Queensland

# Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

## Legislative Assembly

**FRIDAY, 10 OCTOBER 1975**

---

# FRIDAY, 10 OCTOBER 1975

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

## PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Parole Board for the year 1974-75.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the City of Brisbane Act 1924–1974.

Report of the National Trust of Queensland for the year 1974–75.

## QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

### 1. THEFT AND DESTRUCTION OF MOTOR-CARS

**Mr. Burns,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Police—

(1) Is he aware of the concern expressed by the Wynnum police and police in other Bayside areas at the growing incidence of vandals taking cars, using them and then abandoning them, generally with windows smashed?

(2) How many cars were reported stolen in each of the last three years and how many cars were recovered?

(3) What steps have been taken or are planned to stamp out this criminal practice of stealing and destroying cars?

*Answers:*—

(1) Yes.

(2) Statistics are not kept in respect of the theft of cars alone but are incorporated in statistics relating to the theft of motor vehicles generally.

| —— | 1972–73 | 1973–74 | 1974–75 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Offences .. .. .. | 4,739 | 4,770 | 5,203 |
| Vehicles recovered .. | 4,027 | 4,253 | 4,587 |

(3) Following the suggestions received as a result of representations from the honourable member for Wynnum, many measures have been introduced within the Queensland Police Department with a view to eliminating, as far as possible, offences of this kind. Those measures include publicity in respect of security of vehicles left unattended and selective enforcement in areas and localities where offences of this kind appear prevalent. There is, of course, an obligation on each and every member of the public to assist members of the Police Force by supplying information in relation to persons acting

suspiciously in their area and to otherwise assist police when requested. The police alone cannot have any great deal of success without this co-operation.

2. VALUATIONS BY VALUER-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

**Mr. Burns,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Survey, Valuation, Urban and Regional Affairs—

(1) How many times have valuations been carried out by the Valuer-General's Department on each of the valuation divisions and what was the percentage increase on each occasion?

(2) What is the latest value of each division?

(3) What was the date when each division was last valued and when did or will these values become effective?

(4) How did the latest values of each division compare with the previous values?

*Answers:—*

I presume the honourable member's questions refer to the area of the Brisbane City Council.

(1) Five area valuations have been carried out by the Valuer-General. The percentage increases are contained in a schedule which I ask to be incorporated in "Hansard".

(2) This information is contained in the schedule referred to in the answer to question (1).

(3) The valuations of all divisions when last valued are related to the common date, namely, 30 June 1972. The valuations of these divisions have been proclaimed to be effective as from 30 June 1976.

(4) This information is contained in the schedule referred to in the answer to question (1).

SCHEDULE

| Division | Effective dates of Area Valuations | | | | | Valuation to be Effective 30–6–76 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 30–6–52 Per cent Increase | 30–6–57 Per cent Increase | 30–6–63 Per cent Increase | 30–6–69 Per cent Increase | 30–6–76 Per cent Increase | |
| | | | | | | $ |
| Balmoral .. .. | 116·11 | 5·99 | 173·44 | 112·00 | 77·86 | 55,599,180 |
| Belmont .. .. | 90·04 | 16·68 | 182·56 | 123·50 | 87·75 | 69,358,410 |
| Brisbane .. .. | 147·1 | 1·26 | 144·35 | 40·13 | 96·79 | 75,317,110 |
| Coorparoo .. | 142·61 | 9·93 | 179·95 | 127·81 | 59·46 | 264,407,290 |
| Enoggera .. .. | 172·82 | 8·06 | 202·05 | 93·82 | 84·83 | 67,250,820 |
| Hamilton .. .. | 137·38 | 9·15 | 157·59 | 99·90 | 53·83 | 54,976,770 |
| Ithaca .. .. | 133·57 | 4·55 | 218·63 | 70·33 | 67·38 | 49,568,400 |
| Kedron .. .. | 138·53 | 22·91 | 199·22 | 120·92 | 81·28 | 174,217,900 |
| Moggill .. .. | 134·10 | 37·77 | 276·87 | 140·80 | 133·20 | 57,716,520 |
| Sandgate .. .. | 154·32 | 11·68 | 173·72 | 89·53 | 58·46 | 24,602,050 |
| Sherwood .. .. | 152·73 | 4·54 | 181·94 | 152·59 | 86·17 | 74,733,060 |
| South Brisbane .. | 145·20 | 8·29 | 166·02 | 73·58 | 65·74 | 85,951,700 |
| Stephens .. .. | 120·59 | 10·01 | 179·61 | 110·15 | 68·59 | 93,058,520 |
| Taringa .. .. | 131·07 | 14·11 | 231·11 | 138·16 | 62·30 | 51,213,990 |
| Tingalpa .. .. | 92·65 | 15·93 | 184·31 | 138·57 | 135·79 | 30,553,380 |
| Toombul .. .. | 113·34 | 6·81 | 185·04 | 111·42 | 66·80 | 73,428,280 |
| Toowong .. .. | 110·96 | 1·32 | 198·74 | 93·59 | 89·20 | 38,352,080 |
| Windsor .. .. | 130·17 | 4·21 | 204·14 | 93·50 | 49·71 | 53,053,700 |
| Wynnum .. .. | 113·16 | 17·48 | 206·12 | 85·66 | 76·65 | 49,331,470 |
| Yeerongpilly .. | 91·94 | 23·90 | 197·67 | 175·80 | 113·64 | 155,690,420 |
| Total .. .. | 135·47 | 7·49 | 175·89 | 93·68 | 81·88 | 1,598,381,050 |

3. PACKAGING AND LABELLING REGULATIONS

**Mr. Burns,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs—

(1) Further to my question of 5 September 1972, has the Government made any decision in relation to the introduction of a simple three-digit day-of-the-year packaging date code on all food lines?

(2) Has reconsideration been given to the question of a sales expiry date on all perishable foods and the enforcement of regulations so that customers are provided not only with a "packed for" statement but with a "packed by" statement, including the packer's name and address, on all pre-packed goods, thus overcoming the problem of foreign foods being represented as Australian produce?

(3) Whilst I am aware that the weights and measures regulations provide for some control, will he consider the introduction of compulsory weigh-in scales permanently displayed at all pre-packed food counters and the comprehensive marking of the district and State of origin on all pre-packed products?

*Answers:—*

(1 and 2) As advised in my reply to the question asked of me by the honourable member on 5 September 1972, the introduction of a simple three-digit day-of-the-year packaging date code and the marking of a sales expiry date has received the consideration of the Australia-wide Standing Committee on Packaging. This committee does not see any advantage in including such provisions in weights and measures legislation. The inclusion of the packer's name and address or approved packer's identification on an article packed in this State is satisfactorily covered by weights and measures legislation. The matter of foreign foods being represented as Australian produce is one for the consideration of the Commonwealth Government, to whom the honourable member should make representations. The Consumer Affairs Act 1970-1974 makes provision, in section 37, that date marking of prescribed foods may be made mandatory should this be considered desirable in the light of consideration of the matter and the Consumer Affairs Council has considered the desirability of recommending that this be done. The council concluded that, as the Commonwealth Food Standards Committee was considering the development of a draft standard in relation thereto, the matter might be left to the health authorities. In this regard the then Minister for Health in February 1975 is reported as having said that Queensland will introduce compulsory date marking of perishable foodstuffs if it is recommended by the National Health and Medical Research Council. Consequently, I am referring this aspect of the question of the honourable member to the present Minister for Health for his consideration and reply direct.

(3) The check weighing of any pre-packed article by the vendor upon request and in the presence of the purchaser is adequately covered by the present provisions in the Weights and Measures Act. While the comprehensive marking of the State of origin of all pre-packed products is not relevant to weights and measures legislation, I am asking the Chief Inspector of Weights and Measures to list this matter for consideration at the next meeting of the National Standard Committee on Packaging.

4. ROAD WORKS THROUGHOUT QUEENSLAND

**Mr. Ahern** for **Mr. Armstrong,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) What mileage of main, development and secondary roads in the Northern, Central and Southern Divisions is under Main Roads Department responsibility?

(2) What were the total amounts of money spent in each division on permanent and maintenance work over the last four years and what is the allocation for 1975-76?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) This information will take at least a week to prepare as a large amount of work is involved. I will provide the answer within the next week.

5. IMPORTED FRUIT AND VEGETABLES

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the importation of ever-increasing quantities of fruit and vegetables in fresh and processed form, including potatoes, approximating $70 million over the last eleven months, which is an increase of some 66 per cent on previous years?

(2) Will he take action to stop this practice and preserve the market for home-grown products?

*Answers:—*

(1) I am aware of the serious increase in the import of fruit and vegetables, particularly in the processed form.

(2) I have joined with industry leaders in protesting to the Commonwealth Government about this increase in imports. It is to be hoped that the setting up of various national panels such as the Potato Panel, the Citrus Juice Panel and the Vegetable Panel, will be successful in limiting imports and providing a fair market for Australian fruit and vegetable growers.

6. CONSTRUCTION OF HOUSING COMMISSION HOMES, BUNDABERG AND HERVEY BAY

**Mr. Powell,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) When will the seven houses in Thabeban Street, Bundaberg, which are being constructed by McGrath Homes for the Housing Commission, be completed?

(2) What is the cause of the undue delay in the completion of the houses?

(3) When will further tenders be called for the erection of houses for the Housing Commission in (a) Bundaberg and (b) Hervey Bay?

*Answers:*—

(1) At the inspection on 1 October 1975, there was relatively little work remaining for the contractor to do. Arrangements were made that the contractor will advise the inspector as soon as the jobs are ready for finalisation. The houses should be available very shortly.

(2) The contract time of 23 weeks offered by the builder was optimistic for seven houses. This is supported by the fact that the second tenderer nominated 52 weeks. As sewerage became available during the contract it was necessary to submit plans to the council and arrange for the contractor to perform extra work. In the final stages there was some delay in respect of certain completion items. An on-site conference has produced agreement on the work yet to be done and, as already indicated, the houses should be completed in the very near future.

(3) (a) Tenders will close on 4 November 1975 for five houses at Bundaberg. (b) At Hervey Bay land has been acquired. The cut of 29 per cent in this year's housing agreement allocation compared with last year prevents the programming of house construction at Hervey Bay at this stage.

7. EAST BUNDABERG STATE SCHOOL

**Mr. Jensen,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

With reference to his letter to me on 14 May in which he advised that his department had recommended to the Department of Works that the new East Bundaberg State School to be erected on the new site be included in the 1975-76 works programme, has it been included and, if not, what is the reason, as this new school was supposed to have some priority because it was in a category of disadvantaged schools?

*Answer:*—

Although a replacement school at East Bundaberg was recommended in my department's draft works programme for 1975-76 this project could not be included in the final programme. A reduction in the funds available for replacing or upgrading schools has made it necessary to restrict the funds to the completion of projects commenced in the 1974-75 programme.

8. and 9. QUEENSLAND COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN'S ORGANISATION

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

(1) Does the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation operate under a firm constitution and, if so, will he arrange for a copy to be tabled in this House?

(2) Have five executive members of the organisation the voting power to control the State council of the organisation and, if so, does he intend to take steps to rectify this?

*Answers:*—

(1) By amendment to the Primary Producers' Organisation and Marketing Act in 1973, there were constituted commercial fishermen's local branches, commercial fishermen's district councils and the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's State Council. These comprise the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation referred to by the honourable member. No constitution has yet been developed beyond the general provisions contained in the amendment Act referred to and the more specific provisions contained in regulations issued in January 1974.

(2) No. The State council is comprised of two representatives of each of the five district councils. To facilitate the handling of council's affairs, the 10 representatives formed an executive of five from among themselves to control the operations of the council between meetings. However, the council as a whole must hold two meetings a year in addition to the annual meeting. Decisions of the executive of five are ratified at the next meeting of the whole council. The honourable member will see that decisions of the executive of five are subject to scrutiny by the council and further that any of the Council, including the executive of five, may be replaced as a district council representative at its next annual meeting. I am not aware of any dissatisfaction with the present operation of the State council and no steps to alter its structure are presently contemplated.

---

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

(1) Is he aware that a State councillor of the Queensland Commercial Fishermen's Organisation has resigned from the organisation because of a verbal attack made on him while chairman of the association?

(2) Is he aware that the attack was made by the secretary of the association, who is a paid employee?

(3) Does he intend to take any action regarding this matter?

*Answers:*—

(1) I am aware that a State councillor of the organisation has recently resigned but I am not aware of his reasons for so doing.

(2) See Answer to (1).

(3) I regard the resignation as a purely domestic matter for the organisation itself and I do not propose to interfere in any way.

10. FOOD FOR HOSPITAL PATIENTS

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

(1) In view of his statements about supplying nourishing food to patients at the Royal Brisbane and other hospitals, is only a half truck-load of fresh fruit and vegetables now delivered each week instead of the six truck-loads which used to be delivered?

(2) Are the storerooms filled with frozen foods from California?

(3) Are fresh fruit and vegetables now in plentiful supply locally at cheap prices?

*Answers:—*

(1) I am advised that there has not been any change in the hospitals board's policy of purchasing fresh fruit and vegetables.

(2) No.

(3) I suggest that the honourable member seek information on this matter from my colleague the Minister for Primary Industries.

11. REDCLIFFE COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE

**Mr. Frawley**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) Is he aware that the State Government has been accused by the Deputy Mayor of Redcliffe of obstinately refusing to conform to Redcliffe City Council by-laws on the provision of parking facilities for the new Redcliffe Community Health Centre?

(2) Is the requirement of 130 parking spaces for the centre a ridiculous one and typical of the council, which is renowned for poulticing every new development in the city with stringent requirements?

(3) Is he aware that the council has not required adequate parking facilities for many other projects and has on numerous occasions bent the by-laws to suit favoured people, yet attempts to flog the State Government for all it can get?

*Answers:—*

(1) No.

(2) The provision of 130 vehicular parking spaces is not justified.

(3) No.

12. HORNIBROOK HIGHWAY AND VIADUCT

**Mr. Frawley**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) Is he aware that after last Saturday's termination of the toll on the Hornibrook Highway, the President of the Clontarf Branch of the Australian Labor Party made a statement to "The Redcliffe Herald" newspaper in which he said "Heaven help Queensland if the Minister for Main Roads, Mr. Hinze, ever became State Premier", and also accused the Minister of demonstrating once again to the citizens of Redcliffe the brazen dishonesty and hypocrisy of the Queensland Government?

(2) Could the A.L.P., whilst it was in power in this State, have terminated the toll and commenced construction of a new viaduct?

(3) Why cannot the State Government find the money to construct a new crossing?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) The president of the Clontarf branch of the A.L.P. would have to be a nut. He resembles very much his counterpart in Canberra, namely, Charles Jones. I have just returned from Melbourne, where I found that Jones is about as popular as a pig in Jerusalem. He wouldn't have a friend in Australia. This fellow is in the same boat.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** You can't stand him, can you? He has been inflicted on your party and you've got him!

*Answer (contd.):—*

The Hornibrook Highway Order in Council in 1931 provided that another bridge could not be built within three miles of the present bridge without submitting the proposal to a Board and involving possible compensation. The State Government has completed designs for the new bridge but the severe reduction in urban arterial funds by the Commonwealth prevents funds being made available to commence the new bridge. The Deagon deviation is now being built, which fits in with the present and future bridge site. I have conveyed to Mr. Speaker (the honourable member for Redcliffe) and to the honourable member for Murrumba that I will do everything possible to commence the new bridge in conjunction with the Hornibrook Highway as quickly as funds become available. It will cost something like $6,000,000. We would have started on it by now only for the rotten Government in Canberra. It has fleeced $260,000,000 from the motorists and has given back $60,000,000, of which Queensland gets $13,000,000.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** I toss that back to the A.L.P.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I advise all honourable members that I will not tolerate behaviour similar to that which I have just witnessed. I warn all honourable members that I will deal with them under 123A. I will not tolerate persistent interjections on either side of the House when a Minister is on his feet.

13. REPLACEMENT OF SEYMOUR RIVER BRIDGE, BRUCE HIGHWAY

**Mr. Row,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

Do any plans exist for the replacement of the Seymour River Bridge on the Bruce Highway between Ingham and the foot of the Cardwell Range?

*Answer:*—

There are three concrete bridges on the Seymour River and channels and there are no immediate plans for replacement of these bridges. A more flood-free route is being investigated from the Herbert River Bridge to the foot of the Cardwell Range, but this could not be built in the immediate future—again for the same reason.

14. HEALTH PRECAUTIONS FOR TORRES STRAIT ISLANDERS

**Mr. Lindsay,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries—

(1) Is he aware of the outbreak of influenza throughout Papua New Guinea, which has already resulted in over 100 deaths?

(2) Does the physical make-up of Torres Strait Islanders make them vulnerable to bronchial infections of this type and, if so, will he supplement the existing medical facilities at Boigu and Saibai Islands, in view of the extreme danger of infection to the Islanders resulting from their close proximity to and regular association with Papua New Guinea?

*Answers:*—

(1) Yes.

(2) No peoples are resistant to epidemic-type influenza. The medical well-being of the Torres Strait Islanders is subject to continuing oversight by Government medical officers based at Thursday Island with direct radio contact to each inhabited centre. Medical aid posts staffed by trained sisters or nursing aides are established at each island and necessary treatments prescribed. In addition, at islands with air-strips, trained nursing sisters are stationed operating to surrounding islands with ambulance speedboats, and regular clinics are provided. A new centre has been completed at Saibai and within the next two weeks trained sisters will take up duty servicing Saibai, Boigu and Dauan. An effective immunisation campaign, including periodic immunisation against influenza for sections of the population regarded as being "at risk", has been undertaken. I can assure the honourable member that a close oversight is maintained and will continue, to ensure that the maximum possible medical services and facilities are available at all times to the inhabitants.

15. UNIFORM TRAFFIC LAWS

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

(1) What action is being taken by him to obtain uniformity in the road laws of the eastern States?

(2) Is it correct that in New South Wales a "Stop" sign also means that a driver must give way, whilst in Queensland once a driver has stopped his vehicle he may continue his journey and has right of way over any vehicles on his left?

(3) As this causes some confusion, especially for New South Wales drivers in Queensland, will he raise this matter with his ministerial counterpart in New South Wales with a view to obtaining the desired uniformity?

*Answer:*—

(1 to 3) I would refer the honourable member to the answer given on 22 April this year to a similar question by the honourable member for Sandgate. All I can add is that the matter has not yet been resolved at a national level.

16. VALIUM

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

(1) What research has been undertaken into the reason why people take drugs such as valium?

(2) Has valium become Queensland's most widely prescribed drug, with over 4½ million prescriptions for it being written in Australia last year?

(3) Does the drug have any remedial qualities or does it only patch over the real causes of emotional disturbances?

(4) What results have been achieved by the medical programme which asks doctors not to prescribe some specific items recommended in the drug company brochures?

(5) Is valium addictive, either psychologically or physically?

*Answers:*—

(1) Many research programmes of various natures have been conducted in regard to the use of valium (diazepam). Indeed, a study of the effects of this drug was carried out at Wolston Park Hospital and completed in 1967. The study was undertaken in conjunction with other anti-convulsants to examine the anti-convulsant properties of this drug.

(2) Yes.

(3) Valium has definite remedial qualities and is effective in a variety of disorders when appropriately prescribed in adequate dosage.

(4) I do not know the medical programme referred to by the honourable member.

(5) Yes, sometimes psychologically and very rarely physically.

17. NEW SOUTH WALES FOOD SHORTAGES

**Mr. Doumany,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs—

In view of reports that many Sydney supermarkets and grocery stores will be out of some food stocks by the end of this week because of warehouse bans and stoppages, will he investigate this situation and inform the House as to any repercussion which may be anticipated in Queensland?

*Answer:—*

Inquiries made from the Retailers Association of Queensland and the Retail Traders Association (Qld.) of Grocers, Drapers and General Stores reveal that there is nothing to indicate that a situation is likely to develop in Queensland similar to that which has occurred in Sydney.

18. USE OF HALONS IN FIRE EXTINGUISHERS

**Mr. Doumany,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs—

(1) Will he give urgent consideration to the speedy adoption of the newly developed fire-extinguishing chemical agencies called halons, which combine high fire-extinction proficiency with low toxicity and leave virtually no residues?

(2) In particular, will he investigate this matter in relation to fire precautions in boats and pleasure craft?

*Answers:—*

(1) Halcon 1211, commonly known as B.C.F. and conforming with the description in the question, is in widespread use throughout the world. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that there are other types of fire-extinguishing agents with comparable advantages and there is no justification to prefer one to another in all circumstances.

(2) The requirements for pleasure craft are covered by the Navigation (Equipment of Pleasure Yachts) Regulations of 1971, which are administered by my colleague the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services, to whom I have referred this proposal for his consideration and reply direct to the honourable member.

19. TRANSFER OF FIRMS—MADLO, MARA, LYRA, NARRAN AND NINA

**Mr. K. J. Hooper,** pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) With regard to the proprietary companies of Madlo, Mara, Lyra, Narran and Nina, were they all transferred to a certain organisation and the directors and shareholders changed accordingly? If so, what is the name of the certain company and who were the shareholders and directors prior to transfer?

(2) Is he aware that after the transfer the five companies were used to wilfully avoid pay-roll tax by splitting their register in this direction, thus gaining the statutory allowance of $28,000 and, if so, what action is likely to be taken?

*Answers:—*

(1) Owing to the operation of section 5 of the Pay-roll Tax Act, which prohibits the disclosure of information obtained by the commissioner and his staff in the course of administering the Act, it would not be appropriate for me to give the details sought by the honourable member regarding particular companies and individuals.

(2) Without referring to any particular companies, I am able to say that I have been aware of action taken in some cases to split company structures so that what was previously the pay-roll of a single company is now divided among several companies with each one claiming the benefit of the general exemption under the Pay-roll Tax Act. This has been a problem in all States and considerable effort has been directed towards the preparation of legislation which will prevent advantage being taken of such an arrangement. The problem may, of course, become more acute with the doubling of the pay-roll tax exemption as promised in my recent Budget speech. However, to ensure that what I might well describe as the shrewd operator does not deprive the State of revenue and gain an advantage over his fellow man, I propose that, in conjunction with the legislation giving effect to the increased exemptions, amendments will be introduced which ensure that the benefit of the exemption is obtained only once in respect of the one undertaking irrespective of the number of company structures involved.

20. MORETON REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY INVESTIGATION

**Mr. K. J. Hooper,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

Did a subcommittee of the Steering Committee of the Moreton Regional Growth Strategy Investigation form a deputation which met with the Director of Local Government to request that town plans in the course of preparation for a number of local authorities, and particularly for the Brisbane City Council, be deferred until after the completion of the Regional Growth Strategy Investigation and, if so, what was the outcome of those discussions?

*Answer:*—

A subcommittee of the steering committee met the Director of Local Government and me relative to the matter referred to by the honourable member. In view of the uncertainty as to the date of completion of the study, it was decided that the preparation of town-planning schemes then in course of preparation, including the proposed new Brisbane Town Plan, should proceed. If deemed necessary, the town-planning schemes can be amended in the light of information contained in the report on the study.

21. OPENING OF NEW TOWNSVILLE COURTS OF LAW

**Mr. K. J. Hooper,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Will he list the names of those State public servants who will be travelling to Townsville for the opening of the North Queensland courts of law on Friday?

(2) Will any of these State public servants' wives be accompanying them and will their fares and expenses be paid by the State Government?

(3) What will be the total cost of air fares and expenses of State public servants and any other people who are travelling to the court opening at Government expense?

*Answers:*—

(1) So far as the Department of Justice is concerned—Mr. N. Langford, Under Secretary; Mr. W. May, Assistant Under Secretary; Mr. C. Pearson, Executive Officer, Legal Division; Mr. J. L. Harrison, Accountant; Mr. T. Parslow, Q.C., Solicitor-General; and Mr. V. G. McMahon, Crown Solicitor.

(2) Invitations to the function did not include officers' wives.

(3) Travelling allowances, dependent upon the duration of absence from Brisbane, will be paid at the rates prescribed by the Public Service Regulations.

22. REGISTRAR OF SUPREME AND DISTRICT COURTS, CAIRNS

**Mr. Jones,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) Is he aware that District and Supreme Court work in Cairns is presently of higher incidence than it is in other large centres such as Rockhampton, which has an appointed registrar?

(2) If so, will he have this situation investigated with a view to having appropriate appointments made and/or districts varied?

*Answers:*—

(1) The volumes of Circuit Court and District Courts work transacted at Cairns and Rockhampton are comparable.

(2) Provision has been made in the Department's Estimates for 1975-76 for the appointment of an additional classified officer to perform registry work in these jurisdictions. Action will shortly be taken for the creation of the position and the advertising of the vacancy.

23. POLICE FIELD INTERROGATION REPORTS

**Mr. Jones,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Police—

(1) Are field interrogation reports still undertaken by police and filed at police headquarters?

(2) If so, is any check required relative to previous criminal records of persons so accosted and questioned, or are all names still being printed out and filed regardless of the previous clean records of those so interrogated?

(3) Is the practice to continue as an efficiency exercise for over-zealous policemen, or has the project become a requirement for a police State?

*Answers:*—

(1) Yes.

(2 and 3) I would refer the honourable member to my answer to his question of 20 March 1975.

24. HEALTH PROGRAMME FOR TORRES STRAIT ISLANDERS WHO VISIT DARU

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

In view of the appalling deterioration in both the medical facilities and the qualified staff which I observed on a recent visit to Daru in Papua New Guinea, compared with that which existed when I previously visited the area, will he give consideration to the implementation of an innoculation programme against diseases such as cholera and smallpox for Torres Strait Islanders from Saibai, Dauan and Boigu and other Queenslanders who regularly visit this overcrowded tropical area?

*Answer:*—

The Government Medical Officer, Thursday Island, maintains close oversight on the health of all Torres Strait people and a health immunisation programme has been operative throughout the area for many years embracing all of the general vaccinations including smallpox. Because of the short period of immunity conveyed, vaccination against cholera is not provided. Malaria is the only disease of concern and steps were taken to raise this matter with the Commonwealth Government through the medium of the Federal-States

conference held in Sydney on 25 August 1975 proposing that an approach be made to the Government of Papua New Guinea to discuss the implementation of a control programme for malaria in the southern area of Papua south and west of the Fly River in order to minimise the risk of entry of this disease into the Torres Strait islands and Northern Australia. There is already an ongoing malaria control programme dealing with the other Torres Strait islands mentioned, which includes seasonal spraying, early case detection, treatment of cases and focal spraying in response to any case which occurs.

25. CONSUMER SUBSIDIES AND INFLATION

**Mr. McKechnie,** pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

With reference to his answer to a question on 7 October when he said that he wondered why the Commonwealth Government will not accept the old Australian Labor Party policy of consumer subsidies, is the Whitlam Government made up of a group of theorists who are determined to use inflation as a weapon to destroy freedom in Queensland and the rest of Australia?

*Answer:—*

I would agree with the honourable members' assessment of the situation because is is quite clear that the policies of the Federal Labor Government are directed to those ends and that the philosophies they pursue have brought about the present devastation of the Australian way of life. Surely we were given solid proof of the real value of the theories of Mr. Whitlam and his colleagues in Thursday's Press, when it was announced that the Commonwealth deficit for the first three months of the 1975-76 financial year was almost $1,900 million. This is twice the deficit for the same period last year, and surely that was bad enough! And then the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Hayden, goes on record as saying that this is good news—that if the deficit got larger, that would be "a welcome result consistent with a much healthier situation in the economy." If that is socialist theory, if that is socialist economics, then all I can say is this: let us put someone in Canberra who knows something about Government and something about the financing of Government!

26. DEVELOPMENT OF NORTH WEST ISLAND AS TOURIST RESORT

**Mr. Hanson,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service—

(1) With reference to the announcement concerning North West Island, will he make available to me any report, feasibility studies and relevant data which have a bearing on the Government's intention to call world-wide tenders for the island's tourist development?

(2) As there has been a ready and immediate objection to the Government's intention, has a comprehensive environmental impact study been made of the area, including the whole of the Capricorn and Bunker Island group?

(3) As I was responsible, by persistently raising the matter, for having the unwarranted practice bombing attacks by the Navy and R.A.A.F. on the adjacent Fairfax Island stopped, will he supply me with copies of any environmental study so that a clear, concise, non-emotive, non-fanatical study can be made of the whole project by interested parties?

*Answers:—*

(1) In 1966, the Government's Inter-Departmental Committee on Leasing and Development of Queensland Islands furnished a report and, of course, North West Island, as one of hundreds of islands, was mentioned therein. I presume, of course, that the honourable member, in view of his particular interest in some of these islands, at least would have in his possession a copy of that report.

(2 and 3) As Minister for Lands in Queensland, my portfolio does not encompass the administration of the Royal Australian Navy or the Royal Australian Air Force, but I inform the honourable member that the decision to call applications from parties who might be interested in the development of a Barrier Reef resort was taken on the basis of testing the availability, enthusiasm and capabilities of prospective applicants in the considered opinion that, by so doing, no injustice would be done to any other resort proprietor in the region. I assure the honourable member that any or all applications received will be very thoroughly investigated and considered in the light of environmental factors in respect of which the relevant legislation in the State of Queensland embodies the most enlightened yardsticks in the Australian nation.

27. BAN ON FIRE-HAZARD FABRICS FOR CHILDREN'S NIGHTWEAR

**Mrs. Kyburz,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs—

(1) Is he aware that the Victorian Government will ban the making and sale of children's nightwear containing high-fire-hazard fabrics from 1 November?

(2) Will he consider imposing a similar stringent ban, as manufacturers are now preparing next winter's range?

*Answers:—*

(1) Yes.

(2) This matter was discussed at the recent conference of Ministers for Consumer Affairs when the Victorian Minister

reported on the action proposed by Victoria in this regard. All States have uniform legislation covering the labelling of children's nightwear as to inflammability. However, all State Minister for Consumer Affairs agreed that the action proposed by Victoria was desirable and that all of the other States would examine tthe Victorian regulations with a view to seeing whether it would be practicable for them to be implemented on a uniform basis throughout Australia. I can assure the honourable member that I and my officers are fully alert to the situation and the Victorian regulations are presently being actively examined.

28. LOCAL AUTHORITY STUDY OF GARBAGE DISPOSAL METHODS

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

Will he negotiate with the Commonwealth Government for funding by that Government of environmental impact studies in each local government area, into the effects of suggested alternative means of disposal of wet garbage by burial, incineration, disposal into existing sewerage schemes on coastal and inland streams, destruction using 5 per cent caustic soda and dry rending before feeding to pigs?

*Answer:*—

I have always recognised that some local authorities will have a problem in disposing of garbage. For this reason I, and my officers, have had a number of discussions with representatives of local authorities. The honourable the Premier is in charge of environmental impact studies and I will discuss with him the possibility of such an approach to the Commonwealth.

29. TEACHERS AT INNISFAIL, TOOWOOMBA AND CAIRNS

**Mr. Jensen,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

How many teachers have been appointed since 7 December 1974 at Innisfail, Toowoomba and Cairns, from which primary and secondary schools or training colleges were they transferred and what were their qualifications?

*Answer:*—

Collation of the information requested by the honourable member would require the diversion of officers of my department from other duties for some time. I do not feel that such diversion of office staff is justified, and therefore I do not propose to instruct that the information be collated.

30. OVERCROWDING AT BRACKEN RIDGE STATE SCHOOL

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

What provision is made in the 1975-76 programme for the alleviation of overcrowding problems at the Bracken Ridge State School?

*Answer:*—

Bracken Ridge State School has been included in the 1975-76 works programme for six teaching spaces with withdrawal area, the completion of an administration block and the completion of a free-standing library.

31. EXTENSION OF RAIL SERVICES TO PETRIE

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

Will he investigate the extension to Petrie of train services which terminate at Strathpine and so provide a greater service to the many new residents of Lawnton and Petrie?

*Answer:*—

It is departmental practice to watch constantly for movement in patronage of rail services, and where need for alteration in schedules is indicated and some re-arrangement is practicable, action is taken accordingly. The residential development of the area to which the honourable member refers is evident, and investigations are being made into the practicability of improving the frequency of trains to cater for the increasing population. The honourable member's representations earlier in the year in support of requests for extension of services to Petrie have been noted and he will be informed of the result of the investigation as soon as it is completed.

32. TRAFFIC FLOW THROUGH KALLANGUR

**Mr. Akers,** pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

Is the proposal to allow traffic from the second stage of the Bald Hills-Burpengary deviation to flow through residential streets of Kallangur to be reviewed, to alleviate the danger to Kallangur residents created by the present proposal?

*Answer:*—

Traffic will be able to proceed to Kallangur or via Redcliffe Road to Burpengary. There is only a very small difference in mileage by either route. The matter will be carefully watched and, if necessary, traffic will be encouraged to proceed via Redcliffe Road. The next

stage from Redcliffe Road to Burpengary, which bypasses Kallangur, is now under construction.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### DELEGATION OF MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY

**Mr. BURNS:** I ask the Leader of the House: For the benefit of members who might wish to ask questions without notice today, will he please advise the House which Ministers are carrying which proxy portfolios for the 50 per cent of his colleagues who are missing?

**Mr. HODGES:** Ask and you shall receive.

### WITHDRAWAL OF R.E.D. FUNDS

**Mr. DOUMANY:** I ask the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport: Is it true that many earnest and hard-working community groups have been lumbered with uncompleted, white-elephant projects following the abrupt withdrawal of R.E.D. funds by the Commonwealth Government? Will he give consideration to requests from such abandoned and disillusioned groups for special State Government assistance?

**Mr. HERBERT:** Recently I was in Cairns receiving deputations on behalf of Cabinet from interested groups. Half the deputations were from organisations which had part-completed projects in respect of which they had received telegrams cancelling the approvals previously given under the R.E.D. scheme. All over the North, in particular, organisations that are half way through projects—some of them very expensive projects —are now stuck with a white elephant. All the deputations asked the obvious one—whether the State would pick up the tab. It is more than obvious from the financial position indicated by the Treasurer that we are just not in the position to take over often ill-conceived projects that were approved by the Federal Government without investigation. North Queensland seems to be the area that has suffered most. That area has had the problem of getting materials sometimes all the way from Melbourne. It takes a long time for materials to be transported all the way to the North. I understand that some of the organisations have real problems. One of them told me that it has a very large amount of material ordered in the South. It cannot cancel those orders but its finance has been cancelled. Quite logically it asked me who was going to pay for it. It is not our problem; certainly it is not a problem of our making. It is very definitely one for the Federal Government, having given approval for a project and then cancelling it later. Dimbulah is one of the areas with a very specific problem.

The over-all situation is that we are unable through our funds to meet the commitments entered into by the various local authorities. I only hope that it registers with them that the manna from heaven promised by the Whitlam Government has gone very sour. All the State Government can do now is try to salvage some of the smaller projects; the bigger ones will become monuments to an inefficient Government in Canberra. I would suggest that next time Mr. Whitlam wants to look at some ruins he need not take a big jet overseas but can go to North Queensland in particular and have a look at some of the ruins established by the R.E.D. scheme in that part of the State.

### BREAST CANCER

**Mrs. KYBURZ:** I ask the Minister for Health:

(1) Is the incidence of breast cancer increasing in Queensland?

(2) Do the number of patients who suffer from breast cancer constitute a high proportion of all cancer sufferers?

(3) Can he offer women any advice as to the prevention of breast cancer and early diagnosis of the disease?

(4) What steps has the State Government taken to make people aware of early diagnosis procedures for all forms of cancer and to give general advice on the disease?

**Dr. EDWARDS:** I am not sure of the figures, but it is recognised by doctors and medical authorities throughout Australia that the incidence of breast cancer, and indeed of all types of malignancies, is very high. The Queensland Government is well aware of the marked effect that early diagnosis can have on the long-term results of cancer in women, and, in association with the Cancer Fund, it has embarked upon a long-term education programme. The Cancer Fund, for example, has held lectures and seminars for women, and recently one such seminar in the Brisbane City Hall was attended by no fewer than 3,000 women.

The message that we would like to get across to women not only in Queensland but in Australia as well is that there is a need for women to undertake self-examination of their breasts, and to help get the message across the Health Education Council has published a pamphlet instructing women as to the procedure to be followed in such an examination. A very important factor is that early diagnosis of cancer of the breast, or carcinoma of any organ in the human body, can lead in many cases to 100 per cent cure. Such results have been achieved in the treatment of breast cancer.

I will take the opportunity of forwarding the honourable member some information on this matter. If the people in her area are particularly interested in an education programme, we will take steps to see if it can be instituted. I inform the House that this year the Queensland Cancer Fund decided to adopt as its slogan—"Cancer is a word, not a sentence." As a result of our education

programme, we hope that cancer will be diagnosed at a much earlier stage so that the results can be much better for the community.

DISCLOSURE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS' PECUNIARY INTERESTS

**Mr. MELLOY:** In asking the Deputy Premier and Treasurer a question without notice, I draw his attention to the speech made in this House on Wednesday by the honourable member for Merthyr. Will he, in accordance with the honourable member's request, take the necessary steps to make it mandatory for all honourable members to declare all of their shareholdings and directorships?

**Sir GORDON CHALK:** I think I recall the remarks made by the honourable member, which were reported in the Press. I have always believed that a person's conscience is his guide. Whenever Cabinet has considered matters in which a Minister has had an involvement, a declaration has always been made. I do not believe that we have to get down to placing before the public all of our personal activities. People in the business community can invest in shares or engage in other activities without having to tell their neighbours what they are doing. Parliamentarians, particularly Ministers, who want investments have no avenue open to them other than investment in a company or companies. Personally I have never hidden the fact that I have investments. I have not hidden that fact from my Cabinet colleagues. I do not advocate that the affairs of an individual should be thrown open to investigation by outside parties.

RE-OPENING OF STATE PUBLIC SERVICE WAGE CASE

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: In view of the fact that yesterday the Queensland State Service Union lodged an application with the Industrial Commission for a re-opening of the State Public Service wage case—

1. Will the Government do all in its power to expedite the hearing?

2. What is his Government's attitude to the union's claim?

3. Will the Government be represented in the commission for the case?

**Sir GORDON CHALK:** In answer to the first portion of the question, I indicate that the Government will do all within its power to ensure that this matter is heard as quickly as possible. As to the other parts of the question, it is not usual to indicate Government policy in the House.

LECTURE BY CHARLES PERKINS TO STUDENTS AT DARLING DOWNS INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I ask the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities: Is he aware that yesterday Mr. Charles Perkins, the so-called Aboriginal leader, lectured students at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education, Toowoomba? Did Mr. Perkins or any of his advisers inform the Minister that he would be visiting the college? Does the Minister think that schools and colleges should be used as forums by people such as Mr. Perkins, who is financed by the Communist Party of Australia, to expound his radical philosophies?

**Mr. BIRD:** I am not aware of the visit by Mr. Perkins to the Darling Downs institute. Certainly there was no indication to me that he would be visiting the institute. Therefore I do not know the purpose of his visit and I am unable to give very much information on the matter.

However, I can assure all honourable members that I have every confidence that the great majority of students at the institute are so aware of the politics of the day that they would take little or no notice of anything Mr. Perkins had to say to them there.

APPLICATION BY STATE SERVICE UNION FOR FLOW-ON OF WAGE INDEXATION DECISION

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I ask the Deputy Premier and Treasurer: In view of the State Government's expressed support for the concept of wage indexation, can he give an assurance that the application by the State Service Union for a flow-on of the 3.5 per cent wage indexation decision will not be opposed by the Queensland Government?

**Sir GORDON CHALK:** I have already answered a question from another honourable member along somewhat the same lines. I inform the honourable member that in matters of this nature it is not usual to indicate policy before an application is made.

## LOCAL BODIES' LOANS GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK** (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Act 1923–1973 for the purpose of making special validating provision in relation to certain borrowings by local bodies and certain guarantees by the Treasurer with respect to such borrowings, and for purposes incidental thereto."

Motion agreed to.

## INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### SECOND READING

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs) (12.3 p.m.): I move—

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

In winding up the debate at the introductory stage, I replied to most points raised by honourable members and I will now deal with the remaining points.

The pertinent provisions contained in the Bill are—

(A) The repeal of the present section 98 which requires a secret ballot to be taken before a strike shall be deemed to be authorised.

(B) The repeal of section 99 which is concerned with the procedure in implementing the existing section 98.

These sections, which were appropriate in 1961, now in 1975 have proved to be totally ineffective and are redundant and, as stated during the introductory stage, it is proposed to replace these two sections with entirely new sections 98 and 99.

The principal reason for the ineffectiveness of the present sections is considered to be that before a strike ballot can be taken it is necessary for an approach to be made to the Industrial Commission by a party involved or affected for approval to conduct a secret ballot. They have become redundant because parties declined to take necessary action offered to them under these provisions.

The new section recognises the right of the work-force to strike and provides machinery whereby the Industrial Commission which, as the honourable members know, is a completely free and independent industrial tribunal, free from political interference and control, and which, on its own initiative, and at its discretion, may and shall when 20 per cent of those employees at the place of the strike or an industrial union of employees so request, conduct a secret ballot to ascertain whether those on strike desire to return to work. It is considered that this will give the rank and file a free and unfettered opportunity by means of a secret ballot to express their desires.

Furthermore, complaints have been received from trade-unionists that irregularities in some cases were occurring in ascertaining at a meeting the views of the rank and file in relation to the continuation of a strike. The legislation is also designed to meet such a situation.

Another point to which I desire to refer is the concern expressed regarding the removal of the device available under the present legislation, which permits members of an unregistered union to have access to the Industrial Commission for award-making purposes. The one organisation which has been making use of this provision is the unregistered Fire Fighters Union. In this regard I would stress that this body has made six applications for registration and all of these have been rejected, as have six appeals to the Full Industrial Court against such refusal. The registered union recognised by the commission as covering firemen in this State is the Australian Workers Union and it is to remove this duality of representation that this action is being taken. To permit the present situation to continue would make the provisions concerning the recognition by the Industrial Commission of registered trade unions untenable.

Subsequently, the Press reported that the parliamentary debate on the provisions of the Bill ranged from an accurate understanding of the Legislation to such ridiculous charges that it was union-bashing and fascist. It was also suggested in the Press—and apparently believed by many people—that the Bill had been withdrawn. There is, of course, a world of difference between deferment and withdrawal.

I ask the House: Do the people of Queensland disagree with the Industrial Commission's being empowered to seek the opinion of the work-force on strike as part of a normal process during a dispute? Do the people of Queensland believe in the use of industrial muscle in determining an issue in dispute, or do they believe in determination by democratic process by the means of a secret ballot? Do the people of Queensland believe that employees in a strike situation should be entitled to police protection when there is a possibility of violence?

A number of Opposition members have raised the question as to difficulties that could arise in respect of districts for the secret ballots. Having now had an opportunity to study the Bill, they should realise that there are no longer any references to districts and that the ballots are provided for at the establishments where the strike occurs.

Following from this, some honourable members have posed the question as to what would happen where Federal and State awards apply in the same establishment. The situation here, of course, is that State ballot legislation under such circumstances could not apply in Federal jurisdiction. But this legislation, if it is successful in its implementation, would be a reliable example to other jurisdictions, which could be expected to respond speedily with comparable enactments.

Where a Federal award predominates, it is unlikely that the State Commission would order a ballot; nor would there be a request from 20 per cent of the employees or from an industrial union of employees. So in those circumstances the possibility of a ballot would be remote.

The Leader of the Opposition has raised the point as to the position if the strike ballot were boycotted. I can hardly imagine

a situation arising where employees in many circumstances would not welcome the opportunity of casting a secret vote when provided with such protection. Recent experience has shown this to be so in many instances.

Obviously, if it was evident that the whole work-force on strike did not want any say in the future of the strike, there would not be any agitation from 20 per cent of the workers or from the relevant union. The Industrial Commissioners are realistic enough not to direct a strike ballot in these circumstances. But if it were an engineered boycott, it could be dealt with as would be appropriate in the circumstances.

The Leader of the Opposition also suggested that ballot-papers could be forwarded to the worker, who could then discuss the issue in the home with his wife and post in his ballot-paper. I am sure that the import of this legislation would encourage such discussion between the worker and his wife when industrial problems occur.

The fact that postal voting is not permitted also removes the possibility of physical coercion, which the Leader of the Opposition appears to be canvassing when he advocates postal voting. The legislation will see that the voter is able to record his vote without possible coercion.

Again the Leader of the Opposition says the ballot-box will create a picket line. I stress that there is nothing to prevent the peaceful picketing of a plant or establishment; but such picketing will not be permitted when the ballot is being conducted.

The Government sees the normal conciliatory processes of the commission as operating in every instance. It is only in extreme situations, when other avenues have been explored, that it should be necessary to utilise these provisions.

It is the objective of these provisions to obtain, free from duress, the democratic opinion of those who are on strike. This is why the powers conferred on police when a ballot is being taken are being bestowed upon them—that is, to ensure that there will be no obstruction to those seeking to record their vote, when it is believed that such a situation might arise.

The member for Port Curtis (Mr. Hanson) queried the period before which the 20 per cent of the employees can call for a secret ballot. There is no limiting period in the legislation, and it is competent for the 20 per cent to ask for a ballot once a strike situation exists.

The member for Windsor says he sees as a short-coming of the legislation that it does nothing to prevent a strike lasting a fortnight. As I have already said, we would expect the conciliation arbitral processes of the Industrial Commission to be applied before the strike ballot situation operates.

There have been claims that the Bill in some way severely restricts the right of entry of union officials to a plant. Nothing has been taken away from union officials in this regard. There is only the requirement that the union official, upon entering the premises, should make his presence known to the employer or his representative. His encouragement to do so is to ensure that he does not become a trespasser.

One feature of the Bill that attracted favourable comment from both sides of the Chamber was the extension of the period for recovery of arrears of wages to 12 months. This has subsequently received endorsement by employer organisations.

One point that the honourable member for Rockhampton North mentioned, when referring to sweetheart agreements, was that by the legislation the Government was saying that there would be no more collective bargaining. This is not in accordance with the facts. What the legislation does say is that there will be supervision on collective bargaining in accordance with guide-lines established by the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission and which the State commission no doubt will take into account in exercising such supervision.

Honourable members have now had the opportunity to study this Bill, which introduces democratic decisions into a strike situation; a Bill that removes the status of illegality that presently attaches to strikes; a Bill that will prevent the use of industrial muscle; a Bill that confers long service leave benefits to Queensland workers that generally are not available elsewhere in Australia; a Bill that ensures union officials will extend common courtesy to employers when they visit the employer's premises; a Bill that will ensure that union members are not railroaded out of their membership by perverse union officials; a Bill that will, at the same time, ensure that the same officials will not unreasonably withhold membership from persons entitled to it.

Those are, in the main, the measures in this Bill which is now before honourable members for more detailed consideration.

**Mr. YEWDALE** (Rockhampton North) (12.13 p.m.): On behalf of the Opposition I will repeat our objections to the legislation before the House. In doing so I repeat the remarks of the Minister when he quoted the State Treasurer as saying in November 1974—

> "My Government has a good labour relations record and now proposes a new system of secret ballots . . ."

At that time the Treasurer went on to say that it was obvious that the penal provisions against workers who engaged in strikes needed updating. If nothing else, the Government has fulfilled a promise to legislate against workers in Queensland.

I will elaborate briefly on the comments and attitude of the Minister in recent times when he has publicly stated that he is accessible; he is flexible; he is available, and

he is prepared to talk to all sorts of people in all sorts of places about his industrial portfolio. It would seem to me that in this particular case he talked to nobody. He didn't talk to the trade union movement. He didn't talk to the Industrial Commission. In fact, he did not talk to anybody about the legislation. It was a fait accompli. He introduced the Bill and said, "Here it is, boys. You cop it."

The leading speaker supporting the Minister was the honourable member for Toowong. He stood up here and elaborated on what should be done to trade-unionists; he told us how they should be shackled and bound down by this legislation because of their actions. For the interest of honourable members and everybody else, I point out that he is the same gentleman who, in the 1940's, very often frequented an area of Currumbin Creek, and was known as a fellow traveller and a secret card-holder of the Communist Party. At that time he was selling war bonds and moving about the country. It has been said before, and never refuted, that the honourable member for Toowong was a secret card-holder and a fellow traveller. He is the gentleman who gets up to support the Minister in this type of legislation.

The Minister probably talked to a lot of uninformed people about this legislation, and it would seem to me that he also indicated to some of his committee members and supporters in the Chamber, as was revealed by the member for pigswill—I mean, the member for Callide—that he spoke to a couple of miners.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I rise to a point of order. On behalf of the member for Callide I take exception to his being referred to as the member for pigswill, and ask that the comment be withdrawn.

**Mr. Houston:** You can't.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** It is unparliamentary.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Rockhampton North to withdraw the remark that was offensive to the honourable member for Murrumba.

**Mr. Houston:** It wasn't offensive to him; it didn't apply to him. I was trying to tell him that the member for Rockhampton North was not referring to him.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! If the honourable member for Rockhampton North was not referring to the honourable member for Murrumba, there is no valid point of order.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** The Minister and his committee, together with most Government members, are so far removed from the thinking of the trade union movement that it is not funny. This legislation is extremely provocative and unworkable, as was similar legislation introduced by this Government some years ago. The earlier legislation has never functioned. On the Minister's own admission, it was not workable and was not used. Now he has introduced amendments that, similarly, will not be workable and will not be used.

To deal with the principles of the Bill —I refer the House first to the objectionable provision that relates to secret ballots. Section 98 of the Act is being repealed and a new section is to be inserted. Part of it reads as follows:—

> "(1) Where a strike that involves a cessation of work occurs, the Commission—
>
> (a) may of its own motion; and
>
> (b) shall, upon the application of—
>
> (i) an industrial union of employees; or
>
> (ii) not less than 20 per centum of the employees engaged in the project, establishment or undertaking in which the strike has occurred,"

I direct the attention of honourable members to the phrase "may of its own motion". It calls for interpretation. If the Industrial Commission of its own motion directs the registrar to conduct a secret ballot, does either the registrar or the commission have to justify the action taken? This provision seems to me to give unfettered power to an individual in the first instance and the Industrial Commission in the second.

When is the commission or the registrar to decide that a secret ballot will be conducted? Is the decision to be arrived at the day after a strike has commenced or two days or 10 days after the commencement of the strike? Further, will the effect that a strike has on the community have any bearing on the decision arrived at? If so, it would seem that the more widespread the effects of a strike are the sooner the Industrial Commission will direct that a secret ballot be held. If a strike is not having a great effect on the community, perhaps the commission will allow it to proceed for a reasonably lengthy period before directing that a secret ballot be held. There seems to be a contradiction in that the commission will, as a matter of urgency, direct that a ballot be held if the strike is having an effect on the community but will not so direct if the strike is having little or no such effect.

What will happen if, as has occurred, an employer provokes the dispute in the first place? Will the Industrial Commission call on the employer to retract his statements or to correct his actions that led to the dispute? It would seem to me to be fair and just to have such an employer taken to task by the commission or the registrar. The Government cannot have it one way and not the other way, too.

From any angle, the Bill is an attempt by the Government to interfere in the domestic affairs of trade unions. The constitution and rules of many unions contain

provisions allowing the workers to conduct secret ballots if they decide to do so. Why is there such a sudden urge for the Minister or the Government to interfere? Simply because the anti-union elements in the Chamber, in a very amateurish and ignorant manner, arrived at the conclusion that the rank-and-file unionists want secret ballots. Nothing is further from the mark. They do not want secret ballots. Nobody in the Chamber can convince me that the majority of industrial workers are seeking secret ballots. The talk of domination of rank-and-file unionists by union officials is so far from the mark that it isn't funny. The rank and file is not being dominated by union officials.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** Government members who are barking and biting because they know what I say is factual do not know what happens in the trade union movement. They are so far away from what happens that it doesn't matter. Why don't they get out and talk to a few of them occasionally? Why don't they mix with them, try to understand their problems and work for them, rather than against them as in this legislation.

I shall now examine the ramifications of conducting a secret ballot, which the Minister said is in the best interests of the trade union movement. Just who is to vote in a ballot is not quite clear. No-one has explained who is to vote. The clause repealing and replacing section 99 is probably one of the worst provisions in the legislation. It relates to the secret-ballot provision. The new anti-picketing legislation strikes at one of the long-standing traditional activities of the trade union movement. This Government, with its very bad record in State police administration—and a virtual public relations crisis in this sphere—is legislating to direct police officers and a number of members of trade unions to take action against fellow unionists who, in the past, have been involved in picketing over a long period. On most occasions when picket lines have been formed, the police have supervised and the picket lines have been orderly and disciplined. Trade unions normally discipline their picket lines. It is obvious that at times there is a break in discipline but in most instances the police merely supervise picket lines. Members of unions who wish to stand in a passive picket line at the venue of a secret ballot will be denied that right under the legislation. I am clear on that point because the Minister said a moment ago that he is not denying unionists the right to picket a work place. I accept that point and I criticise it; that is what I am directing my comments at. The Minister need not shake his head. The Government is really saying, "You cannot, in a passive, peaceful, organised and disciplined way stand at a ballot venue and say—without physical involvement—'You are doing the wrong thing if you do not vote for the continuation—or otherwise—of this strike.'" While denying unionists that right, the Government is giving the police a legal right to pluck men from a picket line with the possibility of penalties up to $400 being imposed. That is just not on. The Government is only provoking the workers. If they decide to go to the venue of a secret ballot, they will do so while the law remains as it is. And the new law will not make any difference. The Government is only provoking the workers by sending in police to do what they will be forced to do under this legislation.

**Mr. Katter:** Where in this legislation does the honourable member see something banning picket lines?

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I am a little sorry for the ignorance of the honourable member from the bush. The Minister nodded his head in approval of my explanation about people picketing ballot places.

**Mr. Campbell:** I was just amazed at your interpretation, that's all.

**Mr. Katter:** I asked you where in this Bill there is any provision for the prosecution of people for standing in picket lines.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** Let me explain this to the honourable member, who is a bit thick in the head. He is trying to tell me that there is nothing in the Bill that prohibits any bona fide trade unionist and his friends or mates from standing in a position adjacent to a place that has been designated as the venue for a secret strike ballot which the court or registrar has ordered.

**Mr. Lamont:** You're paranoid.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** If that is not the case, the Minister a few moments ago said, "I make it quite clear that we are not denying pickets but we are denying them the right to gather at the place where the ballot is held."

**Mr. Lamont:** It allows some space for a bloke to go into the ballot-box without being jostled. They can picket within a reasonable distance.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** Come on! You've dropped your doll on the floor.

Another observation could be that in the event of a strike ballot for a return to work or a continuation of the stoppage resulting in a vote for a return to work, the Minister has indicated that the workers employed at the place of work will be allowed seven days to return to work. It will be recalled that I argued the likelihood of members or workers who did not return losing all privileges and rights they had accrued; but if one sits and thinks about this provision, a vote to return to work ballot could mean that the disgruntled members who voted against the return to work would then have the right to continue their disgruntlement and say, "We're going to sit out our seven

days. We're not going back to work tomorrow or the next day." The Government is virtually giving them another week to stay on strike. While some of the fellows will go back immediately, others have the right to go back after seven days. That seems to me to be a crazy provision.

**Mr. Katter:** The honourable member still hasn't answered my question.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members will refrain from persistent interjections. I advise the honourable member for Rockhampton North to refrain from answering interjections.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I am avoiding them as much as I can, Mr. Speaker.

There is another side of the story of a strike ballot. In the event of the ballot resulting in a decision to continue the stoppage or strike, what would be the action of the registrar or the court if, after the declaration of a continuation of the strike, some of the men decided to return to work after the ballot as industrial renegades?

**Mr. Lamont:** They can't.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** No. The Government or the Minister or the court will penalise the fellow who does not go back after seven days if the ballot is in favour of a return; but, if the ballot is in favour of a continuation of the strike, the action of the fellow who returns to work is condoned.

**Mr. Lamont:** No.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** Yes, that is so. The honourable member has just said that they will not do anything about it.

**Mr. Lamont:** I said that they can't go back to work under those circumstances. They have been told not to by their mates.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** The honourable member is trying to tell me that an employer will not accept a person returning to work?

**Mr. Lamont:** They wouldn't be able to work. They would be expelled from the union. You know that's true.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I would like to know what the court or the registrar would do about fellows who took that action.

I turn now to sections 11 and 29 of the I.L.O. constitution. To my mind those provisions are completely contradictory to what the Minister and his colleagues have been saying throughout the debate, and in all respects contravene Article 9, paragraph 3, of the I.L.O. constitution.

In referring to part of the legislation, the Minister very proudly said that he is implementing a section of the I.L.O. constitution decisions with regard to remunerations. Nobody argues with that. On the other hand, I think he must listen to argument when he is doing something in the legislation which contravenes the I.L.O. constitution. He wants to implement the sections that suit him but not those that don't suit him. For the interest of the House, I will quote from the relevant sections.

**Mr. Frawley:** Don't put all the blame on the Minister for that.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** The Minister has to accept responsibility. After all, he is the Minister in charge and he is introducing the legislation. If he did not want to introduce it, why didn't he have arguments strong enough to do away with it in the caucus instead of letting Government members talk him out of it?

The constitution reads—

> "The right to form and join trade unions or employers' associations is guaranteed to everybody in all occupations."

This article has for its purpose—"the protection and improvement of working conditions such as collective agreements, joint conciliation procedures for the settlement of labour disputes."

Under the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention of 1948 (No. 87) it is provided that—

> "Workers and employers, without distinction whatsoever, shall have the right to establish" (I stress that point) "and join organisations of their own choosing without previous authorisation."

I am referring specifically to the manner in which the Government is introducing this legislation basically for the express purpose of excluding an organisation in this State representing the fire-fighting section of our community. To my mind this clause is being introduced deliberately to eliminate this well-organised and highly respectable organisation.

The I.L.O. Convention continues—

> "Any suppression of such institution or practices would be unconstitutional, as would be the formation of workers' or employers' organisations that were under any sort of State control."

Any employers group, such as the Commercial Travellers' Association, has the right to form an organisation to protect the interests and to improve the way of life and the living standards of its members.

This organisation I am speaking about exists elsewhere than in Queensland. The United Fire Fighters Union has a State body in every State of Australia. It is highly organised. It knows the industry. It represents the fire fighters who are covered by the D.C.A. requirements at all major airports in Australia. In Queensland it has approximately 804 members, as against 140 members in the other organisation involved. The members joined that organisation of their own volition. Why did they join? I think this is a very pertinent question. To my mind they joined because they could see

in the functioning of the U.F.U. an organisation that would look to their interests and continue to look to them in a very special and separate way. It would seem to me that no other organisation in Australia would be more competent and better organised in the sense of controlling an organisation of people employed in one separate industry—fire-fighting.

**Mr. Katter:** You realise that by inference you are attacking the A.W.U.?

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I am not attacking the A.W.U. Those are the words of the honourable member for Flinders. I make it quite clear that the A.W.U. is not competent and is not geared to cater for fire fighters in this service. This is only one of the callings in which the A.W.U. has infringed.

I feel personally—and I am prepared to say this to anyone at any time—that an organisation such as the U.F.U. is the likely organisation to cater for fire fighters. As I said, it is a national organisation with a State body in each State. Over a period of many years it has argued and negotiated to improve the lot of fire fighters. Its members joined of their own volition. I cannot see any argument against what I am submitting. All I can see is that the Government, through this legislation, is attempting to eliminate this organisation in the interests of another organisation. I cannot be convinced otherwise.

**Dr. Lockwood:** Is it registered?

**Mr. YEWDALE:** Is it registered? For the life of me I cannot see why the Industrial Commission cannot accept that these people are bona fide workers in an industry that they cover, in the numbers they do, on a national and State basis in the sense of membership and organisation.

It is also the Opposition's view and the view of many people in the community that the objective of the Government is to destroy the U.F.U. The Government has lowered itself and is well down the ladder. It is passing this legislation in an expeditious manner to get rid of an organisation that has possibly caused it some concern.

I shall digress slightly and refer to the Rockhampton issue. The details are ponderous and I could speak on them for some time. The U.F.U. followed the course of law. It went through all possible legal channels. In most respects it was a very peaceful campaign. When Commissioner Birch published his findings and the U.F.U. case in the Rockhampton dispute was upheld —the union was declared to be bona fide— all of the workers were reinstated. So that is one of the turmoils in which they have been involved over many years. We find that those fellows from within an industry who are distinctly and entirely——

**Mr. Frawley:** That inquiry proved that the Rockhampton Fire Brigade Board are a bunch of gutless individuals.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** That's right. I agree with the honourable member because I have said plenty of things about the Rockhampton Fire Brigade Board. It has been suggested that if by chance anybody wanted to test the feeling of the fellows in the U.F.U. in Queensland and liked to put them to a secret ballot and ask whether they wanted to belong to the U.F.U. or the A.W.U., he would very readily find out to which organisation these fellows want to belong.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton North will now come back to the Bill.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** As I just said, I would confidently predict that if a secret ballot were held among the U.F.U. members in Queensland as to which organisation they preferred to be represented by, it is quite obvious they would choose the U.F.U.

I also want to refer to other sections of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act which relate to the rights of people in the community. Section 124 states—

> "(1) The Crown may intervene at any stage in any proceedings in the Court or the Commission or before an industrial magistrate.
>
> "(2) The Crown may intervene in any proceedings in any Court or judical tribunal touching or involving the jurisdiction of the Court or of the Commission or of the interpretation of this Act."

I am suggesting here that the Crown can interfere if it so wishes. Through this legislation the Government is going to debar the U.F.U. from registration as a union and not allow them to proceed in an orderly manner in protecting the interests of their members. Section 125 of the Act is headed "Representation of parties at hearing." and reads—

> "(1) On the hearing or determination of any proceedings under this Act whether before the Court or the Commission or an industrial magistrate, a party being an industrial union may be represented by a member or officer, and any party may be represented by his agent duly appointed in writing in that behalf."

Those are just a couple of sections of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act which conflict with the action the Government is now taking.

I wish to return now to the subject of secret ballots. The Minister stated today that the people organising unions, have not availed themselves of the strike ballot provisions.

**Mr. Campbell:** I didn't.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** That is my interpretation of what he said.

I suggest the Minister did say that he has decided to amend this legislation in the interests of everybody concerned, to give

the rank and file more say in the organisation of the union and to give them the right to vote on decisions which have been imposed on them by the trade union leaders.

I have some material here which dates back to a period after the previous legislation was introduced by Mr. Morris. It relates to the ballot that was conducted at Swanbank and the ones conducted at Calcap both on the project and on the site. I have a cutting here which states—

"Collinsville men vote Yes

"The T & LC Unions in early 1967 pressed on with the move for strike ballots, applying the machinery set out in the Act.

"'All attempts to conciliate were met with a blunt refusal by the company,' T & LC president J. Egerton told the Industrial Registrar.

"The outcome of the ballots was clear and emphatic: overwhelming votes in favour of strike action."

I can quote to honourable members figures which cannot be refuted. In the Swanbank ballot the vote for the strike was carried by 206 to 48.

**Mr. Lamont:** What does that prove?

**Mr. YEWDALE:** It proves that what the Minister is trying to do here in Queensland is to suggest to the community at large that secret ballots are something new, something that we want. We have secret ballots, and have had them for ever and a day. They have been used in the instances which I gave to honourable members. I suggest that when workers take industrial action, wherever it might be, they take it to create a disputation and an eventual stoppage of work because they feel this is the only way to prove their point. The Minister is arguing that they should be given a choice about whether they continue the strike after a certain period. To my mind they will make that decision as they have done in the past and as they will in the future.

**Mr. Lamont:** Let them.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** The thing is that it is not necessary.

I have not the figures—I did not have time to take them out—but if one looks at the duration of strikes in this State over a period, one will find that disputation does not continue for very long. Although the duration varies, I think the statement I have made is fairly valid. When there is a complete lock-out of workers and a strike lasts, say, one week, that is a fairly long strike these days.

When will the secret ballot be taken? To my mind, the ramifications of the procedure for a secret ballot could themselves delay the settlement of a strike. The workers, in their own environment and at their own meetings, by secret ballot or otherwise, will voluntarily decide whether or not to go back to work. I know from the feelings expressed by fellows at job level that they are not asking for secret ballots.

The honourable member for Callide said in this Chamber at the introductory stage—I missed this point earlier—that three miners in the hotel at Yeppoon had expressed their concern to him. The honourable member knows very little about the situation. The Miners' Union will not be covered by this legislation. In the coal-mining sphere, the union is predominantly covered by Federal legislation. Take the unions at the Trades Hall. The metal unions, the Waterside Workers' Federation and the Seamens' Union are all covered by Federal awards that will supersede this legislation, either now or later. The Government is saying, "We want to end all the disputation in the State." In fact, the legislation now before the House will not really cover very many people in Queensland. It will cover only those who are predominantly covered by State awards or sections of industries that are covered by State Awards.

Let us look at the areas of disputation in Queensland, Mr. Speaker. One finds that they are largely the metal area, the mining area, the building area and probably the waterfront area. None of these areas will be covered by the legislation that the Minister has introduced. Therefore, honourable members should not go out into the community and say that the Minister in Queensland is going to stop disputation, that he is going to have secret ballots and that he is going to have peace in industry. It is just not on; it will not happen.

The legislation will cover a soft-line area. It will cover many organisations in this State that are not traditionally militant and not known to take direct action or strike action. So in the legislation the Minister is really tilting at windmills.

The principle of the legislation against which I am arguing particularly is that clearly there is interference in the domestic affairs of the unions in this State. Each union has a constitution and a set of rules and standing orders relating to membership admissions, and so on; you name it, Mr. Speaker, and they cover it. These rules go to the Registrar of the State Industrial Court even though they are registered federally. Each set of rules is endorsed or stamped by the court. The court knows all about them and approves of them. That is done also in the case of Federal rules affecting Federal unions in Queensland. Do not let us say, Mr. Speaker, that we are doing something that is necessary. We do not know what should be done about it, in a sense, but we are saying that we want to have secret ballots.

The unions have handled their own domestic affairs for a long time. My personal experience and frequent observation has been that the vast majority of conscientious full-time and part-time trade union

officials spend a great deal of time trying to talk men back to work, not talk them off the job. At times their task is very difficult. As I said earlier, apparently a number of Government members do not know what is taking place at job levels in the industrial area.

There has been talk of domination and arm-twisting by trade union officials forcing men out of work. A trade union official had to go to Blackwater and induce the men there to go back to work and produce coal for the Swanbank Power Station. All honourable members saw the hangman's noose that was put up for him. He went out there for the express purpose of getting those fellows to move coal. That is the sort of trade union official that the Government accuses of trying to induce strike action. It is just not on!

I referred a few moments ago to ballots that had been conducted.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I think they have all finished.

Earlier I referred to ballots at Calcap, Swanbank and Collinsville. On every occasion on which a strike ballot was conducted, the decision was overwhelmingly in favour of the strike. I feel that that is a fairly good indication of the outcome of strike ballots. In that area, the unionists of the day probably were not as geared in their organisation as they are today. I think that unionists today probably would even more readily vote in favour of strike action than they did in those days.

I am not arguing against secret ballots. The trade union movement has had them for years. and it has used them in a number of ways. A fellow I was having a drink with yesterday said to me, "The secret ballot is a mania with the Government. Does Joh Petersen give the National Party fellows a secret ballot in caucus?" Does he?

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** No, he doesn't because he is not game to in some cases. We have a Government that advocates secret ballots for trade unionists, but not for its members in its own party caucus. The Premier is not game to do that.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I've got them jumping around. Why don't they call for a secret ballot in caucus next week?

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask honourable members on my left and also other honourable members in the Chamber to refrain from persistent interjections.

35

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I was talking about ballots, and as an example I refer briefly to the Swanbank ballot in 1960. I refer to the following extract:—

> "These ballots were declared. The decisions were positive support for strike action and support of the union leadership.
>
> "But did the result then make the strikes legal or authorised strikes?
>
> "It did not for the employers' representative, Mr. Ralph James, referring to the Collinsville dispute, then said that workers involved in the ballot conducted by the registrar were confused and did not know what they were voting for."

He supported the secret ballot; he supported the registrar's action; but when the men on the job decided to cease work the employers' representative said that they did not know what they were voting about, even after going through all the higgledy-piggledy of a secret ballot.

The transcript of the employers' submissions in the Calcap-Collinsville dispute proves exactly that, because they just would not accept it. Basically employers do not accept strikes. I can understand that, and I can accept it. They cannot be party to a situation and legislation, and then not accept it. Mr. James did not accept the Collinsville decision because, he said, the men did not know what they were voting about. That is so much poppycock. Everybody has his own ideas, and everybody has his own decisions to make; but when a group of trade unionists vote on a strike issue nobody can tell me that they do not know what they are voting about.

Earlier I made reference to the United Fire Fighters Union organisation. I feel very strongly about this. At the Committee stage, the Opposition will express concern and ask the Minister some questions. We will have something to say at that stage.

The legislation is provocative and unworkable. It is just as unworkable today as was the legislation in 1958. I feel that an underlying attempt is being made to create disputation in the trade union movement even at this time, or, alternatively, to use dissension at a time when it might be electorally advantageous. I firmly believe that that could happen, and that that could be the design. I give the assurance that the unions will do the same with this legislation as they did with the legislation in 1958. They are going to ignore it, and they will so express themselves even if 20 per cent of employees ask the registrar to ask the commission to conduct a secret ballot. They will go about it just as they have done over the years. They will continue to do the lobbying and agitating that they have engaged in. That is traditional.

If the Government believes that merely by putting this measure on the Statute Book it will solve industrial problems, it is a long way behind in its thinking. As I said earlier, the Bill will affect only a certain section of

the working class, a section that rarely enters into industrial disputes. The Bill simply will not work. I shall have more to say about it at the Committee stage.

**Mr. BERTONI** (Mt. Isa) (12.50 p.m.): I do not pretend to be an expert on A.L.P. policies; nor should the honourable member for Rockhampton North claim to be an expert on the policies of the National Party, so I am surprised at his attempt to detail the procedures followed by my party. I think all of us realise that we live in a world of change. Our aims must surely be not just to keep up with change but to legislate to determine what that change should be.

In initiating this legislation the Minister has sought to guide the industrial habits of unions and management along lines that will lead to continued industrial harmony in Queensland. I admire his courage for initiating change. He has done so rather than respond to a long-time need for change, which can happen very easily these days.

I sincerely hope that all who study this legislation will appreciate the attempt that is being made to make the paths of industrial relations easier to negotiate.

Since the printing of the Bill I have studied it and now wish to comment on it. I hope that my remarks will prove to be constructive and not like those of the Opposition, which were obstructive.

I commend the Minister on his amendment to section 17 of the Act by allowing all public holidays occurring during long service leave to be added to the period of that leave. This seems to be very fair.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Don't you think he should have gone a step further and done something about portability of long service leave? Do you know what that means?

**Mr. BERTONI:** I was often taught that if someone stops and listens, he will learn. I hope that the member for Archerfield will learn by listening to my speech.

The amendment to section 29 will have the effect of allowing an award to be varied on the application of either the Minister, an industrial union or an employer. The amendment will also allow the Industrial Commission to vary an award of its own motion. This will have the effect of excluding applications made by individual members of trade unions or persons who are not members of unions. The Minister may recall that the State secretary of the United Fire Fighters Union, Mr. Arthur Rogers, has been using the provisions of this section to cause trouble. His actions in relation to the Rockhampton Fire Brigade may be quoted as an example.

**Mr. Yewdale:** He caused trouble in Rockhampton, did he?

**Mr. BERTONI:** That's right.

The amendment to be made to section 89 is interesting in that it states that the registrar shall refer to the Industrial Commission every industrial agreement filed and that the commission may, of its own motion and without a hearing, approve such agreement. The amendment also provides that an agreement can be altered by the commission on the application of the Crown, the registrar, any person bound by an award or a person aggrieved. Furthermore, the commission may alter an agreement of its own motion. The commission may impose such conditions with respect to an industrial agreement when it considers it advisable in the public interest or for any other reason to do so. It may also prohibit the enforcing of an industrial agreement that is inconsistent with an award or general ruling.

This amendment is deficient in that it allows an individual person to make application to have the terms of an agreement altered. It may also be noted that section 32 of the Act, which is not being amended by the Bill, provides that an industrial agreement can be rescinded or varied on the application of an individual. Therefore it seems to me that these two amendments conflict.

It appears that the commission is attempting to cover all agreements made on industrial matters between unions and employers. It may be noted that a number of agreements in the Mt. Isa electorate are not registered. It may well be that if these documents were attempted to be registered, the commission, in accordance with the amendment to section 89, could alter or not accept some aspect of them. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that at the introductory stage I informed the Committee that the industrial relations which exist between Mt. Isa Mines and the unions could well be an example for the rest of Australia. I am sure that Opposition members would agree with that. I should hate to see what would happen to our industrial peace if any change were made or these agreements were not registered. I would like the Minister's assurance therefore that the commission would at least confer with the parties before any changes were made or agreements were not registered.

I only hope that the right of access of individual unionists to the commission following the finalisation of an agreement is not misused by the professional troublemakers in the community. In a democracy such as ours, where the rights of the individual must be the foremost consideration, there is always a tendency for these liberties to be misused and abused. As a result the whole community suffers and, instead of the liberties being freedoms of our community, they become just the opposite. When they are abused, they become the hangman's noose by which the community commits its own execution. It is up to every one of us and every union member—and any organisation for that matter—to see that the liberties we enjoy do not become the avenues that the enemies of our sociey and democracy use to wreck our way of life.

The amendment to section 98, dealing with power to direct strike ballots, is worthy of a fair trial. There are a number of industrial disputes which, by their very nature, require this type of approach. Where other avenues available under the system have failed to resolve a strike, it is only proper that employees involved should have the facility to express their individual opinions in secret on a return to work, without fear of redress.

There are, however, two aspects of the proposed amendment to this section that cause some concern. The first of these is that a ballot may be ordered only in the case of a strike involving a cessation of work. There are other forms of strikes such as bans (including bans on the working of overtime), go-slow strikes and the like and, in some instances, refusal to work a full 40 ordinary hours per week. All of them can be damaging to the interest of employers and employees and, indeed, the community. I believe that the scope of new section 98 should be broadened to cover these additional industrial disputes.

Secondly, paragraph (b) of subclause (1) of the new section 98 requires the commission to order the conduct of a ballot in either of two circumstances. This can happen firstly upon application by an industrial union of employees and, secondly, upon application by not less than 20 per cent of employees engaged in the project, establishment or undertaking in which the strike has occurred. Whilst the commission would have discretionary power under paragraph (a) of subclause (1) to order a ballot on its own motion, the commission would be required to so order in either of the other two sets of circumstances outlined.

In the unlikely event of a union of employees making an application for a ballot —and we all know that, after all, trade unions always want to appear to be in complete control of any given situation and master of their own destiny—it is left to 20 per cent of the employees involved to make the application.

That also is unlikely, because of the identification of individuals involved and the very likely prospect of recriminations against them by some of their fellow employees and, more than likely, by their own union officials. It would be no more than fair to make provision for an employer, an association or a union of employees to also have the right to apply for a ballot, to be acted upon at the discretion of the commission, it having satisfied itself that other avenues of settlement have been exhausted.

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

**Mr. BERTONI:** Before lunch I was dealing with the proposed section 98 of the Act. I informed the House that the conduct of ballots is controlled by two clauses in the Bill, which provide for a ballot on the application of an industrial union of employees or 20 per cent of the employees. I repeat that my feeling is that it might be fairer if an association or union of employers was extended the same privilege.

I realise that the proposed new section 98 is at least a start in bringing about some changes in a situation where a positive approach to current problems is necessary. Only time and experience will demonstrate how effective the new provision will be. I should inform the House at this point that the removal of the present section 98 entrenches the unqualified right to strike, irrespective of the circumstances and irrespective of the regard for public interest.

In these difficult economic and industrial times it seems a pity that the Government would not retain at least some provision by which it could exercise a vestige of control over industrial disputes—particularly those that affect or are likely to affect essential services and inflict damage on the public at large. The proposed section 98 attempts to provide some means of putting out the fire after it has been raging for some time. Even then, it is extremely doubtful whether the new section will not suffer from frustration or be side-stepped by the unions.

The amendment to section 99 relates to the power that is given to police to arrest without warrant when secret ballots are held in conjunction with stoppages. Frankly speaking, it is doubtful that the implementation of that section will get off the ground. The first application of it will create a real test of industrial strength. Perhaps the Minister could give due consideration to the formation of a small, specially trained "Industrial Relations Force" in substitution for involvement of members of the Police Force. That would perhaps be more acceptable to both employers and employees. The "I.R.F." team, as I call it, would have a wide range of powers in order to assist the Industrial Commission in its duties. If such a force was acceptable, it would be better to delay the introduction of this legislation until early next year, by which time the force could be selected and trained.

I believe that the Minister would have canvassed the opinions of unions and management during the drafting of the Bill. Doubtless he would have gone to great pains to see that its good intentions were made clear to the various people involved in industry.

**Mr. Houston:** Your supposition is wrong.

**Mr. BERTONI:** We will wait and see.

**Mr. Houston:** He said so.

**Mr. BERTONI:** He has consulted certain members; I am sure of that. I would hope that following the passing of the legislation, the Minister requests his department to exert a massive effort to see that the implications of the changes are fully communicated to all sections of industry.

Legislation such as this must be legislation of consensus. It must be a part of the good will of both management and unions.

That good will cannot be engineered unless there is a whole-hearted agreement on its value. Changes such as this always engender suspicion—suspicion that will have to be met with understanding, with discussion and with clarification so that the value of the Bill will become evident to every worth-while unionist and employer.

Unless this public relations exercise is undertaken, misquoted sections and sections quoted out of context will become a rallying point for all radicals and will add fuel to the fire of discontent which is continually smouldering even under the best management relationship. It is not good enough to leave it to the media to communicate the virtues of a Bill such as this. Of necessity newspapers and radio, in news reports, pick out the most startling points in dramatic changes. For example, they do not refer to section 17 of the Act which gives an employee long service leave.

In conclusion I again commend the Minister on the introduction of this Bill, but with a difference. The Bill will come to be appreciated as a very progressive piece of legislation as its effects begin to have some influence on improving the industrial scene in Queensland.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER** (Archerfield) (2.21 p.m.): The Opposition believes that the provisions of the Bill are unwanted, unnecessary and unworkable. They are the product of a Government that is obsessed with a desire for industrial unrest, a Government obsessed with a personal industrial conflict and a Government that is obsessed with a desire for industrial inequality.

Australia is still mourning the death of 13 brave miners at Moura. These men perished earning export income for the nation, yet only a few weeks ago—on 10 August to be precise—Government members grasped the opportunity provided for them in a rare show of initiative by the honourable member for Fassifern to engage in an exercise of miner-bashing. This shows the hypocrisy of this simple Government which, with its temporary numbers in the Chamber, is attempting to force its oppressive legislation upon almost 400,000 workers in Queensland.

It is important for Queenslanders to understand the industrial power of the Government members who promote this Bill and, with their weight of numbers, force its passage through Parliament. The Bill is proposed by the Minister for Industrial Development, who in private life before his election to this Parliament followed the challenging profession of chicken testing. I am told from a source of reliability which I cannot dispute that in his prior calling the Minister could not tell a pullet from a parrot. Among the chickens of Queensland he was known as "Kookaburra Campbell."

Then we have the Premier whose contribution to industrial enlightenment as a member of this Parliament——

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to parliamentary requirements. In speaking of a Minister or any other honourable member he should refer to him by his correct title.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I will, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, the Premier's contribution to industrial enlightenment as a member of this Parliament includes opposition to the 40-hour week, opposition to long service leave and opposition to workers' compensation. His famous words on the 40-hour week were that it would allow workers more time to while away in hotels. What a shocking statement! No wonder the Premier is indicted among decent unionists in Queensland.

**Mr. Frawley:** He didn't say that.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** It is true.

Through the conversion of a mining authority to prospect he turned a couple of dollars into $40,000. He then petitioned the High Court of Australia to dodge taxation on his gains. Fortunately for the Federal Treasurer the learned judge was wiser than he.

Then there is the honourable member for Toowong, the ageing outlaw of the Liberal Party. This advocate of secret ballots for workers cannot win a vote among his own colleagues for Cabinet promotion or Executive selection. As a matter of fact there are honourable members opposite with more favourable experience in land ballots and secret ballots. We have the crooked baker from Moranbah and the camel-train conception from Flinders. Their oasis is the members' bar in this building for the four-course meals they enjoy nearby for 50c a throw. But let a worker have the audacity to seek a meal allowance for a hot dog or a hamburger——

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Bill. I do not want any more of that. The honourable member will come back to the principles of the Bill.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to point up the industrial attitude of some Cabinet members.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The point I wish to make is that the honourable member will come back to the principles of the Bill or I will ask him to resume his seat.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** The Police Minister is known in the circles of law and order as, "Hodges of the Never Never." I am informed, again with reliability that I cannot contest, that this intellectual giant once failed in a Railway Department entrance

examination which 14-year-old schoolboys found relatively easy to pass. His experience in industrial affairs stemmed from counting bananas on Gympie Railway Station.

We have the new honourable member for Salisbury who threatens to throw her constituents into the ocean.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill. If he continues in that vein I shall order him to resume his seat. He will either debate the contents of the Bill or resume his seat.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** As I was saying, honourable members opposite, the projectors of this Bill, are industrial infants. Most of them do not know a hammer from a handcuff. They are motivated by spite and are certainly ill equipped to draft, let alone promote, this legislation now before this Parliament. Outside the Parliament their supporters include the member-to-be for Ryan, who, through his industrial endeavours, managed to retire at an early age on his gains from sharebroking. We have, also on the outside, the chairman of the Wambo Shire Council, who seeks this honour as an Independent and then spends the remainder of his time telling Queenslanders they should not take $50,000,000 from Medibank.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have warned the honourable member previously. This is his last warning. If he continues in that fashion he will resume his seat.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** As I was saying, this is legislation presented by a bunch of people without the slightest affinity for the union movement. It is legislation designed to aid the wealthy at the expense of the producers. This is the conception of people who, in recent weeks in this House, showed their capacity to defy accepted political decency. It is the baby of men and women without political conscience and without industrial knowledge.

We are asked to saddle the trade union movement of Queensland with restrictions dreamed up by political oncers, political hasbeens and political never-will-be's. Looking at the political misfits opposite, I say with conviction that the legislation is predictable in its impossibility. I have no doubt the contents will please the land sharks, exploiters and other parasites of our society who prey on average Queenslanders and appease their souls by contributing to the Liberal and National parties. This Bill was introduced at their behest.

In "The Australian" newspaper recently I saw the chairman of Mount Isa Mines quoted as saying "mining is in a worse condition than other industries." Perhaps it is this perilous condition that restricts Utah Constructions to increasing its profits this year by only an extra $70,000,000—$70,000,000, I might add, that will be sent home to America rather than aid Queensland workers. It is legislation, we now consider, that is proposed by a team of industrial nitwits—a team of industrial troublemakers.

The Minister in introducing the Bill gave as one of his motivating reasons the self-concocted eulogy delivered by Sir Gordon Chalk in his policy speech of 14 November 1974 when that person, in almost ephemeral terms, declared that because his Government had good labour relations it would introduce secret ballots so that a group of employees could determine whether a strike would continue and that because penal provisions were not appropriate to strikes his Government would repeal them.

The Minister also pontificated to the effect that, with a Bill of such major importance, the substance required the careful consideration of both sides of the House. I must say I was really amazed at the Minister's almost Jekyll and Hyde performance during the delivery of his speech. But I must confess it has left me a little nonplussed. With self-righteousness almost bursting his shirt buttons, he exclaimed or maybe said that penal provisions which had operated previously, as promised by the Government, would be repealed. What forthright thinking, what statesmanship, what perception! I almost began to believe the Minister. But if the Government substitutes for penal provisions the new principle of arrest without warrant, merely for picketing a place where a secret ballot is being held, is it getting anywhere? I began to think that the Minister's motives were not all that honourable.

Even a cursory examination of the Minister's speech and the legislation reveals many things. Firstly, it creates considerable doubt as to the validity of the Treasurer's claim that the Government enjoyed good labour relations. If the Bill before the House is an example of the advice in industrial relationships the Government is receiving, it could only indicate that the Government enjoys good labour relations with the pimp, the scab, the union fee dodger and the anti-unionist.

One would have thought that in the intervening years since the 1961 Ken Morris Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill fiasco, the Government would have attempted to inform itself on industrial matters. One would have thought that lacking any members with significant trade union experience, it would have attempted to understand. But this puny, peurile and futile exercise in union-bashing really shows how little the Government has begun to understand or proves that it hasn't even tried to understand.

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, starkly illustrates what happens when the Government entrusts its major industrial relations decision-making to a person whose sole industrial experience in handling employees has been supervising the production lines of the egg battery brooder. I am tempted to observe that so far as labour relations are

concerned if this is the best he can produce, then the Minister would appear to be industrially egg-bound.

I can only describe the principles in the legislation as an industrial omelette, concocted by Right-wing albumen, folded into well-beaten anti-union yolks, and heavily spiced with employer-flavouring and garnishes. It is a classic example of how little regard or understanding the Government has for trade-unionism and is a clear indication that it stems from the anti-union attitudes of the Premier, who never ceases to attack unionism in all its forms.

I always understood that the bulk of the legislation that passes through this Chamber stemmed from discussions with interested parties, those in the community who may be affected, but in any case it usually emanated from people concerned with the problem. To suggest that the legislation before the House sprang from this type of source is hardly credible. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Minister to disclose any union which, as a body, sought the amendments or, conversely, I challenge him to disclose any union which, as a body, approved these suggestions if they emanated from the Minister and were discussed by him with such union.

Some of the principles outlined are so preposterous in concept that any union would have to be industrially naive to even consider their implementation. It is clear that they emanate from either the Minister's industrial immaturity, the union-fee-dodging card-carrying members of the Liberal and Country Parties, or the Liberal ladies' sewing circle.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I rise to a point of order. I take exception to the honourable member's remarks. There are no card-carrying members of the National Party, and I want that statement withdrawn. It is offensive to me.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Murrumba says that the statement is offensive to him. I ask the honourable member for Archerfield to withdraw it.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I withdraw it.

Far from making any contribution towards industrial peace and friendly labour relations, this legislation, if permitted to be placed on the Statute Book, will only add fuel to the fire and could lead to an increased number of disputes not between employer and employee, but between employees and the Act.

It transforms the already industrially efficient Arbitration Commission into the C.I.A. of the industrial movement. Instead of arming the commission with positive aids to help it to solve disputes, it arms it with the bludgeon of trying to force men back to work. This has never been successful and never will work. It has been tried a thousand times before and surely the Minister is not stupid enough to believe it will start working now. Surely the Minister does not believe that fragmenting of unions by his and the commission's interference, merely to end a dispute, is going to promote industrial harmony and promote good labour relations.

It is inconceivable that a supposedly mature Minister would have the temerity to introduce a principle such as he outlined when he referred to the repealing and re-vamping of the clause dealing with penal provisions. In outlining the provisions for the conduct of secret ballots to terminate strikes, he introduced the principle of the court having the right to conduct a ballot either of its own volition or at the request of 20 per cent of the employees engaged in the place. It is in this area that the Minister really lays bare his recognition of the scab, the strike breaker, and the union fee dodger. So that there will be no misunderstanding of why I say the foregoing, let me quote the Minister's actual introductory words dealing with a cessation of work. He said—

> "The commission may of its own motion and shall upon application if an industrial union of employees or not less than 20 per cent of the employees engaged in the place where the strike has occurred direct the registrar or industrial magistrate to conduct a secret ballot."

He later went on to lay down that this ballot, at the commission's discretion, could be of all of the employees at the place where the strike occurred or could be confined to those employees who are on strike, or the commission could hold separate ballots on behalf of each union involved.

I want members to be aware of these statements. I want them to understand the import of these principles. In one fell swoop the Minister dispenses with the importance of the principle of financial membership of unions, because he says "of the people employed there" disregarding, of course, whether they are financial members of a union or employees who bludge on union conditions while dodging union dues, hence my remarks on the Minister's admiration of the fee-dodging card-carrying members of the Liberal and Country Party, because it could have been only from that source that he got the foregoing principles. Surely the only members who should take part in any decision of the union are financial members of that union.

**Mr. Houston:** And while it is on strike.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** That is true—while it is on strike.

But the Minister does a bit better than that when he goes on to refer to the fact that at the commission's discretion the ballot may be of all those employees at the place where the strike has occurred. So you now use as strike breakers anyone you can rake up who isn't really involved

in the dispute. You use those who are prepared to be used as the tool and the toady of the employer, even though the final result may have no effect on the person so used.

**Mr. Frawley:** You are just a Trades Hall parrot.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** And the honourable member is a mug and a parrot.

In all my years of experience as a union organiser—and I was a good one, too; the best there was—I have never seen a Minister who would allow himself to stoop to such an undemocratic principle. I believe such action in providing this principle would be worse than the action of a person obliged to be used under such a principle as contained in the legislation.

**Mr. Frawley:** You were a bludger. You stood over the women cleaners at the Treasury.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I do not take very many interjections from the honourable member for Murrumba, because everybody in the Chamber knows that he is dim-witted and has a psychiatric problem.

But the pièce de résistance must surely be found in the fragmentation principle of the commission being able to conduct separate ballots for separate unions involved in the one dispute, that old and time-honoured device of the intriguer—divide and conquer. How convenient if it is possible to get a return to work verdict by fragmentation, even if the combined votes of all opposed to a return to work, if the ballot were held conjointly, were against such a proposition. So now the Government will have it all ways. It can use union fee dodgers; it can use scabs and strike breakers, or it can use fragmentation.

Far from engendering confidence and trust from the union movement, I believe that if the commission is obliged to resolve industrial problems in the manner envisaged in this legislation, it will be regarded as a servile vassal of the Government, admired by the scab and worshipped by the union fee dodger. I couldn't imagine any decent, industrially oriented person wishing to serve on such a commission. Nor could I perceive any responsible union having regard for its conclusions. If there is anything calculated to discredit the commission, this legislation must surely be it.

It is to the Minister's unending discredit that he allows himself to be used as the person responsible for introducing such undemocratic, irresponsible, anti-union principles. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Bill will, I believe, cast a considerable amount of doubt on the veracity of all who in future serve on the commission.

So repressive is the legislation that even picketing at a time when a strike ballot is being conducted can lead to arrest without warrant. How convenient that the union may not even scrutinise those who cast a ballot! How convenient for the employer to be able to engage in ballot-box stuffing if the unions cannot challenge those voting! How easy to slip in a few who could claim they are employed, merely for the purposes of breaking a strike! Arrest without warrant for picketing! I suggest the Minister seek employment in South Africa as an exponent of the art of industrial apartheid.

That clause of the Bill will do nothing but encourage the efforts of the crawler, the scab, the junior executive clawing his way over his fellow employees, and the bludger who accepts all conditions gained by industrial action but does his best to evade union dues. It is such so-called unionists who publicly avow their membership of the Liberal and Country Parties. It is such unionists who apparently advised the Minister with this legislation.

With true Liberal infantile industrial philosophy, the Minister sought to disguise many of the obnoxious provisions of the Bill with the concessional "goodies", such as extending the time for claiming moneys where an employee has been underpaid from six to 12 months. How benevolent! How magnanimous! But what sort of unionist does the Minister envisage who does not acquaint himself with the terms of an award? Why didn't the Minister do something positive such as the appointment of additional industrial inspectors to ensure that snide employers were obliged to observe award conditions? "Big deal" Fred's contribution was to give the employee the right to claim 12 instead of six months under-award payment. If the Minister wants to talk about the power of arrest without warrant, what about applying the same principle to employers who stand over the weak and the uninformed in such a manner?

According to the Minister it is a more heinous crime to fight for a principle than to rob the weak and the uninformed unionist by under-paying him. If a person believes in a principle and is prepared to back that belief by striking in support of it, he faces arrest without warrant. But if he is a cheap unscrupulous employer who cheats and robs his employees, he had best beware because he may have to fork out 12 months' underpaid wages if somebody gets on to him. Not to worry. Your crime of cheating, lying, and robbery is considered less than that of having principles, according to the Minister's construction of what industrial principles should be. Again not to worry—you are the type who makes millions, are referred to as a successful businessman, and usually appear in the Queensland Government's twice-yearly Honours List.

I am suggesting to the Minister that if he has any political decency, if he has any semblance of industrial nous, if he prides himself in attempting to discharge his office in the most fair and capable manner to all

the people he represents, he will withdraw this ill-conceived legislation and re-assess the position.

He will begin to understand that industrial matters do not deal only with the amount of tomato that is put on the sandwiches in the canteen; that the trade union movement represents the bulk of the population and that the majority of trade-unionists are decent, hard-working honest and capable men; that the prosperity and future of the community is parallel to the peace and prosperity of the trade union members. If he wants to carry on the industrial guerilla warfare of generalissimo Bjelke-Petersen——

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I will not tolerate any further submissions from the honourable member if he does not refer to other honourable members in the correct parliamentary manner.

I also draw the attention of honourable members to Erskine May's "Parliamentary Practice", Eighteenth Edition, in which in Chapter XIX this appears—

> "Reading speeches—A Member is not permitted to read his speech, but may afresh his memory by a reference to notes. The reading of written speeches, which has been allowed in other deliberative assemblies, has never been recognised in either House of Parliament. A Member may read extracts from documents, but his own language must be delivered bona fide in the form of an unwritten composition. The purpose of this rule is primarily to maintain the cut and thrust of debate, which depends upon successive speakers meeting in their speeches to some extent the arguments of earlier speeches; debate decays under a regime of set speeches prepared before hand without reference to each other."

For the benefit of all honourable members the principle as enunciated in that paragraph now applies.

**Government Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am speaking from copious notes, Mr. Speaker, and I assure you that the language in them is as colourful as my own.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have not seen the honourable member raise his head from his notes. No doubt he is reading from a written speech. For the information of the House, this is the last time on which any member will read a written speech.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** If the Minister wants to have as his advisers the scabs and malcontents——

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have told the honourable member that he is not permitted to read his speech. If he wishes to continue, he will make his speech in accordance with the ruling I have given. He may refer to notes, but he will not continue to read his speech.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I will say that this legislation has been introduced at the behest of the big backers in the Liberal Party and National Party—the people who contribute so heavily to the Government's coffers. Finally, this Bill will for ever be known as "Campbell's Folly".

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT** (Chatsworth) (2.43 p.m.): It is more in sorrow than in anger that I refer to the Opposition's attempts to denigrate the Minister by making reference to his participation in past years in the poultry industry. Is there something ignoble or dishonourable about an association with the poultry industry? If that is the proposition put forward by members of the Opposition, they should say so. The Minister had a distinguished association with the poultry industry. He was not content merely to be an egg farmer, as the Opposition chooses to describe him in what apparently it regards as a denigrating term; he was in fact a prominent and distinguished member of the poultry industry.

Members of the Opposition can denigrate the Minister as much as they like, but seldom if ever have the ministerial benches been graced by a more honourable or decent person than one of the calibre of the Honourable Fred Campbell.

I say to the member for Archerfield and to his cohorts that whenever they pick on Campbell they pick on Hewitt as well. This Minister, with whom on occasions I have differences, rates highly in my estimation. It is typical of his standing and his courage that he is prepared to introduce these amendments. I believe those who read "Hansard" will be as disgusted as we on this side of the Chamber are at the attempts by members of the Opposition to denigrate him by saying that he was once an egg farmer.

We can best pursue this debate by referring to the comments of the member for Rockhampton North, who led for the Opposition and put forward its main arguments. He dealt with three basic propositions before he made his way to the meat of the argument.

He said first of all that we are deliberately intruding into trade union affairs. He then issued the challenge that members of the Government parties should meet and talk to trade union leaders. Finally he argued about the policing provisions of these amendments.

Let us examine these three propositions. The first is that we are deliberately intruding into trade union affairs. What nonsense! What piffle! For as long as trade unions have had legitimacy and for as long as they have come of age, Governments have been looking at their affairs. If he wished to use

the words, "intruding into their affairs", he could do so; but it is the right of Governments to regulate the affairs of trade unions. They are not sacrosanct; they are not some class apart; they are not some remote organisation that nobody can look at, speak to or criticise. Indeed, it is the role of Government to act as the umpire, with unions on one side, employers on the other, and the Government in the middle determining the rules of conduct. Saying that we deliberately intrude into the affairs of trade unions really does less than credit to the honourable gentleman who put forward a constructive and well-respected argument at the introductory stage of the Bill.

He then spoke about members meeting and talking to trade union leaders. We missed the honourable gentleman at Surfers Paradise last week-end—we missed him sorely. We would have enjoyed his company. The five Liberal members and the one Liberal Minister enjoyed the company of trade union leaders at the industrial relations seminar at Surfers Paradise last week-end.

**A Government Member:** There was not a single Opposition member there.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The honourable member is quite right.

Indeed, because Liberal members want to meet trade-union leaders they are participating at every opportunity in the arrangements of this seminar. One very prominent trade-union leader will have a quiet chuckle when he reads this speech. (He told me that he always reads my speeches). This gentleman and I shared a convivial glass or two, and we exchanged many comments about the contents of this Bill. I assure the honourable member that the five Liberal members who went to that seminar last week-end looked for the opportunity to discuss the contents of this Bill with trade union leaders. While we may not have found a broad area of agreement, at least we found a basis of mutual respect. I think that is something useful that came out of last week-end.

The honourable gentleman then expressed great concern about the policing provisions in these amendments. No attempt at all is being made to inhibit lawful, regular picketing. The Government recognises the right to picket, just as it recognises the right to strike. Each of us accepts that the right to strike is one of the most fundamental rights of the labourer in this country today. But talking about the policing provisions in this amending legislation is entirely different from talking about the right to strike. We are saying that the integrity of the ballot must be preserved. The area in the immediate vicinity of the balloting place will be policed to ensure that unionists are able to make their way to the ballot-box to cast their votes without any muscle power or undue influence being brought to bear against them. There is a world of difference between that and saying that we are trying to inhibit the lawful right to picket.

**Mr. Yewdale:** Have you any evidence of that muscle power?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Where the evidence of muscle power can be found when we are implementing legislation for the first time, I do not know. This is a provision which, at the moment, is totally untried. How can there be evidence of something that has not yet been implemented? The honourable member would really do well to curb his tongue.

When these proposals were put forward they were greeted with angry susurration by many union leaders. They cried out about fascist measures and union bashing. We heard further arguments along those lines this afternoon from the discredited member from Archerfield. We were entitled to a better response than that. We can hardly enter into sensible dialogue when people respond in such emotive and useless terms. We looked for sensible, constructive criticism. That would have been met, and it would have been considered. But, as I say, such emotive overreactive words lay the ground for very little useful dialogue indeed.

The knockers of these measures, deliberately or otherwise, totally disregard the six very significant reforms that are embodied in these amendments.

**Mr. Yewdale:** Come on! What is significant?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** Let us look at them. First of all, we have liberalised the long-service leave provisions. Is there argument against that? We went to the I.L.O. convention itself and have written into the Act the "performing work of a like nature" provision, once again moving closer to equal recognition of effort by the sexes. We have improved the rights for the recovery of wage arrears. We have given the courts the power to determine the right of admission to an industrial union. We have given a clearer definition of the methods of resignation. We have given safety representatives protection from dismissal.

There was no partial criticism or condemnation of these measures; they were totally condemned out of hand. Those who condemn them totally out of hand are therefore saying to the workers of this State, "We want no part of these significant and progressive measures that the Minister has enunciated." Those six measures in themselves warrant the support of this House.

There is no area of greater sensitivity in public administration than that of industrial relations. There is the need for tolerance and good will between employer and employee, trade union and employer, trade union and Government, and Government and trade union. It is only in such a climate that ultimately industrial laws will evolve that will do the right thing for all parties.

I suppose in that context more and more people ask, "What is the role of trade unions?" The question is often posed these days: "Have they outlived their usefulness?"

**Mr. Yewdale:** Mr. Hewitt——

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The member who tries to interject will be enormously relieved to know that, whenever that question is posed to me, I vehemently defend trade unions. They certainly have not outlived their usefulness. They have an integral part to play in contemporary society. They protect rights that have been won over the course of many years, and they agitate for the increased benefits that rightly should flow to the worker from an affluent society. Under no circumstance would I ever embrace the argument that trade unions have outlived their usefulness. But what I will on occasions deplore is their inflexibility of approach, their refusal to compromise, and their continuation of a class-war mentality. Those are the walls that we have to break down if ever we are to establish this mutuality of respect.

Section 5 of the Act spells out in great details the precise definition of "strike". I was tempted to put it into "Hansard", but I respect the time of the House and I will not do so. However, I refer honourable members to the Act. Whenever we talk about "strike" in speaking of the future of trade unions, we talk about the right to strike. There are those who these days put forward academic questions such as, "Under what circumstances should the right to strike be preserved?" Again I say that under all circumstances the right to withdraw his labour is one of the most fundamental rights of the worker, and under no circumstance should a Government attempt to take that right from him.

One could cite many situations in which an immediate strike must be called. The argument I have most recourse to concerns safety standards. A safety emergency may develop suddenly in the construction of a building of 15 or 16 storeys. It is no use saying to the workers on the spot, "We will take a ballot. We will have a look at this next week. We will have a conference." Next week six, eight or 10 men might be dead. Of course there must be the right to withdraw labour immediately.

Putting those circumstances aside, what is important is that we gauge the wish of the workers and determine whether they want a strike and more importantly whether they want to stay on strike.

The only circumstances I have ever argued under which the right to strike may be modified is with regard to essential services. Those who have been in this Chamber a little longer than since December last year will know that I precipitated a debate on this matter on one other occasion. Those few services that we believe are totally essential for the continuation of society should be looked at in a different light.

Certainly a Government should not presume to say to the workers in those industries, "You cannot strike." A Government should say, "Under what circumstances would you consider not striking? If we give you priority of right to have your claim heard before the commission and if we recognise the essential nature of your industry and give it a loading for that reason, will you consider using the strike weapon lightly or not at all?" There are certain essential industries upon which our society is totally and immediately dependent. One could postulate at great length arguments that would suggest that a society should not be paralysed because a few people are able to withhold their services.

We are first of all revoking a major section of the existing Act—section 98, which was written into it in 1961. In retrospect, the Government freely admits that it was idealistic and unreal and it now repeals the provision. It provided that a strike could be authorised by employees or employers by a secret ballot. But the sheer mechanics of such a move created the groundwork for unauthorised strikes and the loss of spontaneity. So the Government says that this provision comes out.

In its stead the Government says that when a strike is occurring, the workers will have the right to say whether it will continue or not. Taking away all the verbiage and superficial argument, what is wrong with that proposition?

**Mr. Yewdale:** They have that right now.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** The honourable member says they have that right now.

I take all honourable members back to the comfort of their lounge rooms on those occasions when there is a major dispute. We look at the television and the cameras scan the few thousand men at a mass meeting at Lang Park or one of the other major sporting fields. The trade union leaders are in the centre. They outline the case. In the fullness of time a vote is taken. Up goes the forest of hands for an affirmative vote. We look almost in vain for a vote being cast in the negative. It would be hard to find any proposition in the world today where there is such complete and sweet unanimity. I am putting arguments forward in the light of sweet reasonableness. When I put forward that proposition I am not even going to use the words, "union intimidation". I do not want to say that at all. What I do say is that often there is a mob psychology, just because it happens in a mob situation. Fellows might have some feelings or attitudes of their own but might be reluctant to speak. I am not blaming that on the trade union leaders at all. I am not making any allegations of trade union intimidation. I am merely saying that a mob psychology will tend to develop.

In the Minister's proposals, first of all the commission has an option to determine whether a ballot will be held. It can be

requisitioned in certain circumstances that are spelt out in the Bill. What happens? A worker is on strike and he is told, "Tomorrow you will be given the opportunity of ballot to say whether you will stay out or go back." If he is a home-lover, if he consults his family and takes his family's point of view into account, he will sit down quietly with his wife and discuss it, and maybe for the first time in the history of industrial laws in this State the influence of women will count for something —and that could be important.

How often when there has been a strike have women contacted members of Parliament? It happened to me during the recent brewery strike. A woman said to me, "My husband has only had that job for a few weeks. He wants to work. I want him to work. We are getting short of money. What do I do?" All I could do was lament the situation with her and extend my sympathy, which did not mean much in dollars and cents.

**An Opposition Member:** You were short of a beer.

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** That was too good to let go. I have never had such a hankering for beer that I could not do without it for a week, a month, a year or a lifetime, so the honourable member need not worry about me very much there.

But I think the point I touch upon is a real one. Under these circumstances a man will not make a rash judgment at a mass meeting. He will quietly and deliberately take all factors into account and discuss them with his wife. The Opposition might recognise the fact that there is an element of risk for the Government in such a proposal and if Opposition members are strong on their industrial history they might look at the situation that prevailed in the United Kingdom when the hard-pressed Ted Heath had recourse to such a measure. The nation was paralysed by a railway strike. Heath was hemmed in from all sides and his attitude was, "I will return the final say to the strikers themselves."

**Mr. Jones:** What was the result?

**Mr. W. D. HEWITT:** If only the member would stop anticipating and listen for a moment. Goodness me, what he lacks in height he makes up for in noise. Heath brought in these proposals; they were put to the railway workers and they overwhelmingly said, "We will stay on strike", and that was the beginning of the end of Heath's Government. He went downhill. He never recovered and he faced ultimate electoral defeat.

Surely the Government's critics can recognise some courage in implementing such a measure here, because, while we are trying to assess the wish of the worker, we are conceding a possible area of embarrassment to ourselves. Surely there is some evidence of good faith when a Government takes a step such as this.

There are those who say, "You are intruding." Already the Act contains extensive provisions for the control of unions and the use of secret ballots. Section 54 provides that there will be no registration of a union until the registrar is satisfied that elections have been held by secret ballot. Section 81 provides that the registrar has the right to inquire into irregularities. Section 85 provides that ballot papers must be kept for one year. Section 86 provides that the registrar is to conduct elections upon request and section 88 gives him certain powers with regard to proven offences in connection with the elections. So the suggestion that we are suddenly intruding and breaking into union affairs indicates that honourable members opposite do not know much about existing industrial law.

This measure is undoubtedly experimental, but it is one that is put forward in good faith in the hope of mitigating to some extent industrial disputes in this State, which, in 1973-74 cost the workers $5,960,000 and which led to a cost of 314,000 man-days. The cost to the community and to the individual was enormous. Industrial disputes in excess of 10 man-days' duration in the same year numbered 362—more than one for every day of the year. So any step that can be taken to mitigate these disputes should receive the approbation of not only Parliament but also the whole of the State.

The Bill also contains worth-while amendments relative to industrial agreements. The commission already has the right to rescind or vary, and it has the right to prohibit industrial agreements when they are inconsistent with the award. So the Government has not been silent on industrial agreements, and the Act already provides for a duplicate to be lodged with the registrar within 30 days and that agreements are binding and enforceable.

Under the new provisions, the agreement must be in writing and must be approved by the commission, and it must be registered after approval. The commission can impose conditions and can prohibit agreements that are inconsistent with the award. What is wrong with that? The Government is regulating something that has developed in the last decade or so, and it is right and proper that it should be interested in these agreements.

It is too much to expect that in these mid-1970s we will return to the Protestant ethic of hard work, frugality, sobriety and efficiency in one's calling in the market-place. But surely we can return to basic principles and say that we still believe in the dignity of labour and the principle of a fair day's pay for a fair day's work; that the right to work is an untrammelled right; that the right of the worker to exercise his own judgment is also an untrammelled right.

This legislation is experimental, and the distinguished Minister who has introduced it readily concedes that point. It deserves a fair trial, with a sense of good will and tolerance on all sides. Unionists and union leaders would do well to approach it with that sense of fair play.

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Murrumba) (3.7 p.m.): A short time ago we heard the honourable member for Archerfield put before honourable members the greatest heap of verbal garbage it has been my misfortune to listen to since I became a member of this Assembly. It is a shocking indictment on A.L.P. members that they stand up in this Chamber and read briefs prepared by some faceless person at the Trades Hall. They are nothing more than Trades Hall parrots, spouting out what they have been told to say. It is further proof of a statement that I made in this Chamber in 1972, when I said that the A.L.P. had scraped the bottom of the political barrel in its quest for candidates. In 1974 it even scraped the scrapings to get someone to stand for it. Don't tell me anything about the A.L.P.!

There is no doubt that neither the honourable member for Rockhampton North nor the honourable member for Archerfield did much to help the cause of the union that will be affected if this Bill becomes law. It has been left to a Government member to start the ball rolling and put forward a sensible submission on behalf of the United Fire Fighters Union. I am very pleased to do this because I loathe injustice and I am always prepared to take the part of the underdog, no matter which party I belong to and who I represent.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** I will be interested to hear it.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The honourable member is going to hear it.

Before I deal with the meat of the matter, I suggest to the House that the threatening letter that I received from the United Fire Fighters Union—it was sent to all Government parliamentarians—certainly highlighted a growing practice that I think must cease.

It will certainly upset the democracy of this Parliament. Other similar moves have been made by groups to put pressure on members of Parliament to vote this way or that way or to do what they or somebody else wants. I go on record now as saying that I will at all times listen to anybody or any group of persons in my electorate, or even to persons from other parts of the State. No-one is going to tell me how to vote or what to do. Once a member of Parliament takes dictation from anybody outside the House, he is useless as a member of Parliament. He has no backbone or guts and is not worth his place in this Chamber. I intend to carry out my duties as a member of Parliament to the best of my ability, and I will not be stood over by anyone. That will never happen to me.

**Mr. Jensen:** Go back to your caucus room and see how you get on.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I will say that anywhere I wish to say it.

I support the Minister in his introduction of this Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, other than for the two sections that I mentioned earlier. I believe that these sections have been written into the Bill to kill the attempts by the United Fire Fighters Union to gain recognition as a registered union in this State and to appear in the Industrial Commission on its own behalf. That body has made about seven attempts to be registered as a union. Each time it has failed. The reasons given by the Industrial Commission are a lot of hogwash. I don't believe a word of them. Everyone with an ounce of nous knows that. The A.W.U. is behind this. It doesn't want the United Fire Fighters to be registered.

**Mr. Jensen:** Don't you believe in the laws of Queensland?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of course I do. I believe the commission has been unduly influenced by members of the A.W.U. who want to keep the United Fire Fighters out. The U.F.U. has had one of the dirtiest, rottenest deals ever handed out to a union in Queensland. The Rockhampton issue proves that. There were wrongs on both sides. I am not going to whitewash the U.F.U. but 95 per cent of the blame for allowing the situation to get out of hand in Rockhampton can be laid at the door of the Rockhampton Fire Brigade Board. I repeat what I interjected when the honourable member for Rockhampton North was speaking. The Rockhampton Fire Brigade Board was a group of weak-kneed, gutless individauls who allowed the chief officer, Mr. Eves, to dictate to them. He dictated the policy. The report on the inquiry into the Rockhampton Fire Brigade Board indicates that the chairman said—

> "We always accepted the recommendation. We are not in a position to select officers. The Chief Officer makes recommendations and we adopt them.
>
> "We confirm the recommendations made to us; that's our job, not to make selections.
>
> "The Chief Officer gives the orders of what has to be done and the Board endorses it."

If any fire brigade board in my electorate did that, I would get up and slate them every inch of the way. I would throw them out because they would not be worth a tray-bit. All the blame can be laid at the door of the Rockhampton Fire Brigade Board for the trouble in Rockhampton. This need never have happened. The Minister did

the right thing. He gave them the order of the boot. It should have happened long ago. The United Fire Fighters should never have been placed in that position. Members of the U.F.U. are members of the A.L.P., the National Party, the Liberal Party and the D.L.P. I have heard it said on many occasions by many people that the U.F.U. was a group of Communists. That is a rotten lie. There could be Communists in the U.F.U. There are Communists everywhere. There are some on this side of the House in front of me, but they haven't got the guts to stand up and say so.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** You're a Fascist.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I'm not a Fascist. Various political parties are represented in the U.F.U. I have had the opportunity of mixing with a lot of the U.F.U. members. I go to their football matches because I follow their team. Those that I have met are a pretty good bunch of blokes. I am not going to have anyone say at any time that they are a bunch of Communists. They're not. There could be one or two Communists in the U.F.U., but I wouldn't know. If there are, O.K.; there are Communists in all walks of life. We all know that. Just because they get that tag put on them, why should they be prevented from being registered as a union?

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** What you are saying is that they should be registered as a union?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of course they should be granted registration! It is an indictment on us that it has not been done long ago. But I don't need any help from the Opposition. I can do a hell of a good job on my own and the honourable member doesn't have to help me.

There are 73 unions of employees registered in this State, only 46 of which have more than 728 members.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** Your son wrote that brief.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Look at it! He wrote the brief, my eye! I have a son who is a member of the U.F.U.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Why don't you shut up and let me finish?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. A.L.P. members try to side-track me every time I speak. That is because they go in deadly fear of me as they know that I am one person who can expose them for what they are. Look at all the ones I got rid of at the last election! I had a fair bit to do with getting rid of a lot of them. The only electorate in Queensland that the honourable member for Archerfield did not visit during the election campaign was his own. That was one of the few the A.L.P. won. He kept out of it! He stayed out of it and that is why Labor won that seat. If he gets put out at the next election, he will get a job as supervisor of a Brisbane City Council garbage dump because of the experience he has had in dumping garbage. He would be one of the greatest Trades Hall parrots it has ever been my misfortune to listen to. When Mr. Speaker pulled him up, and I am glad he did——

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will come back to the Bill.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Those members who can read—look at what I have in my hand.

As I said, there are 73 unions of employees registered in this State, only 46 of which have more than 728 members, and 27 with fewer.

With Mr. Speaker's permission, I intend to read from a document. Unlike Opposition members, I don't have to read my speeches from briefs prepared for me. I write better speeches than half the members of the Opposition put together. Any speech I make is my own; no-one gives me a brief.

Listen to this: the Federated Jewellers, Watchmakers and Allied Trades Union has 111 members. Incidentally, the U.F.U., in its latest application, stated it had a membership of 804, whereas only about 146 firemen are registered members of the A.W.U. In fact, there are more members of fire brigade boards than there are firemen in the A.W.U.

**Mr. Miller:** How many in the U.F.U.?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** About 804, give or take a couple.

**Mr. Miller:** Are they financial members?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** They are. Why shouldn't there be freedom of choice? No-one could convince me that each one of these 73 unions mentioned here started off as a separate union. There must have been breakaways from other unions. Why isn't the Queensland Plasterers' Union, with a membership of 490, part of the Building Trades Union?

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** It is.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** It is not. It is a separate registered union. The honourable member, who comes from the Trades Hall, does not know anything about what goes on there.

The Australian Workers' Union had a membership of 57,166 at 31 December 1974. A huge, powerful union like that is adopting a dog-in-the-manger attitude if it tries to prevent the U.F.U. from becoming registered. After all, the U.F.U. has a membership of only 804. Why shouldn't it become registered?

It is a specialist union. Who other than its members could fight fires that were more serious than grass fires?

**Mr. Jensen:** What's wrong with them? Why don't they join the A.W.U.?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Why doesn't the honourable member for Bundaberg admit that he is a stooge of the A.W.U.?

**Mr. Jensen:** I am.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of course he is. He admits he's a stooge of the A.W.U. That's the second time I have heard an A.L.P. man tell the truth.

The Australian Association of Social Workers, with a membership of 163, and the Actors and Announcers' Equity Association, with 315 members, are only two of the 27 unions with a membership of 728 or fewer. One would think that those unions would be amalgamated with other unions.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will come back to the Bill.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I am dealing with the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Miller:** Are those unions represented by one union or by two? How many breakaway unions are there in those groups?

**Mr. Wright:** He doesn't know.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I will be honest; I don't know. For example, there are plenty of railway unions here. The Queensland Railday Signalmen's Union, for example, with 84 members, must surely have been part of the A.R.U. at some stage.

**Mr. Wright:** Wouldn't you agree that technical teachers should be allowed to form their own union if they want to? This legislation will prevent them from doing that.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I am very suspicious of anything the honourable member for Rockhampton says about forming a union.

At the bottom of the list there is the Federated Coopers Union, with only five members. I realise, of course, that coopers are a dying race with the advent of stainless-steel kegs. A short way up the list is the Theatre Managers' Association, with 40 members, and the Marine Cooks, Bakers and Butchers' Association, with 64 members. I do not intend to name the 27 small unions that appear on this list. Surely they should not be required to amalgamate with other unions. If any group of specialists want to form their own union, they should be entitled to do so.

It has been claimed that the A.W.U. has done something for fire fighters. It has done absolutely nothing for them. I have with me a copy of the judgment handed down by Commissioner V. J. Anderson in the matter of the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board Award and in the matter of an application by Arthur Rogers and other firemen. They had signed a declaration stating that Mr. Rogers was authorised to act for them. The A.W.U., a party to the award, was not represented at the hearing. The registrar informed the union of the amendments made to the claim and of the inspections that had been made. On 13 September 1974, the A.W.U. did not even go to fight on behalf of the men whom it wanted as members of the union. Commissioner Anderson, when speaking about the Rockhampton affair, said—

> "To my knowledge within recent times action taken by the U.F.U. has been confined to that which is within available processes of the law."

This union has acted in a lawful way.

When I received the letter that was sent to all members of Parliament, my first reaction was to reply with an abusive letter. But all I did was write saying, "Go to hell." I believe in being straight to the point. I was not going to be intimidated. However, I realise that the secretary probably wrote under great stress and strain, as would any union secretary who had his back to the wall. Without doubt he has done his best for his union. He is not a personal friend of mine; I have met him only through my association with firemen. I am one of the few honourable members who are game to say that when the Bill was introduced they did not realise the implications of clause 11. I am telling the truth, and I state now that I am opposed to that clause.

**Mr. Wright:** Will you stop here and oppose it or walk out?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I will do what I want to do. When the time comes I will make my own decision. No-one will make it for me. For the benefit of the honourable member for Rockhampton and all other honourable members, I point out that the day I cross the floor will be the day when my vote changes a decision. I shall not cross the floor on any occasion when it is just a waste of time.

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. Lane:** He is trying to hypnotise you.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I do not react like the honourable member for Rockhampton. I am pretty safe under hypnosis. I have enough trouble without being hypnotised.

The A.W.U. has claimed that half the fire fighters in Queensland are members of the A.W.U. I say without fear of contradiction that that claim is a pack of lies. The

total number of fire fighters in Queensland is 945, of whom 804 are in the United Fire Fighters Union. When I said that there were 160 of them in the A.W.U. I erred on the side of generosity. I do not think the A.W.U. has even 160 firemen members. I admit that I did not know much about the fire fighters' problem, but I tried to find out as much as I could.

I support all provisions in the Bill other than clause 11. If that clause is passed, it may not prevent the United Fire Fighters' Union from becoming a registered union. I accept what the Minister said to me, namely, that the union can be registered if it can obtain the approval of the Industrial Court—but it will affect any application made on its behalf. In other words, if the clause is passed the U.F.U. will have to rely on the A.W.U. to do something for it. But as I understand it, the A.W.U. has done nothing for the United Fire Fighters' Union. We should look closely at this provision before making a final decision.

**Mr. PORTER** (Toowong) (3.23 p.m.): The reaction of the Opposition to this Bill was totally predictable. Neither at the introductory stage nor in this debate have Opposition members shown concern for people. Their only concern—and this has been exhibited in a very fierce and determined manner—has been to maintain the power of radical union bosses. That is something that neither the people in general nor the rank-and-file union members want. Lacking any creditable argument against the provisions of the Bill, and knowing that they represent the views of only a very militant minority, they have resorted to personal abuse and character assassination, which is the authentic stock-in-trade of union Left-wing thuggery. We have witnessed that in the debate in this House. It has been directed at the Minister, the Premier and me.

For some strange reason, Opposition members choose to believe that I am the architect of this Bill. They are quite erroneous in that belief, but that is what they want to believe and therefore I have to be denigrated. Earlier in the debate the honourable member for Rockhampton North said that I had been a card-carrying member of the Communist party at some time when I was selling war bonds. Did I understand the honourable member correctly? I do not want to traduce him.

**Mr. Yewdale:** Yes.

**Mr. PORTER:** Man, this is really wild! It is such utter nonsense that a person should not have to deny it in the House. The fact is that the gentleman who was selling the war bonds was the late A. D. Porter, a well-known accountant in the city, and a very respected man. If he was ever a card-carrying member of the Communist Party, I would be surprised, but traducing a dead man is a very dirty trick indeed.

As to his reference to me, I suppose it is one of the oldest and shabbiest tricks in the trade to throw mud in the expectation that some of it will stick. So I will make a sporting offer to the honourable gentleman. If he can prove that I was ever connected with the Communist Party or a card-carrying member of it, I will resign my seat in this House—provided, of course, that if he cannot prove it he will resign. In other words, "Put up or shut up." I find the honourable member in his attack somewhat disappointing. I did indeed expect a little more from him than that, but one can always be mistaken in trying to read character.

There has been a great deal of agonised outcry about the Bill from a very limited number of people. As I say, it was predictable; it was to be expected. It should be noted that the only agonised squeals and screams have come from Left-wing union bosses. That is all. Nothing has been said by the Right-wing unions. Nothing has come that indicates what the rank and file of union members might suggest. All we have had has been a squeal from those who see their vested interests being affected. The old adage that hell hath no fury like a woman scorned should be changed to read, "Hell hath no fury like a union boss who sees his power being threatened." This Bill is to trim the power of radical union leaders and put it back where it belongs—in the hands of the rank and file.

I believe that one of the most disturbing aspects of the reaction to the Bill—disturbing, but certainly not surprising—has been the comment of some newspaper editorials which, whilst praising the Bill, has suggested that we must be careful that we do not have confrontation with unions. What a preposterous notion! We are accused of confrontation with unions because we as a sovereign Parliament may decide in our wisdom to pass a law which vitally affects the community in general. We are in the process of dealing with a Bill to amend the Companies Act. Does anybody suggest we will have a confrontation with companies?

The attitude about confrontation is part of the brain-washing that we have suffered over a long period, suggesting that unions are somehow utterly and totally different from any other sector of the community, that they have certain inalienable rights which must never be touched and must never be diminished and that they are beyond the law that applies to every other section of the community. It is a quite massive attempt to make us believe that this right to withdraw labour is an inalienable right—indeed, not only an inalienable right but the inalienable right, almost as though it were more sacrosanct than the right to own property.

It is my strong belief that there is nothing in the libertarian doctrine to which I have been committed throughout all my adult

life which prevents the State from defending itself from that type of industrial activity which threatens the well-being of the State. Indeed, not only is there nothing in the doctrine that precludes it but there is everything in the doctrine that requires it, because what is needed is the greatest good for the greatest number.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North is retiring from the Chamber. Not surprising!

I suggest that the Government has the right to ensure that the community is protected at all times. There is nothing sacrosanct about the role of unions. We must all realise that the right to strike, whilst accepted by the people in general, has only a limited application in the minds of practically all of us. It is rather fortuitous that this morning in "The Courier-Mail" there should be a report of the Gallup Poll, which indicated that what has prevailed in every public opinion poll and every survey taken down through the years is now stronger than ever in the public mind; that is, that unions have too much power.

It reveals that 77 per cent of people interviewed said that union officials have too much power. Only 3 per cent said they have not enough power. Further down the article discloses that even A.L.P. voters placed trade union officials (63 per cent) well ahead of multinational companies (45 per cent) as having too much power. So the plain fact of the matter is that Labor Party members still seem to think that Labor is wrong in wanting unions to be so powerful.

**Mr. Jones:** If you took a public poll on politicians, you would probably get the same result.

**Mr. PORTER:** It depends on which politicians. On the honourable member's side of the Chamber there would be a disastrous result.

The notion that the right to be able to withdraw labour with impunity is something that is greater than the right of other people to be free from duress, free from intimidation, free to protect their families, homes and property and free to pursue their own chosen calling is nonsense—and dangerous nonsense.

In the introductory debate I mentioned what is now called the English disease. That is a phrase being commonly and unhappily used. It is the concept that in England trade unions now dominate the Government. No economic decisions of any worth, merit, or capacity can be taken in the United Kingdom unless the trade unions permit the British Government to take them. I do not think there is any doubt that, whilst it could be said that there could be a number of causes for the current problems that Britain is suffering, there is quite general agreement that one of the major causes is the extent of industrial muscle being used by a section of powerful trade union leadership which is never—perhaps not never, but seldom—concerned about or receptive to the national interest.

It is becoming increasingly clear that in this country also there is a very powerful and a substantial minority within the trade union movement which is attempting to use that movement not for the betterment of its members' economic interests but as a weapon for overthrowing constituted political authority. The objectives of the minority in Australia are strikingly akin to the objectives of the minority in the United Kingdom where already they have achieved so much and caused so much disaster. Unhappily, I believe that the English disease is catching; there are already some signs of the malady being here and we have to do a great deal to ensure that it gets no further.

As I look at this problem of unions, surely the heart of the matter—and this Bill in all its aspects is really about it—is the fact that the trade union movement is the product of 19th Century capitalism. It was necessary for a powerful trade union movement to exist when there were powerful and selfish capital interests. But the battles that the trade union movement was out to win have long ago been fought and the objectives obtained. We have now reached the stage where determined men in trade union positions believe that success comes only if they continue to be increasingly militant and therefore they make demands which cannot be met by the nation's economic capacity, which are not in the interests of the nation and which are not in the interests of their own members. This leads to a stage where an inflation stoked by Government overspending is further accelerated into hyperinflation by demands from a section of the community for increased wages.

In the interests of everyone, trade unionism gone wild has to be restrained. But in spite of everybody's knowledge that we have inflation, that it can only be controlled by sacrifice everywhere and despite all the incontrovertible evidence down through the years on how people feel about excessive trade union power, we have this Opposition which, as only 11 members in the Parliament of 82, is trying to pretend that we have no real right to produce this Bill. It says that in fact by doing so we are interfering in the domestic affairs of unions. This "domestic concern" of unions is a very dangerous and pernicious piece of nonsense.

When unions, by operating in key areas of the economy and by combining to provide successive links in a disastrous chain, can hold the community to ransom and deprive people of their jobs, to suggest that union affairs are matters of domestic concern is total hypocrisy and I say now, as I said in the introductory debate, that the nut of this Bill is the argument: who rules, who governs, who runs the country, who is in control, who makes the decisions? Radicals

in militant unions or the Government of the country that is elected at the polls by all the adult people of the country and has to answer for its sins of omission or commission every three years?

Without doubt any society which wishes to endure must be governed, must be ruled, must be controlled by a democratically elected Government. It must not allow itself to be overruled and overborne by any group of trade unions, no matter what they threaten and no matter how much they intimidate, and I remind honourable members again that up till today every poll and every survey has indicated that people thoroughly endorse the stand I am taking here, the stand that this Government is taking.

I believe the Bill heralds a new era. It is the harbinger of a new dawn in industrial affairs. It will work to the detriment of union wreckers and the tin-pot czars we have in some unions, but it will work in the best interests of the community in general and in the very best interests of rank-and-file unionists in particular. I do not think the House should assume that the Bill as it now appears will be precisely the Bill that eventually secures the approval of the House. There are many, I think, who believe that there are areas where safeguards for well-intentioned people can be strengthened. I am one—I have said it before—who believes that the capacity of union musclemen to pressure people who in no sense are employees—they may be running their own business—into taking out union tickets is something that should be outlawed, is something that should be made an offence similar to an offence of a similar type under the Criminal Code.

Another area that I think calls for investigation is the prospect of making union elections more responsive and responsible. For instance, Laurie Short has said on television and radio and in Press articles that all elections for union office-bearers should be held on the same day, just as local authority elections are all held on the one day, and the machinery for this should be through the State Electoral Office. I believe there is great merit in having ballots for union officers all conducted on the one day under machinery which cannot possibly be regarded as suspect in any shape or form, thereby getting a result which truly reflects the rank-and-file attitude.

The Bill is a milestone in the history of this Parliament. It takes us into the modern era. It does nothing but foster the best interests of rank-and-file unionists, and quite clearly, as far as the community in general is concerned, I would say that 80 to 90 per cent of people are totally behind what we are doing. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Houston, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 3.40 p.m.