

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 25 MARCH 1976**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

---

---

**THURSDAY, 25 MARCH 1976**

---

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:—

Proclamation under the Mining Act 1968–1974.

Order in Council under the Mining Act 1968–1974.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST HEALTH  
DEPARTMENT BY DR. WILSON  
AND DR. GARDNER

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Minister for Health): Yesterday, in answer to a question asked by the honourable member for South Brisbane, I indicated that I would lay upon the table a document that had been presented to me. I now seek leave to do so.

(Leave granted.)

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the document on the table.*

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

A.L.P. PAMPHLET ON GRANTS TO SPORTING  
AND YOUTH ORGANISATIONS

**Hon. J. D. HERBERT** (Sherwood—Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport) (11.3 a.m.): I rise to draw the attention of the House and the public to what I consider to be a shocking breach of political ethics. An Australian Labor Party pamphlet, which I shall table, circulated in the Brisbane City Council ward of Acacia, and carrying the authorisation of the honourable member for Archerfield (Mr. K. J. Hooper, M.L.A.), asserts that grants to sporting and youth bodies have been abolished. This blatant misrepresentation has received wide circulation, and the honourable member for Archerfield deserves the strongest censure for having allowed himself to be associated with a claim he knows to be false.

Grants to sporting and youth bodies have not been abolished, either by the Queensland Government or the Federal Government. The Queensland Government, through the Department of Community and Welfare Services and Sport, early this financial year approved the allocation of \$3,100,000 in subsidies and grants to sporting and youth organisations. I give the House my unqualified assurance that this assistance will continue.

The Federal Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Senator Greenwood), in an announcement on 19 March, made it clear that the Federal Government is not abandoning its interest in, and its commitment to, sport. This attitude is evident in the recent endorsement of a grant of \$250,000 for the Australian Olympic team. Senator Greenwood made the Federal Government's position quite clear when he said then that, far from withdrawing assistance, he had asked his department to advise on comprehensive policy in the area of youth, sport and recreation because there was need to rationalise the ad hoc sports and recreation programmes inherited from the previous Government.

Apparently the honourable member for Archerfield believes that a combination of a loud, irresponsible mouth, an unscrupulous

pen and a baseless charge may find credence in some quarters, but his latest exercise further erodes his credibility. The honourable member's recent attack on building societies, including the Trade Union Building Society, wherein he suggested that there was something nefarious about their activities—

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I rise to a point of order. I want to make it quite clear that never at any time have I ever made an attack on the Trade Union Building Society. That statement is grossly offensive and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order.

**Mr. HERBERT:** I repeat that the honourable member's recent attack on building societies, including the Trade Union Building Society, wherein he suggested that there was something nefarious about their activities, has already attracted condemnation by some trade unionists.

I suggest to the honourable member that, instead of acting like an ingrate, he should reflect on the amount of money the State and Federal Governments have poured into his electorate of Archerfield in promoting sport and youth activities. This amount is something of the order of \$500,000.

If the honourable member wants to blame anybody for this Federal Government review—and it is only a review—then he should lay it squarely on the former A.L.P. Government, which left such a financial mess behind after what, mercifully, was a short sojourn. It is not likely that the forlorn crusades by the honourable member will encompass a venture against his own Federal political allies. His endorsement as the A.L.P. candidate for Archerfield already is in jeopardy because so many of his erstwhile colleagues in the party's Trades Hall wing have virtually disowned him.

*Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid the pamphlet referred to on the table.*

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. PROSECUTION FOR MOTOR VEHICLE  
EXHAUST EMISSION

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

(1) How many prosecutions were instituted in the last five years under section 88 (b) of the Traffic Regulations 1962, which states "A person shall not, upon any road, drive a motor vehicle . . . from the exhaust or any other part of which smoke is projected"?

(2) What was the result of these prosecutions and what was the general order of fines imposed?

*Answers:—*

(1) Statistics of the kind sought are not readily available within the Police Department. Obtaining such statistics would require a great deal of research and I do not propose directing that this research be undertaken.

(2) Action for this offence is normally taken by way of a traffic offence notice, which attracts a monetary penalty of \$6.

## 2. INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE ON PRIMARY INDUSTRY AFFAIRS

**Mr. Lamont** for **Mr. Doumany**, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) Has the interchange of research data and publications between officers of the Department of Primary Industries and their counterparts in certain other countries, including Rhodesia, been curtailed for political reasons?

(2) If so, what countries have been selected for such restriction?

(3) Will he review this matter in the light of the global priority of food production and the need to maintain an open professional arena so that maximum progress may be achieved in productivity?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) The question of the supply of information to foreign Governments by State authorities has always been one subject to instruction and guide-lines from the Commonwealth Government of the day, which has the constitutional prerogative of determining Australia's relationships with other countries.

However, I think the honourable member for drawing attention to the current situation in relation to Rhodesia and some other countries, and I will take the matter up with the Prime Minister in an endeavour to have the present restrictions lifted. I am doing so today.

## 3. LOAN-RAISING ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL A.L.P. GOVERNMENT

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

(1) In view of the sitting of State Parliament on 9 December 1975, in which the Premier made certain allegations under privilege concerning unnamed former Commonwealth A.L.P. Ministers and the subsequent total clearance by the now Liberal Attorney-General in Canberra of these same Ministers and rejection of the Premier's claims, on what date was the information which led to this inquiry at great expense to the Queensland taxpayers referred to the legal officers of his department?

(2) On what date did the same legal officers make a decision on whether such an inquiry was warranted or not and what was the text of such decision?

(3) On what later date or dates was alleged evidence obtained from Switzerland, Queensland or any other source referred to the legal officers of his department?

(4) On what date did his department receive on this inquiry a full final report similar to the one submitted to the present Liberal Attorney-General in Canberra?

(5) What was his department's consideration on this report, following Mr. Ellicott's complete rejection of the Premier's inaccurate allegations?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 5) The honourable member should address his question to another Minister.

**Mr. Melloy:** I do so accordingly.

## 4. UNIVERSITY REMEDIAL-READING COURSES

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

(1) Is he aware that several Australian universities have been forced to establish remedial-reading courses for undergraduates?

(2) Is this astonishing development the result of too much experimentation in education at primary and secondary levels being permitted to creep in under the guise of progressive change and in particular too much emphasis on attitudes rather than on knowledge and skills?

(3) Are many so-called progressive changes more expensive than traditional methods which they are replacing?

(4) Will he assure the House that he will not allow experimentation in Queensland schools to reach such a level that remedial-reading courses will ever be required in Queensland tertiary institutions?

*Answers:—*

(1) In the short time available, I have been able to ascertain that there are no remedial-reading courses established at the University of Queensland. The Student Counselling Service does organise a series of reading improvement classes, which are attended by undergraduates of all ages. These classes are attended on a voluntary basis for two hours per week over four weeks and are concerned with the speed of reading, and techniques related to the reading of specialised university material.

(2) I do not believe that there has been the sort of astonishing development alluded to by the honourable member, who has probably been noting the unsubstantiated opinions expressed by a few academics from universities throughout Australia. Nor do I believe that standards in our schools are in danger because of too much experimentation. When I read

these unsubstantiated statements in the Press, I asked my senior officers to make inquiries into them.

(3) Changes to curricula, methods and organisation are introduced only after trial and evaluation. While it is possible that individual teachers or schools may, in their enthusiasm for a change, cause a temporary imbalance in a programme, the supervision exercised by my department ensures that children are not placed at a disadvantage. The honourable member has fallen into the trap of dichotomising so-called progressive and so-called traditional methods. Good teaching calls upon the whole spectrum of methods as appropriate to the needs of the children and the subject being taught. Certainly, providing audio-visual aids, resource materials, reference books, and a variety of learning situations is more expensive than providing merely chalk and a board.

(4) The honourable member has my assurance that I will continue to support the effective teaching of reading in our Primary and secondary schools.

#### 5. ABOLITION OF DEATH DUTIES

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

(1) If State death duties are abolished forthwith, could other States and/or the Commonwealth Government, acting either independently or together, adopt any measures which would effectively offset a sudden unilateral abolition of death duties in Queensland?

(2) What effect would such a move in Queensland have on other States?

(3) What effect could such a move have upon the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement currently being negotiated?

(4) Are there any other possible immediate repercussions of a sudden unilateral abolition of death duties which have not been drawn to the attention of this House?

*Answer:—*

I ask the honourable member to repeat his question for Tuesday, 30 March 1976.

#### 6. BEEF INDUSTRY

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

(1) Are recent Press reports forecasting a further crash in the beef industry fictitious?

(2) What plans has he in mind concerning the state of the beef industry?

*Answers:—*

(1) As the source of the "recent Press reports" is not identified, it is rather difficult to be specific in my comments on their likely accuracy or otherwise. However, the point must be made that nobody

is in a position to give assurances with regard to future movements in the price for beef. While we all hope that the present partial recovery of the beef industry will be sustained and will improve, prices paid for our beef on export markets are subject to many influences and it is virtually impossible to forecast the effect of all these influences on the price of beef.

(2) As far as "plans" for the industry are concerned, a State Beef Industry Committee was established in June last year to determine how the industry might be assisted. Since then four meetings have been held, the last of which was very recently, actually on 12 March. Initially, this committee focused its attention on urgently needed short-term measures. As a result of its activities and support, several such measures have been introduced. The most important of these are:

\* A subsidy on the use of essential tickicides;

\* A reduction in increased rail freight charges for the transport of cattle; and

\* Abolition of road tax.

In addition to these measures and before the establishment of the committee, the Government had introduced other concessions including low-interest loans for carry-on purposes and deferment of land rents, freeholding instalments and stock assessments.

The committee, at its more recent meetings, has concentrated on longer-term measures. While many suggestions in this area were received, there has been no general agreement on longer-term schemes from either the producers themselves or other State Governments. However, good progress was made at the most recent meeting, and certain recommendations were made by the committee to be considered by State Cabinet. These recommendations concern the structure and functions of the Australian Meat Board and, if adopted, I believe they would substantially improve the economic situation of the beef industry in the future. I am hopeful that these recommendations will be conveyed to the Prime Minister by the Premier in the very near future.

#### 7. WYNNUM-MANLY COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE

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

(1) What is the present establishment and what are the responsibilities of staff attached to the Wynnum-Manly Community Medicine and Health Service Centre, 69 Clara Street, Wynnum?

(2) Is there a proposed increase in the staff at this centre and, if so, what fields of service will the additional staff cover?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) The present staff of the Wynnum-Manly Community Health Centre is:—

- 1 medical officer (part-time);
- 2 social workers;
- 1 speech therapist;
- 3 community health nurses;
- 1 home help organiser;
- 1 community health aide;
- 1 clerk; and
- 1 stenographer.

A physiotherapist has been appointed and is expected to commence duty next week, while an occupational therapist is expected in mid-April. A position of psychologist is being advertised currently and an appointment might be expected in late April. Two additional community health nurses will commence training on 29 March and upon completion of such training will commence duty at Wynnum-Manly.

Staff of Community Health Centres are charged with the delivery of preventative health care, supportive services to the general practitioners in the area and assistance in "crisis" situations. Their day-to-day activities are subject to the over-all direction and supervision of the medical officer in charge.

In accordance with Government policy, no primary medical care is or will be available to the community at this health centre.

#### 8. MASTER FISHERMEN'S LICENCES

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

(1) How many Queensland master fishermen's licences were held as at 30 June, 1973, 1974 and 1975?

(2) As at 15 March 1976, what were the numbers of similar licences (a) issued and (b) received but not yet processed?

*Answers:—*

(1) The number of Queensland master fishermen's licences held at 30 June 1973 is not readily available as such were issued from many centres throughout the State.

30 June 1974, 2,504;  
30 June 1975, 2,474.

(2) Latest figures available are to 19 March 1976 and are—(a) 912, (b) 833 currently being processed.

#### 9. INDUSTRIAL ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION AND CAMBRIDGE CREDIT

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

(1) Is the Industrial Acceptance Corporation taking over certain of the Queensland assets of Cambridge Credit and its subsidiaries as mortgagees or money lenders?

(2) Is a company known as Riviera Pty. Ltd. wholly owned by Industrial Acceptance Corporation and is Andrew Bruce Small the Queensland agent of Riviera Pty. Ltd.?

(3) Is the transfer of these assets being carried out in Darwin to avoid State stamp duties and does he condone such tax avoidance?

(4) Will he investigate the circumstances and the involvement of a Gold Coast alderman, Andrew Bruce Small, in recent negotiations with the liquidators of Cambridge Credit involving large rezoning of rural land to residential purposes without any investigations as to the effect of flooding involving thousands of people and homes in Coombabah, Paradise Point, Runaway Bay, Biggera Waters and Labrador?

*Answer:—*

I ask the honourable member to repeat his question for Tuesday, 30 March 1976.

#### 10. SALE OF RIX BUILDING, SOUTHPORT

**Mr. K. J. Hooper**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) Is he aware of the sale of the Rix Building, situated on the corner of Nerang and Scarborough Streets, Southport, for the sum of \$1,200,000 to a permanent building society and, if so, what was the name of the society?

(2) Was this building society subsequently taken over by another building society and, if so, which society?

(3) Is he aware that the society currently holding the property as an asset has had to reduce its book value to \$400,000 as the result of a critical valuation report?

(4) Was the price paid for this property greatly inflated beyond all reason?

(5) Will he initiate action to recover the discrepancy between the real value and the sale price?

(6) Will he authorise an investigation into the principal and his associates to ascertain whether any payments were made to any person associated with any building society which made the proposal?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 6) Details of the matters raised by the member for Archerfield would not, in the normal course of events, be required to be lodged in the office of the Registrar of Building Societies.

#### 11. BOTTLED PASTEURISED MILK

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

(1) Is he aware that the quality of bottled pasteurised milk supplied in Brisbane has dropped considerably since about the time homogenised milk was introduced?

(2) Will he have investigations made to determine why rancid separated cream is now present in a large percentage of bottled pasteurised milk and take immediate steps to restore the quality of milk offered to Brisbane consumers?

*Answers:—*

(1) The quality of all pasteurised milk in Brisbane—bottled and bulk—is monitored constantly by the Otto Madsen Dairy Research Laboratory on behalf of the Brisbane Milk Board. Results of analyses show that the quality is well maintained. However, isolated complaints have been received in cases where milk has been stored for prolonged periods in the course of retail sale and owing to unsatisfactory storage conditions by consumers.

(2) Neither the Brisbane Milk Board nor the Otto Madsen Dairy Research Laboratory has evidence of rancid separated cream occurring in creamline milk. However, clumping of cream which has risen on creamline milk is a natural phenomenon and may be aggravated by prolonged storage of milk. This problem has been more pronounced than usual during recent weeks.

Homogenised bottled milk was introduced in 1972 largely to cater for people who disliked visible cream in milk.

Any consumer having doubts about milk quality should contact the Brisbane Milk Board seeking investigation of his complaint. All complaints are carefully investigated by board officers and follow-up quality tests are carried out at the Otto Madsen Dairy Research Laboratory whenever this is deemed necessary.

12. BOAT PASSAGE AND NEW PORT FOR BRISBANE

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

(1) In view of the confusion in the minds of many small-boat owners concerning the effects of building the new Port of Brisbane on Fisherman Islands, what will be the width of waterway under the causeway bridge which will cross at the mouth of the Boat Passage?

(2) What will be the depth of water and clearance under the bridge?

(3) What effect will the construction of the causeway have on silting in the Boat Passage?

(4) Will steps be taken to ensure that the Boat Passage remains navigable to small craft?

*Answers:—*

(1 and 2) The proposed access to the new port development at Fisherman Islands provides for a causeway and bridge across the Boat Passage. The partial closure of this natural navigational channel cannot be

commenced without the sanction of Parliament, which would also decide the lateral and vertical clearances of any bridge.

At this stage it is proposed that Parliament will be asked to approve a structure which will permit navigation access through the passage over a width of waterway of 60 metres and having a vertical clearance of 3 metres above high-water spring tides. I should add that the tidal range of 2.4 metres will provide additional clearance.

(3 and 4) Studies have been carried out which indicate that minimal siltation of the Boat Passage will occur owing to the small tidal flow through the passage and that the present minimum depth of water in the Boat Passage (0.5 metre below low-water mark) will be preserved.

13. IDENTIFICATION OF POLICE "Q" CARS

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

As most people are now very reluctant to stop when ordered to do so by unmarked police cars, because of recent incidents, will he authorise all unmarked police cars to be equipped with magnetic fastening detachable flashing lights of the type currently available in the United States of America, so that they may be carried in these cars and placed in position when a motorist is to be asked to stop, thereby removing any doubt that the vehicle is a police car?

*Answer:—*

No. A similar type of device has been tested, but found not to be satisfactory under all conditions.

14. COST OF ADDITIONAL TEACHER FACILITIES

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

(1) As the State is constantly reducing the teacher-pupil ratio and his department would have plans for the provision of necessary extra classrooms and back-up facilities that will be needed to satisfy the needs of extra teachers, what will be the cost of providing the additional facilities?

(2) What is the average cost of providing the additional facilities per additional teacher employed by the Education Department?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) The appointment of an additional teacher to a school does not always involve the provision of an additional classroom and other ancillary accommodation.

Minimum additional classroom requirements to meet anticipated enrolments and staffing for the 1977 school year are being received progressively from individual schools and are currently being reviewed.

However, the position is not yet sufficiently clear to give an indication what effect the recently reduced teacher/pupil ratio will have on the cost of providing additional classrooms at various schools as distinct from increased enrolments.

Depending on the location of the particular school and type of construction, the provision of an additional classroom could cost between \$25,000 and \$30,000.

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### SEWERAGE TREATMENT PLANT, QUEENSPORT ROAD

**Mr. MELLOY:** I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Did he call a meeting of industries in the Tingalpa-Murarrrie area at which it was agreed that the Brisbane City Council would construct a sewerage treatment plant at Queensport Road and that industries would make arrangements to connect their discharges to the sewer? Did the Minister agree to recommend to Cabinet that, as this plant was necessary for the implementation of the State's laws in relation to clean air and clean water, and as it would be of tremendous value to local residents and business people, the State provide a 40 per cent subsidy? As the plant was commissioned today and has cost \$380,000 so far, when can the ratepayers who have paid for this plant expect to receive a Government subsidy?

**Mr. HENZE:** A meeting did take place as indicated by the honourable member. The last I heard about it was that it was in the hands of the Brisbane City Council and that the council was to have some electric pumps installed. It was indicated to me that the work would be completed in March and that a number of industries along the Queensport Road sewer would be connecting to this line. That is the latest information I have. I do not know anything further than that, but I will endeavour to obtain further information and convey it to the honourable member.

##### MR. WILEY FANCHER: COST OF ROUND-THE-WORLD FLIGHT

**Mr. MELLOY:** I ask the Premier: Is it a fact that late last year a Wiley Fancher travelled by Qantas to San Francisco, New York, Dublin, Zurich, London, Singapore and back to Australia on a first-class ticket booked by the Premier's Department? What was the cost to Queensland taxpayers of this round-the-world flight, and what was the cost of Fancher's accommodation and other expenses on the trip?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I have already told the House exactly how much the whole inquiry cost the taxpayers of this State. The answer to the honourable member's question is, "Absolutely nil."

**Mr. Melloy:** That's a good answer, the one we wanted.

**Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee) having given notice of a question on the cost of Mr. Fancher's motel accommodation in Brisbane—

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** In answer—

**Mr. Melloy:** That one was on notice.

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I can answer it right now. The answer is the same as the other one. Absolutely nil!

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The question is on notice.

##### FEDERAL FINANCE FOR CRESSBROOK DAM; OMEGA BASE ON DARLING DOWNS

**Mr. WARNER:** I ask the Premier: Has his attention been drawn to an article in the Toowoomba "Chronicle" headed "Why doesn't Joh shop for Toowoomba?" and quoting aldermen of the city council as criticising the Premier for not seeking finance in Canberra for the Cressbrook Dam? Will he outline the current position relative to the Cressbrook Dam? Will he seek funds in Canberra for this project? In addition, will he use his best endeavours to obtain the Omega base for the Darling Downs?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** The honourable member mentioned to me a few days ago that there had been a report in the Toowoomba "Chronicle" to the effect that certain aldermen had alleged that I was not doing anything to assist the construction of the Cressbrook Dam. Neither those aldermen nor any other aldermen or anyone else has communicated with me in that regard. I believe that I can read their minds. The point is that I have always done everything I can for Toowoomba, and I will continue to do so. I think that the people of Toowoomba know that, and I believe also that they are aware of the Government's attitude generally.

The Julius Dam and the project near Bundaberg were nearing completion and money had run out because of cost escalation. That is why I had to raise those matters particularly in Canberra recently. In the case of the Julius Dam, there will be a very greatly increased cost to the community unless further financial assistance can be made available, and, in common with the honourable member for Mt. Isa, I am very concerned about that. Both of us have been doing what we can to ensure that, ultimately, that burden will be removed from the people. I hope that success will be achieved at a later date. We will not give up until we have achieved success, and that is exactly what I told the Prime Minister.

I make it clear to honourable members that the project at Toowoomba is in its initial stages. I have been informed by the Co-ordinator-General that \$225,000 has been made available for the project and that, in addition, further loans will be made available in future years. These loans will attract subsidy, which, in turn, will mean additional money. I assure the honourable member and the people of Toowoomba that when the scheme is implemented and the work is under way, the Government will, if necessary, use every endeavour to press for the funds needed to complete the project.

As to the Omega base—I have always said that I will support the erection of such a base wherever technical studies indicate that it would best be situated and of the greatest advantage. Strong arguments have already been advanced in support of its erection in the Toowoomba district. I believe that I have been foremost in Australia in pushing for the building of such a base, while honourable members opposite are prepared to let the Communists come in and take this country.

#### GOVERNMENT'S ATTITUDE TO REHABILITATION OF HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

**Mr. YOUNG:** I ask the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport: Is he aware of the statement that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" on 24 March in which Alderman Charles Rowland claimed that all handicapped people "should not go out" and that there is no need for specially designed ramps, etc., on city buildings? Will he indicate what the policy of the Government is in this area of rehabilitation?

**Mr. HERBERT:** I read this statement, and all I can say is that Alderman Rowland is living in the last century. I hope that for his own future well-being he will never suffer from any disability that would put him in the category of persons that he believes should be shut in for the rest of their lives. It is an incredible attitude for anyone in public life to adopt, and I think the sooner he gets out of public life, the better.

The State Government's attitude is, of course, the reverse. In all new public buildings we make provision for easy access and egress for all people suffering from disabilities, particularly those in wheel-chairs. And this is the way it should be. In fact I have written to all sporting organisations asking them to do the same thing in the sporting facilities that we subsidise, and most of the organisations have responded well.

I do want to acquaint the House with a most disturbing aspect of this particular survey. All honourable members would be aware of the W.E.L., which has associated with it a lot of well-meaning people, and anyone who read the survey would be interested to know that the Liberal candidate for Corinda, Mr. Phil Denman, received a telephone call last night from the woman who

carried out the survey with him. She told him that an error had been made in his positioning—he was near the bottom of the list below the salt somewhere in his attitude to women—and that he should have been higher up the scale. More importantly, however, the woman who did the collating of the information obtained from the survey for the W.E.L. was Mrs. Sue Yarrow, an executive officer of the W.E.L.—and also a campaign director for Alderman Thomson, the A.L.P. candidate for Corinda. So the value of that survey can be judged accordingly.

#### DELAY IN ISSUE OF MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION STICKERS

**Mr. LESTER:** I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Has the member for Rockhampton North drawn to his attention the delays that are occurring in the issue of motor vehicle registration stickers, particularly to country motorists? Will he tell the House what the current situation is regarding these delays?

**Mr. HINZE:** Of course this matter has been drawn to my attention. The honourable member for Rockhampton North went on with a lot of claptrap yesterday—but of course this is what we have come to expect from members of the Opposition, who do not know the facts about anything. To put the honourable member on the right track, I asked the commissioner to prepare a few notes on the present position.

I think it will be appreciated by most members that the problems and instances cited by the honourable member for Rockhampton North are very much the exception rather than the rule, following extensive improvements to the registration system which I have outlined previously to the House.

Honourable members will recall that I recently outlined steps which have been taken to speed up the registration process, and to upgrade it, over the past 12 months, and these have had very marked effects in reducing the delays in processing registrations.

Delays of up to 12 weeks in some instances have been reduced to only a matter of days, and it might interest members to know that, in the case of straight-out registration, renewals sent to the Main Roads Department's Brisbane offices, the turn-around now averages only 48 hours, which is a vast improvement on the situation which prevailed a year ago.

It should be pointed out that the delay in most cases involving country motorists not yet served by regional registration centres could be very substantially reduced if all renewals were posted direct to the department and not to offices of the clerk of the court. One other avenue of delay would be eliminated.

It should also be remembered that motorists themselves very often contribute to the delays in receiving stickers by incorrectly listing their addresses—in many cases not

giving details of a change of address, for example. This contributes greatly to the department's problems in getting out stickers to people quickly. As a matter of interest, some 2,000 letters a week affecting registrations are returned to the department, and in most cases this is because people have failed to notify of changes of address and therefore can't be traced.

The department will be phasing in its new registration programme from the middle of this year, and this involves many changes aimed at speeding up the whole process still further.

A key part of it is the operation of regional registration centres which will handle the whole process for motorists in their area, including the issue of receipts, stickers and plates.

The first four centres will be opened at Redcliffe, Ipswich, the Gold Coast and Toowoomba, and I am looking at bringing in other centres progressively—places such as Cairns and Townsville. Some regional registration centres also will open in the Brisbane metropolitan area, and these—with the four already named (Redcliffe, Ipswich, Gold Coast and Toowoomba) will handle an estimated 70 per cent of the State's total registrations.

**Mr. Moore:** Why don't you write him a letter?

**Mr. HINZE:** The honourable member for Rockhampton North took 10 minutes of the time of this House yesterday in trying to indicate that we are doing nothing about it. I am now telling him the truth.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much noise in the Chamber and in the public gallery. I ask all honourable members and those people in the gallery to be quiet.

**Mr. HINZE:** The whole registration process will be very much improved by the operation of these regional centres and the problems to which the honourable member for Rockhampton North refers should be almost a thing of the past when all centres are fully operational.

As I said previously, the instances referred to by the honourable member are very much the exception rather than the rule. Of course the department is keen to hear of problems such as this as they arise, and I would be happy to consider any details the honourable member might have, and will certainly attempt to iron out the problems quickly.

#### INDUSTRIAL ACTION BY PROFESSIONAL OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

**Mr. YEWDALE:** In directing this question to the Premier I refer to a report that the Professional Officers' Association of Queensland, representing 8,300 officers in the State Public Service, has taken industrial action for the first time in 60 years, and

ask him whether it is a fact that the association has been waiting for 3½ years for the report of a Cabinet-appointed committee on claims relating to hours of duty, time off, travelling time and overtime? When does he expect this eternal inquiry to be completed and the report made available to the association?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** If the honourable member were to stop to think for a few moments, he would be aware that I could not answer his question off the cuff. The report will come forward in due time; the honourable member need not worry.

#### ALLEGED DISPUTE BETWEEN A.L.P. PRESIDENT AND LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

**Mr. LANE:** I ask the Premier: Did he notice a report in yesterday's "Courier-Mail" which seeks to deceive the public into believing that there is a current dispute between the president of the A.L.P. (Mr. Jack Egerton) and the Leader of the Opposition in this House (Mr. Burns) in which Mr. Burns claims some right or freedom of A.L.P. parliamentary members to express their own views and that they will not be dictated to by their party machine? Is he aware if Mr. Burns holds membership in Actors Equity so that he will not encounter further problems at the Trades Hall for his performance in this current pantomime which so clearly ignores the A.L.P. rules requiring from all of its parliamentary members complete subservience to the organisation?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** Yes. I think that the Leader of the Opposition has more than met his match within his own group. It is interesting to see such statements and it is also interesting to see how the Trades and Labor Council dominates the A.L.P. Opposition members in this House. No doubt they are accustomed to it. It is the way they operate. It is their policy. Indeed, it is their whole attitude towards many things in this State. It is not Opposition members but those behind the scenes who are directing them on how they will speak, how they will work and how they will act.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! I have asked honourable members before not to interject whilst a Minister is on his feet. I again ask for the co-operation of the House in that direction.

#### ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT OF BRISBANE TOWN PLAN

**Mr. GREENWOOD:** I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Is it true that section 4 (4) (v) of the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act requires the Brisbane City Council to include in the new town plan an economic assessment of its provisions? Have Alderman Walsh and his colleagues carried out an estimate of the

cost of implementing their plan or have they simply asked the Government for a blank cheque, with the right to increase rates to implement their badly thought-out and expensive schemes?

**Mr. HINZE:** There must be an election on Saturday! It is true that there is a requirement in the Act that an economic assessment be carried out by the Brisbane City Council. I have no knowledge of whether the council has assessed the cost and I am not, of course, in a position to indicate whether the council will try to pass this off on the ratepayers. It is up to the people to decide on Saturday what to do about it.

#### LAND USE PROVISIONS, BRISBANE TOWN PLAN

**Mr. GREENWOOD:** I direct a further question to the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Is it true that, in the fine print of the Brisbane Town Plan sent up by Alderman Walsh and his colleagues, a new column is provided in every zone which allows the council to approve of some land uses without advertising? If implemented, would this reduce the right of the people of Brisbane to appeal against council decisions to the Local Government Court?

**Mr. HINZE:** The honourable member is correct in what he has said. There is a column added that would restrict the rights of the individual. I want to make it very clear to the Brisbane City Council and all other councils in Queensland that there is no way in the world any council will continue to get away with this type of closed government. A similar question was asked recently by the honourable member for Bundaberg when speaking during the debate on either the Clean Waters Act Amendment Bill or the Clean Air Act Amendment Bill. I indicated then that apparently an attempt was being made by the Brisbane City Council to include the column referred to which would remove the people's right to object. It was rejected by my departmental officers and Cabinet and it will be made perfectly clear to all local authorities that they have to stand the scrutiny of the people just as we have to do in this Parliament.

#### SELECTION OF VICTORIAN ATHLETE IN AUSTRALIAN OLYMPIC TEAM

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I ask the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport: Is he aware of the disgraceful actions of the Australian Amateur Athletics Union selection panel dominated by Victorians who selected as a member of the Australian team for the Montreal Olympic Games a Victorian woman runner, Miss Terri Wangman, who is ranked 19th in Australia with a best time of 11.8 seconds for 100 metres, leaving out a Queenslander, Mrs. Barbara Wilson, who came fourth in the Australian titles and is ranked fourth in Australia with a time of 11.1 seconds?

The rotten, unprincipled actions of these selectors have now destroyed Australia's opportunity to win the 4 x 100 metres women's relay. As the Queensland Government spends a good deal of money each year on the encouragement of sport, does the Minister not feel that actions such as this must surely deter young people from competing in sport when they know that no matter what performances they may register they can be disadvantaged by parochial selectors? Is there anything that the Minister can do to right this dreadful wrong?

**Mr. HERBERT:** I wish there were. We have known for years, of course, that Victorians behave as though all north of the Murray live on another planet and have straw growing out of their ears. But we also notice that every time their weather becomes a little more atrocious than usual they come scurrying up here for holidays.

This latest decision is in line with what we in Queensland have had to put up with in other sports and it is completely shocking. I can only assume that they make their selections on a system of 100 points—95 if an athlete lives in Victoria and five on times. There is no basis on which this Victorian could have made the team other than that she is a Victorian, and everyone in the sport knows it. It is a blatant piece of favouritism by selectors who are purely looking at the Victorians so they will have a nice matey little group to take with them to the Olympic Games leaving out Queenslanders who have done very well. I cannot do anything about it, but I am going to urge athletics officials in Queensland to do everything in their power to get the other States to combine with them to get rid of people who are doing a disservice not only to Queensland but to Australia, because in this selection they are going to deprive Australia of what would have been a certain medal at the Montreal Olympics.

#### MR. JACK EGERTON

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I ask the Premier: In view of the obvious lack of business acumen of Mr. Jack Egerton, the President of the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labor Party, as demonstrated by his performance as a director of the Trade Union Building Society, and also at one time as a director of the Great Australian Permanent Building Society, both of which have experienced trouble, would the Premier draw the attention of the Prime Minister to this so that he can review Mr. Egerton's appointment to the board of Qantas before it suffers the same fate?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I hold no grudge against Mr. Egerton. He no doubt tried to do his very best, but he got caught up in the shemuzzle that was created by Mr. Whitlam. That made it very difficult for even Mr. Egerton to carry out his duties in a

way that would bring about good results for his own societies and, indeed, for Qantas. I do not know whether the honourable member should blame him. I always blame Mr. Whitlam for initially creating the conditions which brought this about. As to whether he should stay on the board of Qantas—that is something for the Commonwealth to decide. I understand, according to reports, that it is now losing money.

#### PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO CHINA

**Mr. MARGINSON:** I ask the Premier: In view of his criticism of persons who have visited China in the past, particularly Mr. Whitlam, has his attention been drawn to the proposed visit to China by the present Prime Minister of Australia? In view of this, has the Premier communicated with the Prime Minister or does he propose to communicate with him, again expressing his opposition to people who visit China and particularly to the proposed visit by Mr. Fraser?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I am interested in the honourable member's question, and I think he will be interested in my reply. I raised this question with the Prime Minister personally on my visit to Canberra last Wednesday week. I said to him that it would be much more to the point if he visited the Torres Strait Islands and other parts of the State before going to Red China. I said that he would achieve much more of benefit to the nation by doing this than by going to visit these people. I do not believe that Mr. Whitlam achieved anything for Australia from all these comings and goings at great cost to the Australian nation. Indeed, they cost a mighty sum of money. I know that the Chinese got one bull and a few other things out of it. They also got a big embassy that cost the Australian taxpayers an enormous amount of money. I do not know what Mr. Whitlam got out of it. All Australia got out of it was a lot of cheap goods imported into this country, to the detriment of Australian manufacturers and Australian workers.

#### ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

**Mr. KATTER:** I ask the Premier: In view of certain newspaper editorials demanding that electorates should have equal, or near-equal, enrolments, what representation does he think this would give the people of Gunpowder or Normanton, places which would come into the Flinders electorate as a result of such redistribution—people who live nearly 1,000 miles from their member at Charters Towers?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** When I read newspaper editorials such as the one in "The Courier-Mail" to which the honourable member refers, I feel sorry for the people who write them, because I realise that they have not the slightest understanding of the

problems or of the over-all situation. One has to forgive them because they live in Brisbane and do not know what they are talking about.

In my opinion, most people who do know the facts realise that there has to be a differential in areas and numbers because of isolation. As the honourable member said, two centres in his electorate are about 600 miles apart. There are no regular air services, no charter services or anything else. Although few people live in these areas, they are entitled to representation. The honourable member gives good representation, as do all honourable members on this side of the House. If the representation given by members of the A.L.P. had been as good, many more of them would be in this Chamber today. I favour very strongly the argument that the people who produce so much wealth for the nation by way of export earnings are entitled to fair representation. While the Government remains in office, it will continue to implement the policy initiated by an A.L.P. Government of having a zonal system and redistributions carried out on the existing basis.

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

#### PRIVILEGE

##### INSERTION OF MEMBERS' QUALIFICATIONS IN PARLIAMENTARY RECORDS

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (12.9 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. As members have been informed that all qualifications, whether certified as being correct or not, that members want placed after their names are to be included in parliamentary records, will you inform the House what is the position of those members who refuse to participate in this exercise of slobbering snobbery by refusing to supply the particulars of qualifications and degrees to which they are entitled? My letters, for example, are B.L., M.P., C.U., F.F., E.C.M., F.A.R.T.S. However, not being a snob, I don't want all those letters written after my name.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! No matter of privilege is involved. If the honourable member wishes to obtain that information, he should direct a question to the Premier on it, either upon or without notice.

#### MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

##### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

**Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Energy) (12.10 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Mining Act 1968–1974 in certain particulars."

The proposed Bill has a twofold purpose. Firstly, it corrects certain anomalies that have become apparent in the present Act and, secondly, introduces new sections aimed at controlling illegal mining.

In 1974, the administrative provisions of the Coal Mining Act were brought under the Mining Act, which means that an application for a lease to mine for coal must now be made under that Act. However, there are many granted coal-mining leases and the current Mining Act makes no provision for the holder of such a lease to have it converted to a mining lease. The amendment provides for this, with resultant advantages which I shall detail at a later time.

Provision has been made to ensure that a title held by virtue of a miners' right does not terminate when that particular miners' right expires, provided that a new right is obtained before, or immediately upon, expiration of the current one.

The amending Bill also streamlines the procedure relating to dealings with a mining lease in relation to transfer, assignment, sub-letting, etc. At present the Act provides that all such dealings shall be submitted to the Minister for preliminary approval and then later, when all arrangements are completed, the documents have to be re-submitted for actual approval of the dealings. This procedure is not required in most cases and leads to unnecessary delay and costs. Provision has been made to permit this preliminary approval to be sought in cases where it is desired by the contracting parties. In other cases the documents are submitted for immediate approval.

When the administrative provisions of the Coal Mining Act were brought under the Mining Act, the particular provisions relating to the payment of royalty by the miner to the person entitled to such on privately owned coal were omitted. The Bill corrects this situation and covers any time lapse.

Difficulty has been experienced in controlling illegal mining on the gem-fields, particularly in the Rubyvale-Sapphire area, with the resultant loss of unworked ground to the genuine miner and of possible royalties to the Crown. After investigations it appears that the most effective deterrent would be the threat of impounding machinery being used illegally.

The Bill provides that the warden, or his authorised agent, may, on reasonable grounds, seize any machinery, vehicles, etc., believed to be operating illegally and impound same. The warden is empowered to hold this property for a maximum period of three months, or until the case is heard, whichever is the sooner. He may, however, on good grounds, release the machinery at any time.

At the end of the three-month period, or on determination of the proceedings (if any), whichever first occurs, if the property has not been released, the warden is required to

contact the owner by post or, if necessary, by advertisement, requesting him to collect it. If the owner cannot be found, the property is sold by auction after proper advertisement. The warden is required to make reasonable inquiry as to the whereabouts of the owner and, if he cannot be traced, the proceeds of the sale are paid over to the Public Curator as unclaimed moneys.

The Bill requires the owner of the property to pay all expenses incurred by the warden in the seizure, removal, holding, etc., of the property, but the warden is empowered to waive payment of the whole or part of these expenses if special circumstances exist.

The Crown, warden, police officers or other authorised persons are protected from civil or criminal liability for acts done in good faith in connection with the seizure of the property, but are not protected from the provisions of the Public Service Act if there has been a breach of that Act.

In order to give added strength to the aforementioned provisions, the maximum money penalty for a breach of the Act has been increased from \$2,000 to \$5,000.

Finally, the Bill corrects a simple error and removes reference to coal-mining licences, which no longer exist.

I consider that the proposed amendments are necessary to improve the administration of the Mining Act and I commend the Bill to the Committee.

**Mr. MARGINSON (Wolston) (12.15 p.m.):** The provisions of the Bill as outlined by the Minister appear to me to remedy some technical defects that have been found and to refer to some extent to illegal mining in the gem-fields. About 18 months ago it was my pleasure to visit the gem-field area. At that time I discussed the problems with a number of miners there. I believe that the Queensland Sapphire Producers' Association has indicated that it is in favour of the proposed amendments that relate to their activities. Unfortunately, however, some of those miners are of the opinion that the amendments will be detrimental to the smaller operator; but at this stage they are not prepared to indicate to me their reasons for that opinion.

I was somewhat disappointed to hear that in the amendments to the Bill there was no proposal for the improvement of safety in mines. That is something I will speak about later. However, first I want to refer to some aspects of mining in Queensland and to statements made by the Premier in connection with this industry which is so very important to the State.

Progressively over a number of years—in fact, for a couple of decades—we have come to realise the mineral wealth of Australia. I believe that we in Queensland have recognised that during the last few years particularly. But while we have profound wealth in our minerals, we still see the sharpshooters—the

overseas interests; the multinational corporations—reaping great benefit from the value of Queensland minerals. I would like to see some limit on the shareholding equity that multinational corporations can have in Queensland undertakings.

I do not know whether members are aware of the overseas interests in some of the big companies that operate in Queensland mining. Let me quote, for instance, Central Queensland Coal Associates. It is 85 per cent owned by Utah Development Co. It has mines at Goonyella, Peak Downs and Saraji. The remaining 15 per cent is owned by Mitsubishi Development Company. Thiess—it sounds good; it sounds local! The Thiess-Peabody-Mitsui group has mines at Moura and Kianga. That concern is 58 per cent owned by Peabody Coal Co., 22 per cent by Thiess Holdings Ltd. and 20 per cent by Mitsui & Co. Utah Development Co. is the really big overseas miner. It is 90 per cent owned by Utah International and 10 per cent by Utah Mining Australia Ltd. Utah operates mines at Blackwater and other places in Queensland. MIM Holdings Ltd. has a 100 per cent interest in Bowen Consolidated. Blair Athol Coal Pty. Ltd. is 57 per cent owned by Conzinc Rio Tinto of Australia, 38 per cent by Clutha and 5 per cent by Mines Administration. Then we have Dacon Colliery Pty. Ltd., which has mines at Dacon and Bowen. It is wholly owned by Wood Hall Trust Ltd.

These are the miners of Queensland's valuable coal. During the time that the Whitlam Government was in office, we heard on many occasions how these people were paying well for their coal. We were told how the Queensland Government did want greater Australian equity, but it continued to blame Rex Connor and the Whitlam Labor Government for many of the downfalls that occurred. Let us have a look at one instance and see how sincere it is.

In its Budget last year, the Labor Government imposed a levy of \$6 a tonne on export coal and both the Premier and the Minister for Mines condemned it. They said that it was detrimental to the Queensland mining industry. They said that it was unfair that the Whitlam Government should apply this levy of \$6 a tonne and they threatened to take legal proceedings. But was it very noticeable, after December last when the Fraser Government attained power, that there was no thought of taking legal proceedings? In fact, the statement was made that they were not going to proceed any further with legal action in respect of the \$6 a tonne.

What did we find? On 21 January the Premier said to us, through the newspapers, that he was not, as I thought, claiming that the \$6 should be removed because it was detrimental to Queensland's coal industry and coal exports. No! He made the statement that he wanted this \$6 a tonne. He said that it was our money. There was no talk of having it removed. He said that he wanted

the \$6 a tonne; he wanted \$120,000,000 a year from this levy which he criticised when Whitlam was in power.

I shall turn now to safety in mines. This itself is a very important problem in Queensland. On 31 July 1972 we witnessed the unfortunate spectacle of an explosion in the Box Flat mine in Ipswich when 17 men were killed. An inquest is held into almost every accident in a mine, particularly one involving fatalities. An inquiry was conducted into this disaster and certain recommendations were made concerning it.

On 20 September last an explosion in the Kianga coal-mine killed 13 men. The editorial in "The Courier-Mail" said that as a result of accidents in mines—with 47 deaths in four years—an average of one Queensland coal miner died in a mining accident every month. When innocent people are killed in mines it is referred to as an accident, but when innocent people are killed on the roads, it is referred to more as manslaughter. I leave that thought with the Committee.

Following the Box Flat disaster, Mr. Hall, the warden in Ipswich, held an inquiry. He made certain specific recommendations because he and the inquiry members felt that there should be some improvement in safety in mines. The Minister for Mines is on record as saying that he considered the report to be sound and reasonable. But the Queensland Government has persistently failed to carry out the recommendations of that inquiry, which noted that coal dust is highly explosive and must be treated with, for example, stone dust to render it inert. The inquiry noted that this section of the safety law should be carried out in accordance with up-to-date world-wide knowledge. I am referring now to the Box Flat inquiry: I shall refer to Kianga shortly.

The inquiry also pointed to the New South Wales Coal Mines Regulation Act as a basis for the review of the Queensland Mining Act that the Minister should implement. The inquiry also referred to New South Wales legislation that provides for a safety-in-mines organisation. Such an organisation should be established in Queensland. It would not only carry out research into safety in Queensland mines but would place emphasis on the practical demonstration of matters relating to safety in coal mines.

Some of the findings of the inquiry were—

"That a concise easily read manual covering the cardinal principles of dealing with mine fires be produced and circulated;

"That senior personnel from all branches of the coal-mining industry be brought together in groups to be advised by a fully competent person on the developments in techniques in fire fighting, of new equipment available, of explosive mixtures generated by a fire, of the production of water gas and/or kindred matters."

The inquiry recommends the establishment of underground fire-fighting depots; the establishment of stone dust supplies underground; the availability of a mine plan accurate up to three months; early detection of spontaneous heating in mines; that unventilated dead-ends be avoided where possible; and that the practicability of foam generators as fire-fighting devices be examined.

The panel consisted of Dr. Rowlands, Senior Lecturer in Mining Engineering at the Queensland University; Mr. Norman Munger of B.H.P.; Mr. Digger Murphy, President of the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union; and Mr. Ivor Balks, another B.H.P. mine manager. They made 24 separate recommendations following the Box Flat disaster inquiry. The Government has done nothing at all about them. In the 23 underground mines in Queensland nothing has been done by the Government, the Minister or the department to improve safety as a result of the Box Flat disaster.

I now come to the Kianga disaster, which occurred on 20 September 1975. These are some of the recommendations of that inquiry—

"1. An autonomous Safety in Mines Research Organisation be established urgently in Queensland to examine, amongst other items:

(a) Spontaneous combustion and the determination of proneness of the various coals;"

The coals in the Kianga mine are very susceptible to spontaneous combustion. The recommendations continue—

"(b) Effective ventilation system in pillar extraction in seams liable to spontaneous combustion;

(c) Rapid means of effective sealing;

(d) Early warning systems of detection of heating to include portable gas analysis instruments. Ideally this proposal should ultimately lead to a National Safety in Mines Research Establishment."

That recommendation is exactly the same as a recommendation made following the Box Flat inquiry. The recommendations continue—

"The Organisation should be designed to disseminate information in the form of safety circulars to enable better and more up to date information to be made available as appropriate to the various facets of the mining industry. The Fire Fighting Techniques in various underground mining conditions be established."

The recommendations then dealt with education. They read—

"(2) (a) There is a basic need for all members of the coal mining industry in Queensland to improve their knowledge with regard to the fundamentals of spontaneous combustion and the underground mining problems associated therewith.

The lack of appreciation of these fundamentals obviously contributed to the disaster at Kianga.

(b) That a publication be assembled urgently and distributed to all members of the industry by the Mines Department explaining the hazards and giving guidelines for handling of underground fires and heatings. Queensland Colliery owners association and the Queensland Combined Mining Unions should assist in this task.

(c) That Rescue Station Superintendents be trained to become expert in dealing with mine fires and to be available for consultation with mine managements.

(f) In addition to the training of rescue brigades in underground rescue and salvage operations, there appears to be a need for higher management to be involved in supervising simulated disaster situations. Emergency action charts should be developed not only to alert all the necessary personnel and emergency organisations but extended to include self checking lists of standard requirements and operations."

That is something similar to what was said following the explosion at the Box Flat Mine. The report on the Box Flat disaster suggested that we should introduce new legislation, and having read this recommendation and having read a similar one in the report following the Kianga coal-mine disaster, I thought, when I heard that amendments were to be made to the Mining Act, that this is what the amendments would relate to, something very urgent.

I know some people think that the winning of coal and the exporting of it overseas to create a record and to give us more royalties and more revenue might be more important than the safety of miners, but to me that is not so. Safety is the first priority for the mine workers in this country.

The report on the Kianga disaster was issued on 7 November last year and the authors recommended—

"That Queensland and New South Wales Mining Acts be standardised."

The recommendations continue—

"The Queensland Coal Mining Act be amended to provide for (i) stone dust/water barriers and roadways where it is difficult to maintain compliance with stone dust regulations."

We realise there must be a certain amount of stone dust and the regulations state that it must be used. The recommendations continue—

"But district returns in seams liable to spontaneous combustion should be continually monitored for carbon monoxide or sampled at least daily prior to and during pillar extractions."

Pillar extraction work was being undertaken at the time of the Kianga disaster. What is more, the company had been doing it for some time. I might add that in March 1975 it was given permission to do so for six

months and this unfortunate incident took place in September 1975. I am not going to suggest that it did not have permission to carry on with it—it did—but it is common knowledge amongst miners that in mines of this nature six months is the longest period over which this work is regarded as safe and that after the expiration of six months it is not so safe. The recommendations continue—

“Provision be made in mines liable to spontaneous combustion at the entrance to every pillar section for preparatory seals prior to the commencement of pillar extraction. That preparations to be approved by the District Mines Inspector. The seals need not necessarily be explosion-proof; but should be capable of rapid erection.”

The idea behind this recommendation was that the members of the inquiry wanted these seals to be capable of being erected quickly. In the case of Kianga it was apparent that they felt that it was not done rapidly enough and that they wanted quicker work to be done in the sealing of mines.

I have endeavoured to point out to the Committee the extent of the losses suffered in these disasters and the recommendation of the inquiries that followed. We lost 17 men at Box Flat. There was an inquiry after that disaster and certain recommendations were made to improve mine safety. Then some three years later we had a disastrous explosion at Kianga, and the inquiry into it made recommendations that followed almost word for word the recommendations made by the Box Flat inquiry. Both inquiries recommended that further safety precautions be taken.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (12.35 p.m.): I wish to make a few remarks—pertinent, I hope! succinct, I hope!—on this proposed measure.

At various times over the years, Mr. Hewitt, we have all been amused by what is known as a demagogic approach to particular questions—men who go at a problem with an open mouth instead of an open mind—and that is the position of A.L.P. members today, both in this Chamber and outside it. The moment we talk about any mining, the moment we talk about any big job that might lead to development, progress and prosperity in the State, we immediately hear members of the A.L.P. bawling out about multinational corporations, the emancipation of the proletariat, and excess profit-taking. How they love to roll their tongues around those words and phrases, although they cannot spell them and do not know what they mean.

Let us be quite honest about this, Mr. Hewitt—I have heard the Minister for Mines and Energy mention it now and again, but I am astonished that it is not driven home more deeply and more often—the State of Queensland started out as a mining State. First there was the discovery of the Gympie field; then there was the big fields to the north—Charters Towers, Chillagoe, the

Palmer and all the others. But in those days most of the mines were small and were worked on the one-man one-principal system of pushing a little half-ton truck along the level and then tipping the mullock over the mullock heap. It is true that many go-getters—Bottomley and others—came in from Great Britain and bought a mine that had, shall we say, been worked out but still had the poppet-legs there. They would take a picture of the poppet-legs, publish it in some of the English newspapers and write flamboyant articles about the financial prospects of the mine, and they would get the suckers in overseas.

However, the fact remains that, even in those early days, if it had not been for the money that came into this country from overseas, many mines would not, and could not, have been developed and Queensland would not have received the flying start that it did from its mining industry. So what is all this malarkey today from the honourable member for wherever he comes from—Mr. Marginson—and others?

The Leader of the Opposition is coming into the Chamber now. He has just been up on the platform somewhere trying to bulldoze people into voting for some unfortunate and decrepit A.L.P. candidate in the council elections. He is continually speaking on this subject over the radio, on television and in the Press, telling people about these vicious, predatory multinational organisations that come into Queensland and take all our ore, coal and minerals, stuff their pockets with wealth, and then go back to Park Lane or some place in New York and spend it on foosies, champagne and boiled chicken. How stupid can the A.L.P. be? I wonder who members of the A.L.P. think they are kidding.

Let us look at perhaps one of the greatest mining enterprises in Queensland—Mount Isa Mines. I know something about this, because I was the deputy chairman of the Cloncurry Shire when Mt. Isa was discovered. I was also the deputy chairman of the Cloncurry Shire when we put Mt. Isa township on the map. As I said before, it was the silliest thing we ever did. We got the local member, the Hon. J. Mullan, to run a line 30 miles square on the Barkly side of the Leichhardt River so that that area could be included in the Cloncurry Shire on the other side of the river. If we had had any brains, we would have got him to run a line 30 miles square on the Cloncurry side of the river and put all of Mt. Isa in the Barkly Shire, because it broke the Cloncurry Shire to establish Mt. Isa and to do the various things that have to be done when a town is established.

What has happened at Mt. Isa? I recommend to the honourable member for Boggabilla, or whatever it is—to the honourable member for Gulargambone—that he read “Mines in the Spinifex”, which is the official history of Mount Isa Mines written by a man who wrote also “Paper and Gold”,

the official history of the National Bank. I wonder what members of the A.L.P. do pick up and read when they go to the Parliamentary Library. I suggest that he read "Mines in the Spinifex". If I were Minister for Mines, I would ask the Minister for Education to insist that at least every secondary school student be compelled to read "Mines in the Spinifex" and "Paper and Gold". They are two books that school students could read to learn the basis of this nation's prosperity.

Mount Isa Mines nearly went broke half a dozen times. I was there right up till 1930. As a matter of fact only very recently I was looking at a photograph of a group of distinguished citizens at the opening of the Mt. Isa line, from Duchess to Mt. Isa, in 1929. Without breaking a lance for myself, I would suggest that I would be the best and most dignified looking member of that group. I know what happened at Mt. Isa because I was there right from the very start and saw the way in which the company developed.

As I have said, Mount Isa Mines nearly went broke and closed down as a result of the action of the Chifley Government, which told the company that it was not to produce any more lead, zinc or silver. The company, at great expense and trouble, had to go to the old broken-down copper fields out west, at Kuridala and other places, to bring in the old second-hand copper machinery—the converters and other things that are used to produce copper. The company set them up at Mt. Isa and then went looking for copper in the lodes below instead of mining silver and lead. Mount Isa Mines could have gone broke quite easily. Moreover, it still then faced a tremendous problem with the refractory ores that cost millions of dollars to mine.

I wonder whether any member of the A.L.P. who burbles and gurgles about multinational corporations would dare suggest that at that time there was in Australia money that could readily have been made available to Mount Isa Mines to enable it to do all the work that was done to put the company on its feet.

When the company was flat out and down—shall we say, down and broken—the Guggenheimer crowd from New York came in with their millions of dollars. But even they did not have enough. After they poured millions of dollars into Mount Isa Mines to help make it what it is today they almost went broke. They thought for quite a long time before they decided whether to put any more money into it. Luckily for us they did. It was only with the American money that Mount Isa Mines was able to reach the stage that it has reached today. If it had not been for that American money the whole town would have died and the area would be overrun by spinifex and kangaroos and wallaroos. I do not know that there are emus out there.

Let's put an end to all this bosh and bunkum about multinational corporations and

stress: what has Mount Isa Mines done for North Queensland? That part of the State would be practically nothing without the mine. Indeed it has the great sugar industry and many other primary industries, but without Mount Isa Mines it would be practically nothing. The company provides work, pays big wages and grants tremendous concessions. Does the honourable member for Gulargambone consider the concessions that are granted by Mount Isa Mines to its employees? Where else in Australia is there a company that pays comparable wages and concessions? Again I say that none of these things would have happened if it had not been for the so-called greedy, predatory multinational corporations that came in and saved Mt. Isa from reverting to virgin bush. Let's have an end to all this poppycock and nonsense.

I can remember when the friend of the honourable member for Archerfield—his present bosom friend—

**Mr. Frawley:** Has he got one?

**Mr. AIKENS:** He has one. The Leader of the Opposition is tenuously his friend, but his great friend at present is Jack Egerton. I can remember when he got on the stump and advocated the nationalisation of Mount Isa Mines. What would have happened if the company had been nationalised? It would have closed up overnight. As it is, the company is just struggling along to make a profit with today's high costs and low overseas prices for minerals. What would happen if the Trades and Labor Council took it over? It would be broke in 10 minutes. Yet we hear this great tearful blurb about the overseas multinational corporations coming into Queensland and taking all our minerals and precious black diamonds and stuffing their pockets with the profits.

The Minister for Mines and Energy mentions this now and again, but it should be blasted to the four winds. I can remember when, soon after Whitlam got into power in 1972, the Federal Parliament had a double meeting. I was listening to it. I rarely listen to other politicians talk; nevertheless I listened to it and watched it on TV. Mr. Lynch was put up to answer some very solid arguments. They were casuistic, but they were sophisticated arguments put up by Jim Cairns and one or two others. I thought that Mr. Lynch, the Federal Treasurer, would have hammered the points I intend to make now. Instead of that, he launched into a long, wandering dissertation or diatribe about the evils of socialism, the menace of Russian Communism and a lot of other blah-blah and blurb—which might be quite true—but raised absolutely no argument at all against the specious arguments put up by Dr. Cairns and the honourable member for Gulargambone (Mr. Marginson). All other members of the A.L.P. put up similar arguments. They do not think about it themselves; they just read and remember what comes down from the Trades Hall.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Mr. Marginson represents the electorate of Wolston. I would be grateful if the honourable member would so refer to him.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I was just anticipating you, Mr. Hewitt. I picked up my notes to make certain. It may have been the murderous glint in your eye that warned me, but, nevertheless, I was just picking this up.

What has happened to our great coal deposits? What have we got from them and what have the multinational corporations got from them? They have got a few million dollars in profit, but what have we got? We have got towns, railways, ports, houses, hospitals, schools, wages, businesses and a thriving community wherever there is a coalmine—a community that is well and soundly based on the best principles of modern living and modern technology.

There are quite a lot of young bloods in the National and Liberal Parties today. Whenever they hear talk about multinational corporations, they should never be on the defensive but on the attack. They should tell the people of Queensland all of the things we have got from these mines that have been given or leased to the alleged multinational corporations. If the whole matter is placed on balance it will be found that it is heavily loaded in favour of Queensland and heavily against the multinational corporations.

I have a few remarks to make about Aurukun and Senator Bonner, who blew his top in the Senate the other day after he happened to read some of the remarks I made about him in this Chamber. I have nothing to retract, and nothing to apologise for. If Senator Bonner is the representative of the Aborigines that he claims to be, let him come to Townsville. I want to show him some things that he should do in the interests of his race. I want him to help me and others clean up the dirty, dissolute and disreputable small section of the Aborigines in Townsville who are making our city a hell hole.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member is departing from the Bill.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I am glad that you let me say that much, Mr. Hewitt.

I am sure that the Minister will agree with everything I said. It is about time that members of his party got behind him and told the A.L.P. magsmen and loud-mouth demagogues just how much benefit this State has got from the multinational corporations.

If we had a country with plenty of wealthy people and they were prepared to put their wealth into buying shares or the funding of these companies, by all means I would favour the highest possible Australian equity in every mine in Queensland that we could possibly have. But I am not a political bigot; I am not a political fanatic and, above all, I am not a political fool. I would not tell

the people things that they know are not true, although the honourable member for Gulargambone goes out to tell the people of Ipswich things that they know are untrue.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. LESTER (Belyando) (12.49 p.m.):** I shall confine my remarks on the Bill at this stage to the Anakie gem-fields, which are in my area. It has been my policy to bring to the notice of this Assembly some of the good things and some of the problems that exist on the gem-fields. It is my job to give the people of these fields a voice on the floor of this Chamber. It is very important that we should do all that we can to try to bring stability to the gem-fields, to try to tighten up the administration of claims on the gem-fields and to try to make them a better place for tourists and for the people who live there. The Central Queensland gem-fields cover some 150 square miles. The area is approximately an hour's drive west of Emerald and its main provincial centre is Rockhampton.

Before dealing with the provisions of the Bill as outlined, I think it is important that I give a general rundown on the existing fields. I will then try to relate the provisions to the existing circumstances. Anakie is the railhead for the Central Queensland gem-fields. It has the school for the area, the police station, a hotel, motel units and other amenities for the community. To the west is the Willows gem-field, which is a rather bushy area more suitable for the small miner. In that area are all types of comfortable accommodation. There are cabins where people can stay, particularly visitors from the southern part of Australia. It also has a caravan park and a post office. Furthermore, there is a very good school-bus service. As well, there is an art gallery. Mrs. Nelson is a very good painter who has come from another part of Australia to work and sell her paintings in the area. In the mornings during the winter months, one of the ladies there makes fresh bread rolls which people on the gem-fields can purchase for their dinner.

Moving south we reach the Sapphire-Rubyvale area, which is a centre for the more commercial mining activities. We are trying to get more stability into that area. Other smaller areas that should be mentioned are Tomahawk Creek, Glenelba and a couple of smaller centres nearby.

I repeat that it is very important that we encourage stability in the area. We want to make the living conditions more attractive for the commercial miner and his employees. We want to make the small miner happy. We can only do that if through our legislation we give the area more stability and encourage better amenities. The area has two halls, one at Anakie and one at Rubyvale. The quality of accommodation is continually improving. There are many cabins, a restaurant, caravan parks, and so on.

Those who visit us from all over Australia are assured of obtaining a reasonable standard of accommodation.

Might I add that to make the fields more attractive we need better roads. Improvements are being progressively made. I was very happy about the recent announcement that the road between Anakie and the Capricorn Highway is to be sealed. In addition, a portion of the road past Sapphire is to be bitumen surfaced, and a new stretch of bitumen has just been completed in the Rubyvale area. I hope that it will not be too long before Rubyvale and Sapphire are connected by a bitumen road. Rubyvale will then be connected by a bitumen road all the way to Brisbane and to points south.

To make it easier for people to get to the gem-fields, of course, we need better access roads to the area. Might I put in another plug for the Comet River Bridge? The flooding of that bridge has cost the business people a great deal in lost revenue. If visitors are prevented from reaching the area because the road access is cut, the gem-fields will lose something very special, and part of the quality of life of the area will be lost to the business people.

One attraction of the gem-fields for visitors is the peace and quiet they can enjoy there. I do not want to knock the cities in any way, but some city people like to get away from the busy traffic, the busy streets, the smoke and the hustle and bustle. If they come to The Willows or the Anakie gem-fields for a holiday, they can get away from it all.

Recently the area obtained a school bus so that the children of people on the gem-fields can now attend a high school. It is a daily service between Emerald and the gem-fields. It is hoped that electricity will soon be reticulated in the area. This is of vital concern to the Minister. The Emerald Shire Council has tried to play its part by providing more amenities. A fine restaurant there is run by three ladies who have been written up in "Women's Weekly".

The present claims are the small miners' claims, which are 66 ft. x 66 ft., the special gem claims of three acres and the alluvial claims, none of which are being renewed. We hope that soon we will be able to introduce a special type of gem claim covering two hectares and lasting two years. These claims can be purchased by only one person or one family partnership. If those people put in big machinery and work like mad, they gain no benefit, because after six months they find they have nothing more to do; they have worked the claim out and will not be able to obtain another one as these claims are not transferable.

Operating in the proper way, these claims will be of significance in that they will keep out the big combines that are presently in other parts of Australia. It would be an awful shame if large combines got into the gem-fields and raped the area of its

precious stones. In this way we will keep the gem-fields working for a long time. This seems to be as satisfactory an answer as I can see to this very difficult problem.

Many difficult problems have arisen over the years in the gem-fields. It has driven many a mining warden silly trying to police the claims and keep everything in order. At least we are providing some form of stability, helping the smaller miner and helping the machine miner who has to operate with less machinery. This adds to the character of the field. We hope that we will not have people coming in and raping the field.

As well, the miners have to lodge a bond of \$6,000 before obtaining these leases when they come up. Only a limited number of leases will be available and I understand that they will have to be balloted for. A miner has to make sure that he fills in the field once he has used it or he will not get back his \$6,000. This will overcome the problem of mullock heaps and other things disfiguring the gem-fields and making them unattractive to tourists.

We have had enormous problems with illegal mining in the area. I do not need to tell the Committee that people who come to the area, jump somebody else's claim and take away his wealth are doing the wrong thing. These people have been known to take upwards of \$50,000 a year from somebody else's claim or from Crown land. If, Mr. Hewitt, you and I robbed a bank of \$50,000, we would go to gaol and all hell would be let loose as a result of the serious crime we had committed. Our action would be no different from that of people who steal from other people's claims gems to the value of up to \$50,000 or more. Before now, the maximum fine was a paltry \$2,000. Anybody who knew what he was doing and knew how to obtain these minerals considered that what he was doing was a joke. He simply paid the fine.

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

**Mr. LESTER:** I should like to point out further that those who engage in illegal mining do not pay taxes, rates, or Crown rents. In fact, they make no contribution to the community generally. They are fly-by-night types who come in, rape the area, take out of it all that they can and go away without having paid the taxes that are paid by those who live in the area. Clearly we have to deal severely with them and I fully support the imposition of a maximum fine of \$5,000 for those caught in the act of illegal mining. In fact, I would be quite happy to see an even heavier fine.

Confiscation of machinery is another matter pertinent to the Bill. If people are caught mining illegally, the only real way to stop them is to confiscate their machinery. On those few occasions on which people have been caught illegally mining, the way in which they have paid small fines and continued on their merry way has been something of a

joke. I have been asked, "What about the wives and families of those caught illegally mining?" My reply to that is, "What about the wives and families of those who pay their taxes and do the right thing by the people of the community generally?" Australia supplies approximately 80 per cent of the world's sapphires. We therefore have an important industry and we have to look after it as best we can in order to bring stability and a long-term future to the gem-fields.

If illegal mining is allowed to continue, it will help bring about an early closure of the gem-fields. The thousands of dollars of minerals that illegal miners take away unchecked mean that the life of the fields becomes so much shorter. I am right behind any moves to hit illegal miners heavily and to clean the place up. Once it became known that illegal miners were to be hit hard, the riff-raff would not go to the gem-fields. We do not want them; we want decent people who are prepared to put a little back into the community. A mining inspector with the right to prosecute would be ideally situated at Emerald. I think that such an appointment would be a sound move and one that would be welcomed by the people of the gem-fields.

I might also say that if illegal mining is allowed to continue on a large scale, it will contribute largely to a reduction in the price of gems. It is only natural that if there are more gems for sale, the price will come down. That, too, would not help the long-term stability of the gem-fields. From every angle that one looks at this problem it is seen that illegal miners are completely wrong and that they have to be hit as hard as possible.

I should like to say in conclusion that I admire the people of the gem-fields for the excellent way in which they improvise and make do. There are all sorts of self-help groups operating in the community. There is a pottery group and even a play group for children. Parents get together to teach the little ones how to do various things and to enjoy each other's company. These are excellent projects. I also hope that it will be possible to bring a bush nursing sister, an ambulance centre and many other amenities to the fields. But we will not get these facilities if illegal mining is allowed to continue. In all of these measures we are trying to stabilise the field and do what we can to avoid this practice.

In conclusion, might I invite each and every honourable member and even our good friends in the gallery—the little boys and girls who are listening—to come out to the gem-fields. Those children in the gallery might like to say to their teachers, "It would be a good thing to take an organised bus tour into the Central Highlands and have a look at the gem-fields, the Fairbairn Dam, the Blair-Athol coal-mine and the traction

engine at Clermont." The Central Highlands is a very good area to come to and I openly invite people to come there.

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. LESTER:** Through you, Mr. Hewitt, might I say to the people in the gallery that some other honourable members are a little concerned that they have missed the boat; they are a little concerned at the fact that there were people in the gallery when they were speaking and they did not think to invite them to their areas. Perhaps their areas are not as good as mine and they might not have been game to invite people to their areas. I am only too pleased to invite everyone in the gallery to come and have a look at my area. If they would like to write to me, I will arrange for them to be looked after in the best possible manner.

**Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (2.22 p.m.):** After the commercials and the travelogue approach, it is probably important that we get back to the measure before the Committee. I was particularly interested in the Minister's introductory speech when he referred specifically to the problems of illegal mining in the Rubyvale, Sapphire and Anakie gem-fields. I am pleased that the problem has now been officially recognised, because when I raised the matter back in 1975 it was denied by the relevant Government authority and, I might add, by the honourable member for Belyando. In fact, I remember his coming out in the media and saying that no illegal mining was going on and that what I was saying had no relevance.

**Mr. LESTER:** I rise to a point of order. I did not say that no illegal mining was going on. What I objected to was the barnstorming approach of the honourable member for Rockhampton—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Rockhampton to accept that denial.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I accept it, and in due course I shall send to the honourable member for Belyando a copy of his own statement which validates what I have just said. But I am pleased that official recognition has now been given to this problem. The amendment which has now been proposed vindicates the claims that were made to me and to many other people by many miners in the area at the time, and I am gratified to see that the Minister is taking some action. It would seem that the basis of his plan is to combat this illegal mining with the threat of impounding the mining machinery of the offenders and also of imposing a \$5,000 fine. This might well achieve his aim, but I question whether it is the best possible. We all know that when it comes to deterrents in law, it is not so much the quantum of the fine, it is not so much the penalty that is involved in law, as the effectiveness of enforcement of that law. It is very good that we have on

our Statute Book such provisions, but these provisions will work only if we have people in the area who can enforce them.

I believe if we are going to overcome the problems we need to couple with these measures the position of a full-time resident mining warden on the fields. This has been advocated before, and the honourable member for Belyando has now taken it upon himself to advocate it also. I believe there are good grounds for this. The existing mining warden lives in Clermont, and he has a rather onerous task in looking after the mining fields around his own area, let alone going down to the Blackwater and Anakie regions. So if we are going to overcome the problem let us give consideration to this, because we are dealing with millions of dollars here and I am sure that the expense of having another officer would not be too great. He has an enormous task to supervise and look after these areas. We all know how the bush telegraph works. One can almost bet on where the mining warden will be on a certain day at a particular time.

**Mr. Jensen:** Lester rings them up on the phone.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Oh, that is why his phone bill is something like \$15,000 a year, is it?

**Mr. LESTER:** I rise to a point of order. I object to that remark by the honourable member for Bundaberg and I ask him to withdraw it.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The honourable member for Bundaberg is not on his feet; it was by way of interjection. If the honourable member for Belyando cannot take it, I suggest he leaves the Chamber.

The future of the fields must also be considered. Obviously the Minister is very interested in this because he is aware of the contribution that has been made by the mining industry to the Central Highlands region, to Central Queensland and to Queensland as a whole. Concern is still being expressed that the mining fields at Sapphire and Anakie—

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I am sorry to interrupt the honourable member's speech, but I did not rule on the point of order taken by the honourable member for Belyando. I should have done so. The honourable member for Bundaberg will withdraw the statement that he made about the honourable member for Belyando.

**Mr. Jensen:** I never said the \$15,000.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will withdraw the statement in an unqualified fashion.

**Mr. Jensen:** I withdraw it.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** Perhaps the honourable member for Belyando will tell the Committee exactly what it was. I know it was many thousands of dollars.

**Mr. Jensen** interjected.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Lindsay:** Why are you so nasty so often?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** He started it.

As I said, concern has been expressed about the long-term future of the mining fields. The honourable member for Belyando did make a point about a change that the Government has planned to overcome the problems there. As honourable members are aware, the small miner—the fellow who works on the 66 ft. by 66 ft. area—has been concerned for a long time about the large-scale miners. The explosion that took place back in 1975 really resulted from that. It was more than just illegal mining; it was more than just the problem of threats from certain people in the area; it was principally their concern about the future of their mining industry. I should like to hear in some detail exactly what the Minister has planned, because he gave an indication some time ago that he was concerned about the matter and that he was going to try to do something about it.

I make one other quick point, Mr. Hewitt. The suggestion has been put to me that it is necessary to stabilise the marketing system. I do not know all the ramifications, but I have been told that the Thai buyers have the marketing sewn up. I do not know what the Government of Queensland can do about it because of the export role of the Commonwealth Government; but it seems to me that some role should be played by Government to ensure that there is true competition, because the Thai buyers tend to get the miners in a stranglehold. They determine the prices; they determine the market over all. I should like to hear the Minister's views on that.

**Mr. Lester:** There is a move on to try to stabilise prices.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I have asked because no public clarification has been given. Within the last two weeks, some miners got in touch with me while they were in Rockhampton and asked whether I knew what the Mines Department was planning. I said, "I am sorry, I don't know. When I get the opportunity, I will find out." I thought the introductory stage of this Bill presented a golden opportunity to raise the matter.

**Mr. Lester:** It is a move within the industry.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** It may be within the industry, but I am sure that the Minister will tell us about it.

In looking at the Mining Act, it is important that we look at the total ramifications. I have heard the Minister for Mines and Energy espouse many times in this Chamber the virtues of the mining industry, and I agree with what he said. I have taken it upon myself to go back over figures

showing the value of mining alone to Central Queensland. If one adds to mining refining and smelting, one begins to realise what a huge financial investment has been made.

I have taken out figures from 1965 to 1976 that I wish to record in "Hansard". In the coal-mining industry alone there has been an expenditure of \$204,000,000, with work in progress valued at \$10,000,000 and additional expenditure of \$404,000,000 either announced or approved. There has been an expenditure of \$250,000 on coal research laboratories. Between 1965 and 1976 \$65,500,000 has been spent on coal towns and \$9,500,000 is being spent at the moment. There has been an expenditure of \$9,100,000 on copper, \$1,200,000 on rutile, \$290,000,000 on alumina and \$2,500,000 on salt. We know, too, that it is planned to spend about \$120,000,000 on the alumina works. So a total of about \$770,550,000 has been invested between 1965 and 1976.

We know, too, what the future possibilities are. An intensive study is being carried out of nickel deposits in the Marlborough area north of Rockhampton, and tentative plans are being made for the mining and smelting of this metal. This could entail an expenditure of \$10,000,000. In relation to steel smelting, various international groups and Governments have investigated the possibility of establishing a smelter close to the Central Queensland fields and using ore from Western Australia. The recent Bowen Basin report produced by the Department of Northern Development favours the area of Port Alma and Gladstone. Such an investment would be in terms of something like \$750,000,000. Coking plants are also in the news. In-depth investigations have been made into the possibility of setting up coal-burning plants for the export of coke, and again the area suggested as being the most suitable one is Rockhampton-Gladstone. The future prospects for Central Queensland, based on mining, smelting and refining—leaving aside for the moment the important beef and farming industries—are very exciting.

Central Queensland has the resources to maintain this growth and the resources to meet the expectations of industry. There is, however, one thing it has not got—a viable port in the Rockhampton area. In 1969, on behalf of the Rockhampton Harbour Board, the Rockhampton City Council, the Rockhampton Promotion Bureau and the Rockhampton Chamber of Commerce a case was submitted to this Government in support of the establishment of a new port in the area.

**Mr. Jensen:** Will Mr. Lester speak about that next time?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** He might. The submission was an excellent one, highlighting as it did the real problems that confronted not only the city of Rockhampton and the Rockhampton City Council—as honourable members are no doubt aware, the people of Rockhampton are bound by an Act of Parliament

to pay up to \$90,000 a year from their revenue towards the cost of maintaining the port, and in fact in some instances the figure has increased to approximately \$140,000—but also the waterside workers and the long-term development of both Central Queensland and the State as a whole.

The area could put up a brand-new case simply on the figures that I have referred to in relation to mining investment over the past few years. Such a case underlines the need to do something for Port Alma.

When the report was first submitted, the port of Gladstone handled something like 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 tons of cargo a year. I am told that since then the figure has increased tremendously. New ports have been established in the Mackay region, yet none have been established in the Rockhampton area.

Such a port is needed, firstly because the smelter is being planned for the Port Alma-Gladstone area and secondly because the nickel works are being planned for the same region. On an over-all basis we should be looking at the provision of port facilities for mining investment of the magnitude that I have referred to.

I believe that Port Alma can be resuscitated, and I would ask the Minister to present an argument on this basis to Cabinet, asking that the viability of Port Alma be completely reinvestigated. Over many years millions of dollars have been spent. In answer to questions I have asked in this Chamber and in reply to correspondence, both the Premier and the Deputy Premier have said that they have wiped away millions of dollars of debt and have also spent millions of dollars on trying to do something about Port Alma.

Port Alma is dying, and unless the Minister for Mines and Energy uses his office and the forces at his disposal to try to do something to tie in the port with the mining industry, the port will die. That certainly will not solve the problems confronting the people of Rockhampton, for the debt will remain. Nor will it overcome the problems facing waterside workers who will lose their jobs. It is up to people such as the Minister for Mines and Energy to present such a case. He has the necessary expertise and advisers behind him to present a very strong case in support of the need for another port.

I would hope that as the mining industries in this area expand—and they will; we know the resources are available and we have a policy that will promote the development of mining in the region—an over-all view is taken and something is done for Port Alma. If something is not done specifically for Port Alma, surely it could be done for some other place in the Rockhampton Harbour Board area. I have taken this opportunity to ask the Minister to give consideration to this matter of vital importance to Central Queensland.

**Hon. R. E. CAMM** (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Energy) (2.35 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members from both sides of the Chamber for their contributions to the debate. The honourable member for Wolston, of course, got on to the multinationals that are hated by the Labor Party. He also referred to the recent mine tragedies. These two tragedies affected everyone associated with the mining industry in Queensland. We have done everything possible to obviate a recurrence of such tragedies. We have received reports from the warden's court on the Box Flat and Kiangra disasters. I assure the honourable member that my officers and I will do everything possible to implement the recommendations contained in the reports. We will not spare any expense on sophisticated equipment for research work.

We must realise, however, that as a coal-producing country we are still very small. As yet we do not export 20,000,000 tonnes a year and produce only a little above that figure. America is a country that produces 300,000,000 to 400,000,000 tonnes a year, yet with all the research equipment and technical knowledge available there and its unlimited capacity for expenditure, explosions still occur in its coal-mines. The most recent occurrence in America is proof of that. Similar disasters happen in other countries. Over the past year we have adopted the practice of sending experts to various research centres of the world, be they in America, Germany or Great Britain, so that they may become acquainted with the latest techniques for ensuring safety for mine workers. We leave no stone unturned.

Ironically, when I made a plea for the extension of open-cut mining in Queensland, it was opposed by Evan Phillips, the chairman of the Miners Federation. On the veranda of Parliament House he told me that he would force the Queensland mine operators to go underground. I said, "You start that propaganda to force our miners underground and I will come out and oppose it." So far he has not carried out his threat. For years the Government has been encouraging mine operators to go into open-cut mining, and I have been doing likewise since becoming Minister for Mines. With the techniques available 10 years ago 80 ft. to 100 ft. of overburden was considered the maximum. In Great Britain today coal is being won by open-cut methods at a depth of 700 ft., while in Germany coal is being mined by open-cut methods at 1,300 ft. Of course, the equipment used is different from what we are using here. We are aiming at more open-cut mining and I think that would be one of the answers to explosions in underground mines.

At the second-reading stage I will outline in greater detail what we are doing to carry out the recommendations of the two warden's court hearings.

The honourable member for Wolston also criticised the Treasurer of Queensland

because he said that the \$6 a tonne levy imposed by the Whitlam Government should come to Queensland. Goodness me, can't he be a Queenslander for once in his life? Can't he be a Queenslander instead of pandering to the people in the South who rule the miners' union?

**Mr. Marginson:** You are taking it out of context.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member criticised the Treasurer.

**Mr. Marginson:** I did not.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member said that the Treasurer indicated that this money should come to Queensland. I agreed whole-heartedly with what the Treasurer said.

This tax was imposed by the Federal Labor Government. We claimed that it was an onerous tax to impose on any exported commodity. For instance, if cattle or grain prices rise tomorrow, the opening is there for the Federal Government to impose a tax on the price of cattle or grain (or on anything else that we might export) and keep the additional amount for itself.

What we objected to at that time was that our royalty was fixed at 5 per cent of the value of the coal when loaded onto the railway wagons and that the \$6 Federal Government levy came off the top. We were deprived of the opportunity of levelling 5 per cent royalty on up to \$100,000,000 that the Federal Government was taking away from the State. In other words, that export levy took \$5,000,000 of our royalty revenue. I still claim that such an imposition on the exports of any State is an onerous tax. The States should have the opportunity to levy taxes on a prosperous industry. The Federal Government already has a 50 per cent interest in this industry, in the form of company tax.

I think the honourable member for Townsville South effectively replied to the nonsense spoken by Opposition members about multinationals. He spoke about the development of Queensland's mineral resources, instancing Mt. Isa and other projects within the State. I have made no secret of the fact—and neither has the Government—that we would like as much Australian equity as possible—100 per cent if we could get it—in all of our mining ventures; but time and time again it has been proved that there is not sufficient risk capital in this country to finance the development of our major projects, many of which have cost hundreds of millions of dollars to develop. So let us not talk about the multinationals and the harm they are doing the country. They are doing a tremendous amount of good.

A perusal of their records would show that over the years they have not taken a great deal out of this country, but the benefits they have left behind have been tremendous.

That applies to the history of mining operations throughout Australia. Let me instance B.H.P. At one time it was owned predominantly by overseas interests. So was Mt. Isa, as the honourable member for Townsville South said. Australian shareholding in Mt. Isa is continually increasing. Australians now have a majority holding in B.H.P. As time goes on, that situation will apply to many of the big mining companies. However, if members of the Labor Party continue the practice of criticising those people, they will chase overseas investment away from this country. The Labor Government in Canberra effectively chased investors away. No project was initiated in this State while the Whitlam Government was in power, and I am in a position to say so.

**Mr. Houston:** What rubbish! You know that's complete rubbish!

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member for Bulimba shows how little he knows about the workings of the mining industry in this country.

**Mr. Houston:** I know all about your Government.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller):** Order! I will not tolerate persistent interjections from the honourable member for Bulimba.

**Mr. CAMM:** I thank the honourable member for Townsville South for his contribution. Like those of us on this side of the House, he would like to see a greater Australian equity in our mining projects, but he does realise the importance of investment in this country.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is too much audible conversation on my left.

**Mr. CAMM:** The honourable member for Townsville South indicated that I could have been more vociferous in my advocacy of development of our mineral resources by the multinationals, or overseas companies. I might say that I mention that quite regularly—once a week—but unfortunately my statements are not always published in the Press. However, I present the balanced view that we must attract this type of investment if we are to develop.

I thank the honourable member for Belyando for his contribution about the gem-fields. As a member, he has taken a very keen interest in the mining operations in his electorate, whether they be at the gem-fields or in the vast coal-mining areas that he represents. I thank him most sincerely for his assistance in my attempts to bring some measure of stability to the gem-fields. When he returns home at the week-end, he speaks to the miners personally. He then confers with me and informs me about what the people are thinking and how they feel improvements can be effected to their operations.

I do not know whether the member for Rockhampton was reported correctly or not in the Press after his visit to the gem-fields. However, what was attributed to him in the Press did a tremendous amount of damage to the Central Queensland gem-fields.

**Mr. Wright:** They said that.

**Mr. CAMM:** Yes, they did say it, and I realised it was right. That was a community in which we were bringing about some measure of stability. There were three sections—the hand miners, the machine operators and the tourists. We were trying to bring the three sections together, thus introducing some stability, and attempting to have better roads and facilities provided by the council. We were working in collaboration with the Emerald Shire Council and we were giving something. But we had to go back again after the outburst following what the honourable member was reported in the Press as having said. I do not know what he said but he did not do himself a great deal of credit.

The honourable member for Rockhampton referred to illegal mining. I would say it applies mainly to machine operators. He implied that and I think it is quite correct. The major illegal mining that we are endeavouring to suppress has only come about following the introduction of heavy machinery that can be transported at very short notice, even at night-time. Large quantities of wash can be taken away.

The honourable member advocated a permanent mining warden in the area. It is a good thought, but it is not the answer to this problem. A mining warden administers the principles of the Mining Act, but the mines inspectors are the men who do a great deal of work. They visit this area quite regularly. Officers from our own department in Brisbane go up there and quietly go around the gem-fields to assess the position and what is going on. It is on the advice of these officers that we compile this type of legislation. The establishment of a permanent warden in that area is not the answer. Possibly there should be more policing by mines inspectors. I assure the honourable member that that is done quite regularly. As a result of their findings I am introducing this legislation.

It quite intrigued me to hear the honourable member for Rockhampton speak about the amount of money that has been invested in his area between 1965 and 1976. That just covers the period that I have been in charge of the Mines Department.

**Mr. Wright:** I give you credit.

**Mr. CAMM:** Why doesn't the honourable member go further and say that he must give absolute credit to the multinationals who came into his area and undertook this development? Who else would have built the alumina plant; who else would have opened the Central Queensland coal-fields—but the

multinationals whom the honourable member's party hates and continues to criticise! Then he asks me to try to influence Cabinet so that Port Alma facilities can be upgraded and kept going.

**Mr. Aikens:** They do not mind what they get from the multinational Arabs and Iraqis.

**Mr. CAMM:** That is right. Unfortunately, it was not forthcoming. They tried hard enough to get it, I believe, but they were not successful.

The multinationals were prepared to risk their money in our mining ventures but were being chased away by the criticism emanating from the party to which the honourable member for Rockhampton belongs. Now he stands up and gives a great deal of credit for the money that is being spent. He should go further and give credit where credit is due.

I can give him a specific instance that might have resulted in a tremendous development in Central Queensland and Port Alma. A consortium of German industrial companies and Italian steel mills was formed in the E.E.C. They established an office in Brisbane. Their representative was at the opening of Goonyella. We had a long discussion there about the possibility of their establishing a tremendous cokeworks in Central Queensland at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. They had perfected a process so that manufactured coke would be transported in bulk to Germany, Italy or wherever they desired it to go. We got so far in our discussions.

When I was visiting Great Britain at one time I flew to Dusseldorf for a couple of days, and Essen. I spoke to the principals of the company. They agreed to come out and they did. The president or the vice-president came to Brisbane. We were getting down to details and I said, "Before you go any further, I think it would be advisable for you to go down to Canberra. We have a new Federal Government now. Find out whether you would be allowed to come into Australia." He said, "We don't mind if we have 40 per cent equity in this project. The only conditions that we would impose are that our technical officers and technicians be allowed to stay for a period to train the Australian workers in this process of developing coke that we have perfected." I said, "That is all right, but you had still better go to Canberra." At half past 7 the next morning I was rung by a rather surprised and disappointed man who said that he was informed that neither he nor his money was welcome in Australia. He closed the office in Brisbane and went home.

The Prime Minister visited Europe soon after. He said there, "Those conditions have been relaxed. We may be able to allow more overseas money in for developmental purposes." The second in charge—the one immediately beneath the one to whom I have referred—came out soon after and said to me,

"There's a change of heart in Canberra. Will you reconsider this proposal?" I said, "There's no need for us to reconsider it. We have the coal held in our departmental reserves for such an industry and if you are prepared to finance it you can have that coal. But you go back to Canberra and find out if the position has really changed." He went to Canberra and telephoned me to tell me the same story—conditions had not changed and neither he nor his money was welcome in Australia.

There is a booklet now distributed in the E.E.C. countries in which it is stated that neither that organisation nor its money is welcome in Australia, and that consortium has established a huge cokeworks in Canada. Coal is available in that country but transport costs favoured Australia. The consortium was chased from this country by the policies of the very party to which Opposition members belong, despite the praise of those policies by the honourable member for Rockhampton.

**Mr. Houston:** How many new companies have come in since?

**Mr. CAMM:** There have not been any new companies allowed in since then.

**Mr. Houston:** In three months.

**Mr. CAMM:** I correct that statement; there has been one to come in. An agreement has been finalised for development at Aurukun, as the honourable member may have noticed.

**Mr. Houston:** Against the Prime Minister.

**Mr. CAMM:** We will see.

**Mr. Houston:** You have no export licence.

**Mr. CAMM:** We will see in the near future if the rot that set in when the Whitlam Government was in power has been cleared out in Canberra to enable other multinationals to come in. I had a visit last week from two industrialists from Great Britain who desire to open up a coalfield in Queensland. I had a visit only this week from the principals of a company that is endeavouring to explore for uranium in the Georgetown area. Overseas companies are now developing a greater interest in investing their funds in Australia and assisting us in the development of our natural resources.

Let us get away from all the talk about multinational companies and what they are doing to our country. We the Queensland people control the minerals in this State and we allow companies to come in and mine under our conditions. The conditions of mining leases are prescribed by the Mining Act. The Federal Government has control over the finance that companies bring in and how they raise it and the ultimate control of the export of those resources. So do we not exercise enough control over these companies to make sure that we get our share of the profits from any major undertaking? The benefits, such as tax and employment opportunities, that flow from the establishment of such enterprises far outweigh the fact that the finance for them might come from overseas.

I shall reserve other comments on the contributions made until the second reading of the Bill.

Motion (Mr. Camm) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

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

### INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs) (2.56 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961–1975 in certain particulars.”

Honourable members will concur that there should be ordered procedures for legal initiatives under any Act. I would suggest—given acceptance of the growing importance of the industrial sector—that the Committee therefore will welcome constructive amendments designed to strengthen the standing of registered unions. To do otherwise would be to endorse fragmentation, create unnecessary confusion and perhaps delay or obstruct industrial justice.

So the purpose of amending section 29 is to prevent unregistered unions from initiating proceedings to vary industrial awards. One of the privileges flowing from a union's registration is the right to appear before the Industrial Commission in all matters affecting members of that union. In other words, a registered industrial union is the official spokesman for all employees in the calling and is expected to present considered argument to the commission on award matters.

The law, as it now stands, says among other things that a registered union may initiate proceedings before the commission to have an award made. Individuals other than the registered union have the legal right to initiate proceedings before the commission to vary the award. However, there have been instances of proceedings being initiated by officials of unregistered unions purporting to be acting as individuals.

This practice circumvents the intention of the Act in that it gives an unregistered association—through subterfuge—the privileges of a registered industrial union without accepting the obligations imposed by the Act. These obligations are many and onerous. For example, a registered union of employees must submit its constitution and rules to the registrar for approval. It must submit each year to the registrar for examination a financial statement and balance sheet showing the distribution of its income. All

information on a registered union's financial situation must be made available to a member on demand. It must furnish a list of the callings under which its members are employed and the names and addresses of members. It must satisfy the registrar that its rules are not contrary to law and do not impose unreasonable conditions on members. It must also satisfy the registrar that its rules provide for secret ballots at elections of officers and meet all other requirements coming within the ambit of its registration.

The practice to which I referred also detracts from the ordered functioning of industrial relations and encourages other splinter groups to seek to embarrass a registered union. Employers, of course, could be faced with competing demands. Nevertheless, I stress again that the amendment does not impinge upon the long-standing right of individuals to seek variation to awards or in any other way impede their access to the Industrial Commission.

Clause 3, which amends section 32, is ancillary to clause 2 in that it refers to the reopening of proceedings and the subsequent variation of any decision given in those proceedings. It is necessary to give effect to the amendment set out in clause 2 of the Bill.

Clause 4 inserts a new section, 60A, to stop the growing practice of union officials inducing persons self-employed or who are partners in a business to become members of industrial unions of employees. These persons are normally employers within the meaning of the Act. It is my understanding that persons self-employed or fewer in number than four in partnership are not entitled to become members of an industrial union of employees. The amendment provides for the return to such person of all moneys collected in somewhat dubious fashion as subscriptions to the union. These persons cannot expect to receive any of the normal benefits of union membership. They are not subject to any industrial awards. They are not entitled to normal benefits. They logically cannot expect to aspire to any office within the union.

I commend the amendments to the Committee.

**Mr. YEWDAL** (Rockhampton North) (3.1 p.m.): The Minister has explained to the committee the amendments that it is proposed to make to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I was amazed at the cloaked and very subtle manner in which the Minister dealt with the amendments in his very short introductory speech. It is quite obvious to me that he has been subject to all sorts of pressures from people outside Parliament to continue his attack on a certain section of the trade union movement in Queensland, and I have no hesitation in saying that the proposed legislation is a continuation of that attack on an organisation that predominantly caters for

members of the fire-fighting service in Queensland. I say "predominantly" deliberately, because it is obvious to me that some 800 people have decided, virtually of their own volition, to join an organisation that caters for the protection of the community in Queensland. That organisation is the United Firefighters' Union, and I say that quite clearly and definitely. Not only does it do that in this State; it also does it in other States and at all airports—in fact, generally throughout Australia.

In an earlier session of this Parliament, legislation was brought before honourable members and debated quite hotly. One particular aspect of that legislation that was hotly debated related to what the Minister is attempting to do in a very subtle way in the proposed amendments. He has not taken the trouble to point out, specify or indicate whether he is referring to any particular section of the community. He has simply said that a certain provision is included.

Over many years, to my mind, the United Firefighters' Union has functioned in relative industrial peace within the State and also within the Commonwealth of Australia. Its members have agreed to the terms and conditions of their employment and carried out their duties in a very efficient and competent manner, and I believe that they will continue to do so. It seems to me that all the Minister is saying—and I can only interpret it in this way until he makes some further elaboration of what is behind the amendment—is that he is going to force about 800 individuals to present themselves personally before the commission to argue what they believe are reasonable and fair conditions to apply to their industry. If that is the case—and I am open to correction—what ridiculous lengths the Government is prepared to go to to endeavour to frustrate a group of people who give very fine service to the community.

In my opinion, the Government has been pressured for many years by all sorts of people outside this Chamber. I will not go into detail and individualise, but it is obvious that there are many people outside who have been doing that. Although the Minister has indicated publicly, both in this Chamber and outside it, on many occasions that he is available, that he is accessible, and that he is prepared to talk to the trade union movement about its problems—in fact, that he is prepared to be the white-haired boy in his portfolio in the industrial field in Queensland—I believe that he is being strongly pressured from within his department and from outside it. He has got to his feet today with the specific purpose of denying the rights of members of a bona fide organisation in this State, an organisation that nobody would suggest has not given the best possible fire-fighting service in Queensland. I have never heard one word of criticism about their service, their ability and their competency.

The Minister has introduced this measure for the specific purpose of covering his tracks when, in bringing forward the previous

legislation, he ducked his responsibility to introduce such a measure. He is not concerned with small groups or splinter groups throughout the State—and there are not many of them. Rather has he used this deceitful method of covering his tracks. I will be interested to hear what he and other members say at the second-reading stage.

**Mr. LANE (Merthyr)** (3.6 p.m.): I am pleased to have the opportunity of supporting the Minister in his proposal to amend the Act in certain respects. As a member of his industrial relations committee, I wish to comment on certain of the amendments brought forward.

The first proposal, that of requiring any group of persons who seek leave to appear before the Industrial Commission to be registered with the commission, is not an unreasonable one. After all, all other people in the community who seek to appear before the commission are required to be registered with it. No employer organisation can appear before the commission unless it is a registered union of employers. And this is properly so. In such a delicate area of administration it is necessary that the commission be able to recognise those people who appear before it for what they are. It should be able to recognise the validity of their appearance on behalf of a group or otherwise.

The big question in relation to this first proposal is: who may initiate proceedings before the Industrial Commission? The Minister says—and he has the support of the Government parties—that only those persons who have gone through the procedures of seeking registration and have been registered by the commission shall have the right to so appear. This requirement effectively cuts out what have been described in other areas as front organisations.

It is not surprising to hear the spokesman for the Left Wing of the Labor movement in this Assembly, the honourable member for Rockhampton North, speak as he did. I am sure that he wishes to take full credit for his remarks, because he is beholden to the Left Wing of the trade union movement. In fact, he would not be in this place if it were not for the support given to him by the militants, in both the industrial and the political spheres. No doubt during the course of this debate the honourable member for Rockhampton North, by his comments, will ensure his endorsement by the Labor Party at the next election. As he was speaking I could not help thinking that he sounded like one of the hacks who address stop-work meetings of waterside workers.

To get back to the proposals introduced by the Minister—it is quite proper to require persons who wish to appear before the commission to prove their validity at some prior time. They must show that they have a valid claim to appear on behalf of a group of people who have an interest in the

industrial matter in dispute before the commission. They should prove that their organisation operates under a set of rules that are democratic, that their officials are registered under rules that require democratic overseeing by someone and that they speak on behalf of some legitimate people. That is what it is all about; that is all that the Minister proposes. In order to have some sort of orderliness in industry they must be able to claim that they have accepted a commission on behalf of people who are reasonably employed within the same calling, and that there is one major spokesman at least within that calling.

**Mr. Yewdale** interjected.

**Mr. LANE:** I do not know to whom the honourable member for Rockhampton North is referring. I should think that he and his colleagues would accept the principle. I wonder what would happen if I took four of my colleagues onto the wharf at Rockhampton and tried to get work there.

**Mr. Houston:** You would not know how to work there.

**Mr. LANE:** That is a much more clever remark than the one that the honourable member's colleague was about to make.

I can well imagine how much standing we would have in that work situation. If we went to the commission and claimed that we were the spokesmen for the Waterside Workers' Federation, I am sure that we could be put out of court quite easily. The principle is the same.

If the honourable member for Rockhampton North were honest with us and himself, he would accept the principle. However, being beholden to those people who ensure his seat in this place, he is unable to do that. No doubt the honourable member will speak again in this debate. I should like to hear him expand on the principle of one voice speaking before the commission on behalf of a group of people employed in the same calling.

**Mr. Houston:** Don't you agree—

**Mr. LANE:** I am not interested in the tangents introduced by the greyhound expert from Bulimba, who takes only a superficial interest in industrial affairs. He is quite a good actor in this place and is not bad at making flamboyant statements to get Press coverage. But he has no real depth of interest in industry. On many occasions I have heard him condemn industrial development in the same way as he attacks industrial affairs and industrial relations.

We want someone to appear before the commission in the name of a group of people who are reasonably drawn together in a democratic manner under a set of rules that are reasonably acceptable in our understanding of democracy. The principle is based on a fair-dinkum Australian understanding of how people should elect their spokesmen.

If we accept the fair-dinkum Australian approach we must support the Minister's proposal. If, on the other hand, some honourable members do not, but seek to maintain groups that have militant political aims designed to gain a short-time militant purpose, they will support what the honourable member for Rockhampton North said today.

The other proposal in the Bill makes it an offence for anyone to engage in the practice of inducing persons who are self-employed or partners in a business to become members of an industrial union of employees against their will. Anyone doing that shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty. I say "against their will" because that eliminates the voluntary concept. We maintain freedom of choice in our approach to this. I hope that the penalty will be enforced.

We all know that this has been brought about primarily by the actions of the officials of the Transport Workers' Union, particularly in the Brisbane area. Honourable members—and indeed the public generally—are well aware that the greatest bully boys and stand-over people in the industrial movement in Brisbane are the officials of the Transport Workers' Union. They seek to intimidate and apply threats and pressure to their members in order to build themselves up into a huge bureaucracy—a great power structure within the Labor movement—for whatever lurks, perks and benefits they can clothe themselves with.

The amendment seeks to include in the Act an offence of inducing. That will not be quite as harsh as the offence that already exists under the Queensland Criminal Code. I speak of section 534. I invite honourable members opposite, particularly Labor's industrial experts, to read that section. Probably they have never bothered with it—and I think it is a great pity that they have not.

**Mr. Yewdale:** You never bothered with it when you were a demon.

**Mr. LANE:** When the honourable member for Rockhampton North was stamping around the wharves of Rockhampton, standing over his fellows, he should have been brought to task under section 534 of the Criminal Code, just as I think the honourable member for Archerfield should have been dealt with when he was coming the bounce with the cleaners of this town as an organiser for the Miscellaneous Workers' Union.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I rise to a point of order. I find the honourable member's remarks offensive, particularly as he was known in the Police Force as "Mr. 10 per cent."

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): Order! Is the honourable member asking for a withdrawal?

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am asking for a withdrawal from "Mr. 10 per cent."

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Merthyr to withdraw that remark.

**Mr. LANE:** Of course, Mr. Miller. The comment I would like to make—and I am sure that no-one will find it offensive—is that all trade union officials (including those of the Waterside Workers' Federation and the Miscellaneous Workers' Union, who are so well represented here today by the very vocal members opposite) should have a copy of section 534 of the Criminal Code of Queensland posted to them so that they can nail it on the wall in their union offices, because the day may yet come when they find themselves prosecuted under that section.

**Mr. Houston:** Why? They haven't broken the law yet.

**Mr. LANE:** Obviously Labor members have never read it. The honourable member for Bulimba says, "Why?" He asks what it is all about. "What's this funny thing all about?", he says. Here it is. It is section 534 of the Criminal Code of Queensland. I suggest that Opposition members go out to the library and have a look at it. In the meantime, if they can follow it, I will read it to them.

"534. **Intimidation of Workmen and Employers.** Any person who—

(2) . . . uses threats or intimidation of any kind to another . . .

(c) for the purpose of inducing any person to belong to any club or association, or to contribute to any common fund, or to pay any fine or penalty; or

(e) on account of any person not having complied, or refusing to comply, with any rules, orders, resolutions, or regulations, made or pretended to be made by any person, or persons, or club, or association . . . or to regulate the mode of carrying on, any manufacture, trade, or business, or the management thereof

. . .  
is guilty of an offence, and is liable on summary conviction to imprisonment with hard labour for three months."

That section, I think, has been in the Criminal Code for many years. It has probably been there since the turn of the century.

I am disappointed that the section has never been enforced. If it had, perhaps, the offence that the Minister and his committee and Government members seek to put into the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act today would be quite unnecessary. That section in the Criminal Code makes it an offence for Arch Bevis to send his henchmen up to the railway yards, as he has been doing, to block owner-drivers from taking their trucks into the railway yards and having them unloaded by trade unionists or to block their trucks from being unloaded in the

railway yards unless those owner-drivers—those small businessmen—succumb to the compulsion to pay a due—a blackmail; a pay-off—to the Transport Workers' Union by way of a union fee.

In many cases a union fee includes a political levy. Both the fee and the levy are abhorrent to many small businessmen. It is the stand-over tactics of the Transport Workers' Union, Arch Bevis and his henchmen, as well as this blackmail that has been employed, that have made it necessary for this principle to be inserted in the legislation. The Minister deserves full commendation for including it. This mafia tactic that is employed by the Transport Workers' Union and endorsed by the trade union officials on the opposite side of this Chamber is the reason that it is necessary for this offence to be placed into the legislation today.

Small businessmen or individuals who run a one-man business with a small truck—for instance, carrying parcels to the Roma Street Railway Yards or collecting groceries from Tickles—should have the right and opportunity to go there on business and have their trucks loaded or unloaded. That is all that we require. It is a great indictment of the Labor movement that this principle has to be inserted in the legislation to guarantee the basic freedoms and rights of people who want to ply their trade in a reasonable way. I should like to hear an explanation from some of the guys opposite.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. LANE:** I am not interested in the propagandist from Bulimba. He has had his day, anyway. I should like to hear it from one of the industrial experts—the honourable member for Rockhampton North or the honourable member for Archerfield.

I should like to hear from them what justification there is for the Transport Workers' Union to stand over self-employed truck drivers at Roma Street Railway Yards and at many of the warehouses in the city and insist that they pay union dues as employees—which they are not—before they are allowed to load or unload their vehicles. That is a clear and precise proposition and I should like to hear a clear and unequivocal answer from members opposite. Then we will see where they stand in terms of personal liberty.

We will show the Labor Party up for exactly what it is—the party of intimidation; the party of blackmail; the party of the old mafia tactic; and the party of the big syndicate operation at the top end of Edward Street. We will show the degree of ruthlessness that these trade union officials employ in their everyday practices against the individual, the average family man who is trying to buy a home and attain a reasonable standard of living so that his wife can go to the shop and buy the family groceries and so that he can afford school uniforms

for his children—the basic necessities of life. These are the things we stand for on this side of the Chamber. These are the things that a man is entitled to earn by his own initiative.

If he can afford a truck and sets himself up in the carrying business, meets the normal safety standards and obeys the reasonable rules laid down for transport, why shouldn't he be allowed to go to the Roma Street Railway Yards—A Government establishment—and deliver goods or collect them? Why can't he conduct a small business in this way? Why is the Labor Party and the Labor movement opposed to the individual, the small businessman, the truck owner-driver? Why do they act so ruthlessly?

(Time expired.)

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER** (Archerfield) (3.24 p.m.): I agree with the remarks of my colleague the honourable member for Rockhampton when he accused the Minister of introducing this Bill in a stealthy and underhand manner. The Minister is a past master at doing this. I remember other legislation that he has introduced over the years. I recall quite vividly some two years ago when he introduced what appeared on the surface to be an innocuous amendment to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to enable a charitable home in Rockhampton to become exempt from award provisions. We on this side of the Chamber were too smart and alert and on the second reading we did him over in no uncertain manner.

I also agree with my colleague that the Bill has been introduced solely to kill off the United Firefighters' Union at the behest of some businessmen outside this Chamber and insurance companies that support fire brigades.

**Mr. Lane:** What about the Transport Workers' Union?

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** This has nothing to do with the Transport Workers' Union.

The Minister should face up to the industrial facts of life in this State. The United Firefighters' Union is a reality and it is here to stay. I think you would agree with me, Mr. Miller—I know the Minister would if he were honest—that the members of the United Firefighters' Union are quite determined not to take out membership of the Australian Workers' Union.

**Mr. Jensen:** Would you take them into the Miscellaneous Workers' Union?

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** No. I think the United Firefighters' Union is quite capable of looking after their affairs. It has been doing it very well for the past 20 years.

The decision to refuse registration to the United Firefighters' Union borders on industrial stupidity. This union has proved its credentials over the years. Its first approach to the Industrial Commission was a couple of

decades ago when its membership was approximately 400; it now stands at almost 1,000. That shows how the union has grown and progressed since that time. Its members are, as I have said, quite adamant that they will not become members of the A.W.U. I have no quarrel with the A.W.U.—I think it is a good union that looks after the interests of its members quite effectively—but it is a cold, hard fact of life that the United Firefighters' Union wants nothing to do with it.

The United Firefighters' Union has proved its credentials over the past 20 years and in that time it has gone from strength to strength.

**Mr. Frawley:** Of course it has.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I agree with the honourable member for Murrumba. It is not often that I agree with him, but he has shown a little intelligence and balance on this occasion.

Members of the United Firefighters' Union are not going to abide by this legislation. They prefer membership of their own union to that of the A.W.U. I think it will be rather ludicrous if the Bill becomes law, because it will enable each individual member of a union to approach the Industrial Commission to have his or her award varied. The legislation can only result in further confrontation between members of the U.F.U. and the A.W.U. It will result in needless industrial strife.

If individual employees are given the right to make their own applications to the Industrial Commission, this will only serve to undermine the legislative role of the trade union movement and take responsibility from the hands of that movement. The trade union movement, as we all know, is responsible at law for its actions. The honourable member for Merthyr was most vocal a few moments ago in his trenchant criticism of some trade unions. Instead of reading criminal law, he should make himself au fait with the industrial laws of this State. If he reads them thoroughly, he will agree with me that all trade unions are responsible at law for their actions.

I say that the Government has double standards. On the one hand, the Government legislates to make unions responsible for their industrial actions. It then gives individual employees the right to usurp the fundamental right of the trade union movement. The Minister must have a vested interest in placing the United Firefighters' Union in such a tenuous position. The amendment will only lead to further disruption in such a vital industry. Most unions act in a responsible manner.

I was interested to hear the honourable member for Merthyr make a trenchant attack on some trade unions. So far as I am concerned, anybody who carries out the work of a union, or a calling covered by it, has a moral obligation to take out a union ticket and become a member. Those who do not

are bludging on other trade union members. They are allowing trade unions to go to industrial tribunals to obtain better wages and conditions but they are not prepared to pay their way. These people are industrial bludgers.

**Mr. Porter:** No, they're not.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am not wrong. As a matter of fact, the ageing outlaw, the Liberal maverick from Toowong, has no knowledge of industrial law. He has never been a member of a trade union and I will be interested to hear his remarks on the Bill. I will also be interested to hear the Minister in reply. I can assure him that the Opposition will peruse the Bill in detail and have more to say during the second-reading stage.

**Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba) (3.30 p.m.):** I find that reluctantly I cannot support the Bill in its entirety. I can certainly support the clause which states that it will be an offence for people to induce anyone to join a union, but I certainly cannot support the other clause dealing with unregistered unions. I believe in justice for all.

**Mr. Jensen:** If you were in the U.F.U. you would be sitting down saying nothing.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I would not. I would be backing up the United Firefighters' Union because I believe in it.

**Mr. Jensen:** You do not believe anything of the sort.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I am not taking the Opposition side here; I am going to run an opposition in the Government benches. Do not think I am siding with anybody in the Australian Labor Party on this; I am making my own opposition to it. I think it is just another attempt by Edgar Williams and the Australian Workers' Union to break up the United Fire Fighters' Union, whose members do not want to join the A.W.U. I think the Minister is genuine. I think he has listened to everybody, but I think he has been misled on this occasion. Only recently the A.W.U. sent men down into Kemp Place in an endeavour to stir up trouble. All they want to do is create a bad impression of the U.F.U. in the eyes of the public, and they are not doing a bad job at present with their rotten, filthy, underhand, pinpricking tactics. I am not frightened to stand in my place and tell the truth about a few of them. Before I finish I am going to tell honourable members about some more rotten tactics that have gone on in an attempt to blacken the reputation of the U.F.U.

**An Honourable Member** interjected.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** He could be, but at least this is a free country now since we got rid of that big lout Whitlam and his cohorts down south.

I am going to say what I want to say. Over 800 people are members of the U.F.U.

and I state here and now that among them are paid-up members of the National Party, the Liberal Party, the Australian Labor Party and the Democratic Labor Party, because I know them. The U.F.U. embraces members of every political party.

**Mr. Jensen:** You would know the D.L.P. section well.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I know the D.L.P. section, yes.

I also know the National Party members and I also know members who are members of the A.L.P. I say now they are good blokes. I have no hesitation in saying that. The A.W.U. claims that over half the firemen in Queensland are members of that union, but that is a pack of lies. Edgar Williams is a straight-out liar when he says that half the firemen in Queensland are members of the A.W.U., and I throw that back into his bearded face. Who the hell does he think he is? He is behind this Bill—I am not stupid—and some of the officers of the Minister's department are in cahoots with him. I am not going to name them now. If I were not a member of this Government, I would really cause some trouble over this Bill. There has been plenty of pressure brought to bear on the Industrial Commission by the A.W.U. I do not believe that the Industrial Commission is free from interference. I know it is supposed to be, but it has been stood over by the A.W.U., a union with 53,000 members—

**Mr. Jensen:** The biggest union in Queensland.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of course it is the biggest union in Queensland; I am not denying that. Why the hell do they want to be dogs in the manger and try to take over a lousy 800 people? Why should these people be forced into the A.W.U.? While I am on the subject—just listen to this—the fire chief of the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade, a fellow called Huckbody, is standing for the Pine Rivers Shire Council this Saturday, and if the people out there have any brains at all he will not get a vote. When probationers come into the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade he stands over them and tries to make them sign a little form which states that they will join the A.W.U. and will remain members. I would have had a copy of the form here today to table if it were not for the fact that one of them who promised to deliver a copy of it to me failed to do so. I do not have it but I will get it before the Bill is passed. This man tries to make them sign this little form—I will have a photostat copy very shortly because I have asked for one—to say that they will remain members of the union. He should be charged under section 534 of the Criminal Code because he is trying to stand over people. I would like to know whether he is an A.W.U. organiser in his spare time, or is he getting a kickback for this?

**Mr. Houston:** Who is that?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The fire chief of the Pine Rivers Fire Brigade, Huckbody. He should be charged under section 534 of the Criminal Code for trying to stand over the probationers.

**Mr. Ahern:** You sound like you rather like him.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I do not like him for practising these dirty, standover tactics. I will not stand for any standover tactics anywhere. A fire chief in another town recently did much the same thing. I have forgotten the name of the town, but I will have it before the second-reading stage. The Bill came on unexpectedly. I did not think it would be coming on today; I thought it would be coming on a bit later in the session. I have not got all my facts assembled, but I will certainly have them before the second-reading debate.

In another town recently the fire chief told six firemen that either they signed forms saying that they would join the A.W.U. or he could dismiss them and replace them with six other men. That is a rotten thing to try to do to somebody. This is supposed to be a free country; yet we allow some fire chiefs to stand over people like that.

Look what happened recently. Nobody gives a damn. The lives and property of nearly 1,000,000 people in Brisbane have become almost a side issue in the A.W.U.'s drive to recruit firemen. They do not care one whit about the people of Brisbane, or in fact the people of Queensland. All they want to do is to get another 800 members into their union. As I said before, why would a union with 53,600 members want to get another 800 members? That shows there is something wrong. I have even received a report from the Industrial Court—

**Mr. Jensen:** The U.F.U. can't look after them properly; that's why.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Oh, they can't look after them properly! The A.W.U. has never tried. There was one case in the Industrial Court in which the A.W.U. did not even put in an appearance on behalf of the United Firefighters' Union.

**Mr. Jensen:** They haven't got to. They put the appearance in; they are the union.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** The A.W.U. would not put it in; they would not go. The secretary of the United Firefighters' Union had to go himself on behalf of the fire-fighters because the A.W.U. would not have anything to do with it.

**Mr. Jensen:** The United Firefighters' Union was thrown out of court.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Oh, rot!

**Mr. Jensen:** Of course it was!

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** There is one thing about me: I am making my own contribution here, and I am not going to help the honourable member. He will do a hell of a crook job when he gets up.

I have gone through the list of unions in Queensland, and I cannot understand why the United Firefighters' Union cannot be registered. Of the 73 unions listed, 46 have more than 800 members and 27 have fewer than 800 members. For example, there is the Theatre Managers' Association with 40. There is the Queensland Signalmen's Union with 84. Why would not those 84 be in the Queensland Railway Traffic Employees' Union, which has over 2,000 members? Why is no attempt made to get them to go into that union? I cannot understand why this has to be done. Why is an attempt being made to make the U.F.U. members join the A.W.U.? Why cannot they join whichever union they want to join?

**Mr. Jensen:** They could join the Miscellaneous Workers' Union.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** They could. Now that the honourable member for Archerfield has nothing to do with it, it might be safe for them to join. I think this is a straight-out attempt by the A.W.U. to have a crack at the U.F.U.

Some honourable members have indicated that they have a copy of the Bill. I have not got one. I listened to the Minister's introductory speech and made some notes while he was speaking. He said that one clause of the Bill—I think he said it was clause 4—opposes the standover tactics of, say, the Transport Workers' Union—Arch Bevis seems to be the ringleader in this—in making owner-drivers join the union, and I am right behind him on that. I definitely support the Minister on that provision.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** I do not want to interrupt, but let me say this to you: there is no need to query who informed on your brother; it was the honourable member for Merthyr.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No it wasn't. The honourable member for Merthyr had nothing to do with setting up my brother.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member is not obliged to accept interjections.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No. If I gave the honourable member another two guesses, he would be pretty close.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** It would not be Mr. Hodges, the Federal Liberal member for Petrie?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I wouldn't like to say that. No comment!

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I certainly support the Minister on the introduction of that provision. I remember that, a couple of years ago, truck

drivers at A.C.F. & Shirleys who were loading fertiliser for the farmers in the Redcliffe-Deception Bay area were stood over by the Transport Workers' Union and made to join the union before they were allowed to load their trucks. That was shocking, and I hope that any fees that have been collected under false pretences by the Transport Workers' Union will be refunded to owner-drivers who were forced to pay union fees in order to be able to deliver fertiliser to the farmers.

The honourable member for Merthyr advised the Committee of the provisions of section 534 of the Criminal Code. I certainly did not know about that section, I do not read all the sections of the Code. However, I am certainly going to obtain a photostat of it, and I believe that the secretary of the Transport Workers' Union should be prosecuted under that section of the Act.

I do not intend to take up any more of the Committee's time at this stage. As I said earlier, I was a little unprepared for this debate, but I will have more facts and figures by the time the Bill is brought forward for its second reading.

**Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (3.40 p.m.):** Whenever amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act come before this Chamber, members of the Opposition make an extraordinarily pathetic effort to try to sound properly indignant. In actual fact, of course, they realise that in endeavouring to make an apology or to present a case on behalf of the extreme Left-wing element in unions they are losing votes hand over fist, for the overwhelming majority of ordinary members of trade unions do not want what the extreme Left-wing elements of certain unions try to compel them to do.

I would say that every recent change that we have made to the Act—this Bill is another in a series of changes—has been met with the same sort of case from members of the Opposition, despite the fact that intervening elections have shown overwhelmingly what the rank and file of ordinary blue-collar working-class people want. Their votes demonstrate what they want. Yet Opposition members put up the same sort of performance, like a circus dog that has been trained to perform a series of tricks and can do nothing else.

All of the amendments to the Act are designed to ensure that genuine rank-and-file members of unions, who are at the same time ordinary members of our total community, are treated with justice and will not be misused to serve certain political and personal ends.

One is impelled to ask just what it is that Opposition members want in the trade unions and want us to do. Do they want us to assist them to provide a formula for national misery? Do they expect our parties, on the basis of the elections that we have won in both the State and the Federal spheres, to assist them in giving aid to a

determined band of men who occupy key positions in society and use their collective power to raise their own incomes, regardless of what this does for the rest of the community? Do they want us to give them power to squeeze the community as a set of gangsters would squeeze them? The electors do not want that, nor do the overwhelming mass of unionists want it.

It is important that we remind ourselves once again just what it is the people do want. Their wants have been measured and these measurements have been published for all to see.

In September of last year the "National Times" published a poll of some 3,000 people showing that 66 per cent of people in Australia feared most the power of big unions. More than twice as many feared big unions as feared big business. The Morgan Gallup poll, as published in the October "Bulletin", indicated that of 4,418 people 73 per cent most feared the power of big unions. In a poll conducted a few weeks later and published in "The Courier-Mail" it was shown that 77 per cent of people agreed that unions had far too much power. In other words, 77 per cent of people believed that unions were too dangerous with the degree of power that they had and only 32 per cent felt that the multinational companies were the greatest danger. There is no question what the overwhelming mass of people in our community want. They want the type of legislation that we are providing in this Bill.

We have already done much to implement on behalf of the community and bona fide union interests those actions which are designed to help the community and to ensure that the people's best interests are preserved. We have moved to stop this past nonsense of trade unions acting in a way that could put them beyond the normal processes of civil law and the consequent penalties. If as a matter of industrial action someone did something that normally would result in his being sent to gaol or his being fined, he was free from penalty. We have moved on that, as we have in the area of secret ballots for strike action. Now we are moving significantly to reduce the power of unions to intimidate, threaten and coerce. Surely no-one can doubt that we need constraints on the Left-wing unions because they had sedulously fostered the notion that unions have almost a divine right to use their muscle in any way they wish for union purposes.

One of the myths that have been fostered relates to compulsory unionism. It is often said that there was compulsory unionism in this State until the Hanger judgment altered it. Of course, there was never compulsory unionism here. Mr. Justice Hanger in referring in his judgment to section 12 (e), which is the relevant section, said that "the sole power to award preference must be found in the present section 12 (e)". Justice

Stable said that it was "quite impossible to import into section 12 (2) of the Act a power to grant compulsory unionism".

It is always astonishing to me how widely held is the belief that once there was compulsory unionism in Queensland and that it was right and proper. There never was compulsory unionism. It is remarkable that in a place like the university there should be the belief that there was compulsory unionism and, because there was, it is all right to bow to union muscle and accept a closed-shop concept. That is what has happened at the university. The honourable member for Bulimba and I are both Government parliamentary members on the senate. At the last meeting of the senate I was amazed and dismayed to find that it was accepting an arrangement with a group of unions, through the Trades and Labor Council, whereby all new employees at the university below the tutorial level would have to become members of a union within four weeks of their joining the university. When a body like the university—whose sole justification for the role it undertakes in our society is that it is a centre of free thought, debate, discussion, dissension and nonconformity—believes that it is in its best interests to force all its employees below tutorial level to become members of a union, we have come to a very sorry stage. But that is exactly what has happened. Sir Zelman Cowen, in his published statement said—

"The university has met the unions in what it believes to be a reasonable compromise."

Of course, the words mean that the university has given in to the threat of industrial trouble unless it accepts the unions' requirements. If the university thinks it has bought peace, it has another think coming.

Implicit in the remarkable concept that unions have power to coerce, intimidate and blackmail is, of course, the union concept—and the honourable member for Merthyr alluded to this—that a union can force a non-employee to become a member of a union. The Minister's amendment contained in Clause 4 of the Bill is perhaps one of the milestones in industrial history in this State. At one fell swoop it removes the power of union officials to intimidate non-employees, to tell them, "You join a union or else if you go to the railhead at Moolabin you will not get your goods unloaded; you can take them to a wholesaler but no-one will put them on a truck."

I have a son who has built up, by his own initiative, an import-export business. He is the owner of it. When goods come in he pitches in and helps uncrate the furniture to get it out to his customers. What happened to him? A little while ago he was visited by an industrial organiser who said to him, "You have got to join a union." My son said, "But that's nonsense; I'm the owner." The chap said, "I don't care; you will join

a union or you will find your goods held up at the wharf." My son said, "That's blackmail." The union organiser said, "You can call it what the hell you like, but you will join the union or else." When things like that happen we have not got a free country. It is absolute nonsense that honourable members on our side of the Chamber, believing in the philosophy that they believe in, espousing and expounding it and winning elections with such magnificent majorities on it, should have to accept the right of any union or union official to deprive citizens of the intrinsic and important aspects of their individual liberty.

Therefore, for me this part of the Bill is very important. I hope the penalties will be invoked to the full. Indeed, I would like to see this sort of penalty removed from industrial law and to have this offence regarded as being within the criminal law, just as any intimidation, any coercion, any type of threatening or any sort of blackmail is regarded as a criminal offence. I do not see that, because it is done in an industrial context, that in any way tends to make the offence less severe or less disastrous. Indeed, I think it makes it more so. My strong hope on this is that this section of the Act will be employed to the full. Rank-and-file unionists do not want this type of action from their unions. They do not approve of it.

As I said before, we have had elections in recent years. The Opposition in this Parliament was reduced to a pathetic rump of 11 members. We have won seats which anyone would have regarded as out-and-out blue-ribbon Labor seats. Why have we won them? Because of Liberal voters in those electorates? Of course not! We have won them because erstwhile Labor voters have turned their backs on the Labor Party and voted for us. Exactly the same thing applied in the Federal election, when we won 17 out of 18 seats—and almost won the 18th, the seat that Mr. Hayden holds, Oxley. Why? Because overwhelmingly Labor people voted for us. Among those Labor people were masses and masses of blue-collar workers who are members of unions and who are fed up to the back teeth with the way their unions are misused against their own direct interests.

The amending Bill is an excellent one. It is well overdue. I am sure that the community in general will welcome it.

**Mr. JENSEN** (Bundaberg) (3.52 p.m.): I did not intend to enter this debate today, but for no reason at all the honourable member for Murrumba attacked the A.W.U. The A.W.U. has looked after firemen for over 50 years, and looked after them well. Members of the fire brigade in my electorate have made no complaints about the A.W.U. The A.W.U. has looked after my centre and other centres in Queensland for over 50 years. If some firemen want to break away and get some different condition (what the

difference is, I don't know) and if they want to be out-and-out radicals, break away and attack the A.W.U., that is their affair.

**Mr. Lane:** You're for the chopper after this, Lew.

**Mr. JENSEN:** I don't worry about choppers in my electorate.

**Mr. Lane:** The Trades Hall will get you after this speech. Keep going.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): Order!

**Mr. JENSEN:** I won't sit in this Chamber and listen to somebody from the Government side attacking the A.W.U.

**Mr. Lane:** What about Yewdale's statements?

**Mr. JENSEN:** He did not attack the A.W.U. The member for Murrumba deliberately attacked the A.W.U. He did that for one reason only. He knew nothing about the United Firefighters association—they call it "union", but it is not registered; it is an association—till he came down to our room one day—

**Mr. Lane** interjected.

**Mr. Frawley** interjected.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! Persistent interjections from the honourable member for Merthyr and the honourable member for Murrumba will not be tolerated.

**Mr. JENSEN:** He came down to our room one day and asked us if we knew anything about this. He said he had to find out something about it as he had to speak on it. Then he found out that his own son was in it, got some information from him and came into the Chamber and attacked the A.W.U.

The A.W.U. is the biggest union in Queensland. As he said, it has over 53,000 members. It has done a hell of a good job for its members. Its advocates go into court day after day and week after week seeking better conditions. They have been responsible for the conditions the firemen enjoy today. Firemen can be paid for sleeping, thanks to the A.W.U.

**Mr. Frawley:** You're Edgar Williams' puppet. He's up in the gallery pulling the strings.

**Mr. JENSEN:** Edgar Williams didn't put me in this Parliament. The people of Bundaberg put me here. If I wish to stand up in Parliament and say what I think about a union or anybody else, I will do so.

So far as I am concerned the U.F.U. is an organisation and if it wants to fight for better conditions, that is up to it. It has tried seven times to be registered by the court and has been knocked out on each occasion. The reason is that the A.W.U.

has looked after firemen for 50 years and has gained for them some of the best conditions in this State. That is why the court has supported the A.W.U. against a splinter union that applies for registration.

This is most important. Egerton, Hawke and the whole lot of them have always said, "We want bigger and stronger unions; we do not want splinter group unions." But the U.F.U. has been accepted by the A.L.P., whereas the A.W.U. has not. The U.F.U. would not be able to pay two bob to the A.L.P., whereas the A.W.U., which could provide \$20,000 a year, is knocked back. That is its business, but it is also my business, as a member of the A.L.P., to stand up and try to stop that type of thing. While I am in Parliament I will fight for what I think is right regardless of whichever union is involved. At one time I attacked the A.W.U. in this Chamber. I do not care which union is involved; no union controls me. If I think there is anything wrong in my party or in a union, I will say so at any time.

**Mr. Lane:** That's why you'll get your head cut off.

**Mr. JENSEN:** That does not worry me one iota. While I have the ability to stand up here and while I still have my head, I will speak. If my head is chopped off, I will not be able to speak in this Chamber.

I reiterate that the A.W.U. has looked after firemen for 50 years and has given them some of the best conditions in Australia. The firemen are even paid while they sleep. But the U.F.U. members do not want to join the A.W.U. In that case, let them join the Miscellaneous Workers' Union. I do not want to interfere with U.F.U. conditions or the body itself. But it cannot obtain registration so it should join with a bigger union.

Nobody should start blaming the A.W.U. for this. This breakaway started in Victoria and spread up here. It broke away in the South because Communists in that area wanted to take over the A.W.U. there. They have not taken over in Queensland and never will. I will stand by what I have said in this Chamber—the A.W.U. will be the union to represent the firemen in Queensland.

**Mr. LOWES** (Brisbane) (3.59 p.m.): I wish to speak briefly in support of this Bill and I do so as a member of the Minister's committee. The committee discussed this matter at length and gave it a great deal of consideration, using the experience of the various members of the committee. The Minister has always had outstanding rapport with the unions and he brings into his portfolio this understanding and the experience not only of himself but also of those with whom he speaks.

My situation is somewhat different from that of previous speakers on this side of the

Chamber. The electorate of Brisbane contains large numbers of rank-and-file unionists. As all honourable members know, this electorate was formerly regarded as a blue-ribbon Labor seat. That situation changed in the State election in 1974 and in the Federal election in 1975. Something is happening in the ranks of the unionists who reside in the Brisbane area. They have divided themselves between the Liberal and Labor parties at election-time. In industrial relations, too, they have divided themselves between moderate and militant unions. In fact, we see this wherever we go. If we go to the electorate we hear the complaints.

As the honourable member for Toowong said, 77 per cent of the people regard unionism as a greater threat to the community as a whole than big business. There are strikes at the present time affecting, in particular, the transport industry. One member of the executive of the Transport Workers' Union seems to get more Press publicity each week than most Ministers. The only reason for this is the way in which he is flying in the face of the wishes of the people and creating havoc and disruption in industry, to the ultimate cost of all consumers in this city and State.

We have seen instances of union strength. I do not know whether that is because the president of the Transport Workers' Union is modelling himself on Jimmy Hoffa. If he is, all I can do is recommend that he take a further look at Jimmy Hoffa and remember where he may have finished up—going through the mincer. Whereas Jimmy Hoffa may have finished up going through the mincer physically, if a fellow such as Arch Bevis fails to have regard to the wishes of the ordinary rank-and-file union members, he could well finish up going through the industrial and political mincer. I can assure the Committee that the people of Brisbane have divided themselves along the lines that I have mentioned. They have voted that way in elections and, if they are given a proper choice in their unions, that is the way they will vote there, too.

It has been suggested by the honourable member for Archerfield that industrial law should not be included in the Criminal Code. Surely if the Criminal Code is apt, that is the law that should apply. Where there are standoff tactics, threats and inducements, surely there is no better method of dealing with those offences than by applying the Criminal Code. Section 534 is the appropriate section. The fact that it may not have been used for some years merely means that there have been no prosecutions under it. Perhaps there should have been and perhaps there will be. When the Minister and his officers are considering industrial matters, I commend to them a reference to section 534 of the Criminal Code and, where appropriate, the application of it.

I support the Minister and the Bill.

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs) (4.3 p.m.), in reply: The Government believes that the cardinal principle in the operation of the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission is their complete unfettered jurisdiction free of duress from any source. It also supports the belief that all organisations that appear before the commission must first have obtained registration. I believe that principle was enunciated by our predecessors in Government. I must therefore express my complete and utter amazement that members of the Australian Labor Party, who profess to speak for unions and their members, should, by their utterances, not only deny the unfettered role that the commission plays but seek to deny the cardinal principle of registration. If they deny registration, they would support a subterfuge by a registered union to take advantage of the present wording of the Act which the Bill seeks to amend.

And so I repeat, Mr. Miller, that I am amazed that those who, by their previous occupations, having appeared before the commission as respondents or in some other role, would know far more about the operations of the commission than I, would show such disregard for what is regarded as the most functional, unbiased and unprejudiced commission in Australia. I think that would sum up my response to the contributions of honourable members opposite, particularly that of the honourable member for Rockhampton North. I am glad to say that the honourable member for Merthyr seemed to show a much greater understanding of the operations of the commission—

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** He certainly showed more understanding than honourable members opposite.

**Mr. Houston:** He rambled.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** He might have rambled in your opinion—

**Mr. Houston:** Be truthful; he did.

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** I do not say he rambled. In the opinion of the honourable member he might have appeared to ramble, but he did point out that clause 4 of the Bill is in keeping with some aspects of section 534 of the Criminal Code, which bears upon the practice we are discussing. He challenged honourable members opposite to say where they stood in regard to this matter of intimidation, and so far we have had no answer from them.

I suppose I do not really have to take any notice of the comments of the honourable member for Archerfield, who opened his brief remarks by referring to my stealthy and underhand manner. Coming as it did from the honourable member, I could perhaps regard it as a compliment. I do not think I will make any further reference to

his remarks except to say that he seemed to be in favour of the intimidatory tactics of those very few union officials who are giving the trade union movement a very bad name.

I do not think that anything the honourable member for Murrumbah had to say calls for any comment in the light of what I have just said, except that I am surprised that he should question the integrity of the Industrial Commission.

The honourable member for Toowong gave further instances of intimidation and he related a personal experience. He also reminded the Committee, if the Committee needed reminding, of the continued growing support of this Government by people who could not formerly find it in themselves to give us their support. I am sure that will be reflected in the results of the elections which will take place on Saturday.

I have only one or two more brief comments. The honourable member for Bundaberg showed up the variance of opinion which exists amongst members of the Opposition on this issue. The contribution of the honourable member for Brisbane revolved around industrial muscle being used by some union officials. I have already referred to that aspect.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

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

### STOCK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

**Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN** (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (4.12 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Stock Act 1915–1974 in certain particulars.”

With the large numbers of stock and limited human and material resources over much of the continent, we are at great risk to the incursion of diseases such as foot and mouth disease, rinderpest or African horse disease.

Queensland alone had an estimated 10,800,000 cattle, 14,100,000 sheep, 410,000 pigs, some 170,000 horses and 5,500,000 poultry on 31 March 1975. With limited outlets for cattle and sheep allied to generally good seasonal conditions since that date, numbers of both those classes of animals have no doubt substantially increased.

Honourable members need no reminding of the importance of the cattle and sheep industries to the Queensland economy.

Exports of meat products, wool and sheepskins in 1973-74 realised \$413,000,000, and even in 1974-75, which was a bad year, exports of these products were valued at \$240,000,000.

Our freedom from disease was due originally to isolation and the long time taken for the journey by sea from Britain. This freedom has been maintained only at the cost of constant vigilance based on strict quarantine precautions, backed up by national and State stock disease control services.

However, no matter how stringent the quarantine conditions or how thoroughly they are policed, it would be foolish to believe that 100 per cent of contraband goods, either in incoming sea or air passengers' luggage or through the post, will be detected by quarantine or customs officials. Sooner or later some dangerous foodstuff or other article of animal origin will get through the barrier.

Of course, the mere entry of such material is not the important matter. It must first be available to animals, and most often this occurs through feeding scraps in garbage. This is why the feeding of swill to pigs presents so great a danger.

Many outbreaks of exotic disease occur throughout the world in association with swill feeding. The 1967 outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Britain is a case in point, and the majority of outbreaks of swine vesicular disease, which closely resembles foot and mouth disease, have occurred in swill-fed pigs. In Australia we have had four outbreaks of swine fever and all began in swill piggeries.

It was on the grounds of reducing the risk at one more level that the Animal Health Committee recommended to the Standing Committee on Agriculture that a ban be placed on the feeding of swill containing material of animal origin to pigs. This recommendation was endorsed by the Australian Agricultural Council at a meeting in August 1974 and was subsequently reaffirmed with a rider that implementation of the ban be effected not later than 30 September 1975.

At a subsequent meeting in August 1975 the Australian Agricultural Council approved that residues from slaughter-houses and butcher shops could be fed to pigs on licensed slaughter-house premises, provided it had been treated to the satisfaction of the chief inspector, and that dairy by-products could be fed without treatment. I might mention that was on my recommendation.

An ordinance prohibits the feeding of swill to pigs in the Australian Capital Territory and a similar ban was introduced in New South Wales as from 30 September 1975. South Australia has banned swill feeding as from 1 January this year; early in the year the Northern Territory announced plans to ban swill feeding and both Victoria and

Western Australia have passed legislation to ban swill feeding as from 1 July next. Tasmania was to review the situation early in 1976, as we have done in Queensland. Reports from the other States indicate little opposition to the proposed ban, although some resistance came from hospital authorities in Victoria.

It has been established that swill feeding accounts for only a small percentage of total garbage generated and that in those States where the ban has been applied the resulting loss of pig production has not been significant.

The principal object of the Bill is to enable the necessary regulation-making powers to be formulated under the Stock Act to provide controls on the foodstuffs that may be fed to swine, and to enable the seizure and destruction of pigs fed on banned foodstuffs should disease eventuate in them.

As a complementary measure, there is provision for registration and control of piggeries, either generally throughout the State or only in prescribed districts, and similarly in all or only certain classes of piggeries.

The regulation-making powers will be widened to place a ban on the feeding of swine with food wastes containing substances of animal origin unless these have first been processed by dry rendering. This refers in the main to garbage from hospitals, hotels, motels, cafeterias and so forth should this be desirable, but the preferred course is to avoid its use at all.

The ban will not apply to the feeding of dairy products, biscuit or bread wastes, fruit or vegetable wastes or to fish waste from fish factories, provided that such materials have not been subjected to contamination with other substances of animal origin.

Provision will also be made for the feeding of slaughter-house and butcher shop wastes and residues to pigs on licensed slaughter-house premises, or in piggeries on other premises that are licensed under the provisions of the regulations, provided these materials are first treated in approved pots to the satisfaction of an inspector.

The number of such licensed piggeries will thus be relatively small. Apart from those conducted on licensed slaughter-house premises, there are only a few that collect slaughter-house wastes and residues for feeding to pigs.

The supervision of slaughter-house piggeries will be carried out during routine meat inspection duties and the few outside piggeries which receive slaughter-house wastes and residues can be brought under supervision without great difficulty.

In September 1975 it was estimated that only 6.8 per cent of pigs were fed on diets containing some swill. At that time the estimate of production loss after introduction

of a ban was put at 1.6 per cent. Events since that date indicate the loss in production may be even less than this figure. Some piggeries previously feeding swill have expanded production on alternative foods.

In the six months ended 31 December 1975, pigmeat production in Queensland increased by about 9 per cent on the 1974 figure. This shows how quickly the industry can change production trends, even at a time when a number of swill feeders ceased production.

It is considered that the proposed amendments will provide an additional safeguard for our livestock industries and I commend the Bill to the Committee.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba) (4.21 p.m.): Because of the internal dissension that was obviously exhibited within the Government parties on this matter over a long period, I can say that the Opposition while not opposing the Bill, certainly will not give the measure its absolute blessing at the introductory stage. That does not mean to say that when we have examined the Bill, its spheres of influence and restrictions, which no doubt in some instances will make things harder for the pig producer, we may not give it our full support at the second-reading stage. We are prepared to allow the Bill to be introduced and we shall examine it to see how it is to operate.

I understood the Minister to say that the principal object of the Bill is to allow regulations to be made governing piggeries that wanted to feed certain types of scrap material normally considered to be foodstuff waste to pigs, as distinct from those piggeries that want to use only commercially produced feed.

I do not think anyone would object to a Government taking action to prevent completely foot and mouth disease coming to our nation. Anyone who has read about this disease certainly would not want even the possibility of its introduction.

**Mr. Frawley:** Whitlam's crowd brought all of this meat in that carries the disease.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Whitlam's crowd did not introduce the meat at all.

**Mr. Frawley:** Yes, they did.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The trouble with Government members is they are always prepared to tell a quarter of the truth.

The Federal Government allowed something to be imported, but if it were not for Government supporters—the free-enterprise importers—not one ounce of material would have been brought to the nation. After all Governments make decisions that allow things to happen, but private industry—the free-enterprise system—is responsible for bringing these things in. We are not debating that. We are debating what can happen when it comes in.

If what Mr. Whitlam did was so wrong, there would be no need for this legislation. The present Federal Government would only have to say, "There will be no more imports." If that were done, there would be no need for this Bill. But the Federal Government is not doing that, and no doubt commercial enterprise has pointed out that it is impossible to do it.

Let us not get tied up with something that happened some time ago. Let us not forget that it was a former Federal Government—the Minister admitted this—which was in control when the Agricultural Council meeting decided to take this action. The only reason that this State has not legislated in this field earlier is that within the Government parties themselves there has been animosity towards the legislation—and even as recently as two days ago. It has been reported that a Minister even wanted to take a member outside and bash him up. It would be unfair to pit an 11 stone man from Callide against a man of 20 stone from another electorate.

**Mr. Sullivan:** More or less.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not think it would be a real contest, although personally I would back the member for Callide, because I think he would be far more active on his feet.

**Mr. Casey:** I don't think either of them could punch his way out of a paper bag.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** As has been said before, in a revolving door they'd both be lost.

**Mr. Casey:** Neither of them would fit in.

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

I do not think that anyone at all would take objection in principle to the amendment. However, as I see it, the problem is to weigh the probability of the disease being introduced through food scraps against the cost of disposal of these scraps. I hope that in his second-reading speech the Minister will give us a little more information. I imagine that, as this matter has been debated so fully in his own party, he has many answers at his fingertips. Surely the Opposition is entitled to know just as much as the honourable member for Callide or any other member of the Government parties. After all, many people in the community support the Labor Party and its ideals.

What will be the cost of implementing this proposal to dispose of food wastes? Let us consider a city the size of Brisbane. Because of the size of its refuse collection and dumping areas, it would be easier for it to control waste from cafes, hospitals, schools, shops, hotels and so on. Although, unfortunately, rats and other vermin would be attracted by the dumps—and I do not think that can be controlled completely—we in the metropolitan area are not troubled by wild pigs. I do not think any honourable member has shot

a wild pig in the city of Brisbane. So in that sense it is possible for food scraps in Brisbane to be disposed of.

However, the disposal of this type of refuse brings with it the problem of odours. The huge volume of waste collected in Brisbane will quickly deteriorate into a state in which it will be completely obnoxious not only to residents living near dumps but also, by prevailing winds, to those living some distance away. That is a problem that will have to be tackled.

I do not know whether the Government has taken into account the tremendous additional cost that this amendment will impose on the city of Brisbane. I do not want to see in this Bill a continuation of what, unfortunately, has been the Government's policy over a number of years. It has been its practice to pass legislation and then hand over to local authorities the problems of enforcing the State law. The local authorities then have to find the money to comply with the State's demands. After all, local authorities have only one major source of income—rate collection. I do not want to go into other fields, such as electricity and the loss of that source of revenue. The point is that, if the Government inflicts on local authorities—and I refer particularly to the Brisbane City Council—the additional burden of the disposal of food wastes, it should come to the assistance of the local authorities by providing the ways and means to dispose of the residue. There may be methods available. I know that various types of massive digesters are in existence. The Government should investigate the best type of refuse digester and subsidise local authorities to install that type of unit.

I am more concerned with the outside areas than with the city of Brisbane. I do not suppose that the Minister can tell us but I do not think that there would be a great deal of Brisbane refuse going very far out into country areas. I think that the refuse would be used relatively close to the city and in other areas where wild pigs are not normally found. I am now concerned with where we have wild pigs and wild goats although I think wild pigs would be the greater worry. I am also concerned with whether the disease is carried by other animals as an intermediary. As I am not a veterinary surgeon I do not know.

**Mr. Gunn** interjected.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I know that they are the ones that suffer from it. I do not know whether there has been any great research in regard to other animals. I am not saying that the dingo carries it in its constitution but it could pick up the meat or other refuse and carry it to another area.

This would mean that the possibility exists in country areas. Again this would impose very heavy disposal costs on the local authority. I do not believe that, like dry

refuse, it can be spread out and covered with dirt and, when settled down, become a playing field or something else. This is a problem facing the local authorities.

I have no doubt that Government members have raised these problems with the Minister. They have not told me and there have been no leaks within the Minister's party.

**Mr. Elliott:** They wrote your screed for you.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** One would swear they did, but I am not reading it. This proves that I know my subject or have a very good memory. Of course, I have had ample opportunity to study it because it has been on the Business Paper for weeks and we have not known whether it would be introduced or not. The fact that it is in now does not guarantee that it will stay in.

These are the things that the Parliament should be told in the Minister's second-reading speech. We should be told whether he has checked the cost and whether or not the State Government is prepared to come to the aid of the local authorities in the provision of disposal units to render this foodstuff—

**Mr. Gunn:** Don't you think the Federal Government should do this?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I think that is an intelligent interjection. Naturally, as this decision was made by the Australian Agricultural Council I take it for granted that the Whitlam Government agreed to it. I have no doubt that when the Ministers met, there would have been some arrangement on a national basis. If there has not been, there should be. I quite agree. I do not expect the State to act on its own. After all, I know that we are the major cattle-producing State but we are not the only cattle-producing State; the other States raise cattle, sheep and other animals.

I have to ask the State Government to tell us about these things and what the cost will be to local authorities. The reason I specify local authorities is that they have to get the money from the public by way of rates, and the major ratepayer is the householder, who has no industry at all and no chance of getting all of his rates back. The producer, too, is allowed his rates as a taxation deduction whereas the ordinary householder pays his rates and that is the end of it; he has no chance of getting any more back through any back-door method or any other method, however legitimate it might be.

We must also consider the other possible means of introducing this disease. The Minister mentioned, among other things, passenger luggage and articles coming to this country by post. I venture to say that any foods entering in this way would be for private use. I do not think that there

would be many cases of cafes, hospitals and schools introducing by that means food materials that would eventually find their way into swill. It is possible, of course, that material from school lunches could find its way into swill. However, I think the major concern is the importation of foodstuffs through legitimate trade channels. The Minister could perhaps tell us whether there could be a tighter quarantine check on such materials.

What worries me particularly is the problem presented by Taiwanese fishermen in the Gulf country. I know that this matter is not covered by the Bill, but it cannot be divorced from it. No matter how efficient we may make internal arrangements, Taiwanese will still come ashore without any form of restriction. Anyone who has travelled overseas will know that before he is allowed to re-enter this country he is asked if he has been anywhere where there have been animals. Certainly it is up to returning travellers to tell the truth, but I think most people would do that. If a person has been in contact with animals, certain fumigation is carried out and that is a desirable contribution to the cause of protection. But in the Gulf Taiwanese can enter the country. I do not believe that there is sufficient surveillance of that area.

**Mr. Gunn:** It is too loose.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is. Surveillance will cost money, but the cost to local authorities and the public will be hundreds of thousands of dollars, anyway. I believe that surveillance has to be stepped up in the Gulf area.

Another matter of concern is the dumping of refuse from ships. It is probably tinned foods and scraps that are dumped before they enter Australian ports, but eventually they find their way to our shores and could be eaten by wild animals. Cattle are mustered only every 12 months or two or three years in the Gulf country and they, too, could cause quite a problem. I think that this State and nation are fortunate indeed that an outbreak of the disease has not occurred in this way. I am more concerned about the introduction of disease in this way than by means of materials entering through normal trade channels.

**Mr. Ahern:** We are fortunate that the viruses do not survive long in salt water.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I agree with the honourable member. But over the years viruses have the unhappy knack of acclimatising themselves to an environment that was once hostile to them. We have seen this happen in many instances.

**Mr. Gunn:** They travel by air, too.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Yes. It is a disease which I understood was transmitted in earlier years only through certain types of animals. In the last outbreak, however, there

were humans who died from it. There must have been some change in the virus that has made humans susceptible to it. Whether there were any other factors associated with those cases, I do not know. I am relying solely on the report that I read.

Naturally the legislation is supported by the grazing and dairying industries. I quite understand their support because the stock that could be affected are their bread and butter. They also know the tremendous cost to them if anything goes wrong. We can all recall only a few years ago, I think at Boonah—

**An Honourable Member:** Mt. Crosby.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Yes, where it was thought that an outbreak of blue tongue was a possibility. That arose through the importing of semen, but it was only a supposition. I do not think it was ever proved, but no risks were taken. At that stage I do not think anyone objected. I think even the owners finally agreed that the cattle had to be destroyed. They might have argued about the compensation they received, but as far as the desire to prevent any possibility of the disease was concerned, I do not think anyone disagreed.

**Mr. Gunn:** It showed up the weakness of our quarantine.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It did, but as the honourable member might remember, some semen came in by what was virtually a back-door method. I do not think much foodstuff comes in through the back door, and if it does let us make the penalties on those who bring it in very heavy indeed.

As I said, I do not think that what is imported by private citizens is the real problem; it is the possibility of problems of imports through the normal commercial channels. I suggest to the Minister that it might be necessary for us to look at that aspect very carefully to see whether we can strengthen the investigatory procedures.

I hope I have made the Opposition's position quite clear. We are not opposing the introduction of the legislation. We would like a few more answers and we shall study the Bill in detail before we give it our final approval.

**Mr. McKECHNIE** (Carnarvon) (4.42 p.m.): I rise to support the Bill. I think it would be fair to say that it is well known that many Government members are supporting the Bill with some reservations. I think Government members should be complimented on the tremendous amount of research that they have undertaken to try to make sure that Queensland is served well by this legislation. I was one of those who opposed the introduction of this Bill some months ago, and I opposed it at that stage because I was not convinced that it would do the job it was meant to do for Queensland.

I think the joint parties very wisely chose to postpone the introduction of this Bill until more evidence was brought forward that it was in the interests of Queensland that local authorities and other people should have to spend so much money on overcoming the swill-feeding problem.

Added evidence that I have received in the past few months does answer many of the criticisms that I previously had of this Bill. I would like to pay a compliment to Dr. Swan, the head of the veterinary school at Goondiwindi. He is a veterinarian with a terrific amount of practical knowledge. He is the sort of academic that I like to listen to—men of proven practical ability. Dr. Swan was able to prove to me that in Mexico the foot and mouth disease virus was carried on the wind some considerable distance in one day. This is very relevant to the question of the feeding of swill to pigs.

The pig is an ideal factory for the breeding of the virus. It breathes it out onto the wind and it can then travel very considerable distances. Some of the opponents of this Bill are under the impression that it would be a waste of time feeding swill into sewerage systems because the normal sewerage treatment does not destroy the virus. It has to be treated with certain chemicals. But a point that was raised by Dr. Swan—and I choose to believe him because I know him to be a practical man—was that when a piece of meat carrying a small amount of the virus is fed into the sewerage system, that virus disperses quite considerably. There is no doubt that it may enter streams, but it is weakened as it goes along.

As all honourable members know, one's resistance must be broken down before one catches any virus. Therefore, surely it is only common sense that it is more difficult to catch a virus that has been dispersed and is in a very weak condition than to catch a virus in its concentrated form, as it may be if it is fed to pigs and then transmitted instead of being transmitted through the water.

At this stage, I think I should make one point clear to the Minister. There has been some talk about the Victorian Subordinate Legislation Committee rejecting regulations in a Bill similar in effect to the Bill that the Minister now proposes to introduce. I am sure that some members of the Committee genuinely believed that that was the case. However, the background to that story—it has been checked this afternoon—is that a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee in Victoria told the Queensland Subordinate Legislation Committee that a committee had thrown it out. It was not understood that he was referring to a party-political committee, not to the Victorian Subordinate Legislation Committee. Those are the facts about that story. They were checked only about half an hour ago.

Another problem that becomes obvious with the introduction of this legislation is

the system followed at meetings of the Agricultural Council. That council does much good work, and it is made up of men of integrity. But I find it rather strange that any Minister, no matter who he is, can go to a meeting of the Agricultural Council and, mainly on the advice of public servants, commit his Government to do something. There is no doubt that the Queensland Government is committed to introducing the Bill. I do not blame the Minister for that; it is the system. It seems wrong to me that one representative of the Government can agree with his counterparts in other States to commit the Government to do certain things before the joint parties have had an opportunity of deciding whether or not they want to do what is being done in other States. It is a system that I would like to see changed in the life of this Parliament. I do not know whether it is practicable to change it in that time or, indeed, at all.

**Mr. Bertoni:** If this had been brought back to a joint party meeting for discussion prior to a commitment being made to the other States, do you consider that it would have got through?

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** In answer to that question, I say that I think if the system was—

**Mr. Sullivan:** What was the question? I couldn't hear it.

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** Although it is using up my time, I will state it very quickly. The question was: if Government members had discussed the matter before it went to the Agricultural Council, would it have got this far? That is a debatable point, and I hope that in future it will be possible to discover some way round it.

The plight of local government was mentioned. There is no doubt that the proposed legislation will add to the cost of local government, and I am very sympathetic towards local government in that respect. The Government has made a decision that will cost local government money. It has not taken that decision lightly; it is a decision that, on balance, it believes must be taken.

Again I offer a suggestion for the future. When a decision is made that will cost local government a lot of money, I believe that individual councils—not only council officers—should be consulted to a greater extent. An estimate of cost should be obtained from every local authority that will be affected before the stage of bringing legislation before Parliament is reached, and that should have been done in this case.

We have heard a good deal about the threat posed by meat imported from other countries. The Queensland Government is accepting its responsibility to do something to stop the spread of foot and mouth disease. The Federal Government also has a very

great responsibility, and should improve its Customs and quarantine procedures. Despite the necessity for reciprocal trade, the Federal Government should ban the import of meat from countries that may have a foot and mouth disease problem. This is particularly necessary if portion of the cost arising from this measure is to be borne by local authorities and individuals.

It has been claimed in certain quarters that there is probably no need to ban the feeding of swill from hospitals, which buy their food supplies from hygienic manufacturers who do not illegally import products from overseas. I do not go along with that claim at all. It is true that a patient who is ill is put on a certain diet by doctors and nurses. However, when he is recovering he usually has the urge to eat his favourite foods and sometimes begs his relatives to bring them in to him. No matter how good hospital administration is—and it is good in Queensland—on some occasions patients are given food that is not prepared by hospital authorities.

The problem of illegal imports of meat is a real one. The Federal Government must increase its supervision of imported foodstuffs. However, no matter how good such supervision might be, it is not possible to stop all people from bringing in prohibited articles. For example, it is not feasible for the postal authorities to open every parcel that comes into Australia.

The problem posed by overseas passengers who disembark at Australian ports is also a serious one. Insufficient attention is paid to their footwear. This is another area in which I urge the Federal Government to take stronger action.

It has been suggested that every package brought into Australia by tourists should be opened. I am a cattleman, and I do not want to see the cattle industry killed; but I am also a Queenslander, and I do not want to see the tourist industry killed. A good deal of common sense must be used in determining which parcels should be opened.

Comments have been made about garbage thrown overboard from ships. It is well known that salt water is quite effective in killing the foot and mouth virus.

**Mr. Moore:** Baloney!

**Mr. McKECHNIE:** The honourable member will have his turn later.

It has been suggested that foot and mouth disease could be introduced by foreign fishermen who enter Australia through the Gulf of Carpentaria. The threat is real. To combat it, I again urge the Federal Government to step up its patrols in the area. At a time when our fishermen are screaming to have the Gulf of Carpentaria closed to foreign fishermen, I wonder if it is

not possible for the Federal Government to meet their request based on quarantine and animal disease considerations. While helping the fishing industry, the closing of the Gulf would also make a worth-while contribution towards keeping foot and mouth disease out of Australia.

It has been said that Queensland, with one other State, should reject this legislation. However, we must accept the facts of life. If we do not pass this legislation it is quite probable that the New South Wales Government will ban the movement of pigs into New South Wales. Despite section 92, I believe the New South Wales Government would have a good, sound basis for doing so.

While discussing the possibility of foot and mouth disease coming to Australia, we should accept the fact that, no matter what we do, it will come here some day. Let us hope that it takes 100 years or more to get here. What contingency plans have been made to meet this scourge if it should come here? It is prevalent in certain countries overseas, but in other countries on the same land mass it is not prevalent. I emphasise that every time we cross the border to New South Wales we have to pass through a tick gate. I should like to think that we in Queensland will look into the possibility of creating a barrier somewhere in the centre of Queensland so that when foot and mouth disease entered one area it could be sealed off. At present, that can be done quite successfully on portions of the Queensland-New South Wales border to control stock movement. I realise that it would be much more expensive to build a pig-proof fence across the centre of Queensland—indeed, it may not be feasible—but I think we should look at the cost of such a fence compared with the cost of losing our export markets, probably for ever, if foot and mouth disease enters North Queensland.

The problems created by foot and mouth disease tend to be oversimplified. We say that if it enters Australia we will lose our export markets. That is true. But if we could close off certain areas, the ban on the rest of Australia might be lifted after a period. We should look into this matter.

I again stress that this measure has been hotly debated. The decision taken by the Government parties was taken in the interests of Queensland and Australia as a whole. There are many good, sound arguments against it, but I believe that the arguments in favour of it are the stronger. I hope that shire councils, hospital boards and others who are disadvantaged by this legislation will accept the fact that this decision was taken by men who wanted to do the best for Queensland and for Australia as a whole.

**Dr. LOCKWOOD** (Toowoomba North) (5 p.m.): In rising to address myself to this introductory debate, I wish first of all to outline the problems that have faced the people in the joint party room. Since this measure was first initiated at the end of May 1975, give or take a week, a great deal of research has been conducted. As facts have emerged about foot and mouth disease, knowledge has been gained and opinions have changed. It would be a sorry state of affairs if people could not change their opinions when made aware of new facts.

Foot and mouth disease is, of course, a virus disease. Viruses are extremely small particles, and one cell that is infected can produce a great number of virus particles. It is a disease mainly of cloven-hoofed animals, such as cattle, sheep and pigs. Reputedly it can be spread into the Australian native animals. It can also be induced into cats, dogs and wild rats. Thus, the disease is capable of infecting a great many species.

The virus is extremely invasive. It infects 100 per cent of herds exposed to it. It is extremely contagious. It can be spread by the coughing or sneezing of an animal and, as other honourable members have stated, it can be blown on the wind. It is rumoured to have been spread by birds which have picked it up on their feet. It is definitely spread by water.

**Mr. Frawley:** It is a pity it couldn't be dropped on the Trades Hall to wipe a few of them out.

**Dr. LOCKWOOD:** There aren't very many of them up there who are cloven-hoofed.

The infection is proportional to the number of virus particles in the inoculating dose. Therefore, if an animal receives lots of virus particles it will get an acute dose of foot and mouth disease. If there are only a few virus particles in the inoculating dose, the result could well be a chronic disease, with the animal surviving to be a carrier.

The disease rarely kills great numbers in a herd. Most of the animals affected become chronic carriers. They can become lame and lose muscle condition; some become infertile, and milk yields drop. It can cause breaking of wool in sheep. There is no permanent immunity to the disease, as far as is known, so reinfection is a problem. That is what happens in countries where the disease is endemic—the beasts become infected and there are small outbreaks of reinfection—but in general the disease is always in all the animals.

What happens if foot and mouth disease breaks out in an area? It is absolute chaos. All the animals I referred to previously have to be killed. The main cause of death from foot and mouth disease is a bullet. By decree or whatever, all the animals in a zone declared to be infected—and on day

one it might be 50 miles by 50 miles—have to be rounded up and destroyed. That is bad luck for all the cattle, sheep and pigs. It is also extremely bad luck for the farmers and graziers in the area. However, it is not such bad luck for the cats, dogs, wild rats and wild pigs. It takes a lot longer to hunt them down. Birds can get out of the area and perhaps transport the virus on their feet. Water can carry the virus downstream—Lord only knows where to, as water is pumped out of streams onto farms.

So in an outbreak there would be a massive financial loss to the district or region in which it was discovered. Quarantine zones have to be set up around the area and they have to be regularly inspected. This costs a great deal of money. In the event of an outbreak here, Australia would suffer tremendous financial loss through decreased exports. The clean countries would rear up in righteous indignation and ban imports of Australian meat, wool, hides and other products.

In containing some of these epidemics, the initial cost is extremely high; but in one epidemic in Canada the cost through loss of exports was 200 times the cost of containing the epidemic. So we in Australia can start thinking in terms of \$1,000 million in the first year of a single outbreak.

Why hasn't it been here before? The answer is that it was here in 1872. In those days of transport by sailing ships, there was time for the men in charge of the animals to detect that they were ill and dispose of them at sea long before they got here. With the advent of steamships, with refrigerated holds, the risk became much greater and each colony, in the early Twentieth Century, was charged with its own quarantine inspections to see that there were no breaches; but there has always been the risk of importing the virus in meat from refrigerated holds.

Quarantine is now an extremely difficult task. It could be said to be virtually impossible because animals can get here well inside the incubation time. That means that they have to be kept in strict quarantine in overseas areas free of foot and mouth disease. We import animals, and this is a Federal matter. It is one that the Federal Parliament is acutely aware of. It takes the utmost precautions, particularly in the case of cattle breeders who are importing semen from some 900 different bulls around the world. Again this semen must come from areas where there is no foot and mouth disease, blue tongue disease or any other disease.

The greatest need is for the immigration and customs people to search for smuggled salami and tins labelled "Vegetables" which in fact contain meat. Australia is well aware of these breaches and publishes them each year.

Perhaps the best defence or the best improvement in the defence against exotic diseases is the combined air-sea surveillance of the northern waters of Australia, particularly the Gulf of Carpentaria and the coast of the Northern Territory, the north-west of Western Australia and northern Queensland. These combined air-sea operations have led to the detection of an increasing number of foreign fishing vessels. What is to stop those fishing vessels from having live animals aboard? A great many of them do. They land illegally in Australia. The value of the fish and prawns that they poach is negligible compared with the cost of destruction and quarantine measures that would have to be undertaken and the loss of exports if any of these diseases entered Australia. It would be a very good means of wreaking financial havoc on this country to introduce such a disease. The authorities are continually on the alert for this.

Persons using pig-swill have been required to boil it. The Minister laid a terrible indictment against pig farmers by announcing that they do not in fact boil the pig-swill. A great many of them have been caught. The Minister's inspectors have thrown pieces of plastic or glass into the fire and they have come upon these three or four days later unburnt. It is a pity that these farmers have not long since been forced to stop feeding swill to pigs. I think they should be forced out of keeping pigs if they have been in such a serious breach of the law and in such serious contempt of their fellow graziers and farmers and, indeed, the entire nation.

It has been suggested that alternative means of disposal of pig-swill should be introduced. I believe the best method is to homogenise pig-swill, much as the housewife uses a vitamiser, and break it down to extremely small particles like a porridge. It should then be boiled through and through before being fed to pigs. It can also be put through a similar process called dry rendering which, I believe, autoclaves the swill till it is in a much drier state than it was when received. A great deal of the water is boiled off at high temperature and the swill is sterilised.

In some areas it has been suggested that it be burnt. I do not think that very much swill could be tipped into incinerators. In Toowoomba it certainly could not because the incinerator is not presently working. It has been suggested that swill be buried. This poses tremendous problems. Mention has been made of rats, dogs and wild pigs getting into the swill when buried and disseminating it widely throughout the country. In wet times, such as we have been going through recently, much of the swill could be washed into waterways, which would be contaminated by it.

Many members have placed great store on tipping down a garbage-disposal unit what now becomes swill. I for one believe that

these units must be banned for the disposal of meat products in inland Australia. Their use might be safe in Brisbane where sewerage goes to the sea and is tipped into salt water, but I do not believe that it is safe in Toowoomba. Let us consider why. The sewerage system of Toowoomba is said to be approximately 50 per cent overloaded at present, and it will remain that way for another two years. The sewage is treated and passes into the creeks that flow into the Condamine. If the sewage contained virus particles, there is no guarantee that they would be killed by passage through the sewer. It is no good thinking that because something is put through a garbage disposal unit the beaters will destroy the virus; they will not.

The virus can be killed by 5 per cent caustic soda in the sewage. The cost of that is \$100 a person per annum and, for a city the size of Toowoomba, that is a lot of money. It can be killed by 0.5 per cent hypochlorous acid (HClO) in one hour. It can be killed by one-hundredth normal hydrochloric acid (HCl) in two hours. It can be killed in two days by storing the raw sewage in tanks and allowing ammonia to generate.

If that is not done, what is the survival time of foot and mouth virus in raw sewage? It could easily live for 20 days at 20°C. It could live for 103 days in sewage in winter and easily for 30 days in animal urine. One must not regard the tipping of these potentially contaminated products into sewage as the end of the problem. In fact, if a garbage disposal unit is used the problem is magnified by the dissemination of treated sewage down streams, out of Toowoomba, down the Condamine, through the Darling Downs and the Maranoa district. How far do these rivers flow in 20 days or 100 days? How many animals enter them to drink? It is impossible to tell. I therefore think that the buttoned-down minds have to be well and truly assured that tipping these products into a sewerage system is not the end of the problem. On the contrary, it may well be the means of spreading a massive outbreak through the southern parts of Queensland.

How long can the virus live in meat? It can live quite easily for 100 days in ham and other types of meat. When it sticks on hairs, hides or sacks, it can easily live 20 days. It can be transported on shoes for quite a few days. If the shoes are used on very hot ground, it might live only three days, and so perhaps the other great barrier to our north is the high ambient temperatures through Indonesia and the rest of South-east Asia. So we need a combined effective control of all the possible means of keeping foot and mouth disease out of this country.

At the Commonwealth level we need expert agricultural intelligence to know where the outbreaks are, where the endemic areas are

and where all the products that we import come from. I believe the Commonwealth is doing a good job on this, but it needs to be better, especially when homo sapiens goes wandering all over the world and enters Australia virtually unchallenged as to where his little peripatetic feet have taken him. The Immigration Department needs to know the routes of all immigrants and overseas tourists visiting Australia. It needs to be actively informed by other countries, and I feel it is part of the function of any tourist service to know exactly what the risks are.

In the past we have been mainly concerned with human diseases. We tell people, "Don't go there; you will get yellow fever." "Watch out for that place; there is smallpox there." But we need to know about the animal and plant diseases. The customs people need to inspect not some but all of the meat, wool, hides and sacks coming into this country, whether they are imported legally or smuggled in. They need to know all about them. They need to know what is in every can. We have seen in the newspapers reports where a Commonwealth official has picked up a can labelled vegetables, cut it open and found that it is a tin of half-cooked meat. This is coming in from South-east Asia. We need to be absolutely certain that we are not importing any meat for any person's particular whim, fancy or preferred taste. Not one grain, not one gram of meat must come into this country from those countries. This is not just to protect the interests of the grazier; it is not to give him his five per cent increase in income; it is to see that he is still in business in five, 10 or 15 years' time.

We need to encourage the use of these autoclaving dry digesters for the processing of all the food products from towns such as Toowoomba. We must stop the people tipping food down these garbage disposal units and letting them think they have done a great job. I might mention in passing that these garbage disposal units cost some of the users as much as \$400 per annum to connect to sewerage, and this is not cheap when it is added onto one's rates. The charge depends on horsepower, and I have been told that in Toowoomba it is worked out on a sort of pedestal rating. I interviewed the matron of a convalescent home, who told me that she would have had something like 19 pedestal fees added to the rates if a garbage disposal unit of adequate size had been installed in that home.

Let me point out here and now that I am not representing the interests of the pig-swill feeders. There is only one such man in my electorate and he tells me he can quite easily change to other feed and it will not worry him at all. He can get on to other kinds of feed that are allowed to be handled; he has waste bread, which comes to him virtually sterile and absolutely free from exotic animal diseases; he can get plenty of fruit waste which is also free from these diseases; so the "swill Bill" is not going to

affect him financially in any way at all. But it is pointed out that he does a better job of collecting the swill than a local council does. He leaves the bins cleaner and the whole place tidier.

There are pig studs in my electorate and the owners are terrified, and rightly so, of the effects of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease. So are all graziers. But the honourable members must be absolutely certain in their minds that the banning of the feeding of swill will not completely prevent outbreaks of foot and mouth disease in this country. As I have shown, if disposal by means of garbage disposal units is encouraged the disease could well be disseminated all over the Darling Downs and the Maranoa.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER** (Archerfield) (5.21 p.m.): After listening to the contributions of the two members who have preceded me in the debate, I think it is obvious that a serious rift exists in the coalition in this Chamber, particularly amongst members of the National Party. I shall deal with that further later in my speech. Where division and strife occur in organisations, those organisations become decadent. By the time of the next election we shall see, instead of the rise and fall of the Roman Empire, the rise and fall of the Tory coalition Government. There have been threats of violence and all sorts of skuldugery, and I shall try to deal with that also in the few minutes that I will be speaking.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am speaking on this Bill only to show the versatility of members of the Opposition.

**Mr. Frawley:** You are good at tipping buckets.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I could tip one over the honourable member, but he is not worth my time. He is only small fry in the coalition Government.

**Mr. Frawley** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I don't go round kicking dogs, as the honourable member does.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): Order!

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** As a matter of fact, I am told that the Bill has been introduced at the instigation of officers of the Department of Primary Industries. They recommended the banning of swill feeding of pigs in this State. I was looking for the member for pig-swill—the honourable member for Callide—but he is not in the Chamber. I am told that pig-swill consists of food refuse collected from cafes and restaurants and that research has shown that the feeding of that raw swill has a tendency to spread or cause

outbreaks of foot and mouth disease. I ask the Minister whether that is true. I am supporting him in this instance.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I thought so.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** The disease itself, I am told, is not a killer of livestock. It was interesting to hear the honourable member for Toowoomba North say that the only killer of livestock affected by foot and mouth disease was the bullet. I am told that the mortality rate of livestock is approximately 3 per cent. However, the economic impact of such an outbreak could be quite severe. The treatment of foot and mouth disease is fairly costly. Contrary to what the honourable member for Toowoomba North has said, I am told that it costs up to \$2 for each treatment and that the treatment has to be carried out a number of times. If an outbreak of foot and mouth disease occurs, other countries will place export bans on the Australian meat industry.

Honourable members, particularly some members of the National Party, will be aware of the functions of the Agricultural Council. I notice that the honourable member for Stafford is listening quite attentively. He would not have a clue what the Agricultural Council is, so I shall try to enlighten him. It is a body consisting of eight representatives of the respective State and Commonwealth departments of primary industries. In June 1975 that council agreed to place a national ban on the swill feeding of pigs, and the Queensland representative agreed to that ban. However, it was deferred till October 1975.

The Minister for Primary Industries in Queensland has made several attempts to introduce a Bill to prohibit swill feeding in this State, but till now he has been thwarted in his attempts by the serious rift that has developed in the Queensland National Party on the matter. He has failed to obtain the approval of various members of the National Party.

I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to some photostat copies that I have here of newspaper headlines. The first one reads "National M.P.'s call to sack Sullivan". The member for pig-swill—not pig-swill; Callide (Mr. Hartwig)—called for the Minister to be sacked. The next one reads "Rural claim of 'swill vendetta'". Another one reads "'Pig-swill Bill' meets ill-will". I am told, also, that it was stated in a newspaper that the Minister for Local Government had threatened to "have" the member for Callide. I do not know which way he meant to "have" him—physically, sexually, or what—but he said he was going to "have" him. I am told on good authority that it was only the intervention of the Premier, who drew the Minister's attention to the parlous state of health of the member for Callide, that prevented the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads from hooking him.

Today I noticed that the secretary of the National Party, Mike Evans, was in the gallery. I am told on good authority that he was down here to back up the Premier in his attempt to get the rebel members of the National Party to support the Minister for Primary Industries. They were told that if they did not support him they would lose their endorsement.

**Mr. Alison:** How is yours?

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Mine is all right. Anyone who has a dollar each way on me will be right.

The United Graziers' Association was vociferously called for the implementation of this ban because of the economic implications of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease. Because of the Minister's inability to control his colleagues in the National Party, Australia's livestock industry has been exposed to the risk of economic devastation.

The member for Callide is the most vocal of the National Party's anti-swill group. I am told, however, that he has been stood over by the Premier and warned that if he enters this debate he can forget about nominating for Callide at the next election.

**Government Members interjected.**

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** That is the story that is going around. I will be interested to see whether he enters the debate tonight. But he won't enter it. He's dinged; he's not in the Chamber.

**Mr. Houston:** He should have been the first on his feet.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** He certainly should have been. But he's frightened of losing his endorsement. He wants to get his pension. The property that he sold in Monto some years ago did not give him enough and now he's scratching.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller):** Order! The honourable member will come back to the Bill.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** As I was saying, Mr. Miller, this Bill has certain serious implications for local authorities, so through you I wish to pose some questions to the Minister. They are: Will the effect of this ban be that local authorities will be faced with the disposal of this refuse or swill that was formerly fed to pigs? Will the Government be giving financial assistance to such local authorities to compensate them for this extra burden? Furthermore, is it estimated that the cost of this extra refuse disposal will run into many millions of dollars? Will ratepayers therefore have to carry an extra load to support the livestock industry?

It is also understood that swill can be made reasonably safe by either dry rendering or boiling of the waste food. Because of the high cost of disposal of such refuse, the Government should implement a scheme of disposal of swill by the above methods. I will be interested to hear the Minister's comments when he replies.

**Mr. ELLIOTT (Cunningham) (5.28 p.m.):** In rising to speak to the Bill I state that I am not opposed to the principle that it is enunciating. However, all of us have a responsibility to ensure that foot and mouth disease never enters Australia, and I for one accept that responsibility. At the same time I call on the Federal Government to look critically at all areas under its control, particularly Customs, the handling of ships' garbage, the importation of meat products and airport activities.

**Mr. Houston:** You don't think Fraser will spend any money, do you?

**Mr. ELLIOTT:** I am certain he will, and we will do everything in our power to make sure that he does. If foot and mouth disease were allowed to enter Australia, the results would be disastrous for our animal industries.

We also have a responsibility to look critically and closely at all aspects of the Bill. No-one is trying to push this under the carpet or claim that this issue is not a contentious one. Many opposing views have been put forward in relation to this legislation.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper interjected.**

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller):** Order! The honourable member for Archerfield has made his speech.

**Mr. ELLIOTT:** We must look closely at the method of disposal of swill, because that is the most contentious issue of all.

It has been suggested that various methods of disposal are at our beck and call. For example, burning, burial, and disposal into sewerage systems through gristers have been suggested. I am totally opposed to the burning of swill and I believe that serious problems are associated with the burial of it. If it is decided that the swill should be buried, it will be buried right across the board, which will include local authority areas that do not have the proper facilities for burying it. We will have to ensure that this material is buried at a certain depth, and to do this certain implements will be required. If we do not ensure that it is buried properly, feral pigs could drag it about, and that could be worse than what is done with it at present.

I wish to refute the suggestion that we put it into sewage treatment works. The eminent doctor from Toowoomba North outlined the problems involved if it were put into sewage works. I strongly oppose this

method of disposal, particularly in the Toowoomba area. If the material goes through the Toowoomba sewage treatment plant, it will eventually pass down the creeks in my electorate. The honourable member for Carnarvon said that it would be dispersed. Dispersement is not good enough. Unless we kill the virus we will be faced with serious problems. We must be certain that anything we do is of a positive and permanent nature. I cannot stress that too strongly.

In the next few years the Toowoomba sewage works will require considerable upgrading. The submissions advanced by the honourable member for Toowoomba North indicate that the processing of the swill in the sewage works is not a feasible proposition. I therefore ask the Minister to seriously consider the cost of processing this swill into stock feed, organic compost or fertiliser to avoid the pollution problems involved with the other methods of disposal and to offset the cost structure that will be occasioned by this Bill. I hope that in this sphere something practical and constructive can be done in terms of conservation.

I believe that many honourable members know far more than I about the technical nature of this measure, and I understand that many more wish to speak on it. Therefore I will not bore the Committee by trying to introduce technicalities. I strongly recommend that we take a stand on the disposal of swill. I reiterate that I support what the Minister is trying to do to prevent the introduction of foot and mouth disease, which would have grave and dire consequences if it should enter this State.

**Mr. JENSEN (Bundaberg)** (5.34 p.m.): The honourable member for Archerfield referred to many controversial features of the proposed Bill, and the honourable member for Cunningham highlighted other matters. The Minister has been asked to look at these things and he must do this because our cattle and sheep industries are too big to be put at risk by foot and mouth disease. We cannot afford to take a risk.

When the Americans were importing Australian beef, they banned imports of beef from Queensland because they were not satisfied with the condition of our abattoirs. Why don't we ban every bit of beef that comes to this country? That is the answer to this problem. Why should we import beef? We are one of the biggest meat

producers in the world, yet we are importing beef and other meat products. We should not allow it.

**Mr. Hartwig:** Your Government started it.

**Mr. JENSEN:** My Government did not start it. My Government might have lifted import controls, but the monopolists supporting the coalition parties—the big men in the game—were responsible for importing these products. If the honourable member says that our Government started it, his Government has done nothing to stop it.

**Mr. Dean:** Time is running out.

**Mr. JENSEN:** Yes, it is. Any day we could have an outbreak of this disease. It is a matter for this Government to take some action.

I have here a package marked "Prawns" from Malaysia. We would be one of the biggest prawn exporters in the world, yet we are bringing prawns in from Malaysia. Mutton and chickens can be imported into this country, yet we are one of the biggest producers of those foodstuffs. It is a scandal that that is allowed to go on in a country such as ours. Other countries ban the import of our products. Why can't we ban the import of theirs?

Let me deal now with pig farms. When in Taiwan I saw pig farms. I did not know there was such a thing as I saw in Taiwan. The pig farms I have seen consisted of a few little sties down at the back of the farm with a few pigs eating out of a dirty old trough. I had not seen a decent pig farm till I went to Taiwan. In every district that we went to the Taiwanese had to show us their pig farms. We went to see sugar mills, but we had to see their pig farms. We had to put on boots and white coats before we entered. They were so clean that a meal could be eaten off the floor. The toilet at the back is washed down every time a pig goes there. (Government laughter.)

That's a fact. It is washed down a drain, mixed with bagasse, taken out and put on the cane fields. What I saw there was astounding. I have seen nothing like it in this country. As I say, the only pig farms I have seen have had a few little huts down the back of the farm—a dirty, muddy place, usually—with an old dirty trough full of rubbish for the pigs to eat. It was very interesting to see what is done in Taiwan and how they are protecting their industry. They gave us boots and white coats to

wear through their pig farms because they didn't want us to introduce diseases from Australia.

The pork industry here is becoming an important industry, I believe. It is a growing industry; but because of it we do not want to put at risk our main industries—beef and sheep. The whole trouble is that we haven't got the guts to wipe imports from other countries, so we deserve what we get.

**Mr. BERTONI** (Mt. Isa) (5.39 p.m.): Contrary to the general belief in this place, I have the highest respect for the honourable member for Archerfield. His impassioned speech this afternoon on this legislation leads me to believe that there is an invitation for us to ask him to join the National Party.

Like the honourable member for Cunningham, I am deeply concerned at the introduction of this Bill. I, too, understand the position of the Minister and what he is trying to do, but I opposed the Bill in the joint party room and I am not yet convinced that this Bill will do what everyone claims it will. When this matter was first brought up, it was suggested that we dispose of the swill through the sewage treatment plant and that this would eliminate the problem. It was also suggested that we could treat the sewage system with a 5 per cent sodium hydroxide solution which would raise the pH and kill the virus. The cost of this exercise to Mt. Isa alone would be something like \$250,000. Apart from that, the effluent itself, when treated, would go back into our lake, which is the source of our water supply. Therefore that approach would have to be out for inland areas like Mt. Isa.

The second method suggested was the burial of the refuse itself. I think all honourable members know that, as much as this appears to be the easiest and most practical method, this is just not so, as indicated to us. There is the problem of covering this refuse, and as the honourable member for Bulimba said, the cost to local authorities will become enormous.

The Minister indicated to us in various discussions that he has the approval of a number of authorities; that they have indicated that they could remove or dispose of this refuse. I suggest that he does not have this information and that the method that he used to obtain this information was not going to council meetings.

**Mr. Houston:** Are you suggesting that the Minister has misled your party?

**Mr. BERTONI:** No.

I put it to him that he told health inspectors to obtain a figure, without broadcasting it or bringing that information to a board or council for discussion. He did this so that he could get some method of approval of this particular matter.

**Mr. Houston** interested.

**Mr. BERTONI:** No, I do not say that. I say that the Minister should first have approached the councils and got an official reply to his recommendations. I should like to know if the Minister received an official reply from the Mt. Isa City Council and not the health inspector in regard to this matter.

The other method suggested was the installation of a dry rendering plant. This method involves a cost of \$30,000 to \$40,000. If the councils had been asked if they were prepared to spend \$30,000 to \$40,000 on a dry rendering plant, which might possibly be the best solution of the three that I have indicated, the councils could have given their replies to the Minister. If the Minister can prove to me that he has these replies from the councils, I would have to apologise to him.

I also suggest that country areas are vastly different from coastal areas.

**Mr. Houston:** Not altogether different.

**Mr. BERTONI:** They have different geography and climates.

Another method suggested was to boil the pig-swill for two hours, which would kill the virus. I suggest that with our high temperatures at Mt. Isa it is possible that the virus would have died anyway. I do not know if the Minister has taken this into consideration.

There is another thing that I object to. At one stage the Mt. Isa City Council put up six piggery sites for sale by auction. Two of them were purchased and the other four were not. After we inquired what went wrong, we found that intending purchasers were told not to purchase the piggery sites because of this impending regulation coming into force. This would go back about two years. The Minister suggested to me that there are not in my area a number of piggeries but only a certain number of pigs. I say that the industry could be viable in my area if the information to which I have referred had not been given out in the beginning.

**Mr. Sullivan:** If you were one of those people who were thinking of purchasing and building up a piggery and an officer of the department informed you that there was a possibility of swill-feeding legislation being brought in, wouldn't you thank him rather than criticise him for that information?

**Mr. BERTONI:** Why would I thank him? Would I thank him without the local authority first approving of such a manoeuvre? After all, the piggery sites were put up by the local authority for auction and someone told prospective purchasers privately not to buy because of the possibility of this legislation. Why were the local authorities not advised? Why were the opinions of local authorities not obtained prior to the making of any decision?

**Mr. Sullivan:** I made it known here when discussions on this matter started. I do not know whether your council made any inquiries. Let me put it this way: had one of those fellows at that time gone off and built a piggery and then the ban came in—

**Mr. Houston:** This is a nice little chit-chat, Mr. Miller.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): Order! The Minister will have the opportunity of replying in good time.

**Mr. BERTONI:** He can reply to that point then.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I certainly will.

**Mr. BERTONI:** It has been suggested by the honourable member for Carnarvon that a fence be built right across Queensland (I do not know at whose expense; the honourable member indicates that it could be the Federal Government) in order to prevent the crossing of pigs from one State to another. I think that would be completely unworkable and not feasible. It has been shown that the virus travels in the wind and such a manoeuvre would be a waste of money.

**Mr. McKechnie:** In the event of an outbreak you could stop everything.

**Mr. BERTONI:** The honourable member indicates that this would stop everything but I do not quite agree with him.

I do not have much to say at this stage; I shall have a lot to say after the Bill has been introduced. I want my remarks recorded because I think that in some areas, particularly the Mt. Isa district, the legislation will increase the burden on ratepayers. Although the Minister has said that he will have discussions with local authorities, I am not yet satisfied that the burden on ratepayers will not be enormous.

I think that certain areas, particularly Mt. Isa and probably the Flinders district, should be exempt from the provisions of the Bill. I put that suggestion to the Minister but he indicated that he was not prepared to consider it; he wanted a complete ban throughout Queensland. The point I make is that he should give special consideration to western areas. I think he said that there are only about three or four piggeries west of a line 200 miles from the coast. I am sure that they could be given a dispensation that would bring relief to councils that are concerned about the cost.

**Mr. TURNER** (Warrego) (5.49 p.m.): The Minister has outlined the reasons for the introduction of the Bill. As a member representing a vast area of inland Queensland and one which, although the honourable member for Gregory might disagree, contains some of the best grazing land in the whole of Western Queensland from which the major source of revenue is beef and wool, I wholeheartedly support the Minister in every endeavour he makes to protect the livestock industry from the introduction of foot and mouth disease. I believe this is so of all the industries and all the associations involved in the livestock industry in Western Queensland. The banning of pig-swill is not the complete answer to the prevention of the entry of foot and mouth disease into Australia—the Minister has always acknowledged that—but I believe, as does the Minister, that we have to take every step possible to prevent the entry of this dreaded disease into our country.

Various speakers have elaborated on the methods by which foot and mouth disease can enter Australia—by ships, travellers on aeroplanes and this type of thing—and the honourable member for Toowoomba North gave a comprehensive report on foot and mouth disease and the different measures that are taken to combat it when it moves into a country, so I do not propose to discuss those aspects.

The Minister indicated that the ban on the feeding of swill to pigs did not include the feeding of dairy products, slaughterhouse offal, waste bread, fruit, vegetables and so on to pigs. Those things have been fed to pigs in the past, are being fed and will continue to be fed.

I believe that anyone who wishes Queensland to stay out of a national scheme is being unrealistic. We are not an island; we are part of a nation. As has been indicated, the Australian Capital Territory introduced this legislation in September 1975, as did New South Wales. South Australia introduced it in January 1976. The Northern Territory plans to introduce a ban on the feeding of swill to pigs and Victoria and Western Australia have already passed the legislation, which is to take effect from 1 July.

I think we must all realise that the live-stock industry in Queensland is a valuable and vital one. This is so all over Australia, for that matter. It is our bounden duty to do what we can to protect it because it is the greatest export-earning industry in Australia. I would say that the same applies in Queensland. For that matter, most of the cities in Queensland owe their prosperity to the rural industries in western areas. That is why I rose to support the Minister most whole-heartedly in any endeavour he makes to prevent foot and mouth disease entering Australia. The Minister has pointed out the tremendous contribution to the economy that has been made by rural industries. A couple of years ago this contribution was of the order of \$413,000,000. I believe we will leave ourselves open to danger if this legislation is not operated on a national basis, although I know that its introduction will affect local authorities financially.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I believe that the cost should be viewed in the light of the revenue derived from a live-stock industry free from foot and mouth disease. I compliment the Minister on the introduction of the Bill and, as I said before, as a member representing a rural community which is completely reliant on the livestock industry I will support him all the way.

**Mr. GYGAR** (Stafford) (5.53 p.m.): In rising to speak to this Bill, as with all other Bills, I think we should ask ourselves two questions. Firstly, what is it going to cost? Secondly, what is it going to achieve? This Bill will cost the people of Queensland millions in taxes, increased rates and other charges on services that will have to be levied not only to support the army of bureaucrats needed to try to enforce it but to support the new facilities needed to try to bring this in—

**Mr. Turner:** What do you think it will cost if foot and mouth disease gets in?

**Mr. GYGAR:** I will come to that later, because this measure will not stop it. It is crazy, because what it is going to do is not prevent foot and mouth disease but in fact make it easier for it to be broadcast all over the country once it does get in here. We are working here on the assumption that it is going to get in, and now we are trying to stop it from spreading, but I could not think of a measure designed to spread it faster.

One could speak in this debate about how this Bill got here in the first place, about the fanatical drive of some people to try to get it into the Chamber and about the repeated reintroduction of it until, like water dropping, it gradually wore away the granite.

One could speak about some rather shameful acts on the part of the United Graziers Association, where the little clique at the top decided that it would get what it wanted and

to hell with what the members wanted. I have spoken to graziers and others to try to find anyone other than the executive of the United Graziers Association who is in favour of the proposed Bill, and it is almost impossible.

**Mr. Turner:** How far did you go?

**Mr. GYGAR:** I went far enough. There has been a smoke-screen of deception by the United Graziers Association, seeking to mislead the Minister, and perhaps his advisers, into thinking that the United Graziers Association was united in its support of this measure. Nothing could be further from the truth.

There have been other things that I have found very disturbing, things that have gone on to try to force members of this Assembly to toe the line. If the Committee divides on this issue, I shall be voting against the motion, because without doubt this is the stupidest, most ill-thought-out measure I could possibly imagine. The most staggering thing is that such a competent and proficient Minister could be railroaded into such lunacy by his advisers.

Let me take the first point. What is it going to cost? The Minister has suggested three methods of getting rid of swill now that it will not be fed to pigs any more. The first is the somewhat wild idea of dry rendering. Dry-rendering plants in places the size of, for example, Toowoomba are going to set the local authority back \$70,000. Where will that come from?

**Mr. Hartwig:** The ratepayer.

**Mr. GYGAR:** An excellent answer.

**Mr. Hartwig:** It doesn't matter about the ratepayer.

**Mr. GYGAR:** It is not going to come from the Commonwealth Government.

**Mr. Hartwig:** No.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member for Callide will have an opportunity to speak later.

**Mr. Hartwig:** You can rest assured of that, Mr. Miller.

**Mr. GYGAR:** It is not going to come from the Agricultural Council; it is not going to come from the United Graziers Association or from the advisers and bureaucrats who seem to be so keen on the measure. It will come from the pockets of the people, and it will cost millions of dollars. No local authority in its right mind will set up the dry-rendering plants that supposedly will solve all the problems. The Minister can forget about that; it just will not happen.

The second method mentioned by the Minister was sewerage. I think my colleague from Toowoomba North (Dr. Lockwood) said enough about sewerage as a method of disposal to discount that once and for all. He has shown that sewage dumping of swill will merely disperse it over hundreds of square miles. That is no answer. The Minister can forget that one. Sewage dumping would involve the building of huge ineffectual extensions to sewerage works. They would not achieve anything and would cost millions of dollars.

The third method is dumping. If it is used, it too will cost a fortune. If the swill is dumped, front-end loaders, plant, equipment and manpower will be needed to ensure that back-filling is carried out. That will not happen. No little local authority will put on additional men and provide additional plant and machinery to fill in dumps. It will cost them too much.

**Mr. Hartwig:** What are we going to do, then?

**Mr. GYGAR:** I will come to that in a moment.

Any of the three methods suggested by the Minister and his advisers would cost a fortune. What would they achieve? Nothing! I have already spoken about that figment of someone's imagination, dry rendering. It is no solution. Sewerage—what a magnificent way to broadcast these viruses!

**Mr. Hartwig:** Health authorities won't allow them to do it. I will tell you that now.

**Mr. GYGAR:** I differ from the opinion expressed by the honourable member, because it is obvious that health authorities will be involved if this crazy scheme is introduced.

The honourable member for Toowoomba North has shown that to put this into sewage in a place such as the Darling Downs is merely going to spread it hundreds of miles—down rivers, through creeks, everywhere. One outbreak will infect a quarter of the State. That is a terrific solution to the problem of foot and mouth disease!

Dumping it—God preserve us if any idiot suggests that we dump this swill at municipal dumps. I really cannot believe that the Minister is crazy enough to believe that such material is going to be back-filled twice a day at those dumps. The Minister is a practical man and could not possibly have reached this conclusion himself. I have more confidence in him than that. But if some hidebound, shiny-pants academic bureaucrat told him that, the Minister should sack him, because he is nothing short of being criminally incompetent.

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

**Mr. GYGAR:** Before the dinner break I was drawing the attention of honourable members to the disaster that could result if the material that it is proposed in the Bill will not be allowed to be fed to pigs is thrown out onto unsupervised dumps and if backfilling is not carried out properly to bury the material deep twice a day. I have already drawn attention to the fact that local councils simply will not be able to afford to do that. The discipline of doing it is simply not there. Perhaps for a month or two months, while the Minister's bureaucrats are around breathing down everybody's neck, they might do it; but it won't last. What happens then? Instead of this material going into a pig yard, where the disease could be detected and could possibly be contained—given that the measures will be drastic and that the loss will be drastic—it goes out onto a dump with the result that we will be creating a veritable smorgasbord for all wild pigs in creation. They will come barging in, have their fill, catch the disease if it is present, and then spread it like wild-fire through the feral pig population of this State. Once the disease gets there, we will never stop it. This State and this country will be finished. There is no way that we could ever be certain of having eliminated foot and mouth disease in the wild pig population. For all time our industry will be destroyed—and that, to my way of thinking, destroys the Bill.

The net result of the Bill is that it will achieve the opposite to what it is supposed to achieve. Throwing foot and mouth disease out among the back country of Queensland is not protecting our grazing industries. It is being negligent and irresponsible. That is why I cannot support this measure, which is the most inept and ill-thought-out proposal I have ever heard. I am staggered to think that the Minister should introduce it. With no disrespect to him, I must vote against this measure. It is bad for local government, for the people of Queensland and for the grazing industry. Conscience demands that we do not allow this to happen in this State, despite the pressures from other less-informed people in the South.

**Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) (7.19 p.m.):** As all honourable members are aware, my electorate does not have any cattle or pigs in it. Nevertheless I am very conscious of our responsibilities in regard to this problem, because exotic diseases could completely ruin our cattle industry. For this reason all of us must take an intelligent interest in what is happening.

We are told that the Commonwealth Government has quarantine under its control. This problem is fundamentally one of quarantine. I have with me a number of books, from which I shall quote, that state it is almost impossible for the Commonwealth people to supervise quarantine in the way that they would like to do it.

So they have asked us to give them a back-up system. They cannot do their job thoroughly, so they have asked the State to back up what they cannot do. This being the case, they should be responsible for compensation on the one hand and the cost to local authorities on the other.

The question comes down really to one of a little old lady coming from Indonesia with a bit of salami in her bag. I cannot see that tinned meats will create any problem; if so, we have not heard of it yet. The problem seems to arise from processed meats that are brought into the country by individuals. But what happens if the little bit of salami is brought in? It does not go into a hotel or a restaurant; it is consumed in the home and the excess is thrown into the garbage, which is collected and taken to the dump. As we have heard, feral pigs can create a problem. I wonder if we are seeing only the tip of the iceberg. I take it that this legislation will be passed but perhaps there is an intention, by way of regulation, to ask local authorities to install incinerators similar to those at our ports, which were provided by the Federal Government. That is the only way to cope with the problem.

The Commonwealth realised that garbage from ships was a possible source of disease—particularly foot and mouth—and, in its wisdom, decided that incinerators must be provided. The States argued about who should pay and eventually—and rightly so—the Commonwealth paid. It was a Commonwealth responsibility. But now the Commonwealth has asked the States for a back-up because it knows that it cannot control the situation adequately. I anticipate that the next move of the Agricultural Council will be to say, "Gentlemen, we are not happy with all this refuse being dumped on normal dumps." As we have heard from many speakers, feral pigs could become contaminated and spread disease. The next move will be for the installation of elaborate, expensive incinerators. Will the local authorities be asked to pay for them? This question should be answered. The Commonwealth should carry out its responsibility when these matters involve the States and, after all, the Commonwealth is only a combination of States. I should like the Minister to express his thoughts on these points. What is proposed cannot possibly be satisfactory, whether the refuse is put in the sewage treatment plants, or in dumps. And there appears to be no alternative.

I anticipate that after the Agricultural Council meets next year we will be told, "Let's do the job properly." If that is to happen, the local authorities and the people who pay the rates should be made aware of it. I should like to think that the Minister will assure us that local authorities will not be placed in this position. This is a Federal responsibility. It is so big it transcends political parties and Governments. It is a matter of doing the job properly and it comes back to who will pay for it. That is the point we are arguing now.

I am worried that people will be put out of business by the moves we intend to make and that local authorities will be loaded with excessive charges. To my mind, this is a Federal responsibility.

We seem to be concentrating on foot and mouth disease, but I am sure honourable members are aware that quite a number of exotic diseases that can be spread by infected animals, all of which could be fatal to our export industries, have not been considered. Perhaps that is because most of them are under the control of the Federal Government. I refer to diseases such as: lumpy skin (which affects cattle and which could be brought to this country by insects), wesselsbron disease (which affects sheep, cattle, horses, pigs and man, and which again is spread by insects), Rift Valley fever (which affects cattle, sheep, goats, buffaloes and man and is spread by insects or infected people), rinderpest (which affects cattle, pigs, buffaloes and goats and is spread by animal products but only rarely) and blue tongue (which affects sheep, cattle and goats and is spread by insects or semen).

Foot and mouth disease is spread by animal products, ships' garbage, infected soil and clothing. I believe that we are concentrating on foot and mouth disease because we believe that the Federal people have a responsibility to take care of the other areas. Insects are cited time and again. A report of the minutes of evidence relating to the construction of an animal health laboratory indicates that some 3,000 dead insects were found on 49 disinfected planes. Doubtless some of them will eventually bring some of these diseases into Australia. Any of them would be disastrous to this country.

A number of honourable members who preceded me in the debate said that ultimately one or more of these diseases will come into this country. This is where I want to interest myself. If this happens, what do we do about

it? I do not know whether honourable members realise that no adequate facility presently exists in Australia to investigate and identify these diseases and eventually to verify that we have eradicated them. There are only four or five such places in the world. Pirbright is the one centre in Great Britain where that work can be done, but they have stated that they will not handle the problem for us.

Dr. Alan Edward Pierce, executive member of the C.S.I.R.O., in giving evidence before the parliamentary standing committee inquiry into the proposal to build an animal health laboratory, said this, and I think it is of a great deal of importance—

“I want to add further to a question that Mr. Kelly asked, whether Pirbright, which is as I said the world reference centre for the diagnosis of foot and mouth disease, could carry out further tests during the course of an Australian control and eradication program. I spoke to the Director, Dr. John Brooksby, by telephone last night and he said simply, no. They have not got available facilities for carrying out extensive testing for overseas countries, nor did they consider this their responsibility. The Director could not make nor could he hold such facilities for immediate readiness for such an emergency. I asked him whether he would do so if Australia were prepared to pay for the service. He again said, no. He pointed out that samples submitted for the initial confirmatory diagnosis, which is their responsibility of course, have to be accompanied by very detailed documentation. This was the arrangement under which they agreed to carry out this service and to accept the samples. He considered that it would be unreasonable to demand and impractical to provide such documentation for a larger number of samples which would be required for testing in order to monitor a control and eradication program. His further advice was that such a procedure, using a laboratory that is 12,000 miles away from the outbreak, was not a practical approach to the backing required by those carrying out the control and eradication program in the field. There would inevitably be delays which he felt would be unacceptable. I have looked at these comments and I must say that in my view they seem to be a reasonable comment on this proposition that we might be able to develop a control and eradication program using this procedure.”

So we have the terrible problem that, if an outbreak occurred next week, nowhere in Australia could we send samples to be identified; nor could we determine whether we had eradicated the problem.

It is rather interesting to note that some years ago mention was made of an animal health laboratory for this very purpose; but it took very many years for the Federal Government to decide, as it did only last year, to do something about this. I commend them on that decision. What I do not commend them on is the area where they decided to establish the laboratory. When I say “laboratory”, I am speaking about something which, on the last estimate some months ago, was estimated to cost \$79,000,000. Of necessity, it must be a high-security establishment, because viruses take no notice of walls or fences. The construction is a type of box within a box, which is the only way to control diseases of this sort.

The committee investigating the matter laid down certain criteria. Investigations were made by a high-level committee to see where it would be most suitable to place such a laboratory. A site was found not far out of Brisbane—a most suitable site. From the information I have, I think it would have been constructed here. However, on a political decision, made by the Cities Commission of all things, it was decided that the laboratory should go to Geelong in Victoria because Geelong is a growth centre. That site did not conform to a lot of the criteria. It was not near a major airport. It was not near a major university. It had a lot to condemn it, yet the Government made that decision—not in Brisbane, not in the North where the cattle are, but down at Geelong because it has been decided that that is a growth centre.

The surprising thing is that the only site that could have been called suitable was at sea level and required 1,200,000 yards of filling at a cost of \$3 a yard. It is the old rifle range. I know it very well indeed because I came from Geelong. In addition, because of salt water under the site and the filling, a special foundation would have to be provided, which again would cost a great deal more money.

The information I have received is that it would cost at least \$10,000,000 more to build this laboratory in Geelong than on the site not far from Brisbane. It must be a great disappointment, when decisions of this nature are made, to find that it will be built not on the best site for this purpose but on a political site to push along a growth centre. At this moment I am pleased to report that the development of this area has stopped. What is going to happen, I do not know. But I would like to think that the Minister for Primary Industries will interest himself in

this matter. The closer this laboratory is to the point of infection, the better will be the service that can be given.

Over a period of many months I have discussed this matter with the Minister and I know that he is extremely interested in it. Now that the present Federal Government has prevented tenders being let—and they were within three weeks of being let—the time is ripe when we as a State, and particularly the Minister for Primary Industries, should move into this area and convince Cabinet of the importance of a laboratory of this nature being provided in this State.

What worries me is that the site at Geelong will take from 2½ to 2¾ years to fill. That means that if a start was made today, a laboratory in Brisbane would be a reality 2½ years earlier than one on the site selected by the Labor Government. This could be of vital importance because as we all know, any of these exotic diseases could arrive here tomorrow.

It is proposed to take seven or eight years to build this laboratory. That in itself is a disaster. And with the Victorian site we can add 2 to 2½ years onto that! I think we would be culpable if we did not do our best to make sure that this laboratory is located on the site where it could be built most rapidly, and, furthermore, at the cheapest price. Throwing away \$10,000,000—and it could be many millions more now—would be a disgrace, but that was typical of the Federal Government that has just left the Treasury Benches. It saw everything as having political content. We have to see it—and I am sure that our Federal people will see it—as a matter of national importance, and must ensure that the decision is not based on political considerations.

I have already quoted from one very substantial report which is headed, "Minutes of Evidence relating to the proposed construction of an Animal Health Laboratory at Geelong, Victoria." It contains the evidence from all of the Australian experts on exotic diseases. It is an extremely interesting document and I recommend that the people involved with this problem read it.

In addition, there is a consolidated report from the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Works relating to the proposed construction of an Animal Health Laboratory at Geelong, Victoria. It, too, is very interesting. But what interests me is that nobody was asked the cost of building the laboratory on this site as against another site. The experts

were asked why they picked Geelong. They said that it was a decision of the Federal Government and that therefore they must carry out their investigations in Geelong. They were asked if there were any other sites and they said that there were four other sites which they thought were suitable, one being not far from Brisbane. But they said they were told by the Cities Commission that it had to be at Geelong—costing more than an extra \$10,000,000 with a delay of a further 2½ years compared with one established here. I suggest that our Minister, with Cabinet support if necessary, do his utmost to see that this laboratory—even if it is not in Queensland, because I do not think this matters—is located where it can be built in the shortest time, because even a saving of one week could save our cattle industry.

Today no country will take our samples; we must do this for ourselves. If there were an outbreak of an exotic disease in this State, or even in this country, it would be 10 years before it could be identified. This is an extremely worrying situation. I take the opportunity in this debate, with your tolerance, Mr. Hewitt, to move a little away from the Bill because I think we must do everything possible to have a laboratory established as soon as possible and at the lowest cost. I do not suggest any downgrading of the present design. I suggest that the design be retained but that the laboratory be built on land that does not require an enormous amount of expense.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The level of audible conversation is not acceptable.

**Mr. WARNER** (Toowoomba South) (7.36 p.m.): I support the Bill with a great deal of reservation. I am sure that honourable members need no reminding by the Minister of the importance of the cattle and sheep industries to the Queensland economy. Any legislation that would be of benefit in the control and prevention of viruses or diseases entering this country not only has to be considered as an urgent measure but has to be effective in its application.

I do not believe that any extra dimension can come from the introduction of the Bill as it has been presented. Unless present Federal legislation is policed to the very letter, the Bill will be useless. Preventative measures are certainly not being carried out in this State today. Anyone who has travelled overseas in the past year will know that few or no precautions are taken to

prevent viruses entering this State or, for that matter, this country. These remarks apply to arrivals by both sea and air.

Swill incinerators do not always work in Brisbane. In fact, I know of several cases where they have broken down and the swill has had to be dumped at sea. Surely this is not an acceptable method of disposal, even though we are told that sea water destroys the virus. I also believe that unless we are prepared to ban all imported meats and products that may carry this virus, such a Bill as we are considering will be of little use—indeed, of no value whatever—especially when we consider the great cost that it will impose on cities such as Toowoomba and the ability of such cities to cope with any direct decision on swill disposal.

I know that this matter has been referred to several times today. However, so far as Toowoomba is concerned, it is a big deal. The present sewerage system in Toowoomba has a capacity to cope with 55,000 people. It has been long overloaded and at present it is endeavouring to cope with a population of 65,000 and an ever-increasing industrial load. Extensions are in progress not only to bring the sewerage system up to date to enable it to cope with the extra load but to provide for at least 10 years ahead. The extensions for the first stage cannot be completed for at least two years and with the growth of the city and the disposal of swill, which I must admit is not a great deal, into the sewerage system, it will be more than fully committed when it is completed in 1979.

The introduction of swill to the system even within 12 months would mean that it could not be treated properly and there could be less than no guarantee that, if a virus was introduced to the present works, it would not end up in a creek many miles down in the Cunningham electorate. I am sure that this is far from what is needed to prevent any spreading of this virus. There seems to be positive proof that no form of sewage treatment will destroy it.

If disposal through the sewerage system is the answer to coping with this situation, which I doubt, it would seem imperative that the sewage works already under construction be further enlarged as soon as possible. Even if consideration was given to this immediately, any estimate of the cost would be so considerable that it would not bear thinking about from the point of view of the local council. The present estimate is some \$3,000,000. I do not believe that the Co-ordinator-General

would go ahead with a loan of that amount to any city at the present moment. The Minister mentioned 20 cities that have not been approached, and I believe they are possibly cities the size of Toowoomba.

An alternative for Toowoomba would be to bury its swill and so take the load off the sewerage system. If this idea were adopted in Toowoomba, we would have to dig a pretty deep hole. In any case, we do not have the land available and would have to go into another electorate.

**An Honourable Member** interjected.

**Mr. WARNER:** We could put it in there, but it would fill up very quickly. The nature of the black soil would not be conducive to the burial of swill, either. As well, there is the enormous cost involved.

**Mr. Gunn:** What about if you strike rock?

**Mr. WARNER:** That's right. Honourable members know the enormous cost to any city council of the bulldozers and back-hoes that would have to be applied to this sort of job. In addition, it would be a seven-days-a-week job and the cost involved would be enormous. Unfortunately, Toowoomba is not one of these areas where one can do things off the top of one's head. I believe that we have to approach the problems of cities such as Toowoomba in a different way. I shall wait until the Bill and the regulations are printed before I speak further on this subject.

**Mr. HARTWIG** (Callide) (7.43 p.m.): First of all, I would like to say in reply to the honourable member for Archerfield that I categorically deny that I have been spoken to by the Premier or any other executive of the National Party. For his information, three weeks ago a well-attended meeting of the Callide electorate council unanimously endorsed my candidature in the forthcoming State elections.

I have been a landowner and cattle producer all my life. I was reared on a cattle property. Honourable members will appreciate that this Bill now before the Committee was in the first instance a nice socialistic plot engineered and presented to the Australian Agricultural Council as the brain-child of none other than Senator Ken Wriedt, who was then the Federal Minister for Agriculture. Of course, he had the backing of none other than the then member for Capricornia, Dr. Everingham. The implementation of this scheme, as with everything else Labor did in the primary sector, was designed to get rid of

the people on the land, to have another slap at the small man, in this instance the small pig man. The scheme was taken to the Australian Agricultural Council about mid-1974 and each State was told that as a matter of urgency it should implement a ban on the swill feeding of pigs. I like the way the socialists dress things up these days, as they did when they called the nationalisation of health "Medibank". Instead of calling this scheme the disposal of scraps, they called it the disposal of swill to give it a little bit more of a nasty taste as far as the average citizen is concerned. Nobody will tell me what are the dangers of foot and mouth disease to the nation today, and yet here we are with a Bill which will accentuate the problem 100 per cent. Never let it be said otherwise! The responsibility for the disposal of scraps and swill will pass from the Department of Primary Industries to local authorities.

The Minister spoke about digesters. How ridiculous can one get! In a small place in the country—take Theodore, for example, where there is one hotel and one hospital—how would the ratepayers find the \$30,000 that it would cost to build a digester?

No one has laid down any guide-lines as to how a local authority will get rid of swill. I will bet London to a brick that it will be thrown about the paddocks, dumped down in the gully and put into trenches. If any disease ever gets into the wild pig population of this nation, it is goodbye to primary industries. That is the note of warning that I have tried time and time again to get through to the Minister because it is so important.

The Minister said that at present 5 per cent of the scraps were being used by piggeries, and I will accept his figure. But two piggeries near Brisbane were using—and I stress the word "were"—over 100 tons of swill a week. It was boiled under hygienic conditions. As a matter of fact, the Department of Primary Industries took visitors from all over Australia to Mr. Taylor's piggery at Redbank to see his set-up, which was approved by the department.

I suggest that the figures published by the Department of Primary Industries were a little misleading, because Mr. Barker at Aspley assures me that he has turned off 5,000 pigs per annum over the last couple of years, whereas the Department of Primary Industries reported to Parliament that he turned off 450 stores for bacon. That is wrong. So the whole structure of the figures is not worth the paper it is written on. The

figures are not accurate and Parliament has been misled. I have checked with the pig producers and they have given me statutory declarations that their figures are correct.

Let me turn now to the pig population of this State. It was down 19 per cent in 1974. With the importation of pigmeats into this nation, the consumer can buy Canadian ham for 30 cents a lb. less than he can buy K.R. Darling Downs ham. Just think of the significance of that if another 50,000 or 60,000 pigs go out of production. Certainly the consumer will be paying more for his pork; but it will also open the gates to a flood of overseas imports.

Let me read from the report of the Bureau of Census and Statistics that I have here which shows the imports of "Ham, pork shoulders prepared or preserved" into this country from countries that have foot and mouth disease. The figures are—

	Kilograms
Canada .. .. .	196,060
Denmark .. .. .	125,818
Ireland .. .. .	342,918
Norway .. .. .	972
United Kingdom ..	437,573
United States of America	1,326
Total ..	1,104,667

Today the Minister said that only treated foodstuffs are allowed into this nation. Yes, from countries in which there is foot and mouth disease!

Yesterday I implored the Minister to allow the boiling of swill under licence and under strict supervision by officers of the Department of Primary Industries so that it could be fed to the pigs and not wasted. Australia and the rest of the world can ill-afford to waste good food.

How is the virus going to be brought into this country? It will be imported in uncooked shoulder meat, not of the standard that we set but of a standard set in other countries where the hygiene and supervision requirements are not as high as those in this country. That is the sort of story that honourable members are being fed.

**Mr. Lane:** Which side are you on?

**Mr. HARTWIG:** I am pointing out the danger of the spread of foot and mouth disease as a result of the implementation of the provisions of the Bill.

Let me turn now to the use of swill around Brisbane. It has to be picked up every day, not once a week. Very recently I was in

Sydney, where I saw in front of restaurants bins upon bins upon bins, swarming with blowflies and with old people scavenging for bits of steak and other meat. Now where does the great health problem lie? Does it lie in the 5 per cent of people who handle food that is fed to pigs or does it lie in the other 95 per cent of the population? If we assume that 10,000 residents of Brisbane are, at any given time, in the restaurants, the hotels and hospitals, that leaves 790,000 people who are elsewhere. Who poses the problem—the 10,000 people or the 790,000? I suggest the problem lies among the 790,000, because food scraps are thrown out into the garbage bin, as they have been for years, by the housewife.

In wet weather such as we are experiencing at present, the dump in many outlying towns is inaccessible. Generally the worst road in a shire is the one to the dump. What will happen to the food scraps that are supposed to be dumped and buried? They will not even be able to reach the trench. They will be thrown into the long grass or down a gully. And God help us when feral pigs get among them. We will have an uncontrollable situation.

If by some chance the virus got into a piggery, at least it could be fumigated overnight. God help us if the virus is allowed to get out into the country.

It has been claimed that the threat comes from the 5 per cent of the population, many of whom are in hospital. But does anybody take a sausage to hospital? Does anybody take a piece of sausage to a hotel for dinner?

I am interested to hear mention of bread. Tuck-shops come to mind. Who will pick up the scraps from them, and who will determine that a bread roll or a bun does not contain a piece of salami? The virus could easily be lurking in a bread roll or a bun.

Mr. Taylor, who for 25 years collected the scraps from the Princess Alexandra Hospital and the Royal Brisbane Hospital, was paying the Government \$3,000 a year. The scraps were delivered to piggeries. As I have said before, there are some unscrupulous operators in the collection of swill for pigs. I make that quite clear.

All scraps that are picked up from any institution should be boiled. At the meeting of our parliamentary committee I asked the director would it be possible to have

the collection of swill supervised. He said it was not possible. I contacted my swill feeders and asked, "How often do you see D.P.I. officers come and check with you?" One fellow replied, "Once every 12 months." The other said, "Once in two years."

Most piggeries are on the outskirts of provincial cities and towns. There are more cars outside the D.P.I. office than there are outside Parliament House. One man even drives 12 miles home for lunch and back again, yet he cannot get off his backside and inspect a piggery once a month.

We are told that all piggeries will be licensed. Anyone who thinks that he will keep a pig or two in his back yard is in for a rude shock. Mr. Newton also told me that, if property owners feed table scraps to the pigs, they will not be registered. Under the Bill they will not be allowed to do it.

Goodness gracious me! We are a handful of people in a marvellous nation, but we have reached the stage when we cannot keep a dozen chooks and sell a dozen eggs, when we cannot shoot ducks on our dams without paying \$5 for a permit and when a man who kills his own beast in an abattoir area is fined \$500. A man in my area whose dairy has an 8 ft. ceiling was told that he had to rebuild.

There is no way in the world that I will support a form of bureaucracy in this nation to squeeze out the little fellow; I know how good he is and I was reared that way myself. I will not stand idly by while legislation is being enacted that will hinder and hamper and, in my electorate, will put 18 families on the dole. When we criticise the Bill we are met with a scream, "But what about foot and mouth disease?" Nobody is more concerned about that than I.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! There is too much audible conversation. I am finding it difficult to hear the honourable member.

**Mr. HARTWIG:** I have appeared on the television programme "This Day Tonight". I have gone on radio and I have worked through the Press with other honourable members to highlight the importation of food and foodstuffs from countries with foot and mouth disease. In certain places I was ridiculed about my appearance and was told, "It is time you laid off the importation of this tinned stuff." One day I met Dr. Everingham at Biloela and we opened a tin of the goddam stuff. I reckon a dog wouldn't eat it. Yet we are bringing this

rubbish into a nation where we are virtually giving away our beef products. That is the sorry plight of the primary industries in our great nation. A man raised his arms to me and said, "I don't think any Government wants it." I am taken aback when I consider the requisitions and the regulations that have been imposed on our primary industries.

Let us see how good the Federal Government is. This scheme was brought in under Whitlam. Our Minister asked if the Federal Government would take over some of the expenditure and he was given a polite no, that the cost must be borne by the local authorities.

Off our 2,340 miles of coastline foreign vessels, which are regarded as a threat to the country, carry live sheep, goats and pigs. The people on those boats are landing on our shores.

Recently I was in the Solomon Islands where we were taken to a native village. We found there were more pigs than Islanders, and while walking around we saw about 500 or 600 people. When we came back we said, "We have been on a piggery in the Solomon Islands." The customs officer said, "Good God, they've got pigs up there, too." That was his idea of a joke.

Today I rang the member for Capricornia and asked him to ask the Minister for Primary Industry if the Commonwealth Government will stop playing around, stop acting the fool and get down to banning the import of this stuff which we know will affect our livestock. Nobody can tell me that it is fair dinkum, because the disease can be introduced in even a sausage. It will come from the same place from which much of our sausage meat is coming today, where foot and mouth disease is to be found.

Foot and mouth disease is in Bali, but how did it get there? Mt. Peter Hooper, a gentleman with a Bachelor of Science degree, is reported as saying—

"There are still many areas that have not been affected and Bali is only about as large in size as many Northern Territory or Queensland cattle stations. The actual spread to Bali was by illegal importation of infected stock, not by external transport of virus."

Allowing animals and products to come into Australia from countries where it is known that foot and mouth disease is endemic is the greatest risk we face, as I see it. In my opinion, banning swill feeding in this country

will only accentuate the problem. I fear for the future of our beef industry. I fear for the future of our primary industry. I know full well the implications of foot and mouth disease. But I know full well that labourers employed by local authorities are not capable of dealing with food wastes.

What will happen in Brisbane when garbage collectors go on strike? Who will pick it up? Nobody can touch the scraps. When the New York garbagemen went on strike, the authorities had to get in bulldozers, and they had to inoculate people against typhoid and cholera. That's the sort of bloody nonsense we will have to put up with from now on—that sort of tripe. I don't think that's good enough in any democracy.

Let it be known that, if the Minister had allowed the boiling of swill-feed for pigs, I would have supported him whole-heartedly; but he knows as well as I do that his officers said, "No, we're not going to allow that, and that's it."

**Mr. Sullivan:** Because you couldn't win, you are taking the attitude you are.

**Mr. HARTWIG:** That's right. That's quite true. And I was the one who stopped the back-tagging of cattle. That was the idea of the same people who are suggesting this. The back-tagging of cattle was going to be brought in, they said. If it wasn't for a bloke called Hartwig, it would have been in. They had a trial run. When they got to Brisbane, there were no tags left on the cattle backs. A little bit of elementary knowledge is what is needed by some of these people.

More Ministers want to take a little bit more notice of members of Parliament and not as much notice of their directors. We were elected here to govern this State in the best manner. If Ministers are taking more notice of their public servants than they are of the men who have been duly elected to represent the State, then I say it is time they were removed.

**Mr. MOORE (Windsor) (8.2 p.m.):** In rising to speak in this debate, I say at the outset that it is my view that this Bill will not serve the useful purpose for which it is intended. It is a useless piece of legislation, drawing the curtain across and sweeping the dirt under the carpet, saying, "All's right. The house looks rather clean." It is the most useless piece of legislation that this Parliament has brought forward. Not only will it not do the job; it will probably exacerbate the

problem if foot and mouth disease ever comes into the country. That is what worries me.

The honourable member for Callide made a very good speech, and I commend him for it. He is somewhat concerned about the pig industry. I am not concerned about the pig industry particularly, but I am concerned about the spread of foot and mouth disease in this country. Rather than talking about its getting into the pig industry, the sheep-raising industry or the cattle industry, we should be talking first about upgrading quarantine regulations to make certain that it does not get into the country. The first occasion it turned up in America, it got in through Canada. Subsequently, after the disease was eradicated, it reoccurred. Every reoccurrence was caused by a breakdown in quarantine.

If the disease does come into our country, it should be isolated in the pigsty—not around the countryside where it can be spread amongst our beef cattle. If it is going to turn up in pig-swill—which is a load of old codswallop—it will go through the guts of the pig. The diseased beast could be isolated in the pigsty, and that would be far less costly for Australia and Queensland—and less costly to the beef industry.

This disease did come into Australia in 1872 and I believe it has been here on four other occasions. Apparently on those occasions it was eradicated. I do not know whether it was eradicated because it was easy to eradicate in this country or whether the climatic conditions in the affected areas were unfavourable for it. Australia has a great variety of climates. It has a hot wet North with high humidity, cold areas with high humidity, hot areas with low humidity and cold areas with low humidity. I do not know what the situation was where the disease was discovered in Victoria. Apparently it was eradicated and while the cost might have seemed high in those days, it was relatively low.

This Bill will not help the situation. The whole idea of the legislation is based on the fact that the virus will arrive here, or that it is here, or something along those lines. As the honourable member for Mt. Gravatt said, it can enter Australia in many ways, including insects in aeroplanes. Whenever a plane arrives in Australia from overseas, the air hostess, the customs officer or some other officer says, "We are about to fumigate this aeroplane. This might affect one or two of

you people if you happen to have any nasal problems. If you have, fold a handkerchief over your nose." Then he goes swish, swish, swish around the aeroplane and that has solved the problem. That is quarantine! That is keeping this type of disease out!

Some things need resaying. The honourable member for Callide talked about the importation of meat. The first thing that this Parliament should do is kick the Federal Government in the stomach for allowing the importation of meat. We are not doing the right thing at the right time and place. The first thing to do under this legislation is not to worry about feeding swill to pigs but to worry about the breakdown in quarantine and allowing the importation of any product which would introduce the disease.

Our wool bags come from India or somewhere else. This virus can survive for a couple of hundred days. There is no reason in the wide world that it could not come in on bags, clothing, footwear or in many other ways. It could come into Australia in imported semen. There is no shortage of ways that it could be introduced.

It is no good pulling the wool over our eyes by introducing legislation in relation to so-called swill feeding. In effect swill is the scraps from somebody's table—the little pieces of meat and anything else that has not been eaten. True it might have been handled by somebody whose hygiene was not as good as the next person's. An odd drop of saliva might be on it. The remains of the food eaten by humans are disposed of in the rubbish tin in the case of a private residence and end up in the dump.

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

**Mr. MOORE:** These food scraps are good animal food, particularly for pigs. So someone says, "We will feed this to the pigs." It has only been handled by somebody. It is not diseased. It is good food.

**Mr. Hartwig:** It looks quite hygienic.

**Mr. MOORE:** Yes; there is nothing wrong with it at that stage. So where does the problem lie? The cafes are not illegally importing contraband salami and putting it on the table. That is a load of rot. There may be some argument against food scraps from the plates used in the infectious wards at hospitals going into a pigsty. I am not certain that scraps from infectious wards go

into the garbage cans, anyway. They may be disposed of in some other way. There may be some argument against scraps from hospitals but that will not solve the problem of preventing foot and mouth disease.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I again draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that there is too much audible conversation. My wishes are not being respected and I expect them to be respected.

**Mr. MOORE:** Hospitals do not buy illegally imported salami and the like to feed patients. They buy by contract from the normal markets foods that are wholesome and economical to purchase. Generally speaking, foot and mouth disease will not be contracted from hospital food. It could, I suppose, come from cafes that provide exotic food such as frog's legs in aspic if the frogs were carriers. But the public at large can go into many delicatessens and buy this type of food if it is allowed into the country. Scraps that may be contaminated with the foot and mouth disease virus go into garbage tins and in country areas they could be picked up by crows or pigs, where there are feral pigs, and transmitted by them. The virus could end up in cattle herds, anyway. So the Bill does nothing at all to prevent infection by this virus. We are talking about an infinitesimal amount of table scraps from cafes or hospitals and forgetting all the other scraps that go into hundreds and thousands of garbage tins throughout Australia.

How stupid it is to say that we are tackling a problem! The whole thing makes me mad. I just do not know who got at the Minister. I know that in the first instance he was of two minds. But he has been got at by somebody by threat or promise and he has given in. He's been damn weak. I have to say that.

This disease appeared in America by virtue of smallpox vaccine. What are we doing about that? Is the Bill going to do anything about that? The virus has a hell of a virility for its size. It is about one ten-thousandth the size of the smallpox virus. It is a mighty little fellow with a hard shell. And here we are fiddling around with it like a lot of school kids! I would like to swear! This is the greatest piece of stupidity and humbug that I have ever seen come before a Parliament and we fall for it just to pretend to the graziers or to some other association that we are doing something. And just so it will look

good! Bugger it, if it is no good, that doesn't matter, but it will look good! Stiffen the crows! What sort of a party are we?

I am concerned about the pig industry and the cattle industry. I would like to believe that if this disease comes into the country it will be isolated. There is no better isolation for it than in a pigsty, with four walls and a fence. It would not be necessary to go round doing a hell of a lot of shooting to dispose of all the animals. The exact place of infection would be known and any half-baked detective could work back to its origin. If swill in a pigsty caused the disease, he would ask, "Where did you get the pig-swill?" He would go to the cafe mentioned and so detect the source of infection. But try to find the source from this other smart move under which the disease will get in a stream from the sewerage system! Let anyone try to detect where it originated. Blind Freddie would know what I am saying is right, but some people are so dumb and stupid that they give me a gut's ache when I hear it all.

We have heard talk about burning and burying swill. Everybody knows that we have strikes. Everybody knows that there is such a thing as leaching. Everybody knows that to save digging a hole with a bulldozer in a piece of territory to bury garbage, it will be put into a gully.

**Mr. Hartwig:** You have to get your bulldozer first.

**Mr. MOORE:** That's right; they probably would not have a bulldozer. After the garbage was put in the gully, people would want it levelled. They would fill the gully in but the watershed is just the same so the garbage would then leach through and run out into a stream. People say that it will be dispersed. It will be dispersed all right, but it will not be lost and it will not be dead. The whole thing is just stupid in the extreme.

It is true that the Minister had one hell of a lot of trouble with us in the joint party meeting. I sympathise with him. I would not be in his place on this occasion for a king's ransom. But the problem is that it is contrary to our policy to have Government by regulation. When we learned that a Bill was going to be presented, he had a hell of a lot of trouble. He said, "We will introduce an amendment to the Stock Act and this proposal by regulation and we will let you see the regulations beforehand. They will be on the table and if you are not happy with them, I

daresay that any member can then move for their disallowance." I do not doubt that there will be one or two who will want to do that. But this is not the point. If we allow public servants to start running this country they will run us by regulation. The regulations we have today are one thing, but with the great multitude of them which go onto the table we would not know what was happening next. That is one of the problems; we would just be ground down by the public servants running the country instead of members of Parliament legislating for it. That is contrary to my views and it should not happen. It is all right to say that we will have a Subordinate Legislation Committee which will look at them but the Subordinate Legislation Committee can do nothing about them if they are not contrary to the Act. That is the limit of its powers. Members might be able to say, "I saw so and so in that. Can we do something about it on a party basis or a platform basis or something like that?" But that is the wrong way and we should not do it. I have said so, and I believe so. It just should not happen.

As I say, the cost of any proposal to prevent the entry of foot and mouth disease into this country does not concern me. I do not care what it costs to keep it out—I am happy about it—because, no matter what the cost, it will not be anything like the cost of its eradication; but this measure is not going to do a thing towards preventing its entry. We have to stop the disease coming into the country, and if it does come in, I want it to be confined to the pig sty. When we are talking to representatives of the beef industry they will say, "Oh, you have got foot and mouth disease in your country." We will say, "Yes, it might be in some cloven-footed animal but it is not in any ruminating cloven-footed animal: it has only ever been found in the pig. That is the only animal that has had it. It has never been in our cattle industry since 1872." We have something to say then. We can say it has occurred only amongst pigs and not amongst cattle and so it may not do our business nearly as much harm.

Some members around this place have said, "Well, if we don't bring this in, New South Wales will not take our pigs." What a load of codswallop. True enough, they would do that if there were foot and mouth disease in this State, but there is not, so I do not want any humbug along those lines simply to attempt to get a point across to

support what is in fact a damn weak argument. When one considers that there are tens of thousands of rubbish tins being emptied into dumps every day, nobody is really worried about this disease. There are thousands and thousands of ways it can be spread and we are talking about one infinitesimal bit of rubbish that is fed to pigs. I like to think it is going to be fed to pigs because if the disease is going to come in we know it is here, we know where it came from and we can work the situation back. We could not do much better than that.

I have about come to the end of my tether, I believe. This situation should not have come about. When the vote in the party room is split right down the middle, it is not the time to bring in legislation of this type. We should have a look at it and then have another look and another look at it, until some sort of unanimity is achieved. Not all the brains are in the Department of Primary Industries; not all the brains are here. It is a crying shame that the Minister is introducing a hoodwinking piece of legislation that will not do a damn bit of good towards keeping the disease out of this country.

**Mr. GUNN** (Somerset) (8.21 p.m.): Members on the Government benches who have opposed certain provisions of the Bill have been accused by various organisations throughout the State of recklessness in putting the cattle industry at risk. Nothing could be further from the truth. Many of us who have been involved in the livestock industry all our lives have fought for years to have quarantine legislation strengthened. For example, I was one of those who strenuously opposed allowing American soldiers to bring hams to this country. I do not remember the United Graziers' Association or any other organisation opposing that. During World War II I lived not far from the Queensland Agricultural College, and many of the local people worked there. It was not unusual for them to bring home hams partly cooked, with one or two slices off them and almost raw near the bone.

I am amazed that foot and mouth disease has never entered this country, because I believe that there has been only token resistance to its introduction. The virus certainly must be very difficult to transmit. It was introduced to the United States of America

last century in some vaccine that was manufactured in Japan. It was not detected there for about six months. People in America did not know what it was, and at that time they did not have the proper facilities for diagnosis. When an unusual disease appears on a farm, it is usual to keep the fact very quiet, and that is where the danger lies.

As far as I am concerned, quarantine in this country has never been strong. That was brought home to quite a number of honourable members who made trips to Asia. The honourable member for Windsor said that when he went there the aeroplane stopped and a man with an aerosol can of spray went up and down the passageway. I thought it was a little comedy. All it did was make the honourable member for Belmont sneeze and give the rest of us sore eyes. I think that every virus in the plane was fairly safe.

Although we went through some slaughterhouses in Japan and we declared that we had done so, it did not seem to make any difference. I came home with the pair of shoes that I wore when I went through a slaughter-house. I cannot think of the organisation—

**Mr. Moore:** It was Eto ham.

**Mr. GUNN:** It was the Eto ham factory.

What concerns me most is that the proposed legislation is ineffective. If it was effective legislation, I am absolutely certain that the Minister would have the full support of every honourable member.

Speakers who have preceded me in the debate have outlined very well their thoughts on the disposal of scraps, or swill, as it is called. Let us consider, Mr. Miller, the position in which local authorities are placed. Very few scraps and very little swill go to piggeries in country areas. They go to the local dump. I have seven local authorities within my electorate, and although they keep their roads in good order, I have no hesitation in saying that their dumps are a disgrace. Food is dumped there on Friday or Friday evening and it is covered at midday on Monday. I wonder at the fact that foot and mouth disease has not spread. I have heard it said that we have been extremely lucky. The point is that we have been lucky for over 100 years, because in earlier years the quarantine precautions taken at ports and airports were rather haphazard. Admittedly, over the past 10 years or so they have been strengthened.

Will disposal in trenches be effective? I say not unless the scraps are buried to a certain depth and are well covered every day by a fair amount of soil. If the swill is put into our sewerage mains, will that be effective? I would be surprised to learn that it is. The virus is very resistant. Admittedly, sodium hydroxide 5 per cent or any strong alkaline solution will destroy it within a certain time. Heat, of course, will destroy any organism. Have we access to these various methods of destruction? What will happen if the swill is put into the sewerage mains? All that will happen in Brisbane is that it will be poured into the river at Luggage Point and swept out in the bay. In country areas we do not know where it will end up.

Many country towns do not even have a garbage service. So that little old lady who brings her piece of salami back from Indonesia is probably creating a problem. It is like playing Russian roulette. If that piece of salami finishes up in Brisbane, it is probably destroyed, but if it ends up in a country area, it is probably dumped in a garbage can or thrown over the back fence. If it contains the virus and is eaten by a wild pig the results will be disastrous.

I have tried to illustrate the ineffectiveness of the Bill. Reference has been made to the loss of pork and bacon production. In fact the Minister has emphasised this aspect. I do not think his point is a valid one. I realise that the quantity lost would not be significant, and all I point out is that we are contesting the effectiveness of the legislation. We are not worried about the price of bacon and pork; if it goes up by 10c or 20c that does not really matter.

If this legislation would succeed in keeping foot and mouth disease out of Australia, I would agree to it. However, that is not so. We have been told that regulations will be promulgated. I don't know why they were not included in the Bill.

The track record of some of the D.P.I. officers has not been too good. I draw attention to the meat authority. No doubt the Minister has done his utmost to try to bring some degree of sanity into this area, and for that I congratulate him. However, we are sceptical about regulations. We will, of course, pass judgment on them at the appropriate time.

To emphasise the ineffectiveness of quarantine regulations in Queensland, I remind honourable members of the blue tongue scare at Mt. Crosby. A person went to Canada,

obtained semen from an insemination centre there and brought it back into Australia. He was not challenged in any way. If it had not been for the fact that he shot off his big mouth at the Churchill cattle sale and his comments were overheard by someone else who realised the danger involved, we could have seen an outbreak of blue tongue in this country. The results would have been disastrous. The authorities acted very swiftly and I recall that the Army was brought in to help. Local dairy herds were slaughtered and undergrowth was burned. The authorities did an excellent job, and we give them full marks for that.

The fortunate aspect was that the semen was obtained from a clean insemination centre. However, only two miles distant blue tongue was prevalent. The insemination centre from which he got the semen was well managed, but it was more by good luck than good management that we escaped this disease. He got through customs with a port-load of semen.

**Mr. Marginson:** They were a bit lucky.

**Mr. GUNN:** They were extremely fortunate. But it could happen again.

I am extremely dissatisfied with quarantine regulations. Irrespective of which Government is in power, meat products are imported to Australia. I suggest that they are still coming in.

I have attended many Q.D.O. meetings only to hear the same old stereotype answer from the Federal Government—be it Labor, or Liberal-National Country Party. We are always told that we must engage in reciprocal trade. That is the greatest heap of boloney I have heard of. Why on earth should we bring \$240,000 worth of carrots from Belgium when in my valley they were running the tandem over carrots? Why do we bring cauliflower and other vegetables from Taiwan when they are rotting in the paddock in the Lockyer Valley? Why do we bring potatoes from New Zealand and Canada?

**An Opposition Member** interjected.

**Mr. GUNN:** They may be bringing a good price now because the season has been too wet and no-one has them.

Last year I remember very clearly that thousands and thousands of tons of processed potatoes were imported by a Victorian firm—mainly from Canada and America—when my people were getting \$25 a tonne, which was lower than cost of production. I

cannot understand these things. Nobody can convince me that the importation of vegetables from countries where these diseases are endemic could not cause an outbreak of foot and mouth disease here.

In the United States Year Book of Agriculture in the 1940s, Professor Lawes stated that this virus was so tough that it was known to exist on the ropes on boats for several months. Nobody can convince me that it could not come over in vegetables.

I know that we must trade with Taiwan, but let us trade in other than dangerous articles. Anything that can bring in any virus which can cause terrible damage to our industries must be dangerous.

We are opposed to this legislation because we consider it will not do the job it is supposed to do and because local authorities at present, through lack of finance, are not doing a good enough job in garbage disposal. I would like to know where the extra money is to come from and what contribution the Federal Government is prepared to make towards the cost of the extra work that will be necessary in the local government field.

**Mr. Hartwig:** Nil.

**Mr. GUNN:** If that is so, it will be a very sad day.

**Mr. Hartwig:** Local authorities have reached the limit in rates.

**Mr. GUNN:** That is so. I do not know too many local authorities that have not reached the limit in rating.

I hope that the Leader of the House will not gag this debate. Many other honourable members want to make a contribution.

**Mr. Sullivan:** I have no intention of gagging the debate. All honourable members are entitled to their say and they will all get it as far as I am concerned.

**Mr. GUNN:** This is what we want. I would only hope that the debate is not gagged.

**Mr. Moore:** He might be wrong in this, but he is a good Minister.

**Mr. GUNN:** I am not suggesting that the Minister would do it. There are those other than the Minister who could do it. Many more members want to speak in this debate. It is a very vital subject. Anyone who has listened to the debate tonight would have gained some impression of the concern that is being felt by the people on this side of

the Chamber and, no doubt, on the other side, too. The honourable member for Bulimba has stated that he is very sceptical also.

In conclusion, I say that there are many questions not answered that I would like to see answered. I would like to see the Minister—

**Mr. Hartwig:** Hold off the troops.

**Mr. GUNN:** Well, I would like to see him introduce a better system of disposal. For God's sake, don't put swill in the sewerage system. In some country areas sewage is used for irrigation. Not so long ago in one of our local authority areas we had an outbreak of beef measles caused by irrigation with effluent from the sewerage system. Let us not put it into the sewerage system. In country areas we make use of our sewage. I can well imagine that, if foot and mouth disease was introduced into the sewerage system, it would be irrigated all over the countryside, or in a particular area where cloven-hoofed animals are pastured.

I enjoin the Minister to talk with the officers of his department and to find a more efficient means of disposal. The cost, provided it is shared by Federal, State and local government, is not of great consequence. What is important is that the virus is destroyed.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Mr. Miller—

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): I call the Minister.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I was next on the list. Are you going to let the Minister take over?

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I have called the Minister.

**Mr. Frawley:** It damn well stinks!

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Wright** interjected.

**Mr. Frawley:** Shut up, or I'll get you.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Hon. V. B. SULLIVAN** (Condamine—Minister for Primary Industries) (8.37 p.m.): I will assure all honourable members who want to speak on this issue that they will be given the opportunity at the first reading.

**Mr. Frawley:** Why weren't we given a chance tonight? It's only half past 8.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** As Minister, I can enter the debate and answer points at any time—after each speaker, if I so desire. Those are the rules of the Parliament, so don't blame me. The honourable member should calm down a bit.

I accept the criticism and the observations made by all members who have spoken so far. I thank the honourable member for Bulimba, who replied for and on behalf of the Opposition, indicating that this measure will have the support of the Opposition. It is my intention to deal in my second-reading speech with all matters raised. Questions have been asked of me and I believe that honourable members are entitled to answers. A number of members have spoken, and I believe there are to be a lot more speeches. It will take some work by my officers and me to provide the answers, but I give honourable members the assurance that answers will be given.

In spite of what has been said by the honourable member for Callide, not only in this Chamber but also in the Press, advocating my sacking, or the removal of my responsibility, I want to assure the people of Callide that they will get everything from me and from the department that they are entitled to. I am not so thin-skinned as to deprive them of that. However, it does disturb me that, a decision having been taken, the actions of the honourable member are somewhat like those of the little fellow who is losing at marbles. He takes his marbles home. I hoped that he would have adopted a different attitude. I have listened closely to everything he said. I reiterate that all we are doing under this Bill is amending the Stock Act to allow the bringing in of regulations. I have given plenty of thought to regulations and, like the honourable member for Callide, I have had a lifetime in the livestock industry. In spite of what some other members have said, I am not quite as dumb as some people might think.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Miller): Order! It has been reported to me that the honourable member for Brisbane has put a tin of garbage on the front bench alongside the Minister. I ask the honourable member for Brisbane to remove that tin of garbage.

**Mr. Lowes:** Very well, Mr. Miller.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** I respect the views of the honourable member for Callide. I hoped that he would have respected my views and those of other people. I read an article in the paper today. I am glad I read it in the paper. At least I give the honourable member marks for having sufficient courage to put it into the paper. I read that because he could not get his way at the party meeting yesterday he recommended the sacking of the Minister for Primary Industries. I think that he will draw the wrath of many people in many primary industries over that statement. Many primary industries have been very concerned at his criticism levelled at me through the Press over recent weeks.

**Mr. Wright:** He wants your job.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** Maybe he does. Maybe he would do it better; who knows?

The point is that I know I have the confidence of all primary industries throughout Queensland for the manner in which I have administered my job. Only a few weeks ago when two other Ministers and I came in for some Press criticism, which was without foundation, a unanimous vote of confidence was passed in the three of us in the party room.

However, I give that assurance. While the honourable member for Callide has put before the Committee his own views, I believe that he is acting very irresponsibly so far as the livestock industries in this State are concerned.

**Mr. HARTWIG:** I rise to a point of order. I came into this Chamber as a member elected by my constituents. I will not tolerate any Minister referring to me as being irresponsible. I find it offensive and I ask the Minister to withdraw that statement.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw the words.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** With all due respect to you, Mr. Miller, I said that the member has acted irresponsibly on this measure.

**Mr. HARTWIG:** I rise to a point of order. He said I acted irresponsibly. I request the Minister to withdraw.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the Minister to withdraw the words that the honourable member finds offensive to him.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** If it is offensive to him, I will withdraw it. When the House is up, I will tell him again.

**Mr. HARTWIG:** I rise to a point of order.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** The Minister will withdraw the words without qualification.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** It seems to have struck a tender spot. He is starting to swill. I withdraw it.

**Mr. Frawley:** You just want yes-men. You don't want us to stand up against you.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** I do not want——

**Mr. Frawley** interjected.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** That is the observation I make.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I will not call the honourable member for Murrumba to order once more.

**Mr. Frawley:** I am being picked on and I will retaliate.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! I now warn the honourable member for Murrumba under Standing Order 123A.

**Mr. SULLIVAN:** I only mention it at this hour of night because it appeared in the Press that the honourable member for Callide has recommended that I be sacked. Possibly he has taken steps to have it included in the A.B.C. news. I do not know. But it will get in the news.

What I want to tell the people of Queensland, particularly those in my electorate, is that I am prepared to box on with the honourable member for Callide at any time. There is nothing personal in this; for some strange reason, I like him—or I used to! I give an assurance to the electors of Callide that I will give to their member's representations on their behalf, either to me or to my department, the attention that I have always given them in the past. I should say that I will want them in writing.

It is my intention to leave the matter at this stage. I have never been one to walk away from a problem and I like to take my critics front on.

Progress reported.

## METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY BILL

### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

**Hon. K. W. HOOPER** (Greenslopes—Minister for Transport) (8.48 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to provide for a Metropolitan Transit Authority, its functions and powers and for related purposes.”

In North America and Western Europe, the need is recognised for efficient public transport to provide an alternative to the private car. Only recently it was announced that the Amtrak Government agency in the United States paid \$352,000,000 in 1975 to support passenger rail services. This does not include the large sums provided by the cities such as New York for their own rapid transit and bus systems.

Honourable members would agree that Queenslanders today expect a relatively high standard of urban life. They need good homes, good jobs, schools, shops and services of every kind, opportunities for recreation and access to recreation facilities. Basic to the satisfaction of these needs and linking them together is the need for movement. People need to travel quickly and easily between their homes and their jobs, whether they work in the centre of Brisbane or at a local centre. Furthermore, they make journeys to go shopping, to visit relatives and friends, to sporting activities and to other leisure retreats.

As our living standards improve, so too have the demands for movement increased. Thus people desire more and more the ability to move around freely and quickly—the maximum possible mobility. A sizeable portion of the community depends largely on efficient public transport for its mobility. The elderly, the young and the handicapped are just three examples.

People who cannot afford a car face serious travel impediments and hardships if public transport services are inadequate. Also, other members of families who own one car would be immobilised while one member of the family was using the family car. For all these reasons, this Government has consistently supported the provision of an efficient system of public transport.

In Australia, as well as overseas, it has long been recognised that, for the effective development of public transport in urban

areas, a special authority was required to co-ordinate the various elements of public transport such as buses, trains and ferries. This authority would also develop these modes in close affinity with the growing requirements of the metropolitan area including its new housing areas, its industries, its shopping and recreational developments.

In its policy speech for the 1972 State elections, this Government undertook to proceed with the co-ordination and rationalisation of all forms of public transport in the metropolitan area, under one regional transport authority. In connection with this, the Government also foreshadowed the implementation of much of the South-east Queensland-Brisbane Region Public Transport Study, commonly known as the Wilbur Smith Plan. Included in the study's recommendations were the electrification of the suburban rail network, the provision of new electric rail cars and modern buses, and the construction of a rail bridge linking the northern and southern suburbs.

Following our re-election in 1972, we immediately took steps to fulfil these promises by establishing a committee strong in public transport expertise, comprising senior interdepartmental officers and a representative of the Brisbane City Council. This committee was later to become known as the Metropolitan Transit Project Board. Subsequently a policy committee for public transport was formed consisting of the Honourable the Treasurer, the Minister for Transport, the then Lord Mayor of Brisbane, the Co-ordinator-General and the Under Treasurer. Under these arrangements a works programme was drawn up which formed the basis of agreement with the Commonwealth for the funding of capital works, aimed at improving public transport in the Brisbane area. A group of full-time officers was appointed to assist in this vital work together with a recognised managing consultant.

In 1974, the Metropolitan Transit Project Board was established as a statutory body by Order in Council and, after world-wide advertisement, an executive chairman was appointed along with other senior officers. As it stands today, the board comprises the executive chairman, the Co-ordinator-General, the Under Treasurer, the Commissioners for Railways, Main Roads and Transport, the Director of Local Government and a representative from the Brisbane City Council and the Commonwealth. At this point, Mr. Hewitt, I would like to offer my thanks to

the members of the policy committee and the board for the sterling work they have performed since their inception.

These major steps I have just outlined, Mr. Hewitt, have led to the current activity now in evidence for all to see in many parts of Brisbane. There is the construction of the cross-river rail link connecting South Brisbane and Roma Street Stations, new interchange facilities and car parks at many suburban railway stations, track work on the Brunswick Street to Mayne, and Mayne to Ferny Grove sections which is a necessary preliminary to electrification, and of course, the new buses being added to the city council's fleet. During this period, considerable research and preliminary work has been initiated into the steps necessary for the formation of a statutory Metropolitan Transit Authority.

Summarising, Mr. Hewitt, the object of this Bill is to establish a Metropolitan Transit Authority for the purpose of providing a properly integrated and efficient system of public passenger transport for the declared region as a culmination of the Government's policy in this direction.

A fundamental aspect of this legislation to which the attention of honourable members will no doubt be closely directed is the constitution and membership of this new authority. In order to enable the authority to represent the many varied interests and cross-sections of the public who will be affected by the authority and its decisions, it is proposed that the authority will consist of seven members. Five members of the authority will be appointed on the recommendation of the Minister. These will include the chairman, who will be the only full-time salaried member of the authority, and the deputy chairman. One member of the authority will also be appointed in order to represent the interests of the general public.

In drawing up these provisions, the Government also recognises the deep interest and contribution made by the local authorities in the area, and in particular the Brisbane City Council. It is therefore proposed that the authority will include one non-elected member nominated by the Brisbane City Council (contrary to all public utterances) and one non-elected member nominated by the remaining local authorities whose areas are partly or wholly included within the declared region.

An important consideration regarding the authority's creation is the "declared region"

within which the authority will exercise its functions. The Bill provides that the declared region will include the whole of the city of Brisbane and also the whole or parts of such neighbouring local authorities as may be decided from time to time by the Governor in Council.

It may be appropriate for neighbouring areas such as Redcliffe, Ipswich and the Gold Coast to be included within the declared region as they have a close connection with Brisbane in a public transport sense. The proposals of the Bill enable this to be done and also provide flexibility so that when development occurs it will be possible to alter the boundaries of the declared region.

As to the functions of the authority, the first provision in this regard is that the authority should formulate programmes for the purpose of providing a properly integrated and efficient system of public transport for submission to the Minister for Transport, and for the implementation of such programmes as are approved by the Government.

One of the important functions of the authority will be the co-ordination and assistance of public transport services by entering into agreements with prescribed persons for the improvement or expansion of public transport services operated by those persons.

The Government does not believe that the solution of public transport problems in Brisbane necessarily lies in the take-over of every public transport service by a central authority. In the first place, the Government itself, through the Queensland railways network, makes a substantial contribution to public transport services within the metropolitan area. The task of providing rail services is complex and one which must be closely integrated with other functions of the railways network, namely, the long-distance passenger trains and freight services.

The Brisbane City Council is playing a major role in providing public transport—in fact, it is still the biggest people-mover in the metropolitan area. Similarly, many private bus operators are making an essential contribution to the public transport needs of the area.

The Government sees no reason why these agencies should not continue in the task of providing essential services, but also recognises that it is now time for co-ordination by a central authority, namely, the proposed Metropolitan Transit Authority. The Bill

has been formed in such a way as to allow flexibility in the operation of these arrangements in the future.

The proposed agreements to which I have just referred may include arrangement for financial assistance. In this regard, the Government is reinforcing the steps already taken towards financial assistance to the Brisbane City Council bus services to the extent of some \$900,000 per annum for school transport and the passing of the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act 1975 whereby the Government set aside up to \$600,000 this financial year for assistance to private bus operators.

From what I have said, I trust honourable members will appreciate that the Government does not have any immediate intention of taking over services currently operated by other agencies. Nevertheless a provision has been included in the Bill whereby the authority could in the future take over and operate public transport services if the Government considers this necessary.

Again, honourable members should appreciate that the authority's powers must be wide enough to enable it to carry out its functions under many varied circumstances which may arise in the future, but which we cannot possibly foresee at present.

The principal power embodied in the Bill enables the authority to operate by itself, or in conjunction with another person, public transport services by land, water or air, including air-cushioned vehicles, on routes within the declared region, or to and from the declared region. For this purpose it has an incidental power to carry luggage or property for delivery on the route.

The authority is empowered to assist a prescribed person in his operation of a public transport service, by providing monetary assistance, passenger transport vehicles, or other facilities. In connection with this power, it can enter into agreements with persons and acquire assets and undertakings to assist in the discharge of its functions.

The authority will also have the power to acquire, use, sell, lease, etc. premises, rolling-stock and other facilities. As well, it is empowered to undertake capital works and to construct, manufacture, maintain, repair, etc. anything required for the purpose of its business. Subject to due notice being given to the responsible road authority and to other

specified protections for traffic and safety, it may temporarily occupy a road for the purpose of constructing tracks, cables, etc.

Because of the need to ensure that the authority follows Government policy, the Bill also makes provision for the authority to adhere to directions relating to policy which may be given from time to time by the Minister, both in regard to carrying out its functions and the use of its powers.

An important aspect of the co-ordination of transport is the question of fares. Many attempts at co-ordination of public transport in different parts of the world have failed because it has not been possible to bring about a rational fares system. The Bill therefore provides that any agreements which the authority may enter into with operators can make provision for control of fares. In that case, since this is an important policy issue, the approval of the Minister for Transport must first be obtained for any proposed changes to fares.

It is recognised that the welfare of the people working in an industry is an essential requirement for its efficient working. This Bill provides that such staff as the authority may employ, to be approved in number by the Minister, will be subject in their conditions of employment to any applicable industrial agreement. The Bill also provides that the authority may institute superannuation schemes and that members of the Public Service who may take up employment with the authority will be able to retain their superannuation benefits and long service leave entitlements.

With regard to the appointment of members of the authority itself, the Bill provides that the chairman will be appointed for a term of six years and the remaining members for a term of three years. The Governor in Council may remove from office a member of the authority for reasons of bankruptcy, becoming incapable, incompetent or unfit, or for any other reason. A member vacates his office if he is absent from three consecutive meetings without the Minister's approval, or if he reaches the age of 70. As well, a member of the authority may resign his office at any time.

The authority shall appoint the times and places of its meetings, while meetings may be called by the chairman, or in his absence the deputy chairman, or in the absence of both of them by the Minister. A quorum will be four members and the authority will perform its functions by majority vote. A member who abstains from voting will be deemed to have voted in the negative.

A minute book will be kept to record the proceedings of the authority, and extracts from the minute book may be used as evidence. The common seal of the authority will be in the custody of the chairman and will be used only under a resolution by the authority. A member of the authority having a pecuniary interest in a matter being discussed at a meeting will be required to disclose his interest and withdraw from the meeting. Any member who fails to comply with this provision forfeits his office.

As is the custom in the case of statutory authorities of this type, the Bill includes a number of provisions to ensure the financial affairs of the authority are kept in a proper manner. The authority will be required to maintain a general fund, a loan fund and a trust fund and any other funds prescribed by the Governor in Council. The general fund will provide for the performance of general business conducted by the authority. The loan fund will provide for capital works and will comprise loans subsidies or grants for that purpose. The trust fund is provided for payment of deposits, etc.

Before 30 September each year the authority will be required to draw up a budget of receipts of expenditure for the financial year for each of its funds, together with comparative figures from the previous year. The budget must be agreed by the Minister and the Honourable the Treasurer, and then approved by the Governor in Council. Once it is approved, it will be binding upon the authority.

The authority may borrow money from the Honourable the Treasurer or by the sale of debentures, but any such loans must be approved beforehand by the Governor in Council. The usual provisions are included in the Bill for the protection of lenders, and also that loans to the authority by a trust will be an authorised investment within the Trusts Act 1973. With the approval of the Governor in Council, the authority may also borrow by means of temporary overdraft.

The authority will be required to keep proper books of account which will be subject to audit annually by the Auditor-General, and it will also be required to produce an annual report which will be laid before this assembly by the Minister.

As already referred to, an important function of the new authority will be to continue implementing the agreement between the State and the Commonwealth for the joint funding of capital works to upgrade public transport in and around Brisbane. In order to assist the authority in the formulation of this programme, it is proposed that a planning advisory committee be set up. To give the Commonwealth an effective voice in such deliberations, the Bill provides that one of the members of the planning advisory committee should be nominated by the Commonwealth Government. Apart from the chairman of the authority and the Commonwealth representative, the other members of

the planning advisory committee would be the Commissioners for Transport, Railways and Main Roads. It will be chaired by the authority's chairman. This will enable Government policy in the planning of different forms of transport to be co-ordinated.

The Government attaches great importance to formulating proper long-term plans for public transport. Many of the defects which are apparent in the present public transport system arise partly from the inability in the past for long-term planning to be given sufficient emphasis. Even today, in its attempts to improve the public transport infrastructure, this Government is being hampered by stop-go effects resulting from shortcomings of the current agreement with the Commonwealth. It is therefore proposed that, within two years from its formation, the authority should prepare a plan for the development of public transport during the period of five years from that date. Following approval, this plan will be published and made available to the public, and will be updated from time to time. In drawing up the plan, the authority will be required to have regard to the exercise by town-planning authorities and transport authorities of their functions.

A provision is also included in the Bill which obliges any transport authority, including the Commissioners for Railways, Main Roads, Transport and the Brisbane City Council and any other local authority, to notify the Metropolitan Transit Authority of any policy decisions it intends to take which might affect public transport. Such policy decisions could include matters affecting the operation of public transport services, provision and regulation of parking areas for motor vehicles and any proposals for major land development.

There is also included in the Bill a provision whereby the authority can require the Queensland Railways to provide rail services and to carry out any necessary capital works for the improvement of those rail services.

All these provisions have been made for the furtherance of the Government's intention to improve the long-term planning for public transport in the metropolitan area.

In conclusion let me stress that this Government has consistently pursued a policy of support and assistance for public transport as an essential component of the continuing development of Brisbane and surrounding areas. We believe that the establishment of a Metropolitan Transit Authority is a major milestone in this development.

It is my intention to let this Bill lay upon the table for as long as possible during this sitting before the second-reading debate so that I may receive comments from honourable members in this Assembly and other interested people. I commend the Bill to the Committee for its earnest consideration.

**Mr. BURNS** (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (9.9 p.m.): With all the problems facing Australia, the biggest domestic problem is what to do with our cities—to decide their optimum size, how they should be planned, whether housing density should be increased and what is to be done about waste collection or pollution. In the concept of this Bill, I accept from the Minister that we have a declared area which would be the Brisbane City Council area and the whole or parts of existing areas and suburbs around it.

I believe that it is necessary to extend any concept of transport planning to take in more than the city of Brisbane because a total urban transport system has many parts and functions. Properly planned, it can make a city and its area attractive. It can make the environment attractive and it can strengthen the centre of the inner city.

In the past we have probably been fortunate in many ways. Because of the lack of transport planning, people who built shopping centres have helped us by not requiring us to build additional roads or transport services that would have brought people into the city. As the city has developed, planners have gone in for suburban shopping centres, perhaps because of the poor city transport service. That, too, has taken some pressure off our transportation service.

A planned total transportation service will assist us in guiding and establishing land-use patterns and improving regional accessibility for the movement of people and goods. It seems to me that it is no good unions arguing for a shorter working week or a shorter working day if it is going to take the worker two hours longer each morning to get across town to his job and two hours longer to get home. Providing a cultural centre on the river-bank and cleaning up the river and making beautiful drives along it serve little purpose if people cannot get there to see them or if we do not have adequate public transport for them.

The Minister said that he intends to declare the area covered by this authority so that it will include the city of Brisbane and also the whole or parts of neighbouring local authorities. In my view, the ambit of the Metropolitan Transit Authority ought to extend as far as Noosa to the north, Toowoomba to the west, and south to the border.

**Mr. K. W. Hooper:** It will one day.

**Mr. BURNS:** I think we ought to start straight away. One of the main problems with transport planning in Queensland is that we have had so many proposals put forward and we have changed our minds so often. If we are about to make a real start by setting up an authority, that authority should be given the opportunity to plan the whole area. While the area I have indicated covers only 1 per cent of the State, over 60 per cent of the population lives in it.

100

Redcliffe, Caboolture, the Gold Coast and Ipswich are really residential areas of the city of Brisbane. People from those areas do travel into and out of the city. It is not as though they are separate entities any more. The people live there but work and play in Brisbane.

I am disappointed that, after all the promises we have been made, the Brisbane ratepayer will continue to be the only capital city ratepayer in Australia to pay for transport services. Brisbane alone, of all capital cities, requires its ratepayers to foot the bill for its bus services. The ratepayers of Brisbane are lucky that the council has been so efficient in operating its transport. I do not say it is a good service; no-one suggests that it is. One of the reasons the service is bad is the very reason the Minister gave. In 1972 we were promised a Brisbane area transport authority. That ruined any future planning. Everyone has had to wait for the Government to act. I can quote from some cuttings of statements by Ministers that the transport authority would take over the buses. At one stage it was said that it would be an all-embracing authority. A lot of furrphies were floated out to the population, especially at election time in 1972, that an authority would take over.

**Mr. K. W. Hooper:** No.

**Mr. BURNS:** I will quote a few statements in a moment.

**Mr. K. W. Hooper:** Not from me, though.

**Mr. BURNS:** Not from the Minister, but from other members of the Government.

Costs are a major problem for the Government and for the city council. On page 24 of the Railway report we see that we lost \$34,997,946 on suburban rail services. In the Minister's speech in the debate on his department's Estimates, when speaking about the railway system in Brisbane, he said that at the same time we transported 34,800,000 people; so we lost more than a dollar a head on the transportation of people on the suburban railways.

In the same time the Brisbane City Council transported 48,852,000 passengers and lost \$3,188,535. I have taken that from the Auditor-General's report on the finances of the council.

It seems to me that, if the Government is to set up this authority, it will be just like the Transport Department. As I understand it, that department has some control over where the bus routes will be. The city council and any other operator in the area has to ask it for permission. The State Transport Department has some control over fares. It has control over the type of service, the times of the services and other aspects of the services conducted in the area. So perhaps we are only taking control away from one transport authority and giving it to another under another name.

I felt that one of the great concepts of an over-all transport authority was that it would also be involved in running its own services. If it is left as it is, with the railways losing millions and the city council losing money, those bodies will not spend more money on providing extra services unless they have a guarantee of passengers there or money flowing from those services. The ratepayers will not want to keep paying additional rates to provide services when they believe that it is a State Government responsibility or one that should be borne across the whole of the city and not by the ratepayers themselves.

If an authority is set up and it is empowered to borrow money, we need to know whether it will buy into the problems of financing the City Council bus services and the Railway Department or whether it will just sit by? I do not know whether I heard the Minister correctly and I did not have a chance to read his speech until he was finished. I think he was dealing with persons but I do not know whether he said anything about purchasing from authorities.

**Mr. K. W. Hooper** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** The Minister does. Then we will wait until we read the Bill.

It is true that the State Government has had a fair amount of control over where buses go. Routes, frequency of services and fare structure, both public and private, are controlled in this way. Possibly this new authority might be able to make representations to the Government to have the council transport services exempted from pay-roll tax and registration on the buses that run on the roads that it repairs. It seems passing strange to require it to pay such a tax. It might be able to get out of paying fuel tax. I do not know why we tax our own authorities to raise money from our own pockets and charge it against persons using the service.

I agree with the Minister. We cannot viciously turn on the car and say that no-one may use a car. It is true that we must develop such a good service that people will not want to use their cars for commuting. Today, the elderly and others who cannot afford a car are forced to use a service that is not nearly as good as we should like it to be.

I now want to talk about the problems that we have had in Brisbane and the number of promises that have been made by Governments over the years. Three surveys have been conducted. The first was in 1947; the second, by Ford, Bacon and Davis in 1962, which was confined to the city of Brisbane; and the third by Wilbur Smith in 1971, which covered Brisbane and surrounding areas.

In 1972 when the State election campaign was on, the then Minister for Transport (Mr. Knox), on 5 March, promised us a programme which was to be completed in the 1970-75 period. This included the Merivale Railway Bridge, electrification and track improvements to most of the railway

system, modernisation of railway stations, provision of car parking areas at railway stations and co-ordinated bus facilities. I think the best we can say is that the programme did not work. Some parts of the programme are under way but most of what was promised has not been completed and 1975 is long gone.

On 4 May 1972 Sir Gordon Chalk, in delivering the Liberal Party policy speech, said—

“The Government will also proceed with the co-ordination and rationalisation of all forms of public transport in the metropolitan area under one Brisbane Regional Transport Authority. The plan envisages these things:—

“The linking of the northern and southern suburbs by rail;

“The building and modernisation of new rail stations with bus-rail interchange facilities, and adequate car parks at suburban stations to facilitate the co-ordination of bus and private transport with the rail system.”

That is the very promise that the former Minister for Transport had given. Sir Gordon continued—

“Further modernisation of railway rolling stock, use of electric rail cars and the provision of modern fast buses;

“Electrification of suburban rail system and the provision of fast and frequent rail services to such areas by the end of the first 5-year stage.”

By the end of next year, if that promise is kept we will have fast electric train services to these areas.

Within a few days of the election, the Premier said that Brisbane's transport did not have a high priority. He said that after the Minister for Transport had made his statement. I could go back further than that but I shall keep to this decade. After the promises in 1970 we were to have a new improved service by 1975; then Sir Gordon Chalk in 1972 promised it by 1977. He said that electrification would be completed by then. Within a week after the election, the Premier said Brisbane's transport did not have a high priority.

A newspaper article on 22 June 1972, one month after the election, reads—

“Government might run city transport

“Wide powers for trust

“The State Government is expected to take control of all public transport in the Brisbane region, including City Council buses.

“Some observers say the Government might even take over the council's money-losing transport department completely; but at least two Ministers are opposed to this.”

That story also made the point that in May 1970 the Brisbane City Council presented to the State Government a recommendation

by Wilbur Smith and Associates that a metropolitan transit authority be created. That was six years ago.

In July 1972 Sir Gordon Chalk was setting up committees. He said that he was chairing the first meeting because as Treasurer he was providing the money. I do not know that much money seems to be forthcoming under the Bill before the Committee this evening. That same statement contained this passage—

“The Government has promised to electrify trains no later than 1977.”

We will all be waiting in 1977 for the trains that were promised then.

I point out that all of these promises were made before the days of the Federal Labor Government, so let us not start blaming them. It was not known then that that Government was to come on the scene later. Those promises were made on the basis of statements by Mr. Nixon, when he was Federal Minister for Transport in the McMahon Government, that they might have a look at financing the scheme, but no concrete promises at all were made.

On 8 February 1973, six months later, this story appeared in the Press—

“4-Area plan for public transport

“A special sub-department of the State Transport Department is expected to be formed this month to plan a co-ordinated public transport system for Brisbane, Ipswich, Redcliffe and the Pine Shire.

“The Acting Premier and State Treasurer (Sir Gordon Chalk) said yesterday, ‘We’re getting the project off the ground.’”

That was in 1973. The same set of promises were made then as were made in 1970 and 1972. So we were doing very well. After 18 years of National-Liberal Government and three or four years of promises, a Bill is being introduced this evening.

I want to look back over the history of this Government in relation to transport.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** A sordid history, too.

**Mr. BURNS:** Yes. In 1947, when the committee that recommended electrification of rail services in Brisbane was formed, it said that the project was economically sound from its inception and warned that, unless an effective electric service was provided, the people of Brisbane would pay dearly for it in other ways without being able to enjoy its benefits. I think we have in fact paid dearly for that decision.

In 1950 the A.L.P. Government instituted the rail electrification programme and commenced quadruplication of lines and the provision of workshops at Banyo, Redbank and Northgate. Some of those buildings have, of course, since been sold and I suppose they will have to be replaced. In 1958 the programme was shelved when in March the Premier announced that it would be deferred. It has been deferred for 18 years.

In 1962 Sir Gordon Chalk said that the cost of the scheme, originally £2,500,000, had increased to £20,000,000. He acknowledged that £8,000,000 had been spent on the scheme at the time that it was being scrapped. Messrs. Ford, Bacon and Davis recommended in 1962 that the State railways transfer to diesel operation. They have now been brought back on the job; sometimes I wonder why.

Wilbur Smith and Associates told the Government in 1968 that the cost would be \$300,000,000. In 1972 Wilbur Smith was reported as saying that the cost was \$750,000,000. Now, in 1976, Heaven only knows how much it will finally cost. The State has therefore lost a lot of money.

On 26 August 1975, the day after I last raised the subject of railway electrification in this Chamber, the Minister made a ministerial statement in which he said—

“. . . what the honourable member conveniently forgets to mention every time he flogs this yarn is that the National-Liberal Government of the day opted to dieselise all of Queensland’s railway system before haphazardly electrifying the suburban network . . .”

That was the Minister. But on 14 October the new Government Deputy Whip (the honourable member for Windsor) said, speaking of the honourable member for Bulimba—

“He spoke about the present Government abandoning electrification of the railways when it attained office. It did that temporarily because secondary education was so lacking in this State that it required a filip of funds.”

I should like to know why this was done. Was it because the Government wanted to go ahead with dieselisation? I still cannot for the life of me understand why a State whose enormous coal resources for years were known would want to put itself in the hands of the suppliers of diesel oil round the world. With the energy crisis pressing heavily upon us, we will be very sorry that we put ourselves in the hands of oil producers instead of relying on our own known resources.

Let us have a look at some of the reports. In 1947 a report stressed the urgency of reserving corridors of land to newly developed areas. This has not been done. If the Government started tomorrow on electrifying the railway system in Brisbane, no new suburbs would get a rail service as a result of that decision. There would be no electrical rail service to Inala, Mansfield, Upper Mt. Gravatt and places like that. Those areas would not be serviced, yet the 1947 report—30 years ago—told us to set aside rail corridors in new areas.

**Mr. Byrne:** Do you think it is better for the money to be spent now on the upgrading

of electric trains on the old tracks, or do you think it should be spent on spreading railways across Brisbane?

**Mr. Lane:** Monorail.

**Mr. BURNS:** Who said "monorail"? That is the one that the Premier is going to have to the Gold Coast and that the real estate agents are advertising. We will not get that before the end of this century. I will be dead and gone before it arrives.

**Mr. Lane:** I certainly hope so.

**Mr. BURNS:** The honourable member probably would. He could bury me under the promises the Premier has been making in this place about transport over the years. He has been flogging a dead horse over the years as far as transportation services are concerned. He has promised and promised. The Government has ripped up the railway lines. It has failed to implement the reports that have been brought down one after the other. For 30 years investigations have been proceeding and rail reports have been coming in, but the Government has refused to take any action on behalf of the people of Brisbane. The Government has failed to face up to its responsibilities and done absolutely nothing in planning for the new suburbs. We are going to continue to remind the people in those areas about this. The latest statement by the new Liberal mayoral candidate is that he is now concerning himself with ferries. We continually see statements about ferries, and I am concerned about them. The Minister for Mines and Energy came back from overseas and suggested that we ought to have free services. He said that the one way we could induce the people of Brisbane and Queensland to use public transport was to offer a free transport service. Does the Minister remember this headline on 14 May 1973: "Free public transport suggested"? We have heard nothing more about it—another broken promise from the Government in this area. Then we had the Minister and others talking about a study of the use of hydrofoils and hovercraft. The headline "Hovercraft is natural here" appeared over a Press statement issued by Mr. Keith Hooper on 4 September 1975.

**Mr. K. W. Hooper:** They are not promises.

**Mr. BURNS:** When people read those statements, they believe the Minister is going to do something about the matters mentioned. If they are not promises, what are they? The real estate agent who ran the advertisement I have here as a result of the Premier's statement on television obviously did believe it. The advertisement stated—

"Estate situated approximately 1 km Beenleigh Station. Fast electric train service as announced by State Government to city of Brisbane and Gold Coast. Enjoy the best of two worlds."

That was published on Saturday, 10 January 1976. People were even offered a free colour television set if they bought a block of land outside Beenleigh. The Premier said, "We are going to have an electric train service to the area." If it was not a promise, the agent thought it was, and the people who are buying blocks of land down there obviously think it was. No action has been taken against the agent.

**Mr. Byrne:** This is what he is trying to tell them.

**Mr. BURNS:** The Premier said it. If a so-called responsible leader of the Government goes on television and says, "monorails to the coast", what can people expect? We have heard mention of BART systems. We were going to have one with rubber tyres running along George Street and Queen Street. All these statements have been made but the people are still spending two hours getting to the far-flung newly developed suburbs that were opened up after the Government came to power.

It has never planned corridors, it has done nothing about the existing services, and today it brings up the same sham proposals. It is a Bill which merely says, "We will oversee it. We will have a look at it and see. We will tell you whether you can run a bus here." The Department of Transport says that now. The Government says, "We will tell you what fares you can charge." The Department of Transport does that now. What is new?

The Government talks about over-all planning. It says that the whole concept is control of public transport by one authority. Doesn't the Government control it now? Can I start a bus service without the approval of the Department of Transport? If I can, let me know because some people have been asking me how to start a bus service. People in my area have been demanding new bus services. When approaches have been made to the private-enterprise operator in the area, and then to the Department of Transport, the department has allowed the operator to tender or has called on private enterprise to tender. What is the difference between what the Government said earlier and what it is saying now? I do not think it has given the people a new authority; I think it is putting a new name on the old one.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (9.30 p.m.):** I am happy to support the Minister in his introduction of a Bill to set up the Metropolitan Transit Authority, because I believe that, as a member of the Minister's committee, I have played some small part in the preparation of the legislation and its approval by Government members.

It was very disappointing to sit in the Chamber and listen to the Leader of the

Opposition, as usual, rave on and say nothing about such an important subject. However, I suppose it is not surprising when one remembers that he has not been in the Chamber for a couple of days. He has not considered it his responsibility, as the Leader of the formal Opposition in this Assembly, to even attend. Tonight he blows in and, at the last minute, grasps a few Press clippings from the Parliamentary Library and reads headlines into "Hansard"—a cheap tactic which in the previous Parliament, when the Opposition was stronger numerically, was used only by the inferior Opposition speakers. The Leader of the Opposition has lowered himself for adopting that tactic. It shows the extent and depth of understanding that the Leader of the Opposition has of these policy problems, and it does not do him any credit.

Those of us who are interested in the detail of the Bill and in what it will do for Greater Brisbane, areas surrounding Greater Brisbane and other areas that will come under the authority look on things more deeply—and very rightly so. It is disappointing that no-one in the Opposition apparently has sought to do any research into or make any study of this very important programme.

It may be news to the Opposition that the public in Brisbane, and, indeed, the public living in the vast developing urban sprawl in areas surrounding Brisbane, are interested in using public transport. In fact, they would welcome the opportunity of travelling to their place of employment in the city in some form of public transport more convenient to them than the private motor vehicle. But members of the Opposition do not seem the slightest bit interested in the matter and do not seem to be prepared to entertain the problem or use any of their limited intellectual capacity in tackling it. The man who stands out markedly in this regard is the Leader of the Opposition.

I should now like to make a few positive comments about the proposed Bill.

**Mr. Byrne:** He drives around in a chauffeur-driven car.

**Mr. LANE:** As the honourable member for Belmont points out, the Leader of the Opposition travels in a chauffeur-driven car, and the ordinary man in the street who is forced to travel by public transport is quite remote from him. I wonder whether his meatworker supporters from around Hemmant in his electorate have the advantage of travelling in chauffeur-driven cars and are divorced from the problems that the Bill seeks to overcome by setting up a good system of public transport in the Greater Brisbane Area. I have no doubt that he will be able to explain to the Labor Party branches and the trade unions in the electorate of Lytton just where he stands on public transport. He certainly did not explain it to members tonight or to the general

public who one might suppose were listening in expectation of hearing the Labor Party's policy on this matter. It was not forthcoming, and, as usual, the contribution of the Leader of the Opposition was drab and disappointing. Now he hides his head in his hands and pretends that he is not involved in the debate. He is probably content to drive around town in his chauffeur-driven car and collect his big salary, leaving the people down around Hemmant and Lytton to go their own way.

On the other hand, we have the Minister for Transport and his officers who are bringing forward this legislation to rationalise and co-ordinate all forms of public transport in the Greater Brisbane Area. Having studied the Bill, I must say I am pleased with the approach of the Minister and his department to this project. I pay a compliment to the chairman of the Metropolitan Transit Project Board, Mr. Peter Welding, who came to Queensland from overseas in answer to an application called by the State Government. He has done quite a professional job in tendering advice, which led to the introduction of this measure.

The subject of public transport in Brisbane called for a new broad outlook and approach as a whole, one different from that which had been built into the sectional interests of the relevant transport authorities that presently exist. I refer of course to the Railway Department and the Transport Department as well as to the Transport Department of the Brisbane City Council.

Unfortunately, as these bureaucracies and departments grow up over the years they tend to become a little bit inbred, so it is indeed refreshing to have come here from somewhere else someone clothed with overriding authority to carry out investigations and to make recommendations on the over-all problem arising in these departments, which probably had narrow and perhaps sectional interests. To that extent I commend the Government for having brought the chairman of the board to Queensland.

I am sure that all of us who represent metropolitan electorates have tried to arrive at the best method of transporting the public. Most of the people with whom I have come in contact desire to travel by their own private motor vehicles, and it would be foolish for any of us to pretend that we would be able to encourage the public to take their cars off the road, park them in the garage at home and use them only on the week-end. That would be quite unrealistic, bearing in mind the attitude of Queenslanders to mobility in transport and enjoyment of this great place we live in.

Over the years groups of idealists and radical people have suggested in their opposition to facilities for private motor-cars that people should be forced to travel by public transport. I am opposed to the application of any form of force to any section of the

public. Of course this is one of the reasons why I was against some of the opposition mounted against the freeway programme.

It is not realistic for any group of persons, for sanctimonious or some other idealistic reason, to set themselves up and to seek to tell the public, "We will not allow you adequate roadways or adequate facilities on which to drive your private car. We will force you to travel by public transport." An attitude such as that is probably the reason why the campaign embarked upon by many of those people failed.

In the few years when Federal Labor was in office I was disappointed at the ridiculous attitude of the Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren), who took a firm stand against freeways for no reason other than that he did not like them. I believe he closed his eyes to the fact that most Australians like to own a family car and want to be able to drive on a freeway, go where they will and enjoy our marvellous countryside and great beaches. I might describe it as freedom of movement.

We have not such a dense population that we should engage in transport conscription tactics, which is what I would call the forcing of people to travel by public transport when they do not want to. That is quite unrealistic. However, it is quite valid to encourage people to travel by public transport. To that end we must provide them with proper amenities and facilities, and we must make it easy for them to co-operate with us. We must provide all forms of public transport with a minimum of inconvenience so that the public are encouraged to travel thereon.

While the Wilbur Smith Transportation Study covered a lot of detailed work which had not been tackled until then—and this was of benefit, therefore, to the community—it did not face up to the realities of the individual citizen's travel desires. This legislation goes a long way in that direction. It seeks to place in the hands of an authority an overriding power to co-ordinate public transport in the area that will be designated. As I understand the proposal, it includes the Greater Brisbane Area and such other areas as are seen to link in with the system. I understand that in the first instance, the area may extend as far south as the Gold Coast and as far north as Redcliffe.

If we confined this authority to a local area, we would be closing our eyes to the fact that, in deciding where to live, people do not respect local authority boundaries, as, indeed, they should not. The urban sprawl has extended far beyond the local authority area of Brisbane. Many people who travel to the city to work or shop come from outside the Greater Brisbane Area.

One of the most attractive proposals in the Bill is the one giving an overriding power to the authority over the traditional transport authorities. The Transit Authority will be able to override decisions made by

the Commissioner for Railways, the Commissioner for Transport and the Commissioner of Main Roads. That is desirable. If the chairman of the Metropolitan Transit Project Board is any indication of the people who are to staff this new authority—and have this power in their own right—I believe we can look to a responsible approach in the authority's dealings with other departments. It is necessary and proper that someone have an overriding authority. The transport commissioners have, as a matter of tradition over a number of years, become kings in their own right.

There is a particular area of transport about which I would like to say a few words tonight. It is one that the Bill takes into consideration. I refer to the river transportation of passengers. I was very pleased to make representations to the Minister over the last year or two about just how river transport for passengers should be taken into consideration in the preparation of this Bill. The Minister listened very patiently to my representations, I must say, and he has included river transport in this Bill. I would like to thank him for acceding to my request. In fact, he has even pre-empted the work of the new authority by commissioning a study to be carried out by the University of Queensland through the existing Metropolitan Transit Project Board into the viability of river transport. I am sure that the board in its recommendation will recognise the great benefit river transport would be to the Brisbane area.

For a number of years a gentleman named Charlie Newitt, who lives in the electorate of the honourable member for Lytton, has conducted a very good transport system for passengers on the Brisbane River. He has been conducting that service despite the obstructions put in his way by the Brisbane City Council and by the Lord Mayor of Brisbane and despite the fact that over a number of years he could not obtain any assistance or encouragement from the Labor Party in this State—the people who hold political power in the City Hall.

I know that that gentleman and his colleagues have approached members of the Opposition. They have approached officials in high places in the Labor Party, seeking their co-operation in getting for Brisbane a modern public transport system on that great freeway which runs through the centre of Brisbane—the Brisbane River—so that passengers could be picked up from Hamilton, Bulimba and Hawthorne and transported up past New Farm and East Brisbane to the centre of the city. What sort of response did they get from the Labor Party—indeed, from the Leader of the Opposition personally and from a former Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bulimba? What sort of co-operation did they give? They thumbed their noses at this proposal. For years they rejected any suggestion by Mr. Newitt that running fast, comfortable ferries from the suburbs—indeed, from their own

electorates—into the city would be a viable or worthy proposition. They ignored Mr. Newitt's representations. Approaches to the Labor city council had the same result. It was not until I took Mr. Newitt to see our Minister for Transport that he was able to get anywhere with his scheme.

No matter what the Leader of the Opposition cares to say, it is a fact that under the Harbours Act the Labor city council has complete and total authority to regulate passenger transport and ferry services on the Brisbane River. It has done nothing about it. It has refused to do anything about it. In fact, it has denied Mr. Newitt any opportunity to give the citizens of Brisbane this facility on Brisbane's greatest freeway, the Brisbane River.

**Hon. K. W. HOOPER** (Greenslopes—Minister for Transport) (9.50 p.m.), in reply: There is very little that I have to answer at this stage. The Leader of the Opposition, of course, was at a disadvantage; the Opposition member who normally speaks on transport is not here this evening. This is understandable. We all know the situation.

By the same token, the Leader of the Opposition was unable to produce one iota of evidence on anything that he was critical of tonight that was in fact directed at me. He did read headlines dealing with something about a hovercraft, but he was quite cunning not to produce the rest of the article. That, of course, is part and parcel of politics and it is accepted.

I thank the honourable member for Merthyr for his support and the particular interest he has shown in river transport. He has been vitally interested in the operations of the Golden Mile Service, and it has done a remarkable job, as he has indicated this evening. It certainly has the support of the Government in anything it can do to make the operation more effective.

By the second-reading stage honourable members will have had the opportunity of reading the Bill and it is important that they do have this opportunity. I will be only too happy to answer their queries at that time.

Motion (Mr. Hooper) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

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

#### SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. A. M. HODGES** (Gympie—Leader of the House): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday next.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.53 p.m.