

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1977

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1977

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

PRESENTATION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I propose to present to His Excellency the Governor, at Government House, on Thursday, 15 September, at 10 a.m., the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech agreed to on 13 September, and I shall be glad to be accompanied by the mover and seconder and such other honourable members as care to be present.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

TREASURER'S ANNUAL STATEMENT

Mr. SPEAKER announced the receipt from the Auditor-General of his report on the Treasurer's Annual Statement for the year 1976-77.

Ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF ELECTORAL COMMISSIONERS UNDER ELECTORAL DISTRICTS ACT

Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier): I lay on the table of the House a copy of the Government Gazette Extraordinary of 13 September 1977 containing a Proclamation by His Excellency the Governor notifying the names and boundaries of each and every Electoral District of the State of Queensland as determined in the report made pursuant to the provisions of the Electoral Districts Act 1971-1977 by the Electoral Commissioners appointed under the said Act.

Whereupon the honourable gentleman laid on the table a copy of the Government Gazette Extraordinary referred to.

PAPERS

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

Reports—

Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops, for the year 1976-77.

Chief Safety Engineer and Chief Inspector of Machinery, Construction Work, and Weights and Measures, for the year 1976-77.

Operations of the Sub-Departments of the Department of Health—"Eventide" (Sandgate), "Eventide" (Rockhampton) and "Eventide" (Charters Towers), for the year 1976-77.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under—

State and Regional Planning and Development, Public Works Organization and Environmental Control Act 1971-1974.

Industrial Development Act 1963-1976.

Explosives Act 1952-1975.

Regulation under the Health Act 1937-1976.

Statutes under the James Cook University of North Queensland Act 1970-1977.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (11.5 a.m.), by leave: Yesterday during question-time in this House the member for Merthyr and the Treasurer conspired together in an attempt to reflect on my attitude to my parliamentary duties. I was absent for a brief period of yesterday's proceedings attending the annual convention of the Queensland Retail Traders' Association at Surfers Paradise—an invitation I was pleased to accept as far back as 3 June.

I am certain small businessmen will be distressed, but not surprised, to learn that when members of Parliament set aside time, at their request, to speak to them on problems such as pay-roll tax, availability of finance and marketing, the Treasurer regards their interest as neglect of duty.

Since my attendance here has been questioned, it should be recorded that while I was at the retailers' convention yesterday the Health Minister was also on the Gold Coast and that last Thursday the Treasurer himself was absent from Parliament attending, I am told, a race-meeting in the North.

I might point out that this morning there are only eight of the 17 Ministers in the Government front benches.

While the member for Merthyr was asking his question, it is reported that nine of the 11 Opposition members were present but that 33 of the 69 Government members, including seven Ministers, were missing. I wonder where they were.

In view of the Treasurer's interest in my parliamentary responsibilities, I suggest he begin examining his own. I believe that as Treasurer he has an obligation to set an economic example to Queenslanders, yet only last week we found him listed as a sundry debtor to the tune of \$147.70 in the liquidation report of a restaurant named "Wintzers".

PETITIONS

REVIEW OF RAPE LAWS

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG (Townsville) presented a petition from 503 citizens of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will have an urgent review made

of the laws relating to rape, with particular reference to the laws relating to evidence.

Petition read and received.

[A similar petition was presented by Mrs. Kyburz (368 signatories), and this petition was read and received.]

DISTRIBUTION OF MARIJUANA AND OTHER SOFT DRUGS

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) presented a petition from 87 electors of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will take no measures that could extend the major social problem of drug usage and will oblige those who are promoting marijuana and/or similar drugs to prove without doubt that such drugs are harmless before any legislation of use is introduced.

Petition read and received.

QUEENSLAND FILM INDUSTRY DEVELOPMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. J. BIELKE-PETERSEN (Barambah—Premier): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to constitute a corporation for the purpose of encouraging the development of the film industry in Queensland; to make provision with respect to the functions and powers of the Corporation and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

MEAT INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. C. A. WHARTON (Burnett—Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries): 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 Meat Industry Act 1965–1973 in certain particulars, and for other purposes."

Motion agreed to.

ACTS INTERPRETATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

RELIGIOUS EDUCATIONAL AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

SUCCESSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

FRUIT-GROWING RECONSTRUCTION SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENTS BILL

THIRD READING

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

DAIRY ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM AGREEMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

RURAL ADJUSTMENT AGREEMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

1. FAIRBAIRN DAM

Mr. Lester, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Water Resources—

Will he give an undertaking that Fairbairn Dam water will be available for use by the time the proposed new meatworks is ready to commence operations at Emerald in May 1978?

Answer:—

Funds are available to ensure water supply will be available to the proposed meatworks by May 1978. Initially it may be necessary to take supply from Selma Weir through the Irrigation Commission's pilot farm.

2. FISH-BREEDING PROGRAMME, FAIRBAIRN DAM

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

Will he visit the Fairbairn Dam and, while there, see if it would be possible to introduce an intensified fish-breeding programme, particularly with yellow-belly?

Answer:—

I will be pleased to accept the invitation of the honourable member to visit the Fairbairn Dam and discuss the practicalities of a fish-breeding scheme. I will be

happy to arrange a technical assessment of the ponded area fisheries potential if such appears warranted.

3. RETURN OF UNSOLD BREAD

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

Will the Government legislate to ban the return of unsold bread from shops to bakers and can the margin for retailers be fixed at a realistic level, which would help protect the smaller baker and vendors and keep the bread industry on a stable basis?

Answer:—

I have received a submission from the bread manufacturers on this matter, which is receiving consideration.

4. COMPANY, LABOR INVESTMENTS

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

(1) Has a firm or company named Labor Investments, or a similar name, been registered according to law and, if so, where is the head office and who are the directors of the company, what is the subscribed capital, what is the main business activity and does the company engage in any activity directly with the objective of reducing unemployment?

(2) Are any of the operations of the company beneficial directly to North Queensland and, if so, how much of the company's money has been invested in North Queensland?

Answers:—

(1) A company named Labor Investments Pty. Ltd. has been registered under the Companies Act 1961-1975.

Statutory returns lodged at the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs indicate that the registered office of the company is—

Radio City,
Ross Street,
Newstead

and that the directors of the company are—

Neal David Kane;
Archibald Andrew McLeish Bevis;
Thomas Stephen Burton;
Harry Hauenschild;
Thomas James Burns; and
William George Hayden.

The statutory return as at 31 December 1976 indicates the subscribed capital was \$7.

The records of the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs do not indicate what is the main business activity

of the company. The memorandum of association registered with the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs contains 31 objects of the company which relate to its activities. I am unaware of any activity that the company engages in directly with the object of reducing unemployment.

(2) I am unaware of any of the operations of the company beneficial directly to North Queensland or how much of the company's money has been invested in North Queensland.

5. PHOSPHATE-MINING NEAR DUCHESS

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

(1) Has the company which is engaged in the mining near Duchess and the export of phosphates or phosphatic rock from Townsville reduced its scope of operations and, if so, to what extent and for what reasons?

(2) If the operations have been curtailed, has the Government offered any financial or other form of assistance to keep the company fully operational?

Answers:—

(1) Queensland Phosphate Limited announced on 11 August 1977 that production of phosphate rock was being reduced to an annual rate of 350 000 tonnes, the reasons given being that—

(a) sales targets were not achieved in the export or domestic markets;

(b) stocks in Townsville now exceed 200 000 tonnes;

(c) the effect of (a) and (b) meant a slower than anticipated build up to production capacity of 1 000 000 tonnes per annum was needed.

(2) On 2 September 1977 the company announced that the Queensland Government had granted temporary assistance in the form of special rebates, which will reduce the amount payable as the cash freight obligation under the terms of the company's freight agreement with the Queensland Railways.

6. EROSION AT BOAT RAMP, KURRAMINE BEACH

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

(1) Did the Beach Protection Authority or the Department of Harbours and Marine, or both, report that the boat ramp at Kurramine Beach in front of the Coral Sea Caravan Park was causing beach erosion and damage and also recommend that the local council make the final decision on the ramp's future?

(2) When will the ramp be removed?

Answers:—

(1) The Beach Protection Authority advised the Johnstone Shire Council in May 1977 that the boat ramp constructed in front of the Coral Sea Caravan Park had accentuated erosion to the coast to its immediate north. Because the area is not within a beach erosion control district and the ramp is a private ramp under the council's control, the matter of its removal or implementation of remedial measures is one for decision by the council.

My colleague the Honourable the Minister for Tourism and Marine Services inspected the problem on 10 July 1977 at a meeting attended by local residents, the chairman and councillors of the Johnstone Shire Council and a representative of the Beach Protection Authority. At this meeting the council was advised of an alternative possibility of beach replenishment which would avoid the need for removal of the ramp.

(2) No information has been received from the council as to its decision in the matter.

7. CHILDREN BEFORE THE COURTS

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

(1) For 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77, how many (a) girls and (b) boys appeared before our courts?

(2) Of these, how many were from (a) the metropolitan area and (b) country areas?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) As the Children's Services Act 1965-1974 under which the Children's Court is constituted is not administered by me the question should be directed to another Minister.

Mr. Houston: I do so accordingly.

8. PRE-SCHOOL CENTRES IN QUEENSLAND

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

(1) How many pre-school centres have been built throughout Queensland by the State Government?

(2) What was the total cost of the centres?

(3) How much of this money was obtained from Commonwealth Governments?

Answers:—

(1) At 30 June 1977, 427 State pre-school units had been completed. A further 34 units will be completed by the end of 1977.

(2) Capital expenditure on the State pre-school scheme totalled \$27,500,000 to 30 June 1977.

(3) Commonwealth contributions towards this expenditure totalled \$7,600,000.

9. WIDENING OF SECTION OF OLD CLEVELAND ROAD, BELMONT

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

(1) Following his announcement that a four-lane road is to be constructed along Old Cleveland Road, the first stage being from Creek Road to Scrub Road, Belmont, when will construction commence?

(2) As over 20,000 vehicles traverse Tingalpa Creek at Capalaba daily, will he expedite the construction programme to have this four-lane road, which is the main arterial road into the Redlands area, extended to Capalaba?

Answers:—

This question touches grounds similar to those raised by the honourable member for Mansfield yesterday. I have since received advice of some additional funds for this financial year.

(1) Work is currently in hand on the construction of a culvert at Philips Creek in conjunction with an overpass being built by a developer. Work on the duplicate bridge over Bulimba Creek is planned to start in October. Further roadwork, including the 1.0 km section, Bulimba Creek to Scrub Road, will start in November. The total cost of these works to provide additional lanes to Scrub Road is about \$3,000,000.

(2) I can appreciate the member's concern for advice on the construction schedule for the provision of four lanes to Capalaba as virtually the full length currently has traffic volumes justifying this standard. It is hoped that the 4.5 km section from Scrub Road to Bacton Road will be built to four lanes before the Commonwealth Games in 1982, and that the more heavily trafficked section from the Mt. Gravatt-Capalaba Road to Capalaba will also be completed by this date.

10. ENROLMENTS FOLLOWING ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

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

(1) Will electors who are in a new electorate as a result of the redistribution be automatically enrolled in the new electorate or will they have to attend to their own transfers?

(2) How will electors know whether they are in fact in another electorate?

Answers:—

I thank the honourable member for his question because the answer will provide information which, hitherto, has not been known.

(1) Electors who are transferred to another electoral district as a result of the redistribution will automatically be transferred to the new district by the Principal Electoral Officer.

(2) Electors whose enrolment is changed as a result of the redistribution will be notified by the Principal Electoral Officer by card in the same way as new electors are notified of enrolment.

11. HOSPITAL LAUNDRY MANAGERS

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

(1) Further to my question of 9 September 1976 on anomalies in hospital laundry wages and with reference to an advertisement in "The Australian" of 30 July 1977 regarding a position of central linen service manager for a Victorian plant less than a quarter of the size of Queensland hospital plants, in which is offered a salary of \$60 per week above the Queensland rate, why are Queensland hospital laundry managers discriminated against in this fashion?

(2) As he advised that laundry managers are employees of hospitals boards and as such could not be brought within the provisions of the Public Service Acts and regulations, why did he say that any laundry manager who wanted a review of his salary should make a submission in the first instance to the hospitals board?

(3) Is he aware that when the laundry managers did ask for a review, the hospitals board supported a review and the matter was referred to the Public Service Board, which took 11 months to review the salaries and, on 5 August, granted an increase of \$2.65 per week, backdated to 1 August?

(4) Did laundry managers, as a result of this appalling treatment, then apply to the courts to be covered by a Federal award to escape the clutches of the Queensland Public Service Board?

(5) Has the Government briefed a Q.C. to oppose this application?

(6) Is any superannuation scheme operating for hospital laundry managers and, if not, why are they treated differently from other public servants?

(7) Will he meet a deputation from hospital laundry managers in an effort to overcome what is obviously an area of discontent in our hospital service?

20

Answers:—

(1) I cannot necessarily accept that the position advertised in Victoria is directly relative to the position of laundry managers in Queensland hospitals.

(2) For employees of hospitals boards this would be the proper and accepted procedure.

(3) On the recommendation of the Department of the Public Service Board, I approved on 1 August 1977 of increased classifications in respect of laundry managers at metropolitan hospitals and in accordance with normal practice the date of operation was the date of approval.

(4 and 5) I am not aware of an application of the nature referred to by the honourable member.

(6) A superannuation scheme is available to all employees of hospitals boards under prescribed conditions.

(7) I would point out that laundry managers are covered by the provisions of a State industrial award titled "Professional and Technical Employees Award—Public Hospitals Boards, Queensland and the Queensland Radium Institute" and of course have recourse to the Industrial Commission through their registered industrial union. I would think that they would be well advised to seek the advice of such union in respect of the matter raised by the honourable member.

12. AMERICAN TEACHERS EMPLOYED IN TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGES

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

(1) Why are American teachers employed at teachers' training colleges when so many Australians are out of work?

(2) Are they paid higher salaries than their Australian counterparts and, for the first two years, do they not have to pay any tax?

Answers:—

(1) Academic staff at the former teachers' colleges, and at all other colleges of advanced education in Queensland, are appointed following open advertisement throughout Australia and elsewhere. Applicants are assessed on the basis of qualifications and experience.

(2) Academic staff in colleges of advanced education are paid salaries in accordance with the schedules recommended from time to time by the Academic Salaries Tribunal, which operates under Commonwealth legislation. Country of origin has no effect on salaries payable.

As the honourable member will know, liability for payment of income tax is subject to determinations by the Commonwealth Government. I am not aware of the details of any provisions that might apply to American citizens resident in Australia.

13. QUEENSLAND VOLUNTEER COAST
GUARD

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

(1) Is he aware of the financial hardship being experienced by the much-needed life-saving organisation, the Queensland Volunteer Coast Guard?

(2) What assistance does the State or Commonwealth Government give to the volunteers who, in aiding people in trouble on our coast, in many cases risk not only their lives, but also their own equipment worth many thousands of dollars?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) The questions should be referred to one of my Cabinet colleagues.

14. REDBANK CREEK WEIR NEAR GATTON

Mr. Moore for **Mr. Bourke**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Water Resources—

(1) What is the timetable for the construction of the proposed weir on Redbank Creek near Gatton?

(2) What is the estimated cost of the weir and how will it be financed?

(3) What are the dimensions of the proposed weir?

Answers:—

(1) Design work for the weir is in progress and it is expected that construction will be completed during the current financial year.

(2) The estimated capital cost of the weir and works is \$150,000 and is to be borne by the State. Charges are expected to be imposed on the Gatton Shire Council and the Queensland Agricultural College for additional supplies of groundwater allocated to them. These charges will meet operation and maintenance costs.

(3) The weir is expected to have a length of 40 metres and an effective height of 2 metres. It will only impound 13 megalitres of water, but it will divert a much larger volume to spreading areas from where it will percolate to join the groundwater reservoir.

15. GATTON BYPASS, BRISBANE-
TOOWOOMBA HIGHWAY

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

(1) What is the timetable for the construction of the proposed Gatton bypass on the Brisbane-Toowoomba highway?

(2) What is the length and cost of the proposed work?

Answers:—

(1) Although Commonwealth moneys provided for national highway construction have increased over the last few years, the increases were nowhere near those recommended by the Bureau of Roads in the 1975 report. There is still a high demand throughout the State for funds allocated to this category from projects with higher priorities than the Gatton bypass. Present planning involves preservation of the route and within the next three years expenditure will be confined to property acquisition.

(2) The length is 21 km and the preliminary estimate of cost is currently \$7,500,000 for a two-lane bypass.

16. CONTROL OF CATTLE TICKS

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

As it is a heavy cost for owners of cattle in areas on the borders of tick-infested areas to constantly dip or spray their cattle and as it is in the interests of the cattle industry and the community generally that the spread of cattle ticks be halted, will he examine methods of giving further aid to beef producers in the border areas in their efforts to prevent further spreading of cattle tick?

Answer:—

Tick control on holdings within the tick-infested area of Queensland has always been considered to be the responsibility of the owners concerned. The department provides information on control programmes which vary from locality to locality and employs specialist tick control extension officers to assist owners with control problems. Those officers also administer the use of department dip moulds, which may be hired by owners who wish to install a plunge dip at minimum cost.

Where tick outbreaks occur within normally tick-free areas, the department provides medicament and equipment in the initial stages to bring such outbreaks under control. However, because of the large number of outbreaks in clean country in recent years, and shortage of finance and staff to maintain this standard of super-

vision and control, a revised policy had to be adopted whereby the owners of infested properties have been obliged to supply their own equipment and labour to complete eradication programmes.

Unfortunately, financial stringency precludes any extension of departmental assistance in relation to tick control within either tick-infested or tick-free areas. At the same time, I would point out that the Government has provided a 25 per cent subsidy on the wholesale price of acaricides to assist producers, at a cost of approximately \$2,300,000 since its inception.

17. SPEECH THERAPIST, BUNDABERG

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

If a speech therapist cannot be obtained by his department for Bundaberg, will his department pay the salary, either on a full-time or a part-time basis, if the Bundaberg Hospitals Board is able to obtain one or two speech therapists for the hospital and other duties?

Answer:—

A position for a speech therapist within special education at Bundaberg will be advertised shortly. If this position is not filled, the normal practice of offering a part-time appointment with this department could be considered.

18. REFUND ON CANCELLATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr. Moore for **Mr. Jensen**, pursuant to notice, asked the Deputy Premier and Treasurer—

Are the nominal defendant and licence fees, which are paid with vehicle registration, refundable in whole or part when the registration is cancelled within the month of payment or after the vehicle has been registered for a month or so?

Answer:—

No; a refund calculated on a monthly basis is made only in respect of the motor vehicle fee and the compulsory insurance premium portions of the registration payment.

19. SUSPENSION OF GRANTS TO SPORTING BODIES

Mr. Moore for **Mr. Jensen**, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

(1) As \$1,560,000 was given to sporting bodies in 1976-77 and this amount will be increased in the 1977-78 Budget,

will he attempt to have the allocation for sport suspended until the economic and unemployment situation improves and have the money transferred to the Health and the Works Departments for hospitals and housing?

(2) If he cannot suspend the allocation until the economy and unemployment situation improves, will he attempt to have Cabinet reduce it by at least 50 per cent and transfer this to the Health and the Works Departments for hospitals and housing?

(3) Is he aware that sporting bodies can raise finance from raffles, lucky numbers, goose clubs, bingo and hoy, art unions, etc., which were illegal a few years ago when there was no allocation for sport but have now been legalised by his Government?

(4) Is he aware that over the years the lion's share of the sporting allocations was given to bowls and golf clubs, which have liquor licences, and, in many cases, these clubs sell at less than hotels and can also run raffles, etc.?

(5) Is he aware that sport and gambling will continue to flourish while unions continue to press for higher wages and fewer hours?

Answers:—

(1) Expenditure for subsidies and grants to sporting bodies in 1976-77 was \$1,560,000. This entailed expenditure by the clubs and associations concerned of at least a further \$3,000,000 and provided a deal of employment in many fields. Figures for the 1977-78 Budget have not yet been finalised and will not be known until the Budget is brought down on 22 September.

(2) No. The scheme fills a long-felt want and, as indicated, expenditure by sporting bodies provides a great deal of employment opportunities.

(3) It is true that sporting bodies now have access to fund-raising activities which were not available some time ago, but the many voluntary sporting administrators, who are so dedicated and work such long hours, are surely entitled to a just reward for their efforts on behalf of the large number of young people who take advantage of the sporting opportunities provided.

(4) Bowls and golf clubs have received only subsidies due under the guide-lines, which provide for subsidy for the development and for the construction of new and

improved playing facilities at the rate of one-third of the cost and for coaching of juniors at the rate of one-half of the cost. The subsidies do not apply to facilities which are not used for the playing of the sport itself. All sporting bodies are subsidised on applications made and approved within the guide-lines laid down.

(5) I have no doubt that added leisure-time will create additional demands on sporting clubs and no-one could deny that great benefits, particularly in the health field, will accrue from such increased usage of sporting facilities and from other forms of healthy recreational pursuits. However, this would seem to indicate that there needs to be a maintenance of financial support from the Government to assist clubs, rather than a lessening, as apparently the honourable member is advocating. The success or otherwise of union pressures for higher wages is not likely to have any real effect on the level of gambling in the community.

20. QUEENSLAND PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETY

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

(1) What is the current liquidity position of the Queensland Permanent Building Society?

(2) What is the latest report on the search for the missing \$2,300,000 allegedly lost in the computer?

(3) Are the chairman of directors and the managing director planning to attend a financial conference in Rio de Janiero in the near future, despite the society's financial position?

(4) If so, who will pay the expenses incurred on this trip?

Answers:—

(1) Information of this nature is confidential to a society, but the Registrar of Building Societies is keeping in close touch with all societies to ensure that the statutory requirements are not contravened.

(2) The registrar is continuing his close surveillance of the activities of an international firm of chartered accountants which has been engaged by the society to conduct an independent examination concerning this matter.

(3) No.

(4) See answer to (3).

21. VISITING MASSAGE SERVICES TO HOTELS AND MOTELS

Mr. K. J. Hooper, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Police—

(1) With no reflection on the hotel and motel managements involved, will he outline to the House the extent of the visiting massage services operating from the Mt. Gravatt and Coorparoo areas to the Coronation Motel and Crest Hotel?

(2) What other hotels and motels are frequented by the fly-by-night massage girls purveying illicit sex?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) It has been held by courts that it is not unlawful for females operating alone to engage in sexual activities for reward. I have no evidence of the extent, if any, of the operations at the Coronation Motel and Crest Hotel of visiting massage services from the Mt. Gravatt and Coorparoo areas. The Acting Commissioner of Police has advised me that he, likewise, has no evidence of any unlawful activities at these premises.

If evidence was made available to me to support prosecution action for prostitution at any hotel or motel, such prosecution action would be taken. The honourable member, from the wording of his question, would appear to believe that he has evidence of unlawful prostitution. If he has any such evidence, I again request him to supply such evidence to enable appropriate action to be taken.

It will be of interest to the dwindling number of A.L.P. supporters in this State that, when he is not enjoying himself at "police-bashing" or causing a run on building societies, their newly appointed shadow Minister on Treasury matters is burning the midnight oil interviewing and tabulating the habits of harlots. I hope that he will be able to spare enough time from these extra-curricular activities next week to prepare a worthwhile contribution to the coming Budget debate.

The honourable member seems totally obsessed with the fact that some prostitutes operate in Brisbane, as indeed they do in any large city of the Western World. What he refuses to explain to this House is how he equates his hypocritical concern over the activities of these persons with his own A.L.P. policy which, as honourable members know, is to legalise prostitution. He wants this Government to set a world first by somehow successfully stamping out all traces of prostitution, yet the policy of his own party would invite harlots and their bludgers to flock into this State from all over Australia.

On two previous occasions, I have challenged the honourable member to provide the Police Department with any evidence

that would assist the police in their efforts to control prostitution. The honourable member has failed to come forward with any factual information at all. He is only interested in the headlines which his accusations bring in some sections of the media.

His sincerity on this issue has been tested and found wanting. Now he has seen fit to cast a slur on the management of two of the city's leading hotels by implying that they would condone improper activities on their premises. The operators of these establishments have now been added to the long list of people whom the honourable member has slandered under the protection of the privilege of this House.

22. WOMEN ON SOCIAL SECURITY EMPLOYED IN VICE DENS

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

(1) Will he ascertain from his Commonwealth colleagues, Mr. Lynch and Senator Guilfoyle, the extent to which Commonwealth tax investigators are checking the records of allegedly out-of-work Brisbane women who are taking between \$300 and \$500 per week working in massage parlours and vice dens?

(2) Will he inquire into the number of unemployed and other social security beneficiaries in Queensland found actively employed in vice dens at the same time as they are receiving their social service cheques?

(3) What Queensland laws are being broken by this subterfuge and deception?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) The matters raised by the honourable member are all ones which are regulated by Federal law. Any offence which would be committed in the circumstances suggested would be a matter entirely for the Commonwealth authorities. If the honourable member runs true to colour and has any information which he considers would be relevant and of assistance to Federal investigators, no doubt he will acquaint them with it.

23. DELUGRIP RSM

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

(1) Is he aware of a new British road-surfacing material known as Delugrip RSM, which is the result of a joint nine-year research project between Dunlop and the Department of Transport and Environmental Planning at the University of Birmingham?

(2) If not, will he investigate claims that this road-surfacing material enables bulk surface water to be quickly dispersed, thus reducing spray thrown up by fast-moving vehicles, while selected aggregates provide a fine texture allowing any remaining water film to be penetrated by the tyre?

(3) Will he investigate claims that this material greatly increases wet-skidding resistance and has high resistance to traffic polishing, while retaining its abrasive surface?

(4) Is he aware that since this material was introduced two years ago on the Hammersmith flyover, the total accident rate has been cut by 65 per cent, while accidents under wet conditions have been reduced from 19 for the two years before to only three for the two years after the introduction of this material?

(5) Is he aware that claims are made that traffic noise is reduced considerably with the use of this material?

Answers:—

(1) Yes. Delugrip is a road-surfacing material patented by Dunlop. It has been reported upon in recent internal reports promulgated by the Australian Road Research Board.

(2) It is reported to produce a surface macrotexture which aids water drainage, and employs aggregates with high polished stone values.

(3) It is reported that the material does perform satisfactorily in these areas but how much better than conventionally designed mixes in the long term may need further assessment. It costs nearly twice as much as conventional hot-rolled asphalt.

(4) I will accept the figures stated for the Hammersmith flyover. Good results have also been obtained in Queensland with specially graded mixes laid at locations where accidents have been prone to occur.

(5) There could be some decrease in traffic noise since conventional type asphaltic surfaces are reported to exhibit a greater depth of surface texture. It would appear that the aggregate used possesses excellent qualities. The honourable member can be assured that these aspects of road surfacing are being closely studied by the Australian Road Research Board and the specialist and construction branches of the Main Roads Department in Queensland.

24. TELEVISION OF BRISBANE RUGBY LEAGUE GRAND FINAL

Mr. Lindsay, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport—

As goal-kicking is likely to be a decisive factor in a closely fought match, is there any way Queensland T.V. channels

covering the Brisbane Rugby League Grand Final next week can be encouraged to have a T.V. camera behind the goal posts as is done in the coverage of Sydney games?

Answer:—

The interest of the honourable member in sport generally and his representations on behalf of sporting clubs and associations are recognised. I am sure that the suggestion by him will be welcomed by all ardent Rugby League supporters. However, this is not a matter which comes within the control of my department and I suggest to the honourable member that he submit the idea to the Brisbane Rugby League and the television stations concerned.

I feel that if he puts this worthwhile suggestion to them, action will be taken to ensure that the standard of telecast will not suffer in comparison with those in southern States and thus television viewers and supporters of this football code will be given the opportunity to witness at close hand all the vital factors in the match.

25. LIBRARY FOR LAIDLEY NORTH STATE SCHOOL

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

(1) When will the Laidley North State School get its new library?

(2) What priority has Laidley North for this library?

(3) How many libraries were constructed last year and how many are likely to be constructed this financial year?

Answers:—

I thank the honourable member for his continued interest in matters pertaining to education in his electorate. The answers to his specific questions are—

(1) Subject to the availability of funds, it is anticipated that the new library at the Laidley North State School will be constructed in the 1978-79 financial year.

(2) Laidley North State School is quite high on the priority list in forward planning for the provision of a new library.

(3) Nineteen school libraries were constructed in the last financial year. Subject to the availability of funds, it is anticipated that approximately the same number of school libraries will be constructed in this financial year.

26. WATER FOR POWERHOUSE, TARONG

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

In the likely event of the next major powerhouse being established at Tarong in the South Burnett, what investigations have been made into the supply of water for such a project and what amount of water would be required?

Answer:—

The State Electricity Commission of Queensland, in conjunction with the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission, is presently investigating water supplies to a number of proposed major power-station sites in Queensland. The quantity of water required for the major power-station under consideration will be approximately 30 000 megalitres per annum.

27. VICTORIAN YOUTH AND FITNESS PUBLICATIONS

Mr. Yewdale, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Community and Welfare Services and Minister for Sport—

With reference to the publications "Fun and Fitness Trails" and "Youth Needs and Public Policies", which are produced by the Department of Youth, Sport and Recreation, Victoria, will he have a departmental officer examine the publications with the object of producing similar editions for distribution to appropriate bodies throughout Queensland?

Answer:—

I am aware of the two publications referred to by the honourable member. The first publication "Fun and Fitness Trails" is held in the library of the department and this publication, together with other similar publications, has been used in the establishment of fitness trails and jogging tracks in Queensland, in which the Queensland National Fitness Council for Sport and Physical Recreation is actively involved.

A Family Fitness, Fun, Flora and Fauna (5F) trail has been established in bushland at Taringa as a joint project with the Brisbane City Council.

A Family Orienteering Course has been established in the Pine Mountain Reserve at Camp Hill. The Queensland National Fitness Council provides, free of charge, maps and participation instructions for both of these trails. The Dalby Area National Fitness Committee, in conjunction with the Dalby Town Council, has established a fitness track in a small park in the town of Dalby. National Fitness Area Committees at Ipswich and Mt. Isa are also investigating the establishment of facilities of this type in those areas.

The second publication "Youth Needs and Public Policies" is presently being examined by officers of the department. The National Fitness Council currently produces reference material mainly in pamphlet form on fitness, sports-coaching and youth leadership and administration.

From these and the available resources within the department library, inquiries can be met from interested organisations in the youth, recreation and fitness areas. The provision of publications can only be undertaken within the constraints of available finance. No good purpose would be served by producing similar documents to those already held by the library in the department, particularly when those produced in other States have application to Queensland conditions.

28. RAIL LINKS TO INDUSTRIAL ESTATES

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

(1) How many industrial estates in Queensland are serviced by a rail loop or line?

(2) Of those that are not serviced, has his department taken steps to have land resumed for the installation of rail links and, if so, on what estates has this action been taken?

Answers:—

(1) Of the industrial estates administered by the Department of Commercial and Industrial Development, the Wacol, Clinton, Hamilton, Gibson Island and Rocklea Estates are presently serviced by rail facilities.

(2) In conjunction with the Railway Department, detailed planning has been undertaken with respect to the provision of rail siding accommodation to the Acacia Ridge and Bohle Industrial Estates. Certain lands have been resumed by the Railway Department for this purpose.

29. DECRIMINALISATION OF VAGRANCY

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

With reference to an article in the "Telegraph" of 7 September headed "Vagrancy, no longer a crime?", will he consider introducing similar legislation in Queensland?

Answer:—

As the legislation relating to vagrancy is not administered by me, the question should be directed to another Minister.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

RELEASE OF SPECIAL PROJECTS FUND MONEY TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BURNS: In asking a question of the Premier, I refer to the Auditor-General's Department report tabled today in which the balance of the Special Projects Fund at 30 June 1977 is quoted as being \$12,743,467, which is the result of savings of restrained salary increases due to partial wage indexation decisions. Will the Premier, as a matter of urgency, release this money to alleviate unemployment in this State, which for the month of August 1977 was the highest ever recorded?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I thought the honourable member would be aware that we had already taken that action. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer has already released \$50,000,000, as he indicated earlier in the week. Prior to that—in fact several months ago—all Ministers had been instructed, as a matter of urgency, to call tenders for work as quickly as possible. In particular the Minister for Works and Housing has commenced a very large programme of letting contracts, as has the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads.

MINING INDUSTRY RESOURCES TAX

Mr. BURNS: I refer the Premier to his answer in the Parliament last Thursday to my question about the proposed resource tax being advocated by the National Country Party leader, Mr. Anthony, in which he said—

"I have an understanding—if I may put it that way—from the Prime Minister that there is no intention of imposing a resources tax in any area."

Does the Premier still support his statement of last Thursday; that is, that in spite of Mr. Anthony's statements since that time there will be no Federal Government resource tax on any mineral or energy source in Australia?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I can only be responsible for my own words; the Prime Minister has to be responsible for his. I reiterate the indication he gave me when I spoke to him. But I also want to say to the honourable member that I am deeply concerned that the people in Canberra, whichever party they belong to, are starting to think and talk as if the resources of the nation belong to them and they have a right to impose special taxes on them. It is clear that their officers are certainly thinking along these lines. I want to reiterate that we in this State will resist with every resource in our power any moves by the Commonwealth Government, whichever party is in power, to enter the field of controlling mineral resources, whatever they might be, and especially to tax them, because the resources belong

to the States and not to Canberra. I say right now that, irrespective of who is in power in Canberra, they have no right to talk or to think the way they are doing.

I want to say also, in relation to the suggestions coming from their officers that there should be a resources tax, that that would be one of the best ways to stifle and control industries and prevent industries and organisations from coming into being, because there are enough difficulties and high costs today without Commonwealth people talking of putting on an additional resources tax, whether it is on coal, oil, uranium or anything else.

DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

Mr. BURNS: I ask the Premier: Can he advise if the position of Director of Environmental Control within the Co-ordinator-General's Department has been abolished, and, if so, is he aware that it is clearly set out in the Clean Air Act that the Director of Environmental Control, Co-ordinator-General's Department, and the Director of Air Pollution Control shall be members of the Air Pollution Council? Under these circumstances, does he consider that urgent legislation is now required to amend the Clean Air Act, and, if so, when will this be introduced?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I think that we have always reiterated very clearly and concisely that we are concerned with the environment generally, and we have, under the Co-ordinator-General, a very close scrutiny and carry out our work in a very responsible manner.

Mr. BURNS: You have done away with the job?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: No. The honourable member is thinking of a slightly different area—in relation to regional councils, and so on. This is why I have repeatedly told Mr. Kevin Newman, the Federal Minister for Environment, to keep out of Queensland, and I say it again. I reiterate that if he is going to continue his attitude of coming up here and trying to tell Queenslanders how to run their affairs in relation to the environment—

Mr. BURNS interjected.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I said to Mr. Newman, if the honourable member would like to know, that if he does not keep his nose out of Queensland—

Mr. BURNS: Is Mr. Ellis still the Director of Environmental Control?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I am not having a friendly discussion with the honourable member; I am trying to answer his question.

Mr. BURNS: What I want to know is: is Mr. Ellis still the Director of Environmental Control?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I say to the honourable member that he has always known and always been aware that we in this State, right from the beginning, have been very active in this area. All departments come under the Co-ordinator-General in relation to environmental matters, and we watch them very closely. If people in Canberra had taken our advice and followed our environmental impact study on Fraser Island, they would never have closed the mining operations there.

URANIUM-MINING, MARY KATHLEEN

Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG: I ask the Minister for Health: Can the Minister advise if there are any health hazards associated with the mining of uranium at Mary Kathleen? Is the Minister satisfied that all health precautions have been carefully adhered to in this matter?

Dr. EDWARDS: The Queensland Government is absolutely certain that there are no health hazards whatsoever in the mining of uranium at Mary Kathleen. I have had my officers visit there on a number of occasions. They have observed and taken tests on the transport of the uranium. Again there is no danger whatsoever regarding this matter. Some information was circulated by a Dr. Caldicott about health hazards associated with the mining of uranium. Again we were able to give information to honourable members to refute any of those claims. The only concern the health authorities throughout the world have had at any time has been about health problems that may—I say "may"—be associated with the waste products of uranium, but I am assured by the Commonwealth health authorities and a statement by the Prime Minister that every aspect of this kind of problem has been investigated. The Prime Minister is satisfied that all precautions have been taken. Therefore, on the ground of health, there seems to be no restriction whatsoever on the export of uranium mined at Mary Kathleen.

HIGH TOP AT COLLINSVILLE STATE SCHOOL

Mr. LESTER: I ask the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities: What is the latest development in our efforts to provide grades 11 and 12 education at Collinsville State School?

Mr. BIRD: I thank the honourable member for his continued interest on behalf of the people of Queensland in all matters, particularly those in his electorate and especially with regard to education.

It is a well known fact that since I became Minister for Education and Cultural Activities I have travelled widely throughout the State to find out the education needs of students.

One of the matters I dealt with very early in the piece was the necessity for high-top facilities in the more remote areas of the State. It would be well known that previously it was our policy not to provide high-top facilities, that is grades 11 and 12, at schools until enrolments in grades 8, 9 and 10 reached a minimum of 200 students. I gave a lot of consideration to altering that figure as I realised that many students throughout the State were finding it difficult to obtain high-top education because of financial considerations or the need to travel long distances.

After giving the matter lengthy consideration I decided to seek the approval of Cabinet to lower that requirement from 200 to 150 students. I realise that I have a responsibility to ensure that all students throughout the State receive the best possible education that can be given to them. It must be remembered that if one dropped the figure too low, the number of students able to go on to grades 11 and 12 would be so low that a full range of courses could not be provided. I am still not absolutely convinced that I have done the right thing in recommending that the figure be dropped to 150. But I was prepared to take that gamble, and I will be watching those schools very closely and monitoring them to ensure that the students in no way lose out on a good education.

At the present time Collinsville State School does not meet the criterion of having 150 students in grades 8, 9 and 10. I assure the honourable member that I am watching the position very closely indeed. I want to ensure that when a decision is made on Collinsville, it will be in the best interests of the students. I assure the honourable member that the matter is not closed but I repeat that I want to ensure that when a decision is made it will be the correct one and indeed in the interests of the students.

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

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

ADMINISTRATION OF FRASER ISLAND

Mr. POWELL (Isis) (12 noon): In the last couple of years the subject of Fraser Island has caused a lot of ire in the countryside. A great deal of publicity has been given to the island and, as a result, many hundreds more people now visit it at holiday time and at other times during the year.

It is because of the publicity that the island is receiving that I rise to speak this morning. A total of five Government departments have an interest in Fraser Island, and I was pleased to learn from the Premier that very shortly a committee will meet that will have something to do with the planning of Fraser Island. I understand that the terms of reference of that committee are—

- (a) To determine terms of reference for a comprehensive planning study of the island;
- (b) To define a tentative work programme for conducting such a study;
- (c) To estimate the cost of the study; and
- (d) To recommend the means by which the study should be conducted.

Already a number of studies of Fraser Island have been done by independent people, who have submitted the results to several authorities, but they are of varying value.

However, the problem with the administration of Fraser Island lies in the fact that five Government departments have an interest in it—Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service, Mines, and Tourism. While those five departments have an interest in the island, two local authorities are supposed to overview and control it. The local authority that traditionally had been the overseer of the island was the Burrum Shire, which now no longer exists. The northern section of the island is administered by the Hervey Bay Town Council and the southern part by the Maryborough City Council.

I suggest that neither local authority has the money to effectively control the visitors to the island. Therefore, it is my belief that the administration of Fraser Island should be taken away from local authority entirely and put in the hands of an administering authority. Very few people live on the island permanently. Those who do so look after themselves. I do not think anybody could expect that the normal town facilities should be provided on Fraser Island, which could be regarded as a remote area. The two existing townships are Happy Valley and Eurong. In Happy Valley, which is presently administered by the Hervey Bay Town Council, very little activity is undertaken by the council—and who could blame it? The same could be said of Eurong.

I was rather disturbed to find in "The Maryborough Chronicle" of 1 September a suggestion from James Birrell and Partners that a further town should be created in the southern part of Fraser Island where sand-mining activity was once carried on. That proposition to me is untenable. Already two towns are on the island, neither of which is fully developed. Some time ago the Lands Department suggested to the Burrum Shire Council that a further 100 blocks of land should be thrown open for development at Happy Valley and Eurong. I think the

figures were 47 for Eurong and 53 for Happy Valley, but I am not quite sure of the exact numbers. That suggestion was turned down by the Burrum Shire Council, which felt that the Lands Department should supply bitumen streets, kerbing and channelling and sewerage. In my opinion, such a suggestion is absolutely ridiculous and certainly not in keeping with the atmosphere that now exists on Fraser Island.

People visit Fraser Island simply because it is an out-of-the-way place. Suggestions that a town should be created with bitumen streets and kerbing and channelling—the town planners even suggested that there should be bitumen roads traversing the island and perhaps a bridge across from the mainland—are ridiculous in the extreme. Let me indicate for the benefit of those honourable members who have never been there—and I suggest if they have not been there they should go and see it now—that there is already a bitumen road on the island. It extends north from the southern part of the island to about Third Creek. It is patently obvious that bitumen roads on Fraser Island just cannot be provided without incurring massive costs. Again, if it is done by the local authorities, it is not fair to the rate-payers and to the remainder of the local authorities. Also, in my opinion, it is not fair to impose conditions such as those on developers in the small townships of Eurong and Happy Valley.

The other point that should be mentioned is that Fraser Island is unique in that it is a complete sand island, so that any gravel, cement, bitumen, or anything else to be used on the island has to be taken there. The logistics of getting something to the island are difficult and the cost is astronomical.

The problem of controlling people on the island is one that exercises the minds of those who live there. Camping is one of the major concerns. Along the eastern coast from Eurong north right up to Sandy Cape, is an area of vacant Crown land about a half-mile wide. The only place where that is not so is where the national park comes down onto the beach. From Happy Valley to Eurong is about 11 miles of vacant Crown land. From Happy Valley north to the national park border is about 9½ miles, and from Waddy Point to Sandy Cape, 18 miles, with a small section just south of Indian Head, extending about four miles.

Anybody can do anything on this vacant Crown land. That is the problem with the place. The Lands Department's branch office is in Bundaberg and it has no intention of regularly going to Fraser Island and policing the place. It has no ranger there. The Forestry Department says that it is not its business and it has no rangers policing this area. It is out of the jurisdiction of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The problem is that nobody at all polices it.

Somebody could add up those areas of vacant Crown land and ask why we want to control people there. I invite honourable members and the critics of control to go and have a look.

During the August school holidays I spent a little time on the island. I was appalled at what some campers are doing. I saw the destruction that they are perpetrating and the mess that they are leaving behind. I refer to some campers, not all campers. Most of the campers who go there are clean and tidy and have consideration for the people who will follow them. The problem concerns sanitary conditions, and something must be done.

I have asked that the local authorities approach the Lands Department to see if the dedication of "vacant Crown land" can be changed to "recreation and camping reserve" so that they would have control over it. I understand that the Mines Department has vetoed that suggestion. I cannot imagine why it would want to do that and I hope that the committee that is to meet soon will be able to investigate the position thoroughly.

There is an urgent need—I repeat "urgent need"—for camping grounds to be set up on Fraser Island. People who have visited the island over recent years would rather not have a regulated camping ground and I can understand why. But they recognise that if the beauty of the island is to be maintained, some control must be introduced. We look to the areas of camping to be set aside and I hope that the Government might even accept the suggestion that private enterprise could enter into an agreement with it to run a camping ground as a commercial proposition that would satisfy people, would fit in environmentally with the island and would satisfy the need to control the people.

People are also concerned about the practice of visitors bringing their domestic pets—their cats and dogs—with them. When some people go on holidays, they want to take the whole household with them—and perhaps my wife is a little like that, too. The problem is that the cats and dogs, when they are taken to the island, may run wild. We have all heard of the problem of the feral cat in the national parks and forestry areas of Queensland. As eminent a person as Harry Butler, who has a very interesting wildlife series on television, has agreed that we must do something to stop these cats and dogs getting into places such as Fraser Island. We have an ideal way of stopping them because they have to be taken there by barge and surely the barge owners could be prevailed upon to stop people from taking animals to places such as this. There is no doubt that we must have some sort of control over the people going to the island.

This applies also to unregistered vehicles. There is no excuse—I repeat "no excuse"—for having such a vehicle on Fraser Island

at all. But there is a problem with policing their use. Everyone wants to pass it on to someone else. This is a remote area but about 40,000 to 45,000 people visit it each year. It is difficult to get to the island and the adventure of going across in the barge is something that I hope will continue. But the Government must recognise that, as long as five departments have their fingers in the pie, something must be done about organising their activities.

(Time expired.)

EFFECT ON THE COMMUNITY OF GOVERNMENT TAXING POLICIES

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (12.11 p.m.): I wish to speak on Government taxing policies and their effect on the community in general and small businesses in particular.

Small business, from the streetside pie-stall to the small corner mixed business, is subject to adverse fluctuations as a result of Government decisions. It is the victim of unemployment and the casualty of excessive taxes, high interest charges, restricted borrowing and consumer uncertainty.

Pay-roll tax is a levy upon not only employment but also employers who reward diligence and productivity by paying higher wages. If an employer pays his workers more, the Government takes more in pay-roll tax. Since this tax, initiated in 1941, was transferred from Commonwealth to State jurisdiction in September 1971, the rate has doubled from 2.5 to 5 per cent.

In Queensland, following the conversion, revenue collections from this source have risen from \$39,400,000 in 1971-72 to an estimated \$192,300,000 in the financial year just ended. In fact, with the release this morning of one of the Auditor-General's reports those figures need amendment, because I am informed that the revenue from pay-roll tax was \$195,300,000, which is \$3,000,000 more than the Budget forecast. Obviously some of the suggestions about tax reductions in Queensland in the last 12 months are not true. I might add that the anticipated increase last financial year was 13.7 per cent, despite some relaxation of exemption limits.

The Liberal and National Parties are, in fact, drawing from relatively low-populated Queensland only \$55,000,000 less than the Federal Government gathered throughout Australia in 1970-71, its last complete year of control. There are small businesses that are suffering a loss and are forced to borrow money to pay the National-Liberal Government its usury tax. In country areas firms have been hounded—often fined—by Government inspectors when, through inflation, their wage bills innocently strayed within its range.

I do not pretend that this tax can be cast aside overnight, but Labor believes there must be a complete revision, and

our economic planning committee is already engaged in its own inquiry. In the interests of job creation, exemption limits from pay-roll tax must be both adequate and indexed. Labor will, as part of its 20-point job generating plan, wipe aside for a year collection of the tax on each new additional employee.

We must look at means of rebating this levy in relation to apprentices' wages. State Government legislation in 1975 prevented degrouping of employees for pay-roll tax purposes and, frankly, too few appreciate the financial effect this decision has on many small business concerns. Last Thursday a businessman associated with four modest companies told me that since those degrouping provisions applied his tax bill had grown from \$4,400 a year to \$12,900, despite a decrease of nine in work numbers. The Liberal and National Parties might talk of cuts, but in many cases by a slick change of rules they have arranged to collect much more. Pay-roll tax is also collected on the 17.5 per cent holiday loading and sick leave.

Employers involved in State Government contracts must wait 90 days for payment, but the same State National-Liberal Government permits them only seven days to meet their pay-roll tax commitments.

The Treasurer cynically describes this as a window and chimney tax. He is prepared to climb through the window and down the chimney of Queensland small-business houses to collect it to the final cent and to the last employee. In fact yesterday at the retailers' convention on the Gold Coast I was told by a number of small businessmen that when they write to him on pay-roll tax matters he rarely answers their letters.

Having dealt briefly with pay-roll tax, let me now pass further into the endless variety of taxes and charges applied to our daily living cost structures. I deal first with Queensland and State revenue collections. According to Treasury Budget predictions in the 12 months to 30 June this year, an expected \$4,300,000 will come from State transport licences and permits; \$19,900,000 from liquor; \$5,600,000 from traffic and \$760,000 from auctioneers and agents.

Land taxes will retrieve an anticipated \$12,000,000; stamp duties, \$103,700,000; death duties, irrespective of their abolition, \$25,500,000; tote and betting taxes, \$14,700,000; bookmakers' turnover tax, \$4,700,000; and the soccer pools tax, \$1,000,000. Those figures are only Queensland and State financial receipts.

Let me move now to last month's Federal Budget and projected income returns for 1977-78, which are calculated on a nation-wide basis.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: The soccer pools are an option, though.

Mr. BURNS: It is a tax and it is collected out of the people's pockets. From income taxation throughout Australia the Commonwealth plans to grab an extra \$1,832 million, and there are no options. The Commonwealth plans to obtain \$307,000,000 more from excise duties and \$215,000,000 more from sales tax, which is charged on such items as workers' clothes, the articles they buy for their wives and even the things they buy for their children. The Commonwealth will also obtain an additional \$174,000,000 from company tax.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. BURNS: Yes, people living in country areas pay sales tax on freight. They pay Queensland Railway Department freight charges, and then sales tax is calculated on the price of the item, including freight, when it reaches country areas. The Commonwealth will also receive an additional \$163,000,000 more from customs charges. The pay-as-you-earn income tax levy this financial year, regardless of pretence of reductive reforms, will rise from \$610 per head of population in 1976-77 to an anticipated \$707.

No matter where Queenslanders may look, where they live or work, or where or how they spend—the consumptive, investitive and productive viability of their earnings is being sapped by bureaucratic impositions of the Liberal-National State and Federal Governments.

I have touched just a sample of the more easily identified State and Federal charges. If we glance further to local authorities we see general rates and water rates. There is in many shires even a penalty on toilet pedestals. I need not mention that electricity rates are soon to rise again; that rail freights have risen twice since 1974; that there were three increases in home interest charges last year and that petrol prices are due to rise 11c a gallon inside 12 months.

For small business, in addition to pay-roll tax, which I named, and numerous other taxes and charges, there are the hidden but nevertheless increasing costs of other factors, one of which is workers' compensation, the charges for which have been increased rather savagely by this Government. Today Queensland has a tax-saturated society in which some businessmen refuse expansion because it means no more than extra problems without income; in which workers are unwilling to take overtime because taxation makes it not worth-while and in which businesses reject new business because they cannot handle the problems and cost of coping with it.

Now let us turn to some of the other problems of small business. I start with availability of finance. It is unrealistic to expect most small businesses, particularly in current economic circumstances, to fund expansion

or improvements from retained profits. Likewise, many lack the access to reasonable interest loans that are open to larger industrial concerns. In New South Wales the State Labor Government is negotiating with private banks on a scheme of guaranteeing loans to small businesses in difficulty. The A.L.P.'s economic planning committee is investigating the feasibility of a similar plan in Queensland.

Small-business guarantee programmes operate in Canada and South Australia, where experience shows less than 1 per cent of loans have been lost. On this basis, a Government could sponsor loans totalling \$100,000,000 if prepared to risk forfeiture of only \$1,000,000. Savings from prevention of business collapses and sustained employment would, I believe, more than compensate for any losses incurred.

From availability of finance I move to excessive taxation and high unemployment. The prosperity of small business is reliant on consumer demand. It is futile to ask people to go forth and spend while the shadow of unemployment hangs over the community and while the real value of pay packets is diminished through over-taxation before they are opened. I believe there must be a reduction in not only direct but also indirect taxes and a reduction in interest rates, which have risen three times since the Liberal-National parties found them unacceptably high in 1975.

In regard to unemployment, emphasis in Government thinking must shift from relief to job creation. In Queensland Labor proposes a 20-point plan which will do something to create these jobs.

Earlier this year it was said—

"If each of our 190,000 small businesses put just one worker off tomorrow, the country would be in chaos: if they put just two workers on, we would have virtually no unemployment."

They are not going to do that without a lead from the Government. To that degree, small business is the barometer of our prosperity and the measure of our ability, in a country flushed with natural advantages, to provide adequate jobs for all who seek them inside our work-force. Maybe there is no instant cure to some of small businesses' problems, but I would welcome the opportunity to hear and discuss them.

Labor's economic planning committee at present is studying the repercussions of pay-roll tax. I invite opinions and suggestions from small business representatives throughout Queensland.

Our door is open to all who feel they can contribute. I can guarantee that when they write a letter to the Labor Party in this State, unlike the Treasurer, we will answer it. We will be prepared to talk and listen to them and to try to assist them in overcoming their problems.

PROGRESS IN HOUSING AND EDUCATION
WORKS, BELMONT; LABOR'S ECONOMIC
POLICIES

Mr. BYRNE (Belmont) (12.20 p.m.): When I was elected to this Parliament almost three years ago, I raised certain matters and chose certain areas of my electorate that were of particular concern to me and mentioned to this Parliament that it was my desire to see them improved. At that time I concentrated chiefly on the maintenance of Housing Commission homes and the maintenance and improvement of State schools and Government buildings in my electorate.

Under members who represented the electorate before me, the expenditure on Housing Commission homes, schools and colleges was exceptionally low. Today, however, I am able to say that in the last couple of years, while I have been the member for the area, there has been an expenditure of somewhere between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000 on the maintenance of Housing Commission homes, and that on the development and expansion of schools, colleges and technical colleges in my area there has been an expenditure of somewhere in the region of \$4,000,000.

I think that this indicates that the Government took note of what I said and became aware of the problems in the area that I represent and the need to rectify them. Let me quote from what I said in 1975—

"It is my hope that in years to come we will see a much-needed improvement and more concern shown to the areas of older Housing Commission homes in the realisation that those homes and the people who live within them are entitled to the same circumstances, the same standards, the same rights and equalities and the same improvements as the people who find themselves living in the newer Housing Commission homes."

The fact of life is that there are no newer Housing Commission homes in my electorate; but, indeed, there is, and has been, a necessity to raise the existing homes to a standard that is in accord with the standards of the people who live in them.

Mr. Lee: We have spent \$11,700,000 on renovations and alterations.

Mr. BYRNE: The Minister informs me that his department has spent \$11,700,000 on improvements and renovations to Housing Commission homes. I might say that that shows a very vast change from the decisions of Governments in the past under former Ministers to a concentration on the importance of maintenance and the raising of standards of Housing Commission homes to show that the people in them are actually considered to be worthwhile citizens, people for whom the Government cares and whose circumstances it wishes to improve.

Mr. Lee: It is because of your representations.

Mr. BYRNE: The Minister flatters me by saying that it is because of my representations. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that on one occasion just after my election to Parliament there were some very heated words when I made certain representations and complaints about the very poor standing of Housing Commission homes in my electorate and the very poor standing of the maintenance of the schools in my area—the bad furniture that they had, the uncarpeted floors, the lack of painting. I received a letter in reply—I do not know whether it was an attempt to keep me quiet, but I did not appreciate it very much—and I wrote back in more substantial terms and in a far more fiery and a far more critical way, and we began to see results. I inform the Minister that the people in my area are very appreciative of the great expenditure that the Government has made in the area that I represent and are looking forward to the continuation of that maintenance and also an improvement of it well into the future.

The people in the schools in the area—the Cavendish Road High School, Belmont State School, Carina State School, Mayfield State School and Seville Road State School—are very appreciative of the work that has been done. Admittedly, at times we would like to see things happen more quickly, but I think that the changes that have occurred in those schools, and in many other schools in the State, over the past three years, are probably the most significant and swiftest that we have seen for many years. It is an important consideration for us to realise that the present Minister for Works and Housing has given very appropriate priority to seeing not only that the standards are high in the new schools and the new Housing Commission homes that are built—and that is a very clear circumstance—but also that there is a continued fight to see that the maintenance of the older schools and the older Housing Commission homes is brought up to a level similar to that which has prevailed elsewhere.

At this stage I should like to comment on some of the remarks of the previous speaker. The conclusions we can draw from the comments of the Leader of the Opposition about small businesses and taxation is that honourable members on that side are continuing to say the same thing. They say, "We intend to decrease direct taxation and indirect taxation, but at the same time increase expenditure on capital works and allocations for employment-creating opportunities." If the Leader of the Opposition were honest in his statements to this Parliament and to the people of Queensland, he would have to say that, in order to provide more money for capital works to relieve unemployment, taxes would have to be increased. He would have to concede that taxes would have to be heavier or that less money would be available for employment-producing opportunities of a capital nature.

He cannot have it both ways; it is one or the other. He tries to ignore that fact, and tries to dupe the public into believing the very things that Whitlam told them. Whitlam said, "We will fix inflation." He fixed it all right—from $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to nearly 20 per cent! He said, "We will fix unemployment." He fixed that, too! He said so many things. He made the sort of promises that the Leader of the Opposition is making in this place now about taxation. He said, "We will bring down your direct and indirect taxes." During the three years Mr. Whitlam was in Government we saw income tax rise by 127 per cent. What an increase during the term of the person who said, "Taxes are too high."

Now we have the Leader of the Opposition in this place saying, "State taxes and charges should be reduced." At the same time he says that we should be increasing our expenditure in areas of capital works. I am sure that the public is not going to be so foolish as to accept this second attempt to dupe them into thinking that they can be given everything without having to have anything taken from them in the first place.

The Leader of the Opposition chooses not to concentrate on the fact that Queensland has the best situation in Australia with payroll tax, that Queensland has been able to abolish probate and succession duty, and that generally the taxation circumstance under this Government is the best that any person in any State in Australia is able to live under. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition does not think that that is good enough. Not only does he say that it is not good enough, but he says, "We are going to try to improve it." That is what Whitlam tried to do. Labor's way of improving things, with its lack of expertise and experience in Government, was the end of economic stability in this nation. I hope that the people of Queensland will realise that—I am certain they will—and come to a realisation that a Labor Government in Queensland would mean not lower direct or indirect taxes, but rather greater taxes both direct and indirect. A Labor Government in this State would not show greater concern for the individual; rather would it show greater concern to take into the stranglehold of Government more power, with fewer freedoms and fewer rights.

It is most important that we reflect on the fact that in the last three years the Queensland Government has been able to allocate enormous expenditure to the maintenance of Housing Commission homes, the construction of new homes, low-interest loans to home builders and the maintenance and expansion of the education system in schools and technical colleges. We have been able to achieve all these things without having the increase in taxation that Whitlam seemed to think he needed—127 per cent in personal income tax over a three-year period.

Mr. Lee: We have also given people the right to own their own home.

Mr. BYRNE: I am pleased the Minister mentioned that.

Under Whitlam we had to fight to have 30 per cent of the houses made available for purchase by people. The other 70 per cent had to be rental houses. Fortunately, this Government has an absolute concern to see that people are able to achieve the security of their own home, so that they do not create a depressed society. As I have said on many occasions, the A.L.P. seems to want a depressed society. A.L.P. members think that a depressed society means votes for them. Therefore in order to try to keep those votes, they do not try to improve society but, instead, try to keep it depressed. The philosophy of the honourable member for Archerfield is a good example of that.

I am pleased to have been able to inform the House about the maintenance of Housing Commission homes and schools in my electorate. I am also pleased to have had the opportunity to throw up the weaknesses and confabulations of the Leader of the Opposition.

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JONES (Cairns) (12.30 p.m.): Without doubt, any Government—be it State or Federal—which ignores northern development will be electorally disadvantaged in the North. The aims of both Governments should be to attract developmental capital to the North (with, perhaps, electoral advantage in train), but they have not been.

The people of North Queensland have been let down badly by Governments of the day. A policy of accelerated development of the region which is desirable for stability, ought to have been potentially attractive, but we in North Queensland have become disenchanted with the inept attitudes of both the Federal and State Governments and their total lack of effort. The State Government particularly has thumbed its nose at North Queensland, while the Federal Government has become arrogant towards the needs of the North. Any Government, either State or Federal, which ignores northern development is at risk. No doubt the present position has been influenced by over-representation of the area north of the Tropic of Capricorn by Government members in both the State and Federal spheres. Both Governments have failed to heed or have become blasé about the requirements of the Far North and the North. They are considered to be second-class areas populated, it is contended, by second-class citizens. Apparently the policies of these Governments, with their inflated northern representation, militate against expenditure on projects of major importance. Do they unrealistically truly believe that they have the northerners sewn

up? The tame-cat Government politicians from the North make precious little effort to alter the situation. Governments of the day describe their approach as even-handed, but by northern standards we get nothing more than the big "A".

The political realities are that this northern region, rich as it is in resources—pastoral, agricultural and mineral—is bled white in true colonial style by drawing off its products and carting them away to the South or overseas for use in manufacturing.

No secondary industry is to be found in Far North Queensland and it does not look as if any secondary industries will be developed there. Nothing commensurate with the contribution we make to both the State and the national economies is being given back to us.

On analysing what the North contributes, I would say that we contribute more than any other sector in Australia to the national economy, yet we suffer the worst unemployment rate in Australia. No attempt has been made by any Government to lower the cost of living, which is a major burden in northern areas. No genuine purpose has been followed by Governments of the day to decide measures or to initiate studies and investigations to achieve the objectives that northerners believe are necessary to the development and promotion of the area. Such objectives are essential to the continuing accelerated development of North Queensland for the betterment and welfare of its citizens. The challenge has not been taken up by either the Federal or the State Government.

The potential for developing the tourist industry is virtually untapped and is left to private individuals with limited funds to exploit. The vast run-off of our northern water resources has been ignored. About 60 per cent of the total run-off of water from the Australian mainland is discharged by rivers in northern Australia. In a land of insufficient water and limited growth and stability, the appraisal of the long-term potential of multi-purpose water development in major river basins has been side-stepped or bypassed. No response to the potential of the hydroelectric resource has been forthcoming. It has been shelved or abandoned.

It is clear that no Government should be commanded to develop the North—and no reasonable northerner expects that—but surely there is a degree of help and assistance that northerners can expect. This area, with a population equal to that of Tasmania, certainly does not get the same consideration as that given to the island State on the national plane.

Surely help is due; but is it not forthcoming. All we as northerners seek are an equity and a fair go. We would not expect our products to be processed in full measure

in the North. Nor would we expect them all to be taken to the southern States and overseas, where secondary industries are developed around our primary products. We would not expect rail freights to be upped by 60 per cent. On the contrary, we would expect them to be cut back by 10 per cent to encourage development in Far North Queensland. Our bauxite and silica sands are being mined; our timber is freighted out for milling. Our sugar is sent off to the South, while we in Far North Queensland pay higher prices for refined sugar, which has been grown at our back door, than those in the capital cities of Hobart and Perth. Our roads, to quote the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, are the worst in the world. To highlight our position and to make the comparison complete—our television programmes that are produced in North Queensland are in black and white.

Recently Mr. Whitlam, who was travelling by road from Brisbane to Townsville, had to respond nationally in the uranium debate. He couldn't do it from Townsville, which did not have facilities for colour telecasting; he had to be flown back to the south-east corner of the State—back to Brisbane—to appear on T.V. on an item of national importance. Our own shows produced in the North, such as the local news, "Points North", "Countryman" and the coverage of the Foley Shield matches, are televised in black and white. None of them are telecast in colour by the A.B.C. But this is typical of the treatment meted out to us in Far North Queensland. It is witnessed every day.

Anyone who really wants to know about the neglect of the North should travel by road from the New South Wales border up to Normanton.

Mr. Casey: And travel at people level.

Mr. JONES: Yes, not like the Ministers, who trip around in an aeroplane. Let us get down to where the people are and see how the people travel every day.

On the road to the Gold Coast a six-lane highway passes the house of the Minister for Main Roads at Oxenford. However, on the road going across from Georgetown to Normanton the bitumen runs out at Gilbert River and in an isolated spot where there is a railway line between Normanton and Croydon is another patch of bitumen. One would think that the bitumen would continue on from Gilbert River to Croydon on the beef road or tourist road, or whatever it might be called, and that it would then continue on from Croydon to Normanton. Those places are isolated in the wet, and for months at a time.

At Kurumba, where export earnings derive from our fishing and prawning industry, what do we see? There is not even a decent access road between Normanton and Kurumba. At question-time in the House

the other day the member for Mackay was told that nothing has been done on that road since 1975. In politics, 1975 is synonymous with the demise of the Labor Government.

I asked a question about dredging the Cairns Harbour. We have to wait for the "Sir Thomas Hiley" to become available so that we can dredge our own harbour. We are turning ships away, to the detriment of our commerce and industry. Look at petrol prices. We in Far North Queensland have to empty our wallets to fill our tanks. Yesterday tobacco growers in Mareeba were being chased off their farms because imported tobacco is used in our cigarettes.

Mr. Casey: Some of it comes from Rhodesia, through Korea.

Mr. JONES: Yes, from all over the place except Australia.

(Time expired.)

INTEGRITY OF EDITORIAL STAFF, "TOWNSVILLE DAILY BULLETIN"; UNEMPLOYMENT, NORTH QUEENSLAND

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (12.40 p.m.): I have heard a lot of things in my time but I do not think I have ever heard such a deplorable instance of casuistry—I cannot say "plain downright lying"—as the speech by the honourable member for Cairns. However, I do not have the time today to say more about that.

Let me deal with the hub of the universe—Townsville. It might sound strange coming from me, but I want to pay a tribute to the Press in Townsville. As everybody knows, "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" was for many years the stodgiest old Tory paper this side of the black stump. Today, it has become A.L.P.-oriented. In fact, it is not much better than an A.L.P. broadsheet. Nevertheless those who are in charge of it—its editorial staff—still have a sense of personal decency and a sense of journalistic ethics.

Quite recently I have had a Press controversy through the columns of that newspaper with the A.L.P. mayor of Townsville (Percy Tucker). We all know how Percy Tucker conducts a controversy. He does not quote any facts or put forward any argument. Instead, he launches into perhaps the most scurrilous, detestable and contemptible splurges of personal vilification that one can think of.

If anybody here is foul-minded enough to read them, I shall bring down with me next week the many statements—I think four of them—that Percy Tucker sent to the editor of "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" in the hope that he would print them in reply to statements that I had made. But to his eternal credit, all that he would print of the shocking things that he obtained from Percy Tucker was some snippets.

Percy Tucker probably received the material from his publicity officer. It costs the rate-payers of Townsville \$100,000 a year for the publicity officer for the A.L.P. Townsville City Council. It does not cost Rex Pilbeam 1c in Rockhampton. He does his own public relations work, as do nearly all of the other provincial city mayors.

The newspaper published only snippets of those statements. Finally, when I had run Percy into a corner—it is simple to get him into a corner, of course—he said, in effect: "I am going to take retaliatory action that will blast the honourable member for Townsville South here, there and everywhere." The newspaper asked, "What are you going to do?" This was all published. Percy Tucker said, "I am not going to tell you. It is a secret. I have a secret weapon." I am now waiting to hear about the mayor's secret weapon to deal with me.

I pay "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" a tribute at least for that. It is A.L.P.-oriented but at least it had sufficient journalistic ethics and personal decency to absolutely refuse to print 90 per cent of the filth and muck that Percy Tucker sent to it. As I said, I have a full copy of all of it.

Let me now deal with the remarks of the honourable member for Cairns. It is true that there is some unemployment in North Queensland, but a person has to go a long way to find it. A fellow who advertises in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" complained to that newspaper that, although he is advertising daily for people, he cannot get them.

Let us be frank in our remarks about unemployment in North Queensland. As I said, there is an unemployment problem in North Queensland, but the unemployed are mainly hippies, no-hopers and dead-beats who are nearly all concentrated in the area represented by the honourable member for Cairns and neighbouring areas. People should go to the Tableland where I have been and to Cairns where I go fairly regularly and see the hordes of these people, communities of them—"communes" as they call them. They are scruffy, dirty and stinking and, naturally are smoking pot.

Quite recently I was in Cairns at the trial of the three policemen charged over the Cedar Bay affair. Bear in mind—and this is something that the people of North Queensland will never forget—that to a man the A.L.P. in this House came out strongly, viciously and venomously against the police. Even after the case was over and the three policemen were found not guilty, the honourable member for Rockhampton—the A.L.P. shadow Minister for Justice in this House—said he was going to again raise the matter of the way the police brutalised these unfortunate people.

I went to Cairns to see them. I was at the Supreme Court in Cairns when the trial was being conducted very fairly and efficiently by Mr. Justice Kneipp. I did not see

these hippies naked outside the court, as they were at Cedar Bay, but I saw the fellow against whom evidence was given that when he was approached at Cedar Bay he was clad in a little T-shirt that reached not as far as his dingle-dangle. His girl-friend was completely naked, dirty and smelly. This fellow was sitting on a log rubbing pig-fat into suppurating sores in his groin. He was only one of hundreds there. Yet he was supported every inch of the way by the A.L.P., including the honourable member for Cairns. He cannot deny that.

Let us now look at some other matters in the hub of the universe—Townsville. We saw from the Minister's answer to my question this morning how much the A.L.P. is doing to remove the stain of unemployment in the North. We heard about the amount of money that Labor Investments has at its disposal, but not one cent has been spent in any way to relieve unemployment. Anybody who cares to get the O.K. from the honourable member for Archerfield can go to Labor Investments and borrow as much money as he needs for the purpose of setting up a brothel, massage parlour or lumber joint. But no-one can obtain money from Labor Investments to establish a decent industry in North Queensland.

Mr. Burns: We have a quarter of a million in the T.V. station in North Queensland.

Mr. AIKENS: In which T.V. station?

Mr. Burns: The one in Townsville.

Mr. AIKENS: In Channel 7?

Mr. Burns: The one in Townsville.

Mr. AIKENS: That's the only commercial station in Townsville.

Mr. Burns: We have a quarter of a million in it. How much have you invested in it?

Mr. AIKENS: More than you have. What is more, I have provided for the Leader of the Opposition because I have money invested in the Townsville crematorium. I was only hoping that when he was in Townsville recently he might have given us some business.

We are told that Townsville is in the grip of unemployment; that it is decaying and disintegrating. Yet hardly a week passes in which the noble physiognomy of Mr. Percy Tucker does not appear in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin", the A.L.P. paper, with a report of the opening of a new industry, shop, office or other undertaking. Every time Percy Tucker opens a new undertaking, which he does sometimes more than once a week, he pays a tribute to the way in which Townsville is booming.

Townsville is the second-fastest-growing city in Australia. It already has a population of nearly 100,000 and, thanks to the efficiency of the police and the fact that neither I nor the honourable members for Townsville and Townsville West will back hippies, no-hopers and dead-beats, one can walk the streets of Townsville without finding any of these types. But go further north and one will find armies of them.

Neither the A.L.P. nor Percy Tucker can have it both ways. Mr. Tucker cannot tell people at opening ceremonies how Townsville is progressing and expanding and at the same time sing the old song of desolation and decay in North Queensland.

Whilst I am on my feet I want to pay a tribute to the Premier and the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport for what they did in the case of the two dismissed railwaymen. That was something that had to be done. I saw the Minister for Transport and the Premier, and, as a result, the situation has been relieved. I hope that sooner or later the Government will go the full distance.

Never at any time did any A.L.P. branch come out in defence of those two railwaymen. The Leader of the Opposition always reminds me of a globule of mercury. I recall from my days of studying physics that the moment one tries to put a finger on a globule of mercury it will shoot here, there and everywhere. That reminds me of the Leader of the Opposition. The moment anyone tries to put a finger on him or attempts to pin him down on any subject, he shoots off at a tangent. So it was with the issue of the railwaymen. Not one member of the A.L.P. officially supported them.

Recently the Leader of the Opposition was in Townsville for a week and during that time there was little in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" but photographs of the Leader of the Opposition, his attractive wife and young daughter. They were real "Tom Burns" editions. Of course, the A.B.C. drove us mad. Everybody knows that the "B" in A.B.C. in Queensland stands for Burns. So we copped it all the time he was there. Finally he went away. He did nothing while he was there except, I think, promise some workers out at some place or other that he would build rose-bordered concrete pathways to the la-la.

(Time expired.)

ELECTRICAL TRADES UNION TAKE-OVER OF
PARLIAMENTARY LABOR PARTY; LEADER OF
THE OPPOSITION

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (12.50 p.m.): The matter of public interest I wish to pursue here today is one which I first raised just two weeks ago when I referred to the internal strife within the Labor Party, and particularly

the increase in influence of the Electrical Trades Union within the Labor movement and its influence over the Parliamentary Labor Party.

I am interested to see the two men involved fleeing from the Chamber when I rise to speak. The Leader of the Opposition is scurrying out of the Chamber like a mongrel dog because he does not want to hear what I have to say about how his Trades Hall bosses are currently standing over him. He can listen on the loudspeaker back in his office and hear exactly what I have to say about him and some of his organisation bosses. Of course, he won't have the problem of being seen to blush as he would if he remained in the Chamber.

A fortnight ago I mentioned the increasing influence of the Electrical Trades Union over the Parliamentary Labor Party and how they were endeavouring at this coming election to increase their influence with the endorsement of the candidate Warburton in Sandgate and the notorious Ken Vaughan in the seat of Nudgee. Of course, I pointed out how they will be disappointed because they have no hope of winning either of those seats. But nevertheless that is their intention.

The speech that I made was reported widely in the Press and I notice that a young journalist, Mr. Denis Reinhardt, who is the Brisbane correspondent for the "Nation Review", has very astutely followed the matter up in his newspaper. The latest edition of "Nation Review" points out how Mr. Burns was disappointed and had such little say in the recent series of endorsements carried out on 8 August by the Queensland Central Executive of the Labor Party. Mr. Reinhardt's article reads—

"On Monday 8 August the state central executive of the Labor party met to select candidates for new state seats created by the redistribution. Burns supported a Brisbane barrister Lew Wyvill for the seat of Chatsworth, and Brothers football club past president Frank Mellit for Brisbane—both non machine people.

"Instead two lacklustre candidates sponsored by Hooper and former assistant state secretary Bob Gibbs were selected."

Of course, these two lacklustre candidates are Brian Davis, the former member for Brisbane, who was the mouthpiece for the Transport Workers' Union in this Parliament, and a man named Mackenroth, who also has a Trades Hall connection. The article continues—

"At eleven the following morning, Burns called Hooper" (the man who organised the selection of these candidates) "to his office to tell him that he was to take up the shadow treasury. He would swap his present housing portfolio with deputy leader Jack Houston.

"In the stand-up row that followed, Hooper told Burns that he didn't know a thing about treasury and was given the impression that that was all the better."

Of course, we have had demonstrated in this Chamber just how little the honourable member for Archerfield does know about Treasury matters. Since Mr. Reinhardt pointed this out in his article, I noticed that this morning the Leader of the Opposition was prompted to rise in his place and deliver a speech on Treasury matters to try to recover some of the ground that has been lost by the dismal performance of the member for Archerfield over the past couple of weeks since he took over the responsibility for Treasury matters. The Leader of the Opposition read a screed on taxation in this State prepared by some of his friends at the university to try to make up some of the lost ground. It is reported, and I must refrain from repeating the words used in the newspaper, that a violent exchange of words took place between the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Archerfield. Shouting was heard throughout the corridors of Parliament House and, indeed, indecent language passed between the two of them on the subject of who would be the Treasury spokesman. The members of this desperate party that must face an election in several weeks' time are still fighting among themselves, using obscenities, abusing each other in the hallways and offices of this building to sort out who will be the spokesman on Treasury matters in this place, and even then they have made a dismal choice.

Anyway, poor Mr. Hooper had two days' notice to prepare a speech for the first Appropriation Bill of this session. We heard it delivered, and it was a pretty poor effort. I do not blame him for that. As he pointed out, he does not know anything about Treasury matters. Of course, he was the best that the Leader of the Opposition could find among the very dismal team of A.L.P. members in this Chamber.

If honourable members know anything about the Australian Labor Party in this State, they know that in recent years it has been reduced to an opportunist party in the hands of the Trades Hall bosses, who trade off endorsements among themselves. They allocate the number of endorsements that each one of the heavies at the Trades Hall will hand out to the lackeys within his own union. That, of course, is why the Australian Workers' Union has had trouble in gaining reaffiliation with the Australian Labor Party in Queensland, why impossible conditions have been placed in its path, and I am pleased that Mr. Reinhardt alluded to it in his article. If the A.W.U., with its numerical strength of delegates, were to reaffiliate with the Australian Labor Party, it would expect its share of plum endorsements for its party hacks, also. That would mean that there would be fewer plum endorsements to go round for the Neal Kanes of this world, and fewer plum endorsements for Arch Bevis to hand out to people like Brian Davis. That is why the A.W.U. was so sound in the years in which it was

affiliated with the Australian Labor Party. It demanded its pound of flesh—its number of endorsements—and the people at the Trades Hall know very well that if the A.W.U. reaffiliated, it would again want them.

Mr. Burns, as Leader of the Opposition, may well be able to fulfil the needs of his party bosses as the political leader of the Labor Party if all they demand is that he appear on television almost every day of his life as an instant expert on everything—he seems to know more about everything than the Encyclopaedia Britannica even pretends to know—and if they are content to listen to his boring rhetoric. So often we have heard him say, 'We have a situation here where such-and-such exists.' He dreams up a hypothetical situation, comments on the situation that he has created in his own mind, and then proceeds to attack the Government and provide answers to his own questions. If they are content with such a man to lead their party machine, then Mr. Burns will stay in that role for a very long time.

However, what I am concerned about, and what I know my colleagues and the responsible journalists who witness the proceedings of Parliament so closely and follow the utterances in this Chamber so closely are concerned about, is the inadequacy of Mr. Burns as a leader of an Opposition on the floor of the Parliament. In the formal, constitutional sense, he just does not measure up in this place. He is not a parliamentary leader in any sense. Sure, he is all right round the back streets of this town or giving a two-second interview or a 30-second interview on television. He is not too bad at that, if you like that sort of thing. But as a parliamentary leader to match the Government on the floor of Parliament in the full formal, constitutional and traditional sense, he just does not measure up. He is a flop, and he is a flop in every sense.

Honourable members know how often Jack Houston has to save him from situations that he gets himself into in this Chamber, and how many mistakes he has made in respect of Standing Orders. I doubt whether he has even read Standing Orders, because he tumbles and falls over the procedures of the House so often on the rare occasions on which he is here. He frequently is absent from the Chamber, and the criticism that I make of Mr. Burns is that he is not a parliamentary leader on the floor of Parliament—he is ineffectual as the Leader of the Opposition in opposing the Leader of the Government. That is where he does not measure up; that is where he falls down. This will be recognised by the public at large and by the journalists who watch these proceedings. Gough Whitlam in his worst days was still a parliamentarian in the true sense. He knew the procedures; he knew the strategies to adopt on the floor of Parliament. Mr. Burns does not even pretend to understand them. I suggest that the main reason

for that is that he has no respect for Parliament; he discounts it; it is quite superfluous to what he sees as his political needs. Indeed, if he ever became the leader of the Government in this place he probably would not call Parliament together at all; he would be frightened he couldn't handle it.

(Time expired.)

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

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport), by leave, without notice: I move—

"That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would otherwise prevent the immediate initiation in Committee of the Whole House of a Bill intituled a Bill to amend the Traffic Act 1949-1977 in certain particulars and for an incidental purpose; and the passing of such Bill through all its stages in one day."

Motion agreed to.

TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (2.17 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Traffic Act 1949-1977 in certain particulars and for an incidental purpose."

The purpose of this Bill is to provide for a speedy procedure for appeals against the refusal of a District Superintendent of Traffic to issue a permit for the holding of a street meeting or a procession. The present provisions of section 57 of the Traffic Act are appropriate to questions relating to drivers' licences or drivers' permits, but the position is not clear as to the procedure which should be adopted in respect of an appeal against a decision by a District Superintendent of Traffic to refuse a permit for a street meeting or a procession.

I must stress at this stage that nothing in the Bill is intended to take away the right of people, no matter how small their number, from congregating or gathering to express dissent on any issue whatsoever, but the community looks to the Government to ensure that in expressing such dissent nothing should occur to affect the rights of other people to travel on the streets or move about

on their lawful business. There is an obligation on the Government to give protection to the general public, who are entitled to have full, free and unfettered use of our streets and footpaths.

There is ample provision and many suitable locations which can be used, and have in fact been used, and will continue to be used, as places where people can gather to listen to those who have something to say on matters which could be of concern to the community. There is Centennial Park, which has long been recognised as a forum for public debate. More central still in the city area is the Roma Street Forum, which is certainly a convenient arena for public debate. Of course, if the gathering is such that the greatest area possible is needed, then, as with major events, there is always the Royal National Exhibition Ground.

Reverting to the Bill, I point out that it will provide for any person or body who feels aggrieved by the refusal of the District Superintendent of Traffic to grant a permit to convene, hold, or address a political, religious or other type of meeting, or to hold a procession on any road, to appeal to the Commissioner of Police against such refusal. In this context I am sure honourable members will realise, and I hope fully appreciate, that one of the most important roles of the Commissioner of Police is to ensure the safety of the community. While the community expects the Government to assure them of safety at all times, it must use established means for this purpose.

The Bill transfers the existing process of appeal to a magistrate to the office of Commissioner of Police on the very sound basis that the latter in the ultimate is responsible for peace and good order in the community. This particular type of appeal on the right to march or hold a street meeting is rather singular in its application from the great majority of existing appeals to a magistrate such as, and which, bear heavily upon the rights of the individual which, in many cases, have a major influence on his livelihood. Only in the light of all the facts and experience of situations which are present, which may develop, or which are likely to endanger the safety of innocent pedestrians using our streets and thoroughfares can anyone make a determination as to what is the right course to follow at a particular time. This is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Police, who must understand the concern of both the community and the Government that violence in the streets, no matter from what cause, cannot be tolerated. In this respect prevention is just as important as remedial action.

Appeals to the commissioner shall be by way of submission in writing by the person refused a permit. In addition the district superintendent shall also lodge a submission in writing as to the application for the permit.

No appeal will lie against the imposition of any condition in respect of a permit issued by a district superintendent.

It will be incumbent on the Commissioner of Police in considering an appeal against a refusal to issue a permit for a street meeting or a procession to have regard to all the facts of the case, including information supplied by or on behalf of the applicant, or by or on behalf of the district superintendent, and he may issue or refuse to issue the permit applied for as if the application had been made to him in the first instance. The decision of the commissioner will be final.

The appeal considerations rest not on the personal rights of an individual, especially in regard to his livelihood, but on the collective rights of a number of individuals who could seek, in the name of public protest, to interfere with the undoubted right of countless thousands of people to the unfettered use of streets or thoroughfares to go about their lawful business. This is not a role which, in the view of the Government, is appropriate to the existing provisions of section 57 of the Traffic Act that devolve upon a court the responsibility which, in the final analysis, must be that of our Police Force through the Commissioner of Police.

An applicant for a permit is only required to apply at least seven days prior to the date fixed for a street meeting or at least 14 days prior to the date fixed for a procession. So in many cases there would be insufficient time for an aggrieved applicant to have his appeal heard before a court. Under the provisions of the Bill the matter can be dealt with speedily by the Commissioner of Police, who would have up-to-date information available to him on all matters relevant to the application for the particular permit desired.

The position is made quite clear in the Bill, and again I emphasise that the community looks to the Government for the assurance that people can move safely on our streets and thoroughfares and that their rights to do so are not trampled on by some members of the community who would have us believe that the streets are for their purposes only, whether it be to register dissent or for any other purpose. Dissent, if it is to be expressed in a way that does not interfere with the rights of the community, must have regard to those rights.

I commend the Bill to all honourable members for earnest consideration in the light of present-day situations and problems which a duly elected Government must resolve in the interests of the people.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (2.24 p.m.): I am no longer surprised when we are brought back for a special afternoon or a few hours to rush some legislation through the Chamber. I am no longer surprised when I find that the Minister in charge of the House can come

around in the morning and say, "This afternoon we will be debating the evidence legislation and rape laws", and then find after lunch that we are debating a rather arrogant and dictatorial move to remove some rights of free speech and assembly.

It seems to me that the first thing we have to admit is that the Government has decided to use its numbers, the 69 it has in Parliament, to squash any opposition in this Parliament or outside in bringing a Bill before us—not just to debate it this afternoon and to let it lie on the table so that members of the community, the legal fraternity and others could study it and judge whether it is fair and just, whether it is impartial or otherwise. No; they don't do that at all. We have to push it through this afternoon. It is going to be put through all stages so there will be no argument in the meantime. It will be finished and complete. That is this Government's style of democracy. The argument is not about the kids in the streets; it is about how this Parliament is used.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. BURNS: I will come back to what happens in the streets and the right of assembly, but let me talk about this Parliament and the way we are being used this afternoon—the way the Government is manipulating us in the same way as it is accusing some people of wanting to manipulate the community outside. The Government is not concerned about the rights of the individual. It is not concerned about democracy or even free speech in this Parliament. The Government will use the gag when it suits it and bully this through the Chamber in any way it likes. It is reminiscent of the days of Nazi Germany or Stalin's Russia; wipe out any opposition to what you believe in and squash anyone who does not agree with you. That is what is happening today.

Let us look at this measure. It goes further than the kids who want to march in the streets, because it says "street meetings"—political meetings. It just means that in future if a commissioner decides that the Labor Party will not be allowed to have street meetings in Lytton or in Yeronga or somewhere else, there will be no right of appeal to a magistrate. There will be no right of appeal to the courts of the land on behalf of the Labor Party, the Liberal Party or any other party. If the commissioner decides, then we must appeal to the commissioner. His decision is final. He will determine which political parties will be able to campaign for the next election. He will determine whether a party can hold street meetings.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. BURNS: Isn't that what the Minister said? Didn't he say it would apply to street meetings—political meetings? Didn't he say that the decision of the commissioner was final and there would be no appeal against it?

Here we have appeals being taken out of the hands of the courts and handed over to the commissioner himself. Once a decision has been made, the appeal is from Caesar to Caesar—and the Government is saying that it can apply to political parties, to political meetings, to street meetings and to the ordinary meetings that members of the community conduct now and have conducted without any trouble since the start of the democratic system in this State.

So in the guise of concern about the people in the street, about processions and about the sanctity of the people who use the streets, the Government is providing machinery to crush anyone who does not suit its political line.

So if I apply for permission to hold a political meeting to argue about the take-over of Australian firms by foreign enterprise and the Government does not like it, it can determine that I cannot hold it. The commissioner, who is a political appointee, can determine, as a result of decisions of the Government, who can speak and who cannot speak in this State.

Look at the masthead on "The Courier-Mail", which talks about freedom of the Press and freedom of expression. Let us consider all the quotes that have been made since the days of Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights and the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. All of those things have been designed to give ordinary people an opportunity to say that they do not agree with the Government. This nation of ours was started by people who came here because they did not agree with the Government of their homeland. When they landed on this shore they said, "Is there a Government here? If so, we're agin it," because they were against the system. Why can't they be against the system? Why should those in power be allowed to say, "No-one may disagree with us, because we are in power and we have the right to say what people will do and what they will not do?"

Every day in this Parliament we see that. The Government says to the little egg producer, "You can't keep so many fowls. You will have to get rid of some of them." The Government does it to the dairy farmer and to the grain grower. It has been doing it in the name of so-called free enterprise—in the name of democracy—for some time in this Parliament.

The plain facts of the matter are that what is happening here this afternoon is a disgrace. It is a blot on the word "democracy". It is a blot on the name of parliamentary democracy when the Government can sneak a Bill into the Parliament without even having the courage to give advance notice and without the courage of letting the members of the public have a look at it before it passes through the second and third readings. The Government is not game to say to the people of Queensland, "This is what we want to do."

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. BURNS: If the honourable member for Townsville South is so right and if everybody agrees with what is in the Bill—and I haven't seen the Bill, so he must know—he is surely going to speak in favour of it. He never speaks against anything the Government does.

Mr. Aikens: I will knock you as flat as a camel's foot when I get into you.

Mr. BURNS: The honourable gentleman's ego is so great that if he wanted some morning exercise he would only have to practise jumping over it. That would be the most exercise he could get. He could keep himself slim without any worries at all. He's going to knock us as flat as a camel's foot, but he will not be talking about the ordinary old working railwayman who might be upset and decide he is going to march down the street.

Mr. Alison interjected.

Mr. BURNS: I am glad to record that the honourable member for Maryborough is laughing. I saw where the workers from Walkers Ltd. in Maryborough marched. When 70 men there got the sack as a result of the Government's mismanagement, they marched up the streets of Maryborough. The Government would like to deny them that right. The Government says that in future they cannot take such action, that that is no longer their right. The honourable member for Maryborough says that the workers from Walkers should not be allowed to march up the streets of Maryborough, that they should not be allowed to take that action when they get upset and concerned. In future, dairy farmers such as those who threw bottles at Gough Whitlam in Perth, will not be allowed to assemble in the streets. I have never objected to persons against me assembling in the streets, but Government members object to such action against them. The Government applauded the dairy farmers for taking a stand and moving into Forest Place in Perth against the Whitlam Government. The honourable member for Albert was hiring buses to transport people from the Gold Coast to Ipswich to protest against Bill Hayden. He put them in the streets.

The same Government members today are saying that they have to introduce a law because someone might be going to argue with them. This Bill is not about who marches in the streets. It will restrict not only the right to march in the streets, but also the right of assembly. In all of the pretended worry by Government members about people marching in the streets, what they are really saying is that they are going to crush dissent. They are saying, "We are going to do what the Khmer Rouge is doing in Cambodia today. We are going to do what Stalin did in Russia. We are going to do what Hitler did in Germany. Anyone

who does not agree with us will not get a permit. You will line up, take it our way, and talk our way, at our times and at our locations. If you do not like that, you will not get a permit. We will send the police out to push you off the streets." That is exactly what this legislation is all about.

Government members can say, "We don't mean that. We don't mean to go that far." But the honourable member for Toowoong will be up in his usual style. He will deliver his usual diatribe and pour out some of the viciousness and the spleen that we always hear when he gets crooked on someone who does not agree with him. But he has to remember that, with this Bill on the statute-book, somebody else who gets into Parliament might, in turn, use it against him. He might make the decision that the Liberal Party cannot hold meetings. He might decide that the honourable member cannot hold a meeting in Toowoong. While Government members are deciding at this stage that they can use it against the people they do not like, they should remember that the day might come when we will be able to use it against them. I do not like repressive legislation in any sphere.

Mr. Porter: Are there no other places? This does not stop you from holding a meeting, other than on a road.

Mr. BURNS: Yes it does.

Mr. Porter: Halls.

Mr. BURNS: I have not seen the Bill. The honourable member may have. What about political meetings? I heard the Minister speak of political meetings. Are political meetings held in halls? Does the honourable member mean to say that every candidate who wants to run against him will have to hire a hall in which to hold a meeting? If he does not have the money to hire a hall, will he not be allowed to have a meeting in Toowoong? If the local police decide that he is not to get a permit, he can hold no meeting.

Mr. Porter: Parks.

Mr. BURNS: They have to go into parks! The only parks and forums that have been provided for free speech in this State, with all of the years of conservative Government, are those provided by the Labor council in this city. Clem Jones started the Centenary Park forum for them. The forum in Roma Street was set up by the Labor Party. The Liberal councillors and the Liberal machine complained about the forum in Centenary Park and they complained about the forum in Roma Street. They ranted and raved against the City Square being used for this purpose. They stacked on all sorts of acts because they thought that possibly these public areas were places where meetings could be held and people could get together. Every time provision has been made for free speech, the Government has gone against it.

Mr. Tenni interjected.

Mr. BURNS: The honourable member should talk! He is a Fascist in full flight when we hear him on his feet in this Parliament. No wonder Fascist legislation of this type receives his full support.

Mr. TENNI: I rise to a point of order. I want the word "Fascist" withdrawn from "Hansard". Because our friend here is a Communist—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Miller): Order! The honourable member is not entitled to make a speech.

Mr. TENNI: That does not mean I am a Fascist.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the remark.

Mr. BURNS: That he is a Fascist in full flight?

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: That is right. He has taken exception to it.

Mr. BURNS: I withdraw the remark that he is a Fascist. Does he want me to take out the word "Fascist" or—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! There will be no discussion on it. I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr. BURNS: I withdraw it.

Today in this Parliament we are witnessing one of the most disgraceful episodes I have ever seen. If the Government feels that the people in the streets need protection, there is a role for the Government to take. I do not support violence in the streets—I have never believed that it is necessary to be violent in the streets to get a message across—but I believe that people should have a right to protest. I believe that people have a right to march peacefully and to protest in a peaceful manner. If an application is made for a permit and the Commissioner of Police decides that he will not allow a person or group to march, the Government should not say in effect, "We don't trust the courts in this matter. They might even mete out a little justice. They might even give someone a fair go. We will have to do it the other way."

Why do they have to do it the other way? Let the Government give us reasons why it is necessary to change the law in such a hurry and to rush this Bill through Parliament this afternoon. Why has the Bill been brought into the Parliament in such secrecy and why is it being rushed through in one day? Is there to be a march somewhere tomorrow morning that the Government wants to suppress? Is there to be a public meeting at which the Government does not want someone to speak?

Or is this just a way of getting the whole issue away from public debate as quickly as possible?

I deplore the reasons given for the Bill. If there is a need for the Government to act against demonstrations, laws already exist to control them. I believe that people should have the right of free assembly and free speech and should be allowed to demonstrate disagreement with the Government, irrespective of its political colour.

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. BURNS: One of the people in this Parliament who does not believe in free speech is the honourable member for Townsville South. Whenever he gets an opportunity to do so, he tries to stop anyone from saying things with which he does not agree. If they are in agreement with him he says, "Hear, hear!" If they disagree with him, he immediately sets out to stop them. He cannot talk about free speech; he believes in it only for himself.

This is a disgraceful Bill and the Labor Party will oppose it at the first reading, the second reading and wherever else we possibly can. It is a denial of the democratic rights of the average Queenslander. It is not designed to take a few radicals out of the streets; it is designed to remove the right of dissent from the average Queenslander.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (2.37 p.m.): What a tirade of inflammatory and hysterical nonsense we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition! He speaks about the lack of democracy. What he is really advocating is an open go for those who want to destroy democracy. He suggests that we should allow the Bill to lie on the table of the House because, he says, in some strange way the Government is not assisting democratic processes by getting this amendment through at a time when we know that the processes of law are going to be subverted merely in order to demonstrate that the people who want to use the streets for protests can indeed use them for their own improper purposes.

This Parliament has a responsibility to govern, and it is going to govern. That has been announced. Beyond the Government and Parliament lie the people. They have the ultimate sanction. Apparently the Leader of the Opposition forgets that within a few weeks at most there will be a general State election. I cannot conceive of any fairer proposition than that a Government should bring down legislation in which it sincerely and deeply believes on the eve of an election at which the electorate can judge it on that aspect of its performance as well as on others. There can be no better tribunal to which a Government can submit these areas of decision than the total electorate itself. For the honourable member to rant and rave and suggest that

we are doing something untoward and not consulting the people is an absolute load of useless, juvenile rubbish.

The present provision in the Act is really a hangover from the days in which a permit to march was issued in order to protect the prospective marchers. There may have been cases in which some few fervent marchers felt that they did not need protection, but they were protected for their own good. A vastly different situation prevails today; it is not the marchers who now require protection. We have amongst us—everybody but the A.L.P. and the Left-wing people associated with the A.L.P. knows this—those whose devout aim is to smash our society. They are out to destroy the very precious fabric of equality for all under the law, and to that end they set out to inflame passions, to try to use the streets as battlefields, to enlist dupes from churches and other quarters of life—which they do—and to enlarge misconceptions wherever they can. And it is essential that these people, most of whom are well known and have long historical records of association with all these kinds of causes down through the years—like some sort of obscene parasites they latch onto any cause that they can use to inflame passions—should not be able to use a minor process of the law in order to vitiate a decision which may be made by the responsible police officer.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that people will not be able to hold a political meeting and that the Labor Party will be prevented from getting to its favoured few or whatever it may be. This Bill deals with meetings on roads and with the occupation of the streets. I have spent a long, long time in politics and I know that it is only over the very last few years that we have had floating around this notion that in order to protest one has to get into the streets. Nowadays we seem to be infested with exhibitionists who want to get into the streets in front of people, to jostle them out of the way and get themselves in front of T.V. cameras—some of which, by strange coincidence, seem to be on the scene of a violent incident at the very moment it happens. Indeed, I wonder just how many street marches there would be if the T.V. cameras were not around.

Mr. Hinze: A bunch of prima donnas.

Mr. PORTER: Well, it is a matter of performing in front of a desirable audience. For most of my time in politics we protested by seizing the opportunity of distributing leaflets, of putting material into letter-boxes and of writing letters to the Press. We did a whole host of things, all of which required hard work and perspiration and went more or less unseen. But that is not good enough for today's protesters. Whatever they do, they have to be seen.

Mr. Powell: It is the work they don't do.

Mr. PORTER: Yes, they hate the work. But the whole performance is given in this high-pitched key, where they scream obscenities to the police and make these loud wails of distress. They endeavour to indicate to those who are operating cameras for T.V. coverage that they are being maltreated—all done for the purpose of getting maximum inflammation out of the cause.

As I say, our society today cannot permit the streets to be turned into battlefields for anybody's benefit, and that is why we have to change this Act at this stage. We have to bring it into line with present-day realities. I say that no society can be expected to sit back and passively watch the enactment of its own demise. I tell honourable members that as long as I am a member of this Government I am certainly not going to sit back passively and watch it die. We are going to fight them all the way for what we believe is right, and we are prepared to let the electorate judge us; which is the right thing to do. So there is a need to act now. The protection is not for the marchers these days—although sometimes it comes to that—but for citizens—the ordinary people, the silent majority, the people to whom the streets belong, the people who have as much right to their opinion as has any protester on any subject; and they have an absolute right to be totally disinterested if that is what they wish. No-one has a right to get into the streets and jostle people off the roadways and footpaths in order to ram his viewpoint down their throats.

What makes the viewpoint of somebody from the university, somebody from the Communist Party or somebody from a Left-wing trade union so sacred? What is so special about it that makes it different from my opinion or Mrs. Jones's opinion or anybody else's opinion? We all have the same rights, and be damned to those people who think they can trample over the rights of ordinary people, who think they have a special call—a special avocation, as it were—that takes them into the streets and permits them with impunity to force their wills, their desires and their opinions on others.

With this protection needed, we have to remember, Mr. Miller, that the ultimate sanction for issuing a street permit will, of course, lie with the Commissioner of Police, and it is absolutely proper that the appeal should go to the Commissioner. He is the man who takes an oath to uphold the law, to preserve order, to ensure that the fabric of society is not rent asunder, and it would be an extraordinary position indeed, in today's circumstances, if he were caught in the situation in which his determination or that of his senior officers could be upset on some obscure point by a magistrate. I say it is absolutely necessary and proper that we should close this little loop-hole for

exploitation by these smart alecs who now attach themselves so freely to the Left-wing sources that want to break down our society.

I say to the Committee that society today cannot under any circumstances accept that the right to protest can be equated with the right to occupy the streets. These two things are not synonymous; they never were, and they never must be. If we accept this in any shape or form, we will inevitably progress to the position that applies in so many other great cities of the world today—London, Belfast, Beirut and many others—where there is not only one mob occupying the streets to protest but also another mob occupying the streets to mount a counter-protest. The result, of course, is that in the streets there are armed affrays that develop into quite a violent form of warfare. Where then is the ordinary citizen's right? What role does he play in this? Is he to be just a casualty? Are we just to step aside and let him become a casualty because we do not dare to stand up to our responsibilities?

I say to members of the Opposition that if they think they are going to find votes by pretending that this Government is authoritarian and dictatorial because it is putting through this amendment this afternoon in this way—

Mr. Jones: You don't have to pretend, brother.

Mr. PORTER: Well, the honourable member says it is not pretending. Let us see what the electorate says in a few weeks' time. Let us see how much support the Opposition gets for its support of the Left-wingers who want to break down society's processes. Let us just see what happens. I have little doubt where honourable members opposite will finish up. They will finish up where they deserve to be.

The fact of the matter is that this is a necessary amendment. We have already had threats of marches and the use of these little processes of the law in order to enable people to make points, and we have decided that the streets are not the place for protests. There are plenty of opportunities for protests. Nobody is stifled; nobody is reduced. But the streets are for citizens, for free people, and that is how they will remain under this Government. I say again that I am absolutely certain that the Queensland electorate will support this massively and we will be admired in every State in Australia for our stand.

Mr. JONES (Cairns) (2.49 p.m.): If we look at political history, Mr. Miller, we find that many ills in our society were created in the defence of democracy. If we want to defend democracy, surely the right of free expression must be one of the basic, fundamental, unfettered rights, and it must be accorded decency and dignity.

The Government admits that denying the right to protest is aimed at a minority; yet this particular amendment will fetter everybody in the State. If, as the honourable member for Toowong said, this is designed to prevent people from jostling in front of television cameras, what is going to happen next if that purpose is achieved? Do we next abolish the right of representatives of the television stations to go out and report what is happening within the State?

It cannot be denied that this is repressive legislation. The people's right to assemble or take part in a procession is being denied. It is provocative legislation. The Government is goading people so that it can bash some heads. It thinks it may get a little bit of political advantage out of it. The Government is wrong. I will say it here and I will say it everywhere.

I reserve my right to say it. I will pick my place where I say it. If the Government wants to send anybody after me to knock me on the head, it can do so. I am going to be out and I am going to be speaking. I challenge anybody to deny my right to speak in my own electorate or anywhere else I choose. The Government is encroaching on the rights of not only individuals but their democratically elected representatives.

What was it that Voltaire said? "No matter how much I may disagree with what he says, I will fight for his right to say it." Free assembly is a fundamental right. The Government is denying the right to free speech and the right to organise. The Government's action is a denial of basic rights. They are all put in jeopardy by this legislation. It is against not a minority but the ordinary citizen. In this place before today we have thought we were legislating for something, but we found we were merely legislating ourselves around a corner. We couldn't see what was going on. The Government can't see what is going on today. It is denying the right of people to dissent. Immediately it denies the right of people to dissent, it is in a lot of strife as a Government.

The Bill is a blatant interference with the judicial process. The Government is setting a dangerous precedent in placing fetters on the role of magistrates. It is now interfering with the courts of the land. It could mean that the Premier of Queensland will be the sole tribunal of appeal from the decisions of the traffic superintendent. The right of the people to express their views in a peaceful manner is basic to our democratic process. We have already seen too many instances of the Premier's being involved in the politics and administration of the Police Force. When controls are imposed on civil liberties by the State, there should always be a right of appeal to the judiciary. The Government is now taking over that role through a political appointee. I haven't met the new Commissioner of Police. It was Whitrod yesterday;

it is Lewis today, who will it be tomorrow? That is the point that must be looked at. Joh Bjelke-Petersen is the Premier today, but who is going to be the next Premier?

The Minister talked about the unfettered use of the footpath and the Roma Street Forum. How can that explanation be applied to Cairns or country towns where there is no Roma Street Forum and no footpaths, and somebody might want to demonstrate? The person or body aggrieved is being granted the right to appeal to the Commissioner of Police. How long will that take? I have seen people upset in the trade union movement and in other situations. How long is it going to take to refer a matter to Brisbane? Does the Government think that it can hold back people, say, in the North? Will it be able to hold them back if they decide to march from, say, the meatworks in a town where there is only one police sergeant? What is it going to do then? Bring in the troops! That's the next thing. Where will it go from there?

Mr. Lickiss interjected.

Mr. JONES: If I were the Minister, I would not be here this afternoon passing this stupid legislation to deny persons their right of assembly and their right to organise.

The Minister said that he is worried about the safety of the community. That is only a fob-off. He is not worried about the safety of the community; he is provocative. The Minister for Justice and Attorney-General should be interested in this. The Government is transferring the due process of law—an appeal to a magistrate—from the courts of law to one person, the Commissioner of Police. He is a figurehead, whoever he might be. He might be a good Joe at this stage of the game, but once again the Government is endangering a process of law.

Members of the Government should be extremely concerned. It is too much to accept that responsibility should devolve on the Commissioner of Police or any individual. This move should not be made. Government members should be ashamed of participating in it. There is to be no appeal from the commissioner's decision; his decision will be final. The right of people to protest collectively is to be denied under some vague section—section 57—of the Traffic Act. In the final analysis the decision is to be made not by this Parliament and not by the judiciary or anybody else, but by the Police Force. People will be denied the 14 days cooling-off period. The police will make decisions in the middle of a muddle.

The Minister told us that appeals will be dealt with speedily by the Commissioner of Police. The time to make a decision is not during particularly hot situations involving the trade union movement, strikes and so on. The Minister said that the Government is worried about people not being able to move about in safety. Throughout our history of organisation, of people marching in

protest, how many people have been injured? When we are considering a denial of the right of assembly, I can only ask to be informed when the persons involved abused that right. That is the main question. When dealing with amendments such as those contained in this Bill, we should ask ourselves if they are fair, right and just for the ordinary citizen.

We are told that the Government is worried about minorities and an honourable member spoke about the silent majority. If anyone wants to talk about the silent majority, I remind him that the man who coined that phrase was President Nixon. He talked about the silent majority, but look at his history! The Government says that it is worried about the silent majority, but in a democracy we would be better off if we were prepared to stand up and be heard. The sooner people stand up, protest and tell the Government what is wrong, the sooner we will have government by the people. That is what it is all about. Surely that is what we are here for. The Government is not here to tell people what to do or to restrict them in this way. The Government is supposed to be the servant of the people of Queensland, yet it is contemplating a confrontation. And it will get it.

If members of the Government look at the T.V. news-reels, they will see that people walk around the White House every day with placards protesting about problems in their areas. They come from near and far to protest in front of the White House, but the Queensland Government is refusing that right here; it is crushing the inherent right to disagree.

If the Government is concerned about demonstrations, I point out that the last demonstration in Cairns was against Whitlam. It was organised by the National Party at the Cairns Airport. If the Government members want to see photographs of that, I can produce them. Many of the northern Government candidates at the last State election were there demonstrating against Whitlam, yet the Government is now denying people the right to hold a placard.

If Government members are interested in decency and honesty in Government, they should turn themselves inside out, analyse themselves and ask if they are fair dinkum about what they are doing this afternoon. In my book I can only say that they should be ashamed of themselves for contemplating this move at this time.

Mr. GIBBS (Albert) (2.59 p.m.): I support this amendment to the Traffic Act, which, I believe, is a correct move to make. Under this Government the people of Queensland know exactly where they stand. That is one of the matters of principle the Government has leaned on under the Premier's leadership. In all instances, especially when unruly marches are involved, the people of Queensland want to know exactly where they

stand and what they can expect in the city, and I think we are referring today mainly to the capital city. People want to know where they will stand if they come to this city and strike an unruly march. There is nothing wrong with peaceful marches. Without a doubt some marches will be recognised, such as on Anzac Day and those other occasions that really represent what Australia stands for. However, with some unruly marches we do not know where things are going to finish up. People who come into the city to do their shopping do not know whether or not they will be injured.

Let us look at what is happening overseas. Ireland is a typical example. Recently there were unruly demonstrations in England. If we like to cast our minds back just a couple of weeks in our own country, the uranium protesters in New South Wales put on a dreadful display. That to me is a disgusting state of affairs. It should not be allowed to continue. The mass of the people in Queensland should not have their freedom of movement put in jeopardy by these people marching. I am pleased to see the introduction of this measure. An application for a permit will be considered. If it is refused, an appeal can be made to the commissioner to see how he feels about the matter. His decision is final, and I think that is as it should be. I repeat that the people of Queensland want to know precisely where they stand. When my constituents come to Brisbane they want to know exactly what the position is with unruly street marches that could occur at any time.

Let us cast our minds back to the Springbok tour, when police had to be brought into Brisbane from all over Queensland to protect the ordinary people in the street. We have to give consideration to our police, too. They are ordinary people like us with families—people in uniform with a duty to perform. Why should our police be subjected to these unruly, unlawful marches that we have been faced with in the past? We have seen in the papers—and it was on television the other night—what happened to the police in New South Wales in the protests about uranium. In no way should any Australian policeman be subjected to that type of conduct.

Mr. Porter: Paint was thrown at them and hat-pins were stuck into them.

Mr. GIBBS: Yes. The people we are talking about are experts at it. Let us make no bones about it.

The previous speaker referred to stopping people from putting forward their points of view. No-one is making an attempt—and I hope no-one ever would—to stop people congregating in an area that is set aside for such purposes so they can put forward their points of view. King George Square and the public forum are the proper

places for this to happen. No-one is denying people the right to speak—the right to say the things they want to say—in a democratic situation. However, people should not be subjected to this on our roads. We are able to look back and say that years ago our roads were fairly quiet places, but today our own Minister for Main Roads—and he is in the Parliament now—is having enough trouble building freeways to cater for traffic, without—

Mr. Casey: He isn't doing too bad down your way.

Mr. GIBBS: He is doing a very good job all over Queensland, as a matter of fact. However, because the Minister is doing a very good job with the roads, there is no need—

Mr. Casey interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Casey interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mackay has been in this Chamber long enough to know that when I call for order I expect that wish to be respected. In any case, we are not talking about main roads development.

Mr. Burns: He raised freeways.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Aikens: Toss him out.

Mr. Wright: He's standing up.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Townsville South can consider himself to be chastised as well.

The honourable member for Albert will relate his speech to the matter under discussion.

Mr. GIBBS: Thank you very much, Mr. Hewitt; but, with due respect, we are talking about people marching on the roads—and a road is a freeway, main road or any other type of road, and I think I am entitled to mention freeways in relation to marches and to permits.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not debate my rulings. The honourable gentleman is correct as long as he talks about roads being congested by demonstrators. He is not in order if he talks about the development of roads; that is the point.

Mr. GIBBS: Thank you very much, Mr. Hewitt. I had no desire to speak on the development of roads. As you are aware, the honourable member for Mackay raised the subject.

We are hearing a lot from him now. As an Independent he did not say very much but now that he is back on the A.L.P. benches, backing the A.L.P. and their Communist

friends who organise these marches, we are hearing more from him. We saw these Communist people, with their big red Communist flags with the hammer and sickle on them, supported no doubt by the honourable member for Mackay, march on this Parliament last year. It was a very unruly march. On the way, they punched some of the citizens and knocked them about. This unruly march was held without a permit. These are the people whom the honourable member for Mackay supports now that he is back in the Red ranks of this Parliament. So let us make no bones about where he stands.

Mr. Hales: He marched with them on Labour Day, too.

Mr. GIBBS: Yes. In Labour Day processions, which have been part of our life for many years, the Communists march right beside the honourable member for Mackay. Next May Day, anybody who takes photos will see him leading them along the road.

I believe that this amendment is the correct thing to do, so that people in Queensland know exactly where they stand and exactly the support they have from the Government in enjoying the peaceful way of life we have become used to in Queensland.

All of these galahs, as I call them, are going to protest about uranium. I am pleased to say that in Queensland so far, the uranium affair has been rather peaceful compared with what has happened in other States. I believe that that is the way it should remain. Protesters can stand up in the City Square and bellow their lungs out if they like about anything they like. There is no doubt that the A.L.P. will help to organise the University of Queensland Union, the Left-wingers, who support them. I know that some of their fellow-travellers are not always welcome visitors. Nevertheless, they are stuck with this situation and it is up to us, as a responsible Government, to make sure that we preserve the rights of all people—not just one or two—who have the right to walk anywhere in our cities and country areas.

It gives me great pleasure to support the Bill to amend the Traffic Act.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (3.8 p.m.): In the last couple of years we have seen developing in this Assembly the characteristics of a truly dishonest Government. It was not so long ago that special

legislation was brought in to protect the honourable member for Cook. It was not so long ago that legislation was brought in to protect the present Minister for Survey and Valuation. The other day the Minister for Justice came into the Chamber and, without telling anybody—apparently half of his back-benchers did not know about it—rushed through legislation that was specifically aimed at protecting the Premier. He did not even have the decency, in his speech, to refer to any of the sections. He just rambled on and hoped that no-one would notice.

Today we have a similar type of situation. I am surprised that the person who carried out this task is the Acting Minister for Transport (Mr. Campbell).

Mr. Campbell: I am not Acting Minister.

Mr. WRIGHT: He is the Minister for Transport? Well, regardless of his being in acting or full capacity, I am surprised that he did this.

When he spoke in introducing the legislation he endeavoured to make out very carefully, like a doctor sitting on the side of a bed talking to a patient, that it was in the interests of everybody because it will overcome all sorts of problems that exist at the moment.

As soon as the honourable member for Toowong stood up the game was given away. We found out then that it was really Fascist legislation, the typical type of dictatorial approach that we have become used to in this Chamber. Regardless of the Minister's attempts to persuade honourable members, especially those in the Opposition, that all he was trying to do was expedite matters of appeal so that a person did not have to go through the due processes of law to a magistrate and instead would go straight to the Police Commissioner, the honourable member for Toowong and the honourable member for Albert talked on and on about violence, protesters and demonstrators. And that is what this legislation is really about.

The honourable member for Toowong had the audacity to claim that this legislation is totally objective. He said that the commissioner is a certain type of person in that he has taken an oath to uphold the law. He is implying that we cannot trust the magistrate and that we can forget about the oath that he takes. I shall read it to honourable members.

His oath of office reads—

"A justice other than a judge of the Supreme Court or of a District Court shall not exercise any of the functions of his office until he has—

(a) taken an oath of allegiance and office in the following form:—

"I . . . do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, as lawful Sovereign of Australia, and Her other Realms and Territories, and to Her Heirs and Successors, according to law, and that I will at all times and in all things discharge the duties of my office according to the laws and statutes of the Commonwealth and of Queensland to the best of my knowledge and ability and will do equal justice to all, without fear, favour or affection. So help me God!"

The honourable member for Toowong implies that the Government does not trust magistrates, regardless of the oath that they take and regardless of the promises that they make. It does not trust them because they may be fair. They may in fact do equal justice to all without fear, favour or affection. Instead, the Government is removing the right of appeal to a magistrate and giving that right of appeal on a question that is before a district superintendent to the Police Commissioner.

In case some members want to talk about the "fair dinkumness" of some Police Commissioners, I draw their attention to an incident that occurred in the city of Brisbane in which it was alleged that a police officer bashed a girl student. It was the Commissioner of Police who said that he would carry out his duties and have an investigation, and the Police Minister also said that this should be done. But such was the political pressure that a decision made in Cabinet prevented the Police Commissioner from doing his duty.

There is nothing to prevent a magistrate from carrying out his duties but a precedent has now been set by the Premier, who interfered with the role that the Police Commissioner saw as his. Yet the honourable member for Toowong has the audacity to tell us that the Police Commissioner has taken a certain type of oath and he will therefore be seen to be free from all sorts of incriminations that might be inferred by Opposition members.

It is quite obvious that what the Government is trying to do is create confrontation. When the Premier said last week that there would be no student marches, confrontation did not occur. We heard the honourable member for South Brisbane say how Government members met and pressurised the Premier into realising that such an order to the police would have a detrimental effect on others as well. What about women who might want to march against abortion? What about all those who are against pornography? We are told that the Premier then withdrew his demand.

But this is not the case any longer. The Government intends to create confrontation because it wants reaction. It wants students and unionists to react. Why? It wants violence and confrontation in the community. If not, what is it worried about? If because a district superintendent has refused to issue a permit, a person appeals to a magistrate and if the magistrate is right in law in his decision surely that is how it should be.

Mr. Porter: You are a blood-in-the-streets man.

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not. I believe in sticking by the law. We all know the history of the honourable member for Toowong and how he wants violence. He wants heads to be kicked in. In fact, I watched as he was speaking and I could see the hatred in his eyes. I could see his love of creating this type of confrontation.

I stand by the view that there should be a right of appeal from the police to the judiciary. Surely this is what democracy is all about. It should not be a matter of appealing from one police officer to a senior police officer.

Mr. Jones: That's Caesar unto Caesar.

Mr. WRIGHT: As the honourable member for Cairns says, that is appealing from Caesar unto Caesar.

It has been said that we have an independent judiciary. Yet we have heard from the honourable member for Toowong that this independence of the judiciary—

Mr. Aikens interjected

Mr. WRIGHT: I should like to hear the honourable member's views later. He will get his chance to speak.

There has to be a system of appeals and the present system under section 57 is such that if a person is aggrieved by the decision of a district superintendent he can take the matter to a magistrate. But if this amendment is passed it is going to mean that a person will have to go to the Commissioner of Police. And do we honestly believe that the Commissioner of Police is going to overrule his district superintendent? Obviously he is not. It has been said by Government members that the only way to stop these demonstrations and protesters is to give this power to the Commissioner of Police.

It was interesting—in fact I almost laughed—to hear the honourable member for Albert say, “The applications should be made, they will be refused, they will be looked at and then you can appeal.” I think he mixed up his words, but that is the order he put them in—the applications will be submitted, they will be refused, they will be looked at and then there will be an appeal. But might I say that he has actually spoken the truth? That is what is going to happen. They will be refused. There will be no real appeal, because we have had it said by other members that the Government is giving this power to the police to stop demonstrations and to stop the right of people to speak out against things they are aggrieved about.

Mr. Porter: No, to stop them doing it in the streets. You are very careful to avoid bringing that out.

Mr. Wright: To stop them doing it in the streets? We are talking about street meetings as well, Mr. Hewitt, and it is time the honourable member for Toowong realised that and that this will militate against every member of Parliament.

Mr. Porter: I don't care.

Mr. Wright: The honourable member does not care very much; but he has never been one for freedom of speech, he has never been one for the right of assembly. We know his background on these things; we know what his views are.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. Wright: I would accept that because I know how he upset the churches. I know how he reacted when certain members of the churches went to the City Square in Brisbane and protested against what the Government was doing. It was the honourable member for Toowong who rose and

used the privileges of this place to name certain people and to attack the priests, nuns and ministers. I hear tell that it was the heads of these churches who actually lodged complaints with the Committee of Privileges. But I notice that it was not mentioned in the report that these complaints were lodged against the honourable member for Toowong.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. Wright: Yes, I am told he left the meeting. He did not have the gumption to stay to hear what they had to say. He had an excuse for going somewhere else. So we all know all about the honourable member for Toowong.

Mr. Porter: I rise to a point of order.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Porter: This is the first point of order I have raised in 11 years in this Parliament, and I do so because the church is involved.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton will resume his seat. I am listening to a point of order and I intend to listen to it in silence.

Mr. Porter: There is no meeting of the Committee of Privileges that I have left because some complaint was alleged against me. I know of no complaint against me that has been lodged with the Committee of Privileges.

Mr. Wright: I accept the explanation, Mr. Hewitt—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Every member had better start learning the rules of this place a little better. The honourable member for Rockhampton will accept the explanation offered by the honourable member for Toowong.

Mr. Wright: I accept his explanation, but might I suggest through you—

Mr. Porter: I rise to a point of order. I want no “buts”. I have said I left no meeting of the Committee of Privileges where an allegation was being made against me, and I know of no allegation made against me with the Committee of Privileges. That is a flat statement of fact.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Rockhampton accepted the denial. I have not heard any qualification as yet. The honourable member for Rockhampton will proceed.

Mr. WRIGHT: Rather than fight with you, Mr. Hewitt, I intend to make no qualification; but I urge all honourable members to look very carefully at the report of the Committee of Privileges and I suggest that they might speak to the chairman and other members of the committee to see who is speaking the truth in this matter.

To come back to the issue in question—this is an attack on the rights of people.

Mr. PORTER: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Hewitt, and I seek your protection. What the honourable member has said is in fact a refutation of the denial that I have made. That in fact is what he said, and I seek your protection in asking that his withdrawal be total.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Rockhampton to accept that explanation without qualification, and I ask him then to proceed with his speech.

Mr. WRIGHT: I accept the explanation that has now been given. It is surprising how people who are always very willing to attack others get upset over issues. Let us get back to the question.

Mr. Casey: We accept it, but we haven't got to believe it.

Mr. WRIGHT: I would accept the interjection of the honourable member for Mackay.

The point I was making is that this legislation is an attack on the rights of people, and it is quite obvious that the matter was not thoroughly thought out by Government members, because I would have thought that at least a few of them were prepared to uphold the rights of individuals. I recall that when the Cedar Bay dispute blew up, at least a few Government members had the courage to say, "Let's have an inquiry; something is wrong."

Mr. Porter: And who were proved to be right and wrong in that event?

Mr. WRIGHT: Oh, you want to talk about the Cedar Bay dispute?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Cedar Bay dispute has nothing to do with the motion under discussion.

Mr. WRIGHT: I was going to answer the interjection by saying that perhaps the situation would have been different had the charges not been withdrawn by the prosecution. We might have had a different verdict. However, I will not dwell on that subject.

I believe that it is wrong to give the total discretionary power to the Commissioner of Police in this instance. That takes away the rights of ordinary people. Surely if a person is aggrieved because of a decision by another police officer, if he believes that a permit should have been issued and that permit was not issued, there ought to be a right of appeal outside the realm of the Police Force. That is the way the Act has operated for many years, and it is the contention of the Opposition that that is how it should remain.

It is quite obvious that the members of the Government, who are supporting this legislation, see a way of overcoming some of the demonstrations by ensuring that a Police Commissioner will have the final say. But I suggest to honourable members that what in fact they are doing is removing the right of people to dissent from Government administrative decisions or decisions of any other type. The amendment will mean, Mr. Hewitt, that if you want a street permit and it is refused, you will no longer be able to take it to the normal area of the judiciary; you will have to go to the Commissioner of Police.

The point was well made by the honourable member for Cairns that Mr. Terry Lewis is now the Commissioner of Police and we are not going to cast aspersions at him, but we do not know who is going to hold the office next. It is wrong that one person should have these powers. Therefore, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members who have spoken in the debate. I am totally opposed to what the Government is doing in this instance, and it is obvious that Government members who support it have not thought it through.

Mr. LINDSAY (Everton) (3.23 p.m.): The evolution of urban industrial society has meant an increase in crime and associated disrespect for the law. The lunatic fringe now seek to dominate society and society rightly

expects us, the democratically elected representatives, to do something about it. So it is with pride that I stand in this Chamber and support the Minister for Transport, the Honourable Fred Campbell, himself a most well-mannered and friendly person, in the proposed amendment to the Traffic Act.

The subject under discussion is the use of the public road, the public thoroughfare, or the street. The great thing about our roads in Queensland up to the present is that, in spite of increasing efforts by the lunatic fringe to change the situation, no matter where you go on the roads you can meet somebody coming from the other direction. That is an important point, I think, in the use of roads. The roads are meant to be used by everybody, by all taxpayers, for travelling in one direction or the other.

Before I move on to the problem that has developed, that is, the lunatic fringe seeking in a series of mob demonstrations to monopolise our roads, perhaps I should comment on what is available to those who wish to express their opposition on any subject. Anybody involved in politics in today's society knows the futility of the street-corner meeting. Nobody would be silly enough to go and stand on a road and start talking politics. If he did, the cars would just knock him over. In general, people in our society are not interested in the street-corner meeting. What has taken over from the street-corner meeting is television, the printed word or the camera. A person genuinely trying to put a message across must aim for those areas—television, and so on. There is nothing to stop anybody in our society today putting a message across either through paid advertising or on television.

However, let me return to the concept of the use of the road by the mob. Is there a man in this Assembly who, having taken the oath to serve his God, his Queen and his country, has been given the order to go out and stop a mob that has broken loose on a main thoroughfare? If there is one man in the Chamber who has I will sit down and he can tell honourable members about it. If not, I will remain on my feet and tell the story. About 10.30 a.m. on 3 January 1961 was the first time I was given such an instruction. It is something that sticks in one's mind. The order we were given was to try to stop the mob without the use of violence or force as it ran up the road and headed for a domestic area.

What does a mob look like when it runs towards a person who is standing there with his bare hands raised and telling them to stop? Who is in charge of a mob? Who can tell a mob to stop? Who can tell a mob to turn left or right? Who can tell a mob to pick up the little old lady who has just been knocked into the gutter? Who can guarantee compensation for my mother or anybody else's mother who is bashed because she just happens to be shopping outside Myer's in Queen Street? Despite comprehensive motor vehicle insurance policies, who guarantees the security of a person's motor vehicle that has been parked in the street outside Parliament House, or in Queen Street or anywhere else? Who guarantees to repair that vehicle if the mob goes through and damages it? Nobody. I want to tell honourable members what the mob looks like. Remember that we as members of this Parliament have a duty to protect our own police as much as possible. We should not put them unnecessarily in dangerous situations. If we allow the lunatic fringe to control society and take charge of the streets, who in hell is going to want to become a policeman? Policemen, too, have mothers, brothers, wives and children. They are not bullet-proof, and they haven't got an in-built crash helmet. They are flesh and blood like us. Having been in that sort of position myself, having had a mob knock me to the ground, having had to get to my feet and run forward and form another line with my hands held out, having been knocked again, having run through houses trying to control the mob, and having seen women holding their children to their breast and saying, "Is it another Congo? Are we going to be raped? Are we going to be murdered?", I, for one, support the Minister's introduction of the Bill. The streets are for the mums and dads and the boys and girls, going up one way and down the other. They are not for any mob to take over and run one way carrying everything in front of them.

I commend the Minister for the introduction of the Bill. I am sure the silent majority will support us. The streets and the roads belong to everybody, not the mob. The commissioner can decide whether he can control a demonstration. If there is no fear of excessive damage to persons and property, surely the marches will go on. Anzac Day and many other marches will go on, but this legislation will ensure that the lunatic fringe does not control the streets of Queensland. I am right behind it.

Mr. YEWDALÉ (Rockhampton North) (3.31 p.m.): Mr. Hewitt,—

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Hewitt. I will leave this Chamber in absolute disgust at the way you are allowing the A.L.P. to prostitute democracy. There are 80 members presently in this Parliament. By the time the 11 A.L.P. members have delivered their speeches, there will still be 69 non-A.L.P. members to deliver a speech. I am damned if I am going to fall for that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will answer the honourable member. A list has been given to me. I assume that it was drawn up with the agreement of both Whips. Until now honourable members have been rising one at a time in conformity with that list. Therefore it appeared to me that there was mutual agreement on that list and I, in fact, have not had to make any choice at all as to the call.

Mr. AIKENS: There is no mutual agreement as far as I am concerned. This gives you an idea of their conception of democracy—yelling and squealing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I call the honourable member for Rockhampton North.

Mr. YEWDALÉ: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt.

The matter before us concerns an amendment to the Traffic Act. It has created hysteria on the part of some Government members. Quite obviously the last speaker considered himself to be a knight in shining armour. He was going to defend the down-trodden mothers and babies in the street who were being bashed and deliberately got at.

It seems to me that the honourable member for Everton who talked hysterically about what happens not only in the streets of Brisbane, but also of the world, is a long way from the factual situation in this State and the Commonwealth.

In considering this amendment to the Traffic Act, I wonder about the concern of the Government for people moving on the roads. It seems that it is not very much concerned about the normal traffic hold-ups in the metropolitan area that are to be seen every day. It is not concerned about the hold-ups in shunting and on the rail loops.

Mr. Newbery: How weak can you be!

Mr. YEWDALÉ: The Minister for Police said, "How weak can you be!" Undoubtedly he would be the weakest Minister on the Government front benches; the moment he is challenged about prostitution and other happenings in Queensland he runs away and makes all sorts of inane statements. Fancy him talking about anybody being weak. He kowtows to the Premier, as most Cabinet Ministers do and will continue to do. They do their job in that fashion.

Mr. NEWBERRY: I rise to a point of order. That statement is incorrect, as the honourable member knows, and I ask him to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Rockhampton North will withdraw the comment that is offensive to the Minister.

Mr. YEWDALÉ: I would like to be clear on the comment the Minister is referring to.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not choose to ask people to repeat their words. I ask the honourable member to accept my ruling and withdraw the words that are offensive to the Minister.

Mr. YEWDALÉ: Whatever the words were, if they are offensive to the Minister, I withdraw them.

During this debate Government members have made predictable contributions. The honourable member for Albert, in supporting the proposal, referred to the advantages to be gained from the amendments in that they overcome all the problems in the community which the Government envisages. He is not in the Chamber now; I suppose he wishes to avoid the backlash that he could expect. He is the very one who deliberately and decisively organised people on the Gold Coast. He put them on buses, trundled them up to the Ipswich area, got them on the streets without a permit, and incited them to take action against a Federal member of Parliament. Yet today he supports these amendments. He is a member of the National Party—a member of the Premier's party—who is in here today pretending to do something about stopping the rabble in the streets, when he himself has been one of that rabble, deliberately and openly inciting people to riot up in Ipswich over a Federal member of Parliament.

Mr. Wright: There was also a demonstration in Rockhampton by a Liberal candidate, and a policeman called Young did the same thing.

Mr. YEWDALÉ: That is right. He took a young lad of about 17 and knocked him down in the street, and the police did not do much about it.

Look at the timing of this legislation. As other members have said, it was brought into Parliament this afternoon without notice. To my knowledge, nobody was consulted about it—probably not even the Government backbench members.

Mr. Lane: Why would they tell the Waterside Workers' Federation about it?

Mr. YEWDALÉ: That's the gentleman who was rolling wharves when he was in his profession as a police officer—rolling them in the hotels and taking their wallets out of their pockets.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LANE: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I intend to protect the honourable member. When the honourable member was referred to in such disparaging terms yesterday, I asked for a withdrawal, and I do the same now.

Mr. YEWDAL: I withdraw, Mr. Hewitt.

It is obvious that the Government members are reacting to my comments and to the very valid criticism I have been directing about their own colleagues on the back benches as well as about Ministers. The Government is panicking. Government members believe that they can get on the bandwagon. They believe that if they push the unions and the demonstrators into a corner, they will get some electoral advantage out of it. Weeks and months ago they decided to make an issue out of the trade union movement and the activists in this State. They have no other issue to raise. That is the very obvious reason why they are trying to provoke people again.

We saw the scenes in Brisbane some few months ago when students marched from the university. The police were on hand. They were fully aware of the demonstration. The students marched for a considerable distance, but the police didn't interfere until the march got virtually into the city, and they moved in then and assaulted a young girl.

Mr. Wright: That was planned.

Mr. YEWDAL: That was as plain as the nose on one's face. The police could have stopped the students two miles away, but they didn't. To my mind the police action was deliberate provocation. When the Press took up the matter, it was clearly seen that the woman was assaulted.

I would like to refer briefly to what has happened in Brisbane with the uranium protests. Each and every one of us who had the opportunity of seeing that T.V. segment knows exactly what took place. We saw the media representatives—the television cameras and the reporters—within close range of the police and the protesters. And we saw very clearly on the television what happened there.

The introduction of this legislation gives the media people an opportunity to prove that they have an open attitude to peaceful demonstrations, that is, if they are interested in what is happening and have the guts to print in their papers just what the Government, through the Premier and the Minister, is doing.

As I said a moment ago, the claim that people are clamouring and blocking up the streets is a lot of hogwash. The fact is that the wharfies (Where is the member

for Merthyr now? He has gone.) marched the streets of Brisbane last week. They walked on the footpath in twos and threes. They did not interfere with anybody. They did not incite anybody. They did not receive any protest from anybody. To my knowledge, nobody was assaulted and nobody was hindered in any way. They did not interfere with traffic or the public.

I would like the Minister to tell me later in this debate how many personal objections or protests or charges have been laid by individual members of the community either through the courts, or to solicitors or to the police. Let us have the complaints. Let them be ventilated. I have never heard any ventilated as a result of any protest, march or anything else. Let us have some facts about it.

A while ago the member for Everton was talking about hysterical mobs bashing old women and children. He referred to the poor fellow's car out on the street. It's not protected now. Nor is the woman up the street or round the corner. Nor is the kid going home from school. What about all those young girls who disappeared and were probably raped and murdered? They were not protected. Yet the Government is trying to tell us that demonstrators are going to carry out acts of violence, incite people and physically harm people.

Mr. Newbery: What about the police who try to protect them?

Mr. YEWDAL: Mr. Hewitt, it has been suggested by you that I withdraw certain remarks. I am going to be provoked again, obviously. If Government members are going to do that, I will have to react. If the provocation continues, I will have to act accordingly.

Mr. Lane: Try to behave like a member of Parliament.

Mr. YEWDAL: In acting as a member of Parliament, I certainly would not pattern myself on one certain member, and that is the loud-mouthed, raucous member from Merthyr, the former police officer.

I took the trouble to read a little in the last hour or so since we discovered what legislation was coming before the Chamber. I took the trouble to look at a very unbiased article by Dr. Jai O'Donnell, a specialist writer from America on labour confrontation, democracy, society, etc. I think it is a very good article and I commend it to all honourable members.

Mr. Gibbs: Where did he come from—Russia?

Mr. YEWDAL: No, from America. The Americans are friends of the Government's. It likes the Yankee system.

Last month in Australia he spoke to gatherings in all major cities in Australia. He drew crowds of 800 and 850 people in

Sydney and Melbourne. He also spoke in Hobart, Adelaide, Perth and Brisbane. The theme of his addresses was that labour confrontation puts democracy and society at risk. I would suggest that the theme of his addresses is applicable to happenings in Queensland today. It is provocation not only of labour, when we talk about the trade unions, but also of other groups in the community, be they uranium protesters, people from the Women's Electoral Lobby or people from the religious organisations, who were referred to by my colleague earlier and who are vehemently opposed by the honourable member for Toowong. Those people are being pushed into a corner. By pushing them into a corner, all that the Government is doing is manifesting a problem.

We were told last week of the new industrial policy by the spokesman for the National Party, Mr. Evans. I did not see it in print; I heard it as a news item. I think it is reasonable to suggest that his theme, following on the Labor Party policy, was one of consultation, conciliation and communication. It is in a very similar strain to what we suggested. I cannot be convinced that the action of this Government and this Minister today, in producing this legislation at this late hour on Wednesday afternoon and rushing it through all stages, is anything like what Mr. Evans said about National Party policy. It has nothing to do with communication or consultation.

The Minister and the Government did not talk to the unions. Government members might say, "Why should we talk to them?" I know that that is their attitude. But they have not talked to anyone else, either. They have not talked to any other group in the community concerning demonstrations or marches in the streets. To my mind this is deliberate and provocative action to try to create just prior to an election the situation that they have been trying to create for weeks in order to provoke people into action. I do not think it will work.

I hope that the community generally and the media take cognisance of the fact that this is the sort of thing the Government has been doing for several weeks in this Parliament—rushing legislation through for its own political interests.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (3.43 p.m.): In his address to the Chamber, the honourable member for Rockhampton made a statement which I have to take up and answer. He said he was surprised that some members of the Government parties did not take exception to what is happening in the Chamber this afternoon and that he thought we should be looking after the rights of individuals in our community. I have to take that challenge up.

I say without any equivocation that if I believed for one moment that the legislation before this Chamber would interfere in any way with the rights of the individual to state

his case, I would oppose it. But not for one moment do I believe that we are interfering with the rights of the individual. On the contrary, we are ensuring that all individuals in our community can enjoy their rights.

Mr. Hinze: We are protecting their rights.

Mr. MILLER: We are protecting the rights of all individuals.

The legislation will not stop people from demonstrating; it merely sets out where they will demonstrate. I am surprised that, after what we have seen happen in other countries, members of the Opposition would want to see people take to the streets.

Mr. Lindsay: We don't want rubber bullets fired up Queen Street, do we?

Mr. MILLER: We want nothing like that.

Let us look at what has happened in America, England, France, Ireland, Spain and many other countries. Chaos, hatred and turmoil have been created. Would Opposition members try to tell me that the radicals who are trying to create such situations here are any different from those in other countries? It has to be admitted that there are in Australia members of the Communist Party, just as there are in every other country, and if they can create chaos in the streets they will do so.

Who was it who referred on television the other night to the right of the individual to march in the streets? I am referring to Mr. Hamilton of the Building Workers' Industrial Union. He was surprised and disappointed that the people at the Roma Street Forum would not take to the streets. It was this member of the Communist Party who spoke on television about the right of the individual to march in the streets. If one looks throughout the world today one sees that it is not members of the Labor Party, the Liberal Party and National Party who are manipulating people in this way in the free countries; this is being done by Communists.

I should like to refer to an incident that took place in Brisbane many years ago and I shall be surprised if Opposition members cannot recall it. The Hanlon Government had hoses turned on demonstrators in Roma Street. That was done by the A.L.P. when it was in Government in this State. And why? Because Mr. Hanlon, as Premier, was an upright man. He believed in law and order and he considered that workers of that day were not obeying the laws of the State. He ordered the use of fire hoses in the streets.

Is it better to have demonstrations in the street, with firemen turning hoses on workers, or is it better to say to the workers, "If you want to demonstrate, go into the forums and demonstrate there. There are the City Square, the Roma Street Forum and Centennial Park, so you have plenty of

opportunities to demonstrate.”? Why do these people want to take to the streets? Is it to get a message to the people? Are they saying that unless they take to the streets of Brisbane they cannot get their message across? I suggest that that is a lot of rubbish. Every demonstration in either the Roma Street Forum or the City Square is covered by all T.V. channels in Brisbane. Why then go into the streets?

The answer is not that the demonstrators cannot get coverage; it is that they want to create chaos. They want to say to the people of Brisbane, “You will drive down the streets when we say you can.” Why do we have a Police Force? Are the police going to decide when traffic will flow or stop? Or are we going to allow a few people in the community to work up such hatred among the workers that they will take to the streets and stop not only motor vehicles from driving down the streets but also people from walking along footpaths?

So far as I am concerned, the right of the individual is paramount and I will fight to the last to ensure that everyone, A.L.P. member or anybody else, who wants to drive down Queen Street or Adelaide Street has the right to do so. He must not be judged by members of the Communist Party or any other minority group that says, “We are going to take to the streets.” The people of Brisbane are looking for democratic government and the right to live in a democratic society. It is our responsibility to ensure that our society is democratic and that people can walk down the streets without being exposed to fear and hatred such as we have seen in other countries. I should hate to see here what I have seen on television happening in the United States, Ireland and England.

Mr. Tenni: The socialists here support that type of thing.

Mr. MILLER: It has to be realised that to a certain degree members of the A.L.P. in this Chamber are, in common with other members of their party, responsible to the Trades Hall. Of course, if the Trades Hall bosses say to members of the Opposition, “We expect you to put up a show for us when we say we want to be able to march in the streets as we choose,” they expect Opposition members to put up a show. This is why today members of the Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition, who is normally a very sane sort of a person, are suggesting that the last demonstration here was not successful.

Why was the last demonstration not successful? Everybody from the university who wanted to go to the forum went there; everybody from the Trades Hall who wanted to go to the forum went there; and every water-sider who wanted to go to the forum went there. But did they disrupt the traffic? Did they disrupt the individuals in society? No! Now, what is wrong with that? They

were able to hold their meeting, and through the news media—every newspaper and television channel covered it—they were able to get their message across to the people. What more do they want? I know what they want—disruption in the streets. They want what is happening in almost every other country in the world today.

I say, “Good luck to the Premier of this State.” He will ensure that we are not going to have in Queensland what we see in Ireland and England. Take the latest demonstration in England, for example, in which a woman member of the Police Force had to be taken away in an ambulance. Some big, burly man decided he would attack a woman member of the Police Force. Why? Because in a moment of hatred he struck out at the law and order of that country. And that is the sort of thing that members of the Opposition are supporting in the Chamber this afternoon. They would claim that a person who wants to go out and demonstrate should be allowed to do so. The honourable member for Cairns said he would demonstrate wherever he wanted to. I think he must have got carried away.

Mr. JONES: I rise to a point of order. The remarks that the honourable member attributes to me are incorrect. What I did say was, “They won’t deny me the right to speak and I will be speaking wherever I wish.”

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Ithaca will accept the explanation.

Mr. MILLER: I accept the explanation, but the honourable member just said in his own words that he reserves the right to speak wherever he wants to.

Mr. Jones: That’s right.

Mr. MILLER: That is what I said; the honourable member reserves the right to speak wherever he wants to.

Mr. Jones: You try to stop me.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member just said, “Try and stop me.” I am suggesting to you, Mr. Hewitt, that he said he will speak wherever he wants to.

Mr. Jones interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Wright interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Jones interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have called for order on three occasions. If I am forced to, I will deal with those who will not accept my rulings.

Mr. MILLER: Mr. Hewitt, I would like to put a question to the Chamber. Having made that statement, would the honourable member for Cairns, no matter what he wants to say, go into a court of law and make a statement without asking the permission of the magistrate or judge to make that statement?

Mr. Jones interjected.

Mr. MILLER: Oh, now he is starting to qualify that statement. But he has just said he will say what he wants to say wherever he wants to say it.

Mr. Jones: That's right, and you won't deny me that right.

Mr. MILLER: We now have the honourable member for Cairns—

Mr. Jones interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I now warn the honourable member for Cairns under the provisions of Standing Order 123A.

Mr. MILLER: We now have the honourable member for Cairns admitting he would go into a court of law and take over that court to say what he wanted to say. So now we have the situation that not only would certain people take over the streets but also would they take over the courts of law. How far are these people prepared to go? I do not think the honourable member for Cairns is really serious when he says he is prepared to go into a court of law and take it over in order to make any statement he wants to make.

Mr. JONES: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is attributing statements to me which are incorrect and which I have not made, so I ask him to withdraw them. He is going on stupidly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Ithaca to accept that explanation.

Mr. MILLER: The honourable member qualified his own statement to this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! On a previous occasion this afternoon I ruled that acceptance of explanations or withdrawals will be made in an unqualified fashion, and I ask the honourable member for Ithaca to accept that ruling.

Mr. MILLER: I will bow to your wishes, Mr. Hewitt. I hope that people reading "Hansard" will decide for themselves.

This legislation has been referred to as provocative legislation. I say without any doubt that the members of the Opposition are being provocative. We are trying to ensure that the people of this State will be able to go about their lawful business without any threat or intimidation, and that includes members of trade unions or any others who wish to demonstrate in a peaceful manner.

We have seen what demonstrations in the streets can turn into, Mr. Hewitt, and I for one am totally opposed to allowing what we have seen in countries overseas to happen here.

Mr. PREST (Port Curtis) (3.56 p.m.): I support the Leader of the Opposition in opposing the proposed amendment to the Traffic Act. I think it is completely unnecessary.

The introduction of the debate on the amending Bill this afternoon without notice is an indication that the Government is becoming desperate. It has been done only because the arrogant dictator who is Premier of this State is becoming worried and is trying to create an issue between the Government and the unions. In fact, he has been trying to do that for some time but has been unsuccessful.

The proposed amendment provides that those who make application and are refused by the Superintendent of Traffic have the right to appeal to the Commissioner of Police. That is not good enough. The Commissioner of Police is supposed to have the power to run the Police Force. However, in the time that I have been a member of this Assembly, when Mr. Whitrod and Mr. Hodges were game enough to stand up to the Premier and not take directions from him, they were removed from office. I am quite certain that, although the proposed amendment provides for a right of appeal to the Commissioner of Police, in fact the appeal will be to the Minister, who will, of course, act on the directions of the Premier.

There was no more disappointed man in this State last Wednesday than the Premier, when the demonstrations that took place were so peaceful. I am sure it was then that he made up his mind to take action and bring down this amendment to the Traffic Act and try again to have confrontation with the unions and the students who demonstrate at times. I do not think it could truthfully be said at any time that the very small minority of people who go onto the streets and demonstrate have the backing of all the people, or even of a majority of the people, in the community. But again I say that the Premier is trying to create an issue on which to go to the people because he feels that the 28 per cent of the vote on which he was elected to Government is slipping away and he has not done anything during his term of office that has strengthened his claim to be Premier of the State. He is now clutching at straws.

We will not know what the Bill really contains until it is printed and it comes up for the second reading. However, what I have heard so far is enough. The proposed amendment takes away the rights of the individual, and once we take away the right of an individual to freedom of speech we are in a police State. Queensland is being run by a dictator, a man who has a very

arrogant attitude to the beliefs of certain people, and I am sure that is why the Premier is intent on seeing bloodshed in the streets.

Only last year Inspector Beattie was instructed to take batons on the marches, and nothing was to be done about it. The Premier overruled the Minister for Police and the Commissioner of Police. Today he is trying to create a situation with this legislation. Nothing would give the Premier of this State greater pleasure than to see bloodshed. I am quite certain that if his present attitude continues he will rue the day that this amendment to the Traffic Act was introduced.

Mr. POWELL (Isis) (4.1 p.m.): I rise to put a few facts straight. The attitude of the A.L.P. to the Bill saddens me greatly. Quite obviously Opposition members do not understand what it is all about. They are prepared to shoot their mouths off when they have no idea what is going on. They are frightened. It is quite clear that they are frightened because they know that the Government of Queensland has decided that it is going to govern and not have a rabble in the streets causing it to do certain things that it does not want to do.

In 1940 Theodore Roosevelt spoke about four freedoms: freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in the way he desires, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. I would ask members of the Opposition whether they agree with that principle. If they don't, let them stand up and speak on that premise, not as the honourable member for Port Curtis did. He spoke about hatred and things that we know do not occur. The honourable member for Port Curtis said that the Queensland Government was desperate. Goodness gracious me, what have we got to be desperate about? The Queensland Government is in the strongest position of any Government this State has known since 1859. We have a State election coming up, and we are determined that there will not be arrogant people in the streets causing mayhem. If Opposition members had taken the trouble to read the relevant section of the Traffic Act and the regulations under the Act pertaining to this matter, they would know that there is no specific reference to street marches and permits for them. The amendment merely regularises the attitudes of the Government.

I remind the Committee that when the honourable member for Port Curtis came into this place, he was followed as Mayor of Gladstone by a Mr. Johnson, who no doubt after the next election will follow him into this Chamber. If the honourable member for Port Curtis continues to carry on in the fashion he does here the people of Gladstone and Port Curtis will have no option but to decide that he is paranoiac and incapable of carrying on his job as a member of Parliament. When somebody has the gall to stand up in this place and say that the Premier

of Queensland was disappointed because the demonstration last week was peaceful it shows his paranoia; it shows his misinformation; it shows his plain stupidity. I can inform Opposition members, and members of the Press if they like, that in the joint Government party room last Wednesday afternoon the Premier was as pleased as punch that the demonstration had gone off peacefully.

Mr. Wright: You had to force him to change his demands.

Mr. POWELL: There has been no change of any demands on anybody. The Premier does not demand that the Government do anything. The trouble is that members of the A.L.P. are so used to bowing to the dictates of people in the Trades Hall that they think we do the same sort of thing. The poor fellows do not understand that we are a democratic institution. The Premier comes along and consults with Government members to find out their feelings before a decision is made. Opposition members cannot understand that. That attitude is so galling they will not accept that it is the way we do things. It is very plain that the Premier was quite pleased that the decisions last week allowed a peaceful demonstration to go ahead.

As I said, we agree with the four freedoms expressed by Theodore Roosevelt. One concerns the freedom of speech and expression. That is exactly what we want to ensure for the people of Queensland. We believe in freedom to go about business the way that people want to go about it. Why do people wish to march in the streets? Why do they wish to hold up placards? It is simply to express a point of view. But what is the difference between expressing a point of view in a forum, a park or a hall and expressing it in the street? The difference is that people have to go to a park or a hall. The T.V. cameras have to go to a hall or a park to show what is going on there. That does not disrupt anybody. Anyone who wishes to hear what is being said has the right to do so. People also have the right to take no notice of what is going on. But the demonstrators do not want anybody to have that second right. They want to be able to force people to take notice of what they are saying. They want to be able to make people listen to what they are saying. They do not want people to come along and listen to them because they have sheer logic, right or democracy on their side. They do not want that at all. Their main interest is to stop people doing things—to cause chaos and confusion.

If a person has a valid, reasonable point of view to put across, he can do that with press and radio coverage; he can write letters to the Press. But sometimes no-one pays him any attention; in those circumstances

his point of view may not be worth listening to. Peaceful demonstrations, such as an Anzac Day march, can be demonstrations of loyalty, but the disruptionists do not want demonstrations of loyalty. The Warana and various other provincial tourist parades are demonstrations of loyalty, but these people are not interested in them. They want something that will disrupt. They want to force their views on other people. We are not interested in their forcing views on us. We would like demonstrations to be peaceful. As I said, I stand for freedom of speech and expression. I hope that everybody else in this Chamber has similar feelings. There is no way in the wide world that I wish to deny any person the right to speak wherever he wishes so long as he does not infringe on the civil liberties of others.

Mr. Wright: That is not what you are saying now.

Mr. POWELL: That is exactly what I am saying. If the honourable member were to listen carefully he would follow the logic in it. But his mind is so blighted and twisted he is too busy trying to find things that are not there.

We say that we will defend the rights of people to freedom of speech and expression. There is no way in the wide world that we will stop it. If I want to hold a demonstration or rally I will have it where it will not cause disruption to traffic; I will have it where it is legal to have it.

Mr. Wright: You will have it where the Police Commissioner says you will have it. That is what is means now.

Mr. POWELL: That is not what it means now. As I said when I started speaking, if only the honourable member would listen before shooting his mouth off, he might learn something.

The member for Port Curtis, who was the speaker before me, made another mistake, and one that is common to the A.L.P. I have to refute it. He was going on about the Premier. I don't know why he hates the Premier. Obviously he does not know him.

Mr. Wright: That still won't get you into Cabinet.

Mr. POWELL: I am not greatly interested in that.

The member for Port Curtis called the Premier an arrogant dictator. Anybody who knows the Premier knows that arrogant he is not and dictator he is not. Leader he is.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. POWELL: We notice where the interjections are coming from. They are coming from the people who do not know the Premier, the people who are determined

not to know the Premier, the people who hate the Premier because they know that he has the leadership qualities and the charisma to lead this State.

The member for Port Curtis stated that the Premier was elected to office with 28 per cent of the vote. If he looks at the figures for the 1974 elections he will find that in the electorate of Barambah the Premier was elected with something over 70 per cent of the vote. There is an example of how these fellows cannot read statistics. If we look at the overall results—the National Party received 27.88 per cent of the vote, the Liberal Party received 31.09 per cent of the vote—

Mr. Wright: What's this got to do with the legislation?

Mr. POWELL: Mr. Hewitt, I am rebutting an argument that was put by the member for Port Curtis. Adding 27.88 to 31.09 gives 58.97 per cent. If that is not a majority, I'll eat my hat. If I can get that majority at the next election, I will be happy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will now come back to the Bill.

Mr. POWELL: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt.

The member for Port Curtis also said that the Premier was intent on seeing bloodshed in the streets. If we were intent on seeing bloodshed in the streets, there is no way in the wide world that we would introduce an amendment such as this. We would say, "You don't have to have a permit. You can march where you like. You can do all you like. You can overturn cars. You can stop traffic if you like." That would cause bloodshed in the streets.

The argument that we have heard this afternoon—and it has probably been one of the better debates in this Parliament for some time—is a philosophical argument on government; just who is the Government and, in a democracy, who governs? Every three years in Australia we have the right to fill out a ballot-paper, put it in the box and decide which party will be the Government for the following three years. I see that as democracy. I do not see democracy being defeated simply because an amendment is moved to provide the means by which people can obtain a permit to march in the street. I do not see that as a limitation on democracy. Whilst every three years we have the right to fill out a ballot-paper and drop it in the box, democracy is defended.

Perhaps I could refer the members of the Opposition back to November 1975, when the Governor-General sacked the Whitlam Government. There they were crying out that democracy was dead, that the people no longer had the right to speak, that the people's will was no longer allowed. But what happened in December 1975? The

people spoke, surely enough, and they gave Whitlam the greatest hiding he has ever had—and the Labor Party with him.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. POWELL: But the people had their say, and that is democracy—not like these people here yelling and trying to shut me up, as they are doing at the moment. They are trying to stop me enjoying freedom of speech and expression at the moment, by their shouting and their attempts to stop this debate.

I repeat, Mr. Hewitt, the debate this afternoon is a philosophical one: do we as the Government make sure that the people have the right to vote every three years for the Government they desire and do we let that Government then go ahead and govern, or do we allow anarchy? That is what the debate is about. If people are allowed to stop traffic when they like and if they are allowed to stop commerce, then we are surely on the road to anarchy. I cannot accept that by this change to the legislation we are denying anybody a legitimate right—and let us look carefully at the adjective “legitimate”. I do not see that we are denying them one legitimate right at all.

Mr. Wright: Why take it out of the hands of the magistrate?

Mr. POWELL: We are not taking it out of the hands of the rightful people to decide what should be going on. When I say the rightful people—

Mr. Wright: You were well and truly caught on that one.

Mr. POWELL: No, not at all. The honourable member is the one who got caught, well and truly, because if we do not have the police deciding who can have the demonstrations and who can do what they want on the roads, who do we allow to do it? Are we going to allow the Leader of the Opposition or another Opposition members to do it? Of course we are not. The Government will make the decision on who is going to do what within the community and that is exactly how it ought to be.

Mr. Marginson: Bypassing the court?

Mr. POWELL: I cannot agree that we are bypassing anything. That is not the way the legislation is written. Maybe that is what has been going on. As I said, what we are concerned about is the freedom of speech and expression and this amendment will not deny that at all.

One of the earlier speakers—I think it was the honourable member for Rockhampton North—said that individuals were not being protected. He cited some examples of people who had been murdered and who had disappeared. The difference is that if we have a group of people incited in the street, we

have the risk of mob violence. It is that risk that both the police and the Government are concerned about.

I do not believe that we are denying anybody anything. We are protecting the rights of people to speak and express themselves as freely as possible so that in their speech and expression they do not deny the civil liberties of other people.

It is all very fine to jump up and down about civil liberties. But let us think about it. Let us consider the rights of each and every individual. Is it my right to be able to stop people in the normal course of their duties? Of course it is not. And it is not anybody else's right, either. We have to make sure that people are protected in their individual freedoms. I sincerely hope that the people of Queensland will not be duped by the stupidities that have gushed forth from the mouths of the Opposition this afternoon, for they have spoken, as usual, without knowledge.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER (Archerfield) (4.18 p.m.): One fact that is quite obvious to me is that the Minister for Transport certainly has not got his heart in this legislation.

An Honourable Member: The honourable member for Townsville South has gone, too.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Townsville South has never been known for his intestinal fortitude. He is like a mongrel dog. He can give it but he can't take it. He put on a shocking spectacle in the Chamber this afternoon when he spoke about a personal relationship that a member of the Opposition was supposed to have been having with a lady in Rockhampton. He flew back into the Chamber and he was going to punch the honourable member for Rockhampton.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will come to the motion before the Committee.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: The honourable member for Townsville South is not worth wasting breath on.

Mr. Porter interjected.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I will be dealing with the honourable member; I have not forgotten him.

As I was saying, it is quite obvious to me that the Minister certainly has not got his heart in this legislation. When he was introducing the Bill I could sense some trepidation in his voice. It is quite obvious that he has been a victim of the numbers game in Cabinet and was on the losing side, so he was forced to introduce this shocking, neo-Fascist amendment for the sole purpose of stifling free speech and assembly in this State.

Mr. Powell: How do those phrases roll off your tongue so smoothly?

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: They roll off my tongue because I speak from the heart, not from the top of my head. It is quite obvious that the honourable member for Isis is toadying to the Premier and looking for a Cabinet post. It is quite true that he might get the Cabinet vacancy because, as can be seen on the Government front bench, elevation to Cabinet rank is not based on ability.

Quite rightly, Queensland is regarded throughout this nation as the Alabama of Australia. The Premier is widely regarded, and rightly so, as Governor Wallace.

As I said, this Bill has been introduced in a vain attempt to stifle much-needed criticism of the reactionary Bjelke-Petersen Government by the progressive elements in our community, the people who seek to legitimately criticise the Government by engaging in peaceful marches but are branded by Government members as Communists, rabbags, fellow-travellers, radicals and Left-wingers.

One of the worst speeches I have heard in this Chamber was that made this afternoon by the honourable member for Everton. I think he must have some form of psychiatric problem. He goes tense and red in the face and grasps the microphone. I suggest that if his stint in Vietnam affected his nervous system he see a psychiatrist as soon as possible.

Mr. Wright: That's not the only thing it affected, either, I'm told.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I do not believe in getting personal.

I agree with my colleague the honourable member for Cairns, who described this amendment as a cheap political ploy by the Government to stifle the critics of the Government's shoddy reactionary policies. They are using the Hitler-like tactic of trying to provoke reaction to produce confrontation between police and demonstrators. It is quite obvious that this is an election ploy because the Government is bereft of any policies for the good of the people of Queensland. It is certainly not worrying about the unemployed. All that it is concerned about is saving its own lousy political hide.

I think most members on the Government side realise that the political pendulum is about to swing the other way and that quite a number who were political flukes at the last election are about to go into political oblivion. I can even name them: the honourable members for Everton, Cooroora, Barron River, Isis—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not discussing electoral prospects. The honourable member will return to the subject matter of the Bill under discussion.

Mr. K. J. HOOPER: I was saying that Government members are trying to divert attention from their lack of policies.

In August last year we witnessed a shocking example of a breach of democracy by this neo-Fascist Government when a young girl who sought to exercise her democratic right by demonstrating against the Government's wrong education policy was brutally bashed over the head by Inspector Mark Beattie of the Queensland Police Force. That action was openly condoned by the Premier and the Government. The Premier overrode a well-established principle of justice and quashed a police inquiry into this vicious assault by a uniformed thug.

I am glad the Minister for Police is walking out, because I am going to repeat that Inspector Mark Beattie, now Superintendent Mark Beattie, is nothing but a uniformed thug. He has been rewarded for bashing this poor defenceless little girl over the head in that the Government saw fit to promote him to the rank of superintendent. Not one Government member raised his voice in protest at this brutal negation of civil rights in Queensland.

The honourable member for Toowong, who is rightly regarded as the Enoch Powell of the Queensland Parliament, stands up here and espouses a spurious pseudo-patriotism. I remind him of the old adage that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel. It certainly applies to the honourable member.

In conclusion, I want to make it quite clear that I will support any peaceful march or demonstration and, if necessary, I will even participate in the march.

Mr. SIMPSON (Cooroora) (4.24 p.m.): I commend the Minister for Transport on the introduction of the Bill, which will bring the Act up to date. We are today at the crossroads of democracy. There are in the community those who would take from us the right of democratic election and who would subject us to the behaviour of professional thugs who would bash people in the streets and get free publicity by means of television. There are those who would use all the latest methods to get round the law, pervert justice and train others to do these things.

It is incredible that the Opposition has the gall to oppose the people's democratic right to be heard, to be safe in the streets and to use the public thoroughfare for peaceful purposes. The Opposition in Queensland is really getting itself into a pathetic state. It is obvious that an election must be close at hand when Opposition members use this forum to try to make out that we are going to take freedom away from people when in fact we are giving freedom back to the people. When Whitlam decided he was right and that the majority of Australians were wrong, he got his thugs out into the streets. They protested and shouted and

tried to pervert the law and the Constitution. They thought they could take over Australia by force. That is what we have to stand up against. These are the people the members of the Opposition associate themselves with—the radicals, the professional thugs and the people who will march down our streets and try to cause the maximum amount of disruption.

The Minister indicated that this amendment to the Act will mean that any appeals will be referred to experts in the area of law and order. And that is what we are talking about—law and order. We are not talking about validating the actions of thugs and law-breakers and those people who would make the streets unsafe for our families.

Mr. Wright: Come on, bash some heads.

Mr. SIMPSON: We want safety in public places. We do not want those like the honourable member who has just interjected and said he would bash them on the head. That is typical of the performance we see from them.

Mr. WRIGHT: I rise to a point of order. I think the honourable member for Cooroora was referring to me. I did not say that. I said very simply that no doubt the member wants to bash some heads.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! First of all, I ask the honourable member if he was referring to the honourable member for Rockhampton.

Mr. SIMPSON: Yes, I was referring to the honourable member for Rockhampton.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Under those circumstances I would ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. SIMPSON: Right. I would also like to take a point of order, because the honourable member said that I said they were bashing heads. I would like that withdrawn.

Mr. Wright: I am sorry; I am not with the debate at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will adjudicate on one point of order at a time. Will the honourable member for Cooroora withdraw the words attributed to him that he said about the honourable member for Rockhampton?

Mr. SIMPSON: I will, Mr. Hewitt.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Will the honourable member for Rockhampton withdraw the words attributed to him that he said about the honourable member for Cooroora?

Mr. Wright: I always believe in fair play, Mr. Hewitt. I shall.

Mr. SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt. It is good to see that in this place we have rules, fair play and a right to be heard.

We see things happening in the streets in other parts of the world which the members of the Opposition would love to see here. Because they, having a minority in this place, cannot overcome the wishes of the majority of the people of this State. They would like to see things happening here such as happened in the streets in England, where on 11 September at Notting Hill 253 people were injured and on 28 August in London 141 people were injured. The police were spat on and bashed. We have even seen that sort of thing in Sydney, where police have had paint poured on them. They have been abused. They are the thin blue line which is trying to preserve law and order in this country. We in this place make the laws and the police have to uphold the laws in public places. And the police are very few in number. If it were not for the good people in this community who are seen peacefully going about their business in the streets and not intimidating others, we would not have any democracy. That is the sort of situation we are providing for today.

Labor members have found themselves with so little support from fair-minded people that they have become radicals and are associating with thugs, mongrels, bashers and other violent types. As one honourable member said earlier, if you associate with dogs you cannot help getting fleas, and that is what is happening in this instance.

In Britain, not only the police were attacked. Marbles were thrown under the feet of horses. That was also done in Melbourne. People who show cruelty to animals have no spirit of fairness, no appreciation of civil rights, liberty and freedom, and they want to take these things away from others.

We must ensure, Mr. Hewitt, that we are fully aware of the elements that are trying to subvert our law and our democracy, and I believe that the proposed amendment must be passed to keep our legislation up to date.

Mr. GUNN (Somerset) (4.31 p.m.): It was extremely interesting to listen to the Opposition and hear the lengths to which it is prepared to go to protect a small ratbag fringe of society that is at present based on our universities. It also was interesting to hear the lengths to which the honourable member for Archerfield was prepared to go to denigrate a good friend of mine, Superintendent Mark Beattie. He suggested to the Committee that Superintendent Beattie was promoted because he bashed an innocent little girl. In fact, he was promoted on the recommendation of the former Commissioner of Police, Mr. Whitrod, the man so much admired by members of the Opposition. I might add that the innocent little girl concerned is well known to me. She is one of the most foul-mouthed women I have ever met. It does not surprise any Government member that members of the Opposition are out to protect people such as that.

What does the amendment set out to do? It sets out to do only one thing. It is exactly the same regulation that we have had right through under the Traffic Act, except that the appeal now goes to the expert, the Commissioner of Police.

Honourable members opposite have said in this Chamber before that we might get a bad Commissioner of Police. Of course, I could advance an equally weak argument by saying that we might get a bad magistrate.

Members of the Opposition have spoken about the rights of individuals, and I think that most of us will acknowledge that everybody in the community has certain rights. But my rights are restricted, and so they should be, particularly when they conflict with the rights of other individuals. That is what the marchers have set out to do.

Mr. K. J. Hooper: They have not, and you know it. They are peaceful, organised marches.

Mr. GUNN: They are very peaceful! We have seen them. They have one specific purpose—to break down the system. That is all that those who take part in marches are interested in. It is not surprising to see honourable members on my right backing them to the hilt, because they have a vested interest in breaking down the free-enterprise system that we enjoy and from which they have got so much themselves. There is no doubt about that.

If I go onto the streets in an unsafe car and hold up the business and commerce of this city or of any town in the State of Queensland, I will be brought before the courts and fined. If I wish to drive any of my cattle to the local dip, I first have to obtain a permit from the local stock inspector to drive them on the road, because they are likely to hold up traffic. I am told that I must travel on one side of the road; I am told also that I can use only certain roads. Yet these demonstrators want to take over the whole of the roads in this city, and I do not believe that they should have that right. They should not have the right to hold up the commerce and business of this city, and we are not going to give them that right. I have not the right to do it, nor has any other member of this Assembly.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member drives out tonight in a car that is unsafe, he will be picked up and charged, and rightly so. That is the crux of the whole matter.

Mr. Wright: Do you have the right to put your cattle on the road?

Mr. GUNN: If I wish to drive my cattle on the road, I have to obtain a stock permit. Those cattle have to be in my care. That is the position, and I accept it. I accept

full responsibility for those cattle when I drive them on the road. I must accept full responsibility if I go out on the road with an unsafe vehicle. I have no right to inflict hardship on other people. That is what the Bill is all about.

Opposition members are out to protect a ratbag fringe of our society. They are a lunatic fringe. They achieve nothing, give nothing, but take everything. Their greatest whinge has been about their scholarships etc. at the university. They will never be worth a crumplet to society. I tell them that. I can pick them out. There is only a very small group of them out there. They are only a very small mob; they are only little people, but they have big mouths.

Surely we are giving the hearing of the appeal to the proper person—the Commissioner of Police. It will be up to him. The decision will be his prerogative. First of all applications will be made to the District Superintendent of Traffic.

An Opposition Member: Where did you get the notes?

Mr. GUNN: Of course I have notes.

Mr. Wright: You've got the Minister's brief.

Mr. GUNN: I have no brief from the Minister at all, nor have I any long-hairs or an unkempt group writing for me, as do Opposition members. I don't need that.

I make the point that what we are doing is absolutely necessary. It was forced on us because when these people take to the streets they do so for one reason only, and that is to break down the system. If we let them go unhindered, we would have a state of affairs like that in some other countries. The United States was mentioned, where there is shooting and everything else in the streets. Demonstrators can yell to their heart's content in the forum and parks. They can vent their spleen in those places, and we don't care two hoots. The Act clearly says, "not upon any road convene, hold or address a political, religious or any other meeting, or hold or take part in a procession." Of course a funeral procession is exempted.

I commend the Minister for amending the Act. It was absolutely necessary. The Bill certainly meets with the satisfaction of everyone on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. LANE (Merthyr) (4.38 p.m.): I wish to make a few brief remarks about the right of appeal, which is what we are discussing in this amendment to the Traffic Act. The right of appeal is something that we all respect and embrace. On many times in the party rooms I and other members of both parties in the coalition have

stood up and defended that right. We have spoken up when there could have been some real infringement of someone's civil liberties under proposed legislation. However, the provisions put forward by the Minister today infringe no-one's civil liberties.

There is ample opportunity for people to protest and express a point of view in any free and democratic way they wish, except when they interfere with other people's liberties. The latter is just what the Opposition is proposing here now. Certain sections of the public, which have been described as minorities, as indeed they are, would wish to interfere with other people's liberties in order to impose on others their own will. When a minority group in the community indicates that it wishes to impose its will by force or violence on the majority, it is not entitled to the same rights or protection at law as it would be in other circumstances.

Under the Traffic Act the district superintendent is given a responsibility to exercise in a wide field. He can direct traffic, block off roads and so on. He has a wide discretionary power. Decisions made by the District Superintendent of Traffic are purely technical. They are based on expert opinion on traffic flow and what is best to ensure the free passage of citizens on our highways and byways. Very properly he is given this power and discretion. A similar power is conferred on individual policemen. They have an absolute right—without any sanction or right of appeal against them—to direct people to stop obstructing traffic or to take their vehicles or themselves from one place to another on a public roadway.

A policeman standing on traffic duty at a major intersection, by his signals (which are prescribed in the Act) indicates that vehicles or persons approaching an intersection shall stop and allow other vehicles or persons to cross in another direction. Indeed, he can stop people approaching from all four or five directions. The motorist and pedestrians are obliged to obey his signals. Such an officer can be a young policeman of 20 years of age who has just been sworn in. He has power under the Traffic Act to issue directions. Anyone who disobeys his direction is liable to a penalty—even to summary arrest without warrant.

If we are prepared to confer on a young constable of police power to control traffic at an intersection, surely the District Superintendent of Traffic—a senior, very experienced officer, with a lifetime of training in traffic control—should be able to make a decision in his own right on whether large hordes of pedestrians can walk down a roadway. Surely at the higher level—the best level for making a technical decision on whether traffic will be blocked and roadways will be disrupted, on whether a little old lady or a small child can walk home, or

an ambulance can take a sick person to a doctor's surgery or hospital—the commissioner should be able to decide what will be done. That is what is being protected today.

That is how we on this side of the Chamber view the matter we are discussing. That is in sharp contrast to the obvious concept held by members of the socialist Opposition. They see this measure as suppression. On the words of the honourable member representing the Waterside Workers' Federation—the honourable member for Rockhampton North—it is obvious that he sees it as suppression of the trade union movement or the activists in this State. The words he used were "the trade union movement and the activists". Anyone on the left of politics—on the extreme left, where he is—is an activist, and it is presumed that he is an activist for good, not for evil. It would only be as an activist for good, in his context. I do not know whether this gentleman honestly believes what he says or whether he is just trying to curry favour with his party organisation. I would hope that the latter is the case. I would like to judge him as being weak rather than wicked. So we will give him the benefit of the doubt on that.

Another remark he made today in criticising the police demonstrates just what regard he has for them. He said that the police did nothing about the march at a certain point but that they allowed the march to come into town and then assaulted a young girl in the centre of the city. That is the sort of contribution he makes. I know that anti-police remarks of that sort would find great favour with the Left Wing of the Labor Party—and especially with the waterside workers' section of the Labor Party, which of course is the section he relies on for his support and, indeed, for his endorsement. I just hope that, when the research officers of the Police Union of Employees read through a copy of today's "Hansard", they copy down a few of the remarks made by the members of the Opposition and print them in the Police Union Journal so that the 3,500 police throughout the State and their families will know exactly where the socialist Left in this Chamber stand on the matter of police officers and their duty. I think that deals reasonably adequately with the member for the waterfront.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable gentleman will refer to the honourable member in proper terms. His electorate is Rockhampton North.

Mr. LANE: Yes, the member for Rockhampton North.

Mr. Lee: Where the waterfront is situated.

Mr. LANE: Yes, where the waterfront of that city is situated.

However, the A.L.P. collectively, under the weak and peculiar leadership it has in this place, has a deep and undivided commitment to follow socialist movements throughout the world. Their platform and their policy express quite clearly their commitment to the international socialist objective. It is for that reason that they are part of an international campaign at the moment to stop the countries of the Western World developing their uranium capacity—to stop Western countries developing on the basis of their great uranium riches. A country in the Western World that has a great wealth of uranium reserves is Australia; so it is not just by chance that the socialist parties of the world—indeed, the Communist Parties of the world, through their mouthpieces in this country (and particularly those who sit on the benches on the other side of the Chamber)—should be conducting a campaign to prevent the mining and export of uranium in this country.

This whole business of protest and street marches—of mobilising the mob—is just part of that campaign. It is probably one of the clumsier parts of the campaign, but it is nevertheless part of it. The more subtle campaigns, of course, involve bringing so-called overseas experts to this country. One wonders how this is all co-ordinated and how the Labor Party members are part of it.

I could not help but notice an article which appeared in the Communist newspaper "Tribune" of 3 August this year which is headed "The only safe nuclear reaction is . . . 'No'." It goes on to describe how two people—a woman named Petra Kelly and a gent named John Carroll "are visiting Melbourne and Sydney to talk about nuclear power and uranium and to participate in Hiroshima Day activities." Of course, the Hiroshima Day activities—the protests and the marches that we are talking about in relation to this Bill—are part of a campaign organised by the Committee for International Co-operation and Disarmament and the various subsidiary committees which are now directed against the development of our uranium capacity. One of these people comes from Ireland. He is the gentleman, John Carroll. The lady comes from Germany.

It is no accident that this Ms. Kelly is a well-known feminist, according to the Communist "Tribune"—those words seem to go hand in hand—and a member of the German Young Socialists. She is on the European Economic Commission in the Division of Social Affairs, Environment and Public Health. She is one of those international bureaucrats who seem to preserve their positions and gain promotion within the international bureaucracy by being activists in favour of the socialist cause. The gentleman, John Carroll, is vice-president of the

Irish Transport and General Workers Union and a member of the European Trade Union Confederation.

They were brought out here and lauded by the Communist "Tribune" as being against marches and the development of our nuclear capacity. They are part of the same lobby and cry that issue from those 11 socialists who sit on the Opposition benches.

To come a little closer to home, let me refer to the Communist "Tribune" of 7 September this year. It is the latest edition. An article in it is headed, "Bjelke bans protest." Of course, the remarks of some people on the Premier's actions against disruptive street marches are quoted. The Council for Civil Liberties president (Mr. Fielding) is quoted in the Communist "Tribune" as strongly criticising the demonstration ban. In this article, well-known members of the Communist Party are quoted as being opponents of it. They include Charlie Gifford, who is currently the Queensland secretary of the Communist Party. He is reported as saying—

"The Communist Party calls on all workers, students, Aborigines and other democratically minded people"—

there is a lovely bunch—

"to resist the Premier's dictatorial action and not be intimidated from following their social consciences."

Charlie Gifford is part of this campaign, together with the Leader of the Opposition and other Labor members of opposition to uranium and to the Premier.

The great headline of the Communist "Tribune"—Australia's Communist weekly—of 3 August this year reads, "Uranium . . . like hell." Like hell for whom? Like hell for Russia, not like hell for Australia, because it is of great significance to Australia that we have this rich find within this country that we can develop. Australia is one of the few sources of low-cost uranium for export, and is in an extremely important position as a supplier of energy to the rest of the world. Of course, that is just what the people in the Left-wing bloc overseas do not want to see happen.

The "Tribune" of 13 July this year—two months ago—carries an article which relates to the right to protest and to demonstrate, as it is called; the right of unruly mobs to take control of the streets. It is headed, "Unionists hit Joh's ravings." The article deals supposedly with the proposed right-to-work legislation, the right of a man to work if he wishes without interference or bans from his employers or indeed his trade union bosses. Those people seem to have a monopoly on the right to work these days.

When it was suggested publicly that some right-to-work legislation should be put forward in this place and that there would be protests and marches and all sorts of activity against it, these people, in statements made to the Communist "Tribune", came

out against it. One of the most prominent people quoted is a well-known member of the Communist Party, Mr. Dick Anear, who at that time was president of the Australian Meat Industry Employees Union. By the way he has been tipped out since by an anti-Communist group within the union.

He is quoted in the Communist "Tribune" as saying—

"If Bjelke wants to do something about the right to work he should create jobs for full employment."

He then goes on to criticise the Premier over his attitude to street marches.

Quoted in the same "Tribune" is the notorious Ken Vaughan, acting secretary of the Electrical Trades Union. This is the union in which the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader hold membership. Ken Vaughan is reported in this Communist paper as saying—

"His continual attacks are all by design. Joh is being advised or directed by people outside the country."

There is now apparently some great international plot to deny Queenslanders work, a plot of which the Premier is a part.

Mr. Akers: Is this Ken Vaughan the endorsed Labor candidate for Nudgee?

Mr. LANE: Of course he is. This Mr. Ken Vaughan, the person quoted in the Communist "Tribune" of 13 July this year, is the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for Nudgee at the coming election. But we know that the people of Nudgee have more sense than to vote for a Trades Hall stooge.

A Government Member: It's a direct insult to the honourable member for Nudgee.

Mr. LANE: It certainly is. If he were in the Chamber now he would hang his head in shame.

Mr. Melloy: I am here.

Mr. LANE: Then he should hang his head in shame.

Mr. Melloy: I never hang my head in shame.

Mr. LANE: Anyone would want to hang his head in shame if he were followed in this place by a person such as Ken Vaughan, who revels in making statements to the Communist "Tribune" and keeps in sweet with the Left.

It is not by accident that Labor members here take part in the campaign to prevent the development of uranium and other sources of power by Western nations, of which Australia is a very important member. Labor members are not concerned about the right of appeal against the decision of the District Superintendent of Traffic. There is

probably not one Labor member who has ever been hindered by a decision of the district superintendent. In years gone by I saw a couple of them holding placards and waving them about in street demonstrations, but I did not see them hindered in any way. I shall not name those former trade union officials who participated in unruly street demonstrations in the past and who were not at all inhibited by the power of the District Superintendent of Traffic. Suffice it to say that they are now present in this Assembly.

I think you would know, Mr. Hewitt, as I and other members know, that it is only by getting the plum Labor endorsements that Labor members have any hope of retaining their positions here. There are only 11 of them and they have to keep themselves in sweet with the Trades Hall, particularly the Left-wing bloc in the Australian Labor Party.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (4.59 p.m.): Debates such as this seem to generate a certain amount of feeling on both sides of the Chamber. I want to try to bring the debate back to basic issues and concentrate on the legislation that the Minister is endeavouring to introduce. He is trying to bring down an amendment to the Traffic Act. The Minister is a nice fellow and on occasions during the last couple of years I have felt sorry for him because of the embarrassing position in which he has found himself. He has had to bring down legislation in which he does not seem to have had much heart.

Over the past couple of years he has done this with industrial legislation. One piece of such industrial legislation was claimed to be the greatest move ever made in this Chamber. It was claimed that it would bring industrial peace and harmony throughout Queensland.

The Minister knew full well that that legislation would not do what he said it would do. It was a decision of the joint Government parties that he should introduce it; consequently when it hit the Chamber his heart was not in it. The legislation was passed; but what has happened since then? It has never ever been used, for the simple reason, as was pointed out by the Opposition at the time, that it could not work effectively.

Today the Minister is introducing amendments to the Traffic Act. I believe from the way in which they were explained by the Minister in his introductory speech that they will do nothing. In fairness to the Minister, I shall wait until I have examined the Bill before I say too much. However, time may not permit that.

I support the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the method adopted by the Government to introduce

this Bill this afternoon. This legislation has been discussed by the joint Government parties on a couple of occasions and suddenly, after a special meeting during the luncheon adjournment, has been introduced into the Chamber this afternoon. Perhaps the Government is merely clutching at straws in an endeavour to find that election issue which it is desperately seeking to take the minds of the people of Queensland off the neglect we have seen over 20 years of bad government in this State.

From the way in which the Minister introduced this Bill this afternoon, I believe we have another piece of legislation that will not work effectively. It might be used, however, by the Premier and his Government to try to bring about some form of confrontation. That is what he is seeking; that is what he looks for. He wants confrontation in order to pull the wool over the eyes of the people. As I understand the Minister's introduction, we are going to see some new form of permits issued under the Traffic Act.

At this stage it appears to me that one of the worst aspects of this new form of permits is that there will be no right of appeal. It is all very well for the Minister to say that if the superintendent of traffic knocks people back they can go to the Commissioner of Police, but I think it was the honourable member for Cairns who pointed out that that is not much good to people wanting to hold a street march in Cairns, Mackay or Mt. Isa.

If people feel aggrieved they prefer to air their grievances lawfully, and I stress the word "lawfully". They desire to do something in accordance with the laws that have existed in this State for a lengthy period. They existed when this Government came into power and it has allowed them to remain in existence for the past 20 years. But we now find that people who want to do something that has been lawful for so long are to be denied that right by some new law which the current incumbents of government in this State feel should be introduced to stop them from exercising their right.

As I said, there will be no right of appeal. This government is saying to the people, "We are going to take certain lawful rights away from you and we are not going to allow you to appeal against their being taken from you." That is a denial of just one more basic right of the individual. Every person should have the right of appeal to a court of law that is completely independent and is shown to be independent. But that is certainly not happening with some of the rules laid down today by Government departments.

The whole logic of the Bill is that, in order to protect certain civil rights of individuals in the community, it is going to take some other rights away from them.

That seems to me to be rather strange. Of course, it is typical of the attitude adopted by the Premier in so many instances in the State of Queensland in the 10 years that we have had to suffer him.

Anyone in Queensland who dares to criticise the Government or any aspect of the Government's administration is called a knocker. He is said to be knocking things in the community if he dares to exercise his basic civil right to criticise. If anyone dares to exercise the basic right to propose an alternative, to put forward a proposal other than that supported by the Government, he is publicly branded as not knowing what he is talking about. These are the methods being used by the National Party when anyone dares to put forward an alternative proposal. Of course, the members of the Liberal Party in this Chamber are the rumpers. They have attached themselves to the rump of the National Party and have supported National Party policies. When I first became a member of this Assembly, there was at least one group of Liberals who stood up so strongly for the rights of the people that they became commonly known throughout the community as the ginger group. They used to sit up on the back bench of the Chamber, and they spent many hours putting forward proposals and criticising the Government because the Government was endeavouring to take away some basic right of the people.

As I said a couple of weeks ago, the policy of Attila the Hun was "divide and conquer", and that policy was applied to the ginger group. They have been divided; they have been conquered. Some of them have been given positions in the Government. Others have retired from Parliament because they could not, as a matter of principle, stay in this Chamber in view of what was happening here. Former members of that group who dared to stand up in the Chamber and support basic Liberal principles were almost thrown out of the parliamentary party and were sent to Coventry by the Premier simply for daring to do that. So today, because of the way those honourable members have been divided and conquered, even that criticism from within the Liberal Party has disappeared and virtually all members of the party are prepared to support whatever the National Party wants to do.

Of course, if anybody dares to exercise his basic right to draw attention to the real community problems in Queensland today, he is told that he is only being politically sensational in order to draw a red herring across the trail and take people's minds away from the real issue. This Government has become the greatest exponent of cover-up in the history of politics in Australia. It endeavours to cover things up as it goes along. The honourable member for Cairns outlined many of them a short while ago; the Leader of the Opposition drew the attention of the Committee to many others. I

do not wish to indulge in tedious repetition, so I only point out that they drew attention to many instances in Queensland in which there has been political cover-up. There are more to come. The Opposition is now looking at further evidence of cover-up in this State.

The people of this State are being convinced, at least partly, by the great propaganda machine of the Queensland Government that their rights are not being taken away from them. It employs more journalists—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable gentleman is digressing from the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: Well, perhaps it does seem so at this stage, but the point is that the freedom of the Press is another of the basic freedoms in our community. However, it is an indisputable fact that the Opposition in this Parliament is denied the same basic rights as the Government in providing information to the Press and to the media generally. If that is not so I would like you, Mr. Hewitt, to examine the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has made an application to get the same facilities as Ministers by way of a telex machine being—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not my role to adjudicate on such matters. In any case, that has nothing to do with the Bill under discussion.

Mr. CASEY: So many human rights will be taken away from the people of the State by the Bill. Those rights do not exist even in this Parliament in that an equal right of access to media is not allowed to the Leader of the Opposition.

Let me come back to marches, or demonstrations as they have been classified by so many people today. Most honourable members have referred to trade-unionists, university students, student groups and demonstrators. But is the Premier really worried about the Dairymen's Action Group? Is he worried about the fact that so many dairymen in this State are starting to become militant because they feel that their rights have been ignored by this Government? Does the Bill mean that the Cattlemen's Union cannot continue to blockade saleyards as they did a few months ago to bring to the notice of the people of the State and nation the terrible plight of the beef industry? They carried out this blockade on a road. They marched along a road and stopped vehicles from taking stock to saleyards in Rockhampton. They have done it quite successfully in other areas of Australia. It has succeeded in drawing attention to their plight. We did not see masses of police lined up to stop those demonstrations the way masses of police crowd around the Roma Street Forum and other places. Without doubt militancy has got the Cattlemen's Union somewhere. Complacency in the beef industry back over the last 100 years got the producers absolutely nowhere.

Perhaps it is rather tragic that these days organisations such as the Cattlemen's Union, trade unions and students can draw the attention of the nation to their plight and get publicity only by creating media sensationalism. That is a tragic aspect of our society.

Even Christian groups who wanted to march together were subjected to criticism by this Government. They were criticised by the honourable member for Toowong, who spoke rather vehemently about them. The honourable member for Rockhampton drew the attention of the Assembly quite fairly to that. The honourable member for Toowong was even prepared to criticise their right to kneel, worship and pray. Surely we have sunk about as low as we can get in Queensland when we are prepared to criticise Christian people for wanting to pray. Who is the honourable member for Toowong to decide the means and convenience of gathering together in this way for this purpose?

The main problem of this Government is that it really does not understand how the ordinary people in the community think and operate. It has lost touch, and it is going to lose touch further by legislation that takes away the civil rights of the community.

The honourable member for Toowong said, "We shouldn't subject our Police Force to having to become involved in these types of things." Nobody on this side of the Chamber wants to see members of the Queensland Police Force subjected to bashing or anything like that. Nobody on this side wants to see the Police Force in Queensland placed in an awkward position. But I would point out that members of the Queensland Police Force in their normal work are subjected every day to far more vicious acts from the criminal element who are prepared to shoot to kill police on sight. A considerable number of police officers have suffered in this way. The Police Force is more concerned about this than about the few people who want to hold a peaceful march concerning their loss of rights. What manner of Government have we in this State that thinks it has a divine right to say, to do and to know what is best for the people of Queensland?

By bringing in this legislation the Government is moving closer to abolishing democracy in Queensland. Democracy will go out the door with the support of the Liberal Party. I go so far as to suggest that the next step in Queensland—and history has a great habit of repeating itself—will be imprisonment without trial. We know that happened in Northern Ireland, Spain, Russia, Vietnam and so many other countries which were subjected to this so-called exercise in Government responsibility.

Mr. Houston: Would you say we are getting to be a police State?

Mr. CASEY: We are certainly moving to that stage. I firmly believe that this situation is not wanted by the majority of members of the Police Force in Queensland. Most of them are fair-dinkum Queenslanders and Australians who believe that we live in the best State and country in the world. They want to keep it that way. We do not want to follow the pathway trodden by so many other countries. We do not want to invoke similar measures but we will do so while there are forces in the community—in the Government or elsewhere—who are trying to divide the community.

By bringing the community together we will cease following the path that so many countries have trodden to their regret. We have to bring the city and country together; we have to bring unionists and employers together and we have to bring Governments together. Instead of standing back, criticising and throwing things at each other, we must concentrate on bringing the community together. This legislation will not do that. It will further divide the community. That is the great mistake being made by the Government. It should be introducing legislation to the Chamber to bring the community together, to bring us together as Queenslanders so that we may all put our shoulders to the same wheel and get the State moving again—to get things moving in the State of Queensland so that it will return to the position it once held and be highly regarded elsewhere in Australia. Let the Government bring Queensland back to the position of high regard it once held in the world.

All the oppressors in the world, whether they have been to the Left or to the Right, are following the same path as that followed by the Government in this legislation.

I know that this seems to be a good political gimmick to the honourable member for Somersett, who should be more concerned at this time about the people who have been burnt out in Kilcoy and Laidley. I know that it sounds a good gimmick to the honourable member for Everton and that it seems to be a good political gimmick to the honourable member for Merthyr. I know that Cabinet is looking desperately for a situation to hang its hat on, but let us bring Queensland together again.

(Time expired.)

Mr. FRAWLEY (Murrumba) (5.19 p.m.): I did not intend to take part in this debate but after listening to some of the hypocritical utterances of some members of the Opposition, who have done nothing but foster violence since becoming members of the A.L.P., I felt impelled to take part in the debate.

I fully support the Minister in introducing these amendments to the Traffic Act. I point out that most of the violence in Australia started with the dismissal of the Whitlam Government by the Governor-General in 1975. I well remember the

A.L.P. candidate for Petrie making a statement to the Press that, if the A.L.P. were not re-elected in 1975, there would be bloodshed in the streets. He tried to frighten the people of Petrie with his utterances.

Fancy the honourable member for Mackay talking about human rights! If ever a member was denied his human rights, it was the honourable member for Mackay when, in 1972, he was knifed in the back by the Q.C.E. along with Bennett and Thackeray. But he has rejoined the A.L.P. In his Address in Reply speech in 1972 he severely castigated the then Leader of the Opposition for not standing by him. Fancy him standing here to put a case for the A.L.P. today! Fancy him saying that this Government did not have the confidence of the people of Queensland! We were re-elected in 1974 with an overwhelming majority when the people tossed out the stack of A.L.P. hypocrites who tried to put forward their Communist and Left-wing policies.

Let us not forget that last year the Leader of the Opposition said to a meeting of building workers at the Trades Hall, "When you march down the streets, don't be frightened to break a few heads if you have to." If that is not an indication of the support for violence that we get from the A.L.P., then I don't know what is. It is typical of the A.L.P. to promote violence in the streets. Look at Senator Georges. He is an associate of Communists and Left-wingers. He had his way paid to Greece for the Greek war trials. He sat down in the streets in 1971 with Gerry Jones, who is now the secretary of the A.L.P. and who only became the secretary because of a rot by the Q.C.E. He should not even have been the secretary, but it was rigged so that he got the position. He and Senator Georges sat down in the streets and disrupted traffic during the Springbok tour.

They incited all sorts of violence in those days. Now, because this Government is game enough to bring in a Bill to try to control these street marches, the A.L.P. gets up here and bleats about the rights of the individual. We are trying to protect the rights of Queenslanders. The Government of this State has always been dedicated to protecting the rights of Queenslanders—to introducing legislation that ensures the people have the freedom of the streets in Brisbane. We will certainly not allow any unauthorised marches to take place in the streets and disrupt traffic.

When I worked in this place—and I am not going to repeat how A.L.P. members thieved all the furniture and sold it; I have said that on plenty of occasions—I had the opportunity of studying the A.L.P. at close hand. The members of this A.L.P. are not fit to wipe the boots of the A.L.P. members who were in Parliament House when I worked here in 1951. At least they weren't too bad. They might have been a group of thieves and robbers, but they weren't

Communists and Left-wingers. I would rather have a thief or a robber than a Communist or a Left-winger. The A.L.P. is dominated by all sorts of people—by all the ratbag radicals, way-out lesbians, homosexuals and so on. All the dregs of society—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will come back to the Bill.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Hewitt. As I said, all the dregs of humanity have hitched their wagon to the A.L.P.'s waning star, because they think that by going to Labor and offering it some support they will get the A.L.P.'s support. By trying to incite violence in the streets, the A.L.P. only wants to deny the people of Queensland the opportunity that this Bill is going to give them.

Getting back to some of the actions of the people who dominate the A.L.P.—as I said before, look at Neil Kane, the senior vice-president of the Q.C.E.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will please come back to the Bill.

Mr. FRAWLEY: I will come back to the Bill, all right. Every A.L.P. speaker in this debate has done nothing but attack the Premier over this Bill. The Bill was introduced by the Minister in all good faith.

Mr. Wright: Why?

Mr. FRAWLEY: As I said before, it is to protect the people of Queensland against unauthorised street marches.

This Opposition is the greatest collection of misfits ever to sit on the Opposition benches of a Queensland Parliament. They are all at each others throats. The only ones with any decency are the member for Sandgate and the member for Nudgee, who are retiring—two men who are sick and tired of what is going on in the A.L.P. today.

Mr. Houston: What about Dr. Crawford? Tell us about your own.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Why don't you shut up? All you want to do is get up here and stir up trouble.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Committee will come to order. The member for Murrumbidgee will return to the contents of the Bill.

Mr. FRAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Hewitt. I was badly distracted.

I do not think there is any reason why any religious body or any other body that wants to have a reasonable march in the streets should not be allowed to do so. Freedom From Hunger, religious organisations and other reasonable bodies will be given the opportunity of conducting a march as long as they make an application and prove that

they are genuine and not a group of ratbags and radicals who are supported by the A.L.P.

I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill right up to the hilt.

Mr. BYRNE (Belmont) (5.24 p.m.): I would hope that honourable members do not become confused by many of the things that have been said in this debate. It strikes me that the entire argument over the past weeks on the matter of street marches revolves around the question who has what rights.

There has been a great lack of understanding by many people in the community as to where rights actually lie and just who actually possesses those rights.

We appear to have reached the stage in today's society when some think that the only ones who possess rights are those in the minorities, when indeed the majorities in the community (the ordinary people in the street, the people who try to follow their daily lives, the people who try to pursue reasonable enterprises and the people who find themselves walking through shopping centres with their families and children) also have rights. Apparently we have so over-concentrated our attention on minorities that we are slowly beginning to neglect the majorities in the community.

Many people are aware that the Young Liberal Movement has come out many times on many issues. Some people consider its members to be all sorts of radicals and Left-wing people. I might quote from the Federal policy document of that body. In my assessment, in coming to an understanding of where I should stand in relation to the question at issue over the past few weeks and what this legislation proposes, the statements made by that body are quite relevant. It says that that movement—

“ . . . believes Government action should aim to create the conditions in which the individual can live a meaningful life of his own choice, and that Governments should ensure, as far as possible that the area of individual decision-making should not be restricted. Any restriction should only be permitted where the public interest and the rights of others cogently require it.”

It strikes me that the more we concentrate on this matter and the more the media pursue this matter, the more we begin to realise that we can over-correct and start to create a circumstance where we favour minorities over the general community.

By that I am not saying that minorities do not have rights. By that I am not saying that certain individuals do not have the right of freedom of speech and of assembly. They do possess those rights. But in society they must be prepared to compromise in respect of those rights. They must be prepared to compromise, having in mind the rights of others. Until that is appreciated, we will have only conflict in the community.

The honourable member for Mackay talked about togetherness and people coming together and creating harmony in the community. But the arguments that the A.L.P. has developed have been only divisive arguments that minority groups should have all the say over the majority.

Democracy has recognised minorities, and rightly so, but it cannot afford at the same time to forget the general good of the majority of the community.

This document goes on to say that it—

“ . . . accepts the fundamental character of freedom of speech, freedom of organization, freedom of assembly and freedom of religion and recognises that controls over the free action of individuals can only be justified where the protection of the community or the rights of others require such controls.”

I point out that Governments have a responsibility to protect the community. Governments have responsibilities to ensure that circumstances do not arise to create detriment to anyone or any group in the community.

If the Government were to stand by and say, “We shall wait until there is bloodshed on the streets; we shall wait until there is violence on the streets; we shall wait until someone is run over in Queen Street during a demonstration because of the confusion that is caused; we shall wait until children are lost and people are confused; we shall wait until there is a public outcry against demonstrations; we shall wait until the public suffers before we take any action”, the Government would not be fulfilling its responsibilities.

Governments are continually being criticised for not making decisions in the present that take into account considerations and situations which will develop in the future. There are people in this community who are effectively saying, “Let there be one person dead before the Government takes action.” I am afraid to say that I cannot support those people. My concern for the community is such that the right of life is a precious thing.

Ask any person in the streets or in any electorate right across Queensland whether he would like his wife, his children or his friends to be injured, hurt, maimed or damaged, or to have their rights seriously infringed on by a group that is trying to express its legal and right point of view. We are not saying that people are wrong in expressing their point of view. We are not saying that they do not have a right to express their point of view. We are asking that there be a fair compromise in the community and that all people respect one another's rights.

There appears to be a feeling in some quarters that we should respect some rights but not others, that we should respect the

rights of people who want to demonstrate and march through Queen Street, and that the Government should do nothing about protecting the rights of those who want to live their ordinary daily lives. Some seem to forget that people plan appointments a long time ahead. They find it difficult to go to dentists and specialists and difficult even to get to town on some occasions to buy things that are needed to keep their homes and families going. There are those who think that it is important that the traffic in Coronation Drive, Queen Street or George Street be held up for two or three hours in order that a small group can express its point of view. And how does it express its point of view? It does it by infringing on the rights of others.

There are no laws in this State, nor will there ever be, that prevent people from expressing their opinions and points of view, but there will be laws that people should not infringe on the rights of others. That infringement, as I have already pointed out, comes in various ways.

It is most important that Governments accept these responsibilities. No doubt there are people within the community, Opposition members and some people associated with the media who like to jump on the bandwagon every time they see a minority group apparently being discriminated against because the majority point of view prevails. Because the views of most people are being taken into account, they say that the minority group is being discriminated against and that the Government is perpetrating an injustice.

Every act infringes on the rights of others. If I go to walk out of the Chamber and at the same time someone else tries to enter, I am infringing on that person's right to come in. That is a minor example of the point that I am trying to make. If I decide that I am going to sit in a certain seat in a theatre booked by somebody else, I am infringing on that person's rights.

Mr. Wright: That's ridiculous.

Mr. BYRNE: If the honourable member listened to what I am saying and reflected on it for a moment, he might change his attitude. His views are as bizarre and backward as the party that he tries to represent. He has no desire to change his ideas or attitudes. The Leader of the Opposition can yawn as much as he likes. Psychologists will tell you that a person will yawn when he has a feeling of deep inferiority or is unable to cope with the situation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will return to the subject-matter of the Bill.

Mr. BYRNE: I point out that this is the introductory stage of the Bill. None of us has a copy of it and none of us knows precisely what it contains. I hope that the

committee will take the sensible attitude of not voting against the introduction of legislation without knowing what it is all about.

There is a conflict within our society between individual privacy, personal right, the many and the one. I refer more specifically to the practical matter of what is involved in the legislation. Apparently there is to be a transfer of appeals from the magistrate to the Police Commissioner. That means, strangely enough, that the person who will now determine the appeal is more accountable to Parliament, the public and the media than any magistrate. The Commissioner of Police can be seen by the public and the Parliament and his decisions on appeals will be very clear. The public will be able to express its point of view in these matters and the Government will not be able to hide behind the decisions of magistrates.

I make one final point. The removal of appeals from magistrates to the Commissioner of Police is, first of all, a streamlining of this process. For instance, if an appeal against a refusal to demonstrate comes before a magistrate, the delay involved is such that by the time the appeal is heard, the date set down for the demonstration will in fact probably have passed. But, more importantly, the commissioner is charged with a much wider responsibility than is a magistrate because the commissioner has a responsibility not only to see that the laws are upheld but also to take into account the circumstances and to see that the public is protected.

That is where the difference lies. The commissioner has a responsibility to uphold the law and also to ensure that the public is protected. A decision made by a commissioner under those terms of reference is far wider and therefore far safer and far more sensible than would be a decision by a magistrate.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (5.36 p.m.): I entered the Chamber only to fill in a bit of time before dinner, and I find that the honourable member for Wolston has not yet spoken. That is astonishing, because I really expected that by now every member of the A.L.P. would have said what he wanted to say and left the dregs for Government and Independent members.

I have just a couple of points to make about the Bill. First of all, I understand that supreme authority for the granting or withholding of a permit to hold a procession will lie in the hands of the police commissioner. To me that is a two-edged sword. What is going to happen if we have a police commissioner like Whitrod? He granted a permit for a procession to any group of scruffies at the university, no matter how smelly, treacherous or foulmouthed they were. They received the accolade and imprimatur of Mr. Whitrod, so I really think that there should be an appeal to somebody if we have another commissioner like Mr.

Whitrod. I think that the Minister who has control of this Bill is wise enough to know that there should be a provision to deal with a case where we have commissioners like Whitrod. He will probably bring down an amendment to the Act at a later stage.

We have heard from the honourable member for Rockhampton and others that there should be an appeal from the Commissioner of Police to the courts.

Mr. Wright: The district superintendent.

Mr. AIKENS: Whoever it is, it is from one to another, from Caesar unto Caesar. But fancy going from the Commissioner of Police to the District Court or the Supreme Court! We are told, of course, that judges of the Supreme Court and District Courts are absolutely omnipotent, they are immaculate, they cannot make mistakes, they are celestially begotten and anointed of God. As a matter of fact, I do not see very much difference between them and a police commissioner. I do not see very much difference between them and some man in the street. And I certainly would not place any member of the judiciary on a higher plane than I am on. So if this Parliament intends to deal with a particular problem, let this Parliament deal with it, make a decision and then stick to it.

Before I left the Chamber in disgust I heard quite a number of members of the A.L.P. class this Bill as a piece of fascist literature. It is an astonishing thing that when anyone disagrees with members of the A.L.P. on any industrial subject at all they immediately point the smearing finger and cry, "Fascist! Police State!". They have no argument to put forward; they merely resort to this cheap and, shall I say, shabby piece of personal abuse.

Mr. Wright: "Doc" Edwards is not even staying for the vote; he's getting out.

Mr. AIKENS: The Minister for Health, "Doc" Edwards, is a man who stands very high in the esteem of the community. I cannot say that for the honourable member who is interjecting, whoever he might be.

Mr. Wright: He's not staying; he's getting out.

Mr. AIKENS: He probably wants to go because he is a little bit envious of my oratorical ability. I do not know, but he may have some reason for going.

But here is the point: We were told that this is a monstrous Bill and that the Labor Party will have none of it. Let us go back to the big railway strike of 1948 when we had a Labor Government in power. That Labor Government introduced probably the most iniquitous and vicious piece of legislation that ever came before this Chamber. It was known as the Anti-Picketing Bill. It was a Bill that provided that any police officer above the rank of sergeant could

order a person off the streets. If he saw two people talking together, he could break up the conversation. He could send a person home by a specific route; he could enter anyone's house; he could break down the door of his house or break open a window in order to get in. If in the house he found anybody with whom he disagreed, he could order that person out of the house and direct him to go to his own house by a certain specific route. Was there anything more monstrous than that? Yet every member of the A.L.P. supported it to the limit; every member of the A.L.P. got behind it and said, "This is what we want."

The Premier at that time was putting forward an argument—I am not quite sure that it was a sound argument—that the railway strike had got into the hands of people who were quite irresponsible and that the only way in which the Government could protect the rights, privileges and freedoms of other people was to pass that legislation, just as this Premier is saying something similar today in regard to the industrial situation and the industrial climate. A.L.P. members supported that legislation; they are opposing this legislation. Where is their consistency? They have no consistency. Their only consistency is in opposing anything that the Government brings down which, in the opinion of the Government, is in the interests of the people.

When we talk about processions, people say, "We want the right of freedom of assembly and freedom of speech." Lovely things theoretically! But do we get them? Go out and address a meeting anywhere at all, as I have over the years. I have been cheered off platforms; I have been jeered off platforms; I have been chased off platforms. Any time I express an opinion that is at variance with the opinion held by the A.L.P., the Left-wingers or the Commos, what is their attitude?

Recently I addressed a meeting up in Townsville concerning two discharged railwaymen. There were about 800 people present, but in the audience we had the same 50 or 60 as we get at most meetings who did not want to let me speak. They did not want to let anybody speak. They adopt a policy of organised interruption to stop someone exercising his freedom of speech. When members of the A.L.P. speak of freedom of speech—and I know that the honourable member for Cairns and some other honourable members raised it rather vociferously—they mean only their freedom to speak. They do not mean the freedom of anybody else to speak. They deny anybody else the right to speak if what he is going to say is at variance with their views. So let us have an end to all this slobbering, sickening hypocrisy that characterises the Labor Party. Its way—and it has perfected it over the years—of interrupting people, of stopping them

from exercising their right of free speech, is to go along to meetings with organised interruptions and prevent them from saying anything.

Now, what will this Bill do? It has been truthfully said by men who are much wiser than I that the most hideous thing that can confront a human being is mob rule. We will reach the stage shortly of the hue and cry. Gather a mob about you—any sort of rabble will do; pick them up from anywhere—take charge of the streets, engage in all the filthy, obnoxious language that you can think of, and let it flow. Never mind about other people wanting to use the streets. But the streets belong to all the people; they do not belong to any little group of dangerous, arrogant idiots who want to take over the streets and use them for their own affairs.

We have seen some shocking examples of that here. I think I heard the honourable member for Rockhampton mention that in one demonstration in Brisbane a little girl was hit by a policeman's baton. That procession was unauthorised; the people concerned had no permit for it. Consequently, they went looking for trouble and they got it. But a few weeks later, when the same group of people went to the police and obtained a permit to hold a procession, there was no trouble because they acted within the law. There is an old saying, and I think it is a basic principle of English justice, that those who will not respect the law must be made to fear the law. I believe that this Bill might make some people fear the law.

I do not know of anything more terrible or hideous than unrestricted mob rule, and that is what we have been getting in Queensland and Australia. Only today, according to the Press, at the mighty trade union congress presided over by the omnipotent Bob Hawke—the God on earth—the waterside workers, the shipbuilders or someone else connected with the maritime industry, marched up the street, invaded the sacred portals and took charge of the meeting. I wonder how the members at the congress felt about it? Just as we would feel about it.

I remember one occasion in Townsville when the present mayor, Percy Tucker, was pretending to be a good, staunch Labor man and a procession marched down Sturt Street as a protest against the French exploding a bomb in the Pacific. Percy marched at the head of the procession carrying a great big piece of cardboard on which was painted in big letters "Ban the Bomb". Immediately behind him was a scruffy, dirty, smelly, long-haired individual with an equally big placard on which was painted "Ban the Bum". He was walking right behind Percy, who was wondering why everybody all the way along the route of the procession was laughing his head off.

If we have any decency, if we have any respect for law and order, and if we have any respect for our womenfolk and those who are not able to look after themselves, we must see that those who want to express their opinion have the right to do so, but only at the various places set aside for that sort of thing. If they want to hold a procession, and the Police Commissioner is of the opinion that no harm, no riot and no dissension will arise, they will get a permit to hold that procession. If they want more than that, they want more than I am prepared to give them.

I hold the honourable member for Cairns in high regard in many respects. But he did not speak here today; he fulminated. He fulminated about the right of people to hold processions. He said, "Why shouldn't they be allowed to hold processions? Why shouldn't they be allowed to take charge of the streets? Why shouldn't they be allowed to push men, women and children off the streets onto the footpath and into the gutter if they wish to?"

Mr. JONES: I rise to a point of order. The remarks attributed to me by the honourable member are incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Townsville South to accept that explanation.

Mr. AIKENS: I will accept that explanation, but I was merely dealing with the implications he made. I want him to recall something. He is a Cairns man who has lived there all his life. He may not have been quite old enough at the time, but what stand did he take when the citizens of Cairns marched on Parramatta Park and the battle of Parramatta Park took place? When many unemployed and hobos were involved in that battle, what stand did the honourable member take?

Mr. JONES: I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr. AIKENS: Some of my mates were there. They took their stand on the side which they thought merited their support. The citizens of Cairns marched on Parramatta Park and a bloody battle (I am not using that in the abusive sense) or a sanguinary battle took place. At that time Hanlon was the Minister in charge of police. He was the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. It was said to him what a terrible thing it was that the police and the respectable citizens of Cairns should have marched on Parramatta Park and engaged in battle. Those inside Parramatta Park had armed themselves with everything they could get, including palings, sticks and bottles. There was blood flowing in the streets. Don't forget that Bob Hawke today is saying that

blood will flow in the streets of Australia. Is that the sort of thing that the A.L.P. wants?

When Hanlon was approached afterwards and it was said, "What a shocking thing for a Labor Minister to do—to set the police and the so-called snobs of Cairns onto the poor unfortunate workers who were camping in Parramatta Park and were determined to prevent the Cairns show from going on", Hanlon said—it is all recorded in "Hansard"—"I am not going to have anybody making a punching bag of my policemen." He was in charge of the police. That was hailed by every sensible person in the country.

As I have said before on innumerable occasions, it depends entirely on what side of the Chamber a Labor man sits as to what his views are on a particular matter. If an A.L.P. man is sitting on the Government side of the House, then on a matter such as this he expresses opinions such as have been expressed today by the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport. He would be over there saying exactly the same things in exactly the same way, using exactly the same vocal inflexion as that used by the Minister. But Labor is not on the Government's side of the Chamber. What is left of Labor is sitting in Opposition. Consequently Labor members believe that they have to pander to the unruly element, to the mob, the long-hairs, the louts and the abusive creatures who take charge of the streets thinking that they own them. Their attitude is entirely dependent on which side they sit.

I have a very simple philosophy on these matters. I am, and always will be, a militant unionist. That does not mean that I have ever been a ratbag. In the big 1928 strike I addressed from the roof of the Trades Hall the biggest meeting of workers ever to be held in Brisbane. I was happy and proud to do it. In similar circumstances I will do the same again. Let there be no doubt about that. But at that time there was no madness or taking charge of the streets.

I remind honourable members that during that strike, which lasted a few weeks, a group of workers went to the Trades Hall carrying mock coffins. They were supposed to be burying something or other. What happened then? There was blood on the stones in Edward Street that day because the Labor Party put the police with their batons onto them, and they hit them with their batons even when they were lying down. If any honourable member wants to find out what happened, let him go to the Parliamentary Library and ask for the photographs that appeared in the "Brisbane Telegraph" that day.

As I have said, the attitude of Labor members depends on which side of the Chamber they occupy. If they are in Government they believe in law and order as I do,

but if they are in Opposition, and the whip is cracking, they believe differently. Let them lift up their shirts so that we may see the whip marks on their backs inflicted by the boys at the Trades Hall and various other places—by the Bevises, the Davises, the Hauenschilds and the rest of them.

Mr. Hinze: Harry Dean has not got any whip marks on his back.

Mr. AIKENS: The Minister is probably right.

Let us have an end to all this slobbering, sickening casuistry. Let us face up to the fact that we are responsible for the good order and safety of all people in Queensland. We are not responsible for the erratic, suicidal and maniacal activities of a few people. A.L.P. members will not get any more votes by taking their present stand; they have the Commo and Left-wing vote as it is. They cannot gain another vote, and they probably despair of ever gaining another vote from the people who vote for Government members and me. They are having a last-ditch throw.

I intend to vote for the measure, but I ask the Minister in charge of the Bill to look again at the absolute provision covering the decision of the Commissioner of Police. When any decision he makes is manifestly unjust or wrong, let it at least go not to a judge of the Supreme Court or District Courts or a magistrate, but to this Parliament. Let the Government bring down an Order in Council or the Minister bring down an amendment to this Bill.

Mr. McKECHNIE (Carnarvon) (5.54 p.m.): I support the Bill. It is important that people should know that the Government realises that people should have freedom. At the same time, the people should understand that freedom must be tempered when it infringes on the rights of other people. A man has a right to swing his arm around as much as he likes, but when it is aimed at somebody else's chin it is questionable whether or not he should have that freedom. So it is with street marches. Unfortunately, a small minority of people in the community are professional demonstrators, hell-bent on misleading well-meaning people and attempting to incite them to violence while demonstrating.

Only a few weeks ago I watched a T.V. programme on the uranium demonstration in Sydney. I saw police having paint thrown on them and being spat at and kicked in the shins. At the same time the general public was inconvenienced. I am sure that we do not want that to happen in Queensland.

This legislation enables anybody who wishes to appeal against the refusal of a superintendent of police to issue a permit for a street march or demonstration the

right to appeal to the Commissioner of Police instead of to a magistrate. The commissioner is an expert in the handling of demonstrations; a magistrate is not an expert in that field. The commissioner knows the record of people who tend to encourage violence and is therefore in a better position to judge the likely consequences of any prospective demonstration. The roadways of this State were built mainly for the travelling public. Why should the travelling public have its rights put in jeopardy because a group of people wants to demonstrate on the road, when there are plenty of other places such as King George Square for them to demonstrate?

We on this side of the Committee would emphasise that traditional processions such as the Anzac Day parade, the Labor Day march and any other procession that does not have as its specific purpose an attempt to incite violence and mob rule will be allowed to continue. I am certain the people of Queensland want to know that this Government is keen to ensure the freedom of the decent men and women in the street rather than have a few professional demonstrators try to bring to this State the disgusting exhibition that many Queenslanders watched on television recently when we saw the actions of the uranium demonstrators in Sydney.

Mr. MARGINSON (Wolston) (5.56 p.m.): I have listened to the debate this afternoon, and particularly to members on the Government side. I want to refer to two matters that affect Government members in this Chamber in connection with demonstrations. First, I remind the Committee—and I am sure some members already know it—that the member for Albert led a demonstration in Ipswich in 1974.

Mr. Houston: Organised it.

Mr. MARGINSON: Organised it and led it.

That was prior to the State election of 1974 and it was on the question of textile workers. They marched upon the office of the then Treasurer of the Commonwealth, Mr. Hayden. The honourable member for Albert led them into a hall in Ipswich that evening, carrying placards. How hypocritical it is for members of the National Party now to speak as they have done this afternoon, when their members have been instrumental in organising and supporting demonstrations.

Mr. Moore: With a permit.

Mr. MARGINSON: I doubt that he had a permit for that.

Mr. Moore: Yes, he had one.

Mr. MARGINSON: He didn't have one. I am pretty sure he didn't have one.

Mr. Moore: He told me he had one.

Mr. MARGINSON: I am sure that the member for Windsor is now plucking things out of the air.

Then one of the present Ministers of the Cabinet—the honourable member for the South Coast—spoke in this place not so long ago in support of demonstrations. Naturally he spoke on that occasion in support of those who demonstrated at a meeting in Perth that was being addressed by the then Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, when empty cans, tomatoes and other missiles were thrown at the Prime Minister. That man, who is now the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads, stood in this Chamber and congratulated them, saying that the people had the right to demonstrate against the Government. He said that that was the only way they could protest at the Government's attitude. I am speaking about a member of the present Cabinet.

Mr. Neal: They didn't do it in the street.

Mr. MARGINSON: They did it in the street. The honourable member shouldn't talk such rubbish.

I have spoken about two members who are now supporting this Bill. I wonder if the Minister who introduced the Bill remembers those two incidents involving its supporters. I ask those who have spoken this afternoon in support of this Bill whether it is not contradictory to the actions of those two members. As those two members do not desire this Bill to be defeated tonight I challenge them, in view of what has happened, not to support it. I ask the Committee to take notice of the actions of those two members who are apparently supporters of the Bill being introduced by the Minister.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (6 p.m.): As I see it, this is phoney legislation. Unfortunately, it is not funny; it is very serious because there has to be imposed on the public of this State restrictions that are not warranted and justified. We have a Government setting out to manufacture a situation concerning law and order in Queensland. We are entitled to ask ourselves the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. Gygar: To keep the rabble under control.

Mr. MELLOY: It is ridiculous to say that it is to keep the rabble under control. This State already has sufficient laws which, if implemented, would keep the rabble under control.

This is discriminatory and political legislation in its purest form. It has only one purpose—to create a political situation for the coming State election. The Premier knows it. The whole purpose of this legislation is to create a situation in which the Government can hammer the Opposition

on the question of law and order. The Premier will say, "We introduced legislation to preserve law and order in this community, to protect the women and children and to ensure that nobody can walk the streets of Brisbane unless he has a permit, because he might disturb a stone or stir up a bit of dust that might get into somebody else's eye." He would use any excuse at all to justify bringing down this legislation.

I said it is a manufactured situation and it is. We are entitled to ask ourselves the purpose of the legislation—why it is being introduced. But before we even ask that question, we know the answer. It is purely political. It is an exercise to create in the public mind the idea that the Government is most vitally concerned with law and order and that the Labor Party is not. It is directed at the Australian Labor Party for party-political and election purposes.

What is behind this legislation? Who asked for it? Certainly the public did not ask for it. I do not think the general public are greatly concerned. As a matter of fact, were it not for television, radio and Press, 99 per cent of the people would not know that a demonstration was being held in this city. These demonstrations do not disturb the community as the Government is trying to suggest in this legislation.

I ask honourable members to take their minds back to the various marches and demonstrations. When have they created a ripple more than 200 yards from the scene? People in the suburbs do not know about them. This threat of public disorder does not stand up, because if the people concerned in the demonstrations were left to themselves and were allowed to have their demonstrations and street marches, there would be very little to them. They would hold a demonstration and that would be the end of it. But as soon as the Government hears of a demonstration or a street march, it at once mobilises the police from all parts of the State. It brings police from as far away as Townsville and Western Queensland simply to create a situation of confrontation. The demonstrators react by thinking, "There will be a confrontation. We had better be prepared. We have to be solid." This sets the scene for hostilities and perhaps even bloodshed. If there is confrontation it will have arisen because the Government has not been prepared to take a chance on the common sense of the people who are conducting the demonstrations.

Demonstrations are a manifestation of the feelings of people. They are not out to create havoc or cause bloodshed. Hostilities can simply be the result of failure to obtain a permit, which gives the Government an excuse to call out the Police Force to hammer demonstrators who appear on the streets.

Constantly we hear about bloodshed in the streets. Forty or 50 years ago there was more bloodshed in the streets than there has ever been at demonstrations. Forty years ago in this city there were football teams such as the White Stars, the Blue Stars, the Merthyrs and the Gilberts who tore each other to pieces after every match. They would tear palings off fences and whale into each other. There was more bloodshed then than is ever seen at demonstrations.

Many of the people at demonstrations and marches are either disinterested or disgusted spectators. Many come to see what happens and are not disturbed by the demonstrators. For them a demonstration is as good as a show and better than going to the theatre. But there would not be any show if there were no confrontation between police and demonstrators. There have been occasions on which 200 police have been massed to confront about 150 demonstrators. There are not many demonstrators at these shows; most are disinterested or disgusted members of the public who have simply gone there to watch. Yet 200 police can be massed to crush, with force if necessary, a demonstration that the Government says is illegal because the organisers failed to obtain a permit for it. This is where the illegality comes in; it is forced on the demonstrators by reason of the attitude of the Government. If the Government allowed the demonstration it would all fizzle out in half an hour. When there is confrontation, there is the possibility of bloodshed and demonstrations will be prolonged for a matter of hours. If demonstrators were allowed to let off steam, the demonstration would be over much sooner.

The purpose of this legislation is purely political. We are close to an election and the Government has very few grounds on which it can win.

Government members may laugh but they laugh up their sleeves to hide their discomfiture. They know that they have little to put to the people at this election. They know the Premier's reputation at the moment. They have only to talk with people in the streets to find that out. Government members are bound body and soul to the reputation of Joh Bjelke-Petersen, and they know it. That is why they go along with this legislation—anything Joh does is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to refer to the Premier in proper terms.

Mr. MELLOY: Mr. Hewitt, you know as well as I do that he is better known as "Joh" than as "Mr. Premier".

The CHAIRMAN: But in this Chamber he is known as the Premier.

Mr. MELLOY: I apologise to the Premier.

An Opposition Member: Premier Joh!

Mr. MELLOY: If I call him "Premier Joh", that is worse. I will refer to him as the Premier.

As I said, this is purely political legislation brought on by the Premier to provide an election gimmick. Honourable members will find that the Premier will enlarge on this tomorrow in the newspapers. He will make further statements to the Press and on T.V. on the necessity for bringing down this very important legislation because, "We can't afford to have an Australian Labor Party Government in Queensland. If we did we would have chaos in the community. We will have bloodshed in the streets; women and children will be kicked in the gutter and there will be general disorder. So we had to bring down this legislation to ensure we don't get a Labor Government after the next election." This is the whole purpose of the Bill.

Mr. Newbery: You said it happened in the Labor days.

Mr. MELLOY: No; it was not political then. The bloodshed we saw there was purely a sporting event. We of the Opposition see our way very clear on this Bill. We are opposing it to the utmost. We do not think it is necessary; it is disgusting and discriminatory legislation.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (6.12 p.m.), in reply: It is a pity that the honourable member for Nudgee, after representing the electorate of Nudgee in a fairly honourable manner should, in one of the last speeches he will make in this Chamber, align himself with those who seek to misinterpret what this Bill provides. It is easy to see why the Opposition have so little support in the community, representing as they do just 13½ per cent of the total number of members in this Chamber, when we see them shedding crocodile tears in the name of democracy. All the Opposition have done, in effect, is champion the street sitters, the vocal and potentially violent minority of people who even the Federal A.L.P. president, Bob Hawke, is continually predicting will cause blood to flow in the streets. That is Bob Hawke's statement, not a figment of my imagination.

Mr. Houston: Only because of your Government's actions.

Mr. CAMPBELL: We are not responsible to Bob Hawke. There will also be blood on the hands of the Opposition in this Chamber if it condones, as it has been condoning, the take-over of the streets and the clashes with authority which have occurred. The Opposition talks about democratic rights, but it sees merit only in allowing radicals the right to stamp on the rights of the majority of law-abiding citizens. These paragons of

political virtue who appear to be shocked at the actions of the Government conveniently forget—and it is good to remind them, I think—how they reacted in times of stress in the community. Reference has already been made to Clem Lack's "Three Decades of Queensland Political History". I really do not want to speak for too long, Mr. Hewitt, but I do want to refer to page 323 of this book because this is how the Labor Government reacted. It says—

"Police and Strikers Clash

"On the same day, police broke up a procession of 140 strike demonstrators at Central Station."

Police broke up a procession when a Labor Government was in office and, as a result, blood ran on the streets. I could take up the time of the Committee by reading at length, but I shall not do that. One has only to refer to Clem Lack's "Three Decades of Queensland Political History" to see that a Labor Government acted in a manner that these political paragons now seek to deny.

I simply repeat what I said at the outset. Despite the fact that the Opposition has tried desperately to divert from the true import of the Bill, the Bill is to provide for a speedy procedure for appeals against a refusal of a District Superintendent of Traffic to issue a permit for the holding of a street meeting or a procession. A lot of nonsense has been talked about preventing street-corner meetings.

Mr. Burns: "Street meeting or procession", you said.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What a lot of nonsense! A police superintendent has that power now.

Mr. Burns: I can appeal to the court, now.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Have you ever had to appeal to the court?

Mr. Burns: There is always a chance. With the way the Premier is behaving these days and the arrogance that is displayed on your side of the Chamber, he might be the tyrant who stops the Labor Party having meetings.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I simply say in conclusion, Mr. Hewitt, that nothing in the Bill is intended to take away the right of people, no matter how small their number, to congregate or gather to express dissent on any issue whatsoever. I agree with honourable members on this side—and, naturally, I support them—that the community looks to the Government to ensure that, in expressing such dissent, nothing should occur to affect the rights of other people to travel on the streets or to move about the city on their lawful business. I am quite confident that the great majority of the community outside will applaud the Government for this action.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Campbell) be agreed to—put; and the Committee divided—

In division—

Honourable Members interjecting—

The **CHAIRMAN:** Order! There will be due decorum observed during a division.

AYES, 36

Bird	Lickiss
Bjelke-Petersen	Lindsay
Camm	McKechnie
Campbell	Miller
Elliott	Moore
Frawley	Neal
Gibbs	Newbery
Glasson	Porter
Goleby	Powell
Gunn	Row
Gygar	Simpson
Hales	Small
Hinze	Tenni
Kaus	Turner
Kippin	Wharton
Kyburz	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lamond	Muller
Lane	Byrne
Lee	

NOES, 11

Burns	Wright
Dean	Yewdale,
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Marginson
Melloy	Casey
Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

SECOND READING

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (6.25 p.m.): I move—

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

I have already outlined the principles of the Bill in some detail. I do not intend to traverse what I have said already. However, the Bill will provide also for an amendment to the head of power to make regulations in the schedule to the principal Act by amending existing paragraph (j) of clause 8 to widen the scope to make regulations in respect of meetings and processions on roads, the routes of funeral processions and of processions generally, or processions of a particular class or description, and appeals against the refusal of permits for meetings or processions on roads.

I listened with interest to the contribution by honourable members who spoke at the introductory stage, but I must reiterate that in considering the rights of people to congregate or to gather or march in orderly procession on any issue whatsoever, the Government accepts its responsibility to

ensure the safety and rights of others to travel on the streets or move about without hindrance or harm.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (6.26 p.m.): I thank the Government for the minute it has given the Opposition to study the Bill. That is in line with the Government's standard of democracy and its attitude to the rights of individuals. When the National-Liberal Government talks of the involvement of the community in legislation coming before Parliament, the National-Liberal Government believes that Opposition members should be allowed only a moment to see that the Bill contains two or three clauses and no time to study them. No-one else in the community will be allowed to study this measure before it is rushed through the House so that the Government can have its way. This hasty legislation produced for pre-election objectives is to be guillotined through this Parliament in a fashion resembling that of colonialist France in the Dark Ages rather than according to the processes of the so-called democratic Queensland of 1977.

Today, without warning or reason, and before proper debate or public consideration, this Parliament has been asked to discount a basic freedom that has been administered by our judicial system since as long as most people can remember. Why should it become suddenly necessary, in an unusual Wednesday afternoon parliamentary sitting, to remove a power from our courts and transfer it to a departmental head—the head of the Police Department? Are we to believe that overnight—since yesterday—something has gone wrong which makes it necessary to relieve our highly trained judges and competent magistrates of an authority they are allowed under existing law?

During the 1930s, one of the first acts of Adolf Hitler in developing Nazi Germany was the suppression of the rights of the judiciary and the demolition of the freedom of the individual. This episode in history, which most people in the world seek to forget, is about to be repeated today in the Bjelke-Petersen Queensland of 1977.

This is not the first occasion that Parliament has been forced at a moment's notice into passing hasty legislation designed to accommodate even the activities of Government members or their temporary political pursuits.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the contents of the Bill.

Mr. BURNS: I have not moved away from them, Mr. Speaker.

This is not the first time that a Bill has been introduced in this way—in an urgent afternoon session—and rushed through the introductory, second-reading, Committee and third-reading stages.

Mr. Lane: Don't get flustered.

Mr. BURNS: There's no worry on that; I won't be getting flustered.

This is the fourth occasion that this Parliament has acted in this way. We passed legislation to protect the honourable member for Cook and later passed further legislation to protect the Minister for Survey and Valuation. Then last Thursday we passed another Bill to keep the Premier out of court tomorrow. Now, today, we are being asked to pass another Bill in a hurry, without allowing public debate or discussion and without giving the community an opportunity to analyse it.

It is no wonder that people get upset at the parliamentary system. No wonder people start to believe that somewhere along the line their rights as individuals in our democracy are being taken over by bureaucrats and those who like to manipulate the system, whether by gerrymander or otherwise, to force their own peculiar views on the community.

In relation to the urgency for this debate, we can only surmise—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will come back to the contents of the Bill. There are only two clauses in it. He had an opportunity at the introductory stage.

Mr. BURNS: It is very difficult to talk about the contents of a Bill when I did not have an opportunity to read it before rising to my feet. If you, Mr. Speaker, can explain to me each time I get away from the Bill how I am getting away from it—and remember I haven't had an opportunity to read the three pages of the Bill before being called on to debate it—then I will be only too pleased to stick to it. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether you found it possible to read the Bill and digest its contents in the last couple of minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have read the Bill since it came into my possession. I ask the honourable member to come back to its contents.

Mr. BURNS: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I believe that this Bill refers to the removal of the right of an appeal to the court. I believe that every one of us who believes in the independence of the judiciary should be prepared to stand and be counted on this issue—the issue that the Government can decide itself to take the right of appeal away from the court and give it to a Police Commissioner. History shows that when the last Police Commissioner did not do what the Premier and this Government wanted, he was shunted aside. He was pushed aside. When he made decisions as a Police Commissioner—

Mr. Hinze: That's not true.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. Of course, we can understand that the Leader of the Opposition gets carried away in a case like this.

Mr. Wright: What's your point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I remind all honourable members that whilst a Minister is on his feet I will not allow persistent interjections.

Mr. Wright: It's a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am in control here, not the honourable member for Rockhampton.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I was saying that I can understand the Leader of the Opposition's being carried away; but the statement he makes that the previous Commissioner of Police was pushed aside is completely untrue. He resigned himself; he tendered his personal resignation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept the Premier's denial.

Mr. BURNS: I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. What I will say is this—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept the Premier's denial.

Mr. BURNS: I said that I withdraw my statement and that I accept his denial.

The previous Commissioner of Police made some decisions which did not agree with the political views of the Premier and they were overridden by the Premier—decisions that could be made under this particular legislation.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. That is completely incorrect. Any decision that was made—and I know the matter to which the Leader of the Opposition is referring—was made by Cabinet.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept the Premier's denial.

Mr. BURNS: I accept his denial, Mr. Speaker. I must report, though, that I watched the Premier on T.V. on that occasion, and he said, "I told the commissioner that he is not to go ahead with that inquiry." He did not say that the Cabinet had told the commissioner. He said, "I told the commissioner". So we have to accept the point that in those circumstances it was the Premier himself who made the decision.

Mr. Casey: The Premier certainly made the decision to transfer Mr. Hodges from the portfolio.

Mr. BURNS: I accept the interjection of the honourable member for Mackay that the Premier himself most certainly made the decision to transfer Mr. Hodges from the Police portfolio—and on the same matter as that on which directions were issued to the Police Commissioner.

Under those circumstances, I think it is rather dangerous for the Government to be saying very clearly that it believes we should get away from the impartial courts and place decisions and rights of appeals in the hands of Police Commissioners, who have been—I can't use the word "shunted"—manipulated for political purposes in the past.

I say that clause 3 goes right to the basic concept of liberalism. It goes right to the party principles of the Minister who introduced the Bill.

Mr. Lane: How would you know?

Mr. BURNS: I looked up the Liberal Party objectives, and, on the basis of those objectives, I find it very difficult to understand how someone like the member for Merthyr is even in the Liberal Party. Quoting for the benefit of the fading memories of some of the people opposite—

"The Liberal Party objective also indicates that our future political system will be under pressures which will need a steadfast commitment to individual liberty and freedom for liberalism to survive."

How can the Minister, as the former president of the Liberal Party, introduce this Bill when he has a commitment to an objective such as that? It is against the political principles of his own party. Let me say this, in case Liberal members of Parliament have not read their objectives lately, that there is a section D subsection (2) which says—and this is important—"Independence of the judiciary". That is a plank of the Liberal Party platform. The very basis and purpose of this legislation is to defeat the rights of appeal that are inbuilt within our system in the independence of the judiciary—to circumvent the independence of the judiciary. That is what the new section 57A is all about. Never before in any nation within the democratic world have the rights of courts been thrown aside with more provocative and prejudiced hate, never with less reason or parliamentary consideration.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen interjected.

Mr. BURNS: I am glad that the Premier interjected and mentioned Mr. Whitlam. In November 1975 when the Kerr affair occurred there were thousands of people in the streets. It was one of the largest meetings I have seen in my life. Every Labor speaker counselled and cautioned the people not to resort to any violence. It was the Liberal Party which put the first statement in the paper and took the first step by

hiring a Nazi thug. A big photograph was played up in the newspaper by Peter Johnson and others from the Liberal Party warning people that if they went to the meeting this Nazi thug would stand over them and belt them. That is Liberal Party policy. Any honourable member can go to the Parliamentary Library and see it. It was the Labor Party that prevented violence in the street in 1975. We went out to do it. Over the years, the Labor Party has always counselled and cautioned people not to create violence in the streets. The people who want blood in the streets are the very conservative elements, such as the Premier, who are bitterly disappointed that the people from the university—

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member seems to be going beyond ordinary reason when he speaks in terms like that, saying that I am the one who wanted blood in the streets. The Leader of the Opposition knows that to be completely ridiculous and untrue. I am seeking to uphold his liberty and freedom.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader of the Opposition to accept the Premier's denial.

Mr. BURNS: I am not sure what the point of order was but I will accept the denial.

Why the sudden haste to deplete the authority of our courts? Why the sudden haste to make the Police Commissioner, subject as he is to political control, the chief justice over every court in this State and in this land? What new circumstances have arisen that suddenly compel the Premier and the Government to introduce this legislation suppressing the traditional rights of the courts? Have our judges and magistrates suddenly gone wrong or gone bad or are they simply guilty of being impartial in their observance of the law rather than accepting the Premier as the one-man judge and jury of everyone, everything, and every thought?

It does not matter what the Opposition presents in this debate, or how we argue the matter, this Parliament, with the departure of every Liberal member's principles, will force this into law in defiance of those very basic principles.

Let me remind the Premier, as a Lutheran, of the history of Martin Luther. He marched and protested in the 1500s and onwards and he was even excommunicated from the church because he believed in what he was standing for. No-one in authority in those days believed what he stood for or defended his rights. He took it unto himself to preach the truth he believed in. He went out and fought against those in authority who sought to repress him and oppress him. He did it, and he was successful.

Later on, in Alabama and other States of America, Martin Luther King went out as a Baptist minister in the same way. He was

not a violent radical, nor did he fit the other descriptions used here about people who are insane and want to take over the streets. He was a decent, honourable man. He was one of the men of Christian faith who decided to go out because they did not believe in what those in authority were saying. The oppressive people in authority were saying that he and his kind were wrong, and that they had to be pushed down and stood on. Martin Luther King was shot dead for what he believed in. He preached non-violence. He preached the Gospel and got the word out to the people. He went into the streets and put his message across.

Today the Government presumes to be all-seeing. The Government says that it knows what is right and what is wrong, what is black and what is white; there are not many greys. No-one will be allowed to disagree with the overall power or the authority of the Government elected in this State. Having assumed that power and authority, the Government says, "We will lay down who will speak, where they will speak and what they will say." That is against all of the tenets of democracy.

This very Parliament stems from the days of Oliver Cromwell and the Roundheads, who would not take what the King was saying. They moved against the King in an exercise to give the ordinary people the right to speak. By introducing the Bill in this way, quickly, so that people do not have an opportunity to see it, the Government is not allowing that, and I do not believe that it represents the views of the average person in the community.

I move now to some of the questions that I should like to ask. Someone asked, "Will it stop marches?" Of course it will not. Someone said that it will get the rabble out of the streets. This Bill will not get any rabble out of the streets. It is a window-dressing Bill designed to create more trouble in the streets. It has nothing to do with getting the rabble off the streets or trying to counsel and assist decent people who either want to show that they are against the Government or that they do not always want to be on side—either the Government's side or ours.

There have been enough speakers on the Opposition side to make known the people whom the Premier stirred up against Mr. Whitlam. He was pleased to see them marching in the streets in 1975. He was hiring buses to cart agitators against Mr. Whitlam all around the nation. Now, when the protests are against him, he does not want them any more. He need not nod his head, either.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: I rise to a point of order. I did not organise any marches of protest against Mr. Whitlam. There were protest meetings in the City Square.

Mr. BURNS: I accept the Premier's denial. The Minister for Local Government and Main Roads got up in this House and cheered on the farmers who threw bottles and hit the Prime Minister on the head in Forrest Place in Perth. He said it was a great idea and he supported them fully.

Mr. HINZE: I rise to a point of order. I do not recall ever cheering on any people to throw bottles in an unseemly manner. The Leader of the Opposition must either be dreaming, as he usually is, or making it up.

Mr. BURNS: I'll pick it out of "Hansard" for him.

Mr. HINZE: If he can do that, I will be prepared to admit it. But I think the honourable member is wrong and I ask that he withdraw his statement.

Mr. BURNS: I will withdraw it, but I shall give the Minister a copy of the relevant "Hansard".

Will this Bill stop violence in the streets? Of course it will not. Is changing appeals from a magistrate to the Police Commissioner going to stop violence in the streets? Someone said it would get the rabble out of the streets. This is certainly a great public-relations exercise. The Government is trying to stir up young militants who think that they have some right to take over the streets and it is trying to induce them to confront the police.

I say to them here and now, as I shall be saying to them outside this House, that they should keep off the streets and away from the artificial confrontations that the Government wants before the election. If they do this they will force the Government to go to the people on issues such as unemployment and the problems arising from the economic mess that it has made in this State. I hope the Premier will give us a few permits for street meetings and I hope we do not have to appeal to the people over him and Cabinet for the right to get our message over. We will be on the streets and we will be saying what we have to say.

How many charges have been laid against objectors who assaulted citizens? Someone said today that little old ladies were knocked down in this city by demonstrators. How many charges were laid by the police in the last two years against demonstrators who knocked down and injured little old ladies? How many little old ladies were carried off to hospital as a result of demonstrations? How many members can honestly say that they have been delayed half an hour or so in the streets in traffic jams caused by demonstrations? I can certainly recall traffic jams caused by the Government's mismanagement.

Whenever people have arrived outside Parliament House and stood on the other side of the road they have marched down the

footpath. No-one has been disadvantaged by those demonstrations. I think we would all rue the day if people could not come to Parliament House and say to members, "We are upset about what is going on in the community", and show the people the extent of their feelings.

One Government member said that those who want to get a message across should go on television. He said in effect that anyone can get on television. I do not know; some complain that they cannot get enough time on television. I have heard Ministers—one in particular—complain that they do not get as much time on television as they would like.

The facts of life are that if television is to be the only means of protest, only millionaires who are able to buy time on television will be able to have a say. In most cases the only way to get the attendance of television cameras is to organise an artificial confrontation.

The argument, then, is that demonstrations should be kept in the squares and parks and pushed into the background. Do Government members remember that it was the Labor Party who, against Liberal Opposition, originally set up public forums in this city? The Liberal Party violently opposed Clem Jones's plan for the establishment of a city square. It also violently opposed the forum concept and the Centennial Park proposal. The C.M.O. and Liberal aldermen of those days spent most of their campaign money attacking Clem Jones and asking the people to throw him out on the grounds that he was wasting money on frivolous projects. The Government now says that the sites of those projects are the right places for demonstrations.

I say to the Minister that if he has something to hide the easiest way to hide it is to say, "Anyone protesting about me has got to go down the other end of town behind a tree. I do not want him seen in public. I want him hidden away." That, in effect, is what the Premier is saying. He does not want people at street-corner meetings—and, whether we like it or not, the Bill refers to street meetings. It refers to appeals with respect to licences for meetings and processions.

Any street meetings that are held on the side of a road in any electorate can be repressed if the Government wishes, and people can still be forced into the position of having to appeal against the decisions of the Government. This is step A tonight, step B tomorrow can be against people in the community who want to hold meetings.

I suggest that the great victories against repression and dictatorships have been won before the eyes of the public. They have not been won in hiding, in some park down the street. People who have some reason for objecting do not really accept the proposition that they should go and object down

the street somewhere. The men of Walkers who marched in Maryborough did so because they were upset and could see their industry going down the drain as a result of Government mismanagement. People have marched on other issues.

I have here a statement from the Cattle-men's Union which says that cattlemen are going to be more militant and stand up and fight. Even Anthony urged them to hold back their cattle. They congregated in a public place outside the cattle sale at Rockhampton. They are entitled to do it if they feel upset. They are entitled to show the people of the nation that they have been badly done by. In fact, the point has been clearly made by the Cattlemen's Union that what happened in the past few days in relation to cattle producers receiving money from the Federal Government is a direct result of their taking the plight of the cattlemen off the farm and into the public arena where people can see it. While the National Party members were talking as though they were representing country people the cattlemen were gradually going broke on their properties. It is only because the Cattlemen's Union and others got out into the streets that the people of this nation became aware of their problems and started to do something about them.

So what does this Bill do? It creates a situation in which the Police Commissioner will be the judge and jury of appeals against the decision of a superintendent of traffic. The Premier has a record of interfering with the duties of the commissioner and his decisions. He has in the past overruled the commissioner's decisions. As I said, the former Police Commissioner did not agree with the Premier and he was manipulated, if I might use that term—if we cannot use the word “shunted”—out of his job.

Mention has been made of public meetings. I can remember as a lad reading of meetings on North Quay where 2,000 people came down on trains to hear Gordon Brown and others every Sunday night. Great meetings were held outside where the Prudential building is today. Meetings such as that are to be shunted aside by this Government. People will not get a permit to hold a meeting like that unless they happen to be in line with the political thinking of the Government. It is the Government's political judgment that will decide whether or not a meeting is acceptable. To me it is not just the rights of Queenslanders that are under attack here today; it is also the rights of our judges, magistrates and justices of the peace.

Mr. Hinze: That's a lot of tommy rot.

Mr. BURNS: Is the Minister going to tell me that this Government appoints justices of the peace and magistrates for other reasons than their proven impartiality and record of good judgment in this area? Is he going to tell me that there is something wrong with the magistrates and justices of

the peace appointed by this State? I say that in the shadow of an election what the Government is doing today is launching an attack on the judiciary and the courts because it wants to create a position in which it can manipulate the people of this State and the few young militants who want to march.

The Government wants to say to them. “We are going to manipulate you into the streets” because the Minister for Local Government wants blood in the streets, as do most of his colleagues. They want disputation. They have had to research newspaper stories about England, Ireland and everywhere else to come up with answers to the questions we have asked about how many people have been disadvantaged or hurt. We have said very clearly to the Government that we already have laws designed to handle violent demonstrations.

Someone mentioned the Labor Government's record on these matters. I think it was the honourable member for Townsville South who went back into this. I will say this: a Labor Government would not allow violent demonstrations in the streets, but it would not cancel the rights of all individuals in order to do it. We would handle the people who want to take their violence into the streets, but we would handle them in the right way. The laws are there to handle them and there would be justice for the people who are required to enforce the laws. There is no justice on the side of a Government which would use those people to manipulate the laws so that they can get at each and every one of us in the community. This is a dastardly, disastrous Bill. It is designed to remove the rights of the individual and attack the very freedoms that people have fought and died for, and I oppose it.

Mr. JONES (Cairns) (6.50 p.m.): The first legislation introduced by the Minister as Minister for Transport must be a bit of a let-down for him. I wonder whether his predecessor in the Transport portfolio would have agreed to the introduction of legislation of this type. I think that the Minister should have left it to the Premier to do his own dirty work on this occasion.

I ask the House: where are all the small “I” Liberals, the little “I” Liberals, the littler “I” bent liberals, the littlest, teeny-weeny “I” liberals, on this occasion? It is an occasion on which they should have been up on their hind legs saying something. I wonder whether this legislation was brought before a meeting of the joint Government parties and, if it was not, why they did not have their say in this Chamber.

The legislation stinks of a bankruptcy of ideas. It is something like the bankruptcy of Fancher, the Premier's financial adviser. It would be interesting to learn just where the Government obtained its advice on this legislation. I do not know if it came from the

League of Rights, or where it came from. But what legal advisers, bereft and bankrupt of ideas, would give the Government such advice? It is a sad commentary on a tragic situation when it is accepted with such vigour by small "I" Liberals and the National Party.

I think that we have reached rock bottom tonight when we are placed in a position of being manipulated as an Assembly because of one man's paranoiac desire to try to kick heads. We are being denied freedom of expression as citizens of Queensland. The Government's action militates against each individual's right to free speech and freedom to demonstrate and organise, as indicated in the proposed amendment to section 57A. The ordinary people of this State are being denied freedom and the question I ask is: what is the next action to be directed against the ordinary citizen? What is the future of the freedom that has been so gallantly defended on earlier occasions and for which some people have given their lives? The Government now intends to withdraw these rights from people who fought for them; that is what it boils down to. They are the ones from whom freedom is being taken.

Queensland was once a proud State, in the vanguard of granting freedoms to people. If the Government continues on its present course, police or troops will be ordered to shoot people down. It is denying people the fundamental and basic right to organise and to demonstrate.

Mr. Lindsay: Where—on the streets?

Mr. Miller: And disrupt.

Mr. JONES: Those interjections are typical of the attitude of the honourable member for Everton and the honourable member for Ithaca—"If somebody disagrees with what you say, kick him." It goes right back to the doyen of the Liberal Party in the old days, the Minister for Labor and Industry (Hon. K. J. Morris), who said on the floor of the House—and he did not last long as Minister for Labor and Industry after he said it—"When I see a head, I will kick it." Those were his words.

Mr. Miller: Those are your words.

Mr. JONES: No; they are his words. They are recorded in "Hansard"; there is no worry about that.

Mr. Miller: You said that.

Mr. JONES: No—"Anybody who disagrees with you, jump on him. Don't give him the right to disagree; don't encourage him to disagree. Just be divisive and polarise Queenslanders, brother against brother. Be provocative." It is an appalling situation. The Government does not test the legislation

against truth and justice. Honourable members opposite test it against their own silly principles, and they will fail dismally.

The honourable member for Everton said that everybody has an undeniable right to appear on television and say what he has to say. People do not have the democratic right to stand up in the street and express their opinions. If you have plenty of money in your hip-pocket like the honourable member for Everton, Mr. Speaker, you can afford to pay the \$2 a second to appear on television and tell the people exactly what you want to tell them. There are people in this society of ours in this great State of Queensland who cannot afford that type of money to get their views across. There are organisations that cannot afford to get their word across. It is their right to stand up and express themselves in a democratic manner. The honourable member wants to compromise those basic rights and deny the fundamental freedoms of our society. By doing so he is defeating the Westminster system of democracy as we understand it.

Mr. Lindsay: Where—on the streets?

Mr. JONES: The honourable member keeps saying, "Where—on the streets?" I have just said that he can afford to go on T.V. but not everybody can afford that to express their opinion. The honourable member would deny people the right to have their say.

What is the Government frightened of? What does it fear? Does it fear an expression of opinion by people? The Minister says that there is a forum in Centenary Place.

Mr. Newbery interjected.

Mr. JONES: Where is there a forum in Mackay, Mirani and elsewhere? In those places people have to go out on the streets to express themselves if they wish to. They do not always want to go out on the streets. When the Government denies them that right it denies them one freedom. The Government keeps eroding their freedoms. This Government does this, so the next can come along and ride it as a bolting horse and say, "That Parliament did that. We will take a bit more."

The Minister for Transport referred to the anti-picketing legislation. That was emergency legislation and a state of emergency was declared. Never mind about what the Labor Government did. What about the Mt. Isa dispute? This Government enacted legislation about 16 or 17 March 1965 to do exactly what the Labor Government did in 1948. The honourable member for Townsville South was one of the strikers, along with me in 1948, who marched illegally against those enactments. The first day I walked into this Chamber I had to vote against those actions again. I will do it again.

I was against them then and I am against them now. The Government is doing the wrong thing. It is worried about what somebody described as furry-headed people or something like that. What is it worrying about them for? It is giving them a grace they don't deserve. What is it frightened of? There are thousands of people in the community who don't take any notice of them. The Government seems to be frightened, scared stiff that somebody will disagree with it. If it is wrong, it should be disagreed with. If it is right, why should it worry if somebody disagrees with it? If the Government is so righteous and always so right, why is it worried when somebody disagrees with it? It is denying hundreds of thousands of people that same basic right. It is attacking the matter in the wrong way.

I have some knowledge of demonstrations, marches and processions. I have participated in them when I have believed in the principles of them. I did so in 1948 and I will do so again if I find that something goes against my conscience.

The Government precipitates trouble by the withdrawal of police from surrounding areas into a concentrated situation. It takes them away from their normal duties and mobilises them into a force of belligerency and confrontation. What for? Why is it necessary? Why does it have to do that sort of thing? Surely there are other ways of doing it? That is what is wrong with this Government. I am sure that the police do not want this. I know policemen and I have many relations who are policemen. They do not want to be embroiled in confrontation. Surely a more rational approach can be adopted.

When two groups of people are thrown into a situation where they are physically opposed, naturally there will be provocation.

Mr. Porter: You want the law of the jungle?

Mr. JONES: That is right. It is the law of the jungle.

The Government is precipitating that situation. The effect of the amendment will be just that, whereas its purpose should be to obviate that situation. The Government should be communicating. I thought that the Minister for Transport, either in Cabinet or the party room, would argue with the Premier and the honourable member for Toowong, who are obviously the purveyors of this legislation.

If a district superintendent receives an application for a permit to hold a march that he believes will be a little on the rough side, why should he not get the parties together, sit down with them and talk to them? He should get down to it, conciliate and communicate. He should say, "This is what can be done; this is what cannot be done; and this is what ought to be done."

At that level the district superintendent could be given a free hand in an atmosphere divorced from politics. I am sure that amicable solutions could be found at that point. The situation will not arise very often. How often do we have these demonstrations or marches? Surely the Government should have given power to the district superintendent. Who knows better what is going on than the district superintendent, the police inspector or the local constabulary? I am not referring only to Brisbane, but to the State of Queensland.

Mr. Lickiss: If you look, you will find that that is already provided. There can be a reconsideration by the district superintendent.

Mr. JONES: But the Government has not provided in the legislation that he must get the parties together to discuss the matter, show them the guide-lines and work out there and then what is or is not to be done.

The district superintendent is given the right to either grant a permit or refuse it. On appeal the district superintendent may send a written deposition to the commissioner in the same way as the aggrieved party. The Commissioner of Police is in Brisbane, perhaps a thousand miles from the centre of activity. It is typical of this Government that, if something happens in Cairns, it has to be referred to Brisbane. Everything has to be done in Brisbane, at the bottom end of the State. That is where decisions are made, but not necessarily where the activities are taking place.

Two days later, after the report is lodged in writing, the commissioner will sit in his office in Brisbane (if the depositions are lodged in time by the district superintendent and the aggrieved party) and make a decision. No-one but the two parties can be involved. The commissioner then reconsiders the whole situation. He has the sole right to issue or refuse a permit. He exercises all power and can say, "Well, old chap, there is no right of appeal against my decision. I am all-powerful; I am the commissioner."

Mr. Wright: Under this new legislation the commissioner may say, "Yes, you can have your street meeting but one of the conditions is that you will not have a microphone." There is no right of appeal against that decision.

Mr. JONES: That is possible. Many things can happen. It is entirely up to the man who makes the decision.

I should say that, as the Government sees it, it is easier to control one person than a myriad of magistrates away from the seat of power. What the Government does is to make a political appointment and to keep him under its thumb. The Commissioner of Police under the centralised control of one

individual can be as unscrupulous as it is possible for anyone to be, and he makes the decision in accordance with section 57A.

The Commissioner of Police is answerable to nobody under the Act, but fundamentally he will be answerable to Cabinet, as he has been in the past. Of course, any decision he makes will be unduly influenced by that factor. The use of the public thoroughfares will be denied to a particular section of the public. It may be a dozen people today, 200 tomorrow or a couple of thousand next week. People will demonstrate against this iniquitous Act. The member for Everton says that anyone who cannot afford television cannot become a political contender or express his point of view. Police will be redirected from their normal duties. They can be tied up with all sorts of things, including worrying about demonstrations. It will be the district superintendent, whereas previously the local sergeant or senior sergeant in charge of traffic made the decision there and then and wrote out the permit. If he was not there, probably one of the girls made the decision, because they knew the local situation. It was no trouble at all. Now there will be a backlog.

Mr. Lickiss: That won't happen.

Mr. JONES: The Bill refers to the District Superintendent of Traffic. You can bet your life that it will be the District Superintendent of Traffic. The district superintendent of the region will be the fellow. The application will have to go to his table. I reiterate that it would be more effective to have a meeting of the people who are involved in the application, if there are any queries on it, and have the thing straightened out on a conciliatory basis. At that level the people involved can be told what they can or cannot do. If that procedure is not adopted, all that will result is an attitude of antagonism. If out of hand somebody says, "No, it's not on. You can't have it. I am not giving you any reasons. If you want to object and appeal against it, write to the Commissioner of Police", that stand-over attitude will raise the hair on the back of any Australian's neck, because Australians do not like to be stood over in this manner. Both police and demonstrators are fundamentally Australians and they do not want to be placed in the situation of being provoked.

Mr. Lickiss: If that situation obtains, it is really a figment of your own imagination.

Mr. JONES: I believe the Minister when he says that, but I am trying to anticipate what might happen. With the best intentions in the world we pass legislation in this House, but we do not interpret that legislation. I am pleased to have the Attorney-General on record as saying that this is going to happen. I am very pleased

indeed to have his assurance. I have not had it from the Minister for Transport; I have not had it from the Minister for Police; I have not had it from the Premier; so I am pleased to have his assurance. I hope that this is the way it will be interpreted, and I hope that the desperate action in desperate situations by a desperate Government—

Mr. Lickiss interjected.

Mr. JONES: Why all the rush at the end? As somebody once said, it's like the sex act. The Government has had three years to enact this type of legislation, but all of a sudden on a Wednesday afternoon, when party meetings are usually held, this Bill is rushed through all stages. No notice was given to the Leader of the Opposition. No notice was given to the Whips. As the spokesman for Transport who would normally handle the Opposition's reply in these situations, I was not extended the courtesy of being given notice. Suddenly the Government has thrown this measure onto the floor of the House.

What does the Government fear? Once again I ask: what is it worried about? Backbench members are standing up and giving the game away. They say, "All that we are trying to do is legislate against just a small ratbag section of society." What is the need? When have we ever had to legislate against a small ratbag section of society? Surely our laws are adequate to cover the situation. They have been in the past and I do not see why they should not be in the future.

The honourable member for Somerset said that he did not think these people should have the right. Who is he to deny them the right?

Mr. GUNN: I rise to a point of order. I did not say anything like that and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Cairns to accept the denial.

Mr. JONES: I will accept the honourable member's denial but "Hansard" will show that what I have said and my interpretation are right.

The Government is legislating against people such as the Cattlemen's Union. In Rockhampton members of that body were so upset that they blockaded the cattleyards for three days. I do not know whether the police superintendent would grant a permit to blockade cattleyards for three days.

Mr. Gunn: It was private property.

Mr. JONES: What if it was private property?

Mr. Gunn: They blockaded the loading ramp.

Mr. JONES: All right, they blockaded the loading ramp.

The Government is making excuses in this situation for a particular section which it is now legislating against. It does not seem to jell. The Government does not realise the ramifications of what it is about. That is quite clear from the remarks and interjections of Government back-bench members.

Section 57A (3) gives the sole right to the Police Commissioner to issue or refuse, and it speaks of the exercise of all or any of the powers of the district superintendent. Individually, the occupiers of those positions may be sane and reasonable men and men of goodwill. But, in tandem, they could be tyrants, villains or ne'er-do-wells. There lies the degree of suppression that might be applied. The amendment gives them their tools of trade. The Government is giving them a set of circumstances *de caetero* and before we know where we are the State will be in chaos simply because the Government has not given any thought to exactly what can transpire, or what may happen because of the stupidity of the legislation.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (7.14 p.m.): What have we had? What hysteria! What sort of fake fury we have had! What pretended outrage! What a deliberate wastage of the time of this House! Talk about Shakespeare and a thing of sound and fury signifying nothing! The endeavours of the Opposition on this occasion have been almost beyond belief. They simply do not understand what the Bill is all about.

The plain fact of the matter is that under the Act as it stands, regulation 124 of sub-section (3) provides that the Commissioner of Police or his responsible officer has now the power to stop a street march, even if a permit has been issued for it. This ultimate power of authority always has rested and always should rest with the commissioner. It is already there. And all of this nonsense about what we are doing, that we are undermining the judiciary, and so on, is the greatest load of rubbish that I have ever heard. What we are doing, and what the Opposition and everybody associated with the Opposition need to realise, is removing one more forum for the Left Wing to exploit—that is, going to a Magistrates Court. That is all that is being done now. I cannot imagine that anyone with any common sense would not applaud us for that. The plain fact is that there has been no change at all in the residual power; it still remains with the Commissioner of Police. If he believes that it is desirable in the interest of public safety to stop a street

march at any point, he can stop it irrespective of whether a permit was or was not issued. It is desirable that the Opposition realises just what the Bill is all about.

We all regret that in dealing with this measure the Opposition has resorted to such gutter tactics. If you cannot deal with the argument, it is an old ploy to try to deal with the person. The honourable member for Rockhampton was a very good example of throwing mud and hoping some of it would stick. He displayed all the characteristics of a cur that, having smelt its own mess, likes to roll in it. It is deplorable that this should happen.

Mr. Wright interjected.

Mr. PORTER: I have already denied it flatly and the honourable member can do what he likes about endeavouring to prove something.

The Opposition's position in this matter is very simple. It is trying to pretend that what the Bill plainly says will not happen will in fact happen. The Bill says in effect that democracy will be preserved by preventing some people from occupying the streets to the exclusion of others. The Opposition is trying to pretend that democracy will be weakened because we are going to stop extremists from occupying the streets and ramming their viewpoints down the throats of others. They are trying to pretend that democratic rights will be impaired because people will not be permitted to march in the streets in a manner that is likely to produce confrontation and possible harm, even bloodshed. They totally ignore the fact that in many cities throughout the world street marches do result in bloody confrontation. That has already happened in southern capitals in Australia.

If anybody believes that in order to protect the viewpoint of some Right-wing ratbags we should allow our streets to become theatres of war, all I can say to them is, "You take that onto the hustings in the coming election and see how well you fare." I welcome the Opposition's pinning its colours to that mast. We will see what it does for them.

Stripped of all the purple phrases that we have heard, the Opposition's attitude at the introductory stage and now the second reading means that they have ranged themselves alongside all the Left-wingers, all the extremists, all those who latch onto any opportunity to protest in the streets. They want their rights protected but they want the rights of others to be swept aside.

The Bill is a simple one. It does no more than recognise the position that already exists and I believe that the House and the community will support it.

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

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the House divided—

AYES, 36

Bird
Bjelke-Petersen
Byrne
Camm
Campbell
Frawley
Gibbs
Glasson
Goleby
Gunn
Gygar
Hales
Hewitt, W. D.
Kippin
Kyburz
Lamond
Lane
Lee
Lickiss

Lindsay
McKechnie
Miller
Moore
Muller
Neal
Newbery
Porter
Powell
Row
Simpson
Small
Tenni
Turner
Wharton

Tellers:
Elliott
Kaus

NOES, 11

Burns
Casey
Dean
Houston
Jones
Marginson
Melloy

Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:
Hooper, K. J.
Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time (Mr. Campbell's motion)—
put; and the House divided—

AYES, 36

Aikens
Bird
Camm
Campbell
Edwards
Frawley
Gibbs
Glasson
Goleby
Gunn
Gygar
Hales
Hewitt, W. D.
Kippin
Kyburz
Lamond
Lane
Lee
Lickiss

Lindsay
McKechnie
Miller
Moore
Muller
Neal
Newbery
Porter
Powell
Row
Simpson
Small
Tenni
Turner
Wharton

Tellers:
Elliott
Kaus

NOES, 11

Burns
Casey
Dean
Houston
Jones
Marginson
Melloy

Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:
Hooper, K. J.
Prest

Resolved in the affirmative.

COMMITTEE

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

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of s. 57; Appeals with respect to issue of licences, etc.—

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (7.36 p.m.): At this stage of the debate it is still not evident why the Government is introducing this

legislation. We know that the legislation consists of two main parts. The first relates to the amendment to s. 57, which reads; in part—

"Any person aggrieved by the refusal of a District Superintendent or of a Superintendent to issue or renew a licence, or by the suspension or cancellation of a licence by a District Superintendent or a Superintendent may appeal against such refusal, suspension or cancellation to justices whose decision notwithstanding the provisions of The Justices Acts shall be final and binding."

That would apply to any licence. I take it that refers to driving licences and the licences we are discussing. Many types of licences are issued under the Traffic Act. I think the Leader of the Opposition referred to licences for piemen, which are currently in the news. It seems that the Government is trying to keep them off the streets, that many Liberal and National Party members want them banned. Under the provisions in the Act the superintendent may refuse a licence, and he has not to give any reason. The new provisions shall be read and construed so that an appeal hereunder shall not lie. Not only has the Government removed the right of appeal for people who have been denied a licence, irrespective of the type of licence, and removed the appeal from the justices, but also it has removed the right of appeal to the commissioner. In this instance the Government has gone the whole way in any conceivable law.

It is interesting that the Minister did not go into detail on this when he introduced the Bill. When Government members who were strongly supporting the legislation spoke, they did not mention this provision. It is very obvious that Government members are quite happy to have a licence refused by the superintendent of traffic or any person responsible for the issuing of licences and that that should be final, irrespective of the circumstances. If a bottle-o runs foul of a superintendent, he has no chance of carrying on his normal occupation. Apparently that is what the Liberal Party is fostering.

When I look around the Chamber I note that the two members who were very forthright in condemning the Leader of the Opposition a few days ago are missing when this legislation is being discussed. I refer to the Premier and Deputy Premier. I feel sure that as leaders of the Government they want this measure to go through. I feel sorry for the deputy leader of the Liberal Party, who is charged with the responsibility of putting the measure through.

Mr. Wright: At this moment only 18 Government members are present out of 69.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That has nothing to do with the clause under discussion.

Mr. HOUSTON: I understand that, but this is an important clause. Members who spoke at the introductory stage and had so much to say about marches and so on did not mention anything about what is being taken away under this provision. This is an old trick practised by the Government. It introduces a Bill and focuses attention on one part which it knows that people will react to. What the Government is doing is bringing this other one through nice and quietly. If the Minister has an explanation of it, I am sure the Committee would like to hear it.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (7.40 p.m.): I well understand the concern of the member for Bulimba about this. As he has pointed out, under the Traffic Act quite a number of licences and permits are dealt with. As I stated earlier, it is the policy of the Government to transfer the appeal in relation to applications for a permit to walk or march on a street and that is but one of several types of permit. There is nothing sinister in this. It is basically a restatement of the last paragraph, so that those other appeals are still catered for.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (7.41 p.m.): It is rather a strange clause, for the simple reason that in many respects it is an indication of the reversal of justice that is being perpetrated by the Bill, and that is reinforced by the point that has just been made by the Minister. This clause confirms that under the Traffic Act the type of appeal that is being created by this Bill shall not apply where someone has his driver's licence suspended by a judge of the Supreme Court, a judge of the District Court or a magistrate. This confirms the principle that they are much higher authorities to which people have a right of appeal in our State. Yet, in relation to some of the other things that are mentioned in following clauses—and I do not want to deal with them specifically at this stage, although they do come under the last part of this clause—somebody else who is aggrieved under the other clause is denied this basic right.

Mr. Houston: That's right. There's no appeal under (c).

Mr. CASEY: My word. It is stated specifically in it. If somebody wants to hold a meeting or a procession and if the District Superintendent of Traffic says "No", the only course of appeal is to the Commissioner of Police. If a person loses his driving licence, he has a right of appeal to a higher court—to the Magistrates Court, the District Court or the Supreme Court.

Let us go a stage further. Subclause (b) refers to the cancellation or suspension of a licence "under any provision of this Act

or under any other Act or law". That means any other Act or law of this Parliament. I presume from that that, if the District Superintendent of Traffic refuses to issue a permit for someone to sell tickets for charity, that person has the right of appeal to a court. However, under this Bill a person who is refused a permit to hold a meeting or procession does not have that right.

What about a collector's licence? People who use the streets and roads of this State to collect garbage or second-hand goods and people who have a second-hand dealer's licence permitting them to collect scrap metal, bottles and so many other things have better rights, if this clause is implemented, than somebody who feels aggrieved under this Bill.

How many wonderful charitable and other organisations in this State raise their money from street stalls? I am not sure where they will stand. Under the Traffic Act, I suppose, they have a right to hold a stall. They collect and congregate people around the stall. Another clause of the Bill refers to—

"a permit to convene, hold or address a political, religious or other meeting on any road".

They get a permit under the Traffic Act from the District Superintendent of Traffic to hold a street stall on a road. But a road includes a thoroughfare or a pedestrian way. Every day of the week organisations, such as St. Vincent de Paul and crippled children, hold second-hand sales on the footpath of Queen Street. People do congregate around those sales. Where do they stand under the Bill? Are they governed by clause 2 or by clause 3?

As the honourable member for Cairns pointed out quite clearly a few moments ago, it is all very well to introduce legislation that sounds in principle like what the Government wants to do. But it covers such a vast field that I think it will be virtually impossible for it to work.

Under this clause we have an acceptance of the principle that the Supreme Court, the District Court or the Magistrates Court is a higher authority than the District Superintendent of Traffic and the Commissioner of Police. In one clause we reaffirm that principle but in the clause we will debate in a minute we go right away from it. Where do we stand?

This is not a question that I am asking on behalf of myself. I am asking it on behalf of the thousands of organisations throughout Queensland that regularly obtain permits under the Traffic Act to conduct street stalls, meetings or other gatherings, at which they hire, sell or exchange goods to raise funds or do charitable acts. This happens so often and is the real question when we study this legislation.

What about the booths outside polling places? We are talking about political purposes. The district superintendent could say, "I refuse to allow you to have a booth outside an election place." It is no good the Minister shaking his head. Under the Bill, we are giving him the power to do that. He could say, "It is a political meeting. You are convening something political. I refuse you permission to establish that booth." He is getting this power. We passed it in the second reading. An appeal can be made to the commissioner but, if he says "No", we cannot go to the court.

Mr. Newbery: He has always had that power.

Mr. CASEY: He has had the power. I accept the interjection from the Minister for Police. But if the person making the application has been aggrieved, he has had the right of appeal to the court. He is not getting that right under the Bill. That is the basic right that the Government is taking away from the people—the right of appeal if they feel aggrieved in this matter. The right of appeal is to the Commissioner of Police.

The Bill differs from so many Acts which give the power and authority to the Minister, who can be overridden by Cabinet. Every citizen has a right, if he is aggrieved, to lodge an appeal. That will not happen in this case. It is being confined very narrowly and will apply to a tremendous number of organisations.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (7.48 p.m.): Following on what the honourable member for Mackay has said—what effect does this Bill have on the right of a citizen to apply to the Supreme Court for a prerogative writ?

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (7.49 p.m.): I indicated earlier that subclauses (a) and (b) are basically a restatement of the existing Act.

An Opposition Member: What about (c)?

Mr. CAMPBELL: That adds to this the provision that there is no appeal to a magistrate in respect of a refusal to issue or renew a licence or an extension or cancellation of a licence or the imposition of a condition if provision is made elsewhere in the Traffic Act for such an appeal as this Bill provides.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (7.50 p.m.): What effect does the Bill have on the right of a citizen to apply to the Supreme Court for a prerogative writ?

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister

for Transport) (7.51 p.m.): The effect of the Act is as I outlined this afternoon and the other amendments are necessary to cope with the other aspects of this legislation. It is the Government's policy to change the appeal provision so that appeals which at present lie to a magistrate will now be made to the Commissioner of Police. That is all the Bill does.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (7.52 p.m.): I do not know whether the Minister for Justice conveyed incorrect information to the Minister for Transport. He is partly right. The operative section of this clause reads—

"This subsection shall be read and construed so that an appeal hereunder shall not lie under this subsection—"

There is no appeal at all.

There is then subclause (a), which is the existing part; and subclause (b), which is also an existing part. There is then subclause (c), which is a rewriting of the first part of the section. In other words, section 57 (1) is rewritten as part (c). The original section 57 provided that a person who felt aggrieved by the refusal of a district superintendent to issue or renew a licence, or by the suspension or cancellation of a licence, could appeal against such refusal, suspension or cancellation to a magistrate. The beginning of the new section 57 provides distinctly that there is no appeal. The wording of subclause (c) to which I object is—

"in respect of the refusal to issue or renew a license or a suspension or cancellation of a license or the imposition of a condition in respect of a license if provision is made elsewhere in this Act for or in respect of such appeal."

The point I am making is that the right of appeal has been taken away. One of the most common cases in which I know there is an appeal is the loss of a driving licence after the accumulation of nine points. It has been accepted practice, I believe, to allow people who lose their licences in this way to appeal to the commissioner. There may be some extraordinary circumstances in which the commissioner may, in his wisdom, allow such an appeal. I do not know of any such cases but no doubt he could in certain circumstances reduce the suspension. But in this case there is no appeal.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (7.53 p.m.): There is provision for that elsewhere in the Traffic Act.

Mr. Houston: The first time it gets to court you will find you are wrong.

Mr. JONES (Cairns) (7.53 p.m.): This clause is a further restriction. There is no provision for an appeal. This is the denial of a right. It is the erosion of an avenue that was previously open to aggrieved parties. It is as simple as that.

Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (7.54 p.m.): The Minister now has virtually admitted that most of the points that we have been making have in fact been correct. Instead of pin-pointing what the Government may have wanted to do, the Bill has actually produced a blanket cover. A right of appeal shall not now lie with persons who wish to convene or hold a meeting to address a political or a religious gathering or any other meeting. I suppose the most common street meetings held in Brisbane would be those held every Sunday night in the city by the Salvation Army. Those would be the major meetings, but there are a number of other religious organisations that meet in exactly the same way every Sunday night in Brisbane. The Salvation Army holds a meeting, marches down Edward Street, I think it is, and then holds another meeting.

This means that some district superintendent of traffic or the Police Commissioner can decide to take away from the Salvation Army its right to hold these meetings and it has no right of appeal to any other body. That is the point I am making.

I know the Minister would agree with me, because he has covered that in the Bill. It is no good the Minister shaking his head; he only has to look at the Bill. The Salvation Army has no right of appeal to any other body, because its permit would be granted under the Traffic Act.

There are a number of other minor religious groups that hold street meetings in this city on a regular basis, and if one of those groups dares to hold a street meeting—I see the honourable member for Toowong shaking his head—and criticise the honourable member for Toowong or the Government's uranium policy or any other Government policy its permit could be cancelled.

I heard somebody before talking about serving God, Queen and country. To many people in this community God still comes first, and that is where He should be. Consequently if their conscience tells them that they must serve God rather than their master and they then criticise this Government, under this clause they can have their right of appeal taken away from them because they are becoming involved in politics.

Question—That clause 2, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 34

Bird
Camm
Campbell
Edwards
Elliott
Frawley
Gibbs
Glasson
Goleby
Gunn
Gygar
Hales
Kippin
Kyburz
Lamond
Lane
Lee
Lickiss

Lindsay
McKechnie
Miller
Moore
Neal
Newbery
Porter
Powell
Row
Simpson
Small
Tenni
Turner
Wharton

Tellers:
Kaus
Muller

NOES, 11

Burns
Dean
Hooper, K. J.
Houston
Jones
Mellory
Prest

Wright
Yewdale

Tellers:
Casey
Marginson

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 3—New s.57A; Appeals with respect to issue of licenses for meetings and processions—

Mr. JONES (Cairns) (8.7 p.m.): What concerns me particularly about this clause are the words—

“Any person aggrieved by the refusal of a District Superintendent to issue—

“(a) a permit to convene, hold or address a political, religious or other meeting on any road.”

The clause specifically refers to religious meetings and processions. Why is there a need to specify the word “religious” in this context? As I said at the earlier stages of the Bill, it seems to me that this could very well be a serious inroad into one of the four freedoms, the freedom of religion. Previously we have spoken mainly about the freedom of speech, the freedom to organise—

Mr. Lee interjected.

Mr. JONES: I do not know whether the honourable gentleman attends church or is a Christian. He should know the parable “Judge not, that ye be not judged.” I would remind him of the intentions of that. If he chooses to judge me, he can do so, but I suggest that in his ministry—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Thou shalt remain relevant to the clause.

Mr. JONES: The 11th commandment is, “Thou shall not be caught”, and that should apply to the Minister for Works and Housing, too.

The inclusion of that word in the clause could be the edge of the wedge for discrimination against some religions the Government or particular Ministers might not like. Groups of Christians could well be concerned, as could groups of other religious denominations, about the oppression that could be applied under this clause. Why include that in the Queensland statutes? Is the Government trying to repress some religious groups so that they cannot express their views, whether they be Christian or non-Christian? What would happen if on a particular occasion the district superintendent was a bigot in respect of a particular section of a religious community? He could decide that it would not be granted a permit. I heard somebody say, “What about the Salvation Army?” What about the Corpus Christi procession, in which I participate?

As the Leader of the Opposition reminds me, there is the Procession of Witness. What is the fear? Why is this provision included in this clause? Why are the words "political" and "religious" spelt out? What does the Government fear? Can the Minister explain to me why those two words are included specifically in subclause 57A (i) (a).

Mr. Houston: This is a meeting.

Mr. JONES: Yes, a meeting on a road.

Mr. Houston: Or on a footpath.

Mr. JONES: Yes, on a road or a car-riageway.

When a permit is granted the district superintendent, the commissioner or even the Government may impose any conditions. A permit containing impossible conditions can be granted to any political or religious organisation. That is also wide open; it is not spelt out in the provision.

There is no appeal against the commissioner's decision. As I said at the introductory stage, it is all very well for individuals, but what happens when a duo is working in tandem against a particular section of the community. It might consist of only a minority, but under the legislation that could happen.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (8.12 p.m.): I find it hard to believe that any religious or political organisation would want to hold a political meeting on a road.

Mr. Houston: They all do.

Mr. Burns: What about the Salvation Army?

Mr. CAMPBELL: The Salvation Army will not be banned from holding its usual Saturday night meetings on the corner of Edward and Queen Streets or anywhere else in the State. This is a simple restating of existing legislation.

Mr. BURNS (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (8.13 p.m.): To follow up that point made by the Minister, I point out that on 6 September 1977 the following appeared in "The Australian"—

"Asked yesterday whether he would prohibit the Quakers or the Council of Churches from staging a march, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen said: 'I am astounded at the company some of these people are keeping and the things they are being mixed up with. If they want to express their opinions they will have to go to one of the areas in the city set aside for public demonstrations.'"

Here are a couple of churches that the Premier has decided he does not favour. Because they are not doing exactly what the Government wants them to do, they could well be pushed aside to the forum or elsewhere to explain their views. The Minister's explanation is not satisfactory to me.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton) (8.14 p.m.): That makes two of us.

The honourable member for Cairns raised a very important issue when he said that the Government is singling out the churches. In recent months—and even going back to September last year—attacks have been launched on churches by members of the Government. That surprises everybody. In the normal political arena it is often said that the conservative groups support the churches, but this is not true in this State. Honourable members may recall the attack made on Aurukun, the attack made by the honourable member for Toowoomba North on the House of Freedom, which was backed up by the Minister for Welfare Services, and the attack made by way of legislation not so long ago by the Minister for Health, when he tried to bring about a form of registration for the churches.

A Government Member interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes; it was withdrawn. We know that it was in the Psychologists Bill. Obviously the member for Isis was not watching the legislation that came through the Chamber. It was only after great opposition that that aspect of the Bill was withdrawn. Now we find, as the member for Cairns, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mackay have said, religious groups have been singled out.

I heard an interjection to the effect that it is a meeting on a road. In that regard the Traffic Act of 1949 is worth while looking at. The definition of "road" reads—

"Includes any road, street, highway, alley, avenue, lane, thoroughfare, track, carriage-way, footway, or subway, whether surveyed or unsurveyed (and all bridges, viaducts, culverts, grids, approaches, crossings, and other things appurtenant thereto) open to or used by the public or to which the public have or are permitted to have access whether on payment of a fee or otherwise: The term also includes"—

and it goes on for another four inches of definition. So it is not just the normal road—or the highway that the member for Albert was talking about earlier.

It is quite obvious that the Premier himself was upset with the opposition that he was receiving from the religious groups in this State. I have here a copy of "The Sunday Mail" of 19 September 1976 containing an article under the heading "Religious group stir on liberty". A group of 60-odd Christians representing Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Methodists and Quakers held a meeting and made statements that were reported. They said—

"We confess that we have been too ready to be part of a silent majority which acquiesce in the way the poor, the powerless, and those who like a different lifestyle have been treated in our society.

"We have been prepared to be comfortable, and stay out of involvement.

"We have resisted involvement even when there are signs that the law is being used to trample on people."

The group further said—

"We fear that in Queensland a style of government is being developed that is reluctant to listen to voices of dissent, that resorts to intimidation in the name of law and order, and that justifies abuses of law and order in the name of higher moral standards and as representatives of the Christian view-point."

They go on to say—

"We want to show there is a plurality of church voices disturbed by recent events in Queensland which suggest that human rights are not always being observed."

They add—

"The community has to be reminded that the Premier is not the only style of Christianity."

The article goes on—

"The group pointed out it was not just the Premier who was being criticised, but the collective attitude of the State Government."

So it is no wonder that we now find that the new legislation specifically refers to religious groups.

I am surprised that so many members of the Government intend to support this provision, because surely one of the real strengths of any democracy is the right of religious freedom. We can criticise a person for the way he performs his Christian duties, but he has the right to perform them in that manner. He can believe what he wants to believe, just as the churches have a right of dissent. However, it seems now that, if a church wants to dissent in any way at a public demonstration by holding any type of meeting, it will have to go cap in hand to the District Superintendent of Police. If the district superintendent says that he will not allow it and the church does not like that, then it has to appeal to the commissioner. I notice, too, that in the same clause the Government has tied it up by making it impossible for people wanting a permit to carry out their function. I refer specifically to subclause (4), which says—

"No appeal shall lie under this section or any other provision of this Act—

(a) against the imposition of any condition in respect of a permit referred to in subsection (1) issued by a District Superintendent".

It goes on also to say that there is no appeal against the commissioner's refusal to issue a permit, and there is no appeal against any imposition placed by the commissioner himself.

But let me come back to the first instance. It will mean that, if the police want to allow some type of demonstration or public meeting by a church or political group, they can allow it, but they can say, "Yes, you can have your permit, but the condition for your street meeting will be that there will be no microphones involved." The legislation says very clearly that conditions will be enforced and there is no right of appeal.

The condition could be, stupidly (but we never know what to expect from this Government), "You can have your meeting if half your fellowship stand along one side of the footpath in a straight line two deep and 20 members long." That is the sort of condition that could be set. I might be delving into the realm of fantasy in saying that, but we never know what to expect.

Sir Bruce Small interjected.

Mr. WRIGHT: We know Sir Bruce's Sieg Heils.

We know what he has done, the way he has twisted the Government's electoral commission and how he has worked his seat down there, so he shouldn't come into it. Let him go back to sleep. He should pull his dark glasses down and forget he is even here.

Government members have not considered what they have done here. They have not considered that the impositions may in fact affect them. Surely we have a right to support the very foundations of democracy, and this provision in fact is acting against them.

I should like the Minister to explain why this appeal is not being allowed. The Minister is removing the right of appeal to the magistrate and making it a right of appeal to the commissioner. We do not want appeal after appeal after appeal. It is normal under most Acts, if a person appeals to a magistrate, for instance, under the Local Government Act, that he cannot go further. Accepting that principle—I do not agree with an appeal to the commissioner—why not allow an appeal against the conditions of the permit? Surely this is the right of the applicant.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (8.21 p.m.): I am amazed that the members of the Opposition, who profess to be so concerned for the community, do not know the existing Act. I do not want to quote the whole of the regulations, but regulation 123 presently provides—

"A political, religious or other meeting shall not be convened, held or addressed on any road unless and until a permit for such meeting has been obtained from the District Superintendent"

and it goes on and on. Opposition members are tilting at windmills.

I move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 35

Bird	Lindsay
Camm	McKechnie
Campbell	Miller
Edwards	Moore
Elliott	Neal
Frawley	Newbery
Gibbs	Porter
Glasson	Powell
Goleby	Row
Gunn	Simpson
Gygar	Small
Hales	Tenni
Kippin	Turner
Knox	Wharton
Kyburz	
Lamond	
Lane	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	Kaus
Lickiss	Muller

NOES, 11

Burns	Wright
Dean	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Casey
Melloy	Marginson
Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 3, as read, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 35

Bird	Lindsay
Camm	McKechnie
Campbell	Miller
Edwards	Moore
Elliott	Neal
Frawley	Newbery
Gibbs	Porter
Glasson	Powell
Goleby	Row
Gunn	Simpson
Gygar	Small
Hales	Tenni
Kippin	Turner
Knox	Wharton
Kyburz	
Lamond	
Lane	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	Kaus
Lickiss	Muller

NOES, 11

Burns	Wright
Dean	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Casey
Melloy	Marginson
Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 4—Amendment of Schedule—

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (8.31 p.m.): After all that has been said in regard to this legislation, I feel very sorry indeed for the Minister for Police in his administration of the Police Force. One of the reasons why a magistrate was appointed to decide appeals against decisions of the district superintendent and other high-ranking police officers was that conflict between police officers was obviated. I suggest to the Minister for Police that he will be heading for trouble when his

commissioner will, on occasions, find that he has to overrule one of his senior officers, in the person of the district superintendent. If he overrules him this will certainly not make for harmony in the force; if he goes along with what the district superintendent happens to decide the whole thing has the appearance of a farce. This is why magistrates were appointed to decide such appeals.

The amendment to the schedule gives the Governor-in-Council the power to amend regulations and to make regulations relating to meetings. At present there are no regulations covering meetings, although this is intended by this amendment. One wonders why on the eve of an election the Government has decided to introduce this power by regulation. It is not power by Act of Parliament; if it were, we would be able to debate it as we have done with other Acts. On the eve of an election this Parliament is being asked to give the Government a blank cheque. It wants to decide, through the commissioner of police, who can or who cannot address public meetings in the streets.

This leaves me deeply concerned as to the application of the basic principles of democracy. Surely one of those basic principles is the right of a person seeking parliamentary office to be able to express his opinion in a public place—provided it is done with decorum—without asking the permission of a servant of the Government of the day. Irrespective of my regard for the Commissioner of Police, and I do have a very high regard for him, this law that is going into the statute-book virtually gives the Commissioner of Police or the district superintendent—whoever they might be—the power, as servants of the Government of the day, to control public meetings.

The Leader of the Opposition has already pointed to occasions when the Premier was reported as having influenced some decisions of the Police Commissioner. Therefore any political candidate is at their mercy as far as the holding of a street meeting is concerned, and I think that is completely wrong. This is especially so on the eve of the next election. Is this power going to be used against some political party which might oppose the Government? Is it aimed at some small group which might believe it has the right to put forward a candidate? Could it even apply to a person standing as an independent? If such a power is used I do not think any major political party would take it lying down.

In this clause, why is the Government coupling funeral processions with meetings and processions and all the other things about which it has been talking? Surely the last journey of a deceased person need not be coupled with normal meetings or processions. I do not know why the Government has seen fit to couple all these. Is it to give the clause

some respectability? Or does the Government think that the Opposition will not speak on it or oppose it because it appreciates the significance of funeral processions?

I say to the Minister that I should like him to give a complete explanation of the Government's intention relative to the issuing of permits for political meetings held in association with an election. I can understand, of course, that the Commissioner of Police or anyone else would not want time clashes for meetings of various political groups in popular places. In such cases times would have to be allocated, as they have been in the past, and I do not think that anyone would object to that. I want a clear understanding from the Minister of the Government's policy in regard to political meetings.

Again, religious meetings are covered by regulations. As other honourable members on this side of the Chamber have said, "Why isolate religion?" The words "political, religious or other meetings" are used. Of course, it is necessary first to define what is a political meeting, and again it is being left in the hands of a policeman to decide what is or is not a political meeting. Till now it has been left to a magistrate to make that decision. I will not re-hash the clauses that have been passed, but that is the situation. What type of regulations will be brought down? I am sure that everyone associated with a religious organisation would like to know what regulations could be brought down to cover them.

Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (8.38 p.m.): This clause merely gives the power to make regulations, which is not now in the Act. As the honourable member is well aware, all regulations come before the House, and that will be the time to consider them.

I move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the Committee divided.

AYES, 36

Bird	Lickiss
Camm	Lindsay
Campbell	McKechnie
Edwards	Miller
Elliott	Moore
Frawley	Neal
Gibbs	Newbery
Glasson	Porter
Goleby	Powell
Gunn	Row
Gygar	Simpson
Hales	Small
Kippin	Tenni
Knox	Turner
Kyburz	Wharton
Lamond	
Lane	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	Kaus
Lester	Muller

NOES, 11

Burns	Wright
Dean	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Casey
Melloy	Marginson
Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—Application of Principal Act as amended—

Mr. PORTER (Toowong): I move—

"That the question be now put."

Question put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 35

Camm	Lindsay
Campbell	McKechnie
Edwards	Miller
Elliott	Moore
Frawley	Neal
Gibbs	Newbery
Glasson	Porter
Goleby	Powell
Gunn	Row
Gygar	Simpson
Hales	Small
Kippin	Tenni
Knox	Turner
Kyburz	Wharton
Lamond	
Lane	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	Kaus
Lester	Muller
Lickiss	

NOES, 11

Burns	Wright
Dean	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Casey
Melloy	Marginson
Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 5, as read, stand part of the Bill— put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 35

Camm	Lindsay
Campbell	McKechnie
Edwards	Miller
Elliott	Moore
Frawley	Neal
Gibbs	Newbery
Glasson	Porter
Goleby	Powell
Gunn	Row
Gygar	Simpson
Hales	Small
Kippin	Tenni
Knox	Turner
Kyburz	Wharton
Lamond	
Lane	<i>Tellers:</i>
Lee	Kaus
Lester	Muller
Lickiss	

NOES, 11

Burns	Wright
Dean	Yewdale
Hooper, K. J.	
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Jones	Casey
Melloy	Marginson
Prest	

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING

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

The House adjourned at 8.52 p.m.