

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 21 OCTOBER 1975

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. ZINC REFINERY, TOWNSVILLE

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

In view of the regrettable decision of Mount Isa Mines not to proceed with the proposed erection of a zinc refinery at Townsville, will he give a full outline of the reasons for this and of any representations that are being or might be made to enable or assist in the restoration of the proposal?

Answer:—

My Department of Commercial and Industrial Development has been working in close liaison with MIM Holdings Ltd. in regard to that company's study of the feasibility of establishing an electrolytic zinc refinery at Townsville. This study has been undertaken over a period of some 18 months and no less than \$3,000,000 has been spent on plant design and other aspects of the project. The company has not decided against the proposal but in the light of the existing economic climate it has found it necessary to defer the project for the time being. In the meantime certain outstanding technical investigations will be carried through to finality. I need hardly say it is the earnest hope of the Government that this project which will add so much to the industrialization of North Queensland will ultimately be brought to fruition.

TUESDAY, 21 OCTOBER 1975

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

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Parliamentary Library Committee, for the year 1974-75.

Commissioner for Railways, for the year 1974-75.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Proclamations under—

Acquisition of Land Act 1967-1969 and the State and Regional Planning and Development, Public Works Organization and Environmental Control Act 1971-1974.

Traffic Act Amendment Act 1974.

Orders in Council under—

Constitution Acts Amendment Act 1971.
The State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1965.

The Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1964.

The Regional Electric Authority Acts, 1945 to 1964.

Water Act 1926-1975.

Fish Supply Management Act 1972.

Fisheries Act 1957-1974.

Regulations under the Queensland Marine Act 1958-1972.

2. NEW UNIFORMS FOR POSTMEN

Mr. Lester, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the fact that the Postal Commission intends to spend thousands upon thousands of dollars on newly designed uniforms and funny, shrilly-sounding little whistles for its postmen?

(2) In view of my successful representation which resulted in the Commonwealth Government scrapping plans to repaint in different colours its trains, 'planes and boats, will he support my suggestion that the new uniforms idea be deferred until postal charges are reduced?

Answers:—

(1) I have no personal knowledge of Postal Commission policy on its employees' uniforms and equipment.

(2) I refer the honourable member to the answer given by the Deputy Premier on 25 September 1975 in reply to a similar suggestion, and can only reiterate the advice given on that occasion.

3. HOUSING COMMISSION RENTAL HOUSES

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

(1) What criteria does the Housing Commission use for the allocation of State rental houses?

(2) If the points system is still in use, what is the number of applicants and their position in the points scale for (a) Bundaberg, (b) Cairns, (c) Townsville, (d) Mackay, (e) Rockhampton, (f) Maryborough, (g) Gympie, (h) Mt. Isa, (i) Biloela and (j) Gladstone?

(3) How many commission houses are available for rental in each of the aforementioned cities and towns?

Answers:—

(1) Applicants are assessed on the following basis:—(a) For family houses—100 points—facing ejectment from present

dwellings or homeless, living in tents, huts or similar unsuitable accommodation; 80 points—living in premises condemned by local or State authorities; 60 points—separated owing to lack of accommodation; 40 points—living under overcrowded conditions or sharing houses with other people; Nil points—adequately housed and not facing ejectment. Three points are added for each child. For allocation of a house constructed under the 1973-74 Housing Agreement the applicant must also conform to the means test stipulated by the Commonwealth. This is currently \$131 per week exclusive of overtime. Two dollars per week is added for each child after the first two. (b) For pensioner units—An applicant must be a pensioner in receipt of the Supplementary (Rent) Allowance. He or she must also be living in poor or unsuitable accommodation or paying a rent manifestly beyond his or her financial capacity.

	With Points Rating				Total with Points Priority	Without Points Priority	Pensioners	Total
	100	80	60	40				
Bundaberg	11	1	5	15	32	68	32	132
Cairns	8	13	6	63	90	189	27	306
Townsville	3	6	4	138	151	245	23	419
Mackay	15	16	2	31	64	87	23	174
Rockhampton	6	5	7	35	53	91	12	156
Maryborough	3	3	..	18	24	75	16	115
Gympie	13	3	1	8	25	21	2	48
Mount Isa	3	..	2	27	32	51	6	89
Biloela	1	1	..	5	7	30	4	41
Gladstone	1	14	15	57	6	78

(3) Houses are allotted immediately a newly completed house becomes available or a vacancy occurs in a house previously occupied. For that reason and with the number of waiting applicants in the towns mentioned, the only houses currently available for rental could be one or two in course of allotment to applicants.

4. CAMBRIDGE CREDIT CORPORATION LIMITED STOCK

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

(1) Is he aware that officers administering the Succession Duties Act are valuing estates which contain debenture stock in Cambridge Credit Corporation Limited as if that stock were still worth its face value and are charging duty accordingly?

(2) As the stock is now valueless or worth much less than its face value, is he prepared to save the costs of expensive appeals against the assessment of the Commissioner of Stamp Duties by requesting that the commissioner either defer the payment of duties on such assets or adopt a more reasonable figure?

Answers:—

(1) In May this year the Receiver for Cambridge Credit Corporation Limited advised that the corporation's financial

position was not clear but that the shortfall was such that it appeared the claims of debenture holders would not be met in full and the unsecured notes would be valueless. Since the advice from the receiver, assessments as a general rule have been made provisionally on the basis that the unsecured notes are valueless and debenture stock has been valued at 50 per cent of face value.

(2) In so far as any assessments made prior to the advice from the receiver are concerned, the persons so assessed may submit the matter to the Commissioner of Stamp Duties for further consideration and possible reassessment in keeping with the present or revised procedures which have or may be adopted by the Stamp Duties Office as the position becomes clearer. This can be done without a formal appeal and without cost.

5. ANALGESICS

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

(1) With reference to the article in the "Sunday Sun" of 3 August, which reported that he planned action to ban corner-store sales of headache powders, what action does he plan to restrict the sale of analgesics?

(2) Has consideration been given to the proposal by some doctors that analgesics be sold only on prescription?

(3) What research has been undertaken to find out why Queensland has more headache-powder addicts than any other State?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) In formulating its control of drugs, Queensland looks to the National Health and Medical Research Council, which keeps such matters under constant review. The Poisons Schedule Sub-Committee of the council is at the present time considering various proposals. These include the restriction to the prescription-only category, restriction to sale by pharmacies, and the sale by other outlets of analgesics in small quantities of an analgesic which would be considered to produce the least harm if abused. It is possible that the final recommendations will be a combination of such proposals. As it is desirable to have uniformity throughout Australia, Queensland would examine any proposal for uniform control very closely.

(3) I am advised that the Social and Preventive Medicine Department of the University of Queensland in conjunction with the University of Melbourne is at present planning a research project which will include the problem of high abuse of analgesics by Queenslanders.

6. CONVICTIONS AND FINES FOR S.P. BETTING

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

(1) How many S.P. betting convictions were recorded in each of the last three years for which figures are available?

(2) In each year, how many were first, second, third or multiple offenders?

(3) What was the total sum received in fines for each year?

(4) How many fines represented the maximum penalty which could be incurred?

Answers:—

(1) Records of this kind have not been kept at a central recording section within the Police Department over the years mentioned. However, statistics of this kind are now being kept and figures for the year 1974-1975 are as follows:—Acting as a bookmaker elsewhere than on a racecourse, 22; Betting in public place, 3; Keep common betting house, 6; and Possession of instruments of betting, 13.

(2) This information is not readily available and it is not proposed to direct that inquiries be undertaken to obtain such information.

(3) As the receipt of fines is a matter for the Justice Department, it is suggested that the honourable member direct this question to my colleague the Honourable the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General.

(4) See answer to (2).

7. RECORD OF POISONS SOLD

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

(1) With reference to the Poisons Regulations of 1973, under which chemists and certain other stores can sell poisons listed in Schedules 1, 6A and 7 and which require a record to be kept in a Poisons Rates Book, what Government officer is responsible on a regular basis for checking the records kept by licensed vendors of poisons to ensure that full details are entered in the record book, such as the name, address, signature and reason for which the poison is required?

(2) How often are such records checked?

Answers:—

(1) State health inspectors are responsible for checking of poisons sales records on a regular basis. Members of the Police Force are also empowered under the Poisons Regulations to carry out such inspections at any time.

(2) Poisons sales books are checked during routine inspections of pharmacies or of licensed poisons-sellers' premises. The frequency of such visits averages once per year, but special inspections are carried out if required.

8. EXTENSIONS TO MARYBOROUGH BASE HOSPITAL

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

(1) What is the contract completion date of the upwards extension to the Maryborough Base Hospital administration block?

(2) Will the dental clinic be housed in the bottom floor of the Demaine Hospital Block when this block is modernised and converted from hospital wards?

(3) If so, what use is intended for the existing building in Adelaide Street, Maryborough, when the dental clinic moves to what is now the Demaine Block?

Answers:—

(1) The manager of the Maryborough Hospitals Board has advised that the anticipated completion date is March 1977.

(2) Yes.

(3) The future use of the existing dental clinic has not yet been determined.

9. MUSICIANS' UNION BAN ON BALLET
"CINDERELLA"

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

Will he investigate a reported threat by the Musicians' Union to impose bans on Her Majesty's Theatre through allied trade unions such as Actors' Equity during the scheduled run of the Queensland Ballet Company's "Cinderella" from 9 December next, the reason for such bans being the proposed use of recorded music by the Queensland Ballet Company, which is under severe financial pressure owing to its inability to secure the services of a Government-sponsored orchestra for this production?

Answer:—

If a situation which could lead to an industrial dispute exists, it is competent for an employer to notify the Industrial Commission accordingly and seek to have the matter resolved by that tribunal. I suggest that appropriate officers of the Queensland Ballet Company in the first instance confer with the State Industrial Registrar, Mr. A. C. Marshall, regarding the procedure to be followed in respect of such an approach.

10. FULL-TIME PROBATION OFFICER
FOR BUNDABERG

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

As the probation officer in charge of the Bundaberg district, who is based in Rockhampton, stated recently that more probationers could be admitted if there was a full-time probation officer in Bundaberg and as this statement was supported in court by Judge Shanahan, will he consider the matter of a full-time probation officer for the Bundaberg district?

Answer:—

I suggest that this question be directed to another Minister.

11. GREYHOUND TRACK, TOWNSVILLE

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

(1) As there is considerable concern amongst the members of the Queensland Greyhound Breeders, Owners and Trainers Association, Townsville Branch, about the failure to have a greyhound track operating in Townsville, what is the latest situation regarding the establishment of the track?

(2) Is any action contemplated to speed up the process of establishing the track, because delays are causing not only concern but considerable financial loss to many people who, in good faith, bought racing stock believing that racing would commence around mid-1975?

Answers:—

(1) I have approved a loan of \$100,000 to be made available to the Townsville Pastoral, Agricultural and Industrial Association from the Racecourse Development and Assistance Fund for the purpose of providing facilities at the showgrounds for the new Townsville Coursing Club. The association is aware of the terms and conditions applying to the loan and, subject to certain formalities concerning security, the documentation for the loan is proceeding.

(2) The provisional licence for night coursing at Townsville was granted to the coursing club a little over 12 months ago. With the expected early finalisation of the \$100,000 loan arrangement, I would think that work to establish the track and other facilities should be able to commence without further delay.

12. WYNNUM LAND FOR HOUSING
COMMISSION USE

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

In view of the urgent need for Housing Commission accommodation in the district of Wynnum, will he consider acquiring subdivided land available in this area, which will provide much needed housing and assist the building industry and employment in the area?

Answer:—

The Queensland Housing Commission will examine any suitable subdivided land in the Wynnum area which may be offered at prices suitable for welfare housing. However, as the honourable member is aware, there has been a cut of nearly 30 per cent in housing agreement money to Queensland in 1975-76 compared with 1974-75. This has drastically reduced the capacity of the commission not only to buy land but to enter into building contracts beyond existing contract commitments.

13. SAND FOR WYNNUM FORESHORES

Mr. Lamond, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services—

In view of the vast, ever-increasing numbers of people from all parts of the metropolitan area visiting and enjoying the foreshores of Brisbane's nearest bay-side area, Wynnum, and bearing in mind that tourism potential is already partly established by sailing and boating people from all over the world competing in world events in this area, will he give further consideration to my earlier submissions on investigating the availability of funds at all levels of government to supply sand on parts of the foreshores of this area, and thus provide a necessary

extension to the foreshore improvement and something for the benefit of those who live in or visit the area?

Answer:—

The foreshores of Wynnum are under the control of the Brisbane City Council and foreshore improvement by way of sand replenishment on beaches is primarily a matter for that council. However, in view of the honourable member's persistent efforts on behalf of his electorate, which have already resulted in a great deal of improvement to the foreshores in his area, and in view of the fact that the Commonwealth Government is phasing out its R.E.D. scheme, I will arrange for an approach to be made to the Brisbane City Council in an endeavour to have the work requested by him carried out, and thus maintain his high record of achievement in foreshore development in his area.

14. CUSTOMER PARKING AREAS FOR SUBURBAN SHOPPERS

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

(1) Has he given consideration to my proposal concerning establishing benefited customer parking areas in suburban shopping areas as an aid to customers and commerce in the field of small business?

(2) Will monopolies and major shop complexes ultimately abolish suburban shopping centres without provision for customer parking?

Answers:—

Following on what my colleague the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services said in reply to the previous question, I point out that not only is the Commonwealth Government phasing out the R.E.D. scheme; it is trying to frighten all the local authorities in Queensland. Tom Uren comes up to Queensland and tells a lot of lies; but he can't help it; he's like the rest of them down there in Canberra. That's how the present Federal Government got there in the first place.

(1) Yes. The conferring of power upon the Brisbane City Council to define benefited areas for the purpose of making and levying separate rates to defray the cost of particular functions, such as the provision of off-street car parks, would require an amendment of the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1974. Such a proposal is included in a number of amendments of the Act submitted by the Brisbane City Council which are presently receiving consideration.

(2) It appears to me that there is a preference in the desires of the public for "one stop" shopping centres, where all shopping requirements can be purchased at the one shopping centre. It seems

therefore desirable for shopping centres to have adequate off-street car-parking facilities, and the ordinances of the Brisbane City Council require sealed parking to be provided within the curtilage of every new drive-in shopping centre.

15. HOUSING COMMISSION ACTIVITIES IN ALBERT ELECTORATE

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

(1) As to date I have not received a reply to my letter of 30 July to the Queensland Housing Commissioner and following his acknowledgement on 19 September of not having answered it, will he supply full information on the activities of the Queensland Housing Commission in the Albert electorate?

(2) Will he supply maps showing all land held or under offer or consideration by the commission in the Albert electorate?

(3) Will he give specific information on the establishing of some very large projects in Beenleigh and surrounding areas of Mt. Warren, Eagleby, Slacks Creek, Daisy Hill, Loganholme, Kingston and City Park Estate?

(4) Will he make a full inspection of these areas with me in the near future?

(5) What is his attitude on home-ownership and integration of commission homes with non-commission homes?

(6) Will he and the commissioner inspect the new brick-veneer design homes with me in the near future?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) Yes.

(3) Commission holdings in these areas will be shown on the maps which I will supply to the honourable member. However, the commission has not acquired, and has no current plans to acquire, land at Mount Warren or Loganholme. At Daisy Hill the commission had only 51 sites and house construction is well in hand. At Slacks Creek the commission has no vacant sites within the Albert electorate.

(4) I will be very pleased to make such inspections at a date suitable to the honourable member having regard to our commitments in the House.

(5) There can be no doubt whatsoever of the firm commitment of this Government and of the Queensland Housing Commission in favour of home ownership.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Private enterprise.

Mr. LEE: That is true. It is a damn sight better than what the honourable member represents.

Answers (contd.):—

However, it should be realised that, in allotting houses constructed under the 1973-74 housing agreement, the commission cannot give preference to home-ownership applicants—thanks to the honourable member's mob again. Subject to priorities on the basis of urgency of need, houses must be allocated having regard to dates of lodgement of applications. Applicants must also satisfy a means test stipulated by the Commonwealth—the honourable member's mob again. These procedures must, and do, produce the result that most successful applicants, and particularly widows and separated wives with children, do not have the economic resources to undertake ownership. In fact, with present-day costs of houses and land, it is necessary in many cases for the commission to rebate (or subsidise) the rent. The integration of commission houses with non-commission houses has been a long-standing policy of the Queensland Housing Commission. The extent to which it can be economically achieved varies from time to time and from place to place. A great many of the commission's land purchase transactions are for single sites or relatively small groups.

(6) See answer to (4).

16. PUBLICATION OF BACTERIOLOGICAL ANALYSES BY WATER QUALITY COUNCIL

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

Why are no results of bacteriological analyses published in the annual reports of the Water Quality Council, despite the fact that in the 1973-74 report of the council it was stated that 983 of 3,000 analyses carried out were of a bacteriological nature?

Answer:—

Results of bacteriological analyses are included in the Annual Report of the Water Quality Council for the year ended 30 June 1975, which will be tabled in the near future.

17. BACTERIOLOGICAL STANDARDS FOR DRINKING AND RECREATION WATER

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

(1) Are there at present any standards for the bacteriological quality of Queensland drinking water and recreation water?

(2) Do such standards exist in other States of Australia and, if so, does the Government propose such standards for Queensland?

Answers:—

(1) Yes. The standard accepted by the director-general for bacteriological quality of drinking water is "The International

Standards for Drinking Water", World Health Organization. The standard for bacteriological quality of recreation water is based on technical standards in "A Compilation of Australian Water Quality Criteria", Australian Water Resources Council.

(2) A national standard does not exist but the Environmental Health Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council has formed a working party which is actively considering two tasks: (a) the formulation of a recommended quality criteria for Australian drinking water, and (b) the conducting of surveys to formulate a national standard for water used for recreational purposes. Queensland will examine any proposed standard with a view to its adoption.

18. JELLY-FISH STINGS

Mrs. Kippin, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries—

Has his department undertaken any research into the prevention and treatment of stings from poisonous jelly-fish and, if so, what are the findings?

Answer:—

Research, sponsored by the State Government through its Queensland Fisheries Service, into poisonous jelly-fish was carried out between 1964 and 1968 by Dr. J. H. Barnes, medical practitioner, Cairns. The prime objective was collection of a sufficient quantity of jelly-fish toxin to enable a study of its physiological effects and produce an antivenene, which was undertaken by the Commonwealth Serum Laboratory with successful result. Coincidental with this study a public warning programme was successfully developed largely through the Queensland Surf Lifesaving Association as well as the mounting of an education programme through the Queensland Health Education Council in consultation with the James Cook University of North Queensland and Dr. J. H. Barnes. Pamphlets providing basic information on recognition and treatment of stings caused by six types of poisonous jelly-fish have been distributed with financial backing of my Government.

19. A.P.M. FORESTS PTY. LTD. LANDS

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service—

What are the locations and areas of land owned by the Australian Paper Mill in the Pine Rivers, Caboolture and Landsborough Shires?

Answer:—

A.P.M. Forests Pty. Ltd. hold about 5 191 hectares of leasehold land in the Pine Rivers, Caboolture and Landsborough

Shires. The lands are located in the parishes of Bribie, Burpengary, Canning, Durundur, Redcliffe, Toorbul, Wararba and Woorim. I do not have details of the freehold lands held by the company.

20. URBAN FORESTRY SCHEME

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

(1) Is he aware of a novel proposal by Dr. John French of the C.S.I.R.O. Division of Building Research, which concerns the improving of our urban and sub-urban environment by planting forests throughout our cities, to be managed and harvested as a timber resource?

(2) Has the possibility of the introduction of this urban forestry scheme into Queensland cities been investigated by his department and, if so, what has been the result?

Answers:—

(1) The detail of the particular proposal by Dr. John French of the C.S.I.R.O. Division of Building Research is not known to me or to my department.

(2) The possibility of the introduction of this scheme into Queensland cities has not been investigated by my department.

21. HOUSING COMMISSION ACCOMMODATION FOR THE AGED AT NEW FARM

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

Following the successful opening of the Queensland Housing Commission block of aged persons units in Kent Street, New Farm, will he undertake to keep under consideration the possibility of siting a further block of units in the New Farm area to cater for the great need which exists for the housing of aged persons in that area?

Answer:—

I appreciate the honourable member's very sincere interest in this direction. I am very pleased that it was found possible to provide such a large number of pensioner units in the New Farm area, where there was a substantial need. The honourable member may be assured that New Farm will be kept under notice, together with other Brisbane suburbs and centres elsewhere in the State, when further programmes for pensioner units are being planned.

22. EXTENSION OF SPOUSE-TO-SPOUSE EXEMPTION FROM DEATH DUTIES

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

With regard to the relaxation of death duties on estates passing between spouses which was announced in the recent State

Budget, will he give consideration to including those children who nurse an aged parent for several years, remain unmarried as a direct or indirect result of devotion to the parent and are then forced to sell the family home on the death of the parent in order to pay death duties under the existing law?

Answer:—

By eliminating duty altogether in estates left to the surviving partner, the Government has made the maximum impact in the area of greatest need. At some future date the State's financial position may be such that the Government can further reduce the incidence of succession duties, but for the present it is not possible to extend the concessions already announced.

23. EXCESSIVE OVERTIME IN RAILWAY DEPARTMENT

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

(1) Is the practice of working excessive overtime prevalent within the Railway Department and, if so, in the last three months for which figures are available, what were the numbers of shifts worked in excess of ten shifts per fortnight in the Mayne and Roma Street depots by drivers, firemen, guards, shunters and examiners?

(2) Over the same period and in these classifications, what were the numbers of shifts for these depots worked in excess of eight hours?

Answers:—

(1) To meet the exigencies of the railway service, it is necessary, principally owing to unforeseen circumstances, for overtime to be worked, but it is not agreed that the working of excessive overtime is prevalent. For the six fortnightly periods between 21 July and 12 October 1975, the number of shifts in excess of 10 per fortnight per employee at Mayne and Roma Street averaged—Mayne—Drivers, .81; Firemen, .7; Guards, 1.4; Examiners, .65; and Shunters, 1.25. Roma Street—Examiners, .9; and Shunters, .55.

(2) This information is not readily available, and its extraction would involve considerable clerical hours and additional expense, which it is considered could not be justified.

24. SHARK-MESHING PROGRAMME; TIN CAN BAY AND CAPRICORN COAST

Mr. K. J. Hooper for **Mr. Yewdale**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services—

Further to his answer to my question on 16 October, do the persons performing the function of shark-netting provide the department with the amount and type of marine life being meshed and removed

from their nets? If so, what are the details of catches during the past six months from the Tin Can Bay and Capricorn Coast areas?

Answer:—

All shark contractors provide the department with details of catches. In the last six months, the following catches have been made:—In the Tin Can Bay area—64 sharks; 4 rays; 8 turtles, of which 7 were returned to the sea alive; 5 porpoises, of which 2 were returned to the sea alive; and 3 bonitos. In the Rockhampton area—40 sharks; 37 rays; 11 turtles, of which 6 were returned to the sea alive; 1 porpoise; 1 dolphin; 16 sawfish; 2 jewfish; 2 short-tooth whales; and 1 tuna.

25. REDUCTION OF LEAD CONTENT IN PETROL

Mr. K. J. Hooper for **Mr. Yewdale**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

(1) Is he aware that the lead content in petrol used in Victoria is to be cut to 60 grams per litre to help control air pollution?

(2) In view of this worth-while measure by the Victorian Government, will he give favourable consideration to implementing a similar control in Queensland?

Answer:—

I table the information requested by the honourable member and ask that it be incorporated in "Hansard".

Names of Defendants	Action Instituted		Penalty
Midland Pacific Holding Pty. Ltd.	Section 113 (3)—display of name outside company office	Ex parte	Fined \$25, costs of court \$2.50, professional costs \$6.30
Dunlop Realty Pty. Ltd.	Section 113 (3)—display of name outside office	Ex parte	Fined \$30, costs of court \$4.25, in default levy and distress
Dunlop Realty Pty. Ltd.	Section 113 (3)—display of words "Registered Office"	Ex parte	Fined \$30, costs of court \$4.25, in default levy and distress
Glenhaven Drive Pty. Ltd.	Section 113 (3)—display of name outside office	Ex parte	Fined \$30, costs of court \$4.25, in default levy and distress
Glenhaven Drive Pty. Ltd.	Section 113 (3)—display of words "Registered Office"	Ex parte	Fined \$30, costs of court \$4.25, in default levy and distress
Blue & White Cabs Ltd.	Section 113 (3)—display of name outside office	Pleaded guilty	Fined \$20, costs of court \$4.25, in default levy and distress
Blue & White Cabs Ltd.	Section 164—accounts to be sent to members before Annual General Meeting	Pleaded guilty	Fined \$20, costs of court \$4.25, in default levy and distress
Finnemore Realty Pty. Ltd.	Section 377—improper use of words "Limited" or "No-Liability"	Pleaded guilty	Fined \$20, costs of court \$4.25

Answer:—

This matter does not come within the jurisdiction of my portfolio.

26. HOTELS CLOSED BY LICENSING COMMISSION

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

(1) How many hotels has the Queensland Licensing Commission closed during 1975 because they were being operated by unauthorised persons?

(2) How many hotels were closed by the commission for the same reason during 1974?

Answers:—

(1) Four.

(2) Five.

27. COMPANY CONVICTIONS AND SENTENCES

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

Further to my question regarding the investigations carried out by the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs and his reply that eight convictions have been obtained, what was the nature of the convictions and what were the sentences handed down by the court?

28. INQUIRY INTO FAILURE OF K. D. MORRIS GROUP

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

With reference to the public revelation that the deficiency of five companies in the K. D. Morris group has been estimated by liquidators at more than \$10 million and the call by the President of the Australian Institute of Credit Management, Mr. M. Carey, for a special investigation into the failure of the K. D. Morris group because of the disastrous effect on many small subcontractors and businessmen financially associated with the group, will he reconsider his stand on this issue and accept this suggestion and have an inquiry initiated?

Answer:—

In accordance with the provisions of subsection 3 of section 234 of the Companies Act 1961–1974, the official liquidators appointed by the Supreme Court of Queensland filed on Thursday last, 16 October 1975, copies of statements of affairs in respect of five companies in the K. D. Morris group in the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs. The above statements together with a memorandum of advice to creditors by the liquidators on their progress in the various administrations is currently being examined by that office. Notice has also been received that meetings of creditors in respect of four of the particular companies will be held in Brisbane on Thursday, 23 October 1975, and in respect of another one of the companies in Townsville on Monday, 27 October 1975. Arrangements have already been made for inspectors from the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs in Brisbane and Townsville to attend these meetings in the capacity of observers. From a preliminary examination of statements already received it is apparent that the liquidators will in all probability be reporting to the commissioner in accordance with the provisions of subsection 3 of section 306 of the Companies Act 1961–1974. Subsection 4 of that section provides that where a report as aforementioned is made the commissioner may, if he thinks fit, investigate the matter and may, if he thinks it expedient, apply to the court for an order conferring on him or any person designated by him for the purpose all such powers to investigate the affairs of the companies as are provided by the Companies Act in the case of a winding-up by the court. The matter of the liquidation of the companies in the K. D. Morris group is currently being examined by the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs and appropriate action, having regard to the foregoing, will be undertaken by that office.

29. EXORBITANT PRICE INCREASES, BLACK-WATER-EMERALD-CENTRAL HIGHLANDS AREA

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

In view of the repeated complaints from consumers in the Blackwater–Emerald–Central Highlands area, such as milk being 24c a bottle compared with 19c in Rockhampton, the Sunday paper 22c compared with 13c and instances of exorbitant price-increasing taking place, such as greaseproof wrapping, 100 ft. x 12 ins., rising from 36c to 66c in one week, will he have an investigation made into profiteering in these areas in the interest of country consumers?

Answer:—

The matter of milk prices is one for the consideration of my colleague the Minister for Primary Industries. In regard to the other items, experience has shown that the fixing of prices by a statutory authority does not overcome the cost involved in the supply of these commodities or control the retail prices of them in these areas. The ineffectiveness of the Prices Justification Tribunal is an example of this. As the honourable member is aware, rigid price control operates in South Australia and it has not in any way reduced the prices of commodities as compared with the prices operating in other States. This is confirmed by a comparison of movements in the Consumer Price Index which, whilst it only applies to capital cities, reveals that the movements of the index in Brisbane compare at least favourably with its movements in Adelaide.

30. LABELLING OF CONTRACEPTIVE PILLS

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

(1) Is he aware of an article in "The Courier-Mail" of 17 October, wherein the U.S. Food and Drug Administration stated that it would propose a new label for birth-control pills, advising women over 40 years of age not to take the pill and warning all users that they may risk blood clots and heart attacks and may bear children with birth defects or suffer complications during pregnancy?

(2) Will he investigate this matter to determine whether a similar situation should prevail in Queensland and report upon the investigation to this House?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2) The Drug Evaluation Committee established on an independent basis by the Commonwealth Government to consider all adverse reactions from the intake of drugs has examined the side-effects of oral contraceptives on many occasions and

I feel sure that the committee will examine this latest report from the Food and Drug Administration of the United States. Any recommendation from the Drug Evaluation Committee is passed on to the National Health and Medical Research Council with a view to incorporating it in uniform legislation. In the main Queensland adopts uniform recommendations of this nature. I am advised by local medical authorities, however, that women taking oral contraceptives should not be alarmed by the newspaper report. This applies particularly to those women who have become pregnant despite the fact that they have taken oral contraceptives. The risk of birth deformities as a result is almost negligible. Whilst there were reports of blood clots and heart attacks with the early formulation of oral contraceptives, the dose of hormone has been greatly reduced and it can be expected that, with this reduction, the risk will become less.

31. HOUSING COMMISSION PARKLAND,
MARGATE ST., MT. GRAVATT EAST

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

(1) Is he aware that the Queensland Housing Commission, at the time it develops estates, sets aside in the trust of the relevant council portions of land for recreation and parkland purposes?

(2) Is he able to establish why no development of such land set aside in Margate Street, Mt. Gravatt, has taken place?

(3) Will he take the necessary action to bring this matter before the Brisbane City Council, so that this land can be of use to the local residents for recreational purposes, instead of being an unsightly, overgrown unofficial rubbish dump and a breeding place for pests?

Answers:—

(1) Yes.

(2 and 3) I am referring the matters raised by the honourable member to the Brisbane City Council for its representations and I will advise him by letter when such representations are to hand.

32. PEDESTRIAN CROSSING LIGHTS NEAR
ST. AMBROSE CONVENT, KELVIN
GROVE ROAD

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

(1) Following an inspection by him of the pedestrian crossing at the St. Ambrose Convent School, Kelvin Grove Road, Kelvin Grove, on 17 October, when will pedestrian-actuated control lights be installed at the crossing?

(2) What is the reason for the delay in installing these urgently needed traffic lights?

Answers:—

(1) Pedestrian-actuated signals have been included for installation this financial year.

(2) Funds cannot be provided to cover all requests for signals and the work can only be programmed as funds become available.

33. SOUND-PROOFING AT COOMERA SCHOOL

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

As the teachers at the Coomera School find it almost impossible to hear at the ground floor level because there is no sound-proofing between the floors, will he take urgent action to overcome this problem?

Answer:—

No recent request has been received by my Department of Works in relation to this matter. An urgent investigation will be undertaken by departmental officers into classroom accommodation conditions at this school and consideration then given to undertaking any necessary work.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

POLICE FORENSIC SCIENCE UNIT

Mr. BURNS: I ask the Minister for Police: Did he read the report in "Sunday Sun" dealing with the Wippell murder case? Could Wippell have been saved the expense of a trial if his department had a well-equipped forensic science unit? Is it a fact that other States in Australia have such units? What is the reason for Queensland's not having a unit, and what can be done to assist Mr. Wippell as a result of this procrastination on Queensland's part?

Mr. HODGES: I am not aware that we do not have a well-set-up forensic science section. There is such a section in the Queensland Police Department, and I think it is the equal of that in any other State in Australia. I do not know the full facts of the story, but there is certainly a forensic science section in the Police Department.

TRACTOR SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. BURNS: I direct a question to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer. I am aware of the problems associated with tractor safety in the small-crop industry but, as another man died on Saturday as the result of a tractor accident, I now ask what is happening in this Parliament in relation to the proposed tractor safety legislation that has been promised on a number of occasions.

Sir GORDON CHALK: So far as I know, certain law already exists in relation to tractors. This is a matter that has been discussed by the Government on a number of occasions and, as I understand it, there are at present laws that provide for the safety of the individual if people abide by them. I know from my own experience long before I entered this Parliament, particularly in North Queensland, that there were in those days tractor accidents, especially in areas where the contour of the land was not entirely suitable for the use of tractors. The honourable member has raised a point, and I am quite prepared to give an undertaking that the Government will see if anything can be done to assist, or if the law as it stands is being flouted by those who operate tractors. If that is the case, there is very little that one can do. It is almost impossible to protect people against what might be regarded as their own folly.

FEEDING OF SWILL TO PIGS; FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. BURNS: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Did he see the article in "Queensland Country Life" headed, "M.P.'s Not Doing Their Homework"? It contained a statement by Mr. Harpham, the United Graziers' Association Cattle Committee chairman that if foot and mouth disease got into Australia, the current depression of the beef market would seem like a boom. Mr. Harpham suggests that if the facts were available to members, we might reconsider the case. Will the Minister make available to all members of Parliament, not only the joint Government parties, the details of the cases for and against the feeding of swill to pigs so that we can make a proper decision in the matter?

Mr. SULLIVAN: I have not actually read the statement made by Mr. Harpham. Usually I read "Queensland Country Life" at the week-end, but this week-end I was busy.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Playing bowls?

Mr. SULLIVAN: In answer to that silly interjection—I would have played bowls if it had not been raining on Sunday afternoon. Actually I spent all day Sunday plodding around paddocks looking at wheat damaged by hail.

The Leader of the Opposition asks that the facts be made available. Once I reach agreement and introduce a measure into the Chamber, if I do in fact reach such agreement, that, I think, would be the appropriate time to discuss it.

Mr. Burns: Don't you think you should give it to us beforehand to help us make a decision?

Mr. SULLIVAN: That would be in conformity with what is happening in Canberra, namely, contravening the practices of Parliament that the Labor Government has been doing for the last two or three years. I would

hope that the Leader of the Opposition will get his opportunity to debate this matter when it is introduced into the House. I accept my responsibility in the matter. I have not as yet obtained approval of the joint parties. I am now considering certain angles to take back in due course to the joint parties, and I hope it will then be possible to introduce a measure. All members will then be able to have their say.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY PAYMENTS

Mr. LAMONT: In directing a question to the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport, I refer him to page 2115 of the House of Representatives "Hansard" of 15 October this year and to page 1205 of the Senate "Hansard" of 16 October. In the first instance, in the debate on the second reading of the Social Services Bill (No. 3), the Liberal spokesman, the Honourable D. Chipp, said *inter alia*—

"We" (in the Liberal Party) "share the view that passage of this Bill should be expedited and I seek leave of the House to move that the debate be adjourned and made an order of the day for a later hour this day."

The Federal A.L.P. spokesman in the House of Representatives, Mr. Riordan, refused this request to pass the Bill increasing pension payments through the Parliament as quickly as possible. In the second instance, Liberal Senator Peter Baume pointed out to the Senate that pensions and other social service benefits were not part of the Budget currently being delayed in the Senate—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to put his question.

Mr. LAMONT: I am just referring the Minister to the question asked in the Senate. It was—

"Does the Government intend to hold up these Bills which authorise the payment of pensions at a higher rate from 4 November? If not, will the Government agree now to accommodate any Opposition moves to expedite passage of these Bills?"

My question is: Is it true that in both the House of Representatives and the Senate the Labor Government spokesmen have unequivocally stated the Government's refusal to allow the money for pension and other social service benefits to be presented and passed through both Houses of Federal Parliament? Will the Minister assure this Parliament that every effort will be made to ensure that pensioners in Queensland will be informed of these facts so they will know that their pensions are being cruelly used as a political football by a cynical, desperate Federal Labor Government and not by the Liberal senators?

Mr. HERBERT: It is true that the Federal Labor boys have refused the Opposition's request to pass the Bill authorising pension

increases. The Department of Children's Services has already been advised by the Federal Department of Social Security not to pay the increased pensions as from 3 November, the date on which they were supposed to be paid. There is normally a Federal complement to the social service payments that we make. We do not normally pay any increases until we have received advice from the Commonwealth that it is prepared to come to our aid. The State Treasurer has already agreed to my department paying the proposed increases in all State social service pensions from the date promised irrespective of whether the Canberra socialists agree to complement that payment in the way in which they should so that all pensioners who receive pensions from my department will receive the increases from the date on which they have been promised.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members on my left to refrain from persistent interjections; if they do not, I shall have to deal with them. The same rule applies to every member of this House.

Mr. HERBERT: I can understand that they do not want this message to get out to the pensioners of Queensland. Unfortunately, I happen to share electoral responsibility with Mr. Hayden. I have had complaints from pensioners in our area that they have received letters from Mr. Hayden on official notepaper warning them that because of Liberal activity they will not be getting their pensions. I have asked for some of those letters in order to table them in the House so that every member will know that the Federal socialists have now reached the position where they will attempt to intimidate pensioners, the poorest section of the community, and do anything at all to try and attain their ends. We are going to drag them screaming to the polls, anyway, but I think that a Government that would descend to these depths and try to mislead pensioners deserves to be thrown out for that action alone. One thing that I can assure them of is that all of those who get cheques from my department will get them at the increased rate.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS, UPPER EDWARD STREET— LEICHHARDT STREET INTERSECTION

Mr. DEAN: I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Has his attention been drawn to the dangerous traffic hazard existing at Upper Edward Street, Brisbane? I come through that way every morning. New traffic lights have been installed at the intersection of Upper Edward Street and Leichhardt Street but for weeks they have not been switched on. Can the Minister tell me now or find out why those lights have not been switched on, particularly in peak hours?

Mr. HINZE: I thank the honourable member for Sandgate for bringing the state of the lights at the Upper Edward Street intersection to my notice. He should understand that this comes under what we call the miters programme of the Brisbane City Council. Like all other schemes with which our good friend in Canberra Mr. Jones is concerned—I do not know whether the honourable member has heard of him but he is a friend of Uren and a few of the other men in Canberra who have been sacked—this scheme has been cut back. Indeed, there have been such cuts in our road programmes that even intersection lights are affected. I am now placed in the position that the installation of lights at school crossings, which, as the honourable member for Sandgate knows, are essential, has to be deferred indefinitely—purely because of our friends in Canberra, who have been able to turn a \$900,000,000 surplus into a \$3,000 million deficit. They are the greatest economic bunglers this nation has ever known. Of course, they are friends of Opposition members, who helped to put them there—and apparently they want to keep them there. They haven't got the guts to go to the people to see how good they are. The honourable member asked me why the traffic lights are not operating in Upper Edward Street. That is the simple answer.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth, in the chair)

Debate resumed from 16 October (see p. 1257) on Sir Gordon Chalk's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1975-76, a sum not exceeding \$108,903 to defray Salaries—His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. AKERS (Pine Rivers) (12.5 p.m.): Like most of the population of Queensland, I was agreeably surprised when Sir Gordon Chalk brought down the State Budget last month. Like Opposition members, I found very little in it to criticise. Like all other members of the Government parties, I applaud the Treasurer and his dedicated staff for producing yet another minor miracle.

A few items have affected particular sections of the community, but much of the crying has been without basis. Much will depend upon what produces the average increase in rail freights. If the average is created by higher costs in the transport of cattle, there is room for considerable complaint. The beef industry is on its knees now, and it could not stand a further kick such as extreme freight rises could deliver.

I was dreading Thursday 25 September as I dreaded 19 August, because the aftermath of 19 August, the day of the Hayden Budget, has been chaos for Australia. That was the day when Australia took another lurch

towards its doom—a doom that nobody in his worst nightmare could have dreamed possible three short years ago. However, other speakers have eloquently shown the disaster of that day, and I do not intend to spend much time on it. My dread for the State Budget was based on the fact that the Treasurer had precisely the same state of the economy on which to base his Budget as did Mr. Hayden. Quite reasonably, one could have expected a horror Budget from the State; but, as we have seen, this was not to be. We have a sound, stable, press-ahead programme for the State for 1975-76.

A very good question is why these two Treasurers produced such widely divergent results against the same economic background. My belief is that prudence, sanity, and, above all, experience and lack of ideological dogma were the factors that made the difference. Hayden and Whitlam were bound by the socialist ideology and were not able to look beyond it. Their party would not have allowed them to do so even if they wanted to. Sir Gordon Chalk has made sound judgments based on common sense and the experience of a record term as State Treasurer.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention, Mr. Hewitt, to a ruling made by Mr. Speaker that it is not permissible to read speeches in this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Mr. Speaker did make that ruling and I intend to observe it. I ask the honourable gentleman not to read verbatim. Of course, he is entitled to refer to notes.

Mr. AKERS: Unlike the honourable member for Archerfield when he was making his contribution just the other day, I have been speaking from copious notes.

Mr. Gibbs: Written by yourself.

Mr. AKERS: Yes, written by me, not by some stooge in the Trades Hall.

Mr. Houston: You can't even type.

Mr. AKERS: That comment shows that Opposition members do not know what they are talking about. These notes are in my handwriting; they are not typed, as the honourable member suggests.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have made a ruling, and the honourable member will proceed. If I think he is contravening my ruling, I shall draw his attention to it. He will take notice of me and nobody else.

Mr. AKERS: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt.

There are several items in the Financial Statement on which I should like to comment. On page 12, reference is made to a new subsidy for local authority libraries. This is a new arrangement that will, I believe,

revolutionise the functioning of library services provided by local authorities throughout Queensland. I was extremely interested to see this provision, because the present subsidy system is complicated and extremely difficult to comprehend and administer. All shire clerks who have library services in their administration expect a completely different method of subsidy payments from the present system. The old scheme provided subsidies for new buildings, but not for extensions to existing buildings. It provided for a 50 per cent subsidy of the salaries of qualified staff but none for assistants, and the assistants are just as important as the qualified staff.

As I said, the new scheme is a major breakthrough in the provision of library services in Queensland—the greatest since the inception of the scheme in the early 1940s. Under the new scheme, all expenditure will draw a 50 per cent subsidy. The scheme will encourage local authorities to spend money on library services by using a sliding scale of subsidy; the more money that is spent by the local authority the more money they will receive in subsidy. The new scheme will cover extensions to existing buildings. I mention as an example the Strathpine library in the Pine Rivers Shire. It was built just two years ago strictly in accordance with the provisions of the old system and already it is overcrowded. Under the old system, there was a disincentive to enlarge this building but now a subsidy is available to increase the accommodation. The limit on the subsidy is 75c per capita of the shire population and this is my only criticism of the new scheme. I understand the Pine Rivers Shire is to receive the maximum subsidy of \$28,290. This figure is based on the Bureau of Statistics estimate of population of 37,720 whereas the true figure would be more like 44,000. Using that figure, the subsidy would be \$4,700 more. This same basic error occurred in 1972, when there was a State electoral distribution—an error of thousands in the estimate of the population of the Pine Rivers Shire—so that the quota was reached even before the first election using the new boundaries was held. This same error is now going to deprive the Pine Rivers library service of \$4,700.

While on the question of libraries I would point out the dire lack of such facilities made available by the Brisbane City Council to the residents of Bracken Ridge and Bald Hills. There are 200 houses currently under construction in Bracken Ridge alone, which will add substantially to an existing population of something like 10,000, and yet there is no provision for a library in the future. The Brisbane City Council is sorely remiss in this respect.

Among the many half-thought-out and ill-informed comments on the Budget by the members of the Opposition was one by the honourable member for Rockhampton extolling the virtues of the Federal Government and its so-called financial support of

local government. He said—and I remember it well because it was desperately incorrect, to say the least—that the Federal Government had helped to reduce the debt structure of local authorities in Queensland. This financial assistance has come in the form of several so-called grants. The only one that could even be thought of as reducing the debt structure of local authorities was that from the Grants Commission, which was the only one without any strings attached to it. Virtually all other money received by local government was for precisely detailed projects, many of which would never have been undertaken if strings had not been attached to the provision of that money.

As an example I cite the Clear Mountain Reserve project near Samford. The Pine Rivers Shire Council had shelved this project because of its cost. In fact, I believe that it would never have gone ahead. The project was forgotten because no council would ever borrow the money necessary to complete this project. They would not have increased their debt structure for such a project. However, when the airy-fairy schemes of the Federal Government were floated, this scheme was submitted for funding under the area improvement programme and the funds were forthcoming. There is now an excellent picnic area and look-out for residents of the Brisbane region. The result is something really worth while, but there is no lowering of the debt structure of the Pine Rivers Shire Council because no loan funds would ever have been applied to this project.

Funds made available under the area improvement programme are producing excellent projects, but they are not assisting to lower the indebtedness of local government. They are being used on the glamour projects, the show-pieces. While show-pieces are being funded by grants, the so-called grants for sewerage are also being issued by Mr. Hayden and Mr. Uren. These are the mundane ones. Even though they are important, they are not the glamorous and showy projects. These "grants" must be repaid, with interest at the bond rate, over 30 or 40 years.

So, even with the funds that the Federal Government is making available, the loan structure is not being assisted. On the contrary, finance of this type has pushed up the sewerage rate in the Shire of Pine Rivers from \$45 two years ago to \$80 this year. You see, Mr. Hewitt, when the State allocates loans for sewerage, it includes a 40 per cent non-repayable subsidy. Loans from the Federal Government do not include any such subsidy, so the full amount is repayable, not only 60 per cent of it as under the State system.

So much for Federal Government assistance to local government! So much for the understanding of the honourable member for Rockhampton of local government! I think it is typical of the lack of understanding among members of the Opposition. They just do not understand what local government is about; nor do their colleagues in

Canberra understand what local government is about. They treat all local government in Australia on exactly the same basis. They do not understand that there is a completely different system in each of the Australian States. One local government in Sydney administers an area of four square miles. The Shire of Pine Rivers, which is far from being the largest local government area in Queensland, is 300 square miles in area. As I said, the system is completely different in each of the States and the basis of financing is completely different, yet the Federal Government is treating all local government in the same way.

While I am discussing the achievements of Whitlam's bush-rangers, I refer honourable members to the speech of the honourable member for Wavell (Dr. Crawford) in the Budget debate. Dr. Crawford quoted figures that will bring fear into the hearts of men who are now employed on building construction—and God knows there are precious few of them left!

As I mentioned earlier, the Hayden Budget was brought down on the dreaded 19th of August. Under that Budget, the Federal Government deferred building projects worth \$58,000,000. That was the equivalent of deferring the employment of 3,000 men in the building industry, in design offices and on construction sites, for one full year throughout Australia. A survey of consulting engineers in September, three weeks after the Budget was brought down, showed that projects worth \$102,000,000 had been cancelled in Queensland. That is the equivalent of nine to 12 months' work for all engineers in Queensland. These included nine Federal projects, 16 State projects and 19 local government jobs, as well as 10 private jobs. These horrific figures indicate that in about mid-1976—that is about when the effects will be felt—15,000 to 20,000 jobs for building workers and others in associated fields just will not exist. These are jobs that should have been available but will not exist because of Hayden's Budget and the actions of Mr. Whitlam and his friends.

How can Whitlam strut around Canberra holding his head up, how can he smile when he lies directly to the television cameras, when these figures are available for only one industry?

Mr. Turner: No trouble to him!

Mr. AKERS: He finds it very easy, as the honourable member for Warrego said.

Land surveyors have reported plummeting levels of work. Where are young people to build their houses if surveyors are not subdividing land? Whitlam said he would bring prices for land down. He has done that all right! He has brought the whole damn lot down, with a resounding crash, onto the heads of the country's poor, unfortunate young married couples looking for a home site. He is all right on his \$70,000-a-year family income. To hell with the battlers and the workers!

Another frightening aspect of this disaster is the destruction of the pools of expertise in many fields. Over the years large teams of experts were built up. It took many years to build those teams, but they are now shattered and scattered. Teams that worked together on large projects, teams that were able to produce economical results and economical answers to very difficult problems, are now gone—probably never to be re-formed. Specialist architects and engineers in fields such as aged persons homes, hospitals and large building constructions are now working on assembly lines building cars, selling real estate, working on prawn trawlers, and surfing, or on the dole. One I know is surfing and another is retreading tyres. Many of them have gone overseas and are lost to Australia. They are good, honest people who have been kicked from job to job over the last few years, but now they are sick of being ground into the dust.

Dr. Scott-Young: Only since 1972.

Mr. AKERS: Yes. They are sick of being ground into the dust and probably will never return to their former professions. That experience is lost. Millions of dollars' worth of training and experience is being used on small drafting jobs, the retreading of tyres or the riding of a surf board.

The building industry definitely needs some action to boost confidence. That will not be forthcoming from Canberra with the present Federal Government, so I must look to our Treasurer, Sir Gordon Chalk, and make a plea to him to take some action to capture the imagination of this dispirited industry which, in one way or another, employs 30 per cent of the work-force. I appeal to the Treasurer to start some forward planning and to let the industry know that schemes are on the way which will be ready to start when finance does become available. Let the industry know that there is a future for it—a future that is close at hand. Let us make this "Press Ahead" Budget do just that. Let us make it mean a lot more for the 30 per cent of the work-force that is directly affected. Let us see if we can do something to get back some of those 15,000 to 20,000 jobs that Mr. Hayden and Mr. Whitlam have destroyed.

In his contribution, one member of the Opposition said that under the previous Government we had the same tax structure that everyone is now complaining about, yet no-one complained about it then. That again shows how complete is the ignorance of honourable members opposite of what is happening around them. Up to 1972 there was a problem slowly growing with the existing tax structure, but let it be remembered that that tax-structure problem is now aggravated by inflation. In 1972 inflation was less than 4 per cent, but now it is estimated to be between 15 and 20 per cent. The problem is now growing four times as quickly. It has been severely aggravated by inflation

and the friends in Government of honourable members opposite have done nothing about it.

In 1972 there was the problem, and it should have been overcome in early 1973, but in 1975 we still have no tangible results. We hear about some vague new system that is going to make it worse, not better—a new system of jumping in salary changes. It is not going to be a gradual thing; it is going to be done in jumps. It will do the same thing but it will hit a person in a big burst instead of small ones over a period.

I described Sir Gordon Chalk's Budget as a miracle. Probably that language was a little strong, but it is certainly pleasing to be able to support in clear conscience the first State Budget I have had to consider. Although it contains several items which are not exactly pleasing, the over-all result is good. It is especially encouraging to see the introduction of the first step in the elimination of death duties and gift duty on items passing from spouse to spouse. I look forward to seeing the full benefit of this move when the Commonwealth Government follows suit. It must take complementary action as soon as possible to have the excellent effect of the State's move carry right through. Other honourable members have shown clearly that because of the Federal Government's policy the effect of the State benefits will not be as great as they should be.

Sir Gordon Chalk: I'm sure that Mr. Fraser will implement it when he gets the opportunity.

Mr. AKERS: I am assured by the Treasurer that the next Prime Minister will institute this programme.

The Liberal Party has always been the champion of small business. A further concrete example of that is the doubling of the pay-roll tax exemption. Small businessmen, Australia's largest employers, are the bane of the socialists. Support for them in their hour of need—when they are under fire from the A.L.P. banshees—is extremely important. I see this move as one step that the Government has been able to take. Again I express the hope that Mr. Fraser can solve many of the problems created for small business.

One item which I believe is missing from the Budget is an increase in the police rental subsidy. House rental paid by policemen attracts a subsidy amounting to a paltry few dollars. It is only sensible to increase the subsidy, which has remained static for many years. If we are to have good policemen in country areas and provincial cities, we must support them fully with housing assistance. They find it very costly when they have to move from the metropolitan area to other cities. Recently a policeman from my area sold his home when transferred to Mackay, where he had to pay over \$60 a week in rent. While a policeman's

salary is reasonably good, it does not cover such a high rental. The Government should investigate, as soon as possible, ways of supporting policemen in country areas.

Community kindergartens know that they will receive support till at least the end of this year. However, they must be told where they are heading. I am not referring only to their financial support, but also to their future role. For many years they provided the only mass pre-school education in Queensland. Committees struggled and strained to raise money to build and run these essential projects. Government support became substantial only in the past four or five years and, although many kindergartens were built in that time, new ones are now being built in areas that could never have hoped to have them. Until the free State system was introduced, many committees had been able to slow down their voluntary work. But worse still, the State pre-schools have been sited almost adjacent to many community kindergartens, which makes it very difficult for them to remain viable. The honourable member for Bulimba has an extremely bad example of that in his electorate.

As soon as humanly possible the Government must sit down with these organisations to work out a settlement of this problem. They do not know where they are going. They are being squeezed out. As a result of hard work and fund-raising, they have obtained community buildings which, it seems, are to go to waste. It is not good enough to say to the committees that the buildings can be used for something else. Committee members have been encouraged by the Government to slave their guts out to build kindergartens, and we are merely saying to them, "You can do something else with them now." All that they want to do is to run a kindergarten, and we are saying to them, "You can put the building to some other use; we are finished with you." That is not good enough. These people must know where they are going.

The problem confronting the local organisations must be resolved. Committees comprising good, honest, hard-working people have built the community kindergartens up over the years. They have provided an excellent service, but now they are being left on the pile to rot. The Federal Government is no better; it will not tell them what it intends to do. It has said to committees that if they do certain things, they will probably get some money; they have been told that they have to introduce further programmes. However, they will not be able to keep going under the present circumstances. They must know what their future is, and I implore the Minister for Education to sit down with representatives from these organisations and sort the matter out. In conclusion, I repeat that this State Budget represents a minor miracle. I congratulate

Sir Gordon Chalk on its production in the present difficult times and I commend him for it.

Hon. R. J. HINZE (South Coast—Minister for Local Government and Main Roads) (12.30 p.m.): It is a great pleasure to follow a young, new member such as the member for Pine Rivers, who has just made his first contribution to a Budget debate in this Chamber. He is a young fellow who knows his electorate very well and works very hard for it. There is no doubt that he will be returned to represent the seat of Pine Rivers for many years to come. He is the type of member we like to see in the Parliament. He knows what he is talking about; he is keen and capable. He is an acquisition to the Liberal Party and to the coalition Government of this State. We are pleased to have him here. It was good to listen to his contribution.

My purpose in rising to speak is to comment very favourably on the Financial Statement—a document that will go down as a milestone in the history of Queensland, presented by possibly the most capable Treasurer in Australia today. I refer, of course, to our friend Sir Gordon Chalk, who has held his office for 10 years. Could anybody imagine that Australian affairs would be so chaotic today if Sir Gordon had been the Treasurer in Canberra for that time—and particularly for the last three years? We certainly wouldn't be in such a hell of a mess as we are today! We wouldn't have to do as Connor said—borrow \$8,000 million from some crooks overseas. What for? To buy back the farm! We were to buy back the farm with somebody else's money! Have you ever heard of anything so stupid, Mr. Hewitt?

I am telling all honourable members that we are living in the most volatile period in the history of Australia. We are very close, of course, to the tension of the period of the Eureka Stockade. No-one knows what will happen next week or the following week. We have a Leader of the Opposition who is determined to let Australia tell Whitlam and those of his crummy crew who are left down there what they think of them. But of course they haven't got the guts to stand up and have a go. They have told us many times that they want an election, but when they get the opportunity, after they challenged us to block Supply in the Senate, they renege. The Opposition is justly entitled to block Supply. That is what the Upper House is there for. When the Opposition uses its authority, Government members are squealing and crying and squirming, running to every State in an effort to indicate to everybody in Australia that we are going broke. Uren was here last Sunday trying to tell the local authorities in Queensland that there is no money.

My colleague the Treasurer is holding up today's "Telegraph" displaying a headline proclaiming that Charlie Jones says that I am telling lies about roads. He has been

saying this for the last two years. All I can do is throw that statement right back to Mr. Jones, because if he tells the truth on this occasion it will be for the first time. He couldn't lie straight in bed. I said to him the other day, "Mr. Jones, I wish I could like you, but it's bloody impossible."

I am putting it to honourable members now that the Federal Government is the crummiest crew that has ever been brought together to attend to the affairs of an Australian Parliament. In 1972, when these people were brought in to govern the country, nobody would have thought that they would have brought us to our knees in such a short time. Within three years Australian politicians are travelling the world trying to borrow something like \$4,000 million from sources that had never heard of us before. It is beyond me. It must be beyond you, Mr. Hewitt. We had never heard of anything like this before. We know that when Labor came to power, it inherited a surplus of \$900,000,000 from a very prudent Government. In spite of all his mistakes, McMahon was a tremendous Treasurer. After his defeat at the election of 1972, perhaps brought about by wrangling within the Liberal Party, we had foisted upon us a Government that has brought us to our knees—a Government that has brought us to a position where we are trying to borrow from anywhere in the world to buy back the farm!

Let me deal with them one by one. Who has Whitlam sacked in the last three years? He has sacked Cairns, Connor, Crean, Cope—Barnard?—well, he moved Barnard upstairs. But what did he do to Murphy? He put him on the High Court bench. And what did Murphy do at the first opportunity he had to make a decision? He brought down a political opinion. He cannot even write a judgment. Of the seven judges who sat on the case, he would be the weakest. I don't think he has written a judgment yet. If he has, it should be shown to the people of Australia so that they can make up their own minds on what they think of him as a judge and what they think of Whitlam for putting him there. One after the other, those Ministers have gone.

What is today's news? Khemlani claims that Whitlam did know about the loan-raising affair. I want to repeat in this Chamber, for Whitlam to deny if he can, that if he did not know what was going on, he would be the greatest mug in the world and, if he did know, he would be the greatest liar. It has to be one or the other.

Now we have got him. He is trying to get out of trouble by holding a half-Senate election. Australia does not want a half-Senate election; it wants the right to tell him where he stands. We need an election for the House of Representatives, or the people's House as he calls it. When we have that election—and heaven help us, we hope to have it before Christmas—the result will be

the same as it was in Queensland last December and there will not be many Labor members in that House.

Where are the members of the cricket team in the Opposition? They have gone. They have cleared out. They cannot take it.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. HINZE: I do not want to talk about Junie Morosi. She is part of the last three-year programme. Things have been going on in Canberra that we have never heard of before and they have become part of the pattern of the Australian Government.

I want to say how proud and pleased I am that we have been presented with this sound Budget by our friend Sir Gordon Chalk. What is he doing for Queensland in circumstances that no other Government in Australia can do? He is making provision for record spending on education. This is what we like to see. This is what this State deserves. This is what we are entitled to.

Our Federal friends are skimming off another \$120,000,000 in taxes on our coal. This stops us from getting more from something that rightly belongs to us in this sovereign State of Queensland. We should be entitled to take something from the coal that is in our ground, but the Canberra boys get to it first and skim off \$6 a tonne, which amounts to \$120,000,000 a year.

Consider the tax being imposed on the motorist. It amounts to \$240,000,000. Add up all the taxation and then see what the Canberra Government is doing with it. It is squandering it by giving it to the bludgers. That is how Cameron referred to them. He said, "If you want to bludge on the Australian Government we'll give you enough money so that you do not have to do anything—as long as you vote for the Australian Government." Plenty of them are down at the Gold Coast soaking up the sun. These bludgers are getting paid by the Australian Government for doing nothing. I did not think I would see the day in Australia when young men say on television—and other honourable members have seen and heard them just as I have—that they are proud that they have not worked for six months, eight months or 10 months, that that is their heritage, that they are entitled to hand-outs and that they do not have to work. All they have to do is to soak up the sun, live on the fat of the land and do nothing in return. There is no way in the world that this nation can accept this situation and provide funds for bludgers—young men who have the energy and muscle. For some strange reason, the Government in Canberra is trying to breed a nation of bludgers.

The Australian Government has pulled down most of what we stand for. What about our National Anthem? Last night I went to the naturalisation ceremony. I had to stand for "Advance Australia Fair." I do not mind it but I prefer "God Save the Queen."

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HINZE: Of course Government members prefer it.

The Governor-General got a shock when he came to Queensland for the Brisbane Exhibition. He was moved by the loyalty of those Queenslanders who stood for "God Save the Queen." I hope that when he gets the opportunity, which I hope will be this week, he will come down on the side of right and say to Whitlam, "Whitlam, my friend, you have to go to the electorate because the people of Australia demand it."

I return to the Financial Statement. This is a Budget of \$1,000 million and the Treasurer is able to say, "I believe I will be able to balance the Budget to within approximately \$5,000,000." Is that not a terrific effort? Is it not quite fantastic? Frankly, we believe that he will do it. And why shouldn't we believe it? He has proved his ability. He has been Treasurer for 10 years and every year he either balances his Budget or goes very close to it. From all those available to them, why could not those in Canberra have found for Treasurer someone with the ability of our colleague and Treasurer here? The Federal Government have gone through Treasurers one after the other. They have had four Treasurers in not quite three years, whereas Queensland has had one in 10 years.

Performance pays, and we must be proud of the fact that ours is a great State. We always balance our Budget, and we always produce more than we buy. If a line were drawn across the map of Australia, the real source of the nation's wealth would be apparent. We sell \$1,800 million worth of goods and buy goods worth \$900,000,000. Western Australia is in the same position.

What are we doing? We are carrying the rest of Australia on our backs. And what do we get in return? When I go down to see Charlie "Famous" Jones in search of some money for roads, what does he tell me? He tells me that I cannot have a lousy \$13,000,000. Frankly, I get sick of listening to him. It is a waste of time going down to see him. I told Tom Uren the same thing. In the programme to overcome the backlog of sewerage, over \$120,000,000 has been provided. How much does Queensland get? Again, a lousy \$13,000,000. The Commonwealth Government cannot get past \$13,000,000 for the greatest State of Australia and the one that keeps the rest of Australia ticking.

But we are going to let Australia know that we will not continue to carry the rest of the country on our back. We are entitled to a return of finance for use on roads. During the last eight months, I have tried, as Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, to visit every local authority in Queensland. I have tried to see something of the 20,000 miles of road that come under the administration of the Main Roads Department. I can tell the Committee that many of them are shocking. There are 12 ft.

roads with the bitumen broken on the edges and when a 30-ton truck comes down the centre, anyone who does not get off the road is likely to be killed. And what about the people who send their children to school in school buses that have to travel over such roads?

People try to tell me about this State's road system. I know all about it. I made a point of seeing the Capricorn, Flinders, Landsborough and Warrego Highways. In the past eight months, I have driven over every highway in the State with the Commissioner of Main Roads and district engineers to enable me to see the state of the roads. They are deplorable and they are getting worse, and there is no reason at all why this State should have to put up with that situation. After all, Queensland produces more than other States, if not on the land then in mining. No other State can compare with Queensland in productivity and the desire to work, as long as we are given the opportunity to do so. But a Federal Government such as the one at present in Canberra is nothing but a millstone around the neck of this State.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HINZE: So a few Opposition members have returned. Where have they been? Have they been asleep? Now that they have returned, I am afraid they will have to cop it. I suppose they will get on the stump in an attempt to get their mates returned to office. They do not want even a half-Senate election; they want a quarter-Senate election. They do not have the guts to tell their mates in Canberra to do the right thing by Australia. Why is that? The only reason is that they know what will happen to them. They will be obliterated. The situation will be much the same as it was in A. E. Moore's time—in the period 1929-32—as after the coming election there will never be another Australian Labor Government as long as I live. There is no way in the world that they will ever again be returned, and they know it. Their record is rotten to the core—and they know that, too.

Their Ministers, of course, have been sacked one after the other. We do not see anything like this in any other Government in Australia. If it is not Connor getting sacked, it is Cairns or someone else. Frankly, if Cairns and Connor and that what's-his-name from South Australia—

A Government Member: Cameron.

Mr. HINZE: That's right, Cameron. If they could get Whitlam down a dark lane on a wet night, they would cut his throat. There would not be much doubt about that. There is no love lost among that crew. That's the truth.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HINZE: I am saying things that members opposite cannot say although they know they are true.

Whitlam and his crew have led this country downhill for so long now that heavens knows how we are going to get out of trouble. Some people would say, "Who would want to govern?" They say, "Poor Fraser! He doesn't want to govern." That does not ring true. The worse the position, the further we have to come back, so it is the duty of the Liberal-National Country Party Opposition to say to all Australians, "Give us a chance and make it somewhere around 6 December."

Mr. Houston: We have had it here for 18 years and look at the mess we're in.

Mr. HINZE: The only reason we have been in power since 1957 is that the people have seen the splendid performance of this Government.

Mr. Houston: You are only in power because of your boundaries, and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am having some difficulty hearing the Minister.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. HINZE: All right, you can't take it. I'm hurting you. That's the way; I can hear you. There are only four of your mates here. Go and get the other six and see if they can keep it up. What happened to Crean? I will tell honourable members opposite what happened to Crean. Your Federal colleagues sacked him and they had to get him back. They are running through them a second time. I suppose if we last long enough they will bring poor old Connor back. If they were decent, they would have to. There is no way in the world that honest, decent adults will take lying down the assertion that he did not tell Whitlam what was going on, and honourable members opposite know that as well as I do. Of course Whitlam knew. Why doesn't he tell Australia he knew? Why isn't he honest? What happened to Elizabeth Reid? Why did he sack her? Why did he put the skids under her?

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order: I find it necessary to extend my protection to the Minister.

Mr. HINZE: I thank you, Mr. Hewitt, and I appreciate your attitude in defending me against these irresponsible people on the Opposition benches. If you weren't there I don't know what they'd do to me. Let us get back to this crummy crew again because we have to give them a tickle. Every Liberal and National Party Government in Australia should be telling the public where they stand, and as for this tripe they came out with last week-end, they make me sick.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HINZE: All right, something like this happened last Saturday: Whitlam got them all together and he said, "Now, go out into the land, my friends, and scare them if you can." He sent McClelland out to say, "We are in trouble concerning the Army." Uren ran out to say that the local authorities are in trouble, that they are going broke. These are scare tactics. Did honourable members watch television last week-end? Every television programme was designed to scare Australians into believing that the Federal Government can get away with a quarter-Senate election or a half-Senate election. That was the only purpose behind those tactics, but reason is slowly being regained. The people are not going to be blackmailed by Whitlam; they are not going to be told lies.

Mr. Hanson: You gave Red Creed a "hornet".

Mr. HINZE: Never mind about Red Creed and the hornet. You can get a good free drink in a pub up at Gladstone, Mr. Hewitt, if you want to. Our old mate Marty has made a million up there out of the poor old graziers and cow cockies. He would not give them credit for one week. Never mind about Red Creed!

Let me talk about phone-tapping. One never heard anything about that until the last few years. What do we find now? Every time a person picks up his phone it goes "click, click, click". The other day I said, "You inquisitive bastards. I hope you heard everything that I said. Take it down. I will give you a bit more for your rotten mates in Canberra. I hope it is on record for them." I went up to one of the fellows from Canberra and said, "How do you tap my phone? I don't care what you hear. I'll tell you anything you want to know. But for heaven's sake—"

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. Hanson interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HINZE: Things such as this upset me, Mr. Hewitt. I am an Australian, and I believe I am entitled to the things to which everybody else in the community is entitled. I want to be able to make a telephone call without having anybody listening to my private conversations. I'm told that Whitlam is in charge of the Government in Canberra. Hasn't he got a few beauties from me! I will give him a few more tomorrow.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You wait till Charlie Jones gets hold of you. He'll give you a few!

Mr. HINZE: There are only one or two things that I have to say to the honourable member about his mates. They took the milk from the kids and tried to give them biscuits—they called them "Whitlam's wafers". They took away the subsidies from the farmers.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: The best thing that ever happened!

Mr. HINZE: The best thing that ever happened! The honourable member is a capitalist if ever I saw one. If he had a blue shirt on, he would be red, white and blue—white hair, a red face and a blue shirt! He is the most diplomatic-looking member in the Chamber—a dyed-in-the-wool capitalist if ever you saw one, Mr. Hewitt!

Just one or two more comments about the honourable member's mates in Canberra and then I will leave them alone. I think he knows how I feel about them. I hope I will have an opportunity in the next few weeks to go out into the streets and tell the people what I think about his mates.

The only thing that worries me is that the situation in Australia today is so volatile that open warfare could break out. I hope that does not happen.

Mr. Houston: You are advocating it.

Mr. HINZE: Not at all, but Whitlam is.

Mr. Houston: No.

Mr. HINZE: Of course he is! He won't take it when he is beaten. The Senate of this nation has said, "No more Supply.", but Whitlam cannot take it. There is only one honourable thing for the Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, to do—say to Mr. Whitlam, "You have got to have another dissolution. That is the only honourable thing to do." Then a Liberal-National-Country Party Government will give the kids back their milk and give the farmers back their subsidies. It will give free enterprise a chance.

What has the Whitlam mob done to the subdividers of land in Australia? They hated the subdividers, didn't they? Of course they did. Ask my friend Sir Bruce Small. One could not sell a block of land or a house in Queensland or in Australia today even if one tried. People cannot get the money to buy houses. Even if they can get it, young people who have recently married are paying 14 or 15 per cent. When I was a young fellow growing up, I did not believe that a Labor Government would ever allow interest rates to rise to 15 per cent. The Labor Government in Canberra stands damned for all eternity in the eyes of Australians for allowing interest rates to rise to such an extent that young people will never be able to own their homes. They will be 40 years paying for a house and land—something that should be their right. Because of inflation they've got no chance of getting what should be their right. What about the recession? 400,000 people unemployed in Australia!

Mr. Alison: Half a million next year.

Mr. HINZE: Half a million next year! Of course, Hawke—that famous Hawke; that chicken hawk—comes out with all sorts of statements. Looking like a glamour boy

on TV, he tries to tell us that industry will work better with the A.L.P. What has happened? More strikes, more unemployment, greater recession, higher inflation!

That crew on the Opposition benches look as if they are punch drunk. They can't take it. From Marty right through, they are all sitting there glum and gloomy. They're thinking about the election. They don't want to get on the streets; they don't want to help their mates. They know they are going to get a hiding.

I do not want to waste any time telling the people of Queensland any more than our Treasurer has already told them about this famous Budget providing for an expenditure programme of \$1,000 million. Queensland has the greatest deposits of coal in the world, but that rotten Connor locked them up. Then what happened? Whitlam relented and tried to square off. Every week Federal Ministers are coming out with something different. During the last two or three years they have applied all sorts of restrictions, but now they are lifting them in an attempt to get sweet with the Australian electorate. It is too late. They are trying to restore one thing after the other, but it is too late. The people are awake to them.

I suppose I am a lot like other people. For the first 12 months I sat there and watched Whitlam. At that time he impressed me. Realisation gradually came to me and I could see that he was a liar. He can look straight at a person and continue to tell lies. He is the most egotistical megalomaniac the nation has ever seen. He believes himself. He honestly believes he knew nothing about the Khemlani affair. As I said a while ago, he is either the biggest mug or the biggest liar of all time. Anyhow, we won't have to put up with him much longer.

There are good things in store for Queensland and Australia because within the next few weeks we will have an opportunity of getting to the people, and we will restore sensible, sane Liberal-National Country Party Government in Australia. This Queensland Government will work with it. After I have been down there to get funds from my friend Peter Nixon, who will be the Minister responsible for road construction, I will be able to say "yes" when honourable members make their pleas for roads and everything else they want. I will be able to give them a sympathetic hearing. Instead of spending \$140,000,000 on education, the Minister for Education will be able to double his expenditure. We will be dealing with sensible people down there.

Mr. Wright: Can we quote you on that one?

Mr. HINZE: Of course. The honourable member interjected a little while ago about boundaries. All that Federal crew want is a half-Senate election so that they can pick up one or two seats, control the Senate and then rig the boundaries in a redistribution.

We have heard all about the one vote, one value principle of honourable members opposite. I live in the biggest electorate in Australia, McPherson, which has between 90,000 and 100,000 people. Heaven knows what the Federal Government would do with that one if it had half a chance!

I know it is Whitlam's attitude to hang on as long as he can. He wants to get control of the Senate. He wants to get that slimy Steele Hall, Bunton and Gorton to go with him. They don't know where they stand in Australian politics today. They are neither one thing nor the other as they sit on the fence. Steele Hall was strutting around Canberra and everybody was asking which way he was going to vote. We sent down an honourable gentleman who was a member of the A.L.P., Mr. Field. What happened? Labour members couldn't stand him. They took action against him in a court presided over by that fellow Murphy. What are they going to do? They are going to kick poor old Field out.

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

Sir BRUCE SMALL (Surfers Paradise) (2.15 p.m.): I rise with mixed feelings to make a small contribution to this debate—with intense satisfaction and admiration on the one hand for our Treasurer, who has grappled with a task under the most difficult circumstances ever to have been experienced—

Mr. Houston: The Treasurer is not here.

Sir BRUCE SMALL: He will read "Hansard"; everything will be all right.

On the one hand I have feelings of commiseration and on the other I have feelings of exultation from my belief that the Budget is a wonderful document. It is an expression of skill reflecting the extraordinary experience our Treasurer has had in the past decade. The problems facing him when he set out to prepare his Budget this year were the high interest rates—these I rank very high in the problems confronting him—inflation, unemployment and rising costs, with the inevitable effect from all of them; that is, a lack of incentive in private enterprise. The uncertainty which flows from all these things is with us every day. As a culmination of a chapter of mistakes, we have seen the collapse of the R.E.D. scheme, the money-printing machine run dry, and the economy of Australia in very grave danger.

I think I can claim that I have lived longer than anybody else in this Chamber. I have very vivid memories of the 1914 drought, the depression that came with it and the war that followed, of the 1919 depression following the effects of the war, of the depression in 1929, with more depression in 1939, and then another war; but in all my lifetime nothing can be compared with the economic structure that has been dragged down to the financial gutter by the drunken sailors who

have taken possession of Canberra. When will we learn? I saw Hitler and Mussolini—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You supported them!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will restrain himself.

Sir BRUCE SMALL: It was my privilege to watch the advent of Hitler and Mussolini and the struggle in the aftermath of defeat following the First World War. I saw the way in which hundreds of thousands of otherwise unemployable people were employed on the building of the autobahns and autostradas. I saw a wonderful demonstration of how adversity can be turned to the advantage of countries in the manner in which they employed the people in those years to build the autobahns and autostradas. On my periodical visits, I had the privilege of running over them at intervals of about 18 months to two years. I had nothing but intense admiration for the massive structure built up within the economy of the country. There was no question of dole.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You are a supporter of Hitler and Mussolini! A nice old Fascist you are!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield will withdraw that comment.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Which comment was that, Mr. Hewitt?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Archerfield called the honourable member for Surfers Paradise a Fascist. He will not call a member that while I am in the chair. He will withdraw the statement.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Hewitt.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable gentleman will withdraw it formally.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: I withdraw it.

Mr. Houston: I hope that applies to us when someone calls us Communists.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member for Bulimba wants to take a point of order on that, I will give him the same protection.

Mr. Houston: Time will tell.

Sir BRUCE SMALL: When I say I watched with admiration the efforts of the leaders of those two countries, I say that quite sincerely, because in the early years of their efforts they were struggling to drag their countries out of the morass of financial bankruptcy that was the inevitable product of defeat in war. That should not be construed for one moment—and I do not believe anybody of sound mind would so construe it—as Fascism or a leaning towards Communism.

I saw the growth of the dole in England following the war. I played golf using as caddies married men with grown-up children who had never been employed.

An Opposition Member: Did you pay them?

Sir BRUCE SMALL: Yes, I paid them. I learned from them that it was better and cheaper for them to stay out of a job—to take the dole and to earn money from caddying, which fairly obviously was not declared for taxation purposes.

Last night I watched a television programme from London telling the story of the poverty of the children of England today. It was claimed that 50,000 men doing a full week's work in England are now taking home in their pay-packets each Friday less money than they would draw if they stopped work and went on the dole. When do we learn? When will we come to our senses and bring some logic and some humanitarian thought to the question of the economy of the country and its significance? Are we prepared to see children in England starve, living on the dole which, with the cost of living increasing at the present inflation rate, is not capable of meeting the cost of sufficient calories to keep body and soul together?

The latest figures indicate that, on the Gold Coast today, unemployment is running at 11 per cent. I still say crowds of hippies down there are being character-formed to draw the dole, live together, pool their resources, rent an empty house and enjoy surf-board riding, the glorious climate and the amenities of a city that has no equal anywhere in the world.

In a long lifetime of business experience, in a long lifetime of world travel, I venture to say I have never seen anything to compare with the situation that has been created in this country of ours. I compare those in Canberra with drunken sailors. We have been subjected to the policies of sociomaniacs who have invaded Canberra, and the only ray of hope I can see is that they run out of high seas, because Cairns, Cope, Crean, Cameron, Connor, Cass and Cavanagh have all been more or less politically exterminated. Our only hope is that they should stay so exterminated. It seems to me that all right-thinking Australians today are praying, as they have never prayed before, for a return to sanity and security, for the incentive to private enterprise will return only when stability is restored by purging the nation of Whitlam and company.

When the time comes—and I sincerely believe that it is just round the corner—enormous tasks will have to be tackled. There will be a tightening of belts. Inevitably, there will be suffering because deficits totalling thousands of millions of dollars have piled up year after year in Canberra with these drunken sailors in charge. All of that has to be repaid. All of that has to be

restored. We have not only to repay the deficits; we have also to experience the loss of the easy money that has been circulating—the free spending and the free circulating of money that has been the outcome of the Federal Government's socialistic policies. Our industries have to be restored and we will, naturally, miss this artificial circulation in the process.

However, the thing that needs restoration more than anything else, even more than finance, is confidence—the belief that efforts will be rewarded, that there is an incentive open to people to make a contribution not only to their own better standard of life but also to an improvement in the quality of life in the community as a whole.

There is much to rejoice about in the Queensland picture. If I painted a doleful picture at the beginning of my speech I want to say now, from deep down in my heart and very sincerely, that I am confident—and sublimely confident—that Queensland stands in the forefront as being more prosperous and having potential for more prosperity than any other State can boast.

Mr. Gunn: Good government.

Sir BRUCE SMALL: Yes, because of good government for the past decade. This has made a very material contribution and in fact has laid the foundation for the prosperity that I speak of.

Queensland would be booming and reflecting its having rich natural resources were it not for the plundering of our primary industries and our mineral resources. It will take years of sound government and strict, skilled budgeting to rectify the mess that Canberra has made.

It seems to me that we have not yet fully appreciated or developed what I regard as the number one industry in the world—tourism. Queensland has a bountiful store of it which is relatively untapped. Australia has to make itself known to the world. The beauty of Australia is beyond description. We have the task in front of us. All State Governments and the Federal Government have to expand their acknowledgment of this fact further and make a contribution so that Australia will become known to the world and so that Australia can share in the benefits of the greatest industry. Its potential is growing every day.

Needless to say, I feel that way about the Gold Coast. It has already made a very substantial contribution. Directly and indirectly it is putting more than \$100,000,000 of revenue into the coffers of the State, but it needs help and encouragement as never before. Gold Coast tourism is labouring under some terrifying wage increases and conditions of employment that threaten its solvency. Alternatively it must demand that prices be raised beyond the ability and willingness of the people to pay.

Wages in restaurants have practically doubled. The week-end rate of pay is now double time. Outside of certain hours, the rate doubles again. That imposes a burden that, at the present prices, restaurants simply cannot bear. At the moment the situation with the leading chain of motels at the Gold Coast is such that, with one exception, all restaurants are closed on Sundays. If necessary a second one will open. Because of the burdensome costs they have to meet, they share the losses incurred in having full restaurants. Restaurants are actually being closed on Sundays. It is not quite as serious for one or two restaurants to bear the loss as it would be if all restaurants were open and bore similar losses individually.

Mr. Jensen: You have spoken three times in this Assembly and each time you have dealt with tourism. That does not interest the people.

Sir Gordon Chalk: A very good presentation, too.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Melloy: You can sit down now because the Treasurer is back.

Sir BRUCE SMALL: I am very glad that the Treasurer is present. I am also glad that he has been Treasurer for the past 10 years. Now that he is present, I shall repeat what I said in his absence. I congratulate him on working his way through the most difficult circumstances that have ever prefaced the presentation of any Budget in history. I salute him for the skill, energy, enthusiasm and determination that he has brought to bear in bringing this Budget to fruition.

Back to the Gold Coast and the suffering of the tourist industry there. On Sunday nights there is a prohibition on entertainment in restaurants. This is having a very serious effect. It is extraordinary that the people who run community singing and family-type live entertainment, together with good food at moderate prices, are forced to close but picture theatres can continue to show films of sex, murder and pornography on Sunday nights as freely as at any other time. I draw attention to that situation in the hope that some relief can be afforded and something done to produce equity and justice.

I believe that local government is in need of a new look. I have said that in this Chamber before and nothing has happened since to cause me to change my mind. I feel that the whole system needs overhauling right from its foundations. The system by which valuations made by the Department of the Valuer-General form the basis of the collection of revenue by local authorities is overdue for very substantial alteration. I believe that there should be a system under which councils receive a share of the revenue obtained from taxation. There should be a tax related directly to services provided.

In some cases charges are related to services, but fundamentally I believe that a much greater proportion of the revenue drawn from ratepayers should be related to the services provided which contribute to their comfort and the quality of life that they enjoy. Ability to pay, of course, has always to be kept in mind in any taxation system. I have no quarrel with that, provided equity is maintained.

I think that there should also be closer control of municipalities by the Government. In many cases municipalities today are guilty of extravagant and wasteful expenditure. An example of such extravagance is the borrowing of \$5,500,000 at 10.4 per cent interest for the construction of a new block of offices on the Gold Coast. The building will not include the slightest semblance of a forum or convention hall that is so badly needed on the Gold Coast, or any sign of a theatre or art gallery. The building will contain offices only, and a loan of \$5,500,000 at 10.4 per cent represents between \$7,000 and \$8,000 a week repayment rent for the next 30 years. I believe that this project is improper, extravagant, wasteful and inefficient. I believe that the Government has a duty to control and discipline local authorities and bring them into line in matters of this kind. It is the ratepayers who are being crucified in the present situation.

A new dam estimated to cost \$8,000,000 and now to cost \$22,000,000 is a burden that no city of 40,000 ratepayers can carry. Add to that \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000 as the estimated cost of completing the sewerage of the city, and another \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000 for work on beaches, groynes and river entrances which is essential for the maintenance of the tourist industry, and there is a colossal burden that could be met only by a city of 40,000 millionaires.

It has also to be remembered that more than 9,000 of the population of the Gold Coast are pensioners drawing full pensions and 23 per cent are over 60 years of age. This compares with 12 per cent for Queensland and 15 per cent for Brisbane. The Gold Coast population has increased from 30,000 in 1960 to 80,000 in 1975. It is planned to expand to a population of 150,000 by 1985, and 200,000 by 1990. This reveals an enormous potential on the one hand but, on the other, equally enormous problems. I repeat my appeal to the Government to take a more serious view of this problem. There is a need to discipline, to assist, to counsel, to guide and to control the development of a business as huge as the Gold Coast.

I conclude by repeating the remarks I made earlier about the Budget and the admiration I feel for the Treasurer. I salute him for a task which has been nobly accomplished. If there are any faults in the system, then it amazes me that there are so few. It amazes me that, in spite of the unpredictables and the imponderables facing the Treasurer in drawing up this Budget, he has come up

with a Budget that is sound in its concept and promises to maintain Queensland in a state of relative prosperity in spite of the doings of Canberra. I hope and pray that the day of a Liberal-National Country Party Government in Canberra is not far away. Long may the Treasurer be spared to continue the good work.

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (2.36 p.m.), in reply: At the outset may I express my very sincere thanks to each member of the Committee who has taken part in this debate. In all, 53 members have spoken, and when one considers that there are 18 Cabinet Ministers, only a couple of whom have spoken, one gets a clear indication of the interest of members generally. They availed themselves of the opportunity to speak in this Budget debate and in doing so ranged over a wide variety of subjects. Not all speakers dealt directly with the Budget, but that is their right. This debate, being an open one, provides an opportunity for members to refer to the Budget itself or to matters affecting their electorates. From that point of view I am appreciative of what has been said.

The make-up of this Chamber at this time is very different from that on any of the nine previous occasions when I have risen to reply in the Budget debate. The present Opposition is few in numbers. I mention that merely because on this occasion I cannot possibly deal with each of the speeches made, as I have done in the past, and therefore I propose to reply in detail to the major arguments that have been put forward by the Opposition as a whole. I want to do this because members of the Opposition—the 10 present and the one who is absent because of a prior commitment—had an opportunity to be critical. I am not saying that some Government members have not been critical of some points, and they are entitled to be if their electorates are affected, but I want to deal at some length with the arguments put forward by the Opposition and then combine most of the points raised by Government members and answer them so that Government members can go back to their electorates with my views on their problems and their relationship to the over-all requirements of the State.

I sat in the Opposition for 10 years. For the past 18 years I have been a member of the Government and I appreciate that not all the things a Government does are perhaps in the interests of a particular area. That is why I admire the approach adopted by a number of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber who have seen fit to raise issues affecting their own electorates but, at the same time, have recognised that the Budget endeavours to do what is best in the interests of Queensland as a whole.

Having said that, I point out to honourable members, that, no matter what position any member of this Assembly might hold, no matter what the responsibilities of

a particular Minister might be, he must concede that the allocation of finance controls the implementation of Government policy. In effect, I think of myself as the hub of a very large wheel—at present, a wheel in which there are 17 supporting spokes. The Treasurer has a responsibility to endeavour to achieve a balance between the needs of the Ministers in charge of the various departments and what is possible according to the finance that is available to the State. Very often that is a difficult task, and I pay a tribute to my ministerial colleagues and those who are primarily associated with the administration of their departments for the part they have played on this occasion in assisting in the preparation of the Budget.

Member after member has risen in his place in the Chamber and given a little praise to me personally for the Budget that I have been able to present to the people of this State. I do not believe that praise is due to me personally. It is true that I have the responsibility of presenting the Budget. However, I believe that much of the praise is due to the executive officers—the Under Treasurer, the Under Secretaries and the heads of the various departments—who have advised the Ministers to whom they are responsible and pointed out the problems that confront them in establishing priorities and administering their departments. As I said earlier, the allocation of finance is one of the decisions that make or break Government policies.

Mr. Jensen: You are holding Joh up.

Sir GORDON CHALK: The honourable member for Bundaberg interjects. Honourable members have heard him interjecting in this Chamber on many occasions, and I sometimes wonder what the people of Bundaberg have sent to us. In my position as Treasurer, I am dealing this afternoon with a matter of great importance to the people of Queensland. An honourable member who comes into the Chamber and interjects from time to time is only taking up the time of the Chamber for one particular purpose—to try to ridicule what the Government is achieving. Because I believe that the people of Queensland desire to hear at least some of the things I have to say, I will not take any further notice of the honourable member's interjections.

Mr. Wright: You drink his rum.

Sir GORDON CHALK: The honourable member for Rockhampton now interjects. I said enough about the honourable member in replying to the Budget debate last year. The letters about the honourable member that I have received from the people of Rockhampton would surprise him. One of these days I will have an opportunity to use them in the appropriate place and indicate clearly what a clown Rockhampton has sent to us.

Let me get back to serious matters, because the Budget is a matter of importance to the people of Queensland. The Leader of the Opposition was the first speaker for the Opposition. Candidly, Mr. Hewitt, I should have thought that he would have given the honourable member for Bulimba the opportunity to speak first. It was a matter for his decision, and I do not criticise him for it, but I should have thought, as I said, that he would have delegated his responsibility for the principal reply to the honourable member for Bulimba. On the other hand, if the Australian Labor Party is ever to get anywhere in Queensland, it is essential for it to build up the image of its leader. Consequently, no doubt, the honourable gentleman decided that he would be the principal spokesman on this occasion. All I can say is that if he believes that he built up his image in the community by the remarks he made, the ideas he advanced, the mistakes he committed and the indications he gave of his inability to understand the Budget, he has another think coming. By the time I have finished with him, he will have a lot of egg on his face.

As he decided to be the principal spokesman for the A.L.P. in the Budget debate, we have to start examining some of the arguments he put forward.

If ever an opportunity is provided for the Opposition, irrespective of the Government of the day, to tell the people of Queensland—and they are entitled to know—what the alternative Government would do, or what the alternative party would do if it were in Government, it is provided by the debate on the Budget. That is the responsibility of an Opposition. Prior to 1957 the shadow Ministers in the Opposition—and I was one of them—chose the Budget debate as the main opportunity to tell the people of Queensland not only where they condemned the Budget but also what they would have done in the circumstances. What did the Leader of the Opposition do on this occasion? He spent some time talking about obviously unpopular increases in one or two forms of taxation. I do not deny him that right. But did he for one moment tell the people of Queensland what he would have done under the circumstances, or did he tell them any of the things his colleagues did during the period they held office in this State? Did he come to any conclusions on the record not of this Government or the A.L.P. Government prior to 1957, but that of his Federal colleagues in Canberra, and their actions and the actions of the two Labor States in the Commonwealth of Australia? Of course not. Consequently there is a need for me to look at one or two of the things he did say.

Let me take rail freights first. The people of Queensland were subjected to nine increases in railway freights during the last 12 years that Labor was in power in this State. That is an indication of what respect the great Australian Labor Party now in

Opposition in this State had for the man on the land during the period that party was in power in Queensland. It belted the primary producer nine times in 12 years.

I shall examine what has happened in the three years in which the Labor Government has been in power in Canberra. Before doing so, I point out that in Queensland, for nine years, there has been what might be termed a holiday in rail freight increases. As a Government, we have swallowed a 184 per cent increase in the wage structure. But what about the A.L.P. in Canberra? In the past three years, with a 65 per cent increase in the wage structure, the A.L.P. in Canberra raised the minimum standard letter postal charge from 7c to 18c—an increase of 157 per cent. That is typical of the Labor Party, members of which in this Chamber criticise the Government for increasing rail freights by 40 per cent.

I shall prove exactly to the people of Queensland where Labor stands on rail freights by quoting the exact words—not something said on the radio—used by Mr. Whitlam when dealing with railway losses at the Premiers' Conference last June, when he was attempting to cajole the States into handing over their railway systems to the Commonwealth Government. This is what he said—

"The principle that the user pays should apply to these services just as to postal and other such services."

The Labor Government in Canberra, supported by the Queensland Leader of the Opposition, says that the user must pay. That was the policy of the Labor Party during the 20 years that it was in power. I remind honourable members that it is still Labor's policy and point out to the primary producers in Queensland that it is still Labor's policy; it has not changed one strut of its policy. The Prime Minister is the man who, today, is saying, "We will take over your railways." He then says, "But the user must pay." That is typical of the criticism and actions of Opposition members. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition would sell our railway system. He would sell the people of Queensland down the drain in an attempt to get rid of this undertaking. Having said that, I do not think there is any further need for me to try to convince the people of Queensland where the Labor Party stands on our railways.

I come now to the proposed increases in taxation and I shall compare them with those in other States. We have only one increase in taxation that is comparable with any of the Labor States. It is true that I have raised the stamp duty on cheques to the equivalent of that payable in other States. When the Leader of the Opposition made his comparisons, he did not tell us anything about what is happening in Labor States such as South Australia. Stamp duty on instalment purchases in Queensland is only 1.5 per cent, but it is 1.8 per cent—and has been so for some time—in South Australia. Stamp duty on

credit business in Queensland is levied at 1.5 per cent, but for this year in South Australia it has stood at 1.8 per cent. The stamp duty payable on motor vehicle comprehensive insurance was criticised by the Leader of the Opposition. In Queensland 5 per cent duty is payable on premiums whereas in South Australia 6 per cent is payable. Some criticism was levelled at the liquor tax. Generally it stands at 7 per cent in Queensland but 8 per cent is payable in South Australia. Tobacco tax is unheard of in Queensland, but it is now fixed at more than 10 per cent on wholesale sales in South Australia. What about petrol tax? We did not implement it. Petrol tax was implemented by Don Dunstan and his team in South Australia. It is true that, after they have robbed the people in that State over such a period, they are now talking about phasing it out. Stamp duty on motor vehicle sales has been criticised by the Leader of the Opposition. In Queensland it is \$1 per \$100. It is \$4 per \$100 in South Australia! One could continue to point out the hypocrisy of the argument advanced by those sitting opposite.

Let us look at our increased charges and their effect on inflation. The Leader of the Opposition in his poetic fashion accused the Government of stoking the fires of inflation. I invite honourable members to read his speech. It accuses us of just that—of stoking the fires of inflation. Our increases will produce the merest wisp of extra smoke from the fires of inflation that his own colleagues in Canberra have kindled, fuelled and fanned to the extent that inflation has risen from some 4 per cent to 17 per cent. In spite of those actions in Canberra, the Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts have the audacity to stand up in the Chamber and criticise the Queensland Government for what it has done. What we have done has affected the inflation only minutely compared with the effect of the financial mismanagement in Canberra on this State of ours.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about unemployment. He holds the view that the State Government is able to exercise a major degree of control over unemployment. His sentiments were parroted by the honourable member for Bundaberg, who has now left the Chamber. His leader sought a statement on what the State has done to relieve unemployment. There would be hardly an honourable member in the Chamber who does not know exactly what this Government has done to try to relieve unemployment. Let us not be under any illusion about who has caused the disastrous unemployment. It has been caused by no-one but the Commonwealth Government with its scatter-brained policies.

We heard the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads (Mr. Hinze) indicate what is happening about unemployment in Queensland. I believe that none but the Federal Labor Government could have brought in such scatter-brained policies. Unemployment was not imported. It is not

something that has been imported into the country, as the Leader of the Opposition said. Unemployment has been created by actions of the Labor Government in Canberra. We had no dependency on the Arabs for oil, as did the rest of the Western world.

Unemployment in Australia, like our inflation, is home-grown. It has been inflicted on the people of Australia by a vindictive, impetuous, unskilled, discredited, power-hungry Federal Labor Government in Canberra. That is why we are in the present situation. The Queensland Government is doing all it can, within the confines of its resources, firstly to prevent unemployment and then to contain it. The Queensland Government's policy for the past two decades has been to develop the State and to provide employment opportunities and a high standard of living for our people. No-one can deny that that has been the policy as enunciated by this Government.

I am prepared to admit that, in the preparation of this year's Budget, I bent over backwards to provide funds for massive capital works programmes, which, besides enabling projects that are themselves absolutely essential, are in themselves labour intensive. I do not believe that one member on the Government side would disagree with the action that we have taken. I believe that it has paid dividends. We have not solved all the unemployment, by any means; but, by providing funds for a massive capital programme, we have provided jobs for many. It is not the Queensland Government's policy to allocate sums of money and label them specifically for unemployment relief as has been done by the Commonwealth Government.

With an increase of only 20 per cent in our capital funds approved by Loan Council and given the huge increase in building costs, it is not possible to go on expanding our activities. We have endeavoured to ensure the continuation of work that has been undertaken. To the limits of its ability, the State has moved to fill up the gaps.

This year, for example, the hospital capital programme will cost \$45,000,000 compared with \$18,000,000 last year. Loan subsidies and grants to local authorities amount to \$43,500,000 compared with \$35,600,000 last year. Compare these figures of advancement with the figures in the Commonwealth Budget. Queensland has allocated \$5,000,000 of very precious loan funds for housing.

By virtue of the recently increased motor vehicle registration, some \$14,000,000 will be provided and channelled into road works. In this Chamber, the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads has indicated just what has happened in relation to road works. The amount of \$14,500,000 has been provided for building maintenance by the Works Department compared with \$10,800,000 last year. This is what we are doing. This is the basis on which we have

ensured the continuity not only of projects associated with the Works Department but also of the employment of public servants.

I shall now deal with some of the other matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that we could splatter eggs over his face.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Sir GORDON CHALK: First of all he made an error in claiming that 55 per cent of the State Budget comes from the Commonwealth.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of the Committee to the level of audible conversation in the Chamber. When I make such a statement I expect it to be respected.

Sir GORDON CHALK: Opposition members have had their say. Now I am entitled to reply.

As I pointed out, the Leader of the Opposition—the would-be Treasurer of Queensland—is so far out in his calculations that he claimed that 55 per cent of the State Budget comes from the Commonwealth. Only 48 per cent of the Consolidated Revenue Fund is received from the Commonwealth.

The money he is talking about is not Commonwealth money. When it is all boiled down, it belongs to the people of Queensland. It has been taxes paid by Queenslanders. He believes it belongs to Whitlam and his team in Canberra. It is most unfortunate that Labor thinks it is Commonwealth money and that we should dance to the whims of the Commonwealth. I have attended Australian Loan Council meetings over a long period. The States are not prepared to dance to the whims of the Commonwealth, irrespective of which Government is in power.

As the Treasurer of Queensland, I have a responsibility to obtain the maximum assistance under the Financial Assistance Grant and from other funds that are made available by the Commonwealth to the States. The Financial Assistance Grant this year is a portion of what Queenslanders have paid in taxes. Constitutionally it is intended to go towards the services of the State. It is for items such as school-teachers, hospitals, nurses, doctors, policemen, primary industry advisers and health and community services. These are the responsibilities of the State.

The State is entitled to have returned to it the funds that are collected by way of taxation from every Queenslanders. It is also true, to repeat a proven fact, that our recent research into the Financial Assistance Grant renegotiations over the past few years revealed that for every 1 per cent increase in wages, the Commonwealth Treasury receives an increase of 1.9 per cent in personal income tax. I want that recorded. The States asked, and argued at the last meeting,

for the inclusion of a 1.5 per cent increase factor in our Financial Assistance Grant formula. Did we get it? Certainly not. The Commonwealth gave us 1 per cent and retained .9 per cent for itself so that it could squander that extra money in the manner in which it has squandered money over the past three years.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about a deficit of \$100,000,000, and then tried to ridicule me because I was able to present a Budget with a deficit of \$5,500,000. When I first set out to prepare the Budget, it is true that I had a deficit of \$118,000,000. Believing that something could be done about it, we went to Canberra, with other Treasurers and Premiers, in the hope of getting some valued assistance. What happened? We were sent back after being told that the responsibility to find extra finance was ours.

It is true that by the negotiation of Medibank this State will be able to pick up an anticipated \$50,000,000 if the Commonwealth Government can get its Budget through and the State can be paid. If \$50,000,000 is subtracted from \$118,000,000, there is still the sum of \$68,000,000 left, and the question remained of where that was to be obtained. By increases right across the board, and without inflicting on the people of Queensland any taxation higher than that inflicted in other States, we were able to find at least another \$45,000,000.

We then looked at other sources of revenue. Whilst I was in the United States I talked to overseas mining interests. Although they whined because we had increased royalties on previous occasions, they were not unsceptible to some further assistance to the State of Queensland. What happened then? By the time I had returned home, Mr. Connor, now departed, had decided, on a visit to Japan in which he did not tell the true story to the Japanese steel interests, to push up the price of Australian coal, thus feathering the nest of the Commonwealth to the extent of \$120,000,000. Of that \$120,000,000, had it remained in the price structure, Queensland would have received a little over \$5,000,000 by way of royalties. In addition to robbing mining interests and the Japanese steel merchants, he also robbed the State of Queensland of over \$8,000,000 by way of taxation. So that had to be put to one side.

We then had another look at the situation. The Federal Budget was about to be introduced, and I had the feeling that Mr. Hayden would hit spirit merchants and the sale of spirits throughout the Commonwealth. What did he do? He got between 4c and 5c from every glass of grog.

Mr. Dean: It should be more.

Sir GORDON CHALK: I appreciate the interjection of the honourable member for Port Curtis.

Mr. HANSON: I rise to a point of order. I did not make that interjection.

Sir GORDON CHALK: I apologise to the honourable member for Port Curtis. It was in fact the honourable member for Sandgate. It was a misunderstanding on my part. I know that the honourable member for Port Curtis has a strong interest in the grog industry in this State.

What I am saying is that the State had no opportunity to go beyond that point. The Federal Government slogged the worker, not the Queensland Government. I am pleased that the Queensland Hoteliers Association has indicated that it is prepared to accept the increase from 6 per cent to 7 per cent in liquor licence fees and does not believe that there will be any necessity for further increases in prices. The hoteliers are prepared to play their part in helping this Government.

I looked at the situation across the board and finally came to the conclusion that it was possible to solve our problems with the taxation measures which I indicated in the Budget. Let us look a little more closely at Commonwealth assistance to this State. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Commonwealth provides \$240,000,000 for education, local authority sewerage, area improvement programmes and so on, or 17 per cent of the State's Consolidated Revenue Budget. The Leader of the Opposition should have done more homework. Quite obviously funds for local authority sewerage, local authority area improvements and capital grants for education do not come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Yet the Leader of the Opposition comes into this Chamber and uses these figures for the purpose of hoodwinking the people of Queensland, when in fact they have nothing whatsoever to do with the Budget, at least not in the way he says. In fact, the State's Consolidated Revenue is estimated to be some \$1,400 million, of which only \$50,000,000 comes as special Commonwealth assistance. The figure therefore is only 3 per cent, and his argument that it is 17 per cent falls to the ground.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about assistance that should be given to the Brisbane City Council. This Government is providing some \$900,000 each year to help the Brisbane City Council maintain part of its transport service, but this year we have gone further. There is an extra charge on the State's revenues as the State moves in to alleviate the increased charges imposed not by this Government but by the council on the parents of school-children required to travel by bus before 8.30 a.m. We are prepared to pick up the tab, and consequently I felt that, in providing \$900,000 towards the operation of the general bus services of the council and, in addition, picking up the tab for our school-children, the State was playing its part.

The Leader of the Opposition also complained that the Government provides free rail transport to school-children, yet subsidises only part of the fare on council buses.

The fact is that the State owns the railways and we do allow free travel for school-children. The council owns the buses, and if the honourable member's argument is worth anything, it is a question of the council deciding to provide free transport.

The Leader of the Opposition complains that the Government is reducing subsidies to local authorities and is unsympathetic to them. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition ask the local authorities which Government they would prefer to deal with. The Commonwealth Government ties them up with red tape and chops and changes its policies almost daily. That has been the position for the past two years, but this State Government has provided a clear and precise subsidy scheme with complete freedom for the local authority to decide what work should be carried out. There are no strings to this money; it is a question of the local authority deciding what work it prefers to do and telling us. We then provide the subsidy. Far from being reduced, as was suggested, State grants and subsidies have increased substantially over recent years—from \$17,000,000 in 1971-72 to \$40,000,000 under this Budget. There is no basis for condemnation of the State in that regard.

The Leader of the Opposition criticised the introduction of what is known as the forwarding-agent system in Queensland and what he described as the rackets in bulk-freight operations. Let him get out in the West and up in the North and make statements of this nature! He will soon find out what people living in those areas think of criticism of that type. It is true that the Government has introduced a bulk-handling system; it is also true that the Railway Department has tried to reduce to a minimum both its cost of operating and its cost of handling. The Leader of the Opposition has made grandiose statements about poetic justice, and so on. If he goes to the Far North and to the western areas of the State and repeats some of the things he has said on this occasion, he will not improve his image. In fact, I suggest that he will have egg not only all over his face but also over many other parts of his body. When the opportunity offers, the people of Queensland will show their full confidence not only in this Government but also in a Liberal-National Country Party Government by returning a Fraser-Anthony Government to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Having spent about the last 40 minutes in dealing with the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, I shall deal now with the speech of the honourable member for Port Curtis, the man who indicated a few moments ago that there should not be any increase in the price of grog in his hotel. I admire him for saying that. I hope he will pay the 7 per cent; I am certain he will. But let me look now at what the honourable member said.

When the former member for Baroona was in this Chamber, as one of the principal critics of the Budget, he said, year in and year out, that in the interests of the people the State should, as he put it, run into deficit. In my opinion, Pat Hanlon had one of the best brains in the Labor Party, and it is unfortunate for the party that he is no longer in this Chamber. However, a very close relative of his has on this occasion propounded the same misguided theories. In fact, I said by way of interjection that I wondered whether the honourable member for Port Curtis had been inspired by the advocacy of his brother-in-law or whether someone had written his speech for him. I am satisfied that the honourable member for Port Curtis did not understand what he was talking about. If his speech was not written by the former member for Baroona, all I can say is that I never cease to be amazed by the Labor Party's almost hysterical desire to send Governments into bankruptcy. That is what the Federal Labor Government has done to Australia. By his advocacy in the Budget debate, the honourable member for Port Curtis has indicated that he wants to see Queensland bankrupt.

Mr. HANSON: I rise to a point of order. The submission made by the Treasurer certainly is offensive. I did not make any such statement. As regards going into deficit—if the honourable gentleman looks back in history at the performance of Labor Treasurers—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HANSON: He will find not deficits but surpluses.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is no valid point of order.

Sir GORDON CHALK: I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Hewitt. I do not like getting under the honourable member's skin, but he has such a big skin that it is very easy to do so. Despite the fact that he is thin in the hide, I again point out that anyone who reads his speech in the Budget debate will see that he advocates that the Government of Queensland should go into deficit, or follow a pattern similar to that being followed in Canberra. Therefore I make no apology for saying that my interpretation of the honourable member's comments was that he advocated that Queensland should go into bankruptcy.

A State can spend only what it has available to it. If it runs into deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, it must short-weight some other sector in order to provide the funds that it needs. The honourable member for Port Curtis would have the Government use its loan funds to fund the deficit and then squeal like hell because there was some cutting back in the work that could be done.

Mr. Hanson interjected.

Sir GORDON CHALK: I am sorry for the honourable member for Port Curtis. He is so bloated for most of the time that he is here that when he gets excited he is like one of those big toads I have kicked in the tail very often in my own back yard. He swells and swells. He can't stand being kicked this afternoon. He continues to swell and swell. One of these days the bubble will burst in Gladstone. What a hell of a mess it will be, but what a great thing for the people of Gladstone when they get Liberal Party representation in this Chamber.

Let me get back to one or two of the other things he said. He alleged that last year's Budget was badly framed. He said, "\$142,000,000 is required for unforeseen expenditure." One would have believed that a man who has been in the Chamber for as long as he has—a person who is allegedly possessed of considerable intelligence—would have been able to read Budgets carefully and ascertain that in the Treasury Estimates there is constantly provided an amount of funds for unforeseen expenditure. That is provided because no-one can tell me when framing a Budget just what is going to be the increase in the wage structure of particular departments. Consequently we provide a sum of money for the purpose of ensuring that when wage structure increases occur, whether it is in one department or another, money can be transferred from "unforeseen expenditure" in the Treasury reserves to the particular department or departments where it is required.

The honourable member for Port Curtis makes a hell of a song about something that he does not know anything about. He will fiddle about with any music whatsoever to try to mislead the people. There is nothing sinister or hidden in what we do in that direction. It is just plain common sense, and the honourable member for Port Curtis cannot understand it.

The honourable member wanted to know why \$2,000,000 unforeseen expenditure for subsidies to local bodies was charged to Consolidated Revenue when \$1,800,000 remained unspent in the Loan Fund. I only mention these things to show—I hate to say it—the stupidity of the honourable member in his reasoning. I am not saying that he is stupid; all I am drawing attention to is the stupidity in his reasoning. The additional \$2,000,000 was provided from Consolidated Revenue Fund to meet the subsidy requirements on further debenture allocations in February 1975, and to allow available Loan Funds to be applied to the State works programme. We wanted to keep people in employment. By doing that we were able to retain men in employment. Bad as the revenue position was in 1974-75, the loan position was worse. When it transpired that loan subsidy requirements would be \$1,800,000 less than the total provision, that amount was redirected to other areas in the loan programme. That is the type of argument put forward by the honourable member.

He has no real financial knowledge and depends on plain, bald criticism without any regard for the facts.

He asked why \$3,500,000 was provided in the Consolidated Revenue Fund for beef cattle industry assistance when only \$963,000 was spent. I point out to him that the Government announced that it would make \$10,000,000 available for concessional loans to beef producers. Later, the Commonwealth Government said it would match the State's contribution to provide for a \$20,000,000 beef-assistance programme. As the demand on the Woolgrowers Assistance Fund was now minimal, it was a sensible and prudent move to utilise the balance of that fund for a purpose similar to that for which it was initially introduced. The \$3,500,000 necessary to fulfil the State's commitment was provided from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The honourable member asked why the Works Department spent \$1,800,000 from the Cultural Capital Development Fund. I point out that the \$1,800,000 provided in this Vote to meet unforeseen expenditure was spent on the purchase of land at South Brisbane for the cultural complex. The honourable member professes to be keenly interested in culture, and when he speaks in this Chamber we realise that he has a cultural background. Yet in spite of that he criticised this project. What we will be providing is something that the State and its people will be proud of.

The honourable member also asked why railway transactions are not processed through a trust fund. He would be surprised to know that I believe this is one suggestion that has some merit.

Mr. Hanson interjected.

Sir GORDON CHALK: The honourable member should be careful; he should not become too swelled up or he will explode. For certain valid reasons that are too complex to go into here, the view has been taken that for the time being such a proposal as that put forward by the honourable member cannot be entertained. He also criticised the use of Golden Casket proceeds for cultural purposes. In earlier years they made a worth-while contribution to hospital revenue, but I believe the time has arrived when we can divert them to another project.

Whereas in earlier years the Casket contribution towards health service costs was a significant one, today, in the light of the annual expenditure on hospitals of \$231,000,000, the Casket proceeds of \$5,500,000 a year are of little significance. The time is opportune for the \$5,500,000 profit from the Casket to be channelled into other than hospital funds, for the benefit not merely of the people of Brisbane, as some people claim, but of the State as a whole. The fund is now established, and our provincial cities will receive assistance if they are prepared to go ahead with the type of cultural activity projects that we believe are necessary and essential for the people of Queensland.

Although the honourable member dealt with quite a number of other matters, I do not intend to dwell on them at length as I wish to refer to the comments made by certain other honourable members. However, to illustrate once more his complete lack of knowledge and inability to grasp the facts, I point out that he claimed the railway staff numbers shown do not relate to the provision, and he then referred to railway employees, etc. It is true that the Estimates refer only to 1,925 railway employees. The total of 22,489 railway employees is not shown in the Estimates. They are the responsibility of the Railway Department as a whole. The honourable member cannot understand a few plain facts.

I was very disappointed at the remarks made by the honourable member for Mackay, who attacked the Government on what he implied was a lack of decentralisation policy. In my opinion his conclusions were not only irrational but also illogical. He cannot deny that Queensland is the most decentralised State in Australia. Thanks to the policy of the Government over the last 10 years of development of resources, the population of Mt. Isa has increased by 54 per cent, Gladstone's population has increased by 55 per cent and Townsville's population has increased by 29 per cent.

Mr. Hanson interjected.

Sir GORDON CHALK: The honourable member did not do anything to increase the population; he would not be capable of doing it.

As I was saying, there has been a 29 per cent population growth in Townsville and a 50 per cent growth on the Gold Coast. I have quoted figures from the North, the South, the East and the West to give an indication of the growth that has occurred—yet we are accused of a lack of decentralisation! As a matter of fact, Queensland is unique in the balance it maintains in its population through decentralisation. The combined population of the local authority areas of Brisbane, Redlands, Ipswich and Pine Rivers (which are generally taken as constituting the metropolitan area) accounted in June 1974 for 44.9 per cent of the State's population, compared with 46 per cent of the total in 1965. The next thing the honourable member will do is accuse us of slipping back in the city area! I have indicated just what the position is.

To support his erroneous argument on this matter, the honourable member for Mackay claimed that roads expenditure budgeted for the North this year is the same as that provided for last year and that therefore the northern areas are worse off.

Mr. Casey: "Maintenance", I said.

Sir GORDON CHALK: He cannot get away from it. He walked into the trap. Let us look at what happened last year. Seventeen per cent of roads expenditure was incurred as the result of terrific flooding,

cyclones and other contingencies. Does he expect that the State can cope with expenditure of that type each year? The Government went to the rescue of his area; yet he decries our efforts and accuses us of not doing the right thing.

He advanced a further argument along those lines when he spoke about rail profits. He failed to take into account that approximately half of the Railway Department's general establishment costs relate to interest and redemption on special lines in the Northern and Central Divisions, which is not shown as a cost in those divisions. The revenue derived from the lines, however, is shown.

The honourable member for Mackay criticised the port of Brisbane. In what I regard as his irrational hatred of the capital of this State and everything that happens in it, he attacked the proposed new port. To refute his allegations, I point out firstly that it is not expected that the port will cost \$100,000,000. Secondly—and most importantly—the port will pay for itself from its own revenue, which will be assured before heavy commitments are entered into. We are criticised for the development of the State—development that will be paid for from the utilisation of the port. Thirdly, the fact that a good deal of the exports through the port of Brisbane come from hinterland areas over 150 miles distant from it is in itself a logical reason why a first-class, modern, self-sufficient port should be developed in the State's capital. It is in the interests of the development of Queensland as a whole that we develop the port.

In his speech the honourable member referred to the development of the port at Lucinda. His comments might indicate that this great sugar man from the North (so great that he would not know what sugar was and so great that he would know what contracting was) had only recently heard of the plans for the improvement, in conjunction with the sugar industry, of the bulk-loading facilities in the ports of Lucinda and Bundaberg. These developments are part of a continuing programme undertaken by the industry to maintain the facilities at sugar ports at a degree of efficiency that is comparable with the volume of sugar expected to flow through those ports and the shipping requirements of the industry's export customers. It has been a matter of public knowledge for some time that the Sugar Board, with the full approval of the sugar industry, has set aside from the proceeds of the 1974 sugar season crop the sum of \$50,000,000 to finance the development of bulk-sugar storage and loading facilities at Bundaberg and Lucinda and to permit larger vessels to load there. If the speech of the honourable member, as it was recorded in "Hansard", was accepted, it could be believed that the Government was doing something radically wrong, whereas in fact it is doing something for the benefit of the people as a whole.

Honourable members may not be generally aware that, under the guidance of the Sugar Board, the sugar industry has been adopting a programme of continuous improvement of facilities for storage and loading of bulk raw sugar at the six Queensland sugar ports. The port of Lucinda is the port that has not received any significant development. At present it is not capable of shipping sugar cargoes of more than 7,500 tonnes whereas the port of Mackay, which is in the honourable member's beloved area, has shipped cargoes as large as 25,000 tonnes and Townsville can ship cargoes of 32,000 tonnes.

Is there a sinister move by the honourable member in this direction? Does he, for his own material benefit, want to kill the sugar industry in certain parts of Queensland? It must be remembered that, like the honourable member for Port Curtis, he is not one of the little fellows in this Chamber. He is one of the capitalist type of people who condemn the worker and stand in this Chamber and say, "Don't do this here. Don't do that there. For God's sake do it all for me." He is the type of individual who stands in this Chamber and advocates his own type of policy that we are forced to listen to. I say that he is here owing to the misjudgment of the electors of Mackay, and if he continues his advocacy of his own policies—let us be realistic—he will not be here much longer.

He referred to the use of Golden Casket money for cultural capital programmes. Like the honourable member for Townsville South who used the high falutin language the other day, the honourable member for Mackay is very culture minded, but when it comes to providing something for our young people and the generation of tomorrow—to get them away from some of the things that have been brought about in this country by the administration and looseness of the Whitlam Government—he wants to deny Queensland any cultural development. As a man from the bush, he again sees the country people being disadvantaged by the Government's new policy on a major cultural project for Queensland. I believe that we have taken a step in the right direction. Whether it be in the city of Mackay—which is in his electorate—or anywhere else, a subsidy of one-third is paid on any major project undertaken for the improvement of a cultural centre.

I now come to the honourable member for Bulimba, who, I believe, should have been given the responsibility of handling the Budget argument on behalf of the Opposition. He put forward quite a number of reasonable suggestions. He complained about the delay in tabling departmental reports. The Government Printer has advised me that it would be physically impossible to print all reports before the Estimates are tabled. Of the more than 80 reports required to be presented to Parliament this session, 23 have been tabled to date. Preference has been given to the reports of those departments that it

is understood will be debated. I am anxious that all honourable members have as much information as possible and I certainly will continue to endeavour to ensure that the major proportion of reports is made available.

The honourable member then pointed out that Queensland received a larger increase in the General Purpose Grant than other States. The reason is this: firstly Queensland has taken advantage of the facilities of the Grants Commission. Those facilities and the commission were available to all States before the Labor Government began to govern Australia. Therefore the Federal Labor Government can take no credit for the increases in State payments. What I am saying is this: we went to the Grants Commission at a time when we believed we had a firm case to present. It is not a question of the Labor Government or somebody else giving us an extra hand-out. We had to appear and prove our case. We proved our case to such an extent that we did get certain large sums of money.

The second reason is the factor in the financial assistance grants formula whereby Queensland received an additional \$2,000,000 in the year into its base in order to catch up with similar payments to South Australia. These are the reasons why Queensland has received additional funds. They are reasons that Queensland was entitled to advance, and they are funds to which this State was entitled.

I point out also that population increases have been responsible for extra money coming Queensland's way. Between December 1971 and December 1974, the increase in population in New South Wales was 3.1 per cent; in Victoria the increase was 3.8 per cent and in Queensland it was 7.9 per cent. That figure surely is an indication of the great development that has been taking place here. It also indicates why Queensland is entitled to additional finance from the Commonwealth in financial assistance grants.

The honourable member spoke generally against increases in taxes and rail freights. I believe that I have indicated the true position this afternoon. I remind the Committee that, whilst it is true that an increase of 40 per cent has been imposed, it is equally true that in New South Wales there were increases of 5 per cent in 1969, 15 per cent in 1971, 10 per cent in 1973 with a second increase in that year of 5 per cent, and 15 per cent the following year.

Mr. Houston: They are Liberals, too.

Sir GORDON CHALK: I am not arguing about that. I am pointing out that there were increases amounting to 60.39 per cent whilst Queenslanders were enjoying a period of freedom from increases. In Victoria there were four increases amounting to 69.78 per cent over that period. What I am pointing out is that the people of Queensland have had a moratorium on railway increases

through the years; while the increase is now to be 40 per cent, thousands of people in New South Wales and Victoria have been paying increased freight rates over the years. Consequently I believe that I can justify the action of the Queensland Government on this occasion.

Those are points that I believe must be raised in this debate. I now look at the more significant items raised by other members. There was great diversity in the range of topics on which members spoke, and it was pleasing to see the new members making their contributions to their first Budget debate. I hope that all who have contributed in this way will remain as members in this Chamber for many years to come, because I believe that the arguments that they have advanced have been based on sound principles. I commend them for that attitude.

Much has been said about rail freights. I make no apologies for what I had to do. I believe that the increases are justified by the fact that over the years the Government has swallowed railway deficits. Predictably, honourable members representing country areas have voiced the need for assistance to rural industries and country residents. We heard the honourable members for Flinders, Fassifern, Carnarvon, Mt. Isa, Barron River, Isis and others express this point of view. The honourable members for Maryborough and Cairns would have preferred a succession of small increases. The honourable member for Belyando was not backward in putting the opposite view, with which I agree. That view is that what has been done is to the advantage of railway users because they have had the continuing benefit of lower rates in past years.

I cannot accept the argument expounded by the honourable member for Callide that the Government should not have increased rail freights as such increases will add further to costs. I interjected when he was speaking because I have to point out that, whilst other costs are increasing, the railway cannot simply swallow its costs and be carried by the Government. On the other hand, I know the industries with which the honourable member is associated and if he studies his cost statements over recent years he will find that all his costs except rail costs have increased. Now that they have been varied, the over-all increase will still be less than the increase in other items.

On the question of succession duty, the Government has made a very progressive step in honouring yet another of its election promises and I believe that this step forward is a very good one. Many honourable members commended this innovation and the point was well made by the honourable members for Mourilyan, Brisbane, Cooroora and Landsborough that the Commonwealth is still active in this field. They pointed out that the most unfortunate aspect of the State's action is that some of the benefit that will

flow from the State's action will be dissipated because the Commonwealth in its greedy approach will take its share of the money which this Government has forgone.

In answer to those honourable members, including the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable members for Warwick and Murrumba, who did to some degree bemoan the increase in driver's licence fees and other charges, let me point out the very minor effect that these increases will have on motoring costs compared with the Commonwealth Government's imposition of a levy of \$2 a barrel on crude oil and associated products. This has resulted in an increase of 5c per gallon of petrol, which, if calculated over a year of motoring, makes the State's increase in driver's licence fees pale into insignificance.

The question of the reduction in pay-roll tax has been very well canvassed by the honourable members for Brisbane, Mansfield, Barron River and Ipswich West. Of course, no matter how good a concession is, the honourable member for Bundaberg—I see he is missing again—will find fault with it and he alone found fault with this concession. I hope he goes back to the small industries in Bundaberg and repeats what he said in this Chamber.

Dealing with housing—many honourable members opposite applauded the miserable Commonwealth allocation for housing. The Commonwealth allocation this year will be \$31,000,000 compared with \$43,000,000 in the previous year. The fact is, nevertheless, that capital funds available for housing this year will be \$61,000,000, or \$4,600,000 less than was expended last year, no matter what the Commonwealth Government might say.

As might be expected, the State's entry into Medibank has been the subject of considerable comment. Whatever the view of the individual on the scheme might be—and we have heard some from the honourable members for Warrego and Kurilpa and, naturally, the honourable members for Wavell and Townsville—the facts are clear and indisputable. The State's acceptance of Medibank has meant virtually no change in our public hospital administration and it has been worth \$50,000,000 to the State Budget. I have to point out that there are problems in this regard, but I know that we have to move with the policies being put forward by Canberra.

On the subject of roads—the honourable members for Flinders and Warrego drew attention to the lack of funds for rural roads. I mentioned in my Budget speech that the road works programme for this year would be \$103,000,000 and the total programme for the department would be \$169,500,000. All honourable members would be aware that the Commonwealth now funds fully the construction and maintenance of roads that it designates as national roads but funds for

these roads come out of the total money that would otherwise be available to the States for use on all its roads. The roads that do not fall into that category are classified under a number of other headings and the Commonwealth contributes towards the cost of these, exercising strict control over the level of funds it provides in each category. In spite of efforts by the State, the Commonwealth has demonstrated a complete lack of concern for rural roads, particularly rural arterial roads. One could go on and on about the effect of the policy of the Commonwealth Government on road construction throughout Queensland.

As to assistance to youth—I was pleased to hear the favourable comments of the honourable member for Mansfield and the honourable members for Barron River, Warwick and Hinchinbrook on the allocation of \$2,400,000 for sport, youth and recreational purposes. The honourable member for Sandgate also approved of that allocation but had some reservation.

The honourable member for Hinchinbrook seemed to have a misunderstanding that I think I should clarify for him. I assure him that there is no time limit on the availability of the approved subsidies for sport and youth projects provided the work is under way and in progress in the period stipulated when the assistance is given. Honourable members will also be aware that the Commonwealth Government has provided assistance in these areas. However, this is another example of crazy administration, because, although Commonwealth subsidy approvals may be given, no funds are available to enable payments to be made this year. In other words, the Commonwealth authorities write a wonderful letter saying that approval has been given, but the last paragraph says, "No funds will be available this year." The organisation concerned can only hope that an allocation will be made in the Commonwealth Budget next year.

I could speak at length about what is being done by the Education Department. The honourable member for Bundaberg expressed doubt about expenditure on education being increased by 42.8 per cent and said that he would prefer to see the additional money spent on relieving unemployment. Although the honourable member interjected earlier in my speech, he is now missing from the Chamber. However, in his absence, I ask what he thinks the major part of the increase is being used for.

Let me explain to honourable members that an increase of 42.8 per cent represents \$98,600,000. Of that, \$49,400,000 is the additional amount needed to cover the cost of award increases for a full year and to keep the staff as at 30 June this year fully employed; \$8,200,000 is to cover the cost of the increase of 2,116 in teacher numbers and 282 in the administrative staff. That indicates the type of increase that is taking place in the Education Department. In addition,

\$13,700,000 is to meet the additional cost of wages of ancillary staff, including some 800 additional cleaners required because of an award variation and about 500 additional aides. Thus \$71,300,000, or 72 per cent, of the additional provision is directed towards maintenance of employment and engagement of additional personnel. Does the honourable member for Bundaberg not want progress of that type within the Education Department? Does he want to see circumstances developing in which education in this State will slip back?

Honourable members representing country areas, particularly the honourable members for Balonne, Cunningham, Toowoomba South and Hinchinbrook, were very appreciative of the increase of 50 per cent in remote-area allowances, the new senior secondary scholarship scheme, and the increase of 33½ per cent in payments to school bus operators.

The 8 per cent increase in police strength was a feature of the Budget welcomed by all honourable members and commended particularly by the honourable members for Albert, Belyando, Baroona, Cunningham, Somerset, Belmont and Everton, who appreciated just how much is being done in this field.

As to the hospital building programme—I have mentioned already the massive injection of funds into the State hospital capital programme, and I have no doubt that all honourable members will appreciate the significance of that.

I could deal with other submissions made by honourable members, but I should like to comment particularly on your own contribution to the debate, Mr. Hewitt. You referred to three main matters: the growth in the Public Service and the criteria for determining that rate of growth; the benefits to be derived from a staff exchange system between the Public Service and the private sector; and the need for an inquiry into the Queensland Public Service. I read your speech with considerable interest.

As to the first item—the growth of the Public Service—I say to you that in recent years it has occurred largely in areas in which increased funds have been available from Commonwealth sources. Examples are education, health and community welfare services. You mentioned the expenditure on education. The same factors apply there as apply to the other activities I mentioned. A further factor that affects the growth rate is the population of Queensland. I referred a few moments ago to the outstanding growth in population, hence the need for additional Government services over recent years has brought about a faster increase in the growth of the Public Service than perhaps in some other areas. The State has had an unprecedented burst in industrial development owing to the management of the Government and its administration. We have had enormous advance in industrial development and

consequently a public demand has existed for the expansion of Government services. This has led to significant increases in staff in such diverse areas as the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs, environmental matters, and control of air and water pollution. I could go on and on.

Although you accepted the necessity for growth in the service, Mr. Hewitt, you asked: "What are the criteria for determining what the growth rate should be?" The situation in Queensland is that the department makes submissions in detail to the Public Service Board for additional staff to cover the expansion of the existing services and any proposed new activity. The upper growth limit is determined each year as a balance between Government policy, departmental needs and the availability of funds.

As to your second point—it is understood that some State Governments have schemes under which certain officers are exchanged with officers in the private sector, thus allowing each to benefit from the experience of other areas. Although we have no such scheme at present in Queensland, the advantages and disadvantages of it were discussed at a recent conference of the Public Service Board. In the meantime, public servants attend conferences covering many areas of endeavour at which both the private and public sectors are represented. By that means, I believe, we can have an exchange of experience.

As to a review of the Queensland Public Service—as pointed out, certain other States have had a review of this type in recent years. The reports produced by some of those reviews are available and are being examined by the Public Service Board.

I do compliment you, Mr. Hewitt, on the contribution you made.

This morning, as the debate drew to a conclusion, we listened to the honourable member for Pine Rivers. He was very concerned about the continuance of kindergartens. I share his concern. We made the initial approach in the early days; we also started pre-school education. The Commonwealth Government of the day has intervened. Candidly I am not quite sure just where we are going or what the ultimate outcome will be. However, I do now indicate that the State is prepared to stand behind its pre-school education scheme and its kindergarten scheme. That is the basis on which, I am certain, we will be able ultimately to come to a satisfactory conclusion.

I listened to the very eloquent speech made by the Minister for Works. He expressed very fully his views on some of the things that are happening in Canberra. His expression was an indication of the real public thinking in Queensland at the moment. I commend him for the contribution he made and the manner in which he made it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Treasurer referred to the Minister who spoke this morning as the Minister for Works. For the sake of clarity I point out that it was the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads.

Sir GORDON CHALK: I apologise for having used the title "Minister for Works". The honourable gentleman I am referring to is the honourable member for Albert, that well-known, efficient Minister for Local Government.

Opposition Members interjected.

Sir GORDON CHALK: All right, the honourable member for South Coast. It is all very well for the Leader of the Opposition to throw his hands up. All he is trying to do is get the egg off his face. I have been in this Chamber a long while, and during that time there have been changes in the areas and names of electorates.

I know now—I knew before but it slipped my memory—that the Minister represents the electorate of South Coast. Irrespective of how the honourable member for Bulimba or the Leader of the Opposition may rant, we know that the Minister made a very cutting speech representing the views of the average Queenslander. I commend him on it.

Finally, we heard from that great stalwart from the Gold Coast the honourable member for Surfers Paradise, who based his contribution this afternoon, as always, on the development of Queensland and the Commonwealth of Australia. Over the years, he has made a very worth-while contribution to the development of our State and nation. In this Chamber he is able to debate and impart his knowledge in a versatile way. I commend him on the words he spoke this afternoon. I know that he is interested in the welfare of the people in the Gold Coast area. He will do all he possibly can to ensure that this Government provides for their advance and that the Government in Canberra realises the way they should be cared for. I am certain that he, with Mr. Eric Robinson, the Federal member for the area, will advance the requirements of the Gold Coast.

I expected the Opposition to marshal its full, but limited, resources to deliver an organised, rational criticism of the Government's policies, including the alternatives it would have offered had it occupied the Treasury benches; but it did not do so. In fact the quality of the Opposition's attack was so low that those Opposition members who did speak only adopted knocking tactics without suggesting specific alternative policies for the consideration of this Parliament and the electors of the State. We listened to a long succession of speakers from the Government side of the Chamber who had obviously done their homework and who were prepared to advance alternative views in instances where they felt that some constructive criticism was warranted. All constructive suggestions,

including those of the honourable member for Chatsworth, have been noted and will be taken into account in the formulation of future Government policies. I hope that the views expressed by the honourable member for Townsville South in his colourful, provocative and articulate fashion will be taken into account similarly by the Opposition.

The value of the Budget debate is enhanced by the fact that it provides a medium for all who so choose to have their say on subjects of their choice. As I said, we have listened to a great variety of speakers with a great variety of views and opinions on matters relating not only to the finances of the State but also to matters of concern to individual members and their constituents.

In closing the debate, I thank honourable members for the contribution they have made on the Budget in this year 1975.

Item (Salaries—His Excellency the Governor) agreed to.

Progress reported.

LOCAL BODIES' LOANS GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (4.5 p.m.): I move—

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

During the introductory stage, I explained that the purpose of the Bill is to extend the provisions of the amendment of 1973 and validate, in addition to debenture loans, any inscribed stock loans which are deficient in a like manner. The previous amendment referred only to debenture borrowings because at that time it was not known that there were any cases of inscribed stock loans where loan formalities were deficient.

It was the notification forwarded to all local bodies advising them of the legislation concerning debentures which caused some of them to take a close look at their inscribed stock dealings and the dates of the relevant Orders in Council.

The honourable member for Bulimba has asked for an indication of the volume of transactions in which local bodies are involved. I stated quite frankly in my reply that I cannot provide a complete list. It would be a most time-consuming task to search the records of every loan still current, and I see no purpose in such an exercise. Only three local bodies issue inscribed stock—the State Electricity Commission, the Southern Electric Authority and the Brisbane City Council. It is possible that in a relatively small number of instances each of these bodies has arranged borrowings which are technically deficient. I am aware of 18 specific loans which this amendment will validate. No doubt there are others.

However, let me make it quite clear that there is no suggestion of anything shady or improper about the borrowings by the local bodies. There is nothing secret or underhand. The formalities had all been observed but we now know that in isolated instances the sequence of the procedural steps taken was wrong. Strictly speaking the Order in Council which authorises the borrowing must come first and then follows the exchange of money and documents, otherwise the transaction is unlawful. We are dealing in this Bill with the odd case where the Order in Council had not been issued as the first step. The majority of the cases which have come to notice have been conversion loans where loan formalities have not commenced early enough to allow the Order in Council to be issued on or before the maturity date of the original loan.

In simple terms, this amendment dealing with inscribed stock transactions does what the previous amendment did for debenture transactions. It validates any past borrowings which, strictly speaking, for the reason I have explained, are unlawful and it provides that the Government will honour the guarantee to which the lender is morally entitled.

I feel that the amendments contained in the Bill are quite straightforward and should be accepted by the House.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (4.8 p.m.): The Opposition supports the measure, if for no other reason than that there are people in the community who in good faith, either individually or through organisations, took up these loans in the various forms available to them in the belief that the legalities had been observed and that their money was secure. To ensure that their security is preserved, the Opposition supports the legislation.

When a Bill is introduced providing for retrospective legalisation, I believe the Parliament is entitled to know the extent to which laws have not been carried out as they should have been or whether there is a doubt as to their having been carried out properly. I believe the Opposition is entitled to know exactly what the situation is.

It is all very well for the Treasurer to say, "There is nothing legally wrong. Everything done is above board." No-one doubts that at all, but surely when Parliament is asked to pass laws retrospectively it is entitled to be made aware of the extent of the actions it is making legal. I do not resile from the position I took that we should be told, if it is at all humanly possible, where the fault lies.

The Treasurer replied in part by naming three Government or semi-government organisations. Here again it should not be a matter of asking a question; it is a matter of knowing the extent to which this happens.

This is the second occasion within a short period on which we have had to make such an amendment. I do not want this to become

a regular procedure; nor I am sure does the Treasurer. Local authorities must be told that they have a responsibility, through their officers, to ensure that they do not take action that will make further amendments necessary.

If something had happened before this legislation became law, the consequences for the people who lent money to various bodies could have been serious. My concern is for those who lent money in good faith, believing their investments were safe. We have to ensure that their position is not jeopardised as a result of carelessness, lack of knowledge or any other reason.

Hon. Sir GORDON CHALK (Lockyer—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (4.11 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Bulimba for his comments. As I said earlier, the issue does not call for lengthy debate. It is true that there were some oversights. I have indicated that it would be almost impossible for me to provide the information that the honourable member is seeking. I can do no more than give him the assurance I gave in my earlier remarks.

Motion (Sir Gordon Chalk) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth, in the chair)

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

LIENS ON CROPS OF SUGAR CANE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. W. E. KNOX (Nundah—Minister for Justice and Attorney-General) (4.13 p.m.): I move—

"The Bill be now read a second time."

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth, in the chair)

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

Bill reported, without amendment.

POULTRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth, in the chair)

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (4.16 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Poultry Industry Act 1946–1973 in certain particulars."

The Queensland poultry industry, although minor in comparison with the cattle and sheep industries, plays a major role in the

production of high-protein foodstuffs. In the 10 years that have elapsed since the last major amendment to the Poultry Industry Act, many changes have taken place in production methods and in the organisation and structure of the industry. The number of egg producers has declined by more than 50 per cent, but the average size of laying flocks has increased from 900 birds to about 5,000 at the present time. Egg production has increased by an estimated 70 per cent and broiler production has more than doubled.

Poultry-breeding establishments have declined in number because this aspect of poultry production has been almost completely taken over by companies which are able to employ qualified geneticists and which have access to the capital required for large-scale breeding programmes. Six companies, including one based in Queensland, now control most of the poultry breeding done in Australia. These firms supply parent breeding stock to hatcheries throughout Australia under franchise arrangements.

The number of registered hatcheries in the State has also declined, but their combined annual output of day-old chickens has increased from just over 9,000,000 to an estimated 22,000,000 in the last ten years. This means that individual hatcheries now have responsibility for the quality and health of a much greater number of chickens than previously.

Because of the changes which have taken place in the structure of the industry and in production methods, some sections of the Poultry Industry Act are no longer relevant, and others need revising to bring them into line with modern industry practice. One of the principal objects of this Bill is to reconstitute the Poultry Advisory Board. The egg industry has four members at present, while the poultry meat sector has only one representative. To correct this imbalance, egg industry representation is to be reduced by two members and poultry meat sector representation increased by one. This latter member will represent broiler chicken growers, giving these producers a direct say on the board for the first time. These changes will also achieve balance in representation between production and marketing sections of the industry.

It is proposed that a senior officer of my department will become chairman of the board in the place of the Minister. This will provide greater continuity of action, and facilitate regularity of meetings. It will also prevent any possible conflict of interest between my position as board chairman and as Minister.

At the same time, opportunity is being taken to widen the scope of the industry problems that may be considered by the board. At present these are restricted to problems of production.

The poultry industry, in common with many other primary industries in recent times, has had to contend with steeply increasing production costs on the one hand and difficult market conditions on the other. The slump in beef prices has had a depressing effect on sales of both poultry meat and eggs, and net returns to producers have fallen. The ability of the industry to adjust to these circumstances is mainly due to the progressive outlook of poultry producers and their willingness to adopt new ideas in the search for increased efficiency. In this regard, poultry producers have always made good use of the wide range of advisory, research and diagnostic services provided for their benefit by my department.

These services are partly financed by precepts collected annually and paid into the Poultry Industry Fund. Precepts are collected from egg producers by the two egg marketing boards. Egg producers outside egg board areas do not at present contribute to the precept. Producers in egg board areas have been critical of this system and do not agree that they should continue to contribute part of the cost of providing services for producers outside board areas while these producers do not pay precepts. It is therefore proposed to amend the Act by making provision for the application of precepting arrangements to such producers as from a date to be fixed. At the same time, provision is made for additional payments as required from Consolidated Revenue to keep the Poultry Industry Fund solvent.

Mention has already been made of the necessity to maintain standards of management and hygiene to ensure high standards of chicken health and quality. Similar standards are also required in relation to all aspects of the production of eggs, egg products and poultry-meats. It is therefore necessary that the powers of inspectors be extended to cover such activities and to enable them to carry out any necessary sampling or testing of products or to require the cleansing of equipment and premises. One weakness in the Act is that there is no power to require the disposal of poultry or poultry products seized because of a breach of the Act. Also, inspectors do not at present have specific power to deal with egg pulp and there is no provision for disposal of eggs and egg products which may be seized where breaches of the regulations are detected. Provision has been made to correct these and similar deficiencies in the powers of inspectors.

It is proposed to change the present system of licensing chicken sexers. Second-class licences based on a 93 per cent standard of accuracy are to be discontinued and provisional licences introduced. Provisional licences will be based on a 97 per cent standard, the same as the current first-class licence. Provisional licence holders will have to pass several tests on sexing accuracy during a one-year period before a first-class licence is issued. The raising of accuracy standards

required of chicken sexers is necessary because commercial hatcheries now guarantee 97 per cent sexing accuracy in day-old chickens sold. The introduction of provisional licences will overcome the problems experienced with some sexers who can reach the necessary standard of accuracy in an examination, but who cannot maintain this standard when working under commercial conditions.

Provisions in the Act relating to departmental accreditation of breeding establishments, hatcheries and hatchery supply farms and certification of freedom from pullorum disease in respect of accredited premises are to be repealed. These provisions were originally introduced to encourage the adoption of scientific breeding methods, but are no longer relevant in view of the developments which have taken place in the field of poultry breeding, to which I referred previously.

It is proposed to delete reference to compensation for poultry or fittings destroyed or to payment made for treatment of fittings pursuant to an order made under the Act.

These provisions are now redundant in view of the Commonwealth-States agreement on compensation for eradication of exotic diseases.

A new section has been introduced which will protect inspectors and the Crown against civil or criminal liability arising out of action taken by an inspector. This protection, of course, will apply only when the action taken is in good faith for the purposes of the Act and pursuant to the Act.

The definition of "disease" has been updated in line with current knowledge of poultry diseases and disease nomenclature.

The matters to which I have referred constitute the major items of importance in the amending Bill. As I mentioned earlier, it is 10 years since the last major amendment to this Act. Many changes have taken place in the poultry industry in this period. Because of this, some sections of the Act are now out of date and new provisions are required to meet new problems. The Bill will update the Act and correct those deficiencies which have become apparent. I commend it to the Committee.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (4.27 p.m.): As the Minister indicated, although the poultry industry may seem insignificant, it is an important primary industry in this State. It provides a source of excellent food which, if taken in sensible quantities, contributes to the good health of those who eat it.

Many years ago, a former Labor Government in this State saw the need to introduce a Bill to provide for strict control of the poultry industry, and such a measure was introduced in this Chamber in 1946. At that time, the numerous diseases becoming prevalent in poultry flocks throughout the State

were causing serious concern, and eventually the Government embodied in legislation the advice of departmental officers that flocks should be compulsorily registered. This ensured that the spread of disease in poultry flocks could be prevented and also that, in time, the diseases themselves could be eliminated.

When that legislation was introduced, a member of the Opposition asked the Minister in charge of the Bill questions pertaining to compensation when an outbreak of disease occurred. He was promptly assured that people whose poultry had to be destroyed would receive compensation. I note that the Minister said in his introductory speech that, as a result of arrangements made between the Commonwealth and State Governments for the control of exotic diseases, the existing section of the Act would be deleted because adequate provision exists for the payment of compensation. That is in line with many amendments introduced in this Chamber. As a legislator, one repeatedly sees the Government introducing not only amendments such as this but also amendments that reflect changes in industry, commerce and, indeed, our everyday life.

The amending Bill of 1946 also introduced a more comprehensive system of grading and branding. That was a very desirable provision from which the people of this State have derived considerable benefit over the years.

The Minister touched on advertisements for sexed chickens by people who claim to have certain competency in that direction. A desirable amendment to previous legislation covering such advertisements is being introduced to prevent the rackets and rorts that were worked many years ago.

I notice a smile on the face of the honourable member for Windsor. No doubt he well remembers some of the rackets that were worked in a petty way in his area. I might tell the Committee something about them at a later stage. As the honourable member grows in wisdom, erudition and understanding after a few more months here, he may realise that, if he pays more attention, his personal thirst for knowledge may be satisfied.

In the past a serious racket was being worked. No doubt some people would do the same today if they could get away with it. Advertisements offered sexed chickens for sale, but the buyer who paid for pullets would end up with a certain number of cockerels.

The Minister is proposing to increase the powers of inspectors and give them protection from possible litigation. This is all very necessary to cleanse the industry, to cover any inadequacies in the existing legislation and, at the same time, meet the public's requirements.

At all times we must ensure the maintenance of desirable standards in this industry in this State. Over a period of meetings and negotiations, the Australian and State Governments agreed to control egg production throughout the nation by the imposition of hen quotas established by the various State Governments. Recently certain amendments were made to the Hen Quotas Act. I will not go into that night of great memories. All States have some sort of uniformity, except Western Australia, which has had its own legislation in operation since 1971. The object of the national quota was to bring production more closely into line with domestic demand, and to prevent the future emergence of large surpluses oriented to a somewhat unreliable world market. At the introductory stage of the Bill to amend the Hen Quotas Act, I said that Japan has been a very significant consumer of Australian egg pulp. In the early 1980s, that country hopes to achieve 100 per cent self-sufficiency with its egg pulp industry. Even though Japan is now getting only 2.5 per cent of its total egg pulp requirements from this country, in actual volume it is a very significant amount, and we are likely to lose that export. It is very desirable that the system enunciated by the Australian and State Governments should be proceeded with using caution and common sense.

At all times production must be related closely to domestic requirements. It is essential for the good of the industry that each producer tries to maintain hen numbers as near as possible to his permitted quota. The downturn in demand by the European Economic Community and Japan has sounded a grave note of warning to our producers. If the industry is to continue on a viable basis, members of the poultry industry must be ever mindful of the decisions of Governments and producer organisations. It would be very foolish in the poultry industry, as in any other industry, to ignore the principles of supply and demand. In the long-term interests of producers' profits, it is essential that cognisance be taken of these principles. In an organised marketing system, where all production is pooled and the return from the disposal of the commodity is averaged out over all suppliers, any inefficiency by any growers reacts on all.

The Minister, in his introductory remarks, referred to the many changes in the poultry industry throughout the State. We must look at these changes sensibly; they cannot be ignored. As the Minister said, the number of egg producers throughout the nation has declined markedly and the size of flocks has increased. Egg production has increased by about 70 per cent and in recent times broiler production has almost doubled. When looking at the industry broadly, it is only fair, equitable and just that, with the reconstitution of the board, the number of members should be altered, and we believe that the broiler people are entitled to more representation.

The Minister referred to the change by which chairmanship of the board passes from him to a senior officer of his department. No doubt this was looked into administratively to see that the public interest is best served. The Minister is the man who is responsible for the department. It is to be hoped that this change was considered properly and that priorities were examined in a sensible light. No Minister should hand over his responsibilities willy-nilly simply to be relieved of them. I do not suggest that that happened on this occasion. No doubt this matter has been considered for some time by the Minister and his predecessors. If this change benefits the industry, we shall certainly be in favour of it. However, as with many of these matters, we reserve our right to comment after we have studied the Bill.

The steep costs inflicted on the industry have a big bearing on the net return, but steep costs are common to industries throughout the world. This matter was canvassed well and truly by Opposition members when they made their contribution to the Budget debate.

I have referred to compensation matters and the powers of inspectors. The chief amendment in the Bill relates to the precepts that producers will be called upon to pay. I suppose that provision applies particularly to North Queensland egg producers. There has been a considerable amount of argument and confrontation between North Queensland egg producers and people from the Egg Board who have made numerous visits to North Queensland in an attempt to interest the producers in becoming members of that organisation.

North Queensland producers experience considerable difficulties in the problems of distance, local marketing and others unique to that part of the State. They have several options open to them. They could continue as they are, they could establish their own board or they could, with the concurrence of growers in other areas, establish one board for the whole of Queensland. With the Egg Board, we believe that eventually the long-term interests of the State would be best served by one organisation.

It is worthy of note that, because North Queensland egg producers have undertaken to pay the full hen levy by the year 1977 and to do so thereafter (which is good news for the industry), the Egg Marketing Board is not greatly concerned at present. It presently sees no great cause for worry about the absence of a statutory authority in North Queensland.

I turn now to the matter of precepts for research and dissemination of information for the benefit of the industry as a whole. The Minister's argument is that, if people in the South have to pay the precept, there is no reason why people in the North should avoid their obligations. People in the North

may have good reasons for not paying the precept and, when the Bill is printed, we will seek information from them on that aspect.

It is interesting to note that a little over 12 months ago a visit was made to the people of the North by inspectors of the board with the idea of policing the Commonwealth hen levy and assisting with the administration of the Acts.

The figures given by the Minister bear little relationship to the facts. A visit to the North in 1966 revealed that 81 farms had flocks subject to levy. The most recent visit in July or August 1974 revealed that the number had dropped to 67. Whilst in 1966 the leviable hens totalled 65,701, the latest count was nearly three times that number—187,580. Those figures follow the trend throughout the length and breadth of this country.

Finally, I hope that the Minister and his department, in applying themselves to matters appertaining to the poultry industry and egg production, act vigilantly at all times. There have been countless complaints from retailers, commercial operators and householders about the quality of the eggs purchased.

Speaking as a person who has bought countless thousands of eggs, I can say that at times I found considerable inadequacy. As the proprietor of a business, I have to stand up repeatedly and try to find the reason for a weakness, a flaw or an inadequacy. In a business a person can become very critical. For the sake of profitability, attention must be directed to quality. We do not at all times get the quality that we pay for.

My statements apply not only to eggs but also to chickens, particularly broiler chickens. Gone are the days when we could get a good feed of chicken. I can remember the good old Rhode Island Red from grandmother's back yard.

(Time expired.)

Mr. GUNN (Somerset) (4.47 p.m.): I join in this debate with quite a deal of enthusiasm. The Minister said that, although this might be a minor industry compared with the sheep and cattle industries, it is nevertheless a very important one. I refer particularly to the growth in the broiler industry.

The Minister said also that it is 10 years since this legislation was amended. With the passage of time, the old Act has become antiquated. With the growth of the poultry industry, particularly the broiler industry, it is absolutely necessary to amend it.

The Minister mentioned also that he will no longer be chairman of the Poultry Advisory Board and that a senior officer of his department will take his place. I do not think anyone will argue against that change. The Minister's duties take up a tremendous amount of his time. As the board is advisory in nature, the Minister will not lose contact with it.

Over the years, the poultry industry has been a very erratic and hard industry. It has been subject to the same escalation in costs as other industries, including other primary industries. At present, the egg market is particularly buoyant. I can remember the time when producers did not receive the cost of production. The feed market, too, is buoyant at present, although it has been very erratic.

I now refer to the services rendered by the department. Over the years I have been very closely connected with the poultry section of Gatton Agricultural College. That section can take pride in its achievements. Many years ago the section was only a minute part of the college whereas today it conducts trials, particularly in the broiler industry, and has grown to some extent. Possibly it could be argued that the services of the department have not been available throughout the State and that the department has concentrated on South-east Queensland, where the industry has been most buoyant. In the future, as the industry grows—and there can be no argument that it is growing—there will be a need to employ more men in this field.

As I said, the poultry industry is not an easy industry. Like all animals and birds, chickens are subject to many diseases. I refer particularly to coccidiosis, which we knew many years ago. It is still in evidence. The sulfa drugs have, of course, done much to eradicate it as well as pullorum disease and many others that afflict the poultry industry. There were no advisory inspectors years ago when the stick-fast flea first appeared and went through the poultry flocks of Queensland doing immense damage. If in those days there had been the inspectors and advisers that are now available, that disease could probably have been stopped early.

In the poultry industry, as in many others, it is absolutely necessary to have strict cleanliness. In the past poultry were reared, for the broiler trade in particular, under conditions in which one would not rear pigs. I am now pleased that properly conducted abattoirs are part of the poultry industry.

I see that the Minister has some advisers present. I should like to know the incidence of avian tuberculosis at the present time in Queensland flocks. Since my college days I have grown a little out of touch with this industry. I remember that at that time there were among poultry diseases that caused quite a deal of concern.

The market for day-old chickens is quite extensive, and these days many such chickens are sold by hatcheries. With regard to the sexing of chickens, 97 per cent accuracy is an extremely high standard. A person who is sold what are claimed to be, say, a couple of hundred pullets does not want to find that 20 per cent are cockerels.

I refer again to the precept agreement, which I believe will not find favour with people in North Queensland. Their argument would probably be that in the past they have not had access to departmental officers. If that is so, I hope that as this industry develops in North Queensland—I can see no reason why it should not—those engaged in it will have access to departmental advisers. The poultry industry is growing, and I cannot see why it should not be extremely important in North Queensland, the Far West, and also the North-west and South-west.

I commend the Bill. The amendments are probably a little overdue. However, they are before us now, and I think they will have the support of the whole Committee.

Mr. JENSEN (Bundaberg) (4.54 p.m.): I listened intently to the Minister's introduction of the Bill. I cannot understand why it is necessary to have both a Poultry Industry Act and a Hen Quotas Act and why hen quotas cannot be dealt with under the Poultry Industry Act. I do not know whether hens are different from poultry.

I remember quite well that when the Minister introduced the Hen Quotas Bill the honourable member for Clayfield entered the debate to speak about the powers given to inspectors to look under beds for poultry. He referred to keeping about 5,000 chooks in a house. There are inspectors appointed under the Hen Quotas Act just as there are under the Fisheries Act, and when the Fisheries Act is amended I will speak again about the appointment of inspectors under various Acts.

I know what fisheries inspectors can do. When the Hen Quotas Bill was under discussion the honourable member for Clayfield apparently did not know that the powers of inspectors under that legislation were to be similar to those of fisheries inspectors. When I read the Bill and find out what the inspectors' duties will be I hope they are not the same as those set out in the Hen Quotas Act. If they are, I hope the honourable member for Clayfield will get up and do to the Minister the same as he did last time.

Mr. Murray: They will find fishy hens under the bed.

Mr. JENSEN: I know fish and crabs and everything are under the bed as far as these blokes are concerned, but I am concerned about cruelty—

Mr. Frawley: Where is your brief?

Mr. JENSEN: My brief is just here. I know my rights as a member of this Parliament. When I was young, my father and my uncle kept fowls and I know more about fowls than most people in this Committee who are supposed to be country men. In my father's day we kept our fowls out in the open under the fruit trees and provided pens for them there. We did not see the cruelty

we see today under the intensive system with the poultry kept in wire cages. If honourable members go to a poultry farm today, they will see the poor little chickens with their feet cut to pieces.

Mr. Frawley: Rubbish!

Mr. JENSEN: They are; I have seen them. Anyone who has been to a poultry farm knows it, so it is no good saying "rubbish". This intensive system is unnatural. Anybody who has been to a poultry farm will have seen the chickens with their feet cut. Mr. Hewitt, if you have not been to such a farm, I would ask you to go and look at their feet. After a while, the feet look like a cane-cutter's hands with corns on them. Their feet are just about cut off. They heal after a while when they get used to being on the barbed wire—not barbed wire—

Mr. Frawley: Come on!

Mr. JENSEN: It is just ordinary wire, but it is as bad for a little chicken as barbed wire would be for us. We talk about diseases. No wonder there are diseases with this intensive system. But the inspectors do not care about cruelty to poultry. These days we speak quite a lot about cruelty to animals. This intensive system is cruelty to poultry.

Mr. Dean: Shocking!

Mr. JENSEN: I agree that it is shocking.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: It is not a joke. If we put honourable members in a wire cage similar to those into which the Japs put our soldiers in wartime, they would say it is shocking, too. The Japs put some of our soldiers in wire cages of the same type.

An Honourable Member: They're heroes today.

Mr. JENSEN: Yes, they are heroes today. This intensive system breeds diseases in poultry. The chickens are fed on the cheapest grain obtainable, usually wheat. If wheat is cheap, they get wheat and we end up with a dirty white yolk. In the old days, we used to feed the chooks on corn and maize and we ended up with a lovely yellow yolk. The Minister for Justice, who has just entered the Chamber, knows something about it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. JENSEN: The Minister for Justice was brought up in Nundah as I was. We had a few chooks. We fed them on maize and we got this beautiful yellow yolk. We could buy eggs then for a shilling a dozen—a penny each—and today they have gone up to nearly 10 cents apiece. We get eggs with shrivelled-up pale, whitish yolks. Even the white albumen is affected. This is

caused by what they are fed. If wheat is cheap, they get wheat; if milo is cheap, they get milo and if corn is cheap, they get measly corn full of weevils. This is what is going on in the poultry industry. I know the poultry industry is one of the smaller industries and needs quite a bit of protection, but it does not need the protection—

Mr. Frawley: Who wrote that rubbish for you?

Mr. JENSEN: I have listened to the interjections of the honourable member for Murrumba and I have written some of them down. He mentioned the grading and branding of eggs. That is something else that puts the price up, just as egg cartons do. When we buy a dozen eggs today, we have to pay for all these things. We pay an extra 2c a dozen for the cartons. The same thing applies to wrapped bread. We get all these idiots who talk about hygiene. They want their bread wrapped and their eggs in cartons. We did not have those in our young days, Mr. Hewitt, but we are still fairly healthy. It is a racket to include in the price structure the cost of unnecessary wrapping or packaging.

Years ago a person could buy a dozen eggs from his neighbour for one shilling. Today, under the capitalist system, every opportunity is taken to increase the price. When the Minister introduced the Hen Quotas Bill, I said that before long we would be asked to pay 10c for an egg. They are virtually 10c each now, and I do not think a year has passed since I made that statement. I remind honourable members that 10c is the equivalent of a shilling.

Children are suffering from what is occurring today. In my young days, children used to rely on eggs, milk and bread—the basic commodities that made a lad or a girl grow. How can people afford to buy eggs, milk and bread for their children today, with the rapid price increases taking place? Bacon and eggs was a tasty dish.

Mr. Sullivan: Now you're talking!

Mr. JENSEN: That is correct. How can the ordinary person afford to eat bacon and eggs today, when bacon is about \$1 a $\frac{1}{2}$ lb.?

I reiterate that children are suffering as a result of the grading systems that are now in operation. Instead of buying eggs from a neighbour or a person down the road, we now have to buy eggs that are graded, branded and packed, and the Egg Board sets the prices. The community has to pay for all the bludgers grading and packing the eggs. It should not have to pay for them.

I remind honourable members of the case of the poor woman in Cairns who was sent to gaol for 24 hours for having two fowls more than the number she was permitted to have.

Mr. Frawley: Tell the truth.

Mr. JENSEN: I think it was a woman in Cairns. She was sent to gaol because she would not pay the Government. She stood on her dig and spent 24 hours in gaol. I say, "Good on her!" There is too much Government control.

Millions of pounds of egg pulp are in store today. In fact, if I had known this Bill was being introduced, I would have gone to the library and got a copy of a newspaper article in which it was stated that there was enough egg pulp in store to last till the end of 1976. It is being exported, of course. Frozen eggs, egg pulp and so on are now available.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: The honourable member for Murrumba does not know much about the poultry industry.

I have made most of the points that I wish to make, Mr. Hewitt. I do not put forward rubbish of the type that we hear from other honourable members. I speak on behalf of the ordinary people of Queensland. My uncle had a poultry farm at Caboolture and my father also had a poultry farm, so I know a little about the poultry industry.

The honourable member for Sandgate tells me that he cannot eat the fowls that come from the broiler industry, as it is called. The birds are fed on artificial pellets. As the honourable member for Port Curtis said a few moments ago, he liked the old Red Orpington. A 7 lb. Rhode Island Red or a Black Orpington was really good to eat.

When poultry were kept in the back yard and could feed on good worms, grubs and green grass, the hens laid nice, yellow-yolked eggs and the roosters grew big. But today hens are reared under cruel conditions, in wire cages, and lay eggs with a dirty-white yolk. When the eggs are cooked in the pan the albumen shrivels up. That is the type of egg the poultry industry is giving the children of today. It is not what we enjoyed when we collected eggs from our back yard or a nearby farm. Today the poultry industry is totally synthetic and is as rotten as anything else synthetic.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: The rat-bag member opposite always wants to bring the A.L.P. in. I'll do him over later on when other legislation is being debated.

I want to make some facts known now. I am not going to speak again to a Bill that condones cruelty and allows a lot of rubbish to be given to children. I draw attention to what is being done today in the poultry industry in relation to packing and grading, the prevalence of white-yolked eggs and the poor quality of eating poultry on the market.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) (5.7 p.m.): Some aspects of the Bill are rather interesting. Many people consider that the poultry industry is only a minor one and that our major industries are the beef and wool industries. In the East a large proportion of the food eaten by the teaming millions consists of poultry, and it is grown under unhygienic conditions. Contrary to the breeding methods adopted in the Queensland industry, the birds usually roam the villages and streets. They eat offal and must be full of exotic diseases.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I would like the speaker to be heard in silence.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: It might be a bit difficult for members to understand why a doctor should talk about chooks, especially ones with feathers on them. Nevertheless I shall proceed.

The poultry industry in Queensland has altered considerably in recent years. The honourable member for Bundaberg spoke about what happened when he was a boy—which must have been a long time ago! He talked about Red Orpingtons and Rhode Island Reds running around the back garden. These days local authorities will not allow persons to keep chooks in a residential area. There are certain reasons for that, including the noise nuisance. Certainly there is nothing more annoying than coming home at 2 a.m. after finishing work and having a bloody Red Orpington or bantam crowing outside the house! Another factor is the risk of diseases created by throwing food on the ground or putting it out in tins and dishes. It attracts rats, mice and other vermin. In some areas not too close to the city snakes will come in after the mice and rats. The keeping of poultry in a residential area is a health hazard, and local authorities have banned it.

On a larger scale, the poultry industry has got away completely from what happened in the old days when the Spaniards used to allow their flocks of turkeys and fowls to roam until they reached a certain stage of growth. In some ways the previous speaker was correct. The present method of rearing chooks seems to be a cruel and superficial one. They are penned up and do not see green grass from the day they are hatched until the time their heads are chopped off.

The Minister is acting wisely in relinquishing his authority as chairman of the board. He has enough work to do without having that responsibility, but I sincerely hope that the Minister is not about to relinquish complete control or the right to change any decision made by the board. It would be very unwise if he were to do that. He should

ensure that in this instance, as in many others, he does not hand over complete control to the board or its chairman.

Mr. Sullivan: It is an advisory board.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: It would be most unwise for the Minister to lose his authority.

The change in the board structure is excellent. The broiler industry is very important to the housewife, especially in times of meat strikes such as those that are prevalent in Townsville. The broiler industry is a big industry. Most food stores sell at reasonable prices deep-frozen chickens, correctly graded so that the housewife may know exactly what she is getting. She can estimate accurately the number of children she can feed with a broiler of a certain size. Such a large industry should have increased representation on the board, and I am pleased to note that the Minister is increasing the industry representation from one to two.

Mr. Hanson: What you are saying is that the precept should be paid by people in North Queensland.

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: At the moment the North Queensland poultry industry is virtually in the "chicken" stage. Some quite large poultry farms are worked intensively in the North. If the growers are big enough they should pay the same precept, but until they become big they should gain benefits from the board.

Broiler producers should be subject to inspection. People forget that chickens raised in ideal conditions of limited movement and what is virtually forced feeding are prone to many diseases. Because they lose immunity they are probably more prone to disease than chickens that roam in yards. As a result, exotic diseases, viruses or moulds can afflict flocks with very low resistance and cause a high mortality rate.

For many years poultry sold for human consumption was not checked by meat inspectors. Slaughterhouse inspections should be carried out at regular intervals, and doubtful specimens from poultry should be preserved for examination by qualified, competent inspectors.

If the egg-pulp industry is controlled it will grow. It is already a big export industry, and we should be able to obtain a good market in the East for our egg pulp, which is of high quality and has good nutritional value. The Egg Marketing Board should do everything possible to create a good market in the East. In my short stays in the East I found that, although there is a lot of uncontrolled poultry breeding, egg-pulp processing is not undertaken. It seems that a good market for egg pulp could be developed in the East.

The amendments to the Act are sound. They tighten up the loop-holes and overcome problems, especially in management. The Minister is wise to relinquish his position as chairman of the advisory board, but I hope that, in the final analysis, he maintains control so that when he is approached about problems that arise under this legislation he has authority to implement changes.

Mr. GOLEBY (Redlands) (5.15 p.m.): The introduction of this measure will be welcomed by the poultry industry generally. It has been mentioned as being a minor rural industry, but I can assure honourable members that it is one of the major primary industries in and around Brisbane. In every facet of primary industry the story is the same: the producers get the rough end of the stick. Because of that, as the Minister indicated in his introductory speech, there has been a 50 per cent decrease in the number of poultry farmers compared to a few years ago. The same decrease is evident in most primary industries because farmers have been forced to get large or get out. That is what has happened in the poultry industry. Flocks have increased from an average of 900 birds to 5,000 birds per farmer. Even so, the industry economically is swinging in the balance.

The honourable member for Bundaberg complained about increased egg prices. I notice that, as soon as he finished his speech, he left the Chamber.

Mr. Frawley: He did an egg flip.

Mr. GOLEBY: That is right. He left the Chamber like a plucked rooster.

The member for Bundaberg spoke about egg quality. I am sure he was relating his remarks to some 20 years ago. Egg producers today are very conscious of the quality of their product. Laying birds are fed, as part of their rations, the ingredients necessary to make sure there is no deficiency in the product. Egg yolks are far from being white and insipid. I would suggest that the honourable member for Bundaberg might be buying his eggs from an unrecognised source. It might be a good idea if in future he were to purchase Egg Board eggs instead of those bought by a corner store under the lap from some other source.

Mr. Hanson: If the retailer rotated his stock—

Mr. GOLEBY: So does the board.

Mr. Hanson: It is the shopkeeper. If he doesn't rotate his stock, it becomes stale.

Mr. GOLEBY: A large poultry farmer's product goes to the board at least every second day.

Mr. Hanson: If he passes it on to the retailer and the retailer doesn't rotate his stock—

Mr. GOLEBY: I know what I am talking about. I would like members to know that

54 per cent of the poultry industry in Queensland is conducted in the electorate of Redlands, so I could claim to have the greatest representation of poultry farms of any member in the Chamber.

The broiler industry has grown significantly over the years. The table bird section of the poultry industry was very, very small prior to the war years. The American troops stationed here were largely responsible for the increase in popularity of table birds. I think we all recall the sudden upsurge in cockerel raising. Prior to Christmas and Easter it became quite a popular practice to purchase 200 or 300 cockerels and raise them for the festive season. That was the forerunner of the upsurge in the meat chicken industry. With that came the great influx of poultry growers.

As I indicated, that has been principally narrowed down to one area—the electorate that I represent. The main reason for that is its close proximity to the poultry abattoirs and the economic necessity of keeping within a 25-mile limit. I do not think I need to go into the details and the intricacies of that. We all know that road tax has been a problem over the years. If one does not exceed the 25-mile limit, one enjoys certain concessions. It is for that reason that the industry has flourished in and around Brisbane.

Mr. Jensen: Eggs have gone up 12 times while bread has gone up eight times and sugar has gone up—

Mr. GOLEBY: I can assure the honourable member that no egg producer is being overpaid. There are no millionaires in that industry.

Mr. Jensen: Why have prices gone up?

Mr. GOLEBY: For the same reasons as other prices. I remind the honourable member for Bundaberg that his salary has gone up and I have not heard him say anything about that.

The conversion rate of the meat chicken is second to none as far as high protein food is concerned. The beef industry cannot be compared with the meat chicken industry which has a quick turn-off of eight to 12 weeks. This results in the growers being capable of producing tremendous quantities of high-quality birds in a very short time.

I completely disagree with the reference of the honourable member for Bundaberg to the poor quality of meat chicken. I can assure him and other honourable members that I had no great liking for poultry until the meat chicken was introduced. That also applies to thousands of housewives in this country. The consumption rate of the meat chicken has gone up and up. It is only now that beef prices have come down that poultry has met with buyer resistance, because in the main, poultry meat is dearer than beef.

With most industries that are somewhat controlled by large processors, the broiler industry is experiencing difficulties. This is happening because the producers are being squeezed to the limit by the processors. While the price of poultry to the consumer has risen, the return to the grower—the broiler grower in particular—has dropped considerably.

Honourable Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row): Order! I ask honourable members to allow the honourable member for Redlands to be heard. They are welcome to interject, but I will not allow continuous cross-firing in the Chamber.

Mr. GOLEBY: The grower has gone to considerable trouble to put a good article on the market and is receiving less for his product now than he received two years ago from the processor whom he contracts to supply. The Minister is well aware of the tactics adopted by the processors to try to squeeze the grower as much as possible and keep his income at the bare minimum and at the same time increase their margins. The retailer, too, has received increased margins. When a set price was recommended and originally agreed to, the processors tried to slip out from underneath when it came to the final crunch.

Mr. Jensen: Without chook raffles they would all be broke.

Mr. GOLEBY: I do not accept that remark from the honourable member for Bundaberg. If that is as far as his thoughts go, I can understand his contribution to the debate.

Broiler growers have to be given the opportunity to make a reasonable living. I appeal to the Minister, when further amending legislation is introduced, to give growers an assurance of an adequate income and an assurance that they will not be held at the mercy of the one or two processors who are presently controlling the industry.

The Minister said that he will relinquish his position as chairman of the Poultry Advisory Board. This is a wise move. He will hand over this position to a senior officer of his department and this will allow for appointment on the board of a representative of the broiler growers. This move is long overdue.

The egg industry in Queensland and in Australia has been revolutionised. I do not agree with the earlier comments about the cruelty that birds are subjected to in the conditions in which they are kept. I could take honourable members to some of the most modern poultry farms in this country, and they would see no cruel treatment of birds. The cleanliness of the whole enterprise is particularly good. New sheds are being constructed in such a manner that the by-products, such as manure, can be removed by tractors with the minimum of

effort, so that the whole place is kept clean and tidy. In referring to the by-products of the poultry industry, let me point out that many rural industries in this State, particularly those in the Salad Bowl that I represent, have benefited greatly from the application of poultry manure to second-class land. Its use has brought that land into production and has increased the volume of production of fruit and vegetables in this area.

It has been common knowledge for quite a long time that if egg pulp was rejected by the board in Queensland, which had no power to seize and confiscate the product, it could be returned to the supplier who could, in turn, put it on the southern market where it would be accepted. I believe that if food is considered unsuitable for human consumption in one State, that surely is good reason for its rejection in all States. Under the proposed legislation, egg pulp will be confiscated by the board if it is considered unsuitable for human consumption.

We all know the rorts that were worked over the years in the sale of chickens, and in sexing guarantees. The granting of provisional licences, which can be obtained only if a chicken sexer demonstrates an accuracy of 97 per cent, will do nothing but protect the industry as a whole. I think that all honourable members will agree with this proposal.

Disease was mentioned by the Minister. Newcastle disease, coccidiosis and other diseases have been a problem in the poultry industry. The broiler industry, in particular, spends many thousands of dollars a year in medication for birds. The possibility of disease is increased by the close housing of birds. Many sheds have 50,000 in a confined space, and if a disease breaks out it can spread rapidly. To date there have been, I understand, only minor outbreaks of Newcastle disease in Australia, and I hope that its incidence can be kept to a minimum.

Contrary to the belief of some northern members, I believe that producers in the south of Queensland, who produce the largest number of eggs, have been carrying the precept since the C.E.M.A. plan was introduced a number of years ago. I believe that it is now to be gradually implemented in northern areas.

Mr. Aikens: The northern poultry producer has had a raw deal for years.

Mr. GOLEBY: Now he is to be put on an equal footing with other producers, which is what he is asking for. Provided northern producers are given equal access to departmental advisers and veterinary services, they will have no axe to grind with the Government.

With those few remarks, I compliment the Minister on the introduction of the Bill. I assure him that the poultry industry of this State will welcome it.

Mr. BERTONI (Mt. Isa) (5.28 p.m.): In rising to speak on the Bill, I commend the Minister on introducing regulations for orderly marketing in the poultry industry. I must agree with the honourable member for Port Curtis that orderly marketing is certainly what the industry is seeking. Governments have throughout the years introduced Bills aimed at bringing this about.

The first levy was the Federal levy that was imposed at the rate of \$1 a hen a year. Some benefit was given to northern areas in that it was first introduced there at the rate of 20 per cent of the levy. This was increased to 40 per cent and it is now 60 per cent. In two years' time those in the North, as has been mentioned, will be paying the full levy.

The main point on which I wish to speak is the introduction of the precept to northern and western areas. The whole industry in Queensland is controlled by the South Queensland Egg Marketing Board and the Central Queensland Egg Marketing Board. It is true that various funds and levies are paid to the South Queensland Egg Marketing Board, which amount to 24.4c a dozen. In the case of permit holders, payments work out at 16.1c. The Central Queensland Egg Marketing Board charges work out at 12.5c per dozen for the ordinary grower and 7.5c per dozen for the permit holder. Contrary to what the Minister may believe, I am not against the precept for North Queensland but I want to query its fairness.

The latest statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that in Brisbane and the south-east corner of the State, 17.48 dozen eggs are produced per head of population; in Central Queensland 5.8 dozen eggs are produced per head of population and in the North West only 3.5 dozen eggs are produced per head of population. When this is related to the allowed hen laying population under the Hen Quotas Act, we find that the figure for South-east Queensland is 1.07 hens per person, for the rest of Queensland excluding the north-western area .58 hens per person and in the north-western area .23 hens per person.

I must agree with the honourable member for Bundaberg. He said that the basic hen quotas are related to the Poultry Industry Act. When one looks at the basic hen quotas, one will agree with the honourable member for Redlands when he said, I think, that over 50 per cent of the egg production of Queensland comes from his area.

When one looks at the Hen Quotas Act 1973, one sees that the largest producers are definitely in the southern area, with one person having a quota of 113,983 hens. There are quite a number of producers with quotas of 50,000 and 20,000 hens. In Division II, which covers mainly Central Queensland, the biggest quota is 13,852 hens. In Division III, which covers North Queensland, the largest quota is 14,073 hens. In my area, the

largest quota is 3,732 hens. This is why I want to bring the question of the fairness of this precept to the Minister's attention.

Is it possible that the producers in the southern areas are controlling the entire industry for their own benefit? My reason for questioning the fairness of the precept is that the Mt. Isa district purchases 10,000 dozen eggs a week from the Brisbane area. We purchase three times as many eggs from Brisbane as we produce ourselves. If we are going to introduce this precept to the northern and western areas of the State, surely the hen quotas for those areas should be increased in order to make them self-sufficient. I cannot see why those areas should have to purchase their egg supplies from Brisbane or Central Queensland when they could be self-sufficient.

We have heard quite a lot this afternoon from honourable members on the subject of inspectors.

I sincerely hope that the introduction of the Bill will lead to the sending of more inspectors to western areas of the State. I was under the impression that an inspector was virtually a public relations officer who advised people as to the meaning of the provisions of the Act that he was required to enforce and, at the same time, had sufficient power to prosecute those who did not comply with them. However, Mt. Isa has had only three visits from an inspector in 10 years, the last being about six weeks ago. When a problem arose that was a matter for the advisory service, a telephone call was made to Brisbane. It was requested that the poultry involved be sent from Mt. Isa to Townsville for refrigeration so that the complaint could be investigated. Four months later advice was received from an inspector that the poultry was too decomposed to worry about and that the complaint should be forgotten.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. BERTONI: I agree with the honourable member for Bundaberg on that point, because I believe that northern areas of the State are virtually being controlled by the southern producers. If a precept is to be introduced for the northern areas—and I am not opposed to its introduction, as I was previously—it should be possible to make northern areas self-sufficient.

At this stage I have only touched on the points that I intend to deal with at the second-reading stage. I hope that the Minister will consider increasing hen quotas in northern areas. In addition, I request that subsidy be paid on the railage of feed for poultry to northern areas to assist people there to some extent. I could go into the mortality rate, the heat and so on, but I will discuss those matters later.

I again ask the Minister to consider all the matters I have raised.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (5.38 p.m.): The main matter that I wish to discuss is the Minister's suggestion that precepts will be amended to include areas outside the existing board areas. As all honourable members are aware, the principal area outside the board areas is that north of Rockhampton, which includes the cities of Mackay, Townsville, Cairns and Mt. Isa.

I state here and now that egg producers in North Queensland are definitely at a disadvantage. The Minister knows that full well because the question has been canvassed frequently in this Chamber. The Minister for Mines and Energy, who is now in the Chamber, is also well aware of the situation, because I have been at conferences with him when North Queensland producers have outlined the problems that they faced in comparison with those faced by producers in the area represented by the honourable member for Redlands.

All I can say is that honourable members are seeing another instance of a Minister's being pressured by southern business interests here in Brisbane. The honourable member for Redlands made that obvious when he said that about 54 per cent of poultry and egg producers in Queensland are in his electorate. Although that may be true, honourable members are aware that he has already brought pressure to bear on another Minister about tractors. I looked up the relevant statistics and found that only six tractors are shown as being registered in the Redlands Shire. I will have more to say about that later. I will not abuse the privilege you have extended to me, Mr. Row, in allowing me to say that much by further canvassing that point in this debate.

Vastly different conditions apply to the production of eggs in North Queensland than in the South-east corner of the State or, for that matter, in Central Queensland. The main basic difference is that North Queensland is outside the normal grain-producing areas. North and Western Queensland are outside of those areas entirely. The essential feed required for the poultry and broiler chicken side of the industry is the grain from Central and South-east Queensland, including the Darling Downs. That is why the egg producers in this part of the State have a distinct advantage.

If these precepts are added on to North Queensland producers, along with the 40 per cent freight increase incorporated in the Budget, many North Queensland producers will be virtually forced out of the industry. That is the very thing that South Queensland producers have been wanting for years so that the poultry industry would be controlled by the smaller group down here. They would even like to force the Central Queensland fellows out of their separate board areas and amalgamate them into a board area under the South Queensland board in the same way as the two fish boards were amalgamated a few years ago to the detriment of fishermen

in the northern areas of the State. Northern fishermen are suffering badly from that legislation.

Most of the producers in the Mackay district, for example, have ways of getting better access to grain by road transport, but they cannot get a permit from the Central Queensland Grain Marketing Board because they are outside the exempt area. Consequently grain producers in Central Queensland, particularly in the Clermont area, who would dearly love to sell their grain direct to egg producers in Mackay cannot do so for the simple reason that it must be marketed through the Central Queensland Grain Marketing Board based on Gladstone.

That is another tale I could tell about the severe anomalies created for some people who have tried to improve the lot of the egg producers in the Mackay district—and the dairy farmers, too—by providing feed at a cheaper rate. It seems ridiculous to have to rail grain from the Clermont district, round through Emerald to Gladstone, and then rerail it from Gladstone back up to Mackay—a total distance of 450 to 500 miles—whereas the producers in the Mackay area could get it by road from 150 to 180 miles away if they were allowed to. That is another policy of the grain boards which militates against the egg producers and poultry farmers in North Queensland.

It is true that in those northern areas they do not currently pay precepts, but they do not get very much assistance from the department, either. Of course, pressure has come from the South Queensland area, which virtually completely controls the entire industry. You, Mr. Row, would be fairly familiar with the problem experienced by northern producers over the years with the hen levy. Because of their disadvantages and the fact that they were forced to pay a levy for which they were getting no Government assistance whatsoever and from which they were getting no return, to a man they bailed up and jacked up on that payment. They bailed up for a number of years. The pressures became very strong. They were threatened with gaol and so on for non-payment of the levy. But truth and justice finally prevailed. Most of the provisions were waived for a time to allow the industry to become more productive—to allow it to get over its development problems and become stronger. I might say that many problems were created by Government legislation. Producers were more or less given a moratorium until 1977, when they will have to pay the full hen levy. The Government's policy indicates that a case has been clearly established for stronger support of the industry in North Queensland.

A little while ago the honourable member for Mt. Isa pointed out that North Queensland is far from self-sufficient in egg production. A large volume of eggs comes from South Queensland to meet northern requirements. This may well continue for a long

time. If we take steps through this legislation to force North Queensland producers out of the industry, South Queensland will become the sole source of supply. The increase in freight rates will make the cost of grain much higher in the area. That in turn will considerably increase the industry's costs and mitigate against production.

I understand that the Northern Territory has always been treated in a somewhat similar way by the Commonwealth Government. Producers have been exempt from the payment of hen levy. That clearly indicates cognisance at a very high level of the disadvantages suffered by producers in isolated areas.

I think it was the honourable member for Redlands who indicated that, somewhere along the line, the producers in the south-eastern corner were carrying the producers in North Queensland in the matter of precepts. When we examine the number of producers in the area and the likely contribution they will make by way of additional precepts, we realise that it will be minimal compared with the over-all contributions by producers throughout Queensland. Why shouldn't a section of the industry in the southern corner be prepared to carry some of the northern area? In my Budget speech I pointed out how people in the northern and western areas of the State are completely disadvantaged in their contacts with various Government departments. Why shouldn't the strong help the weak in this case? Do the producers in the south-east corner want to force everybody else out of the industry so that they will gain complete control? I think that is what they want to do. If a State-wide precept is imposed it will provide another example of a Minister bowing to pressure from Brisbane—and a National Party Minister at that! I should be very surprised if that is the Minister's intention. I believe he is a good, sincere man with a likeable personality.

Mr. Sullivan: And healthy looking, too.

Mr. CASEY: He certainly is, and he has eaten plenty of eggs in his day.

The Minister must look into this matter very closely before he allows the pressure from the wealthy interests in the industry to impose this iniquitous proposal on northern producers. As a consequence it will be forced upon northern consumers. They are the ones who will have to pay the additional costs of freight. They are the ones who will have to pay the additional precepts—that is, if the growers are not pushed right out of the industry. If they are, North Queenslanders will be subjected to whatever might be foisted upon us from South Queensland. I ask the Minister to have a close look at the problem.

Mr. Ahern: Do you realise that on 5,000 laying birds the precept will be only \$100 a year? Is that going to break them?

Mr. CASEY: That might be so. However, I referred not only to precepts but also to freight costs. I am relating it to the over-all industry. Perhaps the honourable member for Landsborough was not in the Chamber when I commenced my remarks. I pointed out that North Queensland is already a disadvantaged area. A very strong principle is involved. In other legislation that has been considered for this industry by the Queensland and Australian Governments, a principle has been set in relation to the application of legislation to the State's northern areas. Once that principle is broken and the pressure of interests in the south-east corner of the State has been successful, pressure will continue to be applied to the Government until the principle is broken on other matters, too.

Mr. DOUMANY (Kurilpa) (5.52 p.m.): I rise in support of the measure. I commend the Minister on setting out, as he has done in these amendments, to tidy up a situation that certainly needs tidying up after all the changes that have taken place in this industry. I think that we should reflect on some that have occurred during the last 25 years. It is an industry that has shown a remarkable transformation from what I would call a barnyard industry, where fowls ran after the stock, pecking at the dung and all the unknown growth factors—vitamin B12 and all the other things. Certainly, they were very healthy birds.

Mr. Hanson: It would have suited the organic farmers.

Mr. DOUMANY: As the honourable member for Port Curtis says, it would have satisfied all the pundits of organic farming. One thing that is important is that in this transition flocks have increased in size from something like 1,000 birds to 5,000 birds, while the number of producers has fallen by something like 50 per cent. There is a good economic reason for that—and it is as plain as the nose on every face in the Chamber—and that is that we just could not keep going with barnyard poultry farming, as much as we liked it and as much as the fowls liked it.

As to the quality of poultry meats, which the honourable member for Port Curtis raised a while ago—I, too, have a lot of sentiment for those Rhode Island Reds of yesteryear which, when put in the pot, gave off a beautiful aroma that spread right throughout the house, from the front door to the back door and outside to the neighbour's house.

However, I remind the honourable member for Port Curtis of the toothpick-like qualities of the meat. As a table bird, it was stringy-bark poultry. Certainly it was delicious to us in its time, and we relished it, but we did not eat it very often, as he will remember. It was eaten only on

special festive occasions. The per-capita consumption of poultry meat at that time was about 5 lb. or 2 kg.

Mr. Casey: That was mainly because you had to ring the chook's neck yourself.

Mr. DOUMANY: It was a rather unpleasant business. One can recall feathers, guts and all in the kitchen sink. That was the do-it-yourself era. One plain fact emerges: the per-capita consumption was about one-fifth of what it is today.

Mr. Lane: The head would slip off the block, for a start.

Mr. DOUMANY: Yes. A person had to be careful with the axe or his thumb would go too. It would end up in the soup and perhaps add to the flavour.

There is no question that some of the greatest progress in agricultural technology has been made in the poultry industry, whether it be in the field of husbandry, breeding, genetics, nutrition, the formulation of rations and, finally and importantly, business management. This transformed what was essentially a sideline or barnyard enterprise of raising chickens, which followed the cows or ran among the fruit trees, into a specialist, factory-line industry. The industry has had to adopt those technological innovations as well as better business management in order to survive and become the type of industry in which a person would invest capital. There is no doubt that without those changes and without that progress we would not have any eggs or poultry meat to eat today. It was tremendously important that the industry should come to grips with those economic and marketing realities.

A Government Member: Rosemary thinks you are cruel.

Mr. DOUMANY: The question of cruelty gets back to the fact that sooner or later the bird's head is on the block. Anybody who eats meat—whether it be steak, the drumstick of a chicken or pork—must reconcile himself to the fact that that animal or bird has been killed by one means or another. It is a very sobering thought.

As to the quality of eggs in the historical, evolutionary period of the industry—we all dearly loved those rich, orange-coloured yolks that were produced by the fowls that ran behind the cows and picked up fresh dung. There is no better source of the various factors that make high-quality eggs than what is found in the dung of ruminants. We miss the very hard shells which did not collapse in the hand under slight compression and did not cause rather calamitous occurrences in the kitchen. That does happen today. But we did not have the yield or the ability in that old system to meet the cost of production and the economic challenges of today.

Another factor that is very important in this change is the urbanisation of poultry-breeding and poultry-producing areas. A generation ago most of the poultry industry was situated in quiet, sylvan settings in the country. They might have been only 10 miles from the Brisbane G.P.O., but they were in the bush. Today, these poor birds are plagued by the noise of heavy transport, traffic, jet planes and children screaming past.

Mr. Lane: And Alfred Grant.

Mr. DOUMANY: Digging out his wares of a Saturday. When the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads (Mr. Hinze) frames his noise legislation, which I understand he is doing at the moment, I am sure he will see that it includes some protection for birds in urbanised areas.

Mr. Wright: Will you call him Mr. Hens then?

Mr. DOUMANY: I do not profess to be a mis-speller and I am not prepared to be one.

Urbanisation has had a very serious effect on this industry. One serious consequence has been the effect of stress and noise on birds. This has had to be coped with.

Following the evolution of this industry, it has changed from being a poor man's business proposition. Anybody who wanted to become a farmer found he could do so by getting a couple of acres of land on the outskirts of the city, buying several hundred day-old or six-week-old chickens and setting himself up in business. He then became a primary producer. That is no longer possible. We have now to look at the whole question as a business proposition based on the maximum injection of technology. That is what the Bill is all about.

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

Mr. DOUMANY: Prior to the dinner recess I was dealing with the history of the poultry industry and relating it to the intent of the Bill now before the Committee. There is no question that the poultry industry has undergone massive transformation over the years.

Before I leave the history of the industry, I should like to make one correction. I think it was the honourable member for Bundaberg who referred to Red Orpingtons. There are no such animals. There are Black Orpingtons and, for the benefit of connoisseurs of barnyard eggs, I might tell the Committee that when Black Orpington roosters run with hens there is often the problem of lack of durability of the eggs for human consumption. Modern poultry technology can therefore be thanked for taking the roosters away from the hens.

I move on to deal with some aspects of the Bill. Egg production has increased by 70 per cent in the period under discussion,

and at the same time the production of poultry meat has doubled. We can therefore see some of the reasons for the changes that have been made in representation on the advisory board. The poultry meat sector is to gain another representative, whilst the egg industry sector is to lose two representatives. This in part reflects the changes that have taken place in the industry. It is a very logical amendment.

I think it is eminently sensible to relieve the Minister from the chairmanship of the advisory board. The Minister is a very busy man. He has much to do in primary industry, exacerbated by the muddling from Canberra, and I am certain that his efforts will have to be even greater in the months to come. I can see more and more weight being placed on his shoulders, and I believe that relieving him of this responsibility is excellent.

Mr. Wright: Lindsay will remove him.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: He's trying hard.

Mr. DOUMANY: After those reflections by the Opposition, I return to some of the factors before us, including the change in balance between the meat and egg producing sectors of the industry. Account has been taken of that change in the terms of the precepts that will now be levied on the meat producing sector. There is no question that that is a matter of justice. The real question is not concerned with regional differences. It is essential that throughout the whole industry a balance is brought to bear in determining who will carry the burden of running the advisory and technical services that support the industry. I think that the proposal incorporated in the Bill is a just one.

One thing that it is important to bear in mind about the advisory board and the work that the Department of Primary Industries is doing for the industry through its poultry section is the fact that technical progress has been virtually the basis of the increasing efficiency that has been required to meet increased and constantly rising costs of production, and to meet the challenge of new market demands. One has to look at the cost per unit of output allied with changes in the market-place and the channels of distribution that have arisen over the years, such as supermarkets in which there is a desire to place uniform products on the shelf or in the freezer. This has all had a profound effect and it has called for technical progress in the industry, and the payment of these precepts by the total industry is an important contribution to continuing that technical progress in the future.

Some of the innovations I would like to see looked at include the feeding of poultry litter to ruminants, particularly cattle. Although this has been done for some time in the United States of America, some research should be done into this practice because I feel that the value of excreta of

both ruminant animals and poultry is probably not being fully utilised at the present time. It could possibly be used also to feed fish. There is an inland type of fish called tilapia, which is a tremendous producer. It is most prolific. It is grown in Fiji. It needs a freshwater pond situation with the sort of base that animals or poultry dung provides and I do not see any reason why the poultry industry or the pig industry, for that matter, could not be used to build a tilapia industry in the long term in this country.

Some of the other provisions of the Bill that are very important relate to the hygiene and quality aspects. We must see that egg pulp and egg products going into various markets are of the desired specification, and if products are substandard, it is most important that the Minister's officers be empowered to seize those products and prevent them getting into those markets because one of the worst things for the industry and its future goodwill is allowing bad products to get into the hands of users, particularly industrial users.

The upgrading of the sexing staff is also most important. It is a most frustrating experience for those who buy chickens only to find after a few weeks that they have a lot of roosters. With 97 per cent accuracy now being called for, I believe that there is a definite need for extremely proficient sexers and I am very heartened by the Minister's statement that a very strong approach will be taken to upgrading the qualifications of sexers and bringing a greater degree of technical accuracy into this area.

My final point relates to the pricing of poultry products. It is very easy to talk about these products having become too expensive, but honourable members should remember that at the moment eggs cost around 95c a dozen compared with something like 40c a dozen in the early 1950's when the average wage was probably around \$25 a week. Today it is running at \$120 to \$150.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. DOUMANY: Make no mistake about it, despite the ravings of the honourable member for Bundaberg, who does not know a Black Orpington from a Red Buff. I would say that the price of poultry meats and eggs at this stage has certainly not risen anywhere near as much as have wages or the general cost of living, and it is still a most economical purchase for the housewife in this country. Bearing in mind the nutritive value of these products, I believe it is a gross misuse of the truth to say that they are too dear.

(Time expired.)

Mr. ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (7.24 p.m.): I believe that the Minister has by these amendments carried out a very necessary streamlining of the Act. The Minister is presently the chairman of the advisory board, but because of the pressure of work

he is not able to continue in that position, so it is necessary to hand over the chairmanship to his departmental head. The make-up of this advisory board is being changed. The chairman will be a senior officer of the Department of Primary Industries. The officer in charge of the poultry section of the Department of Primary Industries will also be on the board. There will be one representative of the Egg Marketing Board, which now has two, and the egg producers will have one representative, as they have now. The commercial producers of poultry will have one representative—there is no change there—and instead of there being a Minister's nominee, the broiler growers will have representation on the advisory board, which is very necessary. There will also be a representative from the day-old-chicken hatcheries. The number on the board will be reduced from nine to seven, and I believe this will make it much more efficient and will streamline its procedures.

Another amendment proposed in the Bill relates to the vexed question—it has been bandied about the Chamber during this debate—of extending precepts to North Queensland. In fairness, I believe that the situation must be looked at in the light of reality. People who use departmental services must surely expect to pay for them. Therefore, the extension of precepts will ensure that there exists a situation that is more equitable than that now prevailing and that those who use the services will be required to pay for them.

Other honourable members have touched on many minor amendments in the Bill, so I shall merely skim over them.

The proposed amendment relative to chicken sexing will improve the competence of chicken sexers. Whereas previously a person could hold a second-class licence, he may now hold a provisional licence with a requirement of 93 per cent accuracy.

Mr. Jensen: 97 per cent.

Mr. ELLIOTT: No. The honourable member for Bundaberg again displays his ignorance. The 97 per cent requirement relates to a person holding a full licence. Unfortunately, the honourable member is not aware of the facts. The requirement for a provisional licence is 93 per cent accuracy. The person holding such a licence will have a year in which to upgrade his standard, after which he can take further examinations. If he attains 97 per cent accuracy, he will be given a full licence.

The Bill also proposes to repeal the section of the Act relating to the accreditation of breeding and hatcheries. Obviously the section is completely redundant because of the improvement that has taken place in the industry over the years. Private enterprise has assured that the industry has become efficient. As the honourable member for Kurilpa said earlier, it has made itself efficient. The people in it have not had to

be pushed, poked or prodded to upgrade their breeding programmes. They have done it off their own bat. Therefore, the section is no longer necessary.

It is also proposed to repeal the section relating to compensation. It is no longer needed, because there is a complementary agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. Who says there is not co-operation in some instances?

It is also proposed to extend the powers of inspectors to some extent. I ask honourable members not to get carried away with the argument that has been put forward in this Chamber before, that it will give further powers of entry and power to seize, and so on. Inspectors have had the power to seize, and I will tell honourable members what the proposed amendment is all about. Unfortunately at times the quality of the product of some producers leaves a little to be desired. Egg pulp has been landed on the southern market in a rotten condition. Egg pulp in a similar condition has been held on the premises of some producers. We require inspectors to be able not only to seize the product but also to do something with it. They need increased powers in that area, and obviously this is a very practical requirement.

The Bill contains a new section designed to protect the Crown and inspectors against civil or criminal liability. We would all realise the situation that could develop when inspectors are carrying out their duties. At times they are put in a very invidious position. In the heat of the moment a producer might argue, and as a result there could be some sort of minor altercation. We must make certain that inspectors are protected. If we require them to do difficult and sometimes unpleasant jobs we must go out of our way to protect them.

As to the Minister's previous role of chairman—it has been argued that he is giving away power. That is not the position at all. That argument would have some merit if we were talking about a statutory marketing board, but we are not discussing that at all. It is an advisory board, and unfortunately the Minister is in the position where he is really advising himself. He would be wearing two hats. He is the chairman of the board, and the board would tender advice back to him. Really he would be acting in two roles, and obviously that is not practicable. This is the major amendment proposed by the Bill, and I commend the Minister for bringing it forward. I also commend it to the Committee.

Mr. KATTER (Flinders) (7.33 p.m.): There are three major aspects of the Bill, the first of which is the downgrading of the role of the Minister and the upgrading of the role of the broiler growers and various other people involved at producer level. This is very good in that usually a marketing board should be controlled by the producer.

It is set up for that purpose and those are the people whose interests we are trying to serve. If they step out of line, the Government should not hesitate to apply the necessary restraints upon the board. Until that time is reached, our Ministers, already overburdened with work, should not be given more to do.

Opposition Members interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gunn): Order!

Mr. KATTER: I understand that the honourable member for Archerfield is a leading authority on foul yolks, but I wish he would restrain himself at the moment.

The second major principle in the Bill is the levying of precepts outside the existing Egg Marketing Board areas. This is very important to people in North Queensland because at the present time we are outside the Egg Marketing Board areas. That extension of precepts will apply to us. I discussed it with the lone poultry grower in Charters Towers. He said that he was receiving some benefit from it and did not have particularly strong feelings about it at this stage. He will receive little or no benefit from the money he pays in precepts.

The honourable member for Mackay put the case rather well when he spoke of the extension services that are being offered. He referred to veterinary extension services that were absolutely useless to the people in Mt. Isa, yet they will be paying for these services.

Mr. Ahern: How many hens has your grower?

Mr. KATTER: I think he has a quota of about 4,000.

Mr. Ahern: It will cost him \$80 a year.

Mr. KATTER: That is true, but a principle is involved. He will be paying \$80 when he should be paying less than that. Let us accept that he is prepared to pay and, on that basis, say that he should get an equal share of the services offered.

Mr. Ahern: He will get a service every six weeks.

Mr. KATTER: That has never occurred.

Mr. Sullivan: You are talking about a principle?

Mr. KATTER: Yes.

Mr. Sullivan: Is it right that one group should pay for something and another group not pay and that they should get more or less the same services?

Mr. KATTER: On what the honourable members for Mt. Isa and Mackay have said and on what I have been told by the producer in my own area, they do not have equal access to these services. Now that they are to pay the precept, they would

be very appreciative if they do have equal access to these services. I am confident that we will get them in the future. We in the North will be very upset if we do not.

I have had some dealings with the Hen Quota Board, and can speak only highly of it and of the intelligence and flexibility of its members, but the quota system creates problems in that it closes the industry. Although the industry is in its infancy in the North, with areas like Mt. Isa and Charters Towers not being fully supplied by locally produced eggs, producers will not be able to expand with a closed industry. The industry in Brisbane has expanded to the maximum. If we are unable to increase our quotas in the future, we will be far happier to pay the precept and get the services. If, instead of 4,000 hens in Charters Towers, we had 10,000, 20,000 or 100,000 hens, we would get the extension services. Because our industry is so small and isolated I can understand the Government's being unable to provide the extension services for which we have contributed. We will not be able to expand in the future in this closed industry. This is a special matter which must be considered in future decision-making.

Mr. Casey: Your producer in Charters Towers could get grain up by road from the Clermont area rather than pay the 40 per cent increase in rail freights.

Mr. KATTER: That is so.

Any people who doubt that industries should move under marketing authorities should reconsider their views. This is particularly relevant to the beef cattle industry, where the fight at the moment is about whether they should move under a marketing board structure. Many arguments have been advanced about our maintaining the free-enterprise supply-and-demand system. This system simply does not exist. No sector of the economy sells on a free, open market. Broken Hill sets the price of steel by agreement with the Australian Government, for manufacturing industries in Australia. The price of copper is set by the mining industry in Australia. Prices in the car industry are set by agreement with the various Governments. The Wheat Board sets the price for domestic wheat. The fisheries have a buying-in price-support scheme which, to some extent, sets the price of fish. The Bar Association sets legal fees in Queensland and the A.M.A. sets fees.

Mr. Greenwood: You are oversimplifying.

Mr. KATTER: When I said that, I might have been oversimplifying; but the legal profession sets its own fees. Similarly the A.M.A. sets the rate to be charged for doctors' services. The trade union movement sets the price of labour in the various sectors of industry it covers. So no sector of the Australian economy is working on the principle of supply and demand. As soon as industries such as the beef industry realise that it is essential that they switch to an

arrangement of marketing boards, the better it will be for country areas such as the one that I have the privilege to represent.

Before I conclude, I raise one minor point. I refer to the certificates for chicken sexers. The idea of handing out a certificate to someone in a highly technical sphere such as this and qualifying him on that basis, without his having to run the gamut of a university degree or a diploma from Gatton—just to train him in one specific field in which he can become an expert—is excellent, and I commend the Minister for bringing it forward.

Mr. GYGAR (Stafford) (7.41 p.m.): I do not intend to speak very long on this measure. First I wish to comment on the restructuring of the Poultry Advisory Board. It is about time we recognised the vast changes that have occurred in the poultry industry in the last few years. We have seen the industry transformed from an organisation almost solely concerned with eggs to one that is now predominantly concerned with the production of poultry for table meat. Not too many years ago, as all of us recall, chicken was a luxury that appeared on the table at Christmas, perhaps Easter, and on other special occasions. Nowadays the situation has changed quite markedly, with chicken becoming one of the ordinary types of fare seen on the average meal table once or twice a week.

I must say that I am not very happy about the Minister's being replaced as the chairman of the board. I do not think it is a principle that a Government should follow. I believe that the Minister has a responsibility to oversee activities such as these and to control them quite closely—particularly in this instance, as we are widening the field that the board can cover. It is not good for a Minister to cast off such wide responsibilities and duties to a nominated officer of his department. As an elected Government, we should seize these problems in both hands and attack them at a ministerial and political level. Perhaps the better system might have been to allow the Minister to delegate all or part of his duties on a temporary basis. However, I put that up for consideration in the future. As a principle, we should lean towards a slightly different approach to the chairmanship of boards and committees.

As I mentioned, I am glad to see that the Poultry Advisory Board is to have its duties extended. As the Minister remarked, at the moment its duties are restricted to problems of production. However, the measure before us will allow them to consider all sorts of other problems in the poultry industry. The first problem to which I suggest they might direct their attention is marketing quality. It has been said by previous speakers that the quality of the egg offered to the public over recent years has, unfortunately, declined. At the same time, we must take into account the cost structure of egg production. As the honourable member for Kurilpa remarked,

the price of an egg in proportion to wages these days is considerably lower, and we must link with this the fact that the quality of the egg on the table has declined.

That has been brought about, naturally enough, by the production-line techniques used in producing eggs these days. In the last few hours we have heard in vast detail about rows and rows of chickens sitting in wire cages and never seeing the light of day. Perhaps that is a necessary evil, but I believe that we can and should do something about the quality of the eggs that are put before the people. Perhaps there is little that can be done about the changing colour of the egg yolk, but matters such as shell thickness could be improved by vitamin supplements. Both the Government and the Poultry Advisory Board should discuss these matters very soon when the board is reconstituted to consider problems of this type.

One other way to improve the quality of eggs sold is to ensure that stale eggs are not sold. Doubtless measures are taken all along the line to ensure that eggs are fresh, but it is an unfortunate reality, as any Brisbane housewife could tell the Parliament, that eggs are not always fresh when they are purchased. Probably it is a problem associated with stock rotation, with processing and perhaps even with identification of when the eggs arrive at the Egg Marketing Board.

I suggest that the Minister seriously consider the date-stamping of each and every egg as soon as it arrives at the board. It is not over the fence to say that some of the eggs are at least months old before they reach the kitchen table. That is just not good enough. To improve the quality and reliability of the product, which is what the housewife wants, we must look at some method of ensuring that the eggs are fresh. Unfortunately, the current methods are not working.

If the breakdown occurs at the retail level, date-stamping will overcome the problem because the stocks of the retailer will be readily identifiable by the buyer as being stale and they will not move off the shelves. At least this will give the consumer a chance. We must find out where the holes in the system are and perhaps smarten up anybody who is not doing his job.

It is unfortunate that the Government is continually forced to apply precepts, taxes and other devices to goods. We have heard a great deal from the beef cattle industry about the costs of tagging and taxes. I should like the Minister to tell me how much of the 95c a dozen that the consumer pays for eggs goes in taxes, precepts, marketing board charges and the rest. How much is the housewife paying in all of these middle-ranging taxes and other devices that add to the cost of the egg?

I think that we all recognise that the newer production methods have vastly decreased production costs. Most people in

the community would like to be assured that the lower production cost is being passed on to the consumer to the full. Eggs are a popular food. They will become more popular while the price remains within the reach of the average family. I ask the Minister to supply these figures so that we can all be assured that not too much of the 95c a dozen is going in taxes and other Government imposts.

Another aspect of the Bill that concerns me and on which I should like an assurance from the Minister, if he can give it, concerns the regulations covering hygiene and the powers of inspectors to inspect, test and seize. Perhaps in times like these, members of the community become somewhat suspicious, but after seeing the type of measure that has been mooted about pigs and swill feeding, I should like the Minister to give an assurance that those regulations are not intended to control the introduction of certain types of chicken feed or place any other similar impost or restriction on producers and that they will not be used for that purpose. The poultry industry would be interested to receive the Minister's assurance on this matter, and I feel sure he will give it in his reply.

The third and final matter to which I draw the attention of the Committee is the protection of inspectors and the Crown against civil or criminal liability. This is another principle that should be looked at closely. I do not criticise the Minister for including the provision in the Bill; every other Minister has it in his legislation. It is becoming common for the Government, at every turn, to introduce a provision that the Crown shall be exempt from liability. I do not think that this is a good principle for us to adopt. If the law is good enough for everyone else, why isn't it good enough for the Crown? All private citizens must take due and adequate care to ensure that they do not infringe the rights of others. Why then should not the same duty be placed on the Crown? The inclusion of such restrictions in this or any other legislation places the Crown beyond the law, and that is a principle that I am very much against. The law is designed to protect people, and if people need protection against the Crown it should be available to them in the courts. I do not think that this type of regulation should be included in this or any other Bill. In making these remarks I am not criticising the Minister for Primary Industries. This is simply a provision that seems to have crept in. No doubt a legal draftsman suddenly discovered the section one day in the distant past, and everyone has since got onto the band wagon. I ask the Minister, and all others, to examine carefully any future proposal that the Crown should be excluded from the law. The Minister said that, in the case of this Bill, this protection would apply only when action is taken in good faith for the purposes of, and in pursuance of, the Act; but a man

can act in good faith and still be grossly negligent. He can act in good faith yet still destroy the livelihood and productive potential of anyone in this or any other industry.

Good faith is not enough. God alone knows how many errors of judgment have been made, and how much destruction has been wrought, by men acting in good faith. I think that we must grant protection to the people against the Crown just as protection is given against anyone else. The Crown should be reduced to the level of the common citizen. If its agents—in this case inspectors—step outside the limits allowed by the law, the innocent victims of their transgressions should be entitled to recompense.

I raise these points as matters of general import because they relate not only to this Bill but to many others. I think that this Minister, and the Ministry at large, should look at such measures and give them very careful examination every time they seek to further restrict people's access to the law.

Dr. LOCKWOOD (Toowoomba North) (7.53 p.m.): Along with others, I believe that, instead of being marked with a code, cartons of eggs should be stamped clearly with a date that can readily be seen by everyone. All in this Chamber have probably at some time been the victims of storekeepers who have failed to rotate their stock on the shelves and have sold very old eggs. As every good cook knows, there is a difference between cooking old and new eggs. People deserve the best. If they can see a date clearly marked on the pack, they will get what they want. If stocks are not properly rotated, particularly in summer, some bad eggs will be sold. And woe betide the housewife who cracks one of them into a dish! She will lose all the other ingredients. If she is lucky, she will have the cost of the eggs refunded.

I should now like to comment on frozen poultry. In general, it is of an extremely high standard and among the best of frozen foods. A few complaints are, however, made about it. Recently there was considerable and successful agitation to have the amount of loose water in frozen birds reduced. There is also a need to have placed in frozen poultry an indicator pad or disc which, if the product is accidentally thawed in storage, will change colour. On far too many occasions food that is partially thawed in storage is later sold to the consumer as first-quality frozen food. This type of product can undergo a good deal of bacterial fermentation. No-one would pretend that a frozen chicken is put into its package sterile. It must be completely frozen and dry at all times in storage. I believe that warnings on proper thawing procedures should be widely circularised to housewives. Perhaps the Minister might care to speak to this. If a

housewife tries to thaw a frozen bird by leaving it on the stainless-steel sink all day—perhaps while she is at work—it will become quite warm on the outside at room temperature and will allow bacterial fermentation to proceed. A good deal of bacterial build-up can follow, and can result in food poisoning. On no account should a housewife attempt to bake a solidly frozen bird. The inside will not thaw and, once again, there can be a dangerous increase in bacteria just inside the body cavity if that part is warm. When the bird is taken out of the oven and set aside, the bacteria keep on multiplying in that portion that, although not frozen, has never reached cooking temperatures.

An Honourable Member: How should they do it?

Dr. LOCKWOOD: Frozen poultry should be thawed very slowly, perhaps for 24 to 36 hours, in a refrigerator, so that as the meat thaws it retains as much goodness as possible and does not lose any quality. Furthermore there is no bacteriological build-up. Upon unsealing the packet, the housewife should wash the bird inside and out in running water.

Recently it was left to the wharfies in Brisbane to condemn a large quantity of meat meal. The stuff should never have been allowed to hit this country's shores. It was not fit for handling by humans, and it certainly was not fit for stock or poultry feed. Countries all around the world that import this meat meal have faced tremendous problems. Infections have occurred, particularly in poultry in other countries, and, I must add, in turkeys in New South Wales. This all resulted from the feeding of meat meal to birds.

If these organisms, particularly typhoid, do get into a poultry set-up or abattoir, we will have real trouble on our hands. The thawing, storing and cooking of birds must be carried out carefully or we will have a large number of outbreaks of typhoid. Various typhoid strains have broken out in Australia, and perhaps meat meal has been the cause. Abattoir meat meal is in fact cooked sterile, but if rats or mice get to it before it is sealed, either at the meatworks, while it is being shipped, on wharves or in any other storage, it can be reinfected with any of the organisms that the animals might be carrying.

In England outbreaks of hitherto unknown strains of typhoid have occurred. For example, an outbreak of *Salmonella typhi paraguayensis* occurred in people. It had come from Paraguay, in South America, the land of foot and mouth disease. I would suggest the outbreak occurred as the result of the import of meat meal—no doubt marked "certified sterile".

There is a need to regularly test all samples of liquid egg or any stored egg products, and the Minister and his officers must have the right to condemn food not fit for human consumption.

In Queensland the bacteria strain that causes the greatest problem in eggs is *Pseudomonas*, known colloquially by doctors as the green death. It is a very nasty type of bacteria, and is highly dangerous in the lungs and intestines of both the very young and the very old. It is extremely difficult to treat. I have seen persons infected with strains of *Pseudomonas* treated by surgeons for months. At all costs any suspicious samples of food must be checked, and if found to be contaminated they must be quickly destroyed.

The other bacteria likely to affect egg products are aerobacter, alcaligenes, escherichia and flavobacterium, and, again, they are all particularly nasty bacteria to have to deal with if ingested by humans.

There is another danger to humans who have ingested these bacteria. If the chickens have been fed regularly on antibiotics—and that is not a rare occurrence in the poultry industry—the bacteria in the chickens can learn to cope with those antibiotics. When ingested by people, the bacteria are already of a resistant strain. It would be bad enough if that was the end; but these bacteria can, by living in association with other bacteria, pass on to their fellows the chemical knowledge, as it were, of how a bacterium can beat an antibiotic. The problem of transferred drug resistance can then emerge.

In my opinion, inspectors must at all times have the right to inspect, and certainly must have the right to hold any suspicious products and destroy them as soon as they have confirmatory evidence.

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (8.2 p.m.): Mr. Gunn—

Mr. Hanson: What would you know about eggs?

Mr. AHERN: The honourable member for Port Curtis asks what I know about eggs. I represent a very great number of egg producers—many more than are represented by the honourable member.

I think it is important that I participate in the debate because of some of the statements made about the operation of the industry in Queensland. There is no doubt that tremendous changes have taken place in the industry in the last 10 years. That was reflected in the introductory speech of of the Minister when he said that in the 10 years since the last major amendment of the Poultry Industry Act the average size of laying flocks has increased from 900 birds to about 5,000. It indicates that there has been tremendous rationalisation in the industry and a realisation by those in it that they would have to increase the scale of their enterprise if they were to survive in today's circumstances. It is pleasing to know that such a tremendous advance has been achieved.

In that 10 years there has also been an increase of 70 per cent in egg production. Again that indicates a very great receptivity on the part of the industry towards information becoming available from private sources and from the Department of Primary Industries. Anyone who has attended any of the poultry information exchanges, as I have in my electorate, would know that poultry farmers are tremendously eager to use the new advice that is coming to them and are using it to good effect. It is wonderful to see the co-operation between the industry and its scientific advisers. Statistics indicate that the industry is much better off as a result.

The Minister also said—and I was astonished by this—that during the 10-year period broiler production in Queensland has doubled. Again there has been tremendous growth and rationalisation in the industry during that time.

Mr. Campbell: Efficiency.

Mr. AHERN: Yes, efficiency is the operative word, as the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs would know.

In the broiler industry in particular, Mr. Gunn, there has been a tremendous amount of rationalisation not only at the farm level but also at the manufacturing level. I was rather surprised to hear the Minister say that only six companies in Australia are in fact breeding chickens. It surprised me that there were as many as that because of the great amount of rationalisation on a horizontal scale in the industry—in fact, more than in any other industry in Australia, to my knowledge. Horizontal integration and vertical integration are the order of the day. It has been very tight, and the competition has been very great. Moves towards rationalisation have been immense, and the industry is now very efficient. The competition in it is exceptionally strong. At every level there is tremendous enthusiasm for change and for the implementation of new ideas and scientific methods. As a result the industry has benefited tremendously, as has the consumer.

By the Bill the Minister is implementing a recommendation from the industry to place on the Poultry Advisory Board a representative of the broiler growers. I welcome this progressive step because it has been something that has been required for a long time. It is the first time the growers have had direct representation. If one studies the vertical integration in the broiler industry and the methods used, one can have no doubt that in that type of tight, competitive climate there are inevitable pressures on the growing side of the industry. Those pressures are seen and known to be there.

The growers themselves are concerned about the contract system. I have spoken about that in this place previously. I have spoken about the relationship between the

integrated company units and the growers out in the field. Certainly there is room for arbitration in broiler growers' contracts. I would ask the Minister whether he is prepared to comment on any progress that is being made in that respect. I understand the matter has been discussed at Australian Agricultural Council level and Federal industry level. It is an area that the Legislature should be interested in, and the industry should accept as part of its statutory provision in Queensland a system of arbitrated grower contracts in the broiler section. That is important when there is tremendous competition and consequent pressure on broiler growers.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. AHERN: The honourable member is talking about caponisation. I am sure he does not know what it is. When one looks at him, there can be no doubt that he has been caponised.

Mention has been made of the provision which will require North Queensland growers outside the Egg Marketing Board area to pay precepts. This has to be put in context to see what it actually means. What are precepts in terms of money actually paid? On the 2,000,000 birds that qualify for counting, growers in Queensland pay something like \$41,000 in precepts. That is not a huge amount of money—about 2c a laying hen in Queensland. On an average flock size of 5,000 laying hens—in North Queensland probably the average flock size would be smaller than that—it would mean something like \$100.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. AHERN: If it is 14,000, as the honourable member interjects, the precept would be \$280. In terms of the over-all operations of a company, that is not going to break the company. It is not a huge amount of money. My information is that the growers are primarily worried not about that, but the progressive increases in the levies they have been paying over recent years. That is the matter of concern to the North Queensland growers.

Let us look at what growers in Queensland get as a result of the payment of the precept. Officers of the Poultry Branch offer a worth-while service to the industry. Anyone who has been as close to the industry as I have and seen these fellows working in the field knows that throughout Queensland they offer a very co-operative, helpful service to the growers on a regular and on-call basis. In South-east Queensland it is known to be an excellent service, which growers value greatly. I understand that this service is not confined to South-east Queensland. For instance, in Townsville, a very conscientious officer visits the growers about once every six weeks. That is a good service. It may be that some growers have been missing out, but these officers are as

near as the telephone. They have been tremendously helpful in my area. The payment is small and the benefits are very large. According to my information, some honourable members have the chook by the tail feathers. It is not the precept about which they should be concerned, but the payment of an increased levy, which is not in the legislation before us.

This industry has excellent legislation covering orderly marketing. The stabilisation and equalisation plans are only now being given an opportunity to work properly for the benefit of the industry. The legislation is modelled on other industry legislation of which production rationalisation and equalisation are features. Each member of the industry benefits equally. In the initial stages of production rationalisation, everyone must accept equal restraint if all are to benefit in the long term. I am sure that the industry as a whole accepts that. In recent times various grower polls have indicated a strong wish to participate. I can only make the point once again that this industry, like others, must be encouraged to look after the smaller quota holders when the opportunity arises to increase general quotas throughout the State.

I know that the Minister is keeping an eye on this matter and I can only hope that the industry is doing likewise. I ask the Minister to refer to this matter later. Because we are still in the throes of production rationalisation, it is not particularly relevant at the moment. Everybody has to cut back and there is no extra quota to share around. There is no way to sort out anomalies until the system starts to work and until the market growth is such that there is an opportunity to share in the increased demand.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. AHERN: Opposition members are tremendously ignorant on this question. I rose in the vain hope that I could enlighten them on a few points.

Mrs. KIPPIN (Mourilyan) (8.14 p.m.): I rise to speak on the Bill because I am a little concerned that northern producers will feel the strain of paying the extra levy. It will not be very much, but every little extra adds to their costs. They appreciated the partial relief from the Commonwealth hen levy that was extended to them. When this levy was introduced in 1965, North Queenslanders protested. Because the Government appreciated the problems facing primary industries and wanted to help North Queenslanders get into business, they were given relief. For the first two years North Queensland producers were subsidised to the extent of 97½ per cent of the levy. For the next two years they were subsidised to the extent of 95 per cent. However, the percentage that northern egg producers are required to pay has risen, until they now pay 60 per cent of the levy. Next year they will pay

80 per cent and the following year, 100 per cent. I hope that the Minister will not impose the proposed precept on northern growers until after they have been phased into the full Commonwealth levy of \$1 per hen. Will the imposition of the precept require the poultry farmer to fill out more forms? Are we imposing another job on him?

Northern poultry farmers, particularly those on the Atherton Tableland, enjoy the services of a district adviser, who can complete his circuit every six to eight weeks. In fact, he is able to visit each of the poultry farmers in his area more frequently than similar advisers in the South. The cost of the adviser to the Department of Primary Industries is about \$13,000, and I think it is only fair that the producers serviced should contribute to that expense. It is envisaged that the annual precept will be of the order of 2c per head. I hope that will not be escalated once there is an over-all levy imposed throughout Queensland.

It is imperative that we take steps to ensure that northern producers are not forced out of business. I stress that. I know that southern farmers are producing eggs in excess of market requirements and could supply the northern market, but North Queenslanders are entitled to fresh eggs. Modern technology helps to keep eggs reasonably fresh in transit, but I still think that it is better to transport the feed than to transport the finished product.

A couple of years ago I stopped buying a certain brand of locally produced eggs because I found that I could not rely on them for quality. Last year I had no choice. My local and most convenient supermarket stocked that brand of eggs only, so once again I had to buy them. However, I found that I was completely satisfied this time. A few months later I met the proprietors of the egg farm and commented on the improvement in their product. Their explanation was that, when they first started, they could not supply all of the market and often had to buy in eggs. The imported eggs suffered in quality during transit. Now that the production of this farm has been increased sufficiently to satisfy local demand, we do not have the problem of eggs inferior in quality.

I have been told that one of the egg producers in a different locality in my electorate is ceasing operations. I certainly hope that his quota will be reallocated to another producer in the same area to help increase the viability of the second producer.

Northern producers do not benefit from access to the grading and packing facilities of the egg boards. They have to buy their own equipment, even though, if they lived in the South, their quotas would not warrant it. One producer has had to outlay \$3,000 for a machine that he needs to use only an hour each day. His basic feeding facilities, which any poultry farmer must acquire to operate efficiently, are capable of dealing

with a much larger egg production. That producer is battling, despite his effort, time and expenditure to make his business a viable proposition. I fully agree with the imposition of quotas to avoid overproduction, but I feel that North Queenslanders are entitled to quotas large enough to cover the full demand in their own local areas.

Mr. HARTWIG (Callide) (8.19 p.m.): I wish to comment only briefly. As is known, I represent the Callide electorate in Central Queensland. My area has many poultry farmers and is the chief source of supply of fresh eggs for the Rockhampton and Central Queensland market. It is therefore a very important industry.

I am concerned that the chairmanship of the advisory board is being passed from the Minister to his nominee. For too long in this Chamber I have been advocating the appointment of junior Ministers. I do not believe that the control of boards and organisations should be placed in the hands of bureaucrats. I am quite firm on this matter. We are representatives of the people of Queensland.

Mr. Wright: You would make a darned good chairman.

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member should keep quiet and he will learn something.

We should be training our future Ministers to practise positive government in this State. Too often a Minister is so engulfed by his work that, to take the Minister for Primary Industries as an example—

Mr. Houston: We wouldn't take him anywhere.

Mr. HARTWIG: The honourable member should keep quiet. For goodness' sake, Mr. Miller, send him out.

Queensland occupies a big area of the Commonwealth, yet we expect one Minister to control an important portfolio such as Primary Industries, which covers a host of primary-producing organisations and all types of primary production for which the Minister is responsible. It is little wonder that he wants to delegate some of his authority. It is physically impossible for one man to be in Brisbane, Cairns, Camooweal and St. George at the same time. But I do take exception to placing the power of government into the hands of bureaucrats.

I have all respect for our public servants and advisers. We cannot do without them. They are valuable men in their fields. I have a lifetime knowledge of them and I am not knocking them. But if we do this, sooner or later we will have more examples of what has happened with the Queensland Meat Industry Board. The Minister has virtually lost control of it. I do not think this is good for a Government, particularly a free-enterprise Government. However, that is only comment.

I consider that the broiler chicken industry is a direct threat to the beef industry.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Why shouldn't families have fowl if they want to?

Mr. HARTWIG: I didn't say anything about that. I said that broiler chickens are in direct competition with beef.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: Why should beef occupy a privileged position?

Mr. HARTWIG: All right.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! Persistent interjections from my left will not be tolerated.

Mr. HARTWIG: Send them out, Mr. Miller, and it will be a lot quieter.

A good deal has been said about what we can produce and whether we are overproducing in the poultry and egg industries. But look at the latest figures on imports. Last year we imported 62,291 kg of poultry from Red China.

Mr. Lindsay: Were they all Left-winged?

Mr. HARTWIG: I will take that point.

We also imported 36,601 kg from Yugoslavia. To cut it short, last year we imported a combination of prepared poultry dinners—they are usually called TV dinners—and other poultry meats totalling 220,000 kg.

At 95c a dozen, our eggs are the second most highly priced eggs in the world. There is only one country in which eggs are dearer than they are in Australia. I shall quote some figures to show the relative prices of a pound of steak and a dozen eggs—

	lb. steak	1 doz. eggs
	\$	c
Canberra	0.96	97
Stockholm	3.50	98
Bonn	3.09	67
Brussels	2.54	67
London	2.16	67
Paris	2.97	81

Mr. Houston: Do you want eggs cheaper or beef dearer? What are you trying to prove?

Mr. HARTWIG: When beef prices were high, the honourable member for Bulimba stood up and said, "Beef is too dear in this State. You are pricing it out of reach of the consumer." The same thing could happen in the poultry industry. Many housewives who would pay 50c for a dozen eggs would be reluctant to pay 97c. I am not advocating a reduction in the price of eggs, but therein lies a story.

Mr. Jensen: The poor working man can't buy eggs today.

Mr. HARTWIG: By regulation and legislation, we are controlling primary industries to such an extent that a primary producer cannot go into the street, or round the

houses and shops, to sell his product. People are not allowed to keep a certain number of fowls. A primary producer cannot kill a beast on his property if he is in an abattoir area.

Mr. Houston: That's bureaucratic Government.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is the point I am making. I am here to represent my constituents in a free-enterprise economy, and I am reluctant to see such a stranglehold placed on primary producers that if a man kills his own beast he has committed a crime because he is within an abattoir area.

Mr. Houston: That's shocking.

Mr. HARTWIG: That is what I am talking about.

I understand that the purpose of this provision is to protect inspectors against any action that might be taken against them. I do not know whether the Minister thinks they may be manhandled when they enter premises. Under the hen quotas legislation we introduced a provision empowering inspectors to enter premises to count fowls and examine books.

I have been told by some leading poultry farmers in my area that there could be a reduction in hen quotas. If they are to be reduced by 10 per cent, I hope that such reductions will apply only to poultry farmers with over 5,000 birds. I am told that poultry farming with fewer than 5,000 birds is hardly an economic proposition. I realise that I am straying a little from the subject matter of the Bill, but I wish to tell the Minister what the smoke signals have been saying out my way. I should like to see poultry farmers with fewer than 5,000 birds left alone if there is to be a reduction of 10 per cent, because they could not stand it. In a news article of 12 May 1975, poultry farmers in New South Wales claimed that they were being robbed of their rights, and that the Egg Board and the quota committee were playing hell and making inroads into their livelihood. As far as the poultry producers in the North are concerned, I have the greatest respect for them. With the heat, the flies, the ticks and the snakes, they have enough to contend with.

A Government Member: And the A.L.P.

Mr. HARTWIG: And the A.L.P. in Canberra. That is another problem. But I do think the Minister could be a bit easier on them.

Mr. TENNI (Barron River) (8.31 p.m.): I rise to make some comments on the Bill before us—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. TENNI: The Labor fellows over there are interjecting right from the word "go"; but we all know the egghead we have running this country in Canberra. I

have not seen him lay a golden egg as yet, but he's got a hell of a scrambled mess down there, so honourable members should not make too many comments about that.

I congratulate the Minister on this Bill; but there are some parts which I must condemn and I make it very clear that I do not support them. To start with, I think it is most important that any Minister be relieved of the position of chairman of an advisory board.

Mr. Wright: Are you saying the Minister is incompetent?

Mr. TENNI: No. A lot of Labor members are incompetent, and I think we are all aware of this. Looking at the cricket team left over there I'd say the electors of this State were certainly aware of it at the last election.

A Minister has more important work to do than chair an advisory board. His other duties and responsibilities are much too important and this duty should be placed in the hands of one of his senior executive officers.

An Opposition Member: You support the bureaucrats?

Mr. TENNI: Well, I am certainly not going to support the socialists; that's for sure.

The second provision is for a reduction in board numbers. There is nothing wrong with this. Many boards with eight, nine or 12 members are very lucky at times to get a 70 per cent roll up at a meeting but nine times out of 10 the meeting is more successful and the members seem to overcome problems very speedily. So in my opinion this is not a bad move; indeed, it is a very good one.

I am afraid I must stand up for the people in the Far North and North West of the State, and particularly the people of my electorate, and oppose this proposal to impose precepts on the poultry farmers.

The honourable member for Landsborough said something about a levy of 2c a head on laying hens. I did say there was a farmer in my electorate who has 14,000 hens and he said, "That is only \$280." With today's terrific increases in costs, that is a lot of money. For argument's sake, with the latest increase, the freight rate for feed from Townsville to Cairns is around \$20 a tonne, so \$280 represents 14 tonnes of feed. To me that is a lot. It is not just chicken-feed; it's real dough.

So I must request that the Minister leave the fellows in far-flung country areas alone. Let them have a decent sort of living. They are having more than enough trouble at the present moment with the socialist regime in Canberra and the actions that they have taken to try to put them out of business. We are all very clear about what they are trying to do to the farmer. We know they are trying to get rid of him. How in hell the rest of the country is going to survive

without the farmer I do not know. How the people in this city will survive if we keep knocking the farmer—whether he be an egg farmer, a grazier, a sheep man or a wheat man does not matter—I just don't know. The socialists are trying to wipe them all out. Whether we are all going to live on the Pill or something else in the future I don't know, but apparently the socialist regime in Canberra want something like this, or perhaps they intend to buy their food supplies from Red China or Russia. That is the only other possibility. But we, as members of a State Government that considers the country people, should not bring about any increase in costs to those people.

Mr. Lester: Did you know that the Government has appointed Mr. Keating, a member from Sydney, as the new Minister for Northern Australia?

Mr. TENNI: That shows the type of people they are. Recently we read that the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber and the Prime Minister intended to write to the Queen about what Sir Colin Hannah had said. Only six months before, the Labor Government issued instructions that photographs of the Queen in Parliament House and other Government buildings were to be ripped down and Whitlam's photograph put up. Now they are going to write to the Queen to try to have something done about a statement made by the Governor of Queensland that was quite correct. That shows the type of people who are in office in Canberra. Someone said something a moment ago about wanting two bob each way down there. Members of the Opposition are the ones who want two bob each way.

A Government Member: They'll be out.

Mr. TENNI: They'll be out; that's for sure—and the sooner the better! They haven't the guts to go to the people at present.

To return to the Bill, Mr. Miller—I ask the Minister to wipe out the 2 cents levy. I do not want to see that come in, and I will fight against it through the various stages of the Bill.

The introduction of a provisional licence for the sexing of chickens is very important. In years gone by, I have been very disappointed when I have bought, say, 25 young chickens, hoping that they were pullets, and half of them have turned out to be roosters. I think that only people who are qualified should be allowed to accept the responsibility of sexing chickens. In my opinion, this is a very important move.

Hygiene is very important to any product of this country and the proposal to introduce a new provision giving protection to inspectors is very important. Possibly backbench members of this Assembly need similar protection, if one can judge by the

way the mob in Canberra are acting. Their attitudes and actions indicate to me that we may not be very safe.

Those are my comments on the proposed Bill. I again ask the Minister to eliminate the 2 cents levy. Let us do the right thing by the people in the country areas.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (8.38 p.m.): It has been quite interesting to hear honourable members, particularly those on this side of the Chamber, enter into what probably will go down in history as the "great chook debate". The debate has now been raging for several hours on a subject which, on the surface, would not appear to be of interest to many members. Honourable members on this side of the Chamber have shown not only great versatility but also their interest in the people as a whole and their sense of responsibility for the whole, broad Queensland community.

Contributions to the debate have been made by members representing electorates in many different parts of the State. We have heard, for example, from the honourable member for Kurilpa, whose electorate is just across the river from this building, who gave a dissertation on the Concorde aircraft and how to chop a chook's head off. The honourable member for Mourilyan spoke about the price of eggs in the local supermarket, and the honourable member for Barron River told us about the Government buildings from which Her Majesty's photograph has been removed.

Probably the one man in the Chamber who is an expert in this field is the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs, and I am disappointed that he has been too busy receiving deputations to be able to take part in the debate. I would have expected him to make a comparison between the breeding of the common hen in the days when he went into the industry, perhaps half a century ago, and today, when technology is so advanced and poultry people talk like Madison Avenue characters.

The Bill is very necessary. As a Liberal by conviction, I have some philosophical reservations about it as it seeks to set up another board. As each new board is created, one wonders whether we are indirectly building up another bureaucracy and another system of control over people's lives. I personally believe in as little Government control over people's lives as possible. I hope that this board will not become another great branch of the Public Service with another battery of inspectors to harass the poor poultry farmer. I am heartened at seeing that the board is to be merely an advisory one. One would gather from that that its purpose will be mainly to improve the industry—to give advice and make sure that the normal rules of hygiene and health are observed and to ensure that the industry is brought up to date with all the latest technological changes.

I was greatly interested in the comments about chicken sexers. The honourable member for Port Curtis is nodding his head. It is quite plain that he is a specialist in sexing chickens of a different kind, and that he is interested in the subject; but I doubt that he has ever reached the degree of efficiency envisaged in the Bill—something like 97 per cent. From what I know of him, he may have been able to get in under the old Act as a second-class chicken sexer—with an efficiency of only 93 per cent. From hereon, the honourable member will be eliminated from the classification in the Bill.

I am interested in the amount of exports of products derived from the poultry industry to earn very-much-needed dollars. I see from the latest statistics available that Japan takes a large quantity of our products. For the year 1973-74 eggs in liquid form earned over \$5,000,000 in revenue for Australia. Those who have visited Japan would know of the great use that eggs are put to in that country in noodle dishes and the like.

Dr. Crawford: And for throwing at political rallies.

Mr. LANE: Yes.

Now that the egg is on a falling market, there is one area of use that I suggest it could be put to. I suggest that the Minister's department encourage the manufacture of pasta products. We have a combination of two things in Queensland which would be very advantageous in any attempt to develop an even larger manufacturing industry based on pasta products—spaghetti, noodles and the like. The hard wheat derived from the Darling Downs—the area from where the Minister comes—is excellent for the manufacture of pasta products. Last year I had the opportunity to accompany the Minister and his committee on a visit to the largest spaghetti manufacturing industry in the Southern Hemisphere—Nanda Macaroni Products at Northgate.

Mr. Sullivan: A most interesting exercise.

Mr. LANE: Yes. It is an industry that could well combine with hard wheat and wheaten flour from the Darling Downs with the egg products to make a very good product that would be saleable overseas, particularly in the East. Already that manufacturer exports a lot of his spaghetti products to a ready market in South-East Asia. The quality of his products is very high. In looking for new uses for eggs, the advisory board could well investigate the use of eggs and wheat from the Darling Downs in the manufacture of pasta products. As we all know, some of the Eastern countries, particularly the Philippines, lack proteins. Members of the parliamentary delegation which visited the area last year were interested to hear that the Philippines Government wanted to increase the protein intake of the people living on the many islands.

Dr. Crawford: Dried eggs are best.

Mr. LANE: As the honourable member for Wavell said, dried eggs are the best way to achieve that end.

Mr. Jensen interjected.

Mr. LANE: We have heard of Rhode Island Reds. Now we have heard from the Bundaberg Red. Isn't he lovely, with a big mouth and nothing up top?

If the funny people down South do not show initiative, Queensland could well investigate the possibility of exporting large quantities of dried eggs, or eggs in liquid form, to the Philippines. I know that a clamp on imports has been imposed by the Philippines Government but in such a narrow area I feel that that Government could be persuaded to import some of this product in the light of the concern felt by its scientists and experts in nutrition about the lack of protein. Recently, an unsuccessful attempt was made to encourage the greater use of fish by people in the urban areas of the Philippines to increase their protein intake. Perhaps we could open a market there for our poultry products.

I compliment my colleagues on their great contribution to this chook debate today. At the same time, I condemn the lack of interest displayed by all Opposition members, with the exception of the honourable member for Port Curtis, who has the real talent in the Opposition. He should really be in his leader's seat. He is the only Opposition man with a really broad knowledge of Queensland. His experience and knowledge are not confined to the Trades Hall or the inner circle of the party hacks of the A.L.P.

Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (8.48 p.m.), in reply: I have been asked why such interest should be displayed in this legislation relative to the Poultry Advisory Board. I suppose I could say with confidence that I could walk into any home in the city of Brisbane or elsewhere, open the door of the refrigerator and find eggs in it. That fact, together with the dynamic increase in the consumption of broiler and chicken meats, is a good reason for the interest displayed by honourable members, 17 of whom made a contribution on this legislation.

I do not intend tonight to deal with the comments made by individual speakers. My appropriate senior officers, who are sitting in the lobby, have taken notes and in my second-reading speech I shall comment on matters raised, commend where commendation is called for and perhaps be critical—

Mr. Wright: What about the honourable member for Callide?

Mr. SULLIVAN: If the honourable member just sits back, I shall deal with the honourable member for Callide at a time which I think is appropriate.

There have been criticisms, but I thank the honourable member for Port Curtis for his acceptance of the legislation on behalf of the Opposition. I thank all other members, too, for their contributions. It appears to me that there is ready acceptance of the legislation, but some members have expressed concern about parts of it. I believe that satisfactory explanations can be given. I hope I can be convincing that what is proposed is for the good of the poultry industry in general and for egg producers in particular.

Mention was made by the honourable member for Merthyr of my colleague the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and his long association with the industry. I wish to acknowledge that he has been of great assistance to me in private discussions we have had about the problems of the industry. It is a coincidence but rather appropriate that he should be in the Chamber at present. I thank him for the assistance he has given.

While it is fresh in my mind, I comment on a remark made by the honourable member for Callide—and I thank him for it—about the difficult and time-consuming work-load on a Minister for Primary Industries, which presently happens to be me.

Mr. Jensen: For how long?

Mr. SULLIVAN: For some considerable time, I think.

He did not specifically say it, but one of the things he indicated was that, whoever might be the Minister for Primary Industries, one of the essential requirements is good health. In spite of what members may have been reading in the paper about me, I think I enjoy just as good health now as I did when the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs first went into breeding poultry 50 years ago.

I leave my comments at that for the time being, Mr. Miller. I will deal with the other points in my second-reading speech.

Motion (Mr. Sullivan) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 10 October (see p. 1085) on Mr. Campbell's motion—

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

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (8.55 p.m.): I take part in this debate for several reasons. Firstly I want to add to some of the remarks

of the Minister and other Government members on industrial unions and matters associated with them. The tragedy is that so many members of the Government have shown by their actions, activities and words that they bitterly hate the trade union movement and all it stands for. If they had their way they would abolish trade-unionism. It is plain however, that the more-responsible Government members realise that the trade union movement is an essential part of our democratic way of life.

It is to be regretted that Bills are introduced before the Government knows exactly what it wants. The present legislation was introduced, presumably after discussion in the Government ranks, on the basis that it expressed the Government's opinion on what the legislation should contain. We found during the introductory stage, however, that many Government members had no idea at all of what was in it.

We also learned that the Minister had not discussed the provisions of the Bill with senior members of the trade union movement, nor had he discussed them with other people responsible for implementing the legislation. Whether he spoke to the employers' organisations is a different matter altogether.

I make it quite clear that the trade union movement comprises more than one or two unions. In this State there are recognised bodies that speak on behalf of the trade union movement, or a large section of it, on important matters of policy.

Mr. Campbell: That would be the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. HOUSTON: The Trades and Labor Council is a very responsible body. I think it has been made quite clear that prior to the introduction of the Bill the Minister did not discuss any of its provisions with that body.

Mr. Campbell: Do you really believe that?

Mr. HOUSTON: That is the opinion that has been voiced, and the Minister has not denied it. He did meet with the trade union leaders after the Bill was introduced and he discussed some of the matters with them. He came away from the meeting completely dogmatic in his attitude—or at least he was reported to be.

Mr. Campbell: I will correct that.

Mr. HOUSTON: I will accept any correction, but that is the way I saw it judging by the manner in which it was presented and the attitude adopted by some Government members towards it. Does the Minister deny that he is still debating the provisions of the Bill within the Government ranks? Does he deny that?

Mr. Campbell: I will correct your misapprehension about not consulting trade union leaders.

Mr. HOUSTON: Perhaps the Minister consulted some trade union leaders, but he did not consult the majority of them.

We are now at the second-reading stage and already we know that if certain Government members have their way some of the clauses will be amended. Certainly the Minister himself is reported as having wanted some amendments made but his suggestions were rejected in the caucus meeting.

This is a ridiculous situation. Surely a Government would not introduce a Bill without having it fully discussed and supported by Government members. But apparently it has. The Minister has introduced the Bill. Fair enough. We knew only what the Minister told us at the introductory stage as to the contents of the legislation. That is the accepted procedure, and it has its good and bad points. Personally I believe that an introductory debate is quite a good system in that it allows a member to discuss matters broadly. I have no fight against that.

Next we are presented with the Bill and each member is allotted 40 minutes to speak to it. He studies the Bill. In some instances he has it for two or three weeks. In this instance, not by design on the part of the Minister but because of the frustration within his own ranks, the Bill is going forward like Topsy—a little at a time. This is the third day on which it has been discussed.

Mr. Campbell: This House is not a rubber stamp.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not, but I am pointing out what the Minister is doing in fact. He is denying Opposition and Government members the opportunity to really consider the Bill. We are given the Bill and an opportunity to study it, to relate its clauses one to the other and then to the existing legislation. I have no fight with that. Even if I disagree with some provisions of the Bill, at least I have had the opportunity to study it, debate it and evaluate the effect it will have over all.

What is more important, our procedure gives the Opposition, and all other members, the opportunity to go to those who they believe can advise them on whether what is proposed is worth while. Surely the Minister would not deny that there are matters on which it is good to seek the advice of people with practical knowledge of the subject.

It is not right to introduce amendments at the last moment, at the Committee stage, when members have only 20 minutes in which to debate clauses. The Minister might move an amendment to a clause without giving Opposition members the opportunity to discuss it with those with whom we might wish to discuss it. That is what is wrong with last-minute changes.

Mr. Campbell: It is democracy at work.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is not democracy at work. It is Government incompetence at work. The Minister should not have brought the Bill before Parliament in the first place until he, supported by his parliamentary colleagues, was satisfied that it was in the best interests of the State. He has not done that. It is not a matter of Parliament's being a rubber stamp. When the Bill eventually reaches the Committee stage, it will be virtually rubber stamped by the Minister's colleagues. No matter what amendments are brought forward, the Minister's colleagues will support them, even though some of them might not have supported them in caucus.

Mr. Campbell: I doubt it.

Mr. HOUSTON: Of course they will. I have seen that happen time and time again. Today we even had members talking about eggs when they would not know one side of an egg from another.

The first point I make is that the introduction of amendments at the last minute is not good government. The Minister talks about democracy at work.

Mr. Campbell: It is being responsible.

Mr. HOUSTON: Let us see how responsible the Minister is. Is he prepared to put in the hands of the Opposition three or four days before he brings on the Committee stage a copy of the amendments that the Government intends to move? That would be democracy, as it would give the Opposition and every other member a chance to see the amendments in toto and to compare them with the existing legislation and the proposed changes.

Mr. Campbell: You tempt me to say what I have already done.

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not mind if the Minister tells us what he has already done. Surely this is not a secret society. If that is the way the Minister operates, then let it be known. The point is that this is industrial legislation that affects not only the workers in industry but the whole of the community.

Unfortunately too many Government members do not know what trade-unionism is all about, and one of their misconceptions is that union leaders stand over their members. Let me set the record straight. Every trade union elects its leaders under rules that are registered with the Industrial Commission. Some rules lay down that ballots in one form or another will be held. The Industrial Commission has the power to order a court-controlled ballot if it wishes. The fact is that no financial member of a union is denied the right to vote at a union election.

Mr. Frawley: You don't give them every facility.

Mr. HOUSTON: Most unions work on the postal ballot system.

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

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was merely trying to enlighten the honourable member.

Mr. Frawley: I was in the E.T.U. the same as you were.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am glad the honourable member mentioned that union. He should know that while he was a financial member he was posted ballot-papers. He would also have sent to him with each ballot-paper an envelope registered with the Postal Department, and that envelope, when returned, would have been kept in a sealed box until it was signed for by the presiding officer at the union ballot. That person would have signed for the number of letters and that registration paper would have been kept by the Postal Department. There was nothing wrong with that at all; it was completely legal. I had the opportunity of being the returning officer for my union on more than one occasion, so I think I would know how union ballots are conducted.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: The trouble is that we did get people who, like the honourable member for Murrumba, were unfinancial and then complained because they did not get a chance to vote.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. I ask for that remark to be withdrawn. It is offensive to me. I was never unfinancial in the 20 years I was in the E.T.U.

Mr. HOUSTON: I will be pleased to withdraw. The point was that as the honourable member did not know much about ballots I took it that he was never sent a ballot-paper. But if he says he was a financial member of the union, I accept it. I am glad to hear that he was financial—and I hope he voted, too. Did he ever vote?

Mr. Frawley: At least it wasn't controlled by commos like it is now.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am sure it is most offensive to every member of the Electrical Trades Union to have a member of this House suggest that office-bearers of that union are members of the Communist Party. On their behalf, I refute that statement. If it were within my power to ask for a withdrawal, I would do so. It is completely untrue. It ill behoves a person who sets himself up as a supporter of democracy, as does the honourable member, to make such outlandish and untrue statements. However, the point is that when the officers of the union are elected they are elected—

Mr. Lane interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Merthyr and the honourable member for Murrumba will cease interjecting.

Mr. HOUSTON: As I was about to say, they are elected according to the rules of the trade union as registered in the Industrial Commission, so therefore no-one can argue that these men or women are not elected legally or responsibly.

Mr. Lane: What percentage vote?

Mr. HOUSTON: If members do not vote that is their business. The only demand is that they be given an opportunity to vote. If they are silly enough not to vote in a trade union election, that is their responsibility. And surely it is their responsibility. The fact is, of course, that in the great majority of instances union members are quite happy with the candidates that are put before them and do not vote in union elections. The existing office-bearers are re-elected virtually unopposed. Those persons who are elected to union positions are entitled to the respect of the community, and they are certainly entitled to the respect of members of this so-called democratic Parliament.

Mr. Lane: What about the Trade Practices Act?

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not think the Trade Practices Act has very much to do with this legislation. That interjection shows, of course, that the honourable member has no knowledge of this industrial legislation. We must assume that he is going to talk and vote on matters that, by his own words, he knows very little about.

Mr. Lane: Why didn't Burns stick to you?

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member for Merthyr is still sore that his colleague from Kurilpa did him over like a dinner on the Liberal executive by four to one.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order. I will not tolerate persistent interjections. I warn all honourable members.

Mr. HOUSTON: When we talk about trade unions, Government members seem to forget—or do not want to know—that, like the workers' unions, employer organisations are also trade unions when they are registered by the Industrial Commission. Some employer organisations have very small membership. There are some with fewer than 10 members. Others have nine members, eight members or seven members. Another has 13 members. So some of these employer organisations are mighty small in terms of numerical strength. I am not saying they represent small organisations; but they are small in numerical strength and responsibility. I wonder how many of the employers' organisations will of their own volition have their ballots controlled by the Industrial Commission.

At present, the membership of trade unions can decide whether or not to have a court-controlled ballot. But one of the clauses in the Bill gives the commission the right to decide whether or not there will be a ballot for union officials. It can be held at the instigation of one disgruntled member. Someone like the honourable member for Murrumbidgee, who hates the trade union movement and all it stands for, could ask for a ballot and it could be granted. I wonder how many court-controlled ballots there will be in any of the employers' organisations. I shall be very interested to hear the Minister's response to my comments, because I am sure that not all those in the employer groups are happy any more than all those in the employees' organisations are happy.

The Minister opened his comments by saying, "We are going to remove the penalty provisions from the Act." That is rather belated, because when the Act was introduced members of the Labor Party pointed out that the provisions would be inoperative and that an endeavour to make them operate would cause more industrial problems than it would solve. In latter years employer organisations have been wise and have not tried to implement that section of the Act. The Minister is now saying that it is going to be removed. He is removing the penal provisions that were associated with a ballot before a strike and applying them to having a ballot during a strike. I say to the Minister that this will be just as impossible to operate as the earlier provision.

Mr. Campbell: You would be joking!

Mr. HOUSTON: I am not joking now, any more than I was joking many years ago. If the Minister wants to know why it will be impossible to operate it effectively and efficiently, I will tell him.

Mr. Campbell: I am listening.

Mr. HOUSTON: It must not be forgotten that there must be a strike. Let us go back to how strikes begin, because many Government members believe that a union official goes to a job and says to the members, "You are on strike." That is not the way it happens. The great majority of strikes begin on the job because workers are dissatisfied with some decision that has been made either by the employer or by someone associated with their work. The men on the job make the first decision.

When I was actively associated with a trade union, quite often I would receive a call at the union office from a shop steward on the job. He would tell me to send an organiser down because there was trouble on the job. The honourable member for Windsor knows exactly what happens. Whether it is in the railways, in private enterprise or somewhere else, the first a union official knows about the men being on strike

is when he is notified that there is trouble on the job. Usually a confrontation takes place and the men go out on strike.

Those men could belong to only one union, and that is quite often the case. But many other people may be employed there. The provision states that 20 per cent of those employed on the job—not 20 per cent of those on strike—can decide that they want a strike ballot. If the law says that is what is required, it will not be very difficult to get 20 per cent, particularly if it is an interunion dispute and if people on the job include staff members. If it is a relatively small job with comparatively few men or women working there, it will not be very difficult to get 20 staff members or those working in association with the staff to declare that they want a strike ballot.

The people involved in the strike could be far fewer than those not involved in the strike. It could end up with a ballot being taken with a resultant majority vote to return to work, but that majority vote would be by those not on strike. The negative voters who said, "We will stay on strike" would be those on strike. It would not solve anything. The Minister could start applying the seven days' provision and take all their amenities and everything else off them. He would merely be prolonging the strike. Instead of its being a small, contained strike in one organisation, the whole of the trade union movement would take up the cudgels on behalf of their fellow workers. Don't let there be any doubt about that.

Mr. Frawley: Are you going to tell us about the U.F.U. tonight?

Mr. HOUSTON: I'll have something to say about that.

Mr. Frawley: I thought you might duck that one.

Mr. HOUSTON: I won't duck anything. The honourable member knows me better than that.

Let me take it another step. Suppose it was decided to continue the strike. Where do we go from there? Are those not on strike, but who had a vote in the strike ballot, now going to be included in the strike? After all, if we are going to talk about democracy and majority rule—

Mr. Katter: Of course.

Mr. HOUSTON: I am glad of the interjection. That means that if 10 fellows are on strike and 100 are not on strike but vote for a strike, the Government is going to say that those other 100 persons are to go out on strike. That is what the honourable member is saying. I take it that he is a member of the caucus which debated and discussed the Bill. The Government is going to have a ballot that will extend the strike within the organisation or industry in which the dispute occurs.

Everything I have heard so far from the Government side is that it is a case of "We will have a ballot, and when the ballot says the strike is to finish the men have to go back to work." What about the occasion when the strikers say they will carry on? Let honourable members opposite cast their minds back a few weeks when ballots were held at the coal-mines at the time of the power strike. At every coal-mine where a ballot was conducted, it was decided to stay on strike. Once that decision is made, there is nothing in the Bill to say when the next ballot is to be taken. Is the Minister going to have another ballot on the next day? Have they got to be out another week before there can be another ballot? What is the procedure if the first ballot is that they are not going back to work? Those are the unanswered questions. That is what the Minister will come up against in reality. They are the realities of life and the realities of working. Let it not be forgotten that when men go on strike, they do not go on strike lightly. When they go on strike, they are united.

Dr. Scott-Young: Half of them are pulled out by their shop stewards.

Mr. HOUSTON: The honourable member shows a complete disregard for the realities of life. I am not saying that there are not some silly strikes, but that is only my view. The point is that the great majority of strikes start at ground level, and come through the system.

Mr. Lane: What major strikes have you disagreed with recently?

Mr. HOUSTON: I haven't disagreed with any major strikes. The honourable member should not get the wrong idea. I have disagreed with the handling of strikes by the Government. I have disagreed with that very forcefully. The last major strike here—the power restriction strike—was brought about by the stupidity of the Government. That strike carried on because of the Government's stupidity. If it does not do something about a new power-house, there will be other industrial trouble to come.

The brewery strike was over wages and conditions, yet Castlemaine Perkins recently increased its dividend from 13½ to 15 per cent. Then honourable members opposite ask why people go on strike!

The point I am making is that the Bill is not a practical approach to the problem. There are far too many unanswered questions. In the future when a strike occurs, somewhere along the line the Government is going to get 20 per cent of those who work in the place where the strike occurs asking for a ballot. The type of strike is relevant. If it is a State-wide strike of electricians, where will a ballot be conducted? If the strike was in a small industry where everyone could be easily contacted, that would be all right.

Mr. Greenwood: What about a political strike?

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not know what the honourable member means by a political strike. As a barrister, he can later give us a long dissertation on what he thinks a political strike is.

I always look on trade unions as bodies whose purpose is to look after all their members in all circumstances. If the honourable member's version is different, he may explain it later.

Mr. Lane: What is your solution?

Mr. HOUSTON: If the honourable member remains quiet, I shall explain how to handle industrial trouble without rolling drunks or anything like that.

Mr. Lane: You have been talking for a long while without telling us anything.

Mr. HOUSTON: At least I did not make a fool of myself by talking about "chooks" and calling the Minister a chicken, or something or other with one left wing. At least I am respectful to the Minister.

I pose the situation in which 20 per cent of the workers call for a ballot. I take it that the court will conduct it. To whom will it give a vote? To everyone employed in the industry whether he is a financial member or not? How will the voting lists be worked? Who is to present the terms of the motion on which they are to vote? I am sure the Minister knows that in strike after strike the motions put to the men about going back to work are as varied as are the variations in the types of strike. Who will decide the wording of the final motion that goes to the men? Who will determine who is legally entitled to vote?

An Honourable Member: Parliament.

Mr. HOUSTON: Parliament could not decide. It does not sit for half the year.

We should be asking ourselves these questions. I am worried most by the fact that if it is decided that a strike is to be carried on, how will we determine the machinery to give the men an opportunity to go back to work? As I said at the outset, it is always dangerous to look at amendments and legislation in isolation. We must determine how one section affects the other.

The Minister spoke about pickets not being allowed within the vicinity of a polling booth. Firstly the polling place has to be determined. This will be determined according to whether it is a local-issue strike, a State-wide strike or a national strike. It could also be a strike concerning one industry, as with the refinery strike. If it is a transport workers' strike, where will the men park their trucks to take part in

the ballot? All these questions need answering. It is useless to say, "We will answer them when they arise." Unless we have all the answers, the confusion will be added to. Once it is decided that a strike is to be called—that the men are not going back to work—what is to be done?

The Minister said that picket lines cannot be within the vicinity of a polling place. Our legal friends will have a field day in determining what is meant by "in the vicinity". I shall be very interested to hear a definition of "in the vicinity". If a ballot-box is in a building—

Mr. Elliott: What is it in a State election.

Mr. HOUSTON: It is supposed to be 20 ft., but I have seen Government supporters standing right next to the door of a polling booth.

The real problem lies in telling the members what they are voting for. Where will they see the ballot-paper outlining the issue? Government members have the idea that picket lines will stop members from voting. That need not be so. A union could want its members to vote. From my point of view, if I believed an issue was very important to the members, I would say, "Go and vote and keep the thing going. Comply with the law." No-one is advocating a deliberate breaking of the law. But how is it intended to get the message to the members once they decide to stay out?

In addition, the provision relating to picket lines will add to the industrial problems. I do not care who the trade unionist is. He will feel pretty strongly about the issue he is on strike over. He is out of work. He has no money coming in. He will feel rather incensed. Whether the Government likes it or not, human nature being what it is, he will be incensed about it. If he feels that people voting in that ballot to tell him he is wrong should not be voting, he will not take it lying down.

The Minister foresees trouble in his own legislation by giving the police the right to arrest without warrant. Surely that takes industrial legislation to the absolute extreme. He is virtually saying to the police, "You will go in there as strike breakers." The Government does nothing else but ensure that the men are herded and refused the normal right to present their case to others. My objection might not be as strong if this legislation set it down that only those who were on strike had the right to vote, and voting lists were held of those who were on strike. But the Government is not doing that. It is broadening the sphere. It is giving the right to vote to people who have no direct connection at all with the strike issue. They have a connection because they work for the one employer. That is a new provision.

Mr. Moore: What is your solution?

Mr. HOUSTON: When there is a strike, let those who are on strike determine it. If it is desired, provision could be made to allow both sides to present their cases to the men involved; but the principle of giving anyone at all the right to vote will lead to hard feelings.

Mr. Moore: It won't work.

Mr. HOUSTON: I quite agree. The only thing is that apparently the honourable member failed to convince the men in his own caucus that it wouldn't work.

Mr. Moore: I am weak.

Mr. HOUSTON: I know you are working on him—

Mr. Moore: I said, "I am weak."

Mr. HOUSTON: I am trying to give the honourable member some assistance and perhaps get through to the Minister some points that he could not get across.

I hope the Minister will reply to my comments about voting lists and whether or not people who are not members of an industrial union will be given the right to vote. How will the list be compiled? How will the Industrial Commission keep an up-to-date list of all employees and the various unions they happen to be members of? We know that in some shops there are union and non-union members in different callings. They could be given the opportunity to vote.

The member for Murrumba challenged me about the fire fighters. I believe the fire fighters should be registered as an industrial union. I don't see anything wrong with that at all.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: I have made no bones about it. Government members are worried about what the A.W.U. thinks. The A.W.U. respects my opinion just as I respect its opinion.

The logic of my decision is this. The Queensland Country Fire Brigade Officers' Association, Union of Employees, with 209 members, is a registered union. The Government has said to the officers, "Well, fellows, it's O.K. You can be a union—a separate identity and a separate union on your own." But the Government is laying it down that the fire fighters, all doing the one class of work, all experts in their own profession, cannot form their own union. The legislation does not lay it down that the courts have the right to decide.

Mr. KATTER: I rise to a point of order. The member for Bulimba is misrepresenting the true position. Never at any stage did the Government refuse to register the body. It was the commission that refused. We cannot tamper with the actions of the commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOUSTON: I am sorry that the honourable member gets so het up about it. No-one is arguing the right of the Industrial Commission to register a union. The point is that the commission has already said that it cannot. The fire fighters can go back to the commission but the legislation provides that no new union can be registered.

Mr. Campbell: No, it doesn't.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, it does. We will debate the clause when we come to it.

The Minister and other Government members have made statements concerning the fire fighters. Surely if men or women decide that they would like to form a union covering their type of industry—particularly as fire-fighting has, over the years, become a more sophisticated occupation with greater money values involved and more technical equipment employed—and they show that they can finance their own activities and provide representation in the commission, it should be up to the commission to decide whether they should be registered in other than their existing union. That is the point I make. Under this legislation, they will not have that opportunity. The Minister is shaking his head and I know that he has said that the legislation is not designed solely against the fire fighters. But they believe it is. They cannot get an industrial award. It is not just being unable to form a union; it is being unable to present a case to the Industrial Commission. That is the part of the legislation that does the damage. The Government has registered the fire officers' association but will not give the fire fighters an opportunity to break away and form their own union.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not blame the A.W.U. To be fair to all concerned, the way I see it, the A.W.U. appeared before the commission and opposed the application of the fire fighters. This legislation does not give them the opportunity to become registered and, if they are not registered, they are not permitted to appear before the commission to improve their conditions. That is what matters. The Government is only playing with words when it speaks of registration. What is important is what they can do. The have to be able to appear before the commission to improve their conditions of employment.

We talk about fragmentation of unions. Look at some of the graziers' associations. There are six graziers' associations throughout Queensland. They are: the United Graziers' Association of Queensland, Union of Employers; the Graziers' Association of South-east Queensland, Union of Employers; the Central Coast Graziers' Association of

Queensland, Union of Employers; the Maranoa Graziers' Association, Union of Employers; the Warrego Graziers' Association, Union of Employers, and the South-west Queensland Graziers' Association, Union of Employers. I have no fight if that is the way they think they should operate as separate groups because of the changes in their business.

Mr. Casey: The way things are going, there will be a few more breakaway unions there.

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes, that is right. It is up to the legislators to make sure that they can do it. Didn't the fellow named Tritton at Richmond or Julia Creek talk about breaking away from something or other a while ago? However, that does not matter. I used those six associations simply as an example.

Mr. Frawley: What about the carpenters' union?

Mr. HOUSTON: I have not marked it on this list but that does not matter.

Six organisations represent different sections of the same type of industry. Of course, there would be slight variations. I have no fight with what they have done. If they want to form associations that way, that is all right; but it should not be laid down hard and fast that no other group will be allowed to form an organisation or a union as a separate identity and so be permitted to appear before the Industrial Commission to look after the members of that union, who joined voluntarily.

Mr. Frawley: Don't you think that the A.W.U. has a stranglehold?

Mr. HOUSTON: No. It can fight its own battles.

(Time expired.)

Mr. KATTER (Flinders) (9.35 p.m.): I agree that the honourable member who has just resumed his seat has exhausted both his time and the patience of the House with his gross misrepresentations.

I start with the first thing that I have noted from his address—and I flatter it with that description. He said that everyone has equal right to nominate for election at union ballots. I can give him three examples in North Queensland to show that that is not correct. Two of them I am not prepared to disclose publicly although I am prepared to tell him privately of them, and one I am only too happy to disclose publicly. In that case, the ballot-papers were received notifying the recipients of those who were nominating for election. At no stage was an opportunity given for the people in North Queensland to nominate anyone for the various positions. So much for the right to nominate for union positions.

All who are familiar with unions will know that it is extremely difficult to unseat anyone at the head of the organisation. How long has Egerton been in his office? How long has Williams been there? How long has every head of every union in Queensland been there? I answer the question by saying that they stay in those positions for as long as they wish to stay there. Does any member think that that would occur in any ordinary democracy, particularly in view of the work that is being done by most of them? Most union leaders can be seen any time anyone likes to drop down to the racecourse or to any of the exclusive clubs round Brisbane. They are very prominent in these places and that is where they spend most of their time.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. KATTER: This noisy racist over here made a fool of himself with his last speech. He is getting old and over the hill. He is too lazy now to do his homework.

The second thing he had to say, pointing to Government members, was, "You people over there would not know anything about unions." Let me tell the House that in North Queensland at the present time there are two A.L.P. candidates. The letters were written and signed by five employees who had scabbed not in one strike but in two. On the other hand, I am pleased to say that one of the hardest-fought contests the National Party has ever had in North Queensland was for the nomination for the Senate vacancy that will be arising shortly. A man named Mr. Stan Collard, a very prominent, active and militant—I am very proud to use that word—trade-unionist won that contest in a very-hard-fought battle. He has never made any apologies for his strong union convictions.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: He's a scab.

Mr. KATTER: If the honourable member is familiar with his record, he will realise how stupid he is to say that and also what a vicious lie has been thrown at this man. The honourable member for Archerfield has accused him of being a scab. I ask him to name one single strike in which he scabbed.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You name one in which he didn't.

Mr. KATTER: There were two in Cloncurry—the Combined Railways Union strike when he was secretary in that town for the north-western area. There is one that I am able to give him straight off.

Electoral councils are the bodies that elect candidates and are responsible for conducting election campaigns, and the presidents of two such councils in North Queensland are union officials. Another one of our prominent officials, and one of the prominent members of our industrial committee, is a union

official with the A.W.U. We have also two major A.R.U. officials. I will not mention the name of one of them because of the vicious, prejudiced tactics adopted inside some unions against these people. For the truth of that statement, we have only to look back to the Hersey affair on the waterfront in the South. The same thing occurs in Queensland and it is a great reflection on our democracy that these intimidatory tactics are still followed. Two of these people are prominent A.R.U. officials and one of them has achieved more for the railway unions in Queensland in the last five years than have any other five officials put together. If I mentioned his name, the House would realise the truth of what I have said. He is now also a prominent member of the National Party.

Mr. Houston: Who is he?

Mr. KATTER: I am not going to say, because that is exactly what the honourable member is after. You will note the arrogant laughter, Mr. Speaker, coming from the former Leader of the Opposition. He has obviously had a lot of experience—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members on my left will refrain from persistent interjections or I shall have to deal with them.

Mr. KATTER: The ex-Leader of the Opposition over here has said—

A Government Member: Another has been in the Labor Party.

An Opposition Member: You won't be there long.

Mr. KATTER: Neither will you, shortly.

The ex-Leader of the Opposition said that the secret ballots make no difference. I wonder why he went on for 35 or 40 minutes condemning the legislation if it makes no difference. If it makes no difference, why go on attacking it for 35 to 40 minutes? That is the stupidity of his line. Let me leave the secret ballots because in fact I agree with what he said. I will not go so far as to make the extreme remark he made that it will make no difference, but I think it makes very little difference in the normal situation.

Having said that, I will jump back to an example last year—the meatworkers' strike, which lasted for six weeks and shut down every meatworks in the State. It was a strike which caused a lot of hardship to a lot of people because, thanks to the Federal Government, the unemployment rate was roaring up at the time and people had no alternative source of employment.

The men employed at the Cape River meatworks had nowhere else to work. It is all right for the people in Townsville and

Brisbane because they can go up the street and get a job elsewhere. We all know many of them did. A lot of them did not, but many of them did. Unfortunately, if one lived in Pentland there was nowhere to go and get another job. So the meat workers negotiated their own settlement and were called scabs. The president of the union was ordered to go to Townsville. He went to Townsville and took along the log of claims. He stood up in front of about 600 people and said, "This is what we are fighting for." He went through the log of claims and he said, "We've already got this at Cape River; we've got this and we've got this." He said that this supposedly militant leadership from down here—all Communists, I might add, all members of the A.L.P., too—

Mr. K. J. Hooper: You're wrong.

Mr. KATTER: I am most certainly correct. They are self-confessed Marxists and all members of the A.L.P. They are affiliated with, and have given large donations to, the A.L.P. And these are the men accusing the Cape River meat workers of being scabs and tame-cat unionists. This fellow got up and went through point after point and it was obvious that the Cape River meat workers were well and truly ahead of the rest of the meat workers in Australia. For example, the slicers and boners in a meatworks are in the forefront. They are the most important people. They are the equivalent of drivers and firemen in the railways and they set the pace for the rest of the people in the meatworks. I am glad the honourable member is laughing at that statement because it indicates he knows nothing about meatworks. Behind them are a lot of various labouring categories—what in the industry are known as following labour. People in the category of following labour at Cape River are paid tally rates and that is one of the very few meatworks in Australia where the following labour is paid tally rates—a huge breakthrough.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. KATTER: I am copping a few interjections. I expected to. In fact, I would have been rather disappointed if I had not. I thought the members of the Opposition would not like what I had to say. They will continue not to like it because I have a bit more to say. The honourable member for Bulimba indicated that he had obviously not read the legislation. Before he spoke, I listened to one of the honourable members for Rockhampton, and again he showed that he had not done his homework. He rose and said, "You will not be allowed to picket at strikes." This is what he said. I pulled him up—

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I would just like to make the point that I have not even spoken in this debate so the honourable member for Flinders does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member states he was not in the House when the remark was made.

Mr. WRIGHT: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. WRIGHT: The honourable member referred to my making some type of statement. I have not spoken during the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no valid point of order.

Mr. KATTER: If the honourable member for Rockhampton North or South or wherever he comes from reads "Hansard", he will realise I said "one of the honourable members for Rockhampton".

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. KATTER: Read "Hansard" and check up, not that I am going to worry about it. The honourable member for Rockhampton North, is it—Mr. Yewdale?

A Government Member: Yes.

Mr. KATTER: We will say "North". The honourable member can stand up and correct me if I am wrong. The honourable member for Rockhampton North rose and said, "You are trying to prevent picketing and you will carry away and put in gaol anyone who is attempting to stop strikes." I rose to a point of order. I said, "That is wrong." The Leader of the Opposition sat there and said, "No it isn't." He raced backwards and forwards through the Bill and suddenly realised that both he and the honourable member for Rockhampton North were entirely wrong again, just as the speaker who preceded me was completely wrong.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. The fact is that I did not say anything like that. I will answer the honourable member later.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Flinders to accept the denial of the honourable member for Bulimba.

Mr. KATTER: There seems to be raging paranoia amongst honourable members on the Opposition benches. One has already misconstrued what I said. I was referring to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Burns), not to the honourable member for Bulimba. He is no longer the Leader of the Opposition; he is a has-been.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KATTER: The major problems for any trade-unionist in Queensland at present, or for that matter in Australia, are the twin problems of inflation and unemployment. I do not like to admit this but I am forced to admit that inflation is the result of wage claims. I do not think that anyone in Australia would deny that. Certainly members of the A.L.P. are blaming the wage earners, but in defence of the trade unions and the employees in Queensland I say that, if there is a 20 per cent inflation rate running in the country, they simply must go out and fight for increases in their wages. One cannot blame the workers for going out and fighting for wage increases. They would be very remiss in their duty towards their fellow trade-unionists if they did not fight for wage increases.

The annual increase in wages in Australia is roughly 35 per cent at the moment, and the net result is roaring inflation. This would not have caused any problem for the workers—and I am speaking from the point of view of the workers—if the A.L.P. Federal Government has not removed tariffs and left the country open to competition from goods from overseas in which rates of inflation are not comparable with the rate in Australia. So cheap goods were coming into the country when wages were roaring along in Australia. It is no skin off the employer's nose; all he does is add the wage increase to the price of the product and pass it on to the consumer. What happens then is that he is not able to compete with foreign-made goods and the result is unemployment.

Let me pause there for a moment and contemplate what the present situation would be in Australia if the coalition Government were in office and there were a 5 per cent rate of inflation. I ask honourable members to think about that.

The 1972 election was fought by the A.L.P. on the basis of unemployment. It demanded that the coalition Government be thrown out of office because it had permitted unemployment to increase to 0.7 per cent. The Federal Labor Government now has 5 per cent unemployment. So let us take the A.L.P.'s own argument in 1972 and throw it out of office as it threw the coalition Government out in 1972. I again ask honourable members to remember that it was 0.7 per cent unemployment for which the coalition Government was thrown out. The A.L.P. Federal Government will be thrown out for permitting unemployment to rise to 5 per cent.

It is a very interesting exercise to go back to the history of the A.L.P., because there is a great dichotomy between what a socialist Government tried to achieve and what is good for the trade-unionists of Australia.

It is interesting to note, too, that that existed right back in 1894. Let me quote very briefly—

"The General Council of the A.L.F. met in Brisbane in August 1890 with all delegates ardent supporters of Lane."

This was a meeting of what was then the A.L.P.

"The manifesto produced at the meeting was characterized by Lane's brand of utopian socialism and included the nationalization of all sources of wealth and all means of production and distribution."

I now quote from the Australian Constitutional General Rules of the Australian Labor Party objective No. 3—

"The democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange."

What was hammered into its platform in 1890 is still there today, and it has been the bane of the A.L.P. ever since.

A Government Member: And of Australia.

Mr. KATTER: Yes, and of Australia. In 1893 the principal factions developing within the movement were the Glassey group and the A.L.F. clique based on the Trades Hall. Right back in 1893 a fight was going on between the political wing of the Labor Party and the Leftist trade unions with the socialist platform put in by Lane. What happened to Glassey, the leader of the A.L.P.? He was axed in 1900. What happened to Kidston, his successor? Let us turn over the pages of history and look at what happened to Kidston—

"Kidston's personal prestige was a threat to——"

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. KATTER: Just let the honourable member listen. He will be interested because I am going to mention his name in my speech. He is very relevant. He has a place in A.L.P. history.

"Kidston's personal prestige was a threat to Trades Hall control of the movement, for while he controlled the Parliamentary Party it was Trades Hall which dominated the grass roots organization."

What happened to Kidston, the A.L.P.'s first Premier? He was thrown out of the Labor Party in 1914. There it is in the pages of history. What happened to Gair in 1956? What happened to Hanlon, Thackeray, and Casey, who was probably one of the best speakers and most able men in the House? What happened to Wright himself. He was downgraded. What happened to Marty Hanson? Exactly the same as what happened to Glassey away back in 1893! Honourable members opposite haven't got one A.L.P. They have got two A.L.P.s, and they have always had. They have the socialists committed to that objective No. 3 and the

others who realise they are supposed to represent the people who voted for them. Many courageous people over the years have been martyred, and probably many more will be in the future. I hope the honourable member for Rockhampton is not one of them.

Socialism is not the only difference between the A.L.P. doctrinaire and the rank and file. There are a number of other issues. Those issues are looming very large because even powerful men like Mr. Egerton are very worried about them. The most prominent one is tertiary education. The present Federal Government has increased its income this year alone by 75 per cent. Taxation has jumped something like 300 or 400 per cent on what it was in 1972. It has taken money from the pockets of the workers and put it into other pockets. Where has the money gone? Let me quote the Prime Minister himself. He said—

“My proudest boast is that spending on tertiary education by the A.L.P. Government has increased sevenfold.”

A 700-per-cent increase in tertiary education! How does that help the trade-unionists? They are not happy about it. It is possible to pick up the thread that Mr. Egerton is not happy about it at all that 0.5 per cent of the population should be getting 3 per cent of the gross national product. That is the figure at the present moment; 3 per cent of the gross national product of Australia is being put out on tertiary education. I am not now going into how well that money is being spent. We all know what the situation is.

Let me turn to the environment. In my own area, seven people are about to be sacked over an environmental issue. Who is the champion of environmental causes in this State? The self-professed champion is Mr. Tom Burns. He is going to cost seven jobs in my area very shortly. Those seven people will know who is the leading environmentalist in this State!

Earlier in the year the Greenvale project was almost closed down. Because of an organisation called G.A.S.P.—Group Action to Stop Pollution—it almost did not get off the ground. This group was organised by Mr. Fabian Sweeney, the then candidate opposed to Mr. Duke Bonnett in Townsville. When Greenvale got into trouble, did the Federal Government, with its massive money, offer help? It refused point-blank to do so. It was left to a relatively small economic group, that is, the Queensland State Government, to bail out Greenvale and save the jobs of 300 people. I assure A.L.P. members that most of the workers at Greenvale know very intimately the details of what happened.

I would be an ardent opponent of foreign investment, but until people in Australia with money, people living in the southern capitals, are prepared to invest money in Australia—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will return to the contents of the Bill.

Mr. KATTER: One of the matters in this legislation concerns the rights, or perhaps the wrongs, of a group smaller than the parent union in Queensland (which is probably centred in Brisbane) taking independent action. To discuss the pros and cons, we must look at the types of union in Queensland. I divide them into three distinct categories. First I refer to the socialist unions and in doing so I quote Mr. Hodson, the State Secretary of the Meatworkers' Union, who said in his annual address to the A.M.I.E.U.—

“So the trade unions have what may be termed a priority responsibility to educate the people that a socialist form of society is the ultimate means by which man will eliminate poverty and suffering, bring an end to recession and wars and guarantee that man will gravitate from the present-day jungle of capitalism and live in peace and progress with one another.”

If we look at the nations of the world and arrange them in descending order of per-capita G.N.P. and how much they are socialised, the lists are identical; the poorer countries are the Communist countries, as in India, which is very much a Communist country in everything but name.

In dealing further with the socialist unions, I quote the comments of Mr. Irving, a prominent member of the meatworkers' union in Townsville, who said—

“I am a man dedicated to the destruction of capitalism and the destruction of capitalists.”

That is his motivating force. When he calls a strike, he is setting out not to help his brother workers but to destroy the system. That is why the Townsville meatworks have lagged so far behind those at the Cape River meatworks in every way. The meeting at which this address was given to the 600 meat workers was a closed one. Because the then president of the Cape River meat workers was receiving wild applause from the meat workers in Townsville, he was not allowed to continue. Irving realised that if the other man continued he, Irving, would be in serious trouble.

Then we have the “fat cat” unions with their boys who trot off to the races and attend the social clubs in Brisbane—those who generally lead the good life. A large number of the organisers of these unions receive various perks and perks from the companies. They owe a lot of their power, prestige and money to the companies. When a member of these unions takes a problem to

a union organiser, as I did on a number of occasions when I was an active member of a union, the union organiser trots up to the people who pay him—the employer. Needless to say the members receive very little satisfaction. Those are the “fat cat” unions.

The third category embraces the responsible militant unions. When I talk about them, I could quote the mine workers at Greenvale. I have heard them slated in the House, and I think rather unfairly—

Mr. MELLOY: I rise to a point of order. I acknowledge that the honourable member is trying hard. What he is trying to do, I do not know, but he is still trying hard. I have listened to him for the last 14 minutes and, in that time, he has made no reference to the Bill whatsoever. This is the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KATTER: The honourable member for Nudgee said that he has been trying. I find him trying, too.

Moving on, I spoke of the responsible militant unions. The unions at Greenvale have not had a single 10-minute stoppage in the last nine months. It is because they realise they cannot kill the goose that lays the golden egg. The company presently is in trouble. The unions have shown admirable—and I stress the word “admirable”—restraint in the last nine months. That is what I am talking about when I mention responsible militant unions.

I would like to finish on a positive note. Under this legislation the Minister is attempting to cut out the class struggle from which our present inflationary spiral stems and to prevent problems such as the Ipswich mine workers strike from recurring in the future. The efforts he has made have been genuine and admirable. Some of the improvements, such as the secret ballot, have a place in our industrial law, contrary to what members of the Opposition have said. I do not think that it would be a very big place but I think it would be a significant place. I applaud the Minister for putting it forward.

The Government is trying to attend to the symptoms. I think it is doing that and doing it very well. But the big problem is class struggle. Trade union leaders have a vested interest in continuing that class struggle. That is where their money, their pay, their power and their prestige come from. That is why they are propagating the class struggle. The unionist must realise that primarily he is working for himself, and society must reflect that philosophy.

I strongly urge the Minister, in follow-up legislation, to consider the concept of worker participation, which is adopted in other countries of the world. If I may, I will cite two classic examples in Australia. One is a meatworks in the Northern Territory where there has not been a single industrial stoppage. It has the highest rates of pay

of any meatworks in Australia. What happens there is that each meat worker after a certain qualifying period becomes a part-owner of the meatworks. He receives voting shares in the meatworks. That is the first example. The second is the Cape River Meatworks, with which I am reasonably familiar. I think the industrial relations that exist there are to be envied. Every week the trade union officials meet with the management of the meatworks.

Mr. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to Standing Order 120, which states—

“A Member shall not digress from the subject-matter under discussion”.

I ask for your ruling on whether the honourable member is still on the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that I am in charge of the House. I will take the necessary action if I think the honourable member for Flinders is straying from the principles of the Bill.

Mr. WRIGHT: I asked you for a ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: My ruling is that the honourable member for Flinders continue with his speech.

Mr. KATTER: I compliment the Minister. At no stage during the discussions of the industrial committee was the right to strike ever questioned. That proves how wide of the mark the Labor Party is. A couple of times a few of us were worried that the right to strike was actually being curtailed. In an inflationary situation the right to strike is the only weapon the worker can use to fight the ravages of inflation. He either pushes up his income or falls behind. I sincerely compliment the Minister on the work he has done and urge him to consider incorporating some form of worker participation in future legislation.

Mr. JENSEN (Bundaberg) (10.5 p.m.): I had no intention of entering the second-reading debate on this Bill until the honourable member for Murrumba misconstrued many parts of it and attacked the A.W.U. I intend to refer to those parts that he misconstrued and make what I consider is a reasonable approach to it.

The Minister, in his second-reading speech, said—

“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."

Mr. FRAWLEY: I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the honourable member is reading word for word a speech which was prepared at the Trades Hall.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the ruling I gave the other day. It still applies.

Mr. JENSEN: I am not reading my speech, Mr. Speaker. I said I was reading what the Minister said in the second-reading debate. It is stupid to say that the speech was prepared by the Trades Hall.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Murrumba and other honourable members to refrain from making persistent interjections and to allow the honourable member for Bundaberg to be heard in silence.

Mr. JENSEN: The honourable member for Murrumba is intimating that the Trades Hall prepared the Minister's speech, to which I am referring. As I was saying, the Minister said that this union had applied six times to the Industrial Commission and had appealed six times to the Full Industrial Court.

He continued—

"The registered union recognised by the commission as covering firemen in this State is the Australian Workers Union..."

Mr. LAMONT: I rise to a point of order. I understand from the explanation made by the honourable member for Bundaberg that he is in fact reading from the speech made by the Minister earlier in this debate and, Mr. Speaker, I ask for your ruling on his doing that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already given my ruling on this matter. He is quoting from a speech made by the Minister.

Mr. JENSEN: I refer particularly to the last sentence of that paragraph. I took a particular note of it. The Minister said—

"To permit the present situation to continue would make the provisions concerning the recognition by the Industrial Commission of registered trade unions untenable."

I agree with that statement. It would make the present position of trade unions untenable. Any trade union would agree with it. There is no trade union that wants a breakaway section to be a thorn in its side. The Minister said this clearly in his second-reading speech. This is the point that this Bill deals with. I personally agree with what the Minister said, as would every trade

union in the State except one or two that may not agree for certain reasons of their own. It is a principle in trade-unionism not to have breakaway sections. They are a thorn in the side and are not to be tolerated.

Mr. Frawley: So you do not want the U.F.U. to be registered?

Mr. JENSEN: I will get onto that.

The honourable member for Murrumba said that the U.F.U. has made about seven applications. So he was fairly correct. The Minister said it has made six applications to the Industrial Commission and six to the High Court. The honourable member for Murrumba said that the reasons given were hogwash. I interjected and said that they could not be hogwash. He does not believe in law and order in this land. The U.F.U. has been to the Industrial Commission six times and has been to the High Court six times. If that is not good enough for anybody, what is? The honourable member for Murrumba said that the decision was hogwash. That means that he does not believe in the laws of this land.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: You said, "High Court". Do you mean the Full Industrial Court?

Mr. JENSEN: It has been to the Industrial Court six times and there have been six appeals to the High Court. I think that is what the Minister said.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: It did not go to the High Court; it went to the Full Industrial Court.

Mr. JENSEN: I shall get exactly what the Minister said. His words were, "The appeals went to the Full Industrial Court." That happened six times.

What I want to deal with is the honourable member's statement that the decisions were hogwash. From earlier than the 1920's, and before the U.F.U. was even heard of in Queensland, the A.W.U. has looked after the interests of firemen. I am giving facts in reply to statements made by the honourable member for Murrumba. The achievements of the A.W.U. have been put before successive industrial registrars in the numerous application made by the U.F.U. for registration. Extensive material was submitted by the A.W.U. to show its record in this field. That is in the files of the Industrial Commission, and it cannot be denied.

The comments of the Industrial Registrar show the stupidity of the statement of the honourable member for Murrumba that the rejection of applications for registration was hogwash. I quote from the decision of the Industrial Registrar of 21 June 1972, when, in rejecting the U.F.U. application, he said—

"The application for registration before me was strongly opposed, and it is evident

that the industrial welfare of firemen in this State has been actively catered for by one of the objectors."

Of course, that objector was the A.W.U.

In rejecting another application for registration by the U.F.U., the Industrial Registrar said on 19 April 1973—

"It is a matter of record that the industrial interests of firemen have been well catered for."

Of course they were well catered for. They have been well catered for over many years in this State.

Mr. Frawley: Rot!

Mr. JENSEN: The honourable member may say, "Rot".

Mr. Frawley: The firemen say it, too.

Mr. JENSEN: The Registrar of the Industrial Commission says that they have been well catered for by the A.W.U. I shall show a little later how well they have been catered for. The U.F.U. went to the commission. It could not be heard, so its members have bludged on conditions obtained by the A.W.U. They are good conditions, too; they are as good as those of any other union in Queensland. And U.F.U. members are enjoying them now.

Mr. Frawley: Because the U.F.U. got them.

Mr. JENSEN: According to the Industrial Commission, it did not. I have just read what was said by the Industrial Commission.

The honourable member for Murrumbidgee then tried to make out that the A.W.U. was responsible for the inclusion of this provision in the Bill. I believe that that is completely wrong. The A.W.U. had nothing to do with the inclusion of this provision in the legislation. Although the A.W.U. did go to the Industrial Commission and fight the U.F.U. over the registration issue, it did not tell the Minister to include this provision in the Bill, as the honourable member for Murrumbidgee implied.

Mr. Frawley: Not the Minister.

Mr. JENSEN: That is completely false, even though, as I said, the A.W.U. did everything in its power to stop registration of the U.F.U. Any industrial union would do the same with a breakaway group. The A.W.U. cannot be blamed for what it did. The honourable member for Murrumbidgee has said that the A.W.U. did absolutely nothing for fire fighters.

Mr. Frawley: You know that there are more firemen in the U.F.U. than in the A.W.U.

Mr. JENSEN: I shall come to that point in a minute.

The honourable member then mentioned the report by Mr. Anderson of the Industrial

Commission, and he said that the A.W.U. did not even go to the commission to fight this matter on behalf of its members.

Mr. Frawley: It didn't.

Mr. JENSEN: It did not. On the occasion on which Mr. Rogers appeared for the U.F.U., it is true that the A.W.U. did not go to the commission. It did not go; it was a deliberate decision by the union not to go.

A Government Member: Does Mr. Hooper agree with you?

Mr. JENSEN: I don't care who agrees or does not agree with me. I am giving facts in reply to the honourable member for Murrumbidgee. Because the A.W.U. believed the U.F.U. application was based unsoundly and made with intemperate haste, they pulled out of the case. They did so because of the national wage guide-lines and the implications arising from indexation and the impending decision which has recently been given by the Australian commission in relation to such guide-lines. That is why the A.W.U. did not proceed. They did have a claim before the commission but they were reluctant to proceed because of the inherent dangers. They felt that pursuing a claim at that time would not be in the interests of their members but would do an injustice to them, as was done by the intemperate U.F.U. claim. The officials of other unions connected with fire-brigade services in this State, including fire officers' unions, have been heard to express horror at the injudicious moves by these inexperienced advocates for the U.F.U. before the commission. The attitude of the A.W.U. and officials of other unions has been vindicated by the more recent wage decision of the Australian commission. Reports have come to hand that firemen employed by the Metropolitan Fire Brigades Board and other boards have expressed disappointment and disgust with those persons who prosecuted the premature case before the Industrial Commission, and that is a fact.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: I am coming to the allegations made by the honourable member for Murrumbidgee about U.F.U. membership. I have said I will reply to all his questions.

Mr. Frawley: 804.

Mr. JENSEN: He mentioned the membership. Many different figures are quoted. The honourable member says 804. Figures as high as 1,000 have been mentioned as the membership of the U.F.U. I do not know the figure and nobody else knows it, but there are, as I understand it, only 950 firemen in Queensland. I know the Minister in answer to a question the other day said there were 1,400.

Mr. Frawley: That included the officers.

Mr. JENSEN: I do not want the honourable member for Murrumbidgee to try to make my speech for me. He made a mess of his and that is why I am replying here today.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I suggest the honourable member gets on with his.

Mr. JENSEN: In reply to a question, the Minister said there were 1,400. I understand there are 950 firemen who are members of either the A.W.U. or the U.F.U. There may be more, such as fire officers and other people.

Let us have a look at the case of the U.F.U. for registration before the Industrial Registrar in 1974. They submitted a list of purported members—the 804 the honourable member for Murrumba was talking about—to support their case. Evidence, including statutory declarations, showed that a considerable number of the names were those of deceased persons, persons who had been out of the industry for many years, persons who had been overseas for many years and some who had been fire-brigade officers for some time. Many persons in the U.F.U. at that time were classed by the A.W.U. as dollar members. Those are the 804 the honourable member for Murrumba was talking about. The A.W.U. will tell him that they paid \$1 to become members.

Mr. Frawley: Rubbish!

Mr. JENSEN: The honourable member can say it is rubbish just as he said the commission is hogwash. He can say what he likes. They are called \$1 members. They paid \$1 to become members of the union and they have not paid a dollar since, as far as the A.W.U. knows.

Mr. Frawley interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: I am only telling the honourable member that I have investigated all his statements. I received replies from the fire brigade in Bundaberg and from the A.W.U. office in Bundaberg. As I said, some of those have never paid another penny for their membership.

The A.W.U. claims that all but a relatively few firemen belong to the A.W.U. It claims that, Mr. Speaker, because the Commonwealth law states, when dealing with financial or unfinancial members of a union that an unfinancial member of any union is still a member of that union. That is the law. A person is still a member of the union even if he is unfinancial, although in every union in the State he would be classed as a scab.

Mr. Frawley: Are you saying that members of the U.F.U. are scabs?

Mr. JENSEN: Yes; in the eyes of the A.W.U. they are scabs because they are unfinancial members of the A.W.U. They have not paid their dues. The law of the land says that they are still members. I am sure the Minister will agree with that. I do not care what the honourable member for Murrumba thinks about it.

In many provincial cities and towns in Queensland—Bundaberg is one of them—100 per cent of firemen are financial members of the A.W.U.

Mr. Frawley: They are not.

Mr. JENSEN: Go and check up.

Mr. Frawley: I have checked up.

Mr. JENSEN: I am not going to argue with the honourable member for Murrumba.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, unfinancial members of unions are regarded as scabs throughout the State because they have not paid their union dues. They have joined another union and have failed to pay their dues to the A.W.U. Officially, they still belong to the A.W.U.

The honourable member for Murrumba and others have accused the A.W.U. of intimidating firemen to join the union. The men to whom I am referring were members of the A.W.U. and have been taken away from that union. In fact, the reverse is the case. That can be shown by reference to "News Flash", the journal of the U.F.U., which shows that a motion passed at the general meeting held in the Trades Hall on 3 September 1971 stated—

"In the forthcoming officers' examination that unfinancial candidates not be provided with an observer or drill crew."

Again, a motion passed at the general meeting in the Trades Hall on 17 February 1972 stated—

"That our members refuse to supply a drill crew for any grade examination, including officers' examinations, for any unfinancial member or non-member."

That means that a man who wishes to sit for any examination to improve himself will not be provided with a crew to assist him to pass that examination if he is not a financial member of the U.F.U.

The honourable member for Murrumba says that men are not forced to join the U.F.U. Can he tell me of any greater form of compulsion than to prevent a man sitting for an examination until he becomes a financial member of the union?

Mr. Greenwood: Are you against compelling a man to join a union?

Mr. JENSEN: In my opinion, every man should be in a union if he is working.

Mr. Greenwood: He should be compelled, even if he does not want to be?

Mr. JENSEN: Yes, he should be compelled to join a union if he has not any valid reason why he should not do so.

Mr. Greenwood: What is a valid reason?

Mr. JENSEN: As an example, religious grounds have been accepted by the commission as being a valid reason. I do not say that they are a valid reason; but some reasons have been accepted by the commission as being valid. If a man is receiving wages

for which a union has fought in court and he does not pay his union dues, he should not receive any increases.

I am giving the House instances from the U.F.U. journal to show that men are not being permitted to sit for examinations for higher positions, even for officers' positions, if they are not financial members of the U.F.U. What greater compulsion is there than that? The journal refers specifically to non-members and unfinancial members. As I said earlier, there must be plenty of them, because it was shown in the Industrial Commission that half the names on the list were not members of the union. The journal points out that they will not get crews.

The honourable member for Murrumbidgee mentioned that he did not know much about the U.F.U. and its problems. That was an understatement. He knows nothing about the U.F.U. except what he got from his son. He came to my office one day and said, "Do you know anything about the U.F.U.?" I said, "I know a little bit about it." He said, "I've got to find something out about it. I have to speak about it on a Bill." I said, "You had better ask somebody else about it. I know a lot about it and I know a lot about the A.W.U."

For a certainty he knows nothing about the conditions and wages that have been gained for firemen by the A.W.U. He does not know that the A.W.U. was the first in Queensland and the first in Australia to have firemen's hours reduced from 56 to 40 a week. The judgment contained the words, "He who sleeps also works." The A.W.U. got that for the firemen. They can sleep, but they are paid for their 40 hours. Prior to that, it was 56 hours.

Let me tell the honourable member that in 1973 the A.W.U. had 12 applications heard and, in particular for the Metropolitan Fire Brigade men, wages were increased from 5 March 1973; incremental payments were phased out in three phases, and increased allowance for accident-pay provisions were granted. In 1974 these were variations in the hours and overtime provisions, interpretations as to payment for annual leave of the South Coast Fire Brigade, changed standards in afternoon and night-shift allowances, and increased wage rates from 1 July 1974. The A.W.U. had 17 applications heard in 1974 for those award changes. He says the A.W.U. does nothing for firemen. Any fireman in Queensland can tell him what the A.W.U. has done for them. The A.W.U. did not fight one case when the U.F.U. went to court, because it was a premature application and the representatives of that union made a fool of themselves. The A.W.U. has gained all those conditions over the years. Every fireman in my city will stand by the A.W.U. on every occasion. The U.F.U. did nothing to gain those conditions for firemen in 1973 and 1974. It was not heard by the court.

No unions respect break-away sections, and such small groups of break-away unionists cannot service a union unless they are paid from outside. They cannot pay officials properly and service the union throughout the State. The Amalgamated Foodstuffs Union and other small unions have joined with the Miscellaneous Workers' Union because they could not continue. They joined a bigger union that could fight cases for them.

Mr. Frawley: You don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. JENSEN: I know what I am talking about but the honourable member showed that he did not know what he was talking about. He said the A.W.U. had done nothing and that decisions of the Industrial Commission were hogwash.

Mr. Egerton and Mr. Hawke have called for large unions in this country. They both said we need only about 16 unions.

They do not want small unions that are a thorn in the side of the industrial movement.

Mr. Frawley: You want a monopoly; that's what you want.

Mr. JENSEN: I am not talking about what I want. I am talking about what the leaders of the unions have said. Mr. Egerton is the Queensland State President and Mr. Hawke is the Federal President of the A.C.T.U. They have both called for larger unions, but the honourable member for Murrumbidgee wants to support a break-away union which is a thorn in the side of a large union. I support what I think is right in unionism. I have been through the mill. I have worked through the mill, and that does not only mean a sugar mill. I have fought my way along in every type of work—labouring, chemistry, right through. I have even fought some honourable members opposite. When Egerton and Hawke say that, they know quite well that a union has to be a big union to present a case before the courts today. If we agree with what Egerton and Hawke say, we must agree that every member of the U.F.U. should be forced back into the A.W.U. As I said before, the A.W.U. says that they are unfinancial members. According to Commonwealth law, unfinancial members are still members of a union.

Mr. Greenwood: Is it Labor's policy to force them back?

Mr. JENSEN: I am not talking about Labor's policy. I am stating what I think is correct according to my opinion on unionism. I am commenting only on certain points raised by the honourable member for Murrumbidgee.

Mr. Katter: Where does Jack Egerton stand on this?

Mr. JENSEN: I am not worried about what anybody else says about it. I am here to say what I think about a union that has supported me all my working life. I will support it in every way that I can. I am not afraid about an attack on me from any other union. I will meet any attack. I will stick up for what I think is right. In every instance the heads of unions have espoused the policy of larger unions. They cannot contradict what I have said tonight about unionism.

One union even threatened members of Parliament. It threatened to let fires go unchecked in schools and Government buildings.

A Government Member: Shocking!

Mr. JENSEN: I thought it was shocking, but that is a matter for the Government, not for me.

These men are supposed to be members of the A.W.U., but A.W.U. members did not make that threat; it was unfinancial members of the A.W.U. who made the threat.

In September 1972, Mr. Souter was reported in these terms—

“In the covering note Mr. Souter warns unions to ‘avoid tactics which seek to bypass the authorised procedures of the trade union movement.’”

On 22 August 1975, Jack Egerton is reported in an article headed “Unions ‘greedy, self-fish’” as saying—

“Trade Unions, when it suited them had become greedy, selfish and capitalistic, Queensland Trades and Labor Council president, Mr. J. Egerton, said.”

Mr. Lane interjected,

Mr. JENSEN: I am saying that certain unions are greedy and selfish and will not join in to do the right thing by their fellow workers.

When Mr. Souter, who would have been president of the A.C.T.U. today if Hawke had not stepped in (he is still the secretary), and Mr. Jack Egerton (these men are pretty straight unionists who are handling things pretty well today) say that some of these unions are greedy and selfish, I can only say that they are right. As Mr. Souter said, we do not go against the trade union movement, and the trade union movement is seeking bigger, better and stronger unions.

Mr. Lane interjected.

Mr. JENSEN: If the honourable member thinks that I will support a union against the A.W.U., he should think again. I will say what I think is right. The Minister was quite correct when he said that it is untenable that this action should be taken time and time again in the courts. It is untenable. No union in Australia wants it.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Lamont, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.