau was completely top heavy. What we are doing now is not so much introducing a new principle as providing for what, I feel sure, will be a streamlined administration.

Some exception was taken to the wide powers that are to be given to the Director-General of Industry. It is true that the powers to be vested in him are fairly extensive, but again they are substantially those that previously were vested in either the Bureau of Industry or, in some cases, particular officers. The change in the set-up is not really a matter of giving additional powers but rather of providing better and more efficient administrative machinery.

As an example of that, the Leader of the Opposition illustrated his remarks by a reference to Clause 7 (3) (c) of the Bill, and quoted the phrase "relationship of real wages to productivity, and methods whereby it may be practicable to adjust wages to productivity". That is merely a matter in relation to which the Director-General may make certain inquiries. Surely there is nothing wrong with that. Again, that wording is simply the wording of the old Act put in a different section in a slightly different context.

So that hon. members will be clear on this point, let me mention that Section 9 (1) (c) of the Labour and Industry Act of 1946 refers to "The relations between real wages and productivity, and any methods whereby it may be practicable to adjust wages to productivity". Apart from a slight alteration in one or two words, which does not in any way alter the meaning, all we have done is to take a certain section out of the old Act and put it into this Bill. I mention that because it would be quite wrong for anybody to attach undue significance to wording such as this,

when, as I say, all we have done is to lift certain provisions out of the old Act and put them into the Bill in such a way that they can be administered more effectively.

Reference also was made to the powers of the Director-General in relation to other departments. I think there was some concern about whether the Director-General might become something of a czar who could direct other departments as to what they should do. If I may be permitted to refer to one particular subclause for the purposes of illustration, I point out that under Clause 7 (4) those rather unusual powers are to be exercised only with the approval of the Minister—that refers to the Minister for Industrial Development—and of the Minister for the time being administering any department, Crown instrumentality, or instrumentality representing the Crown, etc. So, when it is boiled down, all that that clause does is to provide for an effective degree of co-operation between the Department of Industrial Development and the other departments with which it may be associated. That action will be taken not by any streamrolling tactics of particular powers but by co-operation between the departments concerned.

I was a little intrigued by a statement by one hon. member opposite. He put it in the form of a question and I took down his words. They were something to this effect: "Will this piece of paper achieve the Minister's purpose?" Of course, the answer to that is very simply, "No". This piece of paper, in itself, will not achieve anything; but this piece of paper gives us a legal basis for the carrying on of the administrative work of the department, and the question of whether or not we achieve anything worth while depends upon the goodwill and efficiency of the men in the department and of the various people with whom they may be associated.

There are one or two other points that I might mention. As I say, I did particularly appreciate the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he indicated a very considerable degree of recognition by the Opposition of the objectives of the Bill. That follows on my own remarks at the introductory stage, when I pointed out that, in my view, matters of this kind, affecting national security, social security, and the well-being of our people generally, should not be a matter of party politics. They should transcend party politics, because there is no reason why members on opposite sides of the House should have substantially differing views on such matters.

Some references have been made to the question of employment. There again the providing of means so that we have full, profitable and congenial employment for our people is something that is just as dear to the hearts of members on this side of the Chamber as it is to members on the other.

In concluding, I should like to remind the House that industrial development is not the sole responsibility of Governments; it is a responsibility in which we must all share. Although there are many bodies that could take an interest in this subject, I refer particularly to the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, the Brisbane Chamber of Commerce, the Australian Institute of Management, and the various trade unions. I regard those bodies as representing four groups, each one of which has some responsibility and each one of which has very considerable power to assist us in achieving our objective.

Again, as a Government we have a responsibility. Governments must give a lead—they must be prepared to co-operate and assist—and I can assure the House that the purpose of this Government is to do everything it can towards this objective, and, as I have indicated, I am very happy indeed to have at least a reasonable measure of assurance from the Opposition that they also are in accord with that objective.

Motion (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendments and repeals of II Geo. VI. No. 20—

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba (4.13 p.m.): I wish particularly to deal with Clause 2 (b) which eliminates Part III of the Labour and Industry Act, which is headed, "Part III—Constitution and Powers of the Bureau of Industry." By Clause 2 (c), Section 5 is amended by omitting all definitions except the definition of "Minister". On page 2 of the Bill, Clause 2 (g) states that Section 78 is repealed and the following section is inserted in its stead, and included in that section, on about line 13, there appear the words, "enter any land, factory . . . "

To my way of thinking the Labour and Industry Act should contain a definition of "factory" because, in that Act the term "factory" is used and, if we take the definition out, what interpretation will be placed on the word "factory"?

In Section 78, the word "land" is used but there is no other definition of "land" in that Act. I suggest that that definition also be retained.

On page 2 of the Bill the amendment to Section 79 provides that any person who obstructs or hinders, etc., shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £20. Under the Act, £20 was the penalty provided in 1946. Perhaps the Minister can tell us whether there have been any occasions when people have endeavoured to obstruct the officers. If no-one has endeavoured to obstruct the officers I can understand that the severity of the penalty does not matter as much as if the offence were prevalent. However, if

the offence is prevalent it may warrant his considering an increase in the penalty to bring it more in line with modern times.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.16 p.m.): The hon. member for Bulimba has raised two quite interesting points. The first one, particularly, is a very technical point, as to whether or not the retention of the definition of "factory" might be necessary in what will remain of the Labour and Industry Acts. As advised at present, we feel it is not required. Had the hon. member given me notice of this matter a few days ago I would have been able to have it inquired into and get some legal advice on the point. At the moment I am not able to do that, but I assure the hon. member that I will have the point looked into. I contemplate that for other reasons quite disconnected with the purposes of this Bill, there will be other amendments to the Labour and Industry Acts. If, on further consideration, it is found desirable either to retain that definition of "factory" or to insert a new definition of "factory," it will be possible to do that when considering the Bill to amend the Labour and Industry Acts, presently listed on the business sheet under the Orders of the Day.

The point made about the penalty is quite a minor one. I do not think it is very important one way or the other. However, I will take a note of the hon. member's suggestion; we may have a look at it at some time in the future.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.18 p.m.): The Minister mentioned the amendment of the Labour and Industry Acts. The word "person" comes into that legislation. I did not raise that point before, but as that is the way the Minister is going to deal with the other matter I raised, I suggest that he have a look at the definition of the word "person" in those Acts.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.19 p.m.): This is a matter that I omitted to mention before. These definitions are in the part of the Labour and Industry Acts which is now being repealed. That is rather an important point. As the word factory in its grammatical meaning is wide, it seems to me on the information I have before me at the present time that it really is not necessary to have such a definition in this Bill. I shall obtain further advice on that point before the other Bill goes through its final stages. It seems to me, subject to further information, that this Bill is quite in order. As far as the definition of "person" is concerned, I point out that there is a definition of "person" in the Acts Interpretation Act.

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—Functions of the corporation—

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.21 p.m.): Clause 6 (1) (c) says, "Acquiring and providing land for use for industrial purposes." Where factories are established in Brisbane, or Queensland, and they desire to expand, is it the intention of the Government to use this part of the legislation to acquire neighbouring house properties, and so on? Is property to be taken over by the Government and then to pass from the Government to the industry concerned to allow it to expand? I know that land may be acquired by various means, and some years ago some sort of exchanges were made on behalf of the Royal National Association. I know that the Minister said earlier that we should not take too much notice of what a Minister says. I do not doubt the Minister's integrity: if he says a certain thing, he will have Cabinet backing for it. I think there are people who would like to have this matter made clear—whether it is intended to use this provision to acquire land forcibly from people to allow some industrial undertaking to expand.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.22 p.m.): Of course, it is quite impossible for me to attempt at any particular time to make predictions about various circumstances that might arise over a long term of years during which legislation of this nature may be in operation. So far as the immediate intention is concerned, it is not proposed to use that provision for acquisition by force. Of course, power to acquire is necessary to enable property to be purchased. The real point is whether this is power to acquire in the sense of purchase—the Government, in relation to provisions of this kind, might need to acquire land for certain purposes—or power of compulsory acquisition. I should like to make it clear that this power is not one of compulsory acquisition.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 29, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

NORTHERN ELECTRIC AUTHORITY OF QUEENSLAND BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.24 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.25 p.m.): The Minister has circulated an amendment to the Bill. We are quite happy with it, because there is quite a lot we could say about the particular clause dealing with the right of individuals to take action in the case of personal injury. As the Minister has circulated the amendment, I take it he will speak on it in the Committee stage. It shows, following the Minister's earlier remarks, that, although we have every faith

in the Parliamentary Draftsman in his interpretation of the Government's intentions, there are occasions when whole clauses that are completely out of date are allowed to slip through. As the Minister has indicated, it was never the intention to have the clause there as written, and we accept that.

Whether it is an advantage to have the one authority to cover the generating of power for the existing three authorities is something only time will tell. I tend to agree with the Minister that it could be a principle that should be extended throughout the State. In Brisbane we have the one generating authority; the only difference is that it is also a distributing authority. Whether the day will come when it will be decided to separate the generating authority completely from the distributing authority, I think the functioning and operation of the Northern Electric Authority will be the yardstick on which future action will be based. If the Northern Electric Authority improves the efficiency of generating, as I hope it will, and if it ensures an adequate supply of electricity under all conditions and maintains a cheap rate of power, the principle should be carried into the central and southern divisions.

I think all will agree that one of the greatest factors contributing to the development of Queensland is the cheapness of electrical power. As I have often said, electrical power has so many advantages over all other forms of power that we have to consider it when we think of the State's development.

One of the most important matters I should like the Minister to clear up relates to unit tariffs for bulk supply to the three authorities. Is each authority to be charged the same rate per unit? If not, what is the Government's thinking on the differentiation of charges? Is the rate for each to be determined by the cost factor at each powerhouse, or is the Northern Electric Authority to consider the overall cost of production for the whole area and use that as a basis for a common bulk-supply charge to the various authorities? To make the thing go from the start, it is necessary to have a uniform unit of supply. If we start charging the various supply areas according to the powerhouse supplying, we are immediately defeating the objective inherent in the proposal.

I should like the Minister also to give us some idea where responsibility starts and finishes with regard to the generating authority and the supply authorities. I know it has been said quite openly and quite rightly that the new authority will concern itself with the generating of power. From powerhouses the supply will, of course, go to substations, and at that point the two authorities meet. There is the problem of the maintenance and charges of substations. To avoid encountering difficulties when it comes to this type of thing, I think that where the power of the Authority starts and finishes should be clearly defined.

There is also in the Bill the power for the Authority to supply small areas. One of the problems that have come to the notice of some members is that when the supply authority is providing a line to a certain area it demands a certain guarantee for the use of power. I have no quarrel with that general principle, but I think that the consumer should be told, "This job will cost us so much. The initial cost of providing the installation to you is so much, and, according to the law, you must guarantee a percentage of it."

Mr. Hiley interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: No, the Minister is on the wrong leg there. That raises a separate point. The point is that the supply authority could say to a prospective consumer, "This job is going to cost us £1,000, so you have to guarantee a bill of £100." The consumer could say, "But this job will cost only £400." I believe that the supply authority should say to the consumer, "This is what we require you to guarantee, and we base it on these figures." The supply authority could otherwise say, for various reasons, "We don't want to supply this fellow. To put him off, we will say it is going to cost £2,000 or £3,000." This applies not only to this particular authority. In all justice, I think the supply authority should give sufficient information to show that what it says is in fact true.

The Authority will be more of a financial advisory authority than an expert authority on the development of electricity. I notice that most decisions made by the board become final only after reference to the Commissioner. I feel that that is quite a good point, because it ensures that there is still the one authority in Queensland. Under the original Act, the State Electricity Commission was established to provide one body with overriding and co-ordinating powers to deal with development of electricity within this State. Retaining authority in the Commissioner appeals to me, as it prevents any one board, merely because particular members have certain ideas of their own, following a policy that would interfere with future development.

Generally, we consider the measure worthy of support.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.34 p.m.), in reply: The hon. member for Bulimba raised some quite interesting points, some of which I am able to reply to at this stage but others of which could, if desired, be more appropriately dealt with when certain clauses are under discussion in the Committee stage. Perhaps, as a matter of convenience, I might take his points in a somewhat different sequence from that in which they were raised.

One of the points raised obviously related to the price of electric power to consumers. I should point out that that matter is not dealt with in the Bill. This is a Bill dealing with the establishment of the Northern Electric Authority, and substantially the activities of the Northern Electric Authority are the generating of power, the main transmission lines, and the supply of bulk power to regional authorities.

Mr. Houston: Yes, but the price of bulk power comes into it.

Mr. MUNRO: Yes, I shall deal with that; but I did feel at one stage that the hon. member was raising the question of the price at which power would be supplied to particular consumers.

Mr. Houston: No.

Mr. MUNRO: Only on rare occasions and only under unusual circumstances would the Northern Electric Authority engage in what might be very well described as the retail selling of power to the ultimate consumers.

I point out that the question of price generally, that is, as between the Northern Electric Authority and the regional authority, is dealt with in Clause 21 of the Bill. If the hon. member wishes to pursue that question a little further, I think it might be better if we discussed it under that clause during the Committee stage instead of at the second-reading stage.

The other matters raised at this stage relate mainly to the basis of this proposed central control of the generation and main transmission. Perhaps it is desirable that I should give some further explanation of that basis, even though I might cover to some extent points to which I did make some reference at the introductory stage.

Looking at it on a long-term basis, it is obviously quite impracticable to have power stations at Mackay, Collinsville, Townsville, and on the Tully and Barron Rivers, with a common service to perform of supplying electricity on one combined system, but under separate ownership, management, and operation, however much goodwill there may be between the various owners.

This is as true in North Queensland as it is elsewhere, where the correct action has been taken to deal with the matter as the need arose. In Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales there is a central control of generation and main transmission with but few minor exceptions.

At this stage, we in Queensland have centralised generation and main transmission for a large area of Southern Queensland. We are extending it to North Queensland. We are not bringing all of it under one central control as in other States, at least at this stage, because we believe in a large measure of decentralisation, and there is no economic prospect yet of developing an interconnecting and common system of supply from Brisbane to Cairns. We are proceeding soundly by stages, as each stage becomes necessary and as each stage becomes advantageous.

As far as North Queensland is concerned, a considerable degree of co-operation between the three boards through the use of interconnecting transmission lines has already been achieved and has enabled those three boards to be supplied with electricity at a lower cost than would have applied if they had remained isolated from each other. However, the steps which brought this about inevitably brought forward the day when it would be necessary for one authority to assume the responsibility for controlling the combined operation of the power stations for which we are now providing. Among other things, this ensures that the most efficient plant can be used to suit the particular kind of load being supplied at any time, and capital investment in reserve plant can be kept to a minimum.

As an example of the results that can be achieved in this way, it is estimated that an improvement of five per cent. in efficiency in the North Queensland system will produce a saving in costs of some £100,000 per annum. With central control, efficiency of plant operation will improve progressively, particularly after Collinsville comes into operation, compared with what the position would be if each regional board continued to control generation within its own region.

I might say that substantial savings have already been achieved by the inter-connections already effected, which in themselves make central control of operations necessary. The State Electricity Commission has estimated that, on the level of present-day costs, the average cost of production over the whole system should decrease from approximately 1·6d. per kilowatt-hour in 1963-64 to 1·4d. per kilowatt-hour in 1966-67.

Summing that up—and this perhaps applies to some extent to the views put forward at the introductory stage—there is no question of the establishment of this new authority imposing additional costs on consumers. The whole objective of it is to give greater efficiency, particularly in generation and mains transmission.

With very rare exceptions, the setting up of this new authority will not involve additional staff. We are going to particular pains, as we do in other matters, to see that the existing staffs are absorbed, because we do not want any person to be at a disadvantage by reason of this change, but, as the years go by, the tendency will be for this unified authority to be able to give this expanding service with less staff than would have been the case otherwise. That will be one of the big factors tending towards the lessening of costs.

It is for that reason that we are able to add that, even in the immediate result, there will not be any increase in costs, and in the

longer term result the effect of this reorganisation will certainly be that costs will be lower than they would have been if this reorganisation had not taken place.

Motion (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gaven, South Coast, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 9, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—Deputies for members—

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.44 p.m.): Clause 10 deals with deputies for members. I think this is quite a good scheme, to have appointed at this stage what we normally call permanent deputies. I feel that far too often, with some of our boards, such as the apprenticeship authorities, because they do not get full attendance as a result of the employment officer being unable to get there, it is hard to get someone else to attend and speak with authority. Sometimes the business of a board meeting may centre on purely technical matters whereas on other occasions it might consist entirely of purely financial matters. I can see the advantage of having the attendance of a full member qualified in the technical field or the attendance of a full member qualified in the financial field. I do not know whether I am reading something into the clause that is not there, but I suggest that principle could be used to advantage.

Clauses 10 and 11 are tied up with each other. Clause 10 deals with deputies for members, and Clause 11 deals with the proceedings of the authority. Clause 10 provides—

> "In the case of any member other than the Chairman or the Commissioner the Governor in Council may appoint a deputy to act in the place of such member in the event of his illness or absence."

Clause 11 provides that a quorum shall comprise not less than four members.

Supposing a deputy is appointed to replace a member and he attends a meeting, making one of the four who constitute a quorum, but in the meantime the delegate with the permanent appointment has died; in other words, it means that the person for whom he was deputising is not ill. Of course, he is absent. What would happen if important decisions were made at that meeting when one of the people who formed a quorum had been acting as a deputy to a person who is no longer living? The word "absence" would cover it in one sense, I suppose. Unfortunately with so much legislation coming up for discussion we have not had time to prepare suggested amendments. It may be a point that the Minister's officers could have a look at, not necessarily at this stage, but when future amendments are being considered.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.47 p.m.): I do not think there is likely to be any great difficulty arising from the point raised. As the hon. member points out, a quorum shall comprise not less than four members. He will realise that the total membership of the board shall be seven—the Chairman, the Commissioner for Electricity Supply, and five other members. Even if it did unfortunately happen that one member died, it would be extremely unlikely that that would result in any difficulty in convening a meeting with a quorum of four members.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.48 p.m.): A meeting is held with only four people present, but suppose the four at the meeting include a deputy, and the person he is deputising for has passed away that morning and no-one is aware of the fact; what would happen about the decisions arrived at at that meeting which, in fact, would have a quorum of three plus the deputy for the person who was deceased? That is my point.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.49 p.m.): I do not think it is desirable to discuss this matter at any length. I merely repeat that I think it is most unlikely that any great difficulty will arise. First of all, it would be a most unusual occurrence for one member to die so suddenly before a meeting and that the other members would be unaware of it. It would be unusual to have a meeting with only four members present. When there are seven members on any board of that kind it is reasonable to expect a much better attendance than four. Even in the extreme circumstances mentioned, there would not be any difficulty if the deputy acted in a bona-fide way. I am not prepared to give any legal opinion off the cuff about that position. I merely repeat that I do not think it is likely to cause any great difficulty.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 20, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 21—Prices for electricity—

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.51 p.m.): This clause covers the price of electricity to be charged in bulk to the authorities. The point I wish to bring to the notice of the Minister is that the cost involved in producing electrical energy depends on the type of powerhouse, that is, whether it is a coal burner, a hydro power house or, at a later stage, an oil burner. The age of the powerhouse and the type of fuel used will determine the cost of running it. It is possible that certain authority areas may be supplied by older and poorer equipped powerhouses and that another authority area will be supplied mainly by a more modern powerhouse and therefore the cost of production would be lower. As the whole system is

worked on a grid system, that is, there is an inter-tying of the powerhouses, I should like to be sure that each of these authorities at Townsville, Cairns and Mackay will receive its bulk energy at the same rate so that if a new powerhouse is developed in one distribution area the other two will get the benefit. In other words, I should like an assurance from the Minister that the better powerhouse will not cause a differentiation in the bulk cost of electricity in the various areas. I think the Minister should be able to give some idea whether or not there will be a uniform price throughout.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development (4.53 p.m.): This could raise a relatively extensive and very difficult question if we were to enter into a discussion about the methods of costing and the basis under which prices for the supply of electric power may be determined. I can only point out at this stage that the machinery for determining prices is quite fully and effectively set out in the Bill, particularly in Clause 21, which we are discussing at present. It will be noted, by way of a preliminary to the main question, that in terms of this clause the price to be paid by any board or other electric authority to the Northern Electric Authority for the supply of electricity in bulk shall be determined by the Commission. That is similar to the agreement on reorganisation in South-eastern Queensland. The principles to be taken into account by the Commission in determining such price have been accepted by the boards in agreeing to the setting up of the Northern Electric Authority and are set out in the subclauses. Of course, in addition there are the clauses following this clause which are supplementary and provide for procedures for appeal against a price determination. There is provision for decision by the Industrial Court, if necessary, on appeal. I think probably the hon. member is concerned mainly with what might be termed long-term effects as between one particular locality and another. That is something that will have to be worked out in the light of developments as they take place. Generally, my understanding of the matter is that the broad intention behind the provisions of the Bill is that the prices for the bulk supply of electricity will be progressively equalised. When I say "equalised", I do not mean among all concerned, but the particular intention is, as far as possible, to move towards equalisation of price as between various localities in the State. I understand that this is at present in operation through the State Electricity Commission in the fixing of tariffs. I wish to make it clear that, when I refer to that equalisation, I do not mean equalisation to every consumer. Obviously there are different types of consumer, and, in addition, the consumer who undertakes to take a very large supply may be in a position to obtain his power at a lower price than would be available to a very small user.

Clause 21, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 22 to 74, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 75—Limitation of actions for negligence—

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Industrial Development) (4.59 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 38, lines 42 to 47, omit the paragraph—

'(a) notice in writing that injury or damage has been sustained shall be given to the Authority within one month, and the action shall be commenced within six months from the date on which the injury or damage was sustained, or in the case of the death of the person injured, within twelve months from the date of death;'

and insert in lieu thereof the following paragraph—

'(a) in the case of damage to property, notice in writing that damage has been sustained shall be given to the Authority within one month, and the action shall be commenced within six months from the date on which the damage was sustained;'."

I thank the hon. member for Bulimba, who is handling the Committee stage of the debate on behalf of the Opposition, for indicating earlier that the amendment will be accepted by the Opposition. At the same time, I think perhaps it is desirable for the purposes of the record that I make some short explanation of it.

Until 1956 it was the practice to provide in Acts relating to semi-governmental bodies, such as local authorities and electric authorities, special limitations respecting the bringing of actions against the body in respect of injury or damage to persons or property for which the body was alleged to be legally liable. These special limitations required the claimant to notify the Authority of his claim and to bring the action within specified periods of time.

Under the Local Government Act of 1936 and the Regional Electric Authorities Act of 1945 the notice had to be given within one month and the action brought within six months after the event.

However, in 1956 a Law Reform (Limitation of Actions) Act abolished from every Act these special limitations upon actions against semi-governmental authorities so far as they had related to claims for damages in respect of personal injury.

The policy laid down in this 1956 Act has regrettably been overlooked in the drafting of this Bill. Paragraph (a) of Clause

75 applies the old limitation to actions in respect of both personal injury and damage to property.

So far as injuries to persons are concerned, it is desired to follow the policy laid down in 1956, and accordingly the amendment that I am moving alters paragraph (a) of Clause 75 to confine its operation to actions in respect of property.

It will be observed from that explanation that this amendment is merely a legal technicality to make it clear that in this Bill we are adhering to the principles inherent in the Law Reform (Limitations of Actions) Act of 1956. Accordingly I feel sure that this amendment will be accepted by the Committee.

Amendment (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

Clause 75, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 76 to 88, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

STAMP ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer) (5.5 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The Bill contains concessions in three directions. Firstly, it abolishes the stamp duty on options to purchase land and improvements. Secondly, it provides a measure of relief in respect of stamp duty on debenture stock which in any period of one year is renewed by the holder at least once and where there is no break in the continual holding during the year. Thirdly, it grants exemption from stamp duty on debentures issued by local authorities and semi-governmental bodies.

The three provisions attracted no adverse comment at the introductory stage, there have been no representations made to me in the intervening period, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (5.6 p.m.): In view of the increase in State taxation since 1957 under the present Treasurer, the Opposition would be very ungrateful if it opposed any of the concessions proposed in the Bill.

We are particularly pleased to note that the opportunity is being taken to relieve local authorities and Crown instrumentalities of the payment of stamp duty on debentures that they issue as securities. This will make common the exemption that applied previously only to raisings by means of inscribed stock or bonds. I think we should take the opportunity to suggest that all Governments should give more relief to local authorities in a number of respects. Pay-roll tax is one that has nothing to do with this Government, but there are a number of ways in which State and Federal Governments, which have vast fields of revenue collection that are not available to local authorities, could recognise the need of local authorities to secure additional revenue to meet the growing responsibilities that they are being asked to carry in the present economic life of Australia. Although the concession proposed by the Treasurer is somewhat limited and not a great amount of money is involved, it does indicate that he recognises that at least the State Government, if not the Federal Government, should not try to derive revenue from local authorities under the present circumstances, when the State is attracting greatly increased revenue in a number of directions.

I do not think we can add anything other than to say that we find rather intriguing the Treasurer's statement that virtually two out of three purchase options fall through and that the duty is rebatable and is not worth collecting. Since he became Treasurer, Mr. Hiley has taken the opportunity of correcting many situations involving a good deal of tedious and unrewarding work for the Crown and the completion of returns that was irksome to the people concerned. I might mention as an example tobacconist licences, which were not useful to the Crown as a means of producing revenue.

It is difficult to understand why so many options fall through; I do not know why they should. Nevertheless, the Treasurer states that that is the position, and we recognise that the decision to abolish the collection under such circumstances is reasonable. We are quite happy with the provisions of the Bill.

Motion (Mr. Hiley) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gaven, South Coast, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

SUCCESSION AND PROBATE DUTIES ACTS AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer) (5.10 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Again this is a Bill which contains a number of concessions, some of which break some novel and interesting ground. It corrects what I presented at the introductory stage as an unjust levy where a wife insures her husband's life out of her own separate estate. It defers the duty charge on the family home up to £10,000 in value until the death or re-marriage of the surviving spouse or until the prior disposal of the home. It extends the provisions for exempting and rebating in the case of a surviving

wife or children under 21 to the surviving spouse. It lifts the exemption figure in such cases from £4,000 to £5,000 and the rebatable figure from £4,750 to £7,000. In addition, it varies the method of rebating from three sharp steps at £250 intervals to a very graduated, tapering drop of 1 per cent. for every £20 in excess of £5,000.

It also extends the exemption from duty to children over the age of 21 where a predecessor leaves an estate not exceeding £3,000 and is not survived by a spouse. The present limit is £1,500.

In relation to gift duty, the Bill tidies up what had been done administratively to grant exemption to gifts made available by the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees to the Australian Council of Churches in aid of re-settlement in Queensland of refugees. It also increases from £1,000 to £2,000 the exemption granted in the case of a gift made by a donor to a child or spouse. Then, as a final principle, it provides that gifts in the measured period to exempted donees will not be taken into account in determining the rate applicable to dutiable gifts until they exceed £200 and then only to the extent of the excess. Some of these concessions are quite novel to Queensland practice.

It is nearly a fortnight since the Bill was presented at the introductory stage. As no representations have been made to me either for correction of the provisions or for some ancillary amendment, I content myself by commending the Bill to the House.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (5.13 p.m.): Again the Treasurer is providing a number of concessions, which naturally would not be opposed by the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition said when speaking on the Friendly Societies Bill that we hear a lot about the cost of living but not so much about the cost of dying, which is now increasing almost as fast as, or faster than the cost of living. It is pleasing to see that the Treasurer has been prepared to rebate, or give some relief in, succession and probate duties. As we pointed out at the introductory stage, he certainly had plenty of scope to do this because he anticipates collecting some 70 per cent. more in succession and probate duties this year than the previous Government did in 1956-57. Notwithstnding that, these concessions are being given, and a number of other concessions have been given in recent years.

As to the provisions dealing with the matrimonial home—a rather quaint term the Treasurer has arrived at in the Bill—which are designed to protect the person, either widow or widower, who is left with the family home, the figure of £10,000 might be regarded by some people as a little too high. Having regard to today's values I do not think it can be regarded as excessive except that, starting off at a very high figure, it should not be taken as a precedent for future amendments to the extent that it might allow people to put all sorts of conglomerations around their homes by way of investment in an attempt in some way to avoid their obligation in the payment of duty. As the Treasurer pointed out at the introductory stage, the Bill does recognise the principle that the concession is for the family home and that, irrespective of the financial circumstances of the family, it is still the family home, and that should be recognised by the State in its attitude towards the collection of succession and probate duties.

At the introductory stage I expressed some reservation about the extension of the right of the wife to take out insurance policies on the life of her husband. I still feel that it does tend to give advantage to the woman who either has independent means or is a working wife, as against the wife who, either through necessity or from personal choice, stays at home and looks after the family.

A point was raised about the interpretation of independent means or what were the wife's own resources, as they affected the taking out of insurance policies on the life of her husband and also her interest in joint bank accounts. I realise that that is hardly a matter that can be dealt with under this Bill, but I hope the Treasurer will give some attention to it in the ensuing year to see if some more equitable arrangement can be made which will recognise the fact that the woman who stays home and looks after the family is entitled to some recognition of her contribution. Even though she has no independent means or cannot earn by her own personal exertions outside the family home she is entitled to be rewarded by some of the earnings of her husband, which should be regarded as her own earnings in that she does play an essential part in carrying on the home. If she were not there the husband would be obliged, as in the case of many widowers, to pay someone to do the work done by her. Of course, we would all hate to let our wives put a figure on what they are worth for their work in our homes, but we should go some little way towards working it out so that that section of the wives in the community will not be unfairly treated as against those wives with independent means or those who because of their professional abilities or for other reasons are able to identify their own savings.

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer) (5.18 p.m.), in reply: It is quite true that during the period I have been the Treasurer of this State the collections in this field, as with the other taxes levied by the State, have risen. The figure of 70 per cent. is not an inaccurate assessment of it. In some cases we have endeavoured to bring the rate of tax levied in Queensland up to the Australian standard scale. That has applied particularly to some of the impositions of stamp duty where we were well behind the Australian standard scale. In the field of probate and succession duties we have not increased any rates. Indeed, the

only changes that have been made have been to grant higher rebates and higher exemptions. The fact that a greater productivity now flows is a reflection of the fact that there are more people constantly present in Queensland, and with more deaths with every passing year the average of the State is higher.

It is true that this has been the product of a combination of circumstances. It is one of the symptoms of a community that when the number of people increases the values of so many things in that community tend to rise relatively. If you go back to the time when the Darling Downs was still only lightly farmed there was still a great deal under pasture and you could move around the Darling Downs and easily buy land quite suitable for cultivable purposes because there was plenty of it, but suddenly it reached the point where all the best land was under the plough. As soon as that happened scarcity values showed up. That is the classic example in primary-producing land. The same trend is true of all our commercial land, and the best suburban shopping-centre land. Today we strike the picture that in all the recognised suburban shopping-centres values have sprung up to a figure that would almost make you blink, yet within 100 yards of the top-priced land there is ordinary suburban land which is still bringing the ordinary suburban allotment price.

All these things are the product of an organised developing metropolis. It has not happened suddenly; it has been a steady pressure which, to some extent, was held back artificially by the intervention of the war and the post-war period. I should say that, from 1950 on, the movement in values has reflected the pressures which accumulated between 1939 and 1950. They were penned up by the exigencies of war and some of the post-war restrictions, but they have slowly burst through and levelled out.

On every hand we can see quite dramatic changes in values between 1950 and 1960-1963. The effect of that has made taxation from sucession duties very reproductive compared with the level of even a few years ago.

Then, such matters as falling interest rates have helped because the fall in the interest rates on gilt stocks tends to put the market higher. The result is that when interest rates are high capital values on the stock exchange are low, and, when interest rates are low, conversely there are very high prices on the stock exchange. If people could choose a time to die they should always choose the time when interest rates are high. To the extent that interest rates have moved into the low bracket there is no doubt that they have helped revenue such as succession and probate duties, because, as we all know, stock exchange values are extremely high. Interest rates of 2 per cent. and 3 per cent. push people into the high brackets of tax simply because the market assessment of the stocks and shares they hold is very high at the moment of death.

The next matter raised by the hon. member concerns the £10,000 limit for the family home. Whilst the hon. member expressed himself as particularly satisfied with it, I want him and other hon. members in the Chamber to know that the Government gave considerable thought as to whether there should be any limit at all. After all, if the principle is that we are protecting the normal home, these things tend to become relative, and whereas a cottage worth £2,500 is a home unit to one man, as it is his home, it could be argued in the same way that to the man who can afford £20,000 or £30,000 for a house, that house is still his home.

We gave considerable thought to whether furnishings should come into it, or whether it should be purely land and home. As soon as it came to the question of furnishing I ran into a problem with the man who chooses to furnish his home with expensive antiques. The man who wants to do that will put thousands and thousands of pounds' worth into one room. If we say that should be exempted merely because it happens to be something found within the home we could get the other man—and we would not have to go outside Queensland for an example of this—who may have paintings worth a couple of hundred thousand pounds. Should he be entitled to exemption because he chooses to furnish his house in this way? Where one man wishes to run a dairy farm and provide something for the country, the other man might say, "Well, it suits me, and I like to have antiques and paintings worth hundreds of thousands of pounds." Should he be exempted merely because, while you must keep the cows on the dairy farm because you cannot put them in the home, you can put pictures and antiques in the home?

Mr. Hanlon: If you exempted cows from duty, they probably would put them in the home.

Mr. HILEY: I suppose there would be an attempt. They do put cows in homes in Switzerland, Holland and Germany; I have seen plenty of them.

Weighing it up, we came to the conclusion that we could not include furnishings in the home; we had to stop at the land and buildings. Applying that same principle, once we were on guard against the thought that wealthy people may get round this in the manner I have indicated, for the same reason our thinking was: if we put a limit of £10,000 on the value of the home, it will meet 99½ per cent. of the cases in the community; that will just have that little protection against the possibility that some

type will elect to build a great big castle, figuratively speaking, and have a huge investment there and secure a very great exemption from probate duty merely because he did not meet the ordinary requirements of a home but indulged his vanity to produce something of colossal value. Consequently, that was the thinking behind the fixation of the £10,000 limit. I will admit quite candidly that there is a degree of illogical content in fixing any limit. We felt that, with all its logical faults, it was better to have some little protection against that sort of thing.

The third matter the hon. member raised was the question of the wife insuring her husband, and he expressed himself as still having some doubts on it, particularly as to whether it would be of equal help to the working wife and to the wife who was able to stop home and take it easy. If anything, I would say the working wife, if she chooses to insure her husband, will be in a far easier position to demonstrate that she has paid those premiums out of her own separate estate than a dependant wife.

Mr. Hanlon: It was the other way round. I said you were disadvantaging the woman who stays at home, perhaps of necessity with a young family. She cannot establish her means.

Mr. HILEY: I am sorry. I misunderstood that point. I would say quite clearly that the working wife will be the one who will have the clearest entitlement to the benefit. The main difficulty of the wife who stops at home will be to prove that she pays out of her moneys. She can do it all right if the husband and wife during their lifetime go through the right motions; but if it is left to a vague presumption she is under a difficulty, there is no doubt.

That is the matter I referred to where the statute law in England has been altered to provide some presumption of property right in this matter. That is what I am having examined.

So that hon. members will understand it, let me point out that it is perfectly competent for a husband to give money to his wife. If he gives her too much in one year he pays some gift duty. But £2,000 a year, or £40 a week, is not a bad rate of gift to be able to make before it becomes dutiable. If he can afford more than £40 a week he can still give it but it will cost him some duty. If a husband can clearly establish that he gave his wife so much to keep the house and it is the clear understanding between them that anything that is over requirement is hers—if they can establish that—my officers tell me that there is no doubt at all that it is hers. The whole intention as established by that is that it is a gift. But how many husbands do that? Very often you will find that the bank account is in the husband's name. He gives the wife what she needs from time to time. He might find she is holding a bit too much. Of course, some wives succeed in having a little bank account of their own into which they put it and that accumulates over a period to some hundreds of pounds. But if she can establish that he was not interested in what she kept out of the balance, that that was hers, then it is hers, and if she chooses to insure her husband out of that source, she is right. Trouble arises if she uses his money to do it before it becomes hers by gift.

Mr. Hanlon: Your officers do not seem to have taken that into account. If a husband deposits an amount in a joint bank account, surely he in effect makes a gift of half to his wife and, as long as that does not exceed the amount on which gift duty is required, why should they ask her to account for that after his death?

Mr. HILEY: If that is all he does, that might be so, but it is then found that the method of using the account indicates that it is used almost entirely for paying his bills, not hers.

Mr. Hughes: What acceptable method would the wife have to adopt to establish her right?

Mr. HILEY: The simplest way would be for the Government to bring in an amendment to the law similar to that recently passed in England, under which in such cases the law presumes that money in a joint account is equally the property of both. That, I think, is the sense of it.

If something could be done to make it no longer necessary for officers of the Stamp Duties Office to check through people's affairs in an endeavour to ascertain from the behaviour of the parties what the intention was, it would be of tremendous help. I am prepared to go on record as saying that the time spent in trying to trace all of these happenings in joint accounts is vexatious to both my officers and the people concerned. Unfortunately, every time we look at the matter we find a number of cases emerge in which quite clearly there is substantially a clear gift involved in payments to joint accounts, and for that reason we have to go through the lot and try to sort the wheat from the chaff.

Dr. Noble: If a husband made a gift of £2,000 to his wife and if she in turn were to pay back to her husband all moneys that he had spent on his insurances, in the event of his death would the policies be taxable?

Mr. HILEY: There is another way to deal with that position. If the hon. gentleman consults a good accountant or solicitor, either will show him how to deal with it. If a man chooses to sell his policies to his wife at their ascertained surrender value, and she buys them out of her funds, that, believe, is a protected transaction. If s' pays the full surrender value from fur

which are hers, they still being hers even if they originated by gift from her husband, I believe it would be protected, but I suggest that a little time be allowed between the transactions. Do not make them too connected.

Mr. Hanlon: That is my point. People who are awake to these things and can afford to get accountants and lawyers are able to do them, but the poor old person just plugging along finishes up paying.

Mr. HILEY: There is that danger, but he does not always, I can assure the hon. member. As I indicated at the introductory stage, I do not regard the present state of affairs as quite satisfactory. I stated then that I was getting my officers to look into it. I am sorry that I misunderstood the hon. member for Baroona. I thought that his point was that a working wife was worse off. Quite clearly what he says is correct. The working wife is better off under the present law than the dependent wife.

Mr. Hughes: They could envisage a long list of requisitions from the Stamp Duties Office to establish their rightful claims.

Mr. HILEY: I know, and that is what I am anxious to avoid.

I am grateful for the way in which the measure has been received. I suggest to hon. members on both sides that I have answered enough of these queries for today, at any rate. They are a bit tricky to deal with off the cuff, and I hope that on the matter raised by my colleague the Minister for Health I have given him sound advice.

Motion (Mr. Hiley) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 12, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

MOTOR VEHICLES INSURANCE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer) (5.36 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Two or three matters were raised by hon. members at the introductory stage about which I have made inquiries and on which I have additional information to present to the House.

First, the Leader of the Opposition inquired whether there was any limit to the extended time that the court could allow for claims. The answer is that there is no such limit. As an instance, at least one case has arisen where an extension of one year has been sanctioned. It is a matter entirely within the discretion of the court. If a person was so injured that it was necessary to give a very lengthy delay so that he would be in a position to carry out his obligations under the Act, it would be competent for the court to extend and extend and extend until such time as it thought that, in fairness to the injured person, he would be in a position to prosecute his claim.

The hon. member for Kedron referred to the case where a person does not know the protection that he has under the law by virtue of the Nominal Defendant provisions. On that point, I am advised that ignorance of the Nominal Defendant provisions has so far been viewed with some sympathy by the court in dealing with out-of-time applications. I should imagine—I hope that the court will not treat this as an unkind comment—that the court probably is stretching the law a little in taking that kindly attitude. In cases where it finds that people are ignorant of their rights, it takes that as a sufficient reason for granting an extension. It is not my desire to quarrel with such an attitude on the part of the court, but I should imagine that the court will progressively harden its attitude in this respect. After all, when something is new only a few people know of it; but as it becomes more and more part of our every-day living habits, more and more people know of it and more and more legal advisers become perfectly familiar with it. I should imagine that the court will say, in the early stages of a new law, "Not very many people know about it," but that it will get harder and harder. Eventually, when an application is made by a person who says, "Your Honour, I did not know this was possible," he will run the risk of the judge saying to him, "Well, this has been going on for five years. It is time you did know." People will run the risk of the court becoming a bit testy about ignorance of the law.

The hon. member for Kedron also inquired about the actual amount of compensation paid under third-party insurance in Queensland, not by the Nominal Defendant. Compulsory third-party insurance statistics, which are derived from the annual reports of the Insurance Commissioner, show that in the year ended 1961 the gross premiums received in that field were £3,079,580, whereas claims met in respect of accidents amounted to £2,624,799, giving a percentage of claims to premiums of 85·2 per cent. Let me stop to observe that an 85 per cent. claims ratio for insurance offices generally would be sufficiently high to prevent them from receiving any margin. By the time they paid their costs of administration they would be in the red with an 85 per cent. claims ratio.

For the year ended 1962 the position was a little better. It will be remembered that we had increased premium rates which, in the meantime, had become fully effective. Premiums amounted to £3,934,583. Claims were higher than the previous year at £3,077,778, which left a percentage claim to premiums of 78·2 per cent. 78·2 per cent. is no bonanza. At that average claims

ratio, some offices would still make a little money out of compulsory third-party business and some would still lose money; but at least it was a move in the right direction and I was a lot more content when the ratio fell to 78·2 per cent. I shall be very interested to see what the statistics show at the end of the year 1963.

The hon. member for Windsor inquired as to the position that obtains in the case of a transfer of ownership effected round about the due date of renewal. The hon. member considered the position as originally intended under the Act was that once the insurer was paid the premium he took over the policy for the 13 months. My comment on that statement is that no difficulty is expected to arise as a result of transfers of ownership that occur close to the registration renewal date. Dealing first with the case of a transfer prior to the registration renewal date, the existing insurer automatically covers the new owner until this date. What happens then will depend upon whether or not the insurer has given at least one month's notice that he declines to renew.

If he has not so declined, the Department of Main Roads will accept a renewal premium from the new owner, and, provided this premium is paid within 30 days of the registration renewal date, the insurance cover is continuous. On the other hand, if the insurer has declined to renew, the new owner must approach a new insurer and obtain a certificate of insurance before he can renew the registration of his vehicle. So it seems to me that both the hazards are covered. Of course, if he foolishly delays to do this until after the registration renewal date, he will be uncovered from that date until the date of obtaining the new insurance. This danger applies to all declinatures, irrespective of the question of a transfer.

Turning now to a transfer that occurs at or soon after the registration renewal date, the Department of Main Roads will not register the transfer until the registration fee and insurance premium have been paid. If this has already been done by the transferor, the insurance cover (whether a renewed cover or a new cover) will be in existence and will automatically apply to the new owner.

On the other hand, if it has not been done, the new owner will either pay the insurance premium to the Department of Main Roads (in the case where the insurer has not declined to renew) or effect new insurance, and in either case he will be covered from the date the transfer is registered by the Department of Main Roads. Until that date, the original owner retains his existing liability, that is, the transfer has no effect in law until registered by the Department of Main Roads.

So far as my officers can see, there is no gap, there is no hiatus, there is no fault in the concept of this arrangement, and quite clearly I feel we should be grateful to the insurance companies for coming to the rescue by granting something which is, in fact, not otherwise needed. If an insured's registration runs out on the fourth day of this month and he does not re-insure until Christmas Eve, in fact he is unregistered and uninsured during the intervening period; he is breaking the law. The insurance companies were good enough, when we put this forward to them, to say, "Look, provided we have not turned him down and said we won't have him, and provided he pays his renewed registration and premium within 30 days of the new date, we will forget the fact that he was uncovered in the intervening period. We will treat him as if the cover is continuous." That was a wonderfully helpful gesture. It did away with the necessity for perhaps a whole series of claims on the Nominal Defendant Fund by people involved in accidents between the time when their registrations fell due and the few days later when they paid their premiums.

At the time the Nominal Defendant legislation was before Parliament I presented statistics showing the average delay in renewing registrations. The Department of Main Roads has mechanised its systems of sending out notices; it sends them out weeks ahead. We all know that we have to make these payments but I guarantee that if a census was taken even amongst hon. members we would find that a percentage of them do not pay by the due date. In some cases this is done quite innocently because people have a settled habit of paying all accounts in a heap at the end of the month. They put their registration renewal notice with the bill from the grocer and the bill from the draper, and all the other bills, and pay them all at the end of the month. As this is quite a common practice in a settled domestic community it is hard to regard the fact that a man so behaves as something sinful and dreadful. Still, the fact is that that man is not registered, and it means that he is uninsured for the period between the due date and the end of the month, if that is when he pays.

The fact that the insurance companies said, "We won't take advantage of this; we will assume he was covered as long as he renews within 30 days", was tremendously helpful to us. I have done some sounding out. The insurance companies are quite open in their attitude. They say, "Where we have said we don't want the risk and have given him 30 days' notice that we won't take him, we are not going to give him any extension. We have given him 30 days' notice that he has to find another insurer." I can hardly regard their attitude as other than fair. Indeed, on the history of things they have been extremely helpful and useful in trying to meet this grave social problem of the uninsured driver and the victim of such a person.

That is all I wish to add to what I said at the introductory stage when the Committee was kind enough to receive this proposal very graciously. Those matters were raised for further information, and I now submit the Bill to the House.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (5.48 p.m.): I am grateful to the Treasurer for having dealt with some of the points raised at the introductory stage by the Leader of the Opposition and other speakers. Frankly, I am finding it a little difficult to follow the Treasurer's lauding of the insurance companies in regard to the 30-day period. At the introductory stage he said that they accepted the cover subject to the condition that when the insured person renewed his policy after the due date he signed a declaration that he had not been involved in an accident during that period. He did say that unfortunately some people made false declarations. It would seem to me that the only benefit is if the insured has had an accident in that period, other than the fact that he does not require to submit a fresh application if he breaks his continuity and he does not have to go through the formalities of applying for cover and being accepted again by the company.

Although I appreciate the Treasurer's point about facilitating the procedures as far as the Nominal Defendant is concerned, with due respect to him I cannot see that it is any great concession on the part of the insurance companies to say that as long as somebody has not had an accident for the period up to 30 days after the due date they will then be prepared to accept his premium and give him cover for the 30 days during which he did not have any reason to claim. I cannot follow the Treasurer in that regard. I do not know whether there was some point I missed. The only time an insurance company would be giving anything away or saving a claim on the Nominal Defendant would be if there had been an accident in that period of 30 days. I can see some point in it if it were not known at the time that the person was the one who had been involved in an accident, and he may have signed a false declaration. If the insurance companies are prepared to give cover even though a person knowingly signs a false declaration that he has not been involved in an accident.

Mr. Hiley: Other people may drive the car; the insurance is on the car, and the insurer gets his declaration. I can assure the hon. member the companies would have quite a lot of these twilight acceptances—in-between acceptances. In this case it is very much like the privilege of being able to bet on a winner of a race five minutes after the race is over.

Mr. HANLON: I was dealing with where they are caught——

Mr. Hiley: The insurance is on the car.

Mr. HANLON: They are still caught. I think that ultimately the responsibility must be placed on the driver. I think the hon. member for Windsor said that the only practical way to apply third party is to attach it to the motor vehicle. As opposed to that, the rejection of an applicant, or a policy, generally speaking, is against the applicant who owns the vehicle because the companies do not know who else may drive the vehicle. The Treasurer has pointed out that the cover is on the vehicle, but where an application is rejected by an insurance company, the company must obviously believe that the person making the application is not a fit person. Sooner of later the responsibility must attach to the driver rather than the vehicle. Where third-party cover was refused for any person it would have to be referred to the Traffic Department to see whether he should have a licence if he is regarded as unfit for compulsory third-party cover.

The only other point that the Treasurer did not deal with related to the submission of the hon. member for Windsor that the Bill was getting away from the original concept of the Nominal Defendant legislation as he envisaged it in relation to the period of 30 days, and he said that he considered there was some anomaly between the experience in other States and in Queensland.

The Bill appears to clear up a number of anomalies that have arisen in the operation of the Nominal Defendant Fund, and we have no opposition to it.

Motion (Mr. Hiley) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

AGRICULTURAL BANK (SPECIAL RATIFICATION) BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer) (7.15 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

There is only one principle contained in the Bill and that is the ratification of a transaction between the Agricultural Bank and Amagraze Ltd., a body that would not

ordinarily be eligible to participate in advances from the bank. The history of the matter was explained at the introductory stage, and how the advance was made to Callide Dawson Co-operative Meat and Bacon Association Ltd., which organisation found it impossible to complete its works and carry them on.

This whole operation was designed as a rescue operation, as experience elsewhere suggested that that course had proved helpful. It is hoped that the same thing will now happen at Biloela. I particularly asked hon. members to observe at the introductory stage that no general power of ratification is sought. It is a special power limited and confirmed to this one transaction and no others.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (7.17 p.m.): I do not think there can be any disagreement with the principles contained in the Bill. In past years the Australian Labour Party whilst in Government extended similar credit through the loan funds of Queensland to other organisations, possibly not knowing at the time that there was any necessity for ratification by legislation.

I think it has to be agreed that industries such as this will at odd times require governmental assistance. No doubt under the new industrial development legislation some of the many projects put forward from time to time will be given careful consideration. They will have to be analysed closely to consider the economics of the industries themselves, and possibly the Treasurer will not be placed in the same position as he was on the last occasion when, although he did not agree with the principals in charge of this co-operative, he did extend finance to place it on a footing to enable it eventually to establish an industry in that district.

I would much prefer to have a co-operative organisation in this area, but, even if it be Amagraze or some other form of private enterprise, at least it is an industry and will provide employment for many people. Biloela is in an area that is progressing at a fast rate, which I hope will continue. I hope that many other districts will receive similar benefits in the establishment, through the Department of Industrial Development, of industrial activities in country areas.

The ratification of the agreement is possibly necessary in law, and we are in complete agreement with it. I hope that the Treasurer will be able to secure repayment of the loan over such a period as will enable the State to be reimbursed for the expense to which it has been put, but at least we will have the satisfaction of knowing that an industry has been established in the district.

Motion (Mr. Hiley) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair)

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

RACING AND BETTING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer) (7.22 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

The dominant purpose of the Bill is to improve the administrative arrangements under the Racing and Betting Act. It covers such matters as overcoming the difficulty in obtaining properly completed returns, copies of betting sheets, and payment of the amount of turnover tax that bookmakers are required to forward each week. It deals with the problem that arises where payment of the tax is not made, and deals also with the problem arising where cheques for the amount are paid but are returned dishonoured by the bank. It also envisages the cases in which it is found that returns have been falsified. It amends all these provisions by giving the Commissioner power to prevent a bookmaker from further operation where he fails to pay his turnover tax.

In regard to the collection of betting ticket tax on credit bets, a simplified proposal is contained in the Bill in terms of which, instead of each bookmaker submitting a return of credit bets every month, he will now issue a ticket for each credit bet, which will either be delivered to the bettor or be destroyed at his discretion after entering the number of the ticket and other details on his betting sheet. That will telescope the accounting of credit bets with that of cash bets. A single betting sheet, in respect of which no difficulty has emerged, will be the common procedure for both.

The Bill deals also with two requests received from the Paddock Bookmakers' Association. The first extends by one hour the time during which betting on a racecourse is permitted, from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. At present during the summer months, when there is a long twilight in the southern States, races often are held that start after 6 p.m. and, strictly speaking, the on-course bookmaker is expected to close his book sharp at 6 p.m. This will allow him an extra hour of legal grace and allow him to complete his operations on the last southern races.

Then the Bill meets the point raised by the Paddock Bookmakers' Association in regard to the provisions of the Act relating to court actions and the recovery of costs

in connection therewith. At present the law requires an action by a bookmaker to be laid within three months of the accruing of the cause of action. The Bill extends that time limit to 12 months and removes the provision relating to the recovery of costs, so that, in future, the rules relating to the recovery of costs will be similar to those that apply in any other court action.

The Bill also inserts a prohibition against the selling of totalisator tickets by other than proper totalisator authorities.

The final matter relates to betting on galloping events by bookmakers at trotting meetings. I indicated in some detail at the introductory stage that while it was decided that existing trotting clubs should continue to have the privilege of bookmakers betting on galloping events and to receive a share of the on-course turnover tax in relation to that betting, it was resolved that steps should be taken to allow the formation of new trotting clubs, and, where they are proposed to be formed for the main purpose of taking advantage of interest in galloping races, to restrict their wagering on galloping events.

Those are the principles contained in the Bill. They were fully explained and debated at the introductory stage, and no matters were raised to which I am conscious a reply has not been forthcoming.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (7.26 p.m.): In due deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I should first like to mention a matter that might concern you. A meeting of the Australian Labour Party was being held downstairs and it was carried on a little longer than we expected. In deference to you, I apologise for the late arrival of members of the Opposition after the dinner adjournment.

As to this Bill, I do not think there is a great deal about which we can argue. The Bill was fully debated at the introductory stage and I believe that nothing should be repeated from this side at this stage.

On the subject of trotting clubs, I believe they have catered for quite a number of people who wish to bet in ways different to those available to them on the various racecourses. I do not know a great deal about it, but I believe that many trotting clubs have contributed greatly towards country show societies and outer suburban show societies, such as at Redcliffe and Ipswich. At both those places I understand that they have considerably improved the showgrounds so that they have made some contribution other than to the game of betting on racing.

The Bill as it relates to that particular section of racing does, in fact, provide that there will be no general extension in this regard; each case will be treated on its merits. I believe that is a proper provision to make. If there are cases in country towns in Queensland—and I believe there are quite a few where there is no local racing but where there is a local show society—where trotting clubs wish to operate in conjunction with show societies, they will be given sympathetic consideration in the matter of having a date set aside for the sport in those areas.

I believe the Bill could react favourably to the public interest in many of these country towns where racing is not as flourishing or prosperous as it is in Brisbane at the present time.

Motion (Mr. Hiley) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Hodges, Gympie, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 9, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

EXPLOSIVES ACTS AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga—Minister for Health) (7.30 p.m.): I move—

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

There are few principles associated with this Bill. The main principle is the transfer of administration to the Department of Health from the Treasury.

The Director of the Government Chemical Laboratory was the Chief Inspector of Explosives. He and his staff are responsible for the testing of all explosives to ascertain if they are suitable for storage, transport and use. It is, therefore, more convenient to have the Director in charge of the administration of this Act.

Explosives used in the exploration for the production of petroleum are excluded from the ambit of this Bill because they are controlled under the Petroleum Acts, 1923 to 1962.

A small amendment to the Queensland Marine Act is also made. It deletes the provision from this Act to fix fees for storage, etc., in Government or licensed magazines. In future the fixing of fees will be provided for in the Explosives Acts by the amendment contained in Clause 9 of this Bill.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (7.32 p.m.): This Bill was discussed rather fully at the introductory stage. Although it does not raise any contentious matters, there is one point that I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister. In his introductory remarks the Minister mentioned the Petroleum Acts. From what I understand of the Explosive Acts and the Petroleum Acts there is nothing which allows any intervention on the part of the Fire Brigades Board in relation to any oil refinery that may be constructed in Queensland. It is rather a strange feature of our legislation that at the present time two oil refineries can be built on the outskirts of Brisbane but no permission is

given to the Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade to force the companies concerned to provide the necessary precautions against fire in the construction of those refineries.

Dr. Noble: That matter would come under the Petroleum Act or the Fire Brigade Act.

Mr. LLOYD: We are discussing the Explosive Act. In Clause 4 of the Bill mention is made of the Petroleum Acts, 1923 to 1962. I do not think it is a matter that comes under the Fire Brigade Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member wishes to refer to Clause 4 he could discuss the matter in Committee. I cannot read the Petroleum Act into Clause 4.

Mr. LLOYD: I defer to your opinion, Mr. Speaker, but I thought it was a matter of sufficient public importance to raise at this stage. It seems to be remarkable that in the construction of the refineries the Chief Officer of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade must make a request to the constructing authority because he cannot insist that these precautions be taken. Such matters must be given consideration to protect the people of Brisbane. I merely mention that point in passing. I realise that I may be diverting somewhat from the principles of the Bill, but it contains a number of clauses and some of them cover the Petroleum Act. If such a provision is not included now it should be made the subject of an amendment by the Government at some time in the future.

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga—Minister for Health) (7.36 p.m.), in reply: I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that clause 4 (5) states—

> "Nothing in this Act applies to the storage and use of explosives in connection with the exploration for and production of petroleum under and subject to 'The Petroleum Acts, 1923 to 1962.'"

Provision is made in the Petroleum Act to cover the explosives used.

Motion (Dr. Noble) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Hodges, Gympie, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 11, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

STOCK ROUTES AND RURAL LANDS PROTECTION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Lands) (7.38 p.m.): I move—

> "That the Bill be now read a second time."

During the introductory stage of the Bill I covered the need for the action that we are taking in the amendments to the Stock Routes and Rural Lands Protection Acts in the campaign to control giant sensitive plant. At that stage I told the Committee how important it was that any action we were likely to take or had to take must be taken quickly. During the debate certain hon. members from North Queensland gave us a good deal of information about the serious problem presented by giant sensitive plant. The action that is designed to be taken concerns getting on with the problem of destroying successive generations of giant sensitive plant before they have an opportunity to seed. The whole plan of control is more or less aimed at killing each successive generation, for if one crop of the plant goes to seed we are confronted with a very hard and enduring seed which does not all come up in the next season, or even in two or three successive seasons.

The process of exhausting all the seeds lying in the soil takes a long time. If we missed one crop and allowed it to go to seed, perhaps after having kept a very scrupulous control over the plant for three or four years, we could have to go right back to the beginning and start all over again the process of exhausting the seed lying in the soil.

For the purpose of getting all of the crop that comes up after rain in an area we are taking action to make it possible for the Co-ordinating Board to go straight to the heart of the problem without having to wait for a meeting of the local authority. Under the old scheme that had to be done and it sometimes meant a delay of three or four weeks. Then followed subsequent delays of serving notices and waiting for the expiry of the time mentioned in the notice within which the occupier of the land had to destroy the pest. Then we had to take another action, which culminated perhaps in the authorising of some person by the local authority to go onto the land and do the actual work of destruction. All this took too much time and sometimes the seed had been dropped on the soil and the plant started off again.

I think we canvassed all the objectives of the Bill and the means by which we hope to achieve them and it would be only repeating what I said earlier if I went through the story again. So, without more ado, I rest on what I said at the introductory stage.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (7.42 p.m.): The Bill is a highly desirable one. It takes out of the hands of the local authority the control of something that would take quite a long time for enforcement on an inspector's report. As local authority meetings are held from month to month, there could be a delay of two months before any action

is taken against the giant sensitive plant, which is creating quite a hazard in sugar lands. From time to time when hon. members now on the Government benches were in Opposition, they raised questions about the control of many of these pests at present running over much of the land of the State. It seems that, as soon as one pest comes under control, another one springs up and becomes a nuisance, whether it is brought from other States, carried by the wind or dropped by some other means.

At all times it has been the practice for the Government to make the local authorities responsible for control. Here is the greatest argument against giving local authorities control in this matter and taking it away from the Government. Although local authorities may enforce destruction of pests on private land-owners, they are notoriously neglectful of the nuisance on their own lands in so many parts of Queensland and much of the nuisance comes about by the spread of plant pests from local-authority lands, or even Crown lands, onto private land, thus creating quite an economic nuisance for the primary producer. I do not know whether it is possible for the Government to control it adequately with its own resources. Under the Bill the Department of Lands will now take over the control of giant sensitive plant. It will become the inspecting authority and will be able to take immediate action to have this pest eradicated from private land. In many cases in which there are similar threats to the economy of the State, the control of other pests could be placed on the same level.

In many cases local authorities have not inspectors with either the necessary ability or the facilities for eradication. I believe that the Government should accept greater responsibility in these matters through instrumentalities such as the Department of Lands and the Department of Primary Industries. When I say that, I think that I am repeating a number of remarks made from time to time when Government members were in Opposition. I think that greater consideration should be given to this matter. We are allowing the spread of many plant pests that have become nuisances particularly in the last 20 or 30 years, and I think that consideration could be given to extending this legislation to the control of them.

There is only one principle contained in the Bill, and I do not think that the Opposition has any objection to the extension of the legislation.

Mr. HARRISON (Logan) (7.47 p.m.): As a member of the Co-ordinating Board, I wish to support this legislation extending to the Board's inspectors powers normally exercised only by local authorities. Giant sensitive plant is a very dangerous weed, particularly to the sugar industry. Over several years it has become quite evident from experience that the best way to deal with it is to prevent regeneration and seeding.

I do not think anyone will raise any serious objection to this measure, and I am glad the Opposition has realised the need for it. Aerial spraying, which we attempted to use in 1952, was not, with the knowledge that we had in those days, as effective as it is now. I remember inspecting the area in 1952 and being not very satisfied with the result. I understand that now in 1963 the results of aerial spraying are good.

This measure will be a very great help in controlling this serious problem. With aerial spraying we hope to do 90 per cent. of the job of destroying the pest, but a close ground inspection by the staff that we have, supported by Government funds, is needed to eradicate it completely as quickly as possible. I should like to inform the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that officers of the biological section of the Department of Lands have made all the inspections necessary over the last 10 years to determine how to control this weed. As the Minister stated, it has a hard seed which germinates over many years, and we can expect to have to continue to fight it for a number of years to come.

We are very appreciative of the Government's recognition two or three years ago that this problem had to be faced, particularly in the interests of the sugar industry, and we believe that we now have a practical method of controlling the weed. The Bill will make possible a more practical approach to the problem and ensure, as far as it is possible to do so, that no plant goes to seed, because it will give local inspectors power to take the necessary action promptly instead of referring the matter to local authorities and waiting for an extended period.

As a member of the Co-ordinating Board, and with some knowledge of this problem after having made an inspection, I want to say that I am completely in agreement with the legislation and believe that it will speed the fight to eradicate giant sensitive plant.

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Lands) (7.51 p.m.), in reply: As at the introductory stage, I find to my pleasure that there is nothing but approbation for what we are trying to do. I hope that over the years I will earn the reputation that all the legislation I bring before the House is completely innocuous and highly desirable and that it will not be necessary for me to defend myself. I think that my record is pretty good.

Mr. Lloyd: What have you to say about King Ranch?

Mr. FLETCHER: As a matter of fact, I was relying on the lease to King Ranch to reinforce the principle that I have enunciated. It was such an obviously and transparently desirable thing to do that I cannot think that even any member of the Opposition, whose job it is to find fault with what I do, could possibly have thought that there was anything wrong with it.

Mr. Mann: Did you read what was in "Sunday Truth"?

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not read "Sunday Truth".

Mr. Duffey: But you speak the truth.

Mr. FLETCHER: I speak the truth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I trust the Minister will not introduce an extraneous matter.

Mr. FLETCHER: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but it will be noted—I am sure you will not mind my saying this—that I do on all occasions speak the truth.

I am happy to know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition thinks that this is a highly desirable thing to do. He said that he thought the principle contained in the Bill could be extended to deal with other noxious weeds, and there may be something in his argument. There have been occasions when I have thought that local authorities, for one reason or another—one may be that they do not want to become unpopular with the ratepayers generally—sometimes hold their horses a little and do not act as enthusiastically in dealing with a noxious weed in their own area as we in the Department of Lands would like them to, or as the members of the Co-ordinating Board, who are bearing the burden and the responsibility of looking after this very important aspect of the agricultural and pastoral industries, would like them to.

Mr. Lloyd: Sometimes local authorities and the Crown are the greatest offenders.

Mr. FLETCHER: I admit that. Indeed, that was the point of some of the things that I said at the introductory stage. I admit that there are things that can be said about Crown lands which indicate that we have a long way to go to bring them up to the position where we could say we had completely eradicated all the pests thereon, and I said at the introductory stage that it is very unlikely that, practically, we will reach that position in our time. We would need an inexhaustible supply of money and endless time. I said that we are doing everything practicable under the circumstances in attacking the various pests where they are serious in the areas that come under our jurisdiction. It is no good spending a lot of money out in the isolated areas where weeds thrive or animals regenerate from year to year when they cannot affect anyone very much. But in a case such as this, where the giant sensitive plant is brought into valuable cane lands and looks like overrunning a bigger and bigger area of very valuable land each year, we must do something in the public interest. That is exactly what we have done—£50,000 in the first five years and, for this particular five-year period, of which we are in the first one, £30,000, and we hope that we will be virtually on top of the problem by the time we get to the end of it.

We have had a fairly intelligent evaluation of the situation and I think I can confidently say that we are better off this year than we were last year, and that successively we hope to be better off next year than this year.

Mr. Harrison interjected.

Mr. FLETCHER: That would be the obvious attitude to take—the principle of a stitch in time saves nine; it might save a lot more than nine in matters such as this.

The hon. member for Logan speaks with the weight and substance of a man who is a member of the Co-ordinating Board and who knows a good deal about the intimate dealings with various types of animal and vegetable pests that come within the ambit of that board's responsibility. He spoke of aerial spraying, but I honestly do not think that aerial spraying can be regarded as effective in this campaign to control giant sensitive plant. It has now reached the stage of our chasing the isolated plant, or the isolated small area of plants, and preventing them from seeding. There was a stage in some areas when blanket spraying would have been a good thing. Of course, with some pests like Noogoora burr, the blanket spray is about the only effective thing; but we have reached the stage of desperately trying to stop this particular plant from seeding. We have to seek out individual plants and destroy them before they seed; we hope to control this pest in that way.

The biological section has been, of course, a tremendous help, 2,4-D has been effective. It is one of the main hormone sprays, and if it is effective we will have gone a long way towards achieving a very fair degree of control.

Motion (Mr. Fletcher) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Hodges, Gympie, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

The House adjourned at 7.59 p.m.