

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 2 DECEMBER 1976**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

#### 1. DISPUTES REFERRED TO INDUSTRIAL COURT

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

(1) How many disputes have been referred to the Industrial Court and how many of such disputes were settled by the court in each of the last three financial years?

(2) On how many occasions in each of the last three financial years has the Industrial Court issued an order subsequent to a dispute?

(3) On how many occasions in each financial year has an order of the Industrial Court been disobeyed by (a) a trade union and (b) an employer?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) It is not the function of the Industrial Court to settle disputes; this is a function of the Industrial Commission.

#### 2. STAND-DOWN ORDERS AND MAN-HOURS LOST

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

(1) How many stand-down applications to the Industrial Court have been made in each of the last three financial years and how many were successful?

(2) How many man-days of work were lost by employees through stand-down orders in each of the last three financial years?

*Answers:—*

(1) Stand-down applications are not made to the Industrial Court. They are made to the Industrial Commission.

(2) No official information is available.

### THURSDAY, 2 DECEMBER 1976

Mr. ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. W. D. Hewitt, Chatsworth) read prayers and took the chair at 11 a.m.

#### PAPER

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

Report of the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development for the year 1975-76.

#### 3. REGISTERED TRADE UNIONS AND MEMBERS

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

(1) How many unions are registered under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, what is the name of each union and how many workers are members of each union?

(2) On how many occasions in each of the last three financial years (a) has the registrar granted an application for an

inquiry under s. 76 of the Act to refer the matter to the commission, (b) has the registrar acted on any powers granted by the commission under s. 77 (3) of the Act and (c) were prosecutions made for breaches of the Act and under what section or regulation were such prosecutions launched?

*Answers:—*

(1) Unions of employees, 75; Unions of employers, 43.

This information is contained in annual reports of the President of the Industrial Court presented to Parliament with an addition of a further two unions, namely—

United Firefighters' Union, Queensland Branch, Union of Employees—829 members as at 2 September 1976;

The University of Queensland Academic Staff Association (Union of Employees)—804 members, 12 Associated members as at 23 November 1976.

(2) (a) 1973-4, Nil; 1974-5, 1; 1975-6, Nil.

(One application has been filed to date during the year 1976-7).

(b) No.

(c) It is not practicable to supply this information as detailed information would be required from every Industrial Magistrate's Court in Queensland.

#### 4. CUSTOMER CAR-PARKS IN SUBURBAN SHOPPING AREAS

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

(1) Is he aware of the continuing and growing concern of business people in suburban shopping areas such as Wynnum because of the lack of customer car-park facilities?

(2) Further to a question asked by me on 22 October 1975 on the same matter—has any progress been made by his department and the Brisbane City Council to relieve this pressing need?

*Answers:—*

(1) Yes.

(2) As I mentioned in my reply to the honourable member's question of 21 October 1975, the conferring of power upon the Brisbane City Council to define benefited areas for the purpose of the making and levying of separate rates to defray the cost of particular functions of local government, such as the provision of off-street car-parking facilities, would require an appropriate amendment of the City of Brisbane Act 1924-1974.

I have discussed proposals for amendment of the Act with the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of Brisbane and am awaiting a submission from the council in regard thereto. The matter will receive consideration when the council's submission is to hand.

I might add that the provision of off-street car-parking facilities to serve existing shopping centres is a matter primarily for the owners of shops located therein. Any new developments of this nature are required by the town-planning laws to provide adequate off-street parking facilities to service their patrons.

#### 5. RAILWAY "K" WAGONS

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

(1) What plans exist for the building of "K" wagons to carry cattle?

(2) Could new wagons be made with removable sides, similar to road transport sides, so that they can go west as flat-top and drop-side wagons and return as stock crates carrying cattle and so avoid the present waste in taking empty "K" wagons west and empty flat-top and drop-side wagons east?

*Answers:—*

(1) Tenders were recently invited for the manufacture and supply of 125 "KL" cattle wagons constructed to the conventional design for such wagons.

(2) I thank the honourable member for his suggestion for the adoption of a different design. A somewhat similar proposal was previously investigated but I assure the honourable member that the suggestion he now makes will be seriously examined and advice duly conveyed to him.

#### 6. SOCCER FOOTBALL POOLS

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

(1) As s. 17 of the Soccer Football Pools Act makes provision for funds collected under the Act to be distributed through the Sport and Youth Trust Fund to support and develop such sporting and youth facilities as the Governor in Council determines and as local authorities are by far the major providers of sporting fields in Queensland, has the Government yet considered any programme of direct financial reimbursement or assistance from the Sport and Youth Trust Fund to assist local councils, which are finding it more difficult day by day to keep providing these facilities?

(2) Has a specialist committee or other advisory body been established to advise the Governor in Council on suitable disbursement of soccer pools funds and are there any local government representatives on any such advisory body?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) The Sports and Youth Pools Allocation Advisory Committee, a well-qualified representative body of major sporting interests, has submitted a guideline proposal to the Government for the disbursement of pools money held in the Sport and Youth Trust Fund. That proposal is presently under examination and until a decision is taken by Cabinet I prefer not to disclose its contents.

#### 7. DANGEROUS TOYS

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

(1) Is he aware of the New South Wales Government's decision to take urgent action before the Christmas-gift period to ban toys that could endanger the lives of young children?

(2) Has his department carried out any investigations into toys on sale in Queensland and, if so, what were the results?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) This is not a matter coming within my ministerial jurisdiction. I suggest the honourable member redirect his question to the Minister for Health.

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

#### 8. INFLUENZA VACCINE

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

(1) Has the Australian Government been amassing an influenza vaccine since June for a vaccination programme next winter?

(2) As leading medical authorities have suggested that this programme could create health problems similar to those experienced in America where 33 deaths occurred as a result of the vaccination programme, what investigation has the National Health and Medical Research Council or his department undertaken to ensure that the vaccination programme is safe?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) I am advised by the director of the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories that bivalent A/Victoria strain vaccine is presently available and will also be marketed in Australia during next winter.

The laboratories have also produced a bulk reserve of A/New Jersey vaccine which could be used if there is an outbreak of swine influenza in the northern hemisphere during its present winter or if any cases occur in Australia next year.

The director further advises that reports of investigations carried out in America into the 33 deaths reported following vaccination has shown that none was directly due to the vaccine. All deaths were attributable to other causes.

The National Health and Medical Research Council is presently considering all aspects of this problem.

#### 9. DELAY IN BUILDING NEW EMERALD COURT HOUSE

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

(1) Is he aware that R. J. Bennell Pty. Ltd. of Coffs Harbour, who was building the new court-house in Emerald, has ceased operations and owes at least \$20,000 in wages and in debts to local businessmen in Emerald?

(2) As the economy of Emerald is being seriously affected, what action can the Government take to see that local creditors are paid?

(3) When will work again commence on the court-house?

(4) What can be done in the future to prevent yahoo-type foreign companies from winning contracts over reputable local-based companies, which would have had the building nearly completed by this time?

*Answers:—*

(1 to 3) I am aware that R. J. Bennell Pty. Ltd., now known as Employ Constructions, is not at present proceeding with the works on construction of the Emerald Court House.

The contractor has been called upon to show cause why the contract should not be cancelled or the work taken over. Until this matter is resolved, I am not in a position to fully answer parts (1), (2) and (3) of the honourable member's question.

(4) For the honourable member's benefit, I draw his attention to the considerable works which have and are being undertaken in his electorate successfully and I express my disappointment in his statement that my department deals with foreign or yahoo-type companies. The department investigates all its prospective contractors with all the resources available to it. In the

present case the contractor was given a very good reference by a reliable independent interstate authority.

10. NEW POLICE STATION FOR  
BLACKWATER

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

As he has obtained money to upgrade police facilities in Queensland, will he now build a new police station at Blackwater, as the present one is in a demountable building and as such is unfit to be part of the progressive Belyando electorate?

*Answer:—*

The additional money obtained for the upgrading of police facilities in Queensland must be allocated, as the honourable member will appreciate, on a priority basis. As police housing is regarded as the top priority at the moment, the erection of a new police station at Blackwater cannot proceed this financial year. As advised in my previous answer of 18 November 1976, this project will be listed for consideration in 1977-78.

11. GEM-FIELDS LEGISLATION

**Mr. Lester**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Mines and Energy—

(1) Will he institute an inquiry and make a detailed statement as to how the new gem-fields legislation will ensure a good future for the gem-fields?

(2) Will he come to the gem-fields early in the new year and meet these good people?

(3) Will he reduce the \$300 bond requirement for small claims?

*Answers:—*

(1) As I have mentioned many times before, the previous legislation pertaining to the gem-fields had been found to be unworkable.

The new legislation limits the number of claims which may be held at any one time by any one person to two. Claims are restricted to 100 ft. by 100 ft. maximum. Leases for mining are restricted to a maximum of 5 acres and for treatment purposes to a maximum of 10 acres. Only two of either type of lease may be held at any one time by any one person. Approximately 90 square miles on the Anakie gem-field have been set aside for claims only, on which only hand-mining-type machinery may be used.

It is considered that such limitation of the number of mining tenements that may be held and the size thereof will have a

conserving effect on the gem-fields and provide opportunities for the tourist, the small miner and the large-scale operator. The legislation is now drafted in such a way that further limitations may be introduced at any time, if found necessary.

An inquiry in any form is not necessary as many hours of research by many departmental officers has already been carried out, and I do not propose to initiate one.

(2) I propose to visit the Anakie gem-field next year if time permits. I have already met many people and deputations from various sections of the industry on the field as well as from the Emerald Chamber of Commerce. As the honourable member himself is aware, the sectional interest of some of the gem miners may be judged from the fact that on one occasion whilst interviewing representatives of one group of miners they refused my request to allow representatives of another group to join in the discussions.

(3) The size of the security deposit or bond is at the discretion of the warden, who no doubt takes into consideration damage that may be caused to grazing lands and the cost of rehabilitation by the Crown in terms of the conditions should the claimholder default. A lesser bond would tend to encourage default.

12 and 13. QUEENSLAND PERMANENT  
BUILDING SOCIETY

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

(1) With reference to the decision by the Queensland Permanent Building Society to increase interest rates to 13.5 per cent while the Metropolitan Permanent Building Society and most other reputable societies have not increased borrowing rates, is he aware that in 1974 Q.P.B.S. sent seven directors and their wives to Rio de Janeiro to attend the world conference of building societies?

(2) Has the loan rate been increased to cover the costs of sending another seven directors to San Francisco, the venue of next year's world conference, at investors' expense?

*Answers:—*

(1) It is understood that six directors attended the world conference of building societies in Rio De Janeiro in 1974. However, Queensland Permanent Building Society did not pay their fares. For the honourable member's information, two of the directors, J. V. Hodgkinson and B. H. Knowles, read papers at the conference.

(2) I have no knowledge of the intention of any of the directors to attend the world conference of building societies to be held in San Francisco in 1977.

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

(1) Do two of the directors of Queensland Permanent Building Society have vested interests which conflict with their duties as directors of the second largest building society in Queensland?

(2) Did two directors, namely, Mr. D. B. Postle and Mr. Lloyd Olsen, carry out valuation work for the society and, if so, what was the amount paid in valuation fees to the two directors for the year ended 30 June?

*Answers:—*

(1) I have no knowledge of any conflict of interest of any directors of Queensland Permanent Building Society. Section 22F (2) (d) (ii) of the Building Societies Act 1886-1976 permits a director to act as a valuer on behalf of the society.

(2) The company, Olsen & Bell Pty. Ltd., of which Mr. L. F. Olsen is a director, and the firm A. V. Postle & Co., a proprietor of which is A. V. Postle & Co. (Brisbane) Pty. Ltd., of which Mr. D. B. A. Postle is a director, have carried out valuations on behalf of Queensland Permanent Building Society. The amount paid in valuation fees is not on record in the office of the Registrar of Building Societies.

14. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF  
MINISTER FOR SURVEY AND VALUATION

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

(1) With reference to s. 5 (1) of the Officials in Parliament Act, which provides that any member of this Assembly holding an office of profit under the Crown shall have his seat declared vacant, is he aware that on 11 October 1973 the Minister for Survey and Valuation, who is also the member for Ashgrove, Mr. John Ward Greenwood, was granted a Crown commission to prosecute and to present indictments, as indicated on page 747 of the Queensland Government Gazette of 3 October 1973?

(2) Is he aware that on 17 March 1976, a day on which this Parliament was sitting, Mr. Greenwood absented himself from the House, thereby abandoning the representation of his electorate, to act as Crown prosecutor and present an indictment in the matter of the Crown against Dean in the District Court at Brisbane before Judge Broad?

(3) Did Mr. Greenwood receive a fee for this prosecution while at the same time drawing his parliamentary salary for the day?

(4) Is he aware that, after Mr. Greenwood was elected as a member of this Assembly following the 1974 elections, papers laid before this Parliament, namely, No. 434 of 30 October 1974 and No. 400 of 11 November 1975, showed that Mr. Greenwood received from the Crown fees for his services as prosecutor amounting to \$1,447.50 and \$6,109.50, respectively?

(5) Will he institute moves pursuant to s. 5 (1) of the Officials in Parliament Act to have Mr. Greenwood's seat declared vacant since he was engaging in an office of profit under the Crown, or will he have Mr. Greenwood pay back any moneys that he may have received by way of fees from the Crown if he purported to hold a Queen's Commission to prosecute?

(6) How many persons have been convicted and/or imprisoned as a result of indictments presented and prosecuted by Mr. Greenwood, since it may appear that Mr. Greenwood had no authority to present the indictments and prosecute criminal matters?

(7) As those persons were wrongfully convicted, will he take steps to release them from prison and reverse their convictions?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 7) The honourable member's question is based on a misunderstanding of the effect of section 5 of the Officials in Parliament Act and, in particular, the meaning of the words "office of profit under the Crown". The appointment of a barrister as a person who may present indictments in the Supreme and District Courts is not an appointment of an office of profit under the Crown, nor is acceptance of a brief to prosecute in a particular case by a barrister so appointed. Members of a private bar are regularly briefed by the Crown in both civil and criminal matters. In the case of criminal matters, appointment by the Governor in Council as a person who may present indictments is necessary before a barrister can appear as Crown prosecutor.

There is no basis for suggesting that there has been any contravention of section 5 of the Officials in Parliament Act by Mr. Greenwood. On the information available to me, the only trials in which Mr. Greenwood has appeared as Crown prosecutor since he was elected to Parliament are the one mentioned by the honourable member, which occurred about four months before Mr. Greenwood became a Minister, and one other case about a month after he was elected and before he was sworn in as a member. The former trial resulted in a nolle prosequi and the latter a verdict of not guilty.

There is ample precedent that former members of the Queensland Parliament in their legal practices have accepted briefs from various quarters including the Crown over previous years whilst members of Parliament.

15. BURPENGARY PRE-SCHOOL

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

Will the pre-school at Burpengary, which was commenced this year as a pilot pre-school within the State school, be continued in 1977 and, if so, is the pre-school to be conducted in the public hall or are plans in hand to erect a temporary building?

*Answer:—*

No decision has been made yet because the suitability of the hall has to be investigated. An inspector of schools is visiting the pre-school today to check this. Should accommodation be satisfactory, the pilot pre-school will continue in 1977 but, if not, it is not intended to erect a temporary building. In this circumstance a further decision on provision in the area will be made in conjunction with needs in other places.

16. SALARIES OF SHIRE CLERKS AND ENGINEERS

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

What formula is used by local authorities to determine the annual salaries of shire clerks and engineers?

*Answer:—*

The minimum salary of the clerk of a local authority in Queensland is determined in accordance with the Municipal Officers' (Queensland) Consolidated Award, which is a federal award, but the local authority may, by resolution, decide to pay its clerk more than the award provision. Under the award the clerk's minimum salary is based on revenue of the local authority by which he is employed, in accordance with a sliding scale prescribed in the award.

Exactly the same situation applies in respect of the engineer of a local authority, but the award in that case is the Engineers (Local Governing Authorities, Queensland) Award.

17. SUBSTANDARD HOUSE CONSTRUCTION

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

When it is an indisputable fact that a house under construction by a master builder for a worker, being financed by

a housing society, contains worthless timber and the workmanship is of shockingly bad quality, even to the extent of being dangerous, and the unfortunate worker's complaints are being buck-passed by all concerned, has he any statutory authority to intervene, on request, to protect the worker and ensure that the home is soundly and competently built and, if so, how can his protection be sought and applied?

*Answer:—*

The owner should make a formal complaint to the Builders' Registration Board of Queensland. Appropriate action by the board is taken if necessary corrective work is not undertaken by the builder. The builder could be deregistered if he fails to correct the faulty work but the owner would have no further redress with the board. However, the proposed new legislation insurance provisions will protect the owner's interests.

18. A.L.P. POLICY ON KNIGHTHOODS

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

Is he aware that the A.L.P. and the Trades and Labor Council viciously criticised and expelled Sir John Egerton for accepting an imperial knighthood and, if so, will he advise this House of the Italian honours, including a knighthood, granted to Mr. Al Grassby, and whether the A.L.P. or Trades and Labor Council has taken any action against him for accepting these foreign honours?

*Answer:—*

The point made by the honourable member is appreciated. I am aware that Mr. Grassby was awarded and readily accepted certain Italian honours but I am not aware of any action having been taken against him by the political party that he supports. This, of course, only serves to illustrate the stupidity and inconsistency of the policies and attitudes of the Australian Labor Party.

How hypocritical can the A.L.P. be—its members accept honours when it suits them but are critical of those who accept honours bestowed by Her Majesty.

19. BLACKDOWNS STATION, CHILLAGOE

**Mr. Deeral**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Survey and Valuation—

What are the results of the investigation of Blackdowns Station, Chillagoe, which was carried out by his Chief Executive Surveyor?

*Answer:—*

I am advised by the Surveyor-General that at this stage the complete assessment of the investigation has not been finalised. However, he expects a report and recommendation from the Chief Executive Surveyor early next week.

20. GRANTS TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES

**Mr. Abern** for **Mr. Neal**, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

(1) With reference to State Treasury grants to local authorities, will they receive similar grants this financial year and, if so, when can councils expect to receive them?

(2) When may local authorities expect to receive their announced Grants Commission grants?

*Answers:—*

(1) An amount of \$5,000,000 is provided in the Budget for the current year for special grants to local authorities. It is intended that the distribution of the funds will be made as early as possible in the new year but I am not in a position to nominate a specific date.

(2) The funds from the Commonwealth were received by the Treasury Department yesterday. Individual cheques for each local authority are now in the process of being drawn and I will be forwarding these within a day or two.

21. COMPLAINT FROM PARENT OF APPRENTICE JOCKEY

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

(1) Since his elevation to the position of Deputy Premier and Treasurer, has he received a letter from a parent of an indentured apprentice jockey setting out certain complaints regarding the living and working conditions of his son?

(2) Did the writer indicate that no satisfaction could be obtained from the Queensland Turf Club?

(3) If he has received this letter, what action has he taken and has he acknowledged the letter and advised the sender regarding the matter?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) No. I have no recollection or record of ever receiving or acknowledging such a letter.

22. PLATE-GLASS WINDSCREENS IN CARS

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

(1) Is he aware that some cars are either sold or fitted with lethal plate-glass windcreens?

(2) What action will he take to ensure that the situation is rectified?

(3) Are there any State or Commonwealth regulations which forbid using such glass for car windcreens?

*Answers:—*

(1) No.

(2) If the honourable member will provide me with information supporting the fact that plate-glass windcreens are being sold or fitted to cars, I will have the position investigated as a matter of urgency and appropriate action taken if his allegations are founded on fact.

(3) Yes. I refer the honourable member to the provisions of clause 68 and the reference to Australian Design Rule No. 8 in clause 99 of the schedule to Part 13 of The Traffic Regulations, 1962.

23. GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS OCCUPYING RENTED OR LEASED PREMISES

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

(1) What departments and/or sub-departments under the control of the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs are located in premises not owned by the State Government, where are they situated and what is the anticipated rental or leasing costs for the current financial year?

(2) How many officers of the Public Service are working in these departments and/or subdepartments?

(3) How long have the departments and/or subdepartments been situated in these locations, how long will they continue to operate in rented or leased accommodation and on what dates do rental or leasing agreements for the buildings come up for review?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) I do not intend to have compiled the information sought by the honourable member. It is sufficient for me to say that the Government is implementing a programme of improved accommodation for its employees and the appropriate accommodation will be provided in both Government owned and leased premises.

24. JUVENILE VANDALISM IN TOWNSVILLE

**Mr. Abern** for **Mr. M. D. Hooper**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Works and Housing—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the damage inflicted in recent weeks by juvenile vandals at the Child Guidance Centre being constructed at the corner of Cambridge and Palmerston Streets, Townsville?



(2) Did he see a photograph published in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" showing the latest examples of vandalism, which now runs into thousands of dollars, and is he prepared to authorise special police surveillance at week-ends until this building is completed in January?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) The information which has been conveyed to me is that the matter raised by the honourable member is one for consideration by the Townsville Hospital Board.

#### 25. GARBUTT STATE SCHOOL LIBRARY

**Mr. Ahern** for **Mr. M. D. Hooper**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities—

As his attention has previously been drawn to the inadequate library space and facilities for the teaching staff and students at the Garbutt State School, when will a new library be constructed at the Garbutt Primary School?

*Answer:—*

Library accommodation to modern standards is being provided at State primary schools throughout Queensland in accordance with funds available for this work in each financial year. So far it has not been possible to assist Garbutt State School in this regard. The school will be considered, however, for inclusion in a future priority list.

#### 26. COMMONWEALTH RELIEF FOR FARMER VICTIMS OF HAILSTORM AT MIDDLE RIDGE, TOOWOOMBA

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

As a further hail storm on 27 November completely destroyed acres of small crops in the Middle Ridge area of Toowoomba, which area was also the scene of hail devastation on 10 January last, has he received a reply to his submission to the Prime Minister for financial relief for the farmers and, if not, will he make a further submission on their behalf?

*Answer:—*

Yes, I have received a reply from the Prime Minister, but I regret to say that my representations were unsuccessful. In view of the result of my previous submission, I feel that no good purpose would be served by my making a further approach to the Commonwealth Government.

#### 27. LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND PAY-ROLL TAX

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

Why are local authorities required to pay pay-roll tax on wages and salaries paid out of loan or revenue funds in respect of the essential non-profit public service undertakings of water supply, sewerage and cemeteries?

*Answer:—*

Whilst these may be non-profit undertakings by local authorities, they are nevertheless business undertakings which are revenue producing. For this reason these and certain other activities including electricity undertakings, parking stations and transport services were excluded from the general exemption which was provided for local authorities at the time pay-roll tax became a State tax. It is pointed out that no special exemption was provided for local authorities under the earlier Commonwealth legislation and they have benefited as a result of the concessions allowed by the State.

#### 28. TOURIST FILM OF CENTRAL HIGHLANDS AND NORTH COAST

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

In view of his Press release dated 23 November that a film featuring Brisbane and South-east Queensland tourist scenes is to be made by Martin William Films Pty. Ltd. to assist the tourist industry, will he consider further films that will include scenes of the tourist attractions in the central and northern coastal area and the Central Highlands area of Queensland and, if so, when could these films be made?

*Answer:—*

The policy of the Queensland Government Tourist Bureau is to produce each year a 35mm film depicting a particular region of the State, and the current film on Brisbane and South-east Queensland is part of this on-going promotional exercise. A film on Rockhampton and the Central Queensland region was produced in 1970 and this production, "Capricorn Charter", had an extensive distribution in theatres throughout Australia and New Zealand. In 1972, the bureau produced a general Queensland film which laid emphasis on the State's leading tourist features, including the gem-fields of Central Queensland. This production enjoyed a spectacular success on the commercial theatre circuit in Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific islands and the United Kingdom and is still in circulation.

It is intended that the bureau's film production programme be retained as an essential part of its marketing drive, but

no decision has yet been taken as to which tourist region of the State will feature in the 1977-78 tourist film.

29. LOCAL AUTHORITY COLLECTION OF HARBOUR DUES FROM BOAT OWNERS

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

(1) Has he received any complaints or objections in regard to the recent Order in Council which provides that, even where the Department of Harbours and Marine accepts no responsibility for the repair or replacement of mooring facilities, the local authority is directed to be the department's collecting agent for harbour dues placed on boat owners and is required to pass those fees on to the department in full?

(2) What are the department's reasons for imposing this duty on local authorities, when those bodies already have substantial commitments in the maintenance of harbours?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) I would refer the honourable member to my answer on 9 September last to questions on this matter by the honourable member for Landsborough.

30. WOLFDENE DAM

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

As the Moreton Regional Study has been completed with regard to water resources, in what year is the Wolfdene Dam programmed for construction?

*Answer:—*

Indications are that following the completion of Wivenhoe Dam, anticipated to be in 1982, an additional water supply scheme will be required in the mid-1990s. Construction of Wolfdene Dam is one of the possibilities for this supply, but to date the Government has not made a firm decision.

31. CARRIAGE OF NEW VEHICLES BY ROAD TRANSPORT

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

(1) Is the carriage of new vehicles by road transport restricted to Brisbane and 400 km therefrom?

(2) Why has this been adopted?

(3) As this adversely affects many country and provincial areas, in particular Central Queensland, will he immediately investigate the matter with a view to removing the present restrictions?

*Answers:—*

(1) Yes.

(2) In the interest of a balanced rail/road distribution system.

(3) The position was reviewed as recently as August this year in conjunction with representations to me by the honourable members for Callide and Port Curtis, when it was decided not to change existing policy.

32. JURISDICTION OVER BEACHES IN LIVINGSTONE SHIRE

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

(1) Which Government departments have jurisdiction over the beaches in Livingstone Shire between high-water mark and low-water mark?

(2) Which authority has ultimate control over sand-dune areas above high-water mark, which are esplanades, gazetted roads or vacant Crown land?

(3) Which departments have jurisdiction over off-road and other vehicles (a) on the beaches and (b) on the sand dunes?

(4) Does Livingstone Shire Council have authority to move sand from below high-water mark to create, against Beach Protection Authority advice, an artificial dune in front of the council caravan park on Farnborough Beach?

*Answers:—*

(1 and 2) I presume the honourable member is referring to beach protection measures. The Beach Protection Authority has jurisdiction under the Beach Protection Act to control on any unoccupied Crown land situated in a declared Beach Erosion Control District such matters as interference with sand and other material and the traversing of vehicles. The local authority has jurisdiction to control such matters on any foreshore or other Crown land under its control.

(3) See answer to (1 and 2). On and from 1 January 1977, local authorities will have control under section 35 of the Motor Vehicles Control Act.

(4) No.

33. TEACHERS RECRUITED FROM OVERSEAS

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

(1) Are overseas teachers presently working in the Queensland teaching service paid more than their Queensland counterparts of equal classification and/or qualifications?

(2) If so, are such overseas teachers considered by his department to be better qualified or more experienced teachers?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) There is no difference between the salaries of Queensland and overseas teachers of equal experience and qualifications. Both would be placed on the same classification. If the honourable member has any specific case in mind, he should provide me with the details.

#### 34. HIGH SCHOOL FOR BAYVIEW HEIGHTS, CAIRNS

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

(1) Has land been set aside or acquired yet for a new high school at Bayview Heights, Cairns, and, if so, what was the purchase price?

(2) Did this amount include the adjoining primary and pre-school site?

(3) If not, were moneys provided for securing the high school property reallocated and, if so, in what manner?

(4) If the funds were redirected, what are the reasons and on whose recommendation was the change in policy and/or site made?

*Answers:—*

(1) Land has not been acquired as yet for a site for a new high school at Bayview Heights, Cairns.

(2) Investigations are continuing with the view to determining the suitability of sites in this area for pre-school, primary and secondary schools.

(3 and 4) Funds are set aside each year for the acquisition of sites for schools and are allocated to the sites of highest priorities.

#### 35. TEMPORARY PRE-SCHOOL ARRANGEMENTS FOR EDMONTON AREA CHILDREN

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

(1) Is he aware of the difficulties confronting parents in the Edmonton area wishing to enrol pre-school children next year, following the 12-month deferment of the construction of the Bayview Heights primary school and pre-schools at Cairns?

(2) Until pre-school facilities are established at Hambleton and/or Bayview Heights, will he give an assurance that the same arrangements now prevailing will apply to the enrolment of Edmonton children at the Gordonvale and/or Balaclava pre-schools.

*Answers:—*

(1) Yes, I am aware of the lack of pre-school facilities for children from Edmonton.

(2) When the Department of Education assumed responsibility for the Gordonvale Kindergarten in 1975, it was agreed that the department would honour the existing admission waiting list of the kindergarten association for the first year to assist a smooth transition of the kindergarten to department control. In this way some children from Edmonton were enrolled. Admission procedures at the Gordonvale centre have now been brought into line with those operating in other State pre-school centres and preference is given to children within the catchment area of the associated school. It is planned to provide new pre-school facilities at Hambleton for children from Edmonton as funds become available for this project.

#### FORM OF QUESTIONS

**Mr. LESTER** (Belyando) having given notice of a question—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I suggest that the honourable member get to the crux of the question. He is putting too much embellishment into it.

**Mr. FRAWLEY** (Murrumba) proceeding to give notice of a question about a ministerial Christmas party—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The question is frivolous.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton) proceeding to give notice of a question—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Questions are not to be used to allow a Minister to refute rumours.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I would ask him to comment—

**Mr. ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! It is equally out of order to invite comment.

#### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

##### ALTERNATIVE WORK FOR FRASER ISLAND SAND-MINING EMPLOYEES

**Mr. ALISON:** I ask the acting Premier: In view of the winding down of sand-mining operations on Fraser Island as a result of the Federal Government's ban on sand-mining from 1 January next and the very serious personal hardship occasioned to employees in the industry, will he press the Federal Government for urgent and favourable consideration of the projects submitted to Mr. Malcolm Fraser, the Prime Minister, earlier this week, so that there will be an assurance to these employees of work in the Maryborough, Hervey Bay, Tin Can Bay and Rainbow Beach areas?

**Mr. CAMM:** I am sure that the Premier will be pressing for money to be released so that work can be provided in the area to employ the men who have been thrown out of work as a result of the action of the Federal Government.

#### RUBELLA VACCINATION

**Mr. GOLEBY:** I ask the Minister for Health: What is the recommended age for the administration of rubella vaccine for females? Does his department provide information on such important matters?

**Dr. EDWARDS:** This morning I was in the honourable member's electorate visiting some of the facilities in which he has shown great interest. During my visit I was handed a pamphlet that had been distributed by two people (Councillors Geary and Mellis of the Redland Shire Council) and no doubt this has prompted the honourable member's question.

At the beginning of his question the honourable member asked the ideal age at which vaccination should be given. It is recommended that it should be given to all females who are prepared to have the vaccination between the ages of 12 and 14 years. It is available through local authorities throughout the State, and my department has undertaken very wide publicity to try to encourage females to have the vaccination between those ages, the reason being, of course, that rubella is a preventable disease and women who contract it during the early stage of pregnancy have children who, in many cases, have a deformity, which is very regrettable.

I was very disturbed that during my visit to the Redlands electorate I noticed this pamphlet distributed by these two councillors who are supposed to be responsible members of the local authority. They circulated a document, of which I have copies and which I am quite prepared to table, in which they advised the residents of Division 3 of the Redland Shire to have all those over the age of 14 years inoculated against rubella.

I deplore the circulation of such irresponsible and inaccurate statements as they could lead to very great tragedy and I hope that these councillors who were so ready to give inaccurate advice will be just as willing to circulate correct advice within the electorate. I would be quite happy to make available the pamphlets that my department has produced on this matter and I know that the honourable member for Redlands will make certain that the residents of his electorate are given correct advice by him rather than inaccurate information by irresponsible councillors.

#### TYPHOID AND CHOLERA VACCINATIONS

**Dr. LOCKWOOD:** I ask the Minister for Health: Is he aware that epidemics of typhoid can still occur in any country? Will he advise all persons, particularly tourists, to

have typhoid vaccinations even though they are no longer required for the issue of an international health certificate?

**Dr. EDWARDS:** I am aware that there is now a limitation in the advice given by the Commonwealth Health Department to people travelling overseas in that it is no longer essential for a traveller to have a typhoid vaccination, or even vaccination against smallpox, unless he will be visiting any of a few endemic areas. My advice, and the advice of my department, is that people who are travelling overseas, particularly to areas where typhoid and cholera are endemic, would be very wise to have vaccinations against those diseases. I am certain that that would be the advice given by all medical practitioners to their patients who were travelling overseas.

I support the honourable member's suggestion that all persons who are travelling overseas should consult their medical practitioners about typhoid and cholera vaccinations.

#### ACCOMMODATION AT WOODRIDGE POLICE STATION

**Mrs. KYBURZ:** I ask the Minister for Police: What action has he taken to relieve the accommodation situation at the Woodridge Police Station?

**Mr. NEWBERY:** I have had discussions with the Treasurer, and steps are being taken to have finance made available to relieve the shortage of housing immediately.

#### EDUCATING MOTORISTS TO KEEP TO LEFT-HAND LANE ON FOUR-LANE HIGHWAYS

**Mrs. KYBURZ:** I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: As three months' grace has already been given to road-hogs who clog up the right-hand passing lane of Queensland multi-lane highways, what action will be taken on this matter? How can the public, with particular reference to trucks and caravans, be educated to keep to the left unless overtaking?

**Mr. HINZE:** I thank the honourable member for Salisbury for such an intelligent question.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. HINZE:** This is what one would expect of such an attractive young lady.

We started a campaign to try to educate motorists, particularly around the city of Brisbane, to drive in the left-hand lane when they are travelling slowly. We are very pleased with the response, particularly from truck drivers and some bus drivers, but by and large I think the campaign has failed, as do all these sorts of things when compliance is voluntary. I think we have to put a little bit of a sting into it, and this is what we propose to do. There are nowhere

near sufficient signs on the four-lane highways to Ipswich, the Gold Coast and the North Coast. But I thank the honourable member for the question. I will make the necessary recommendations to Cabinet immediately after the Christmas recess to make it mandatory for motorists to travel in the left-hand lane of four-lane highways unless overtaking.

TRANSPORT OF URANIUM FROM MARY  
KATHLEEN

**Mr. AIKENS:** I ask the Minister for Transport: Has he seen a report in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" of 1 December, wherein a headline announced that railwaymen opposed the mining and transport of uranium from Mary Kathleen? If so, as 90 per cent of railwaymen at Townsville support the mining and export of uranium from Mary Kathleen, will he inquire on what basis this report appeared other than from a small group of trade-union officials affiliated with the A.L.P. and the Communist Party?

**Mr. K. W. HOOPER:** I did not see the report that the honourable member referred to. I should be glad if he would draw it to my attention. I shall be happy to make any investigation that he desires, as indicated this morning. I inform the House, however, that it is the intention of the Railway Department to transport the uranium.

CARRIAGE OF NEW VEHICLES BY ROAD  
TRANSPORT

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I ask the Minister for Transport: In view of his comments today about the Government's policy to restrict the carriage of new vehicles to areas of Central Queensland beyond the 400 km limit and in view of the representations that have been made by many firms in the area and the importance of the matter to the many people who want to enter this industry, would he please review it again?

**Mr. K. W. HOOPER:** Certainly, I will be happy to review it.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANTS  
COMMISSION BILL

INITIATION

**Hon. T. G. NEWBERY** (Mirani—Leader of the House): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to

establish a Local Government Grants Commission to make recommendations concerning the distribution of certain financial assistance to local authorities and with respect to other matters relating to the finances of local authorities; to hold inquiries and make investigations in connexion therewith; and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND  
ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
(No. 2)

INITIATION

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

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961–1976 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL  
(No. 3)

THIRD READING

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

COAL MINING ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL

THIRD READING

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

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL

THIRD READING

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

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND  
ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL (No. 2)

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(The Acting Chairman of Committees, Mr. Gunn, Somerset, in the chair)

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs) (12.6 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1961–1976 in certain particulars."

Honourable members and, indeed all Queenslanders, are fully aware of the importance of this legislation and of the reasons for its introduction. I stress the need for dispassionate and constructive debate on this obviously highly volatile subject. What steps must a responsible Government take to curb irresponsible actions by a very small minority of unions and union leaders?

Honourable members know of the recent strikes over Medibank and at Collinsville and Gladstone and of action proposed to stop the movement of yellowcake from Mary Kathleen despite unanimous endorsement of production by unionists there.

Federal A.L.P. and State A.L.P. policy as I understand it is that existing uranium contracts should be filled. Queensland Trades and Labor Council says they should not. It follows, I take it, that the Opposition in this Parliament will oppose any union action which might be taken over Mary Kathleen production and will support the Government in its backing of Mary Kathleen unionists. To do otherwise would be to make a sham of its public statements and to admit "official" Labor has no say in its union organisational wing. If that be so, the Opposition can have no quibble with the actions the Government will take under this legislation.

Let me stress at the outset, however, that I strongly support responsible unionism. It is only the actions of a minority and the apparent failure of organised Labor to accept its obligation to keep its house in order which make this legislation necessary. This Government is bound to accept its duty to act firmly in the public interest and will always do so. So this is what this Bill is all about—irresponsible industrial actions and a charter from the people to make laws on behalf of all the people.

I give just one example at this point. Yesterday's newspapers carried the story of plans by the Building and Construction Employees' Union to circumvent these new industrial laws by transferring to Federal awards. In other words, this union wants to operate industrially outside State law while allowing all unionists under State awards to suffer from any penalties that may flow on from their actions. This is the sort of action which earns the condemnation of every responsible unionist.

I am aware that in the past few days three Government departments—Works, Main Roads and Housing—have been served with a log of claims by the Builders Labourers' Federation in an endeavour to have employees in these departments who are builders' labourers covered by a Federal award. This of course will be resisted.

But no matter what the eventual outcome is, the proposed action of the construction workers casts into relief both the role organised labour must play if it is to command respect, and the rights employers have

in law but appear reluctant to use. I give an example of the latter. On 7 March 1974, I introduced a Bill permitting civil damages to be sought against unions and officials taking part in bans for other than industrial purposes. The reason was a ban placed on an A.M.P. Society building site in Brisbane by building unions and endorsed by the Trades and Labor Council. I quote this example to indicate that industrial legislation, to be effective, confers responsibilities on those who seek governmental action.

It is also a regrettable fact that legislation necessarily must be comprehensive, and this means that, as far as tort is concerned, unions wanting to play their part can be hurt as a result of the actions of a few. So now, because of the complete irresponsibility of those few, all Queensland unions and their officials will, under this legislation, lose the immunity from actions in tort which they have enjoyed for more than 50 years.

It has been legislation unique to Queensland, and even protected Federal unions and officers of Federal unions operating in Queensland. This means, of course, that Federal unions operating in Queensland will not be exempt from civil actions from now on. I am sorry for the overwhelming majority of responsible unions; all I can say about the others is that they brought it upon themselves.

Figures are not available yet on man-days lost in the recent printing, Comalco, Collinsville and other strikes, but they will be substantial. However, one example alone would suffice to make this legislation necessary. In July, a purely political strike over Medibank was mainly responsible for the loss of 236,700 man-days in Queensland alone and nearly 1,700,000 man-days on a national basis. To that national figure must be added a further 483,000 man-days lost in June, in Victoria, over Medibank. Surely, no one can condone virtually criminal actions such as these during times of grave economic stringency.

It is a sorry fact that Australia now has the dubious distinction of ranking third in the world for strikes—slightly behind Canada and Italy. According to figures released by the International Labour Organisation, Australia last year lost 1,390 working days for every 1,000 workers employed in manufacturing, mining, construction and transport industries. Continued resurgence of industrial unrest gives every indication that the current year will finish second only to 1974. To date, it is the second worst in Australia's history.

The number of working days lost during the last five years has exceeded the total of days lost during the previous 18 years. The way Australia is going, we could quite easily lead the world in industrial lawlessness—a rare tribute, I am sure, to union responsibility in one of the most wealthy

and most fortunate countries in the world! Anyone would think we had full employment, no inflation, buoyant overseas markets and financial reserves and were not pricing ourselves away from traditional customers. It is not only a shocking state of affairs; it is virtually a deliberate act of subversion.

Well, the people of Queensland have called "halt" and the Government of Queensland today is acting. Briefly—I will enlarge later—this amending Bill, among other things, confers wider legal powers on the Industrial Commission to make orders on strikes. It covers the standing down of employees during an event for which an employer is not responsible or over which he has no control, while preserving for an employee the right to appeal to an industrial magistrate against being stood down.

It confers on the Industrial Commission very wide powers to issue directions or make orders in relation to any strike or lock-out; a strike will become illegal if a return to work order is disobeyed. It lays down that any union of employers or employees failing to comply with an order issued by an industrial commissioner can be summoned before the Full Industrial Court to show cause why its registration should not be suspended. It also covers powers dealing with periods and conditions of deregistration and secret strike ballots and it also removes protection from tort.

Now, I should like to comment on aspects of the measure in more detail. The Bill contains a new section, section 21A, which deals with the right of an employer to stand down employees in certain cases. This new section eliminates the need for employers to apply to the Industrial Commission for stand-down orders where anything occurs for which the employer is not responsible or over which he has no control. This is drafted in very wide terms to cover not only situations where, for example, an employer is unable to provide work because of electricity rationing as a result of a strike in a powerhouse but also cases of natural disasters, for example, floods, cyclones, etc., which would prevent an employer from carrying on his business.

However, any employee who is stood down without pay has right of appeal to an industrial magistrate. In the event that the industrial magistrate allows the appeal, he may order the resumption of work by the employee and the payment of wages during the period that the employee was stood down. For the purposes of the section the term "employer" includes the Crown.

Another new section is 36A. It concerns the direction or order of a commissioner in relation to a strike or lock-out. The section confers additional teeth on the Industrial Commission, enabling a commissioner at any time to issue a direction or make an order as he thinks fit in relation to any strike or lock-out. Disobedience of the direction or

order by an industrial union or body corporate involves a penalty of \$2,000; and by an individual, \$200.

Sections 70, 71, 72 and 72A are repealed. Sections 70, 71 and 72 of the Act confer protection from tort on trade unions and union officials. As section 72A, which enables the Governor in Council to suspend the operation of sections 70, 71 and 72 for three months, is redundant if sections 70, 71 and 72 are repealed, section 72A is also repealed.

Section 73A, under which the registrar is to require an industrial union to show cause in certain cases, is also new. This makes it mandatory upon the industrial registrar, where he has reason to believe in a case coming to his notice that an industrial union or any officer thereof has failed to comply with an order or direction issued by an industrial commissioner, to require that industrial union to show cause before the full Industrial Court why the court should not suspend its registration. If it appears to the court that the industrial union or officer has failed to comply with the direction or order and that cause for so failing has not been shown to the court's satisfaction, then the court may order the registration of the industrial union to be suspended for such period or upon such conditions as is specified in the order of the court. The suspension of registration may be either wholly or with respect to one or more of the callings which the industrial union represents, or as to all or one or more of the areas or establishments in which such callings are carried on.

Amendments to section 98 considerably strengthen the provisions relating to the conduct of secret ballots in the strike situation. As section 98 stands at present a strike must involve a stoppage of work. Upon amendment, a ballot can be ordered in the case of overtime bans, "go-slows" and "work to regulation" strikes. The amendment will also spell out the right of an employer or an industrial union of employers to ask the commission to order a ballot. Power is also conferred upon the Minister to direct the commission to order a secret ballot and the scope for holding a secret ballot is also extended to cover a strike in a calling.

A new section is 124A, under which the Minister may intervene in the public interest. This new section extends the power of intervention that the Crown already has by conferring on the Minister the power to intervene in the public interest at any stage in any proceedings or in any matter in the court or the commission or before an industrial magistrate or before the industrial registrar. Upon intervention the Minister is deemed to be a party to the proceedings.

Yet another new section, section 135A deals with "averments in certain cases". The purpose is to facilitate proceedings against officers and members of industrial unions who have not complied with directions or orders of the Industrial Commission made under sections 36A or 102.

In making out a complaint against an officer or member of an industrial union, an allegation or averment in the complaint that any person is or is not an officer or a member of an industrial union shall be evidence of the matter so alleged or averred, and in the absence of evidence in rebuttal thereof shall be conclusive evidence of such matter.

Honourable members will agree that this legislation represents a firmer line with unions over strikes. But they will also agree that responsible unions will not be hurt; rather will they welcome the protection of its provisions. In my long-held view, this legislation entrenches the Government's twin industrial aims—to protect public interest and to help resolve disputes. I repeat—and I have said it many times: the Government strongly encourages consultation and conciliation up to the point of deadlock, after which it requires both parties to accept arbitration. The Government considers that negotiations on wages and working conditions are best dealt with free of Government intervention, and has set up machinery for this purpose. The Government also believes that unions of employers and employees are fully entitled to manage their own affairs. But irresponsible acts require firm Government intervention on behalf of the people it has been elected to represent.

In my opinion, in the total context of industrial disputes, there should be only limited need to implement the tougher provisions we are writing into the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Most disputes are, and should be, resolved on the shop floor by negotiation between employer and employee, or through the machinery of consultation and arbitration.

We know we cannot legislate to encourage industrial harmony in areas of national economic policy, of course. We also know that jurisdiction in Queensland is limited to State-registered unions. But as far as it is within our competence, we will continue to legislate for the welfare of the people, while constantly refining what I believe to be the best procedures for conciliation and arbitration in Australia.

This Bill is aimed solely at those who seek to impose their will and their ideologies on Queenslanders. This Government has now given them its answer. I commend the measure to the Committee.

**Mr. YEWDAL** (Rockhampton North) (12.23 p.m.): At the outset I will comment on the Minister's introductory speech. His introduction of the Bill could be described as the action of a reluctant maiden. I felt that the Minister did not have much heart in his work and was very reluctant. That has been indicated by him in other ways. In a recent statement in the Press he said that he did not feel that a Government

could legislate against strikes. Of course, that is contrary to what he is attempting to do here this morning.

The proposals and sentiments on industrial legislation hawked around the news media in the last couple of weeks clearly show the Government's total misunderstanding of how to handle industrial disputes. They must be taken as an admission of its miserable failure to understand and resolve the issues at stake. Of course, this legislation is notice of an early election next year, and is an attempt to deflect public opinion away from the very real issues in this State. The real issues, of course, are rising prices and unemployment. The Government is quite aware of that.

In the last 12 months inflation in Queensland has been running at about 15 per cent. According to the last Consumer Price Index figures, Queensland experienced the highest increase of all States. Unemployment in Queensland is destined to reach 40,000, almost 5 per cent of the work-force. This comes at a time when the Government is attempting to provoke and cause the greatest industrial unrest in the century. This Government has always displayed a general disregard for the welfare of Queensland's 800,000-odd men and women employees of the nation's work-force.

Let us look at the facts. The latest available figures for industrial disputes show that the number of working days lost in August fell dramatically from the July figure. In August 1976 only 12,300 working days were lost. This compares with the June figure of 18,000 days lost.

The most recent available statistics showing a breakdown of causes of industrial disputes reveal that for the six months ended June 1976 a total of 852,000 working days were lost in Australia.

I will not go into a complete breakdown of the causes. It is sufficient to point out that disputes over wages accounted for 43.5 per cent and disputes over working hours accounted for 2.4 per cent. Other causes, including political causes, accounted for 2.3 per cent. Included in other causes are disputes over public holidays and disputes for which no particular reason was given, but they represent an almost insignificant proportion of the total.

The latest available figures for industrial accidents show that in Queensland in 1973-74 there were 60,462 accidents resulting in work injuries, which caused 1,029,000 days of lost time through temporary disability as well as 50 fatalities and 535 cases of permanent disability. That is significant. Although the Government is attempting by legislation to reduce industrial disputes, it is not doing a great deal about safety in industry.

In the same year, working days lost through industrial disputes numbered 314,900, or less than one-third of the total working days lost through industrial accidents. In other words, the number of days lost through



industrial accidents was three times that lost as a result of industrial disputes. It is impossible to measure the pain and suffering and the heart-break caused by the death of 50 workers and the permanent disabilities suffered by another 735 workers. It is also impossible to measure the cost of the support and care of the families of those workers under our community welfare schemes.

The history of industrial legislation throughout the world shows that in the early 1970s the Conservative Heath Government in the United Kingdom attempted to adopt strong-arm tactics to bludgeon workers into industrial docility. One piece of legislation that it enacted was the Industrial Relations Act, which attempted to define an "unfair industrial practice" and to remove civil immunities if such a practice was found by the infamous National Industrial Relations Court.

Among other things, the Heath Government reduced protection against unfair dismissal and introduced arbitrary and extensive emergency powers. Unions and individual officials were fined varying amounts ranging from £1,000 to £500,000. It is history that that legislation caused the massive miners' strike in Britain.

Heath went to the polls on that issue and his Government's majority of 120 seats vanished overnight. The Wilson Labor Government came to office on the very appropriate slogan, "Let's turn on the lights."

As to secret ballots—it seems that whenever a Conservative Government shows concern on industrial relations the matter of secret ballots is brought to the fore. Section 54 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act provides that the Industrial Registrar shall not register a union unless the rules of that union provide that the election of officers shall be by secret ballot.

At this stage I seek the leave of the Committee to have incorporated in "Hansard" rule 19 of the Building Workers' Industrial Union.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Is leave granted?

**Government Members:** No.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why can't he read it out?

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order! The honourable member will read the document.

**Mr. YEWDALE:** I hope that other members are treated in a similar fashion in future.

Rule 19 states—

"ELECTION OF STATE PRESIDENT, STATE SECRETARY, S.M.C. MEMBERS AND ORGANISERS

- (1) Any member of the Queensland Branch who is financial and who at the time of nomination has had not less than three years continuous financial membership

immediately prior to nomination may nominate for any of the positions named at the head of this rule. No member shall be a candidate for two or more offices that, if elected to, he would be unable to hold at the same time.

- (2) The term of office for the above positions shall be three years and such term shall commence from the date the successful candidates are declared elected by the Returning Officer conducting the ballot.
- (3) A candidate for any of the above positions shall complete the nomination form which shall be available from the Returning Officer and Sub-branches of the Union. The nomination form must be signed by the candidate and endorsed by two financial members who immediately prior to signing the nomination have had not less than 12 months continuous financial membership.
- (4) Nominations for the above positions shall open on the first day of October in the year in which the ballot is to be held and shall close at noon on the fourteenth day of October in that year. All Sub-Branches shall be notified by circular of the opening and closing date of nominations and shall be supplied with nomination forms prior to the opening date of nominations.
- (5) If at the closing date for the nominations only sufficient nominations have been received to fill any vacancy or vacancies the Returning Officer shall thereupon declare the person or persons so nominating elected.
- (6) If more nominations are received than there are vacancies, the Returning Officer shall arrange for the names to be drawn in a Ballot in the presence of the State Management Committee and such names shall be placed on the Ballot Paper in the order in which they are so drawn.
- (7) Within six days of the closure of nominations, the State Secretary shall provide the Returning Officer with a certified list of members entitled to vote in the election.

The members entitled to vote shall be those who in a year in which the above Ballot is conducted are financial to the month of September in that year. The list of members entitled to vote shall be available at the office of the Branch and it may be perused by any Scrutineers or members entitled to vote in the said election. Notice of the availability of the list shall be published in 'The Courier-Mail'.

- (8) The Returning Officer shall post to each member entitled to vote a Ballot Paper personally initialled by him, together with a printed Business Reply Envelope in which the Ballot Paper must be returned. The opening date of

the Ballot shall be the first day of November and the closing date shall be Noon on the seventeenth day of November in the year in which the ballot is held.

- (9) All Ballot Papers shall be returned to the Returning Officer C/- the Post Office Box named on the Business Reply Envelope. The Post Office Box to which the Ballot Papers are to be returned, shall be hired by the Returning Officer prior to the despatch of Ballot Papers or if the Box has been previously used by the Union he shall cause the lock to be changed.

The Returning Officer shall at times, reasonable notice of which has been given to the Scrutineers, collect the returned Ballot Papers from the Post Office Box and deposit them in the Ballot Box. Such Ballot Box shall be kept at the Bank at which the Branch Account is held for the time being, and shall prior to the commencement of the Ballot be held by the Returning Officer and may be sealed by any Scrutineer.

On the conclusion of the Ballot the Ballot Box shall be picked up by the Returning Officer at a time, reasonable notice of which has been given to the Scrutineers, and taken to the Union's rooms and be opened in the presence of Scrutineers and the count shall then proceed. If it is necessary to interrupt the count for any purpose the papers shall be sealed in the Ballot Box, to which any seals may be affixed by a Scrutineer.

- (10) Two Scrutineers who are not candidates but who are members of the Union shall be appointed by the State Management Committee prior to the closing of nominations; they shall assist the Returning Officer in all stages of the Ballot, including the count.
- (11) Any candidate at his own expense may appoint a financial member of the Union to act as his Scrutineer. Any Scrutineer so appointed may be present at any stage of the Ballot, provided that the Returning Officer is also present.
- (12) In the case of the State President and the State Secretary, the candidate with the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

In the case of the State Management Committee, the twelve candidates with the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

In the case of State Organisers, the candidates up to the number required and with the highest number of votes shall be declared elected.

- (13) In the case of an equality of votes for any two or more candidates, the Returning Officer shall determine by casting his vote which of the candidates is elected.

- (14) The Returning Officer shall notify the State Management Committee of the result of the Ballot in writing and the State Management Committee shall publish such result in its Minutes and the 'Building Workers' Journal' and/or 'Building Worker'. He shall also notify each successful candidate by post and publish their names in at least one daily newspaper circulating in the Branch Area.

The Returning Officer's Report to the State Management Committee shall contain all relevant information including the number of Ballot Papers printed, the number posted, the number returned, the number unused, the number of votes received by each candidate, the names of those nominated for each office and their proposers.

- (15) The successful candidates shall take up their respective duties immediately they are declared elected by the Returning Officer and they shall remain elected until their successors take office.
- (16) Should a vacancy occur in any of the above mentioned offices, the State Management Committee shall fill the position by election for the remaining portion of the term within one month. Nominations for any vacancy shall be called through the Sub-Branches of the Union and nominees shall fulfil the conditions laid down in Rule 19 (1) and Rule 19 (3).

Provided that until the 1966 elections the three years referred to in clause (2) of Rule 10 and clause (1) hereof shall continue to be regarded as three years continuous membership.

- (17) In any election the Returning Officer and Scrutineers shall do all things necessary to preserve the secrecy of the Ballot and shall conduct themselves in a sober, proper and impartial manner. Scrutineers shall, as far as practicable, be present at all stages of the Ballot. They shall obey any directions given to them by the Returning Officer. If any Scrutineer or Scrutineers are not present at any stage or stages of the Ballot, the Returning Officer may proceed nonetheless.
- (18) Any accidental or unavoidable omission or error in the carrying out or observance of this Rule shall not invalidate an election if such omission or error appears not to have affected the result of an election."

That is the end of that requirement by the Committee.

**Mr. Houston:** It was not a requirement of the Committee at all.

**The ACTING CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. YEWDAL:** In dealing further with secret ballots, I point out that for very many years I was deeply involved on behalf of

one branch of a Queensland industrial union in secret ballots for the election of union officials. I venture to say that the Waterside Workers' Union ballots for the election of officers, not only in Queensland but right throughout Australia, would probably be among the most stringently controlled to be found anywhere. A lot of people who know very little about what happens in the unions are probably surprised when they hear information such as the rules that I have just read out to the Committee.

The Minister in his speech stated that responsible unionists will be disadvantaged by these amendments. How does the Minister intend to encourage industrial peace if, on his own admission, many of his so-called reasonable unionists are worse off than others?

The withdrawal of civil immunities will not meet with the approval of all unionists. The withdrawal of such immunities, if enforced, will eventually lead to a unionist facing a gaol sentence. The extreme penalty of gaoling a union official will not solve a widespread industrial dispute. The gaoling of Clarrie O'Shea and the Australia-wide backlash to such gaoling meant the end of punitive provisions of the Commonwealth Arbitration Act.

Removal of immunity for trade union officials will be a backward, retrograde and extremely anti-democratic action and will be fought bitterly by trade-unionists generally. The withdrawal of the immunity will prevent the furtherance of legitimate claims where the employer refuses to discuss issues with workers or the union.

**Mr. KATTER:** I rise to a point of order. There is absolutely nothing in this legislation about gaoling union officials.

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

**Mr. YEWDALE:** It means a return to the 1870s, when unions still in their infancy were struggling to survive against the onslaught of the free-wheeling economic system of the day. Removal of civil immunities will lead to a return to the law of the jungle where unions and workers can be blackmailed if they are forced to resort to industrial action.

The automatic stand-down provisions could increase industrial disputes. Employers will now be in a position to engineer strikes if there is a shortage of materials or a business downturn. It will be very easy to deny workers their right to one or two days' work per week.

The Government threat of deregistration will only draw unions together and widen industrial disputes.

This legislation is an action of confrontation, whereas, I feel, the recipe is conciliation. The Government's role should be to encourage worker/employer co-operation

and understanding. Workers must gradually share more of the control and decision-making in industry. With education standards increasing at a rapid rate, this is not only a possibility but a necessity.

I noted in the Press this morning that the Prime Minister of Australia last evening had dinner with Bob Hawke. The report said that, while the event was something of a social occasion, the two men did discuss industrial matters in Australia today. I say again that our Minister (Mr. Campbell) has tried and is still trying to effect conciliation, but unfortunately our Premier and other people in the Government like to dominate and dictate to some of our Ministers. I believe that the Premier is spreading his wings and dictating to this Minister.

The Minister's actions in recent months have indicated that he has tried to talk to the unions and tried to solve many industrial issues in this State. Only a couple of weeks ago he made a statement to the Parliament in which he said he felt that it should always be the right of unionists to take strike action. I am not quoting him word for word, but that is generally what he said. As I said earlier, in the last 48 hours or so he has been quoted in the Press as saying that he believes it is impossible to legislate to stop strikes. However he is here this morning (and I believe reluctantly) introducing a measure arising from a recommendation by a committee—a committee whose members have very little experience or knowledge of industrial matters and are far removed from rank and file unionists in Queensland.

I believe most sincerely that many of the disputes in Queensland, particularly in recent times, have extended for far too long. The trade union movement has to look at what it is doing in prolonged strikes. I do not think that the standard of living that has been created in our community allows for the withdrawal of facilities and certain of the services that we need from day to day. I believe that that matter has to be seriously looked at.

I do not think that this legislation will solve the problems. I think that the Minister said the Government is only after that minority of officials in the militant area of trade unionism. The information that has been fed back to me from trade union officials that I associate with fairly regularly, even in my own town, is to the effect that in the alumina plant issue—and the other day in another place Mr. Porter denied this to me—it was very evident that the trade union officials in Gladstone at the crunch of the strike were trying their hardest to get the fellows back on the job. To my mind that was a very genuine approach by the union officials. The type of ballot that was conducted in Gladstone on that very crucial day was probably as democratic as any that could be held anywhere because the public were standing close to the meeting, saw the

whole happening and saw the decision being reached by those persons themselves quite voluntarily.

They decided to continue the strike. I thought it was wrong and the union officials thought it was wrong. The union officials then deliberately went out of their way after the decision was taken to try to negotiate and get those fellows back on the plant. They did that very thing; they got them back on the plant. The Minister has said in this Chamber that he had every confidence in the trade union officials of those unions at the Trades Hall in Brisbane and thought that in the best interests of their members at that alumina plant they would carry on negotiations after the return to work.

I have argument with certain actions taken by certain unions and I will be attempting to do something about it in other places. I reiterate that I do not think this legislation is going to do it. Because the Minister has said it publicly, I do not think he feels that it is going to do it. Because certain people in the Government who have been given the responsibility of being on a committee to talk about legislation to control unionists in Queensland and to report back to the Cabinet and the caucus do not get down to talking to the people about their problems, they do not understand and will never fully understand. They concern themselves only with their own narrow attitude to what they think is a wild, rampaging group of unionists in Queensland who want to do all sorts of things to the economy and the Government.

That is just not the case. The average rank-and-file unionist has principles. Whatever is said to him he is going to take an interest in the community round him. He is going to look at the environment. He is going to express himself on things that affect him, his wife and his kids. I think he is entitled to do that.

There has been mention of political issues. I raise another point made by the honourable member for Toowong. He asked whether we thought it was reasonable that an elected Government should be overridden by a group of trade-unionists in the State. I said, "No, that's not on and I don't think it ever will be on." Any Government should be open to criticism. Trade-unionists are part of our community—and a big part. They are entitled to express their concern on matters, not necessarily to the stage of continued disputation and cessation of work; but surely they are entitled to express themselves. If, over some issue, there is minor disruption and a cessation of work which is not of a prolonged nature, I see nothing wrong with trade-unionists expressing themselves in this way.

I say again that I do not agree with long disputation or long stoppages of work where they affect so many members of the community. But whatever we say, whatever

we do in this Chamber and whatever legislation is passed—the same as Clarrie O'Shea and the Crimes Act—the Government will not implement it in the 1980s. It has to get around the table and talk with unionists and union officials.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (12.43 p.m.):** I welcome this legislation. I am sure that the overwhelming number of members of this Parliament will welcome it and I am quite certain that the great mass of people in the community, including the great majority of trade union rank-and-file members, will also welcome it.

Of course, this is not a final solution to problems in the industrial field. What ever will be? But this goes a long way towards putting the control of union affairs back into the hands of the ordinary rank and file, and tries to redress some of the dreadful imbalance that has developed over the years as we have had dedicated Communists—extremely radical, Left-wing people and some of them even anarchists—who have insinuated themselves into high positions in union office in various key unions and are able to do tremendous things in damaging the economy of this country but never have any hesitation about using union muscle to paralyse the community and to act in the very worst interests of their own members. So let us be quite sure about that. This legislation is designed to assist the trade union movement. It will assist the trade union movement by reducing the flexibility and capacity for manoeuvre of the dedicated, radical, Left-wing leaders in a few unions but unfortunately very important, very powerful and very strategically placed unions. The Minister is to be congratulated on what he has done. The foolish and pathetic attempt by the Opposition to suggest that he has in effect been dragged to the party as a reluctant maiden is the kind of rubbish that one would expect from it and it has no relation at all to the facts. This has already been indicated by the Minister, as no doubt it will be by other speakers, too.

The debate on the introduction of a Bill provides an opportunity to deal with the major issues that underlie the legislation. In other words, it gives an opportunity to look at what the legislation does, which is quite different from what the Opposition pretends it does, and also why it does it. Of course, the attitude of the Opposition is totally predictable. It is an inevitable part of its permanent and unchanging attitude, which is to support the extreme Left Wing, which has become established in some key unions. No matter what Opposition members say or pretend in terms of the interests of rank-and-file unionists, that is their attitude. Their aim is to keep in office the extreme Left-wingers who are determined to misuse the union movement in order to soften up the

community and wreck our economy. Their only interest is in acting as some sort of Trojan horse in society in order to bring us to our knees so that we will be the easier victims for some form of Communist domination.

I want to make it quite plain that the Government, by means of this legislation, wants to help the genuine trade-unionist. That is, I am sure, the viewpoint of all Government members. We want trade unions to be strong and effective in their proper field. The degree to which they come out of that field and try to usurp the political arena is the degree to which they will be reduced to impotence. Political power, of course, is what the radicals want.

Our role in producing this legislation is as the Minister has said; it is designed to assist trade unions and unionists in our genuine desire to improve the lot of the workers. We want to put power back in the hands of the rank and file. What we will get from the Opposition today, and what we have already had and will continue to get from union bosses outside, is no more than an indication of their fear that their privileged positions will be reduced by the provisions of the Bill. The old saw, "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned" could now well be, "Hell hath no fury like a union boss who sees his privileged position likely to be reduced."

One really needs a glossary when trying to deal with the nonsense talked by the Opposition and union leaders. I have had quite a bit to do with this in television debates and other fields. I had such a discussion with the honourable member for Rockhampton North, who spoke just a few minutes ago. In order to understand what these people are saying, one needs a glossary which defines the terms that they use. Anything designed to restrict the Left Wing in union affairs is "union-bashing." To them, union-bashing means doing anything to protect the community against unbridled union muscle. They say that the Government is seeking a confrontation. This means, of course, that the Government should do nothing at all that is aimed at checking unreasonable union demands. We get thrown at us, "You are trying to reduce democratic union rights." That means, of course, the union's right to have its own way at any cost. We are told that we are attacking the rights of the workers. What that really means is that we might be attacking the unlimited right of the Left-wing boss to treat the community as cannon fodder in the class war and the workers as mindless ciphers to be pushed around and manipulated at will. In the process, they treat themselves as the princes of a new industrial autarchy. It is not so long ago that we read in the Press that one union boss in a southern State was receiving approximately \$43,000 a year in salary and privileges. Not bad for a friend of the workers!

The shadow Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs said that the great mass of ordinary people and rank-and-file unionists were fearful of what the Government might do; they did not want anything done in terms of changing industrial legislation. Let me give a few hard facts about it. There was a Gallup Poll, the only poll that in over 40 years of politics I found really reliable in trying to assess public attitudes, published in "The Bulletin" in June which dealt with over 4,000 people, of whom well over 1,000 were members of trade unions. The results of this poll, which are compatible with similar polls taken over the past 10 years—only a little more so—showed that not only do the overwhelming majority of the community believe certain things about trade unions, but so also do the overwhelming majority of trade-unionists believe these things.

For instance, on the consideration that membership of trade unions should be voluntary and not compulsory, 68 per cent of the community went along with that, and so did 61 per cent of trade union members. On the issue of secret ballots for strike determinations, 82 per cent of the general community wanted it and so did 73 per cent of trade union members. On the election of office bearers by secret ballot, 83 per cent of the community were in favour and so were 82 per cent of trade union members. On the question whether these ballots should be conducted by the relevant State Electoral Offices, 54 per cent of the community were in favour and 48 per cent of trade union members were in favour. And only 44 per cent of trade union members were against it! Here is an interesting one: the belief that there should not be union affiliation with any particular political party was held by 68 per cent of the community and by 67 per cent of trade union members. Let the A.L.P. put that in its pipe and smoke it! As to the attitude towards political strikes—85 per cent of the community were against them, and so were 78 per cent of trade-unionists. As to whether unions have too much power, 69 per cent of the community agreed, as did 57 per cent of trade-unionists. And on whether there are far too many strikes, 84 per cent of the community agreed, as did 76 per cent of trade-unionists.

It is important, Mr. Gunn, that those figures be read into the record because something must be said to dispel this noxious rubbish we get time and time again from union officials, and from the A.L.P. acting on their behalf, that what we are attempting to do here is against the wishes of most union members and against the wishes of most people. It is in fact in line with the wishes of four out of every five people, in most cases, so let us not have any doubt at all that what the Government is doing is in fact totally in line with what the overwhelming majority of people want, and what the overwhelming majority of trade-unionists want.

It seems to me that if the trade union movement is to remain a source of strength and a source of sustenance to the ordinary worker, then it is absolutely essential that we try to contain those people who want to misuse the trade union movement for either their own purposes—that is, to enjoy the unbridled use of power—or for some political purpose, and there is no doubt that this applies to many people in trade unions today. When I say “many”, that is quantitative. I think that Sir John Egerton, who, of course, will be well remembered by members opposite and for whom they have a high regard in his industrial capacity—if they did not have a high regard for him they did not mention it until he became Sir John—said that there are something like 20 or 30 people in the union movement who, if they could be isolated and cleansed from the union movement, would leave it as industrial machinery which would be infinitely better for the country as well as for trade-unionists. I have no doubt if we could get rid of the Halfpennys, the Carmichaels, the Clancys, the Gallaghers, the Fitzgibbons and so on—

**A Government Member:** Hamilton.

**Mr. PORTER:** I have not mentioned any Queensland ones—I do not want to be harsh.

**Mr. Houston:** Don't you know any Queensland ones?

**Mr. PORTER:** Yes, I know quite a few, and if at a later stage the honourable member prods me I will be happy to mention them, but at this stage I am talking in general terms. There is no doubt that these people are not interested one jot, one tittle, in the union movement, but they have managed to get hold of unions such as the A.M.W.U., the seamen, the B.W.I.U., the B.L.F., the miners and the F.E.D.F.A. I might add the New South Wales Teachers' Federation to that list, too.

**An Honourable Member:** What about Ray Costello?

**Mr. PORTER:** As I say, I don't want to mention Queensland ones at the moment—Mr. Costello or anyone else. The plain fact is that there is a pattern of Communist usurpation of power in certain key unions which must be resisted. Literally everybody, except the puppets of the Opposition who dance to the tune of the Communist bosses, and their few followers, wants that done. We have simply got to do it because there must be a time when government cannot allow itself to be held to ransom, and it cannot allow the community to be held to ransom. Unions must confine their concern to union affairs. They simply cannot be allowed to dictate what the policy of the country shall be in areas such as the mining and transport of uranium, whether repairs to our naval fleet should be carried out at Cockatoo Island dockyard, whether we

should permit shipping to Indonesia and other countries, whether we should have an Omega communications system, whether we should export wheat to places like Chile, whether there should be a Medibank levy, whether the United States carrier “Truxton” should be allowed to visit our shores, or whether a Government should be allowed to erect a power station, as in the case of Newport in Victoria. There are a whole host of areas where increasingly unions are attempting to take over the role of Government. They are permitted to do so because the Left-wing bosses have got themselves into these powerful positions. They have been eased into them by our indolence on this side—our reluctance to stand up and be counted on important occasions—and, of course, by the very willing, eager, dedicated assistance of honourable members opposite, the members of the Labor Party in this State, and members of that party in other States. All of us want to see strong unions. All of us want to see a truly effective industrial union system.

**Mr. Burns:** You don't.

**Mr. PORTER:** It is no use saying that I don't. My whole life and all my public utterances say the same. All of us want to see a strong industrial union system which is concerned with the well-being of its members. But I, in common with 85 per cent of the community, will utterly oppose any attempt by Communists and their fellow-travellers—

**Mr. Burns** interjected.

**Mr. PORTER:** The Leader of the Opposition, by his constant comments, indicates which category he falls into.

We will utterly oppose any attempts by Left-wing radicals and their supporters to use the union movement to destroy a true union movement and in the process endeavour to destroy the authority of elected Governments. That just isn't on!

I mentioned a little while ago that there were many Communist bosses throughout Australia. We have one Communist boss in Queensland who is the president of the Communist Party. We have another Communist boss in Mr. Halfpenny who is the Australian president of the Communist Party. That man, who is the head of a very big and powerful Australian union, has been a dedicated Communist from way back. Of course he went over to the Soviet Union to be trained. Trained for what? To help Australia? To help Australian trade-unionists? Does anybody really believe that? The honourable member for Rockhampton North seems to believe all sorts of things. From what he says, doubtless he believes in fairies at the bottom of the garden. He wants Left-wing union bosses and unions to be left alone. Does anyone imagine that Communist Russia takes people from Australia and trains them to be of assistance to Australia

against whatever Russia may want to do, whether it be in a military, economic or trading activity? To believe that, one would really have to believe in fairies at the bottom of the garden. It is high time the Labor Party started to realise just what sort of bedfellows it has been consorting with and tumbled them out and got rid of them. For my part I believe that the time is well overdue for some action to be taken.

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

**Mr. PORTER:** In opening its case, as it were, against this legislation the Opposition realised that in order to make any sort of showing at all it has to pretend that certain provisions that are not in the legislation are in it. No doubt the Opposition will continue in the same strain. It set out to create a bogey, as it were, to try to raise false fears and to pretend that nightmares are suddenly coming to life in the form of new fines, penalties and sanctions that will outrage the average trade-unionist. That is, of course, absolute nonsense. Those things are not there at all.

Only one provision in the Bill deals in any way with that aspect, and that is the new section 36A, which gives a commissioner a power of direction or order in the event of a strike or a lock-out. A union or a body corporate can be liable to a penalty of \$2,000 and an individual to \$200. The main thrust of the Bill, however, is, firstly, to enable the trade union movement in general to be more in control of its own affairs and, secondly, to reduce the capacity of trade unions to inflict disaster and harm on the community.

Under the new stand-down provision, which reverses the existing procedure, the employer will have the right to stand down employees who cannot be gainfully employed in their normal work. It will be up to the union to move in the court for redress or for an order that they be not stood down. The outcome of this provision will be that trade-unionists will see very rapidly who it is that is harming them, who it is that is placing them at a disadvantage and who it is that is putting them out of the work they normally do and get paid for. They will be able to see that it is a small group in some other union that is fortunate enough to be in a key industry, such as the electricity industry, whose action has had the result of putting them and other trade-unionists out of work. This provision is a good one and it will make for a greater degree of sanity than we have seen in other places.

The repeal of any degree of protection for trade unions and their members against action for damages arising out of industrial activity is wanted by the overwhelming majority of the community. The Minister has said, and I agree with him, that it may be difficult at law to recover damages in such a case. However, that the opportunity be provided as a matter of principle

goes without saying. There is no reason in the wide world why trade unions, as corporate bodies, and why members of trade unions should be seen to be different from anyone else in the community.

The requirement to show cause will, in many cases, put greater emphasis on the power of suspension of registration and/or deregistration than has been the case in the past. I am inclined to think that this will have a salutary effect on those mischievous trade unions that are apt to abuse their power to be registered under the Act and then promptly proceed to misuse it for their own political and other personal purposes. I am sure that most of us will regard as a very good thing this greater emphasis on the capacity to suspend and ultimately deregister a union.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (2.19 p.m.): At the outset—let us lay down a fairly solid and broad basis on which to talk to this measure. Without qualification or hesitation, I say that good, strong trade-unionism is necessary in any country. It must, however, be good, strong and clean trade-unionism. Unfortunately, in many sections of the trade union movement today we do not have that.

That situation has arisen because since World War II we have lived comparatively, and at times actually, in an affluent society. People have not had to struggle for jobs. There has been no great measure of unemployment. Money has been reasonably plentiful. Children leaving school have been able to get jobs without difficulty. Consequently, everybody settled back in the belief that everything was hunky-dory, that everything in the garden was lovely with employment, trade-unionism, politics and everything else in Australia.

Because of that, many women entered the work-force, and all that a unionist thought he had to do was to wait until a trade union organiser or job rep came along to buy his ticket from him. When he bought his union ticket he thought his obligations to the trade union movement and society were finished. Because of that apathy and laissez-faire of the great mass of trade-unionists in Australia—they were all getting enough money to buy new cars, refrigerators and homes and pay for holidays and everything else they needed—the Communists moved in. The Communists never lose sight of their main objective, that is, control of the country. If they can't control it in one way they will control it in another. Some time ago they gave up running candidates in political elections. They do not need to run in political elections today. They merely move into the trade union movement, and because in Australia the trade union movement is affiliated with the A.L.P., the Communists control the A.L.P. through the trade union movement.

Only in one other country in the world does that happen, and that is in England. It is no fluke that, in England and Australia today, economic and industrial conditions are at their lowest ebb. That is simply because those who have been elected by the people to Parliament to control the destinies of the country cannot do it because their back-room bosses—who are mostly Communists—tell them what to do, and the Communists are always working in the interests of the Communist Party. Do not let us kid ourselves on that point! Because of this grip on the Australian economy and the Australian people by the Communist trade union leaders and those who run along with them, we have a pretty shocking state of affairs.

I shall shortly deal with perhaps the most important part of Australia, that is, North Queensland, and outline what happened there only recently. My chief objection to the new brand of Communist trade-unionism is that it plays with a double-headed penny. Out in the West, when two-up was the national game, any man who floated a knob, that is, played with a double-headed penny, was likely to be kicked out of the ring. But the Communists and their fellow-travellers play the trade union game with a double-headed penny. They go to the Industrial Commission and ask for certain increases in wages and better conditions. If after hearing the case the Industrial Commission rejects it either wholly or in part, the Communists immediately pull a strike. They say, "To hell with the Industrial Commission. We would have taken what it gave us if it had given us all that we wanted, but it did not do so. Come on, boys, let's walk off the job." When that is done the most important people in Australia, particularly the most important people in Queensland, are forgotten. In my opinion the most important people in Queensland are the women and the kids. They are the ones who are forgotten. They have to carry the burden of all the wildcat Communist-inspired strikes. They, and not so much the men, have to suffer the hardships.

I shall now deal with what happened quite recently in North Queensland. Up at Collinsville, where working conditions are particularly good—and this matter was never mentioned during the whole trouble—the Collinsville strikers are supplied with very fine homes for a petty-fogging rental. As a matter of fact they have a better home than I have or even better than that of the Leader of the Opposition. They enjoy wonderful conditions. I tackled one of them and asked him, "Why are you chaps on strike?" He said, "We are isolated." I asked, "Why do you consider that you are isolated?" He said, "They have cut the rail-motor service between here and Bowen." I said, "They had to cut it off because you people would not patronise it." With the marvellous clarity of argument that the

Communists put forward, he said, "Why should we patronise it? We have our own cars. We can run to and from Bowen whenever we like." I asked, "Are you suggesting that the Railway Department should maintain a rail-motor service that no-one patronises?" He said, "Yes, and that is why we are isolated." That is just a little side issue to let honourable members know what goes on and how the minds of those people work.

The Collinsville strikers—and this is something that wasn't stressed often enough—went to the Industrial Commission and asked, if I remember rightly, for an increase of \$8.50 per week because of their isolation. A good case was put up for them before the commission, but the commission rejected their claim. Immediately the commission rejected the application, the men decided to walk off the job until they were given a rise of \$50 a week—\$10 a day, 5 days a week. Some of them even insisted that they should demand that amount seven days a week! Consequently, the whole of the economy and the decent living conditions of North Queensland were thrown into discard.

What a wonderful thing! I feel sure that every Communist and every A.L.P. member in North Queensland was laughing his head off at the plight of kiddies going to school with not even a cup of tea. There was no electricity to boil the kettle. They would go to school with a glass of water and a cold sandwich. Workers would go to work with a cold sandwich and a glass of water. They never knew when the power was going to be off or when it was going to be on. The women and the kids suffered their hardships uncomplainingly, although some of them complained very strongly to me. In the shops, people were groping round in the dark, with perspiration running down their skin because the air-conditioning had failed.

They were the people who were persecuted. They were the people who were getting it in the neck—not the Government; not the N.E.A.; not the members of the A.L.P., the members of the National Party or the members of the Liberal Party; but the women and the kids of North Queensland. The Communists and the trade union leaders and the Trades and Labor Council in Townsville, which supported them to the limit, were laughing their heads off. The men who should have been supporting the women and kids—those who were elected to positions of authority (A.L.P. members of Parliament, A.L.P. aldermen, A.L.P. mayors and A.L.P. men holding other positions of trust)—not only never said a word in support of the women and kids, but some of them came out openly and supported the actions of this little group at Collinsville that had the whole of North Queensland tied up and paralysed.

A Full Bench of the Arbitration Commission had knocked back the claim for \$8.50 a week. Then it was suggested—I think it



was Mr. Pont who suggested it—that a recommendation should be made as to the amount to be granted to the men in order to settle the strike. Naturally, the N.E.A. said, “No, we are not going to have Mr. Pont make a recommendation.” If I were a worker, I would want Mr. Pont to make a recommendation; sure thing. George Pont has one idea, and one only, of settling an industrial disturbance and that is, “Give the workers everything they ask for, because it is part of our job as industrial commissioners to provide for industrial peace.” George Pont has always been prepared to buy industrial peace at the expense of the people who have to pay for industrial peace. So the N.E.A., to use an old expression, wouldn’t touch George Pont with a 40 ft. pole. In all seriousness they said, “No. This is a matter that was decided by a Full Bench of the Arbitration Commission and it should go back to the Full Bench of the Arbitration Commission.”

While the North starved, while the North was persecuted, while millions and millions of dollars went down the drain in North Queensland, while workers in North Queensland walked the streets looking for work, having been laid off because of the power strike, this Government did nothing—absolutely nothing. It is quite true, as the Premier pointed out when he came to Townsville after the strike, that some of the employers could have taken action against their employees; but it is also quite true that, with the situation that I think will be relieved by this Bill, the employees carried on at work if they were engaged in any industry other than the one at Collinsville. Their jobs went on all the time. Their money went on all the time. They suffered no inconvenience. Only the women and kids of those who were laid off or those who had to battle along by themselves were placed in jeopardy.

When the Premier came to North Queensland, he addressed a big meeting in Lowths Hotel—or, rather, a meeting was arranged for him by the Chamber of Commerce and by the captains of industry in North Queensland. People came from Cairns in the North, Mackay in the South and out as far as, I think, Hughenden in the West. These people—member after member of the various organisations—went up to the Premier or to the chairman of the meeting, Mr. Alymer (who is chairman of the Chamber of Commerce), and showed in actual facts and figures the millions of dollars that had been lost to North Queensland. North Queensland had been absolutely paralysed by this handful of men at Collinsville.

After that was finished, they were sitting there still licking their wounds and I went to the microphone and told them what should be done. I said to them as I say to this Committee and to the Minister, “I was born and bred in the A.L.P. and in the trade union movement. I know them backwards. I know how they work. I know that some

of the things they do now were done in my time. I know that since World War II the Communists have moved in to control the trade union movement and by controlling the trade union movement they control the A.L.P.” I also said to them, “You have to fight. You must have a confrontation. Make these fellows put their hands up and see just what they are made of. I have never known a fight to be won by a man who ran away from it.” We had some of the trade union leaders here flattering some of our Ministers and saying, “Don’t hold a confrontation with the trade union movement.” They were huffing, puffing and bluffing, as we used to say in the old days. They said, “Don’t dare to have a confrontation with the trade union movement, because the trade union movement will finish up as the victor.”

Every time a man says to me, “Don’t hold a confrontation with me; don’t dare to put your hands up to me”, no matter how big or how small he is, despite my age and despite the rather derogatory remarks made the other day by the pot-bellied old dill from Archerfield, I will take him on. Whether I win or lose, I will take him on.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Kaus): Order! I ask the honourable member to refrain from using that language.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I will do that. I was a little hurt.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I withdraw it. He made a big man of himself by saying that I was a white-haired old mug. I am white haired and grey and I am proud of it because I have gone grey in the service of the people, the working class, the useful people. That is more than the pot-bellied member for Archerfield can say.

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

**Mr. AIKENS:** If he is not pot-bellied, I will withdraw it.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** I withdraw it.

**Mr. Frawley:** He couldn’t count time with a drumstick.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I think he is on the right leg in regard to those Crown prosecutors, believe me. I will say that for him. I think the information is being fed to him, just the same. I think the Leader of the Opposition was a bit behind that one. The honourable member for Archerfield hasn’t enough brains to work that one out for himself, but he is on the right leg.

Then we have the Mary Kathleen issue. This is an industry that is very vital to Townsville and to Queensland. The Mary Kathleen mine was closed down. Production and export of uranium were stopped. Every time those in charge of the Mary Kathleen mine and the people in that area, in Townsville and in North Queensland, said, "When is the Mary Kathleen mine going to open again?", the catchcry of the A.L.P. and the Communists was, "We are waiting for the Ranger report. Nothing can be done until we get the Ranger report." Well, we got the Ranger report and it shows clearly that Mary Kathleen can be worked and that the uranium can be exported.

Yet only yesterday in Townsville there was a gathering of railway trade union officials—90 per cent of them Communists—and they decided—and they gave a statement to "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" to that effect—that the railwaymen would not handle Mary Kathleen uranium and would have nothing to do with it. Approximately 90 per cent of the railway workers in Townsville want the Mary Kathleen mine to open, want uranium to be produced, and want it to be exported. Yet this little handful of self-appointed self-opinionated trade union leaders said, "No." They were led by Comms and half-baked Comms.

As would be expected, one of them is my A.L.P. opponent in the next State election. He is coming up for the third time and everybody knows what happens when a person goes down for the third time. These people are taking complete control of the show.

After the phosphate mine was opened near Duchess and the Government spent a lot of money to put a railway line into it and the phosphate was being brought down to Townsville, the company decided to establish a phosphate plant in South Townsville. What happened then? The workers never had a say. One trade union leader—I think it was Freddie Thompson, the Comm—made a statement to the Press off his own bat. He said, "This phosphate plant won't go here. We'll declare it black." Let us not forget that union leaders, like Queen Victoria, who said, "We are not amused", always use the royal plural—"we"; never "I". They say, "Not a nail will be driven in the works. Not a hole will be dug. Not a screw will be screwed." One man alone declared the phosphate plant black.

Fortunately for the people of Townsville, as the result of the erection of the Townsville Power Station some years ago by an A.L.P. Government, despite my vehement opposition (it has since then spewed filth all over South Townsville), the Government amended the Local Government Act to set up a Local Government Court to hear and determine appeals against decisions of local authorities to allow the establishment of industries. Objections then became an ordinary process of law.

Finally, the Townsville City Council, in the knowledge that it would not have a leg to stand on if the matter was taken to the Local Government Court, granted, though very reluctantly, permission for the erection of the phosphate plant. There will therefore be another industry in Townsville that will provide more work and more employment.

But still the unions are fighting. They have behind them a man named Graham Wells. He is a nice little fellow and an A.L.P. stooge. He was granted \$12,000, I think, a year by the Whitlam Government. Why the Fraser Government continues this grant, I do not know. He set himself up in an office in Sturt Street and called himself an environmental consultant. The only consulting that I have known him to do is, if I may make a play on the word, insulting all who want to do anything for North Queensland. Every organisation and movement supported by decent reputable people and common sense is opposed by Mr. Graham Wells.

Let me now refer to railway stoppages. I was a railwayman for 27 years and I left the Railway Department with a record of trade union activity that may perhaps be equalled but has certainly not been bettered. I was in the A.R.U. for many years during which I held every union office except paid positions. If I were still in the Railway Department, I would be doing something about preventing all the silly stoppages that take place in the West. Whenever a fellow returns home drunk or has an argument, it is no longer a matter of going to the union official on the job and saying, "Let's go and have a talk with the station master," or the district superintendent or locomotive foreman. It's simply, "Come on, boys, let's walk off.", and off they go down to the hotel. All industry in North Queensland that relies on the railway line from Townsville to Mt. Isa is then paralysed.

Occasionally railway workers may have a genuine grievance, and I say without hesitation that I will be on the side of anyone who I think has a genuine complaint. But everyone in Queensland is sick and tired of the Al Capone tactics of little groups of standover trade-unionists and A.L.P. members. I heard the Minister speak of conciliation. The idea that standover trade-unionists have of conciliation is Al Capone's idea—stick a gun in a fellow's belly and say to him, "Give me what I want—or else." That is their idea of conciliation.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. JONES** (Cairns) (2.39 p.m.): The Minister stressed the need for dispassionate and unbiased debate. I shall endeavour to heed his call for constructive submissions. However, I wish to digress for a moment to refer to the emphasis that has been placed on political strikes and the alleged intervention by the Government to prevent them. The recent Medibank strike has been said to be the epitome of a political strike. I speak

now as a former voluntary union official in the Railway Department. I was a railway-man for 23 years.

**Mr. Aikens:** A good one, too.

**Mr. JONES:** I thank the honourable member. I appreciate that comment coming from him because I know of his political and trade union history. I think that is well defined in his maiden speech on the black-banning of ore in, I think, 1931. I remember the honourable member's participation with men like "Pooger" O'Brien, the former district secretary of the A.R.U., "Stinker" Gairns and a former district superintendent of the railways, "Bluey" Dinsmore, in disputes—

**Mr. Aikens:** I walked the streets for nine months after that.

**Mr. JONES:** Those were the days when things were really tough and the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act had not reached the standard of perfection that it has today. But the trade unions' reason for the Medibank strike was that the introduction of the Medibank levy meant a reduction in wages. We could go on from there and talk about the demise of the free hospital system for the average worker. But where is the line of demarcation between a political dispute and an industrial dispute? If workers' wages are involved, naturally they will react.

I do not believe in political interference in strikes. The Collinsville dispute is behind us now, but I could never understand why the Industrial Commission ordered the stand-down of 100,000 employees in Far North Queensland, and yet did not order the parties in dispute into court.

When we look at the uranium issue I suppose we could hark back to the days when the watersiders said, "No scrap iron for Japan." Disputes like the uranium dispute sometimes result from a deep conviction about a certain issue, and the ordinary workers are not immune to this type of feeling. The right to demonstrate is one of our political rights. We hear arguments about rights and privileges, but I believe the right to strike was established by people such as the honourable member for Townsville South, and he can go back to the 1915 tramway strike—

**Mr. Aikens:** Where do you stand on the uranium strike?

**Mr. JONES:** I anticipated that the honourable member would ask me that. Our position was clearly defined in "The Courier-Mail" last Wednesday following the meeting of the Parliamentary Labor Party and, of course, I always adhere to the policies laid down by my party.

The Minister also stated, and I think he stated it very responsibly, that most unions were responsible, and that there was responsible unionism in Queensland. But he also

said that this legislation—and he appeared to be pushed into this position—was to ensure that the unions kept their house in order. Of course, that smacks of political interference and naivety, and I do not think the naivety is the Minister's. The Minister also said that the employers have had certain powers under the law which they have refused to use in recent disputes. That is true. Of course, when they get into trouble they look over the fence like a lot of other people and want the Government to intervene. They do not have the guts to intervene themselves and take the unions on; they want the Government to intervene. If we start bypassing our properly set-up Industrial Commission and our conciliation and arbitration laws, we get into a lot of trouble. We can see that once we bypass the courts, whether they be industrial, criminal or civil courts, we start to get into deep water. Where the employers have failed to act, they call on Governments, and I do not think Governments should be hoodwinked into entering into such situations.

One of the amendments now before the Committee makes Federal unions subject to actions in tort. I wonder how much force that will have in law, and what effect it will have in practice. This applies to the other issues of how we will define political, financial or industrial disputes. Where are we going to draw the line on unemployment, inflation, the value of money and all these things which affect workers? These matters will be debated at union level. Unionists will come out on strike in the future about them. Those are the types of things that the Minister is going to regard as political matters.

**Mr. Ahern:** Aren't your people a bit sick and tired of all the strikes we are having today?

**Mr. JONES:** Yes. As I develop my argument I am sure the honourable member for Landsborough will agree with what I say.

It must be remembered that sometimes the ordinary bloke on the job, along with his mates, feels that he has no redress between elections other than the withdrawal of his labour. This is the point I want to make.

Even if the Bill reduces the opportunity for that type of redress, the Government cannot prevent organised labour from taking its own decisions. The Government could legislate to improve the means of the employees to obtain redress. There are difficulties inherent in every piece of industrial legislation for management, labour and the unions. "Co-operation" is the key word, not "confrontation"; conciliation, not silly retaliation. The unions are not always to blame for the problems that arise. It is not always a union's fault that there is a strike. Sometimes a union creates an industrial dispute, but there are times when management, through its stupidity, creates disputes. Industrial history records foolhardy actions of all shades of shame and stupidity.

The Minister said that this was a volatile subject. It is a volatile subject on the floor when blokes are discussing their right to withdraw their labour. It is only the ignorant and non-involved who do not realise the degree of emotion that emanates from the floor at these times. More times than I can recall the union official, the representative, or the fellow on the job convinces workers not to go out on strike. When they are on strike he convinces them to return to work. Too many hotch-potch strikes are started at that level.

I agree with the honourable member for Townsville South that it is not only the strikers who are affected, but their wives and children. That is the gut issue. Let it not be forgotten that the fellows on the job who make the decision to strike do not welcome such a decision. Usually they make it after a lot of hard thought. I speak on their behalf as one of them over a long period. They would welcome any action at all that would facilitate getting their demands and needs heard by an appropriate authority. Half the time, they take action out of frustration because they can't get their message across, or they can't get an interpretation of a particular aspect of an award or a particular condition on the job. That is the real problem of industrial relations.

I emphasise the word "relations". The relating is the important thing. There must be relating through their union officials to the industrial machinery, with the workers on the job relating to the boss, whether he be a foreman, superintendent, manager or some other head who is directing that particular operation.

Unionists are Australians. They resent interference in their affairs. They are sufficiently educated to look after their own affairs; let there be no doubt about that. That is an Australian trait that applies to them as much as to anybody else. If the men understand the issue, they will work themselves to a standstill. That was reiterated in a recent report on Darwin. Brigadier Stretton had high praise for the waterside workers when they were called upon to work on behalf of people in the disaster area. If the Minister relates that to industrial legislation, and learns that message, I am sure he will get more out of the blokes on the job than by introducing legislation such as this.

If management keeps workers in the mushroom club—in the dark and fed on manure—they will get their hackles up. If they are treated as being something below the level of management, they will dig in their heels.

If the average Australian is misinformed, misdirected or misled, he will jack up. But given a fair go and the opportunity to present his grievance, he will respond. Whether the average Australian is under fire or at work, if he is called on at the right time and in the right manner, he will respond. Whether he is a soldier, a water-front worker or a worker in any other

industry, he will take on all comers, and he will come out with flying colours. He won't be exploited; he won't be used and he won't be abused. None of us would put up with that, so why should the average worker? Is he any different from us? I was a trade-unionist for 23 years, and proud of it. I have a very high regard for the trade-unionist, the fellow on the job. He is a good bloke and the salt of the earth.

I laugh my head off at suggestions of Communist infiltration into unions. Any Communists who have infiltrated the unions have been able to do so simply because of apathy—and that does not last for very long. A wonderful Labor man, J. B. Chifley, said, "Beware of the whispered word 'Communist'." He also said to the ordinary fellow on the job, "If you are going to do a job and if you are going to do a job in your union, do it well. The Communist representative in your union, a dedicated servant of his master, does his job well. You do yours well." I think this sentiment was reflected recently by the Speaker of the Federal House.

Many persons are hurt by the irresponsible actions of a few, but I do not see that this Bill, which permits civil action to be taken against trade-unionists and their officials, will do anything to overcome the problem. Instead it will aggravate it.

What the Government should be doing is looking at the actions that lead up to the boiling-point of a dispute. This is when conciliation and arbitration should occur, not after the event. The imposition of penalties on union officials will only cause unionists to feel aggrieved, isolated and discriminated against. Action taken against their elected officials will create a volatile situation.

The Minister admitted that the overwhelming majority of trade unions and unionists are responsible. I do not believe that industrial lawlessness is rampant at the present time. I see among trade-unionists a restive feeling, one that reflects the insecurity of the industrial climate in Australia today.

If the Industrial Commission makes orders in relation to strikes it will be partly responsible for industrial trouble. It is within the commission's province to avoid such trouble. Admittedly, all the Government can do is lay down guide-lines; the Industrial Commission must view each case on its merits in the light of submissions made to it by the unions and the employers. If the Government bypasses this avenue to industrial peace and harmony, the community will be faced with as dangerous a situation as if it were to bypass the civil and criminal courts. I do not see how the provision giving to an employee the right of appeal to an industrial magistrate will work. I should be interested to learn what degree of priority an individual employee will get, what it may cost him and what are his chances of being heard before a strike is resolved and the men are back at work.

I feel that stand-down orders during strikes are failures—failures by the parties to confer and conciliate to resolve issues on a rational, reasonable basis. Making laws to deal with strikes and strikers, and standing down employees, I repeat, is ineffective. Let us strengthen the areas where the men on the job, the boss and the unions involved can conciliate. Do not let us aggravate the situation by imposing strict controls.

The Government cannot legislate for specific situations.

**Mr. Moore:** What do you mean by that?

**Mr. JONES:** We cannot control the situation when it gets out of the hands of the ordinary man on the job. The time to mediate and conciliate is before that happens. That is the point I have been leading up to.

We cannot legislate to control specific situations, and we cannot legislate for industrial harmony. Arbitration in its true and full form, and conciliation rather than confrontation, are what I am appealing for. Words like, "disobedience of employees" smack of master-and-servant relationship and will be resented by the workers of Australia. They won't cop it.

**Mr. Moore:** Who wrote that for you?

**Mr. JONES:** I wrote it. It is in my handwriting. I have greater feeling for the people than the honourable member has.

I suggest that we should have a roving Industrial Commission that can be called on to conciliate and mediate at a minute's notice. In this way we would resolve many of the problems when the boys on the job are called out.

The Minister's intervention should be confined. He has power to intervene in the public interest but he should not take on the role of a roving industrial trouble-shooter. Rather he should liken his role to that of the Governor-General in a constitutional crisis but, of course, we would hope that he would not become vexed, partial or suffer from the malady of megalomania.

**Mr. POWELL (Isis) (2.58 p.m.):** The Minister, in his opening remarks, said that he strongly supported responsible unionism, as, I think, do most honourable members. We are very strong supporters of responsible unionism.

The Opposition spokesman on labour relations said that there were about 800,000 employees in Queensland who would regard the amendments in this Bill as anathema to them. Some of those 800,000 live in my electorate. A large proportion of the 18,500 electors in my area are union members, and it is on their behalf that I rise to contribute to this debate.

It is patently obvious that something has to be done to stop the lawlessness of some unions in our community. The honourable

member for Cairns spoke at length about responsible unions not liking the type of legislation that we are introducing today. I suggest that responsible unions will welcome this legislation. They are sick and tired of the irresponsible few making them look foolish in the eyes of the community. They are sick and tired of the irresponsible few calling out large numbers of employees for political reasons. The honourable member for Cairns said that we cannot prevent organised labour from taking action. Of course we cannot prevent organised labour withdrawing from a work position. Nobody wants to stop that. And nothing in this legislation will do that. All we want for the average person is the right to have a say. That is not being allowed in some unions today.

The honourable member for Cairns pointed out that a former Leader of the Labor Party in Australia, Chifley, spoke about the bad influence that Communists have on union leadership and the fact that they are so dedicated that they infiltrate unions and take over. That is not happening, he claimed. I invite honourable members to study the leadership of some Australian unions today and where and why strikes are occurring. How many strikes have occurred in the last 12 months on purely industrial grounds? How many strikes that have lasted more than one day have occurred on a purely industrial basis? Most of them, it will be found, have occurred because of some political ideology that the leader of the union has been able to hoodwink the unionists into accepting.

I instance the Medibank strike and remind honourable members of the misleading statements made by union leaders about Medibank. Of course, they were aided and abetted by our friends opposite. It is said that the Australian workers don't want to be bludgeoned into something; that they do not want to be bullied. I fully agree; they do not want to be bullied. But if they are told the facts, they can weigh up in an intelligent manner whether or not a strike should be held. The problem is that they are not given the full facts.

I again refer to the Medibank strike. We were told at that time by the Labor leaders that Medibank was being wiped out; that never again would anyone on a low income be able to receive free hospital treatment. History has proved them wrong. For low-income earners and pensioners, Medibank has not changed, and it will not change—even though some of us, perhaps, might like to see it abolished altogether. Medibank has been kept on as it was first instituted. Misleading statements by union leaders and Labor leaders convinced the average worker that something that was an advantage to him would be done away with. That has just not happened.

I refer also to the misleading statements made in the media by Labor leaders about the Cedar Bay incident. This is the typical type of tactic that they use. They complain

because we want secret ballots. They complain because we believe that there has to be some legislative power to assist the Industrial Commission in conciliation and arbitration. There has to be legislative power for the commission because Labor leaders make so many misleading statements and adopt so many misleading attitudes that the people are not able to get the true picture on issues. I could list any number of instances.

**Mr. Burns:** Will this legislation change that?

**Mr. POWELL:** It won't change it, but it will bring some of the Opposition Leader's type of people to heel. They will have to obey the law for a change, which they haven't had to do in the past. We might then have a chance to get the true message across to them.

**Mr. Burns:** Under this legislation? How?

**Mr. POWELL:** The legislation will give responsible unions a chance to obtain the back-up of the Industrial Commission.

Most of us are sick and tired of political strikes. As I said before, a large number of people in my electorate are unionists. I hope that they attend their union meetings and I hope that they have their say. They are sick and tired of political strikes. Let us consider the one on uranium, for instance. The member for Cairns said that some union members have a deep feeling of conscience on the issue of uranium. Of course they do—just as they have a deep feeling of conscience on many things. But a Government is elected to govern, not to accept the decisions forced on it by a small minority.

Accepting the premise that a Government is elected to govern—surely the time for the unions to try to stop the Government from doing one thing or another is during an election campaign. That is when they should bring out their facts. That is their opportunity, and in Australia they have it every three years. They have the opportunity to change the Government and therefore to change the direction in which the country is going. They cannot do it by stopping work on some vital project every month or six weeks.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North said that the workers of this country are more concerned with inflation, rising prices and unemployment, and that we should be trying to fight those three things. I agree with him. Inflation, devaluation of our money and unemployment are very serious factors. But surely we can tackle them by getting unions to act responsibly. Surely the reason for the devaluation of our money is real terms is that we are not producing economically enough to compete effectively on world markets.

I think it was the honourable member for Bundaberg who said in a recent speech that we cannot eat refrigerators and motorcars. Of course we can't. The real productivity of this country must be pushed

ahead. It is impossible for us to compete on world markets if we have to put up with continual strikes, and continually rising prices.

The honourable member for Rockhampton North also said that the Government was very interested in promoting industrial disputes. That is a stupid statement because it is the last thing we want to do. The first thing we must do is stop these disputes and bring people to the stage of conciliation, where they can discuss in real terms what should be done to overcome misunderstandings. And one would hope that most real disputes are simply misunderstandings.

In his opening remarks the Minister said that sections 70, 71, 72 and 72A, which deal with tort, are to be repealed. I congratulate him on this move because it means nothing and it is a waste of time having that provision in the legislation. Queensland is the only State with tort provisions in this type of legislation. It is reasonable that we should get rid of them. I do not see why any section of the community should be kept above the law. It is good to see that that is being changed.

The Bill gives the commission far more teeth in dealing with a strike or lock-out. In recent days the Industrial Commission has ordered a union back to work and that union has refused. One Opposition speaker said that legislation already exists for an employer to apply to the commission for deregistration of the union. This is correct; the legislation does exist. But why should a lone employer have to stick his neck out by seeking the deregistration of a union? I do not believe that he should.

What happens if he does? I take the example of a fairly large factory whose production is vital to the economy of a country town. What happens when the employees go on strike? The commission orders them back to work. They refuse. Their employer applies to the commission for deregistration of the union. Immediately he is black-banned and other unions are brought into the action. That person will eventually have to go out of business because of the illegal actions of the union. If the commission is to be the authority that orders a union back to work, surely the commission should also have the power to make sure that there is a return to work. If a union remains in contempt of the commission, it is my opinion that the commission should have power to order deregistration. Let us deal with the situation in that manner.

It is obvious that the proposed amendments will give the Act teeth. They will also help responsible unions and unionists. I congratulate the Minister on bringing down the Bill. He has had discussions with various people on the matter and he has found out what they think about it. I will be interested to hear the reaction in my electorate to the Bill. I look forward to unionists and

their leaders in my electorate coming to me and discussing the amendments when they see the Bill. Only in this way will it be possible to get the type of legislation that the people want. I believe that they want the Industrial Commission to have more powers and they want it to use them. The Bill will give those powers. I look forward to further debate on this matter on the second reading.

**Mr. BURNS** (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (3.12 p.m.): In September 1975—only 15 months ago—the Minister introduced legislation to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. At that time he told us that it was the most important legislation in the industrial field for a decade and a half. He said that it was a new dimension in industrial law. Now, in December 1976, he has discovered, with the prompting of the Premier, that he has some new major amendments to bring down.

The Minister said in 1975—

“The present penal provisions which operate against employees who engage in strikes will be repealed. I refer particularly to the existing provisions in sections 98 and 99, which have not operated effectively in recent years.”

Today legislation is being introduced to penalise workers who go on strike, and some sort of penal clauses are being introduced to control unions. Last year the penal clauses were removed because they were not operating effectively.

The honourable member for Isis, who gave us the benefit of his knowledge of this Act, said that unionists will have a greater say as a result of the Bill. On my reading of the Minister's speech, I cannot see how unionists' say in union matters will change. So far as I am concerned, the Bill is designed for one reason only—to try to divide the community a little more. Whenever Tory Governments gets into trouble and inflation is running rife, as the Minister admitted, and people are losing their jobs, they always blame the worker. They put the blame on unions, and the working man on the job. Always they say that it is his fault because he tries to get a little more money in his pocket to buy food for his wife and children. According to them, it is wrong to ask for that.

They say that he is not allowed to ask for an increase in wages and they say that it was a political strike when workers struck because they wanted to be repaid the amount that was being taken out of their pockets to pay for Medibank. That money is being taken from their pockets because of the lies over three years of the people who led this Government and argued that Fraser should be in power federally. You know as well as I do that you said that Medibank would not be touched. You told the people that they would not have to pay any extra money.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Kaus): Order! The Leader of the Opposition will address the Chair.

**Mr. BURNS:** Yes, Mr. Kaus. Before the election your Government told the people that their wages would be fully indexed if Fraser was elected, and after the election Fraser went into Parliament and told the nation that he no longer believed in full indexation. The Federal Treasurer said last week-end that even though the Australian dollar had been devalued by 17½ per cent. he was going to ensure that the results did not find their way into the cost of living index and did not result in wage increases. In fact, it has been said very plainly in the last few days that the Prime Minister is setting out to freeze the workers' wages. That obviously will end his indexation promise forever.

The worker is just like any small businessman; he does not have a bottomless pit from which to obtain money. As a result of Government lies, mismanagement and broken promises, he finds that he has to pay, because of an increase in housing interest rates, an additional \$7.50 a week on a home loan of \$25,000. Naturally he has to do something to earn the extra money. This year a man paying off a \$25,000 home has to pay an extra \$375 a year, or \$7 a week. We also know he has to pay extra for Medibank, which was free before. Medibank was not taken out of his wages before, but it is now a direct charge against his buying power. He has a surcharge now on top of his income tax. The tax reductions promised by Mr. Fraser—income tax would be indexed across the board—have not happened, and we were told last week-end that they are not going to happen. But when the worker starts to say, “You have robbed me on Medibank; you have robbed me on interest rates; you have robbed me on indexation; \$20 or \$30 has come out of my pocket because of the lies of the Fraser Government; and I'm not going to cop it any more”, the Government cries, “Political strike!” I would like to hear some definition of the term “political strike”.

Mount Isa Mines Limited has recognised that the question of health insurance is an industrial matter because it has just written it into an agreement. It is an agreement between the mine and the men. So do not tell me that is not an industrial matter when that company agrees to cover the workers as far as health insurance is concerned. It is being done there, and it is done all round the world. The Government should not try to make laws to produce tame-cat unions who will not have the right to act on this particular issue. Then we are told that this Government wants the rank and file of unions to have a say. What hypocrisy!

What hypocrisy from Government members here who cannot elect their own Ministers. Mr. Bjelke-Petersen appoints them. What about the right of a say by Government rank-and-file members? Why aren't you doing something?

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition will address the Chair.

**Mr. BURNS:** Yes, Mr. Kaus. What about the members of this Government having a say in the Ministry appointed in this Parliament? Joh Bjelke-Petersen tells them what to do. He appoints the Ministers and the back-benchers take it. They cop it sweet because they do not have the courage to stand up and fight. The Government talks of rank and file.

What about the rank-and-file members of the Liberal Party? At the recent Liberal Party Convention, the rank and file said that they wanted three-cornered contests and the Treasurer—"Ditto" they call him because everything Joh says, he copies—said straight out, "I'm not going to let the rank and file tell me what to do." and yet all of a sudden Government members are now concerned about the rights of the rank and file. They are two examples of the Government's inactivity. It will not allow the rank-and-file members of the Government parties to have a say—

**Mr. Lamont:** What's this got to do with the Bill?

**Mr. BURNS:** It has to do with rank-and-file control. It is nothing like the speech of the honourable member for Toowong. He was talking about what went on all around the world. We went on a travelogue with him, and it had nothing to do with the Bill. It was the same old speech he always uses. Rank-and-file members in this Government have nothing to do with the election of Cabinet, and they are not allowed to have a say about three-cornered contests or things like that.

What we have is a silver-tail committee set up under the honourable member for Toowong, whose long history as a Liberal Party secretary has divorced him from the ordinary working man. He would not recognise one if he tripped over him as he walked out of Parliament House. This "Porter" Committee has decided it is going to be Big Brother. Inspired by the arrogance and dictatorship methods of the Premier, they want to introduce laws to bash the workers into line, because working families are going to cop it hard in the next 12 months, and when they do they are going to start to buck and refuse to cop it. The Government feels it must have some tough legislation to push down the workers' throats to try to create strikes so it can go to the people at a trumped-up early election-time and blame the workers and industrial unrest in their hurry-scurry to get a few votes and get back in here. In the days of the Nazis, they talked of Bolshies and Jews. Today the Government talks about Commos, unions, workers, hippies and so on. The Government is exactly what Whitrod described it as the other day. The day is fast approaching when we will have a Police State. It is on its way, and we can expect the trend to fascism to get stronger and stronger.

Political strikes, for example—or the threat of political strikes, if you call them that—saved the Barrier Reef. This Government would have allowed it to be mined. Government members ran away. The Liberal Party faced up to Cooloola only after the unions made it face up to it. I can remember some members who are now nodding their heads who changed their minds over Cooloola when they found there was some public support for it. Before that they were straight-out miners as far as Cooloola was concerned.

Under this new legislation, the A.J.A. black ban on the Premier 12 months ago when he tried to victimise a working journalist who told him a few honest truths about himself would have been enough to have that union deregistered, just because it was prepared to stand up for its man. The unions which wanted to save the Barrier Reef would have been deregistered as would the unions which wanted to fight over Cooloola. That is the way the Government wants to operate.

What are political strikes? If I argue that I want \$4 Medibank payments paid into my wages, is that a political strike? It is if I say "Medibank"; but if I say "\$4 a week", it is an industrial strike. It's about wages on one hand and health care on the other, but the fact is to the worker it's about \$4 a week. The Government is arguing over a few words. Every man and woman on every job should be entitled to say, "I don't want to give my labour." That has been a right which has been enshrined in most constitutions around the world for a long while.

The honourable member for Toowong is worried about Newport in Victoria. What happens if a Queensland worker's pocket is hurt? That is what the Medibank strike was all about. If the Government keeps taking money out of his pocket, he is going to ask for more money. It does not matter who attacks his pocket, he is going to say, "I have only a certain amount of money. I have to pay so much for Medibank. I need more money to live." Don't forget that the colleagues of honourable members opposite created that extra tax. It is a 2½ per cent levy. Remember the promises?

**Dr. Crawford** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** The honourable member for Wavell is coming in. He was one of the great proponents of Fraser getting in. He told us that Medibank would not cost us any more under a Fraser Government. He said that there would be no levy. Time after time in this Parliament he told us that there would be no levy under the new Fraser scheme. He had accused the Whitlam Government of trying to introduce a 1½ per cent levy. Now we have a 2½ per cent levy, but the honourable member for Wavell is strangely silent about that. I will say why. He is doing all right out of Medibank. He is one of the doctors who has



done very well out of Medibank. He and a lot of others who were against it are doing very well out of it today.

We were promised full indexation, but the worker is going to find himself subject to a wage freeze in the very near future. It will be a political decision that freezes his wages. If he goes on strike, is the Government going to say that that is a political strike? Honourable members opposite are the people who argued against price and wage control. They joined with the union movement as far as the national referendum was concerned and said, "No wage or price control." I can understand why they don't want price control. This morning I had two or three more examples of how the 17½ per cent devaluation decision has already put up the price of spare parts for farm machinery, and four-wheel-drive vehicles. It has already affected the price of bearings and some metals. There is no price control because Government members didn't want it; but they want wage control. They are going to freeze workers' wages, and then if they start to strike over the wage freeze the Government will say that it is a political strike.

**Mr. Porter:** Aren't you aware that a "political strike" is already defined in some industrial legislation, not only in this country but in others?

**Mr. BURNS:** The honourable member did not define one of them in his speech.

**Mr. Porter:** It is already defined.

**Mr. BURNS:** I don't believe that a strike over Medibank is a political strike. That money was taken out of the workers' pocket. The worker was promised that the scheme would not change. There was to be no levy at all. Then the money was taken away from him. When the worker said, "I am upset about being robbed; I want some money to replace what I've lost", Government members said, "Oh, that's political!"

Let me ask the honourable member for Toowong a question. What did this Government do about Irelands? It knew that firm was going broke. The firm did not give the worker a dollar. It failed to pay wages. What did the Government do about that? It took no action at all. But if the worker takes action, they cry, "Oh, it is political!" or "Oh, it is some other thing!" They couldn't care less that the poor old worker missed out. The worker and his union have had to place some bans on to try to force the Government to do something about it. What investigation has the Government ordered into that company? What action has it taken through the courts to protect those workers? The wages weren't there. The boss decided to close down. He said, "I've gone broke, I haven't got any more money." Bad luck! As far as he was concerned, no long service leave and none of the back pay they were entitled to. "Bad luck, my friends," he said, "you've lost

all that. They're the facts of life." The Government remained strangely silent. Only the union will act to help its members.

The Bill is a rather pathetic attempt by the Government to again pull the wool over the people's eyes. I will say one thing about the Minister: I think he has tried to cool down some of the hotheads in his ranks. I think he realises that, more than anything else, the need today is for conciliation and for people to work together. Whenever a big stick is waved at workers on the job—I don't care what job it is—and they are threatened with deregistration, fines, etc., they will get their back up. The average Australian doesn't cop it. He doesn't like being threatened and he won't take it. Any suggestion that there is some sort of union official who whips down on the job and pulls the wool over the eyes of the workers and makes them lose all their wages is a lot of rubbish.

As the honourable member for Port Curtis would be able to tell the Committee, at Gladstone the union officials were sitting on the platform and recommended that the workers should go back to work. However, the workers took a vote and decided to stay out. The union officials said, "I don't know what we are going to do now." But they were blamed by the Government.

In a very recent strike in Queensland, in spite of the fact that the union officials told the men they could not win, they decided to go on strike. Isn't it their right to make the decision? There should be nothing to compel them to do exactly what their union official says. Quite often these days union officials are overridden by the rank and file.

The Government suggests that by writing into the legislation some sort of automatic stand-down clause or the deregistration of a union it will solve the problem. Do Government members know what happens when unions are deregistered? The first thing that happens is that the body-snatchers from other unions fight over the members of the deregistered union. Later on, with re-registration, demarcation disputes will arise. It will be a matter of union against union in deciding who will do which job. The history of industrial disputes shows that that happens.

If that is what the Government wants and if it believes that these provisions are the answer, it can go for its life. But I would remind it that nothing in the Bill that it brought forward 12 months ago did anything to improve the cause of trade-unionists in this State.

**Mr. Frawley** interjected.

**Mr. BURNS:** The honourable member was in this Parliament at that time and he will have the opportunity in his speech to tell us what really happened as the result of the introduction of that Bill. He will have the opportunity to tell us how many strikes

it prevented and how many lost man-hours it saved. That Bill was hailed as one of the most momentous pieces of legislation to be introduced into this Parliament. But what has happened?

Is it true, as Government members claim, that most of the strikes that occurred recently were political? Let us take the Medibank strike as being a political one—I don't agree that it was—and let us look at the other strikes that occurred. Which of them were political? Let Government members name a few of them now.

**Mr. Porter:** I named them this morning.

**Mr. BURNS:** Name them now, or can't the honourable member do it without his brief? He talked about New York, America, Victoria and any other place in the world than Queensland. The only strike that Government members consistently put forward as being a political one is the Medibank strike.

**Mr. Lee:** Your brief comes from the Trades Hall.

**Mr. BURNS:** Poor old Norm! He should be the last one to talk about briefs. He can't read two lines without stuttering and spluttering. His best course is to be very brief in his submissions to Parliament. He is the Minister who had control over the Ireland's affair. That company was getting contracts from him and its workers, who are virtually under the Minister's control, are losing their wages. He has done nothing about it. The company was going broke even when it was getting contracts from the Minister.

**Mr. Lee:** Why didn't you tell me?

**Mr. BURNS:** Why didn't we tell him? About 12 months ago the honourable member for Archerfield told him about the plight of the building societies, but he would not listen. He was incapable of working out what was wrong with the building societies. Eventually, when they got into trouble, he had to bail them out. If he had listened to the honourable member for Archerfield 12 months earlier, he would have been able to do something for them.

**Mr. Lee:** That has nothing to do with this legislation.

**Mr. BURNS:** Of course it hasn't. I was side-tracked by the Minister; he tried to get me on the wrong track.

**Mr. Lamont:** It's not difficult to get you off the track on industrial matters.

**Mr. BURNS:** The real worker, the man who has toiled in the field or factory—not the lily-white or fancy-bred Hong Kong policeman who has sat on silver-tail committees or spent most of his time in Lennons Hotel or bar-flying—does not like losing his wages, nor

does he want to go on strike. It is very difficult for a worker to have to give away his wages. He will only do so when he is angry or desperate.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (3.29 p.m.):** This afternoon the Leader of the Opposition spent a good deal of his time trying to tell the Committee that the Medibank strike was not a political strike. I would remind him that when the Federal Labor Government announced its intention to introduce Medibank and to pay for it by imposing a levy on the people of Australia, there was no outcry whatever from the trade union movement. As long as the Labor Party was prepared to do that, the trade unions thought it was quite in order. In fact, many trade-unionists, including Mr. Hawke, said that the only way the Federal Government could pay for Medibank was by imposing a levy on the workers of 1.35 per cent.

**Dr. Crawford:** A levy of 1.35 per cent, doubled with a charge on Consolidated Revenue.

**Mr. MILLER:** We knew from overseas experience that that was only the start, that it would go on and on and that the levy would have to be increased. The Leader of the Opposition did not object at that time; nor did the trade union movement.

**Mr. Burns:** I did.

**Mr. MILLER:** The Leader of the Opposition says that he did. I hope that one of the later Opposition speakers will quote any report of Mr. Burns's objecting to a Medibank levy when Labor proposed introducing it in 1974. Now that the Fraser Government has introduced a levy, Labor says that it is wrong.

**A Government Member:** It is a political strike.

**Mr. MILLER:** We say it is a political strike. Labor says that it is not, and that it is only protecting the workers' money. What a farcical situation!

At least we on this side try to be consistent. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, who said that the only way the workers can exercise power is through strikes, that there are more workers than the silver-tails he referred to. They can vote out of office, at any time they wish to, any Liberal or National Party Government they do not like. If they do not like what those parties are doing, they have the right to vote them out of office. There is no doubt that workers, with their numbers, can do that whenever they like. Workers certainly do not need political strikes to improve their conditions. There is a time and place for that and that is through the ballot box, not by making the weak suffer—the children, the mothers-to-be and the old people. That is what happened during the

electricity strike. We were told by the honourable member for Barron River how the senior citizens in his area were denied air-conditioning and cooling fans. Surely to goodness people must be protected against the irresponsible rank and file.

I should like to see this measure go a little further. I am very disappointed that we have not taken steps to stop political levies.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Row): Order! There is still far too much noise in the Chamber. Until the level of noise drops, the debate will not proceed.

**Mr. MILLER:** I believe we should have gone further and legislated against political levies. They should have been outlawed by this legislation. I hope it is not long before we amend the legislation to include an appropriate provision. If ever there was an iniquitous provision in the trade union rules, it is the one that allows a trade union to levy a person (irrespective of his politics) so that part of his union fees goes to the A.L.P. to perhaps fight a political party with which he is affiliated. That is against many of the democratic freedoms as we know them. Yet we are allowing it to continue. This is one matter that we should have legislated against.

I shall make my position quite clear. I believe that we cannot legislate to stop strikes. That is absolutely impossible. However, I believe that we can legislate to try to curtail the number of irresponsible strikes for political reasons. And that is what this legislation is all about.

**Dr. Crawford:** By giving the workers a say.

**Mr. MILLER:** That is so.

We are ensuring that responsible trade union members will have a say. I want to talk for a moment about responsible trade-unionists. Quite recently I was involved in the sextons' dispute. Honourable members will recall that the sextons went on strike because the Brisbane City Council would not listen to their claim. Most people in the community believed that the sextons were irresponsible. I do not. Because they are a small group of fewer than 30 people, they could not achieve their just demands. The Brisbane City Council said, "Why should we listen to 30 people? We will keep them under the Roadmaking Award." Should a person who is in charge of a cemetery, who is responsible for a certain amount of book-work and who controls labour, be registered under the Roadmaking Award?

Time and time again the city council refused to meet the demands of this group of men. The men came to see me. In the end, they decided that they would have to take strike action to bring to the notice of the community the fact that they could not get justice. That was a case in which a group of responsible people were, on

appearances, regarded by the rest of the community as irresponsible. I believe they were responsible. However, under the Act they could not get justice. The Industrial Commission was not prepared to listen to them. I use that case to illustrate that not all strikes are irresponsible. However, I do hope that through this legislation we can control irresponsible union action.

These amendments will allow action of tort as of right—something that I have been asking for in this Chamber for many years. Last year or the year before, the Minister introduced legislation that allowed employers or industries to take action for tort if the Government thought that they had the right to do so. That action will now be open to them as of right, as it is in every other State in Australia. I ask members of the Opposition: have irresponsible claims of tort been made either by industry or by individuals? I certainly do not know of any. I do know that two very responsible claims were made in South Australia and Western Australia. In South Australia the Transport Workers' Union decided that the wool of an individual farmer would not be shifted. In Western Australia the Transport Workers' Union decided not to supply petrol to a taxi company that would not insist on its drivers joining a union.

Unions cannot be allowed to victimise people, and those two cases I have just cited were instances in which people were victimised. The Leader of the Opposition said that we cannot make unionists work. That is quite true. I do not believe that we should make unionists work if they do not want to. However, we have to ensure that unionists do not victimise individuals or small companies as they see fit. That is what has been happening, and that is why as long as six years ago I wanted action of tort legislated for. The two cases I mentioned are the only ones that I know of that have come before the courts.

**Mr. Burns:** Very few bosses end up suing a union.

**Mr. MILLER:** That is right. As a matter of fact, I believe that most bosses are too scared to take on a union in an action of tort. In fact, they are too scared to take them on for any reason at all. However, I am hoping that when this amendment becomes law those who feel they are being victimised will avail themselves of the opportunity to act against the unions responsible. I am concerned, however, that we have State and Federal unions. We all know that the Transport Workers' Union is a party to a Federal award. I do not know how we can do it, but I want Federal award unions to be held responsible for their actions in the State of Queensland.

**An Honourable Member** interjected.

**Mr. MILLER:** The Commonwealth Constitution is being looked at and this might be one way we can do something.

I am a little concerned when I read in the paper that the building unions are considering going Federal merely to keep outside this sort of legislation.

**Mr. Burns:** That is what will happen.

**Mr. MILLER:** Does the Leader of the Opposition believe it is right and just? If the Building Workers' Industrial Union victimises one builder, surely he should be able to take the union to court.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** What about a scruffy humpy-builder?

**Mr. MILLER:** I do not care what he is. If an individual is being victimised, he should have the right to take the union to court. If he does, he should expect justice.

We know that in Western Australia the Transport Workers' Union transferred its money from the State branch's bank to the Federal body's bank, so that it would not have to pay the court award. I believe that this is one area that will create problems in regard to actions for tort.

**Mr. Burns:** Do you know that most of the Federal awards now have automatic stand-down clauses and that they are not used?

**Mr. MILLER:** Frankly, I agree that employers have reached the stage that if they cannot gainfully employ their staff they should be able to stand them down. Only a month or so ago I outlined in the House what it costs to keep a man in gaol. The same could be said of an employer. How many employers can afford to have employees standing around doing nothing, waiting for the Industrial Commission to say that the staff can be stood down? If for one reason or another an industry is compelled to stand down its staff, it should have the right to do so. On the other hand, the staff should have the right to go to the Industrial Commission and appeal against the stand-down if they believe that they are being victimised.

The Leader of the Opposition says that under the Federal awards this is a right. We are only enacting the provisions of the Federal awards. Surely the employers of Queensland are as entitled to that condition as are the employers working in New South Wales or any other State in Australia or even employees working in Queensland with employees under a Federal award.

There is one thing we must be careful of. If these unions become Federal unions, I can see the possibility that Queensland unions might be preferred. I believe that we should have preference for unionists at the point of engagement. If this legislation is going to be bypassed by State unions going Federal, we should have a clause in the legislation to provide for State union preference.

I now refer to the number of strikes under the previous Labor Federal Government. Prior to Labor taking office in 1972, we were told that under a Labor Federal Government we would have no more strikes and that the Government would be able to satisfy

the demands of even irresponsible unions. This has not proved to be the case. In fact, in 1974 we had the greatest number of days lost through industrial strikes since conciliation and arbitration came into being in Australia.

**Mr. Houston:** In what industry?

**Mr. MILLER:** I am not going to list the industries. The honourable member for Bulimba realises the truth of what I am saying. Even his own Labor Government admitted in 1974 that more days were then lost through strikes than had been lost at any other time under any other Government.

As I understand that there are a number of members who wish to speak on the Bill, I shall reserve further remarks until the second reading.

**Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba)** (3.46 p.m.): This Bill is necessary because of attempts by the A.L.P. and their Communist running mates to use trade unions for purposes completely divorced from the concept of trade-unionism.

It is rather a coincidence that the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the Minister for Health, the honourable member for Windsor and I were all at one time members of the Electrical Trades Union. I was a member of the Electrical Trades Union for 20 years, so I have some right to speak as a former unionist.

**Mr. Houston:** Are you still a member?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No. When I started my own business, I resigned from the union. I believe that all who start their own businesses should resign from unions. I was, however, a union member for 20 years. I have been absolutely disgusted and sickened—

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** You scabbed on your mates.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** That is a shocking statement coming from the Idi Amin of Inala, who is well known as the patron of the Inala Branch of the Chilean Communist Party.

I have been sickened by attempts to use the rank and file of unions to further the cause of some union secretaries and other officials, and their political ambitions. How many former union organisers, secretaries and God knows what have there been in this Parliament as representatives of the Labor Party? The honourable member for Archerfield is one of them. He was an organiser of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union, and he used to stand over the women cleaners in the Treasury Building and rob them if they did not pay their union dues. The Labor candidate for Nudgee at the next election, Mr. Vaughan, is a union official who is already making statements on the uranium issue.

**Mr. Lindsay:** Would you agree that nomination as an A.L.P. candidate for parliamentary representation is a closed shop—a tight little group?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Of course it is. They all come from a tight little group.

We heard the Leader of the Opposition make an emotional speech, as he always does, about the workers and how the Government is robbing them. When the United Firefighters' Union was trying desperately to obtain registration, did the Leader of the Opposition speak on their behalf? If he did, I did not hear him. Only a couple of A.L.P. members spoke up for them.

**Mr. Houston:** You were not here.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Anyone can read "Hansard" and see how I backed the United Firefighters' Union.

**Mr. Casey:** Were you the one who was responsible for making the Minister change his mind?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** No, but I tried very hard to make him change his mind. I backed the United Firefighters' Union in this Chamber. In fact, I did a better job in helping to get them registered than did any member of the A.L.P. They have acknowledged that, too; they have written to me expressing their gratitude for my support.

**Mr. K. J. Hooper:** You will also admit that you and I were a good unity ticket on that occasion?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** Yes, I must agree with that. The honourable member for Archerfield did a good job for the United Firefighters' Union.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Row):** Order! I remind the honourable member for Archerfield that he may not interject from other than his usual place in the Chamber.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** He is distracting me, Mr. Row.

Monday, 12 July 1976, was a very historic day because that was the occasion of the first general political strike in Australia.

**Mr. Houston:** A genuine one?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I did not say "genuine". There has never been a genuine political strike in Australia, to my knowledge. However, as the honourable member for Bulimba is much older than I am, he may know more about that.

This first national political strike was engineered by the pro-Communist Left and was supported by the Australian Council of Trade Unions. It caused a great deal of disruption. Rank-and-file unionists, together with many unions and branches, were totally opposed to it, and resisted it. Some of the unions that resisted it were the Clerical Officers' Association, the Federated Clerks'

Union, the Commonwealth Bank Officers' Association, the A.B.C. Staff Association, the National Union of Railwaymen, the National Union of Insurance Employees, the Tasmanian Teachers' Federation and the Transport Workers' Union of Tasmania.

The strike was supposed to be a protest against the Government's changes to Medibank; but the extreme Left Wing, based on about 20 of the socialist-Left and Communist-led unions in the power-generation, transport, building and maritime fields used Medibank as part of a campaign to confront the Federal Government. Spokesmen from Communist unions at the conference of Federal unions called for continuing mass action, including further strikes, mass demonstrations and rallies. We have seen the result of some of those. Even the "Tribune" stated that the great promise of a national strike had been lost if it was seen as a one-hit campaign—in other words, they want more strikes.

Of course, the political stoppage over Medibank is only one of several unfinished strikes that the A.C.T.U. has on its books. There are disputes over Newport, Mary Kathleen uranium, Omega, South African trade, Indonesian shipping and Chilean wheat sales. These are still on the books of the A.C.T.U. and some of its most important affiliates. Of course, the A.C.T.U. will now be used to disrupt the general economy, because it is part of a deal—

**Mr. Houston:** Who wrote that for you?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I wrote it myself. This is part of a deal Bob Hawke made with the Left when he wanted to become A.C.T.U. president in 1969. It greatly advanced the position of the Left and gave it a bit of power in the unions. In 1972 Mr. Whitlam promised the Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union, which we know is run by well-known Communists Carmichael and Halfpenny, a deal in return for a large donation for the 1972 Federal election campaign. I do not have the exact figure with me, but it was about \$100,000. Mr. Whitlam promised Carmichael he would never apply the penal provisions of the Arbitration Act against the Amalgamated Metal Workers' Union. Of course, these provisions applied not only to the A.M.W.U. but to the entire union movement in Australia. Now the A.M.W.U. is the only organisation in Australia that is not subject to legal obligations for damages inflicted by the union, including its members. That is a shocking state of affairs. It is the only body that is effectively in a position similar to that of the English barons before the feudal system yielded a central government—in other words, it can destroy anything without having to pay the price, and that is totally incorrect.

We had the case of 11 metal workers from the Victorian city of Ballarat who have been referred to as the "Eureka 11"—that was the site of the Eureka Stockade

many years ago—because they refused to participate in the Medibank strike on 30 June. The metal industry was just one of a number of industries in which union members were victimised because they would not take part in the strike. They were charged by the A.M.W.U. and fined a maximum of \$20 by the Ballarat branch. But those men honestly believed that they had not committed any offence under the union rules because they had had a vote on the matter. A meeting of union members had been held on 28 June, two days before the strike, and two-thirds of the members of the A.M.W.U. voted against that strike. However, the union organiser refused to accept the decision. He even pulled the plug out of the public address system so that members could not address the meeting. That is a great example of what some union organisers, secretaries and officials do. These men felt that they were being denied the principle of natural justice and appealed against the imposition of that fine. It has been a struggle for freedom by these men against the stand-over tactics of the A.M.W.U.

The Minister said that the Bill contains a new clause which deals with the right of an employer to stand down employees in certain cases. It eliminates the need for employers to apply to the Industrial Commission for stand-down orders where anything occurs for which the employer is not responsible or over which he has no control. I think that is a perfectly reasonable clause to insert in the Bill. If an employer cannot provide work because of an electricity strike or something of that nature, why should he be expected to employ people and thus lose money? That applies particularly to a small employer.

The Minister mentioned another amendment with which I agree wholeheartedly. He said that any employee who is stood down without pay will have the right of appeal to an industrial magistrate, and if the magistrate upholds that appeal, he can order the resumption of work by the employee and, more importantly, the payment of wages during the period that the employee was stood down. I agree with that. It is a very important amendment and I think that rank-and-file members of unions will applaud it.

Another important amendment relates to the direction or order of a commissioner in relation to a strike or lock-out. Disobedience by an industrial union of a direction involves a penalty. I agree that men have the right to withhold their labour if they are dissatisfied, but not for political purposes. For example, we had the B.W.I.U. putting a stop-work ban on the Bellevue Hotel. Why the devil would any industrial union be concerned about the Bellevue Hotel? I wish the damned thing had been pulled to the ground. No union should be concerned about things such as that. Workers should be concerned

about housing, sickness and their family. But why should they be ostensibly concerned about the environment and worrying about the Bellevue Hotel?

If any industrial officer or union official has failed to comply with a court order, the court can order that the registration of the union be suspended. In effect, that puts the onus on rank-and-file members of the union to see that their union officials face up to their responsibilities.

Of course, there is a right for the employer, employers or members of a union to ask for a ballot. In addition, the Minister has the power to direct the commission to order a secret ballot. Previously there could be a secret ballot, but first there had to be a strike. Now a secret ballot can be ordered without there being a strike. I think that is the correct procedure. We had a recent example in Gladstone where many of the women managed to persuade their husbands to go back to work. I do not believe that most of those fellows wanted to have a strike. While I was a member of the Electrical Trades Union, most of the time as an employee of a very good firm—

**Mr. Houston:** What were you? A fitter, or a mechanic?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** A mechanic. I did not want to say this before, but when the honourable member for Bulimba was teaching at the college his class had the highest rate of failure of any class in the college. Probably the reason why I received an electrical worker's ticket was that I was not in his class. I was in the same class as the honourable member for Windsor.

I agree with conciliation and consultation. I believe that the majority of rank-and-file members of unions would also agree with that. I do not believe that they are interested in strikes, either industrial or political. Nearly every strike in this country is called by a minority—usually a group of trade union officials who want to push their own political barrow or who have some axe to grind. The recent teachers' stoppages were a good example of that. Costello, the President of the Queensland Teachers' Union, has constantly used his union for political purposes and to further the political aims of himself and the A.L.P. When Mr. Whitlam was campaigning, Costello spent thousands of dollars of teachers' money in advertisements on behalf of the A.L.P. in the daily newspapers.

I do not think it is right to spend a union's money on advertisements for any political party. Costello has conducted a campaign against the Premier by using the teachers' stoppages and getting his Left-wing stooges in the union to tell parents and citizens' associations at various schools—they did it in my electorate—that the Premier was solely responsible for the teachers' problems and the sacking of the three pot-smoking teachers.

**Dr. Crawford:** Most of the schools didn't back the strikes.

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** That is quite right. I had the unfortunate experience of a principal of a school in my electorate bringing over a pot-smoking teacher from Sandgate to tell the parents and citizens' association that there was nothing wrong with smoking pot—in fact, he told them that smoking pot was far better than drinking beer. As far as I am concerned, both of them are no good, and the honourable member for Sandgate would agree with that.

**Mr. Moore:** Where do you stand on sex?

**Mr. FRAWLEY:** I do not wish to discuss that in this Chamber.

I am convinced that the proposed amendments to the Act will allow the rank-and-file members of unions to have their say in strikes and stoppages. The Minister should be commended for having the courage to bring down this Bill.

**Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba)** (4 p.m.): I listened with great interest to previous speakers. From those on the Government side we hear the same old speeches time after time.

I thought it would be interesting to ascertain the number of times that this Act has been amended since the Government's election to office in 1957. On each occasion that it was amended certain comments were made, and I am sure, Mr. Row, that you would not mind my referring to them.

The present Minister in charge of this portfolio is the fourth Minister of this Government to be responsible for this Act and for trade unions.

**Mr. Moore:** Mr. Morris did a good job.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Mr. Morris was the first one, and, as the member for Windsor said, he did a good job. But apparently his party did not think much of him, because it withheld its endorsement of him when he was a senator. Perhaps I should say that his name was put so far down the list of candidates that he had no hope of winning. That is what his party thought of him.

Mr. Morris was followed by Mr. Dewar, I won't go into his career, but I think it is true to say that he retired from Parliament. Next came Mr. Herbert, who is still here, and finally Mr. Campbell.

Of those four Ministers, only one had wide experience of trade unions, he having been a member of the executive of a trade union. I would say he knew something about unions, and this knowledge was reflected in his activities in Parliament. During his whole career as Minister in charge of this portfolio, he saw no need whatever to amend this Act.

**Mr. Lamont:** Are you saying the present Minister doesn't know anything about unions?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I am saying—

**Mr. Lamont:** Come on, commit yourself.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** He has not had the same experience as the member for Sherwood, who was an executive member of a union.

**Mr. Lamont:** Even your own blokes like him.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Who?

**Mr. Lamont:** The present Minister.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No-one dislikes him. I am not talking about whether or not I would go to the races with him; I am talking about whether or not he is a good Minister in charge of this legislation. I am talking about him not on a personal basis, but on his ability to administer this Act. As the honourable member for Rockhampton North made very clear, on this occasion he is a very reluctant Minister. No-one who knows him well would say any different. I have no doubt that he is doing the job that his party has asked him to do.

Mr. Herbert was able, while he occupied this portfolio, to withstand the constant agitation by a Right-wing minority in his party to have the Act amended.

**Mr. Campbell:** This is a good story.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** This is fact. Other Ministers were not able to resist such agitation.

In 1957 this Government got into power on a negative vote. The people voted against the Australian Labor Party and the Q.L.P., and this Government came into power. It should not kid itself that it got into power on its merits. This Minister could not even get into Parliament at that time.

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

**Mr. HOUSTON:** If a safe seat had been available, he would have tried. At that time he was an executive member of the Liberal Party. As soon as an opportunity presented itself in 1960, he stood for Parliament and was elected. However, I am more interested at the moment in what Mr. Morris said. In 1959, or two years after his election to office—it took him that length of time to do anything about this legislation—he said—

‘Honourable members will recall that in the combined policy speech of the present Government parties’—  
that was in July 1957.

**Mr. Campbell:** August.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No, the election was on 3 August and the policy speech was delivered in July.

As I was saying—

‘Honourable members will recall that in the combined policy speech of the present Government parties, a policy which the people of Queensland supported in

the 1957 elections, we pledged ourselves, if elected, to introduce the principle of secret ballot legislation, court controlled or otherwise, similar to that which is operating so satisfactorily in the Federal court."

Various Government speakers stated how they would control the Communists and how they would give the rank-and-file members the right to have secret ballots.

**Mr. Campbell:** I gave Hughie Hamilton a fright.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I don't know whether the Minister did or not; I haven't seen both of them on a dark night. At page 1112 of "Hansard" for that year, Mr. Duggan said by way of interjection—

"Does your legislation intend to deal with Mr. Hanson or the members of this union?"

Mr. Hanson was secretary of the Painters' Union at that time.

**Mr. Campbell** interjected.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is important to air these things.

**Mr. Morris** said—

"The legislation is not intended to deal with anybody, but it will give members of unions power to deal with their own leaders—power to get rid of Communist control."

The legislation was introduced at that time to do just that, and the important point is that it failed because a Government, no matter how hard it tries, cannot force people to get rid of someone they do not want to get rid of. The legislation was there and I will say that that Bill contained provisions for unions to hold secret ballots.

**Mr. Campbell:** What is in this Bill concerning ballots for union officials?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I have not seen the Bill yet.

**Mr. Campbell:** You have seen the speech.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Maybe it is in the speech. I am not denying that it is in the speech.

**Mr. Gygar:** You are talking off the top of your head. You have not studied your subject.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is not that at all. Does the honourable member remember every word spoken by the Minister?

**An Opposition Member:** He was not even in the Chamber.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The honourable member should go back to reading his paper.

The industrial legislation was next amended in 1961. I shall quote now from Volume 229 of "Hansard" at page 2400. The then Minister, Mr. Morris, said—

"I should like to say at the outset that this is a very big Bill. It comprises 140 pages and 140 clauses. As the time at my disposal is limited . . .

That statement, of course, was challenged later on because the Minister's time when introducing a Bill is not limited. Apparently the Minister wanted a clear go without interjections, but he did not get away with that.

The Minister then said—

"As the time at my disposal is limited, I do not propose to reply to questions asked by way of interjection during my introductory speech. I will answer them when I reply."

Incidentally, he did not answer questions to any real extent.

Later, the Minister said—

"This is a complete measure, not an amending Bill. During the election campaign in 1960, the Government parties undertook to review the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act with a view to giving the industrial tribunal the flexibility and machinery to enable it to act promptly and speedily not only when an industrial dispute occurs but also whenever there is good reason to believe that an industrial dispute is likely to occur or that circumstances operating could give rise to such a position."

That statement could well have been made again by the Minister on this occasion. The Minister has introduced this legislation and again we are telling the Minister that, because the Government cannot make people do something that they do not want to do, it will not work.

At page 2403, Mr. Morris said—

"It is therefore proposed that there shall be an Industrial Court and an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission with the present system of industrial magistrates being retained."

I might explain that the Government intended that even the thought of a dispute would be investigated. The whole set-up of the industrial tribunal was altered to facilitate that.

By the second-reading stage, Mr. Morris had got greater heart, apparently from what his supporters told him. He was a little stronger in his statements. On page 2893 he said—

"There is no doubt that the Bill will give the industrial tribunal of the State that flexibility which it did not previously possess. It will enable it to act promptly with a view to preventing and/or settling industrial disputes. It will also assist rank and file unionists to control and direct their own union affairs, which power in a number of cases, I am sorry to say, they do not have at present.

As the Leader of the Opposition said, every time there is trouble in the State or nation the Government trots out the industrial legislation to amend it and tries to tell the public that it is being tough on the unions. It is trying to be tough on them all right, but it is bound to fail every time it tries to do something like this.



Later, there was a change of Ministers, when Mr. Dewar succeeded Mr. Morris. In "Hansard" Volume 236 of 1963, at page 1916, he introduced further amendments. He said they were only minor. There were four of them. The first amended the provision relating to long service leave—a minor thing. The second dealt with a single commissioner referring certain matters to the Full Bench of the Industrial Commission. The third dealt with clarification of trading hours. The fourth—a minor amendment relating to coin-operated pumps—was in a later Bill introduced by Mr. Dewar. It was not considered to be of any great importance.

I come forward in time to when the present Minister took charge of the portfolio. In 1974 he introduced a Bill to protect the public, as he said, against the Building Workers' Union by outlawing black bans. He assured us that the legislation would put a stop to that. Because most members were here when that was brought in, I will not go through the details.

**Mr. Campbell:** It cured the problem.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I don't know whether it cured the problem. The men went back to work, but I do not think that that legislation played any part in their return.

Later on another piece of legislation was brought in. In fact, in that parliamentary sitting year there were three amendments to this Act. This year we have already had one amendment—against the firefighters. We all know the result of that. But what I wanted to point out is that year after year the Government has said, "We have the answers to industrial problems. We will legislate for more punitive action."

**Mr. Campbell:** That's not right.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Government has altered the law to make it tougher, if you like, for union executives.

**Mr. Campbell:** I haven't used the word "toughness", either.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The Minister might not have used the word "tough", but that is the way he meant it to be.

**Mr. Campbell:** Don't put words into my mouth.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Other speakers have said that the Government is going to get tough on trade union leaders.

**Government Members:** Who said that?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Of course they said they are going to get tough on them.

**Mr. Lane:** It's only the leaders you are interested in, not the rank and file.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I am glad the honourable member wants to know about the rank and file. As I have already pointed out, it is the rank and file who elect the union leaders. Is the Government trying to suggest to me that all these amendments to this Act since 1959

—all designed, according to the Ministers themselves, to bring rank-and-file control of unions—have failed? Are they telling us that trade union leaders today are not elected according to the democratic processes laid down by their registered rules?

**Mrs. Kyburz:** Yes.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Then name one. Let us get right down to tin-tacks so that we know whom we are talking about.

**Mr. Campbell:** Are you aware that this legislation has no bearing on the election of trade union officials?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I will tell the Minister all about that when I have studied the details in the Bill. The Minister has been living with it for months. For weeks he has been arguing the toss with his own party. I do not enter the debate knowing every word in the Bill and being able to dot every "i" and cross every "t". However, I will debate every word with the Minister at the second-reading stage, once I have had a chance to have a look at the Bill.

Much has been said about Medibank and political strikes. The Minister has said what the Government is going to do about political strikes. He will never do away with political strikes.

**Mr. Campbell:** Of course we won't.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Because the Government cannot define what a political strike is.

**Mr. Campbell:** The public can.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I don't think they can. The Minister will try to bamboozle them into believing it.

**Mr. Campbell:** Not me!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The same as he told them 12 months ago that Fraser was the saviour of Australia; the same as Fraser promised all kinds of things and, when he got to power, said that he wouldn't do it; the same as a week ago Mr. Lynch said, "There will definitely be no devaluation," and within a few days he devalued and said, "We just couldn't let it be known that we were going to take that action."

I did not hear any Government members object to the doctors' saying in 1975, "If Medibank is brought in, we won't attend to the patients. We won't take pensioners if Medibank is brought in." There was no objection by the Government on that. But when the workers say, "If you take 2½ per cent out of our wages compulsorily, we have less to take home."—

**Dr. Edwards:** The levy was your idea.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** We didn't say 2½ per cent.

**Dr. Edwards:** That was the principle.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It was a levy, yes, and apparently the unionists would accept 1.25 per cent or whatever it was.

**Dr. Edwards:** Mr. Hayden indicated that it would rise to 2½ per cent.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** And the unions didn't object to it?

**Dr. Edwards:** No.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That remains to be seen. The Minister for Health might know more than I do on that particular point. But it was not brought in.

What the unions objected to first and foremost was that they had been hoodwinked. A lot of unionists voted for the Liberal Party and the National Party. If they had not, the Government would not have obtained as many votes. One of the reasons they voted for those parties was that Fraser and his supporters said there would be no change in Medibank. That is what upset the trade union movement. I would be upset if I was told one thing and something else took place.

In the coming quarter Medibank will be reflected in the cost of living; let there be no doubt about that. This again will affect the take-home pay of the rank-and-file members of the work-force. If a man takes home less pay, he has every reason to object.

I did not hear the Government object when Mainline went broke or when Morris could not pay his employees. Now we have another company in the hands of a receiver.

**Mr. Moore:** It was the Federal Labor Government's economic policies that caused them to go to the wall.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The honourable member should not be silly. They were only going a couple of years. The Government tried to help them and surely the honourable member does not suggest that the Government's money is bad. The Government of this State has given them contracts one after the other, yet we find they are not able to pay their way.

What about the industrial situation? Companies will get to the stage where they will not have enough money to pay the workers. I would be happier if the Government introduced legislation under which every employer had to put money into a trust account as it became due to the employees. How many companies have trust accounts to cover payments for long service leave? How many have trust accounts to pay the 17½ per cent loading on holiday pay? Has the Government done anything about guaranteeing that the workers get their just entitlements? The Government does not put that in its legislation. Government members have not even discussed it. That is how interested they are in this type of thing.

**Mr. McKechnie:** If companies had to put money away for that purpose, how many of them would go broke and how many jobs would be lost?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** That is the whole story. If a company cannot afford to put away the money to pay the employees their entitlements as they become due, how will it pay when they leave or are entitled to holiday pay? That is the type of thing the Government goes on with. It wants the worker to carry the whole responsibility.

An Honourable Member interjected.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** Let us see if Ireland's employees get all of their money. Statements already made indicate that they will not. That should be the first responsibility of the Government.

From time to time we hear different arguments in this Chamber. I was interested to hear the honourable member for Murrumba say that this was good legislation this time. Only a few months ago the legislation that came in was bad.

**Mr. Campbell:** At least he is honest.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not doubt his personal honesty.

What I am saying is that he is like a lot of other people. If he knows even only a little bit about the details, he blindly follows the lead of the Right-wingers in the Liberal and National Parties. When he knows something about a subject—and he knew something about the fire fighters' problem—he comes out strongly against the legislation. Because he knew what it was all about, he came out strongly on our side against what the Government was trying to do. On other matters, when he does not know what it is all about, he adopts the old party line.

I was interested to listen to the Minister's introduction. He said early in his speech that he would like the debate to be of a high level. I appreciate his thoughts on these matters. But still we have the same old jargon and the same old attack on the trade union movement. I would like any Government member to tell me of any union that has not conducted its last set of ballots according to the registered rules of that union. If any member can tell me that, I shall be prepared to listen to further argument. Every union official is elected according to the rules.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. LAMONT** (South Brisbane) (4.20 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I rise to support the Minister on the introduction of the Bill. I must say at the outset that I have been appalled and not a little intrigued by the paucity of contributions from Opposition members who claim to understand the unions. In fact, I think the word "contribution" would flatter most of the statements made from the Opposition benches. The contribution of the Leader of the Opposition had about the value of the proverbial widow's mite and was in fact less charitable.

I was struck by the monumental lack of concern and unwillingness of both the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy to discuss matters pertaining to the Bill. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition should sack his speech writer; he would do better using his own ideas. The Leader of the Opposition rarely talked about industrial matters. He rambled on about everything from the Mafia to Medibank and back again. The only time he referred to industrial matters was when he was trying to put words into the mouth of the Minister and other members on this side of the Chamber.

One of his statements that particularly intrigued me was, "This Government always puts the blame on the worker." The spokesman for the Government on industrial matters is the Minister for Labour Relations and I should like to challenge the Leader of the Opposition, or any other member of his party, to show where this Minister has "always put the blame on the worker". In fact, nothing could be further from the truth.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, lacking anything to contribute, gave us the history of four Ministers in this portfolio. During his speech I challenged him on his attitude to the Minister.

The Leader of the Opposition said that the Minister was "always putting the blame on the worker". That is sheer nonsense. The Leader of the Opposition, the deputy leader and all other Opposition members know it, too. This Minister is in fact very highly regarded by responsible unionists from Tweed Heads to Cape York Peninsula, and the Opposition very well knows it.

I therefore asked myself why Opposition members were so unwilling this afternoon to discuss industrial relations on a Bill that deals with this subject. The simple answer is that they know very well that the Bill is not union-bashing. Of course, they would like to paint it as such and no doubt they will go off to their Trades Hall mates and do just that. What an irresponsible attitude that is towards the community! Attempts will be made to paint the Bill as a means of union-bashing to incite unions to oppose it and to develop unrest in the union movement. Opposition members could, if they were responsible, read the Bill and regard the Minister, as everyone else regards him, as one who understands industrial relations and who has made a significant contribution to industrial harmony in this State. If they then went back to their Trades Hall friends and said precisely that, they would find most of their mates nodding in agreement. I know that that attitude does not appear in the prepared speeches handed down to Opposition members to deliver here. Nevertheless, that is what they should be saying.

Many of the things that Opposition members have complained about, many of the things that some unions have been led to

believe would be included in the Bill, and many things that have appeared in the Press were not mentioned by the Minister when introducing the legislation. Many of the things that the unions fear, and the Labor Party seems to think are forthcoming, have not been mentioned by the Minister at all. The reason for that is that the Government, represented so ably in the industrial field by the present Minister, realises that unionists must look after their own affairs. There has never been a suggestion that the Government should legislate to control the unions or to ensure that some people rather than others become union presidents and secretaries. That is sheer fancy. It has never been suggested by the Minister, the Government parties or the Government.

It is the role of government to attempt to create an atmosphere in which unionists can set their own house in order according to their own wishes. That is the aim of the Bill. Legislation that was passed last year had that philosophy as its aim. It made provision for a group of unionists, if they felt there was a need for a certain course of action, to approach the commission, request a secret ballot and so forth. That was one of the Bill's provisions. This Government brought in legislation then to assist rank-and-file unionists to set about putting their own house in order, and that is the philosophy of this Bill. It has been the philosophy of this Minister as long as he has been Minister, and as far as I know, it has been the philosophy of this Government as long as it has been the Government.

A lot of the things that appeared in the Press have, as I said, been dropped from consideration, if they ever were considered by some people. I know there was talk, and it was spread around my electorate among trade-unionists. A few of them who were concerned called me because they had been fed untruths by certain people in the Opposition. They rang me and said, "Are we going to be compelled? Are you going to have compulsory voting and are you going to penalise us by docking our pay if in fact we don't vote at trade union elections?" I assured them that that would not be in the Bill. Nothing could be more designed to incense a unionist than to take money from him as a fine for not voting at his union election. I hope every unionist does vote at his union election, but we are certainly not going to consider penalising a man for not doing so if he desires to exercise his right not to vote. I think we would be absolutely foolish to listen to advice to make voting compulsory and to dock pay if unionists did not vote. Can honourable members just imagine what would happen? The members of the Opposition would be the first people down at the payout counter saying, "Go and see the Liberal Party members and National Party members. They are the ones who took the \$20 and \$30 out of your pay packet for exercising

your right not to vote a few months ago." That is the way that the Opposition has been stirring up unionists in the community and that is the sort of irresponsible attitude that I have come to expect from certain members of the Opposition.

**Mr. Houston:** Who told the Press you were going to do it? You discussed it in your caucus.

**Mr. LAMONT:** I do not know who told the Press that, but I would not put it past the honourable member for Bulimba to leak that sort of story. Certainly somebody told unionists in my electorate and deliberately tried to set them on my back. But luckily in the couple of years I have been in this Parliament I have managed to gain the confidence of my unionist constituents, who will take my word for something and not believe a story leaked to the Press.

I know it is the philosophy of this Government, too, that unions are private organisations. We also know, of course, that because of the attitude of some big businesses which have come to closed-shop agreements with unions, union membership is compulsory for some; but legally unions are private and voluntary organisations, and that being so, it is not for the Government to try to tell them how they must run their show. Until we are prepared to make unionism compulsory we have no right to try to tell unionists how they must act in their organisation; but what we can do is create the atmosphere through legislation, and the facilities through legislation, to assist unionists to ensure they get the union they want. I believe that it is the social obligation of people to belong to a union if they are in the sort of employment where unionism is appropriate. I know the honourable member for Rockhampton is dying to say, "What about the Queensland Teachers' Union?" I certainly do not hold that teachers should be subjected to compulsory unionism. I believe that as professionals, teachers should form a professional association and uplift themselves from the sort of union tactics that their president, unfortunately, leads them into. Speaking about groups of professionals in unions—we have several nurses in the gallery and the Queensland Teachers' Union, which members opposite support, could do well to take a leaf out of the book of the nurses' union and see how a group of professional people can in fact conduct themselves within a union.

A lot of the charges that have been made by Opposition spokesmen today have implied that Government members think that unions should be banned, that they should be controlled by Governments, that men want to be out of work and that they love going on strike. No-one has ever said that. None of us believe it. Men don't want to be out of work.

**Mr. Wright:** What about Charlie Porter?

**Mr. LAMONT:** Mr. Porter is not the Minister. I am talking about the statements made by the Minister.

**Mr. Houston:** He's the chairman of your committee.

**Mr. LAMONT:** Not my committee. Let me make this very clear. I am a member of the Minister's industrial relations committee. I am proud to be so and proud to be associated with his interpretation of how unions should be treated and respected. I do not accept that any other back-bencher speaks for me on unionism, nor expect any back-bencher to accept that I speak for him.

**Mr. Houston:** But you do support Mr. Porter's attitude.

**Mr. LAMONT:** No, I don't. I believe that men don't want to be out of work. I believe that most union leaders don't want to see their men out of work, either.

Not so long ago I asked a question of the Minister about the working days lost over the last five years. In his reply he said that a quarter-by-quarter comparison of these figures was essential because of their seasonal nature. He added—

"Such a comparison does indicate that the level of working days lost in the first two quarters of 1976 are below those in the same quarters for the years 1973, 1974, 1975."

They are the years of the Federal Labor Government, of course. The number of days lost in the first and second quarters of this year were only one-third of the number of days lost in the same period in the previous three years. That seems to suggest that in this State, anyway, the legislation we introduced last December has had a salutary effect in allowing the union member himself to set his own house in order. The number of working days lost through strikes and industrial unrest in this State in this year has been cut to one-third of what it was previously. I think that is a tribute not only to the Minister but also to last December's legislation, which is operating now.

The Labor Opposition does put words into our mouths. I am not talking about the specific proposals in the legislation. I will do that at the second-reading stage when the Bill is before the House. However, I would like to say one thing because I believe the Minister referred to it in his introduction. I refer to sections 70, 71 and 72 of the Act, relating to the protection of the unions against being sued in tort. It was a victory that was won by Australian unionists in 1916. It is probably crazy to be upsetting people by taking those provisions out of the Act. It is something that has been in this State for 60 years. I know that a lot of people in the Liberal Party, a lot of employers and a lot of other people in the general community, are incensed about victimisation by unions who want to see those provisions taken out so that the unions can be sued. This is a

totally futile wish because no-one is really going to sue a union, get a judgment against it and collect, anyway. That is a fact of life. When Whitby or somebody else says, "It won't work, because we won't allow it to work", he is not being recalcitrant but merely stating a fact of life. Unionists won't see it happen, and that is why it won't happen.

Before I close I want to say one thing about political strikes. This is the elected Government of the State. No matter how responsible a union is, no matter how much conscience it may have about issues that are not industrial issues—matters that are not workers' hours, wages or conditions—it has no mandate from the people to try to bring about a situation which the Government deems not to be the correct solution. We are the elected Government. I would like to see what the Labor Opposition Leader would do and say if retailers closed their retail outlets because they did not like the way the Government acted on foreign policy, health or education, or if doctors withdrew their services from unionists because they didn't like something in a field unrelated to medicine.

Political strikes are totally unacceptable in a democratic society. Most unionists have reached the stage where they, too, believe that. I think we have got to the stage where we can say that we are getting responsible unionism. We are getting responsible unionism in this State under the leadership and guidance of a Minister who understands unions. We are getting it through legislation that does create the situation where, in fact, men can set their own union house in order.

The Opposition has been unwilling today to debate industrial relations. The reason is that it realised from the Minister's introductory comments that the fears it has been spreading and the stirring that it has been doing in the industrial community of the State will not be realised. The Opposition has sheepishly realised that it has been accusing the Government of doing things that it has no intention whatsoever of doing. That is the whole truth of the situation.

The secret of good unionism lies in a good Minister, a strong Act, good union leadership and active union members. We have got that in this State. The reason why the Leader of the Opposition rushed off and talked about Medibank and everything else under the sun except industrial relations is simply that he and his fellow members of the Opposition sheepishly realised that all the Minister is doing is constantly tailoring the Act to suit changing needs and a changing and evolving community. That is all the Minister has done. The Opposition realises it but it is still trying to pretend otherwise. The silence of Opposition members on industrial relations is an admission that the Minister is too good for them.

**Mr. DOUMANY** (Kurilpa) (4.36 p.m.): I rise to speak in support of the Bill—a reasonable Bill for reasonable people. And the

vast majority of citizens who are members of the trade union movement are reasonable people.

I am a little tired of listening to the worn-out clichés of the class-war era emanating from the Opposition. Whenever industrial relations are mentioned in this Chamber, Opposition members resort quite readily to old, worn-out hackneyed phrases that would be better fitted to the late 1800s, when children were resurrected from the coal-mines.

I am also getting very tired of the attempts by the Leader of the Opposition to identify himself in such a matey manner with the worker. He talks as if only he has the prerogative to allude to workers and to identify with them. We are all workers, and I am fed up to the back teeth with the absolute nonsense and tripe of distinguishing between workers and non-workers simply on the basis of some political label. Every member of the community who earns his way is a worker.

This Bill is concerned about those decent, hard-working people in the trade union movement who are workers not only by the label of political cliché but also because they have earned the title by their efforts.

**Mr. Moore:** They've got corns on their hands.

**Mr. DOUMANY:** The ones with corns on their hands, corns on their brains, or whatever.

We want to see reasonableness and honesty brought back into the industrial sector, and most of the people in the industrial sector also want it.

I quote from an article that appeared in "Facts", the publication of the Institute of Public Affairs, of August-September 1976. It reveals some interesting attitudes within the trade union movement.

It says—

"Almost 60 per cent of trade union members thought unions had too much power. Only around 10 per cent thought trade unions did not have enough power."

That fact was revealed by a recent survey among the rank and file of the trade unions, and it is not really strange that trade-unionists adopt that attitude. After all, they are people and citizens, like everyone else—like members in this Chamber, like the people in the gallery and like the people outside this place. They are human beings and they do not want to be herded into some political corral by voluble spokesmen whose only interest lies in strengthening their own hand and their own control over the destinies of individuals. That is what this Bill is about.

It is interesting to note in the same article in "Facts" that, of the unionists who responded to the questionnaire, only 22 per cent favoured strikes arising from disagreement with Government economic policy. Certainly 95 per cent of unionists favoured

activities by unions arising from negotiations for improved working conditions or higher wages. Those are sensible grounds for industrial activity, but I emphasise that only 22 per cent saw fit to involve themselves in activity related to disagreement with Government economic policy.

As a matter of interest, only 16 per cent wanted to indulge in activities aimed at replacing private enterprise with socialism. That should certainly be a salutary lesson to Opposition members when they think about their approach to the next elections, that is, if they do not wish to be rolled to the extent that they were in December 1974.

One plain fact staring us in the face in Australia, which is terribly pertinent to this legislation and Government policy, is that if we want Australia to be set back on the road to recovery, if we want unemployment to be cut right back to the level that we consider to be tolerable, and if we want prosperity, we must have productivity. We must lift the output of goods and services. We must achieve that with good cost control.

There is only one way to achieve what is necessary and that is through a reasonable attitude and performance by everybody—by employers on the one hand and by employees on the other. The provisions of this Bill are aimed at moving towards that state of reasonableness. They are aimed at promoting greater harmony in industrial relations. Without that harmony and a cut in the rate of disruption, we will not get the improvement in productivity or the lift in the output of goods and services that is necessary to underpin economic recovery in Queensland and the nation.

Each year massive losses of wages are incurred. Last year about \$96,000,000 was lost in wages. Since January this year we have again lost about \$96,000,000, and there are still three or four months to go. In 1974 \$125,000,000 was lost in wages. The lost working days reflected the loss in wages. Such losses are intolerable. They bleed the nation as surely as a gash across the main artery bleeds the body. This economic bleeding must stop and this Bill will help to stop it.

Those honourable members who listened closely to the Minister's introductory speech would have heard him stress the need for reasonableness and discretion in the Government's approach to trade unions. Because the Minister knows that the majority of trade unions and trade-unionists are doing a good job and that they are reasonable people, he does not want to tackle every trade union with a heavy hand. The last thing the Government wanted to do was to bring in a bludgeon which, like a scythe, would virtually affect every union and unionist, irrespective of intent and responsibility. These provisions are discretionary and selective and I am certain that they will be used selectively.

**Mr. MOORE** (Windsor) (4.45 p.m.): In rising to speak to this legislation, I think the first thing any member in the Chamber

would want to do is place himself in the position of the average trade-unionist and say to himself, "What would I want if I were to implement legislation for the trade union movement?" The first thing that would come to my mind would be to have a say in the affairs of my own union. Although I have not seen the Bill, I believe that it will not impose compulsory voting for the election of union officials or before strike action is taken in the first place, unless some other action is taken.

As a shop steward in the Electrical Trades Union for many years, I would say that the average member of the E.T.U. felt that voting should have been compulsory to obtain a broader view of the feelings of union members, yet when a ballot was taken only about 20 per cent of the members voted. If the Minister had introduced that principle in this legislation, the hierarchy of the unions—the secretaries and presidents—would have opposed it, but the rank and file would have welcomed it.

Another matter I raise is compulsory secret ballots. Under this Bill ballots will not be compulsory in the first instance. They will only be compulsory if the union asks for it or if the Minister moves for it, or something along those lines. Where any action depends on someone making the initial move, usually it just does not come about. So, if the provision is to be made in accordance with my understanding of it, it will be virtually useless and of no effect. The trade union movement will carry on in the same way as if has before this legislation. That is my view.

I wish to speak now about compulsory levies. Trade-unionists today are members of all political parties. The working man now is voting Liberal in Liberal seats and National Party is National Party seats. He does not believe that the Labor Party is any longer the working man's party. However, he is being forced to pay an affiliation fee of about 75c that goes into the coffers of the A.L.P. to defeat the party that he supports. The workers are not very happy about that. In the last couple of days I have had four or five phone calls—not very many, I admit—from trade-unionists, who said they were not particularly keen on paying levies but that, if there were to be levies, they should be automatically excluded from them unless they wished to pay and contracted in. The legislation falls down in that regard. They say that, if there must be a capitation fee to be paid to a political party, the men should be able to indicate that their capitation fee go to the party that they support, whether it be the Labor Party, the Liberal Party or the National Party. They feel that, if there is to be a capitation fee to be paid to a political party, it should be done on a voluntary basis, not compulsorily. That is another area in which this legislation falls down.

One of the weaknesses in the trade union movement at the moment is that at the last election the parliamentary wing of the A.L.P. was reduced to 11 members; virtually a cricket team. It has no strength in this Chamber in debating power or in numbers; virtually it has no strength at all.

But there is certainly power in the trade union movement. Most union secretaries are members of the Labor Party—one exception being the secretary of the Federated Clerks Union—and some others are members of the Communist Party. They are attempting to have Labor Party legislation forced upon the people through the strong hand of the trade union movement. Despite the fact that they do not necessarily have the full support of that movement, they say, "We have no governing power but we have a rather large membership in the trade union movement and with our political muscle in the trade union movement we will tell the Government what to do."

They say this in relation to the export of minerals and whether they will load the ships to take goods to Indonesia or Vietnam where there is an international dispute. That is the stand the trade union movement takes today. That is not its purpose. It is there solely to look after the well-being of its members, to obtain better wages and conditions for them and to see that nobody is victimised. If it operates along those lines so that the workers feel they have some future, no-one can say the trade union movement is not doing a good job. However, it is not doing that; it is being used and manipulated. This is a bit of a shame.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that MIM Limited pays the Medibank levy of its employees and he considers that all employers should do likewise. Perhaps MIM can do it. Following the 17½ per cent devaluation, it is in a better position. So are some of the coal-mining industries which have a rather large export income. They might be able to pay the Medibank levy, which amounts to a sizeable sum of money.

However, the majority of employers of labour are small. Some of them employ only two workers. If they have to maintain reserve funds to pay the Medibank levy, sickness benefits, superannuation and all the other things, it will be frightening for them. They would all want to opt out and work for someone else simply because of the imposition we would be placing on them. We seem to imagine that all employers have very large reserves, but that is not the case.

Most disputes in the trade union movement arise over margins between unions. It is my view that the Government could well encourage all unions to get together at a round-table conference and decide on the percentage margins they are prepared to accept above or below another union. While

we have a number of unions in this country, they are unions of individuals or individual unions (we do not have a union of unions) and they are at one another's throats. If rank-and-file members of one union have been on a low scale of wages for a number of years and by argument before the Industrial Commission are able to obtain a rise, the other unionists with whom they have caught up want their margins increased. They say, "We have to maintain our margins. These fellows have caught up with us. We have to go ahead again."

Some of the unfortunate unions that have never had a fair go will never get it under the present system. There is something wrong with that. If the Government does not take the initiative, I should like to think that the trade union movement itself will one day say, "As good Queenslanders and Australians and in the interests of the economy, let us get our heads together and decide on margins for three years. We can have another look at the situation after that time." Such an attitude would certainly do no harm at all.

I promised not to speak for very long, so I have just discarded a couple of pages of my notes.

All members must remember that certain things have their own laws. No matter what we do here and what laws we pass, if they are wrong they will not work. If this law is wrong, it will not work. It is no use saying, "The law is on our side." If a law is not right, it will not work. Individually and severally it is our responsibility to map things out for the benefit of this State.

Although the trade union movement is criticising the Government over the use of a heavy hand, it must always be remembered that there is no tougher or more ruthless boss than the unions themselves when members appear to step out of line. Opposition members know that very well. How often does one see a unionist bucking his union? People will buck the Government and the boss, but will they ever buck their unions? They never will. Trade unions are the toughest masters of all. If a unionist does not go on strike when called out, even though he may have bills to pay, a member of his family in hospital, or some other personal economic reason which he explains to his fellow men, he is dealt with by the union. I remember the time in the Railway Department when electricians went out on strike, without union backing, and remained out for eight or nine weeks. Some men whose home economics could not stand such a strike went back to work. The Railway Department, gutless and all as it was and still is, allowed those men to be dismissed. They paid the penalty for their responsibility and loyalty. That was a crying shame.

The Minister and all other Government members are not engaged on an exercise of union-bashing. If the legislation now being

brought down turns out to be wrong, we will amend it. All that we are attempting to do is to give unionists a say in their own affairs.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

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

### NURSING STUDIES BILL

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Minister for Health) (5.1 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to provide for the establishment of a Board of Nursing Studies, the accreditation of schools of nursing and the promotion and recognition of approved courses of nursing education and training and for related purposes.”

This new legislation will be cited as the Nursing Studies Act 1976. Earlier during this session I tabled a Health Paper on Nursing Education and advised honourable members that it was the intention of the Government to introduce a totally new concept of training and education of nurses in Queensland to ensure that our nurses continue to be of the highest standard.

For many years the training of nurses in hospitals in Queensland has been controlled by the Nurses Board of Queensland, which formulated the curriculum, established entry standards, conducted examinations and carried out all other associated functions in addition to the normal responsibilities of a registration authority. I would like to pay tribute at this time to the members and officers of the Nurses Board of Queensland during those years, whose conscientious efforts have enabled nurse training in Queensland to attain high standards and to be held in high esteem throughout Australia. The demands of nursing education are now such that it is desirable that they be the single responsibility of a competent authority which has the capacity to avail itself of the necessary expertise to keep abreast of the changing trends of medicine and their resultant effect on the nursing profession.

To ensure that the legislation reflected the needs of nursing as seen by nurses throughout this State, I invited submissions from nursing organisations, nurses, medical practitioners, medical workers and any other interested individual. These submissions, of which many hundreds were received, were examined by a working party of three registered nurses who were seconded from their respective hospitals to advise on the content of the legislation now being introduced for consideration. The members of the working party travelled throughout Queensland talking to nurses and nursing organisations, concerning

their submissions and seeking their views. I would at this time like to pay tribute to Miss Elvery, Miss McCully and Miss Batchler, who were seconded from their hospitals to be members of this working party. I also would like to record my appreciation to Miss Foley and Miss Zsembay from my Division of Nursing, (and I am pleased to have Miss Foley here this afternoon as one of my advisors) and also to officers of my department who have worked so hard in the preparation of this legislation. Following detailed consideration of all representations, the working party furnished me with its recommendations and due consideration has been given to these recommendations in the preparation of this important Bill.

This Bill seeks to establish a Board of Nursing Studies with a full-time chairman, who shall be a nurse qualified for registration in Queensland. The Adviser in Nursing of my department shall be the deputy chairman of the board, which shall have 10 other members representative of nurses, the medical profession and the Department of Education. One member of the board will be a student nurse, who shall be appointed for a term of 12 months. All other members, apart from the chairman and deputy chairman who will be full-time public servants, shall be appointed for a term of three years. The Board of Nursing Studies will be financed from within the Estimates of the Department of Health. The Bill lays down routine provisions for appointment of board members, filling casual vacancies, tenure of office of members, conduct of board meetings and payment of fees and allowances to board members.

Provision is made for the formation of advisory committees to assist the board in its activities.

The board's functions in respect of nursing education in Queensland generally, and the day-to-day activities of education of nurses are clearly established. Provision is made in the Bill to include education of nurses in colleges of advanced education. This will not happen immediately, of course, but consideration has already been given to this transition from the traditional hospital-based nurse-training programme. The Board of Nursing Studies will be charged with the responsibility to recommend accreditation of schools of nursing within colleges of advanced education to conduct nursing-education programmes and to approve the content of the proposed courses.

The policy of the Government is that the Board of Nursing Studies will lay down minimum requirements to all educating authorities for nurse education, whether this be in a hospital-based programme, a tertiary education centre or any other education centre, so that the graduate nurse, from whatever centre or training she comes, will have similar opportunities for nursing positions and post-graduate training programmes. The emphasis of the programmes arranged by the board will be, and must be, on clinical experience



and training and patient-care programmes. I emphasise that all courses will be approved by the Board of Nursing Studies, and arrangements have been made with State education authorities for such procedures.

The board's staff will have access to all accredited schools of nursing. As I indicated earlier in these remarks, the Board of Nursing Studies will recommend accreditation of schools of nursing. To obviate any difficulty during the transition period, when control of nursing education passes from the Nurses Board of Queensland to the Board of Nursing Studies, all approved nurse-training schools approved by the Nurses Board of Queensland will review accreditation at the date of transition. This will not prevent the Board of Nursing Studies in due course recommending withdrawal of accreditation from, or the giving of accreditation to, a particular school of nursing if it considers it warranted. Accreditation or withdrawal of accreditation will be by way of Order in Council.

The Bill requires accredited schools to maintain records required by the board and to permit inspection by the board's staff. Provision is made for accredited schools of nursing to issue certificates, degrees or diplomas to successful students, and for the board to arrange examinations to assist a school of nursing where necessary.

A feature of the Bill is that it provides for the situation in the future where the Board of Nursing Studies will not conduct State-wide examinations but rather individual schools of nursing will conduct their own examinations within guide-lines established by the board.

To ensure that a suitably qualified person is obtained for the position of chairman, it is proposed to widely advertise the position. Some time could elapse before an appointment is made to this position and the appointee takes up duty. Appointment of other board staff will follow immediately after the chairman's appointment. Provision is made in this Bill, therefore, for an appointed day to be proclaimed. Until this proclamation, training of nurses in Queensland hospitals under the provisions of the Nurses Act 1964 will be continued.

The Bill also contains provision for the board to make regulations necessary to give effect to the various functions of the board.

Monetary provision exists in the Estimates of my department for the current financial year to establish the Board of Nursing Studies and to employ the necessary staff, and I assure honourable members that no time will be lost in seeking the necessary appointments once the legislation is passed.

The influence of the Board of Nursing Studies would also encompass post-graduate education programmes.

The role of the nurse in our hospitals and in other health areas is a demanding one with the use of modern technology in treatment changing traditional procedures. It

is therefore essential that our nurses be equipped, and continue to be equipped, to cope with these changes and developments.

The development of nursing education in Queensland under the auspices of the Board of Nursing Studies will ensure that Queensland nurses will maintain their high standard of proficiency and will be well equipped to meet the demands of their profession in the future.

I want to pay a tribute to the nurses throughout the State for their diligence and dedication over a long period. I also want to pay a tribute to Miss Schultz, who has been associated with the Royal Australian Nursing Federation for a lengthy period and who retires at the end of the year. Her contribution to nursing in this State will be long remembered by all who have been associated with her. As Minister, I have always respected the work she has done as an executive officer of the Royal Australian Nursing Federation. Her services will be missed in future. I know that she is pleased with this Bill and looks upon it as some reward for her efforts and those of many other people, some of whom are in the gallery listening to the introduction of the Bill.

Thanks to the efforts of many nurses throughout the State, this breakthrough is being made in the training and education of nurses. I thank the nurses who have contributed so much in such a fine way over such a lengthy period. This nursing education programme will mean that the high tradition and standard of nursing in Queensland will not only continue but also expand.

I commend the motion to the Committee.

**Mr. MELLOY** (Nudgee) (5.12 p.m.): The Opposition welcomes the introduction of this Bill. Any legislation that adds to the status of the nursing profession is most desirable.

The Minister's introductory comments were not very informative. Although he has indicated the intention of the Bill, he has not told us what its provisions are or how they are to be implemented. We will not be able to assess the Bill until we have seen it. However, from his remarks I gather that the Bill will raise the professional status of the nursing profession. In view of the very important role played by nurses, this is highly desirable.

No-one would deny that over the years nurses have been confronted by a series of frustrations and trials and tribulations. A good deal of turmoil has been created within the nursing profession—so much so that nurses have been forced to hold stop-work meetings. I think two were held at the Festival Hall. Nurses have expressed dissatisfaction about their conditions and their training. If the Bill does anything at all to improve their conditions, it will be welcomed by them.

I want to speak particularly about country girls. Many of them become interested in nursing but are unable to undertake training because no facilities for it exist in country areas. Those who wish to enter the profession are forced to leave their homes to attend the training hospitals in coastal centres. I do not know how this problem can be overcome.

Another difficult situation arises in that with the high level of unemployment in country areas a lot of girls have a tendency to turn to nursing as a last resort. In these circumstances, a number of girls who are not really cut out for nursing take it on and, because of their unsuitability, are unable to see their training through. This, of course, causes a certain amount of disruption in the hospital service. How that problem, too, will be overcome, I do not know.

Amenities for girls in the country are not what they should be, and it is difficult to get qualified nurses to go to country hospitals where social amenities are lacking. If after serving their term in city hospitals nurses are unable to find employment in city hospitals, they often leave for southern States rather than go to Queensland country areas. The Government must overcome this problem, but I do not know how it can tackle it. Perhaps the only answer is to have dedicated girls entering the profession.

When girls enter the nursing profession and get a taste for it, they usually become dedicated. Much of the credit for the patient recovery rate in our hospitals is due to the nursing staff, who in many instances take the place of the doctor. Many country hospitals are staffed by a matron and a couple of nursing aides or assistants in nursing. Tremendous responsibility falls on girls in country areas to ensure proper treatment of patients. The doctor may spend an hour at a country hospital on two or three mornings of the week and for the rest of the time the patients' lives are in the hands of the matron and her assistants.

The lack of constant supervision could be disastrous to some patients. I emphasise that in country hospitals much of the responsibility falls on the nursing staff.

Nurses have been forced to work many hours of overtime. This problem must be overcome. They have also had to study in their own time rather than during working hours, although I understand that much of this difficulty has been overcome. In recent years the stigma of their being glorified housemaids has been removed. However, I understand that they still have to do some domestic work. Trainees and graduate nurses should not have to carry out any domestic duties in a hospital. In some instances it may be unavoidable, but every effort should be made to ensure that it does not happen.

The Minister said that the board's functions in respect of nursing in Queensland are clearly established by the Bill, but that is as

much as he said. We will have to study the Bill to see how well the education activities are established and then make an assessment.

He also said that provision is made in the Bill for nurses to be educated in colleges of advanced education. Again we will have to study the Bill to see what the implications are. There are not so many colleges of advanced education in Queensland.

**Mrs. Kyburz:** There is the Q.I.T.

**Mr. MELLOY:** That is one in Queensland.

If colleges of advanced education are to be involved in training nurses, what will their role be?

**Mrs. Kyburz:** They have nothing to do with it.

**Mr. MELLOY:** They have nothing to do with it? That does not accord with the Minister's speech.

**Dr. Edwards:** The Board of Nursing Studies will lay down the requirements. Those colleges which are particularly interested in the course will report back to the board and, if the board approves the course, they may set it up.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I intended to raise a point later about the involvement of colleges of advanced education. As the Minister pointed out, provision is being made to include education of nurses in colleges of advanced education, not advice from colleges of advanced education. They will therefore be involved in the training of nurses.

**Dr. Crawford:** Certain ones.

**Mr. MELLOY:** To a certain degree, yes.

**Mr. Lamont:** Only those that have a course accredited by the board.

**Mr. MELLOY:** This must mean that some will not have the advantage of courses at colleges of advanced education.

**Dr. Crawford:** Eventually they all will.

**Mr. Lamont:** You don't want them to proliferate, do you?

**Mr. MELLOY:** The Government can have it whichever way it likes. Either the colleges of advanced education are involved or they are not. Either they are necessary or they are not necessary. If they are not necessary, why does the Minister put it in a Bill?

**Mr. Lamont:** Controlled and planned development.

**Mr. MELLOY:** I think we will get a further word from the Minister on this when he replies. As I said earlier, he did not say in his introductory speech just how he intends to implement the provisions of the Bill. He has indicated the principles in the Bill, but not the means of implementation.

**Mr. Frawley:** He doesn't want to tell you too much at once; otherwise he will confuse you.

**Mr. MELLOY:** We don't have to talk to you for you to be confused. You confuse yourself.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller):** Order! I ask the honourable member to address the Chair.

**Mr. MELLOY:** The Minister went on to say that the board staff will have access to all accredited schools of nursing. I would like the Minister to indicate—and he probably will—what will be the full extent of the facilities for nurse education and nurse training. Is the present system of hospital training to be broken down in any way? I believe that over the years that has been one of the propositions put forward by nurses; that is, that they attend a college for their general academic training and complete their training in a hospital. I do not know whether the Minister proposes anything like that or whether we will retain the system of training hospitals that we have now.

As I said earlier, there is probably a lot in this Bill that we will have to examine very closely. The Minister has not outlined it in any detail. He has given an indication of the purposes of the Bill. Whatever its contents, the Bill is an advance for the nursing profession. Nursing is one of the most important professions in the medical field, apart from doctors of medicine themselves. As we all know, there are other paramedical fields. However, in the long run, if we get down to the nitty-gritty of the treatment of the patient, we must ensure that the nurses give the treatment that is necessary. Therefore, we will be pleased to study the Bill when it is printed.

**Mrs. KYBURZ (Salisbury) (5.23 p.m.):** I think it is quite fitting that I, as one of the two women members of Parliament, should lead the Government debate on this Bill, which is a very important one for so many women in Queensland. Before I discuss the Bill, I commend the Minister for its introduction and also for bringing a woman into the lobbies of Parliament House for the first time. Miss Joan Foley, the Minister's adviser on nursing matters, is the first woman in the history of Queensland to enter the parliamentary lobby as a ministerial adviser. I am particularly pleased to see her here today, because I think she is taking a step forward in the advancement of women in this State.

The provisions of this Bill are extremely important not only to the women of Queensland—and the men, of course—who are presently in the nursing profession but also to those who are yet to join that profession. As the Minister has already mentioned, it is an extremely honourable profession and

one to which we as the legislators of this State owe a great deal. So many of the people of Queensland would be pleased that the Bill in the future will result in a nursing profession which will be not only well dedicated but also well accredited throughout Australia.

I did not hear the Minister mention anything about the interchange of nursing accreditation between the States. I am concerned to see that that may happen. I feel that a nurse trained in New South Wales or Victoria should be perfectly entitled to registration in Queensland and vice versa. I do not know whether the Bill provides that. The Minister did not mention it and he might like to comment on it.

I think that the Board of Nursing Studies will have a very wide field to cover. It will deal with accreditation and many other factors in nursing. The functions of the board are clearly defined. The board will in fact be an advisory board. Its most important function will be to recommend minimum standards. I presume that means minimum standards for people who wish to enter the nursing profession. The board will also recommend accreditation of schools of nursing. I am pleased that we might have schools of nursing in the country hospitals. I hope that more people all over the State will have greater opportunity to train in the nursing profession. Also the board will have the responsibility for the development of courses and the determination of the supervision of qualifying standards.

I feel sure that most honourable members would have no hesitation in saying that nurses have been educated to a very high standard. However, the colleges of advanced education might be brought into play some time in the future. There is no doubt that in most colleges of advanced education there is plenty of room for the education of professions other than teaching. If in fact nursing education is going to play a major part, we hope to see other professions coming into those colleges in the future.

I am pleased that the Bill will pay more than lip-service to the future of nursing in Queensland. So many people are very proud of our nurses. I do not say that lightly. We are proud of their work in hospitals and also their service above and beyond the call of duty.

I support the Bill and thank the Minister for bringing it in.

**Mr. LINDSAY (Everton) (5.28 p.m.):** I thought I would take a few moments to speak in support of the Minister in his introduction of the proposal to develop the Board of Nursing Studies and also on behalf of the silent majority of the Everton electorate to express our views and our deep and high regard for the efforts that the nursing profession—the nursing women of Queensland—have made in the past, are making now and hopefully will continue to make.

There is no doubt in my mind that the nursing profession and nurses in general are the unsung heroes of the health-care profession. It has always seemed strange to me that doctors enjoy enormous social standing and financial reward while the nurses do not fare nearly as well. Perhaps one can only hope and pray that nurses get their very just and very deserved rewards in heaven, if not here.

My mother, who was a trained nurse, played an important part in my development. I would say most definitely that without her help I would not have found the determination in more ways than one to be here. It was perhaps as a result of my mother's dedication to and love of the medical profession that in more recent times my sister became a doctor.

I should like to refer to the part played by nurses in the Armed Services. I notice a number of nurses in the gallery this afternoon. I commend to them the possibility of continuing their profession at some later date in the Armed Services. It was my happy experience to serve with the Australian Forces in New Guinea, Malaya and Vietnam and to have attached to my unit members of the Australian Nursing Corps. I could speak at some length on the heroism and the humanising influence of the nursing members of the Australian Forces, particularly in Vietnam. I can say quite confidently on behalf of every member of the Royal Australian Regiment who served in those areas that without the nursing support that we received I doubt whether we would have been capable of performing the task.

In more recent times I have been to Aboriginal mission stations and to the islands of Torres Strait where quite a number of Queensland nurses are playing a very important part in the development of this fine State. I take this opportunity to commend them and to urge them to continue the excellent work that they are doing.

One thing that disturbs me a little, particularly with the introduction of new ideas in nursing training, is the standard of dress of nurses. I urge girls entering the nursing profession not to take lightly the honour of the veil and everything for which it stands. I urge them to maintain the high standard of dress and professionalism that it has been my pleasure to observe as I have travelled throughout Queensland.

**Dr. CRAWFORD** (Wavell) (5.32 p.m.): I am sure that all members will agree that of all the professional groups in the community the nursing profession is the noblest. I state quite unequivocally that there is no way in which any member of the medical profession could practise without the willing co-operation of nurses who are prepared to work with patients and not only carry out the instructions of the medical practitioner but make informed judgments of their own of a patient's condition and report the results of those judgments to him at the appropriate time.

In recent years nurses have taken a progressively greater share of direct responsibility in medical treatment. It is now quite possible to establish, as they have been established in this city, coronary care units and similar units in which nurses take major responsibility and report only gross abnormalities to the medical officer who theoretically is in charge.

It has been one of my contentions for many years that nurses should basically be allowed to run their own affairs and I endorse completely the idea of setting up a Board of Nursing Studies in which, and through which, the nursing profession can organise and manage the curriculum, which is embodied in the basic concept of the board, and monitor examinations and maintain standards which traditionally have been high in this State and elsewhere in Australia.

The use of colleges of advanced education for the training of nurses is not at all controversial. The first thought that I had on this subject was the establishment of a nursing school within the Queensland Institute of Technology, which geographically is conveniently located in this city and where in recent years a new Conservatorium of Music has been established. Previously the conservatorium was at South Brisbane, near Somerville House. I am sure the Minister would agree that, for Brisbane at least, the Queensland Institute of Technology is conveniently situated.

Traditionally, of course, nurses have almost been slave labour, both in the way in which they have been treated by patients and in the way they have been treated by members of other professions. One has only to read accounts of the Crimean War and the conditions with which Florence Nightingale and her nurses had to cope to realise how true was that description of their origin in a professional sense, because the girls in those days were treated very badly indeed. There have been gradual changes over the years, and most of these have been for the better. They have been improvements and therefore in the best interests of the profession.

At the moment we are tied in more of a moral sense than a practical sense with the British tradition of attempting to train our girls in a hospital which has a minimum of 300 beds. There are practical reasons for this. In a hospital of this size a greater variety of facilities is available for training the girls so they can have the widest possible experience. It is not in principle a good idea to train nurses in a small hospital, and over the years in Queensland we have had a very large number of these, particularly in country areas, as was mentioned by the honourable member for Nudgee. It is not desirable to train nurses in small localised country centres, however desirable it may be from the angle of retaining the girls in that area. For the reasons I have mentioned, we have moved, we are moving and we will continue to move into an area of training girls in hospitals which have at least 300

beds, and also because Australian nurses going to the United Kingdom to practise, as so many of them do these days, find it desirable that they may be able to receive automatic registration in the United Kingdom.

If they have not received training in a 300-bed hospital in Australia, they have some difficulty and sometimes have to revert to being trainee nurses for a six or 12-month period in a British hospital before being registered. So as we progress with our nursing training ideas in Australia, and I am sure the nurses know this very well—as a matter of fact, they have been mentioning it for a long time—we must keep in mind the idea of a hospital of adequate size for training. Incidentally, it is not a coincidence that the Wesley Hospital now being established in Coronation Drive has 303 beds. This did not happen by accident, but very much by design.

About three years ago the Health Department initiated a sudden change in the way in which examinations were conducted. The idea was quite satisfactory, but the way in which it was brought about was not good. It was introduced on a take it or leave it basis without sufficient guide-lines being set down. It was almost a sudden guillotine idea that the old training would be out and the new training would be in. There was a very great amount of heart-burning among nursing tutors and others in the State who had to plan new courses on short notice so the new training could be implemented. I commend the change of attitude in the department, which has now, through the Minister, taken the nurses very much into its confidence. The whole new idea of this Board of Nursing Studies has been discussed at great length and the nurses themselves are delighted that this board is to be set up.

For many years now in America there has been a tendency in nursing for theoretical training to take precedence over practical training. When one moves around this world and meets some nurses who have been trained in America—I am referring to fully qualified and registered nurses—it is not unusual to find that these girls have very great theoretical knowledge but very little practical training in nursing. I am sure it will not happen here, but I do not want to see this new Board of Nursing Studies in any way influenced by the example which has come through from America and set up a purely academic form of training at perhaps a university level which ignores or does not take sufficient cognisance of the practical training which is so vital to the over-all efficiency of nurses.

This is a very real risk. It is fine for university courses to be set up to allow nurses who have received their full training—be it three or four years—to then move to special courses in, say, nursing administration, business methods or other important aspects of running hospital units, but I would be very much against the new

Nursing Studies Board setting up a university-type course where there was too much emphasis on theoretical training and not enough on practical training. Much of the aspect of tender loving care would be removed from the course. That training is currently important and will continue to be important for the nurse who is actually looking after the patient. The pendulum has been swinging towards traditional nursing attention.

We are now setting up something of a dichotomy between a nurse who is fully trained and a nursing aide. The Minister has a new name for the nursing aide—which is unimportant—but there is a dichotomy existing now between those who order the treatment and those who carry it out. We have to beware of this also. Every nurse, even if she is the matron or the nursing administrator in the greatest metropolitan hospital in the country, should be able to attend to the humdrum nursing duties of looking after a patient's back and all other aspects of the work of the nursing profession, in exactly the same way as the most junior of nursing aides. It is important that we continue the traditional thought, which I know historically was the inspiration for nurses, that they should be able to really look after a patient well and adequately, and not be motivated by too many theoretical considerations.

At the moment the training for nurses is about one-third theoretical and two-thirds practical. In my view that is about the right ratio level. It is all carried out in the hospital's time, and I believe it should continue in about that proportion. As for the whole of the teaching schedule of nurses—and this will be a matter for consideration by the board—it is important that all the lecturing in major centres be carried out at one time by one lecturer. Around the ridges over the years we have had many people in various hospitals talking on the one subject at the same time. If we can establish an adequate institute in Brisbane, for instance, virtually all the lectures in the various subjects can be given there. This would facilitate the efficiency of the whole training programme.

As for the rest of Queensland—initially, institutes could be set up in Toowoomba, Rockhampton and Townsville. These could be basic training units under the control of the Board of Nursing Studies. Girls could be brought to those centres for their theoretical training and subsequently exchanged with nurses in outlying areas. I think this will work very well in this State. Because of our decentralised population it is a very big problem, but it can be overcome by this means. It will never be ideal, but it will work in a practical sense in due season.

This is a very good piece of legislation and I am delighted to see it come before the Committee.

**Mr. LAMONT** (South Brisbane) (5.45 p.m.): I am delighted to support the introduction of this Bill. I have been associated with the Minister's committee since I came into Parliament two years ago, and I have been working with the Minister and his committee on this matter for some time. My interest in this Chamber is principally education, and therefore a Bill which deals with both education and health is something in which I have taken a great interest. Because I know that a number of members want to pay a tribute to this wonderful profession of nursing and because time is running out, I shall confine my comments to one or two points.

In my electorate, more than 500 nurses are employed at the Mater Hospital and the Princess Alexandra Hospital. For that reason, I regularly read the R.A.N.F. journal. Over the past 12 months I have noticed in it constant references to goals in nursing education.

The anxiety expressed this afternoon by the Opposition spokesman on health was shared by me when I first saw the results of workshops on goals in nursing education, where almost unanimously participants were in favour of the transfer of nursing education into the general system of education. But that, of course, is open to interpretation and can mean many things. About a year ago I went to the Minister and expressed my concern, because I did not believe that some colleges of advance education were competent to provide nursing education. The Minister assured me that it certainly was not his intention that nurses go into colleges of advanced education in the way interpreted by the Opposition spokesman.

This scheme is being confined at the outset to the Q.I.T., and the system of accreditation for nursing courses will be such that the courses will never get out of the hands of nurses. The Nursing Studies Board will set minimum requirements for a course and the education boffins will have an opportunity to devise a course, but it will come back to the nurses for final approval. About a year ago I told the Minister I thought that should be the case, and he assured me that that was his intention. On further reading of statements by nurses in their journal, I am happy to find that that is precisely the intention.

I know that colleges of advanced education have their backs to the wall in trying to justify their existence, but for the obvious reasons stated by my colleague from Wavell and for the reasons expressed by the honourable member for Nudgee, I would hate to see them given control of nursing. If that were to occur, no doubt nurses would be "educated for life and not for jobs", and the colleges of advanced education would tell us it is more important to prepare nurses for society and that the hospitals could later train them on the job for nursing. None of us wants to see that happen.

It would be appropriate to state here and now that the Minister's methods of finding out what the nurses wanted are to be commended. He and his representatives made extensive tours, and they also seconded three very senior nurses to visit nurses in all parts of the State and to come back and be taken into the confidence of the Minister. That is an excellent procedure and one that should be commended.

I shall defer my detailed comments until the second-reading stage, when we can go into all aspects of the Bill. I am delighted that the Bill has come forward in its present form, with its guarantee of a continuity of the high standard of the nursing profession.

**Mr. DOUMANY** (Kurilpa) (5.49 p.m.): I rise to pay a tribute to the nursing profession, which is one of the most significant professions in the community. It is, however, one that we tend to take for granted and even forget about until we need to call upon it for assistance.

One aspect of the Bill that is of utmost importance is that relating to uniformity of standards and methods of training. The Bill takes an over-all look at things and takes an over-all grasp of nursing training in the State. This is very important, because we are living in a time of very rapid change in medical services and health care. Part of that change involves the movement away from institutional medicine to what I might term individual medicine, particularly in the area of domiciliary nursing. In line with the rapidly expanding technology of medicine, there is a fast-growing call on the skill and expertise of nurses, on their ability to be self sufficient in situations that perhaps they would not have encountered a generation ago outside the war-service situations referred to by the honourable member for Everton. The need is increasing for nurses to become involved in various projects and activities in the community and to become skilled in various fields of human relations. We now see them in activity centres and geriatric centres and participating in many other groups in the community. This is quite different from their traditional role in massive hospital institutions where they were under the umbrella of a central administration. The Board of Nursing Studies to be created under the Bill will be most important in fitting and adjusting nurses to the new work environment in which they serve.

Recent statistics indicate a serious wastage in the nursing profession. However, contrary to the implication of the honourable member for Nudgee, it is not confined to rural areas. An examination of a table in the 1974-75 report issued by the Minister's department shows varying percentages of wastage in all areas. One very important fact in the reasons given for wastage of student nurses is that there is not one instance of mis-demeanour. It appears that more basic reasons attributable to personality, bent and

aptitude are involved. I hope that the new Board of Nursing Studies will overcome this problem.

**Dr. LOCKWOOD** (Toowoomba North) (5.52 p.m.): I am glad of the opportunity to make a few short comments at this stage of the Bill, but I assure honourable members that I will make a lengthy contribution of some note at the second-reading stage.

I thank all honourable members who assisted the Government and the Government's committee to formulate opinions on exactly what was necessary to allow the nursing profession to go forward from the 1970s into the future in the light of the explosion in knowledge and techniques that is becoming apparent in medicine, nursing and all the paramedical sciences. We received opinions from nurses, doctors, people from the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States of America and the southern States, and more especially from nurses in Queensland, on the many and varied types of nursing practice.

Despite modern trends, nurses are still hamstrung by being confined to the practice of nursing in places in which they are under the direction of a matron, in association with a doctor, or in some Government department in which nursing of a particular type is carried on.

With the passage of this legislation I hope that nursing will come of age and go forward as one of the many and varied professions each standing in its own right. I speak of such things as physicians' assistants and nurse practitioners. In this way, the women and men who have been trained can carry out examinations and many other activities that now can be performed in this State only by doctors. I believe that they should be able to carry out these procedures, and I hope that this legislation opens up their future and gives them opportunities which will allow them to take part in these ventures.

**Hon. L. R. EDWARDS** (Ipswich—Minister for Health) (5.55 p.m.), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions. I thank the Committee, too, for the co-operation we have received to get this Bill printed tonight so that it can be circulated to the nursing profession. I look forward to the second reading of the Bill, when the many members who have not had an opportunity to speak on its initiation will be able to give us the benefit of their contributions. I also look forward to their comments when I introduce a Bill for the Nurses' Registration Board.

Motion (Dr. Edwards) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

Bill presented and, on motion of Dr. Edwards, read a first time.

The House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.