

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER 1977**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

"2. That Mr. Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland in the loss they have sustained."

The late Duncan Macdonald of Peachester, who died last Thursday in the Maleny hospital, was 92 years of age. He was a member of this Assembly for some 15 years. He entered the House as the Country Party member for the former seat of Stanley on 2 April 1938 and remained its representative till 28 April 1950, and he then represented the renamed seat of Somerset from 29 April 1950 to 6 March 1953, when he retired from politics.

Only two of the longer serving members—Mr. Aikens and I—remember Mr. Macdonald personally. He was a man who certainly dedicated himself to his parliamentary duties and to his responsibilities as a Whip in this Chamber. I remember very well his friendly nature and his distinctive Gaelic accent, which was heard frequently in this Chamber. I should say that he certainly won the respect of members on both sides of the House and served his electors with a devotion that was a true reflection of his Scottish upbringing.

## WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER 1977

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported by Mr. Speaker:—

Auctioneers and Agents Act Amendment Bill;  
Trustee Companies Act Amendment Bill;  
Collections Act Amendment Bill;  
Evidence Bill;  
Valuation of Land Act Amendment Bill;  
Meat Industry Act Amendment Bill;  
Queensland Film Industry Development Bill.

### DEATH OF MR. D. MACDONALD

#### MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

**Hon. J. BJELKE-PETERSEN** (Barambah—Premier) (11.4 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

"1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late Duncan Macdonald, Esquire, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland.

From 27 May 1947 to 30 May 1950 he was the Opposition Whip, as I said earlier, and performed those duties with vigour and diligence. Mr. Macdonald was a man with a sense of history, and he applied his knowledge with a breadth of feeling that gave depth to the debates in this Chamber. He had a good reputation, which he cultivated amongst all his colleagues. He frequently quoted outstanding people of early history—the Iron Duke or William Cowper, for example—and he did so with effect and with a wit that enhanced his reputation as a debater in this Chamber.

He was born in Scotland in 1885 and came to North Queensland in 1908. In his youth he was a noted boxer and played first-class Rugby Union. In his later years, he spent much time at shooting, and proved himself most proficient. He was educated at the Glasgow Academy and the University of Edinburgh.

His support of the then Country Party covered several decades. His services to local government began in 1927, or some 50 years ago, and he was for many years a councillor and chairman of the Landsborough Shire Council. For his working life, he was a farmer and grazier, and he served the industry well.

His wife predeceased him some years ago. He is now survived by a son and two daughters. Despite his age, he enjoyed good health, and his death came suddenly.

I express to Mr. Macdonald's surviving relatives the sincere regrets of this House and of my Government, as well as my own personal condolences, on the death of a former member of this Assembly and a one-time colleague of mine on this side of politics.

**Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (11.8 a.m.): I second the motion.

The late Duncan Macdonald was not known to me personally, but he was known to me by repute. On occasions such as this, one is constantly reminded that many distinguished citizens served in this Assembly many years ago, long before many of us began our service. Particularly when they reach a great age, as Duncan Macdonald did, we tend to overlook that they were members of this Assembly and that they rendered distinguished service to the people of this State.

Duncan Macdonald had the reputation of being a very forthright and well-principled man, and he was insistent on those things in which he believed being implemented, although on occasions he did not have his own way. Isn't that what happens to most of us in this Assembly? Those who come into Parliament hoping to reform everything by Christmas find that it is a very slow process. That is the usual experience.

As the Premier mentioned, the late Duncan Macdonald was a very highly regarded citizen, and I am sure that all honourable members wish to extend to his relatives sincere sympathy and sorrow at this time.

**Mr. BURNS** (Lytton—Leader of the Opposition) (11.10 a.m.): The Opposition wishes to be associated with this motion of condolence. Like the Deputy Premier, I did not know Mr. Macdonald personally. However, I am sure that together with all former members of Parliament he served this State and this nation with distinction. I am equally sure that his family would have missed out on a lot and made a great number of sacrifices to enable him to carry out his duties as a parliamentarian.

The late Mr. Macdonald was a member of Parliament from 1938 to 1953, a period that included the war years. That period, when our State and our nation were under threat, when troops and materials were on the move and when certain areas of Queensland were bombed, would have put tremendous stress on members of Parliament.

The Opposition joins in this motion and offers its condolences to Mr. Macdonald's family.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (11.11 a.m.): I am very sorry to learn of the passing of Malcolm Macdonald—I am sorry; Duncan Macdonald. There were two members,

Malcolm McIntyre and Duncan Macdonald—both Scotsmen—in Parliament at the same time. And sometimes it is pretty hard to differentiate between Scotsmen!

As I was about to say, Duncan Macdonald was in Parliament when I was elected to it. Anyone who had anything at all in him could not help liking Duncan Macdonald, but I feel sure that quite a number of people did not appreciate many of his qualities. As I say, he was a Scotsman. I would not agree with those persons who say that that is a hard thing to say about any man; there are very many fine Scotsmen. Like most Scotsmen, the older Duncan Macdonald grew, the more pronounced his Scottish accent became. At times when he became a little angry—which was rarely—it was very difficult for us in Parliament to understand what he was saying. Nevertheless he possessed a fund of sound common sense and on many occasions we benefited from it.

I want to pay a tribute to his erudition. He was a remarkable man in that regard. I am not quite sure, but I think he went to Oxford. At any rate, he certainly gave the impression that he did.

For the first six years after I entered Parliament we had in the House a Rhodes Scholar who had taken a degree in Greek at Oxford. His name was Fred Paterson. Very often Duncan Macdonald and Fred Paterson would converse in Greek. It aroused a little bit of pique in most of us because we could not understand what they were talking about. However, they got their message across to one another.

I liked, as I do now, to extend my knowledge of the English language if I could, and very frequently when I uttered a quotation it struck some chord in his memory. He would later come up and in his broad Scots burr would elaborate on the quotation that I had recited. At times he would come up with similar quotations.

I liked Duncan Macdonald very much indeed. That was partly because in some ways, to use a common expression, he used to butter me up by telling me that I was using words and phrases that were not usually heard in the Queensland Parliament. At times he would ask my advice on certain matters. Whether or not he wanted that advice, I do not know. But we know what Scotsmen are—they like us to have the idea that we know a lot more than we do know.

As I say I liked Duncan Macdonald very much. He was not a flamboyant man; in fact, his attitude was the very antithesis of flamboyancy. He was a good, hard, clean-living man—a first-class Queenslander. This Parliament regrets his passing, and I feel sure that Queensland will be the poorer for it.

**Mr. GUNN** (Somerset) (11.14 a.m.): I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers. Although I did not know Mr. Duncan Macdonald, from some of the older members of my electorate council I knew of his history in this Parliament.

Originally he represented the seat of Stanley, which, in those days, extended to within a couple of miles of my home. Later on it became the seat of Lockyer. Mr. Macdonald then represented the seat of Somerset for many years. Although I did not know him, after I won the seat of Somerset in 1972 he wrote me a short note—and in a very firm hand. I understand what he must have done in this House because in those days conditions were altogether different from what they are now. He left his mark in the electorate. It is quite common for some of the older electors of Somerset to speak of him. I repeat that I appreciate the work he did and I extend my condolences to his family.

Motion (Mr. Bjelke-Petersen) agreed to, honourable members standing in silence.

### PAPERS

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

#### Reports—

Department of Community and Welfare Services and Sport, for the year 1976-77.

Department of Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement, for the year 1976-77.

The following paper was laid on the table:—

Regulation under the Mining Act 1968-1976.

### PETITIONS

#### PROBLEM OF DRUG USAGE

**Mr. ALISON** (Maryborough) presented a petition from 20 citizens 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 legalization of use is introduced.

Petition read and received.

#### STATE SCHOLARSHIPS AND LIVING ALLOWANCES FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton) presented a petition from 1,321 citizens of Queensland praying that the Parliament of Queensland will reconsider the decision to abolish State scholarships and provide a living allowance for all students studying teaching courses at tertiary institutions.

Petition read and received.

### QUEENSLAND CEMENT & LIME COMPANY LIMITED AGREEMENT BILL

#### THIRD READING

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

### QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

#### 1. IMPROVED CONDITIONS FOR POLICE AND THEIR FAMILIES

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

As a result of his policy of touring the State to personally inspect police housing and office conditions and his subsequent representations to the Treasurer for works in a number of areas, what steps are now being taken to improve the conditions for members of the Queensland Police Force and their families?

*Answer:—*

As a result of my touring the State and seeing at first hand the conditions under which some police and their families were both living and working, I made strong representations for further funds to be allocated for police accommodation. A special allocation of finance has now been made available for this purpose, and a list of high-priority projects has been forwarded to the Department of Works. These projects include the erection of in excess of 30 either new or replacement residences. Action is also in hand regarding the replacement of several police stations and the acquisition of premises to be utilised as a police station. The number to be built will be subject to the availability of funds having regard to the actual building costs. The provision of additional office accommodation at a number of police stations has also been requested, in addition to the installation of septic systems at 16 centres throughout the State.

Officers of the Department of Works are currently investigating these projects, preparing plans, etc., and it is anticipated that, with the completion of these works in this financial year, the conditions of members of the Queensland Police Force and their families will be greatly improved.

#### 2. S.E.Q.E.B. APPLIANCE INFORMATION CENTRE

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

Is there to be any change in the role of the S.E.Q.E.B. appliance information centre, Adelaide Street, by converting the centre to a selling agency and, if so, what provision will the board make to protect the consumer who purchases electrical appliances from the centre?

*Answer:—*

The South East Queensland Electricity Board has not made or planned any change to the service provided by the appliance information centre in Adelaide Street.

### 3. TIMBER ROYALTIES, STATE FORESTS AND FRASER ISLAND

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

(1) In 1975-76, what was the average royalty collected for native hardwood timbers produced on (a) all State forests and (b) Fraser Island?

(2) In each of the last five years, what was (a) the total volume of timber produced, (b) the average number of Forestry Department employees permanently employed, (c) the total revenue collected from the sale of timber products and (d) the total cost of conducting forestry operations on Fraser Island?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) The questions appear to be identical in content with those asked by the honourable member for Sandgate six months ago and I would refer him to my reply of 5 April 1977 as reported in "Hansard".

### 4. REPORT ON BLACK RITE DANCE AT EDWARD RIVER

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

(1) As the report in "The Courier-Mail" of 3 September headed "Black Rite Open to All" was worded to indicate that the dance performed at Edward River was in recognition of the opening of a new hospital and that it was the first time white people had been allowed to view the dance, how can he reconcile this with the fact that this same dance was performed by the council chairman in 1966 for the member for Tablelands, other white staff members, and women and children?

(2) Did he or the director see the report prior to its being published?

(3) Will he take the necessary steps to avoid any embarrassment to the Edward River people, and especially to John Coleman, who no doubt was incorrectly reported?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) I did not observe the 1966 member for Tablelands at the opening of the new hospital at Edward River. However, I would accept that the honourable member is living in the dream-time of Labor policies.

The facts are that a ceremonial tribal dance was performed and the chairman of the council, Mr. Punta Coleman, described it to me and members of my party. For the information of the honourable member, I can say that this ceremony was unique, as it was performed by a relative of the late leader King Charlie, whose tribal name was Thatch Kumpar. As the hospital was similarly named, we were advised that custom required the dance to be performed to release the name for use, and therein lies the uniqueness of the ceremony.

The honourable member may not be aware that normal Aboriginal custom is not to use a person's name after death. Considerable explanation was conveyed to the party on the significance of the occasion, and as far as I can determine, it was correctly reported. I must say further that the reporter respected the good ethics of his profession and did not submit to me or my director the contents of his Press release. I respect his integrity. I can only conclude that the honourable member and his spirit adviser continue to live in the A.L.P. dream-time.

### 5. WIDENING OF OLD CLEVELAND ROAD, BELMONT

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

What expenditure is involved in the broadening of Old Cleveland Road and the construction of bridges between Adelaide Street, Carina, and Scrub Road, Belmont?

*Answer:—*

I am pleased to be able to report that the total cost of the provision of additional lanes to Scrub Road is about \$3,000,000.

### 6. TRAFFIC LIGHTS AT CAVENDISH ROAD INTERSECTIONS

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

What expenditure was involved in the installation of traffic-light systems at the intersection of Creek Road and Cavendish Road, Mt. Gravatt East, and Holland/Boundary Roads and Cavendish Road, Holland Park, respectively?

*Answer:—*

The traffic signal installations about which the honourable member seeks the information are not on roads declared under the Main Roads Act, but are the responsibility of the Brisbane City Council. The Main Roads Department provided an amount of \$327,000 for 1977-78 to the Brisbane City Council for traffic works of its own choice.

7. MR. NOOR DEEN OF CARINA

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

(1) Has Mr. Noor Deen of Carina previously been convicted of offences of a criminal nature?

(2) If so, what were the offences and the penalties or sentences given, what was the length of time served under each sentence and what were the relevant dates?

*Answers:—*

(1) Yes.

(2) At the District Court, Brisbane, on 30 October 1970, Mr. Noor Deen was convicted of conspiracy to defraud and sentenced to six months' imprisonment with hard labour. He was discharged from prison on 27 February 1971.

At the District Court, Brisbane, on 14 April 1975, he was convicted of stealing and sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment with hard labour and ordered to make restitution of \$2,262.38. He was released on parole on 12 December 1975.

8. QUALIFICATIONS OF MR. E. M. JOHNSTON, LAND COURT MEMBER

**Dr. Scott-Young**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Justice and Attorney-General—

(1) What legal qualifications are held by Mr. E. M. Johnston, a member of the Land Court?

(2) Does he hold qualifications that allow him to assess the effects of noise and stress on the breeding of animals, and has he had experience in animal husbandry?

*Answer:—*

(1 and 2) The members of the Land Court are appointed under the provisions of the Land Act 1962-1975. It is suggested, therefore, that the question be directed to the Honourable the Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service, who is the Minister charged with the administration of the Act.

9. SEALING OF BUS TURN-ABOUT AREA, WEIR STATE SCHOOL

**Dr. Scott-Young**, pursuant to notice, asked the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads—

(1) Has he been acquainted with an article in "The Townsville Daily Bulletin" in which it is stated that the Thuringowa Shire Council is looking to the Government to supply the money to seal the bus turn-about area in front of the Weir State School?

(2) Will he, when working out priorities, give consideration to this urgently required work?

*Answers:—*

(1) Until now, the article had not been brought to my attention. I thank the honourable member for so doing.

(2) The Main Roads Department does not accept responsibility for providing bus turnabouts in front of schools. This is a local authority responsibility. The local authority could programme the work from Commonwealth aid grants which it receives from the Main Roads Department if it so wished.

10. TOOWOOMBA PUBLIC PASSENGER TRANSPORT STUDY

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

What progress has been made on the study of public passenger transport in the Toowoomba urban area, and when will the results be available?

*Answer:—*

Approximately 50 per cent of the work, including the collection of essential data required for the study, has been completed. The scheduled date for submission of the study report is 31 December 1977, and it should be presented to me shortly after that date.

11. LAETRILE AND VITAMIN B<sub>17</sub>

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

(1) What is the legal position regarding the supply of laetrile, its active ingredient amygdalin or so-called vitamin B<sub>17</sub>?

(2) Has this drug any recognised medical use?

(3) Is there any indication of people from Queensland being duped into travelling to the Cook Islands for treatment with this preparation?

(4) If administration of the compound is actually harmless, will he examine the possibility of making it available under medical supervision in Government hospitals so as to prevent any profiteering based on the false expectations of desperately ill people?

*Answers:—*

(1) On the recommendation of the National Health and Medical Research Council the drug laetrile is available for research and analysis purposes only provided the Director-General of Health has approved.

(2) In June 1975, the Australian Drug Evaluation Committee examined new data supporting an application for approval to market laetrile for cancer therapy but a recommendation followed that the request be rejected because of lack of proven efficacy, the possibility of toxicity and the absence of knowledge of metabolism, excretion and serum levels. A recent report of the American Food and Drug Administration includes statements that a United States judge found that laetrile is unsafe and ineffective.

(3) As the latest treatment for cancer is available in Queensland hospitals free of charge, there is no need for patients to travel outside Queensland for it.

(4) In view of the latest report and other reports that the drug is unsafe and of no proven value I am not prepared to have it made available at this stage.

#### 12. COMPANY, EAST WEST INVESTMENTS PTY. LTD.

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

(1) Will he have investigated the activities of the company East West Investments Pty. Ltd., which has sent out cards addressed to Mr. Moneymaker, exhorting people to be capitalists, beat inflation and make money while they sleep, etc., and purporting to offer a secured method of obtaining an income for periods of three, eight, 10 or 15 years?

(2) Will he report to the public on the reliability of this company?

*Answers:—*

(1) East West Investments Pty. Ltd. is a company duly registered in Western Australia. This company is subject to an investigation by the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs in that State at the present time. The matter of soliciting in Queensland for participation in any scheme is within the ambit of that investigation. The Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs in Queensland has undertaken to provide the Corporate Affairs Office in Western Australia with any assistance it may require.

(2) I am not in a position to comment on the reliability of this company.

#### 13. PERMANENT BUILDING SOCIETIES CONTINGENCY FUND

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

(1) How much money is in the Permanent Building Societies Contingency Fund?

(2) Will it be enough to cover the expected loss of deposits if or when the Queensland Permanent Building Society again opens its doors?

(3) Has Mr. F. L. Olsen, chairman of Queensland Permanent Building Society, resigned from the Permanent Building Societies Contingency Fund Committee?

(4) Will he give an assurance that the State Government will guarantee any discrepancies and will not again call on S.G.I.O. investors to bear the burden?

*Answers:—*

(1 and 2) As I have already stated in this House, the Permanent Building Societies Contingency Fund has available more than sufficient moneys to meet the estimated loss of the Queensland Permanent Building Society.

(3) Yes.

(4) As I have repeatedly stated publicly and in this House, the State Government does not guarantee the funds of private organisations. However, the Permanent Building Societies Contingency Fund was established by this Government under the Building Societies Act 1888–1976, and is funded by the building society industry for the specific purpose of protecting the interests of share-holding and depositing members, persons lending money and creditors of permanent building societies.

#### 14. REGISTERED DRUG ADDICTS

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

How many (a) male and (b) female drug addicts are registered in Maryborough, Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns?

*Answer:—*

The numbers of registered male and female drug addicts in provincial cities in Queensland are:—

|         |    |    |    |    |    |
|---------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Males   | .. | .. | .. | .. | 30 |
| Females | .. | .. | .. | .. | 5  |

#### 15. FISHING IN GULF RIVERS

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

(1) Does he realise that the closing of Gulf rivers to fishing will deprive five families in the Flinders electorate of their livelihood, as the men are full-time fishermen?

(2) Is he aware that some of these people have invested over \$30,000 in equipment during the last two years?

(3) Is he aware that fish breed only during the wet season and that, if the net size is set at 7 in., each fish of this

size will have already bred and spawned hundreds of offspring, and does he agree that this is a strong case for reconsidering the decision, which is helping only the large operators working in the Gulf with expensive boats?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 3) The closures of streams referred to by the honourable member are partial closures only of certain rivers and streams upstream of locations as set out in the Government Gazette published on 17 September 1977. These closures are restricted to net fishing and are for a trial period in an endeavour to reduce over-fishing and to protect juvenile and maturing adult fish during their vulnerable stages to establish a reservoir for seasonal and migration replenishment of fish stocks in the overall interests of commercial fishermen. They are certainly not designed to be detrimental to the total fishery resource. This action was taken after extensive consultation with commercial fishermen and their representatives, as well as industry and angling groups.

Perhaps the honourable member is not aware that my Queensland Fisheries Service has, in conjunction with the C.S.I.R.O., embarked upon a significant barramundi research project to ensure that the barramundi fishing industry remains economically viable to the overall benefit of commercial fishermen.

I am aware that most commercial fishermen, who depend on the resource for their livelihood and to service their quite considerable capital investment, recognise the need to conserve the resource not only for current operators but for those families who, for generations, have followed the industry as a means of livelihood.

The honourable member can be assured that the matter will be kept under continuous review.

#### 16. FACILITIES FOR MEATWORKS ALONG FLINDERS RAILWAY LINE

**Mr. Ahern** for **Mr. Katter**, pursuant to notice, asked the Premier—

Will he give the people along the Flinders railway line some assurance that the infrastructure normally required in any community will be provided at Julia Creek, or anywhere else along this line, in order to facilitate the building of a meatworks?

*Answer:—*

It is difficult to determine what infrastructure would be necessary. Until such time as a firm proposal based on feasibility studies for a meatworks facility in the area is available, it is not possible to give the

honourable member a positive answer. Naturally we would want to assist any worthwhile project which would help the cattle industry.

#### 17. AIR-CONDITIONING OF FETTLERS CAMP, MAXWELTON

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

As the new quarters for the fettlers based at Maxwelton, although extremely acceptable and adequate, were built for air-conditioning and are unbearably hot during the summer months, will he provide air-conditioning if the men agree to pay for it out of their camping allowance?

*Answer:—*

There are practical difficulties associated with the provision of air-conditioning in the mobile unit accommodation occupied by members of the mechanised resurfacing gang referred to. The matter is, however, under investigation following the honourable member's earlier representations to me and I shall duly advise him of the outcome.

#### 18. PSEUDO WHOLESALERS

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

(1) Has there been any investigation of businesses which call themselves wholesalers?

(2) Are there any rules governing their operation?

(3) Are they subject to any checks to see that their prices are indeed wholesale?

(4) Is he aware that some wholesalers in the toy field are charging up to \$3 more for a doll than local suburban retail outlets?

(5) What recourse has the consumer against this misleading form of advertising?

(6) What steps has the Government taken to protect consumers from these rip-offs?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 6) As the honourable member is aware specials are a well established form of present-day marketing and I have no reason to believe that the difference in prices quoted by the honourable member is anything but that. The case in question highlights the importance of consumers shopping around to obtain the most favourable price consistent with quality.

Inquiries are proceeding at the present time into the differentiation between wholesalers and retailers and their respective roles, which in some respects are unclear. However, I would stress that these inquiries were not initiated as a result of the honourable member's question.

19. AUSTRALIAN PERMANENT  
RETIREMENT FUND

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

(1) Was the Australian Permanent Retirement Fund controlled by the same directors as the Australian Permanent Building Society and the Australian Co-operative Development Society?

(2) As building society investors have been repaid through the Contingency Fund and the Development Society is in liquidation, what has happened to the Australian Permanent Retirement Fund?

(3) Who controls the fund at present?

(4) What is the situation of investors who joined the retirement scheme?

*Answer:—*

(1 to 4) The Australian Permanent Retirement Fund was established by a trust deed dated 12 November 1973 with A.P.R.F. Management Pty. Ltd. as manager and A.P.R.F. Nominees Pty. Ltd. as trustee. Records held in the Office of the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs show that all of the directors (except one) of these two companies were at various times also directors of the Australian Permanent Building Society Limited or the Australian Co-operative Development Society Limited or both.

A total of \$13,896.95 held in the retirement fund was invested with Australian Permanent Building Society Limited and this amount is being held by the liquidator of that society. I am advised that the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs is taking such steps as are necessary to facilitate disbursement of these moneys.

20. COMPUTER-RELATED CRIMES

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

(1) Is he aware of reports that, of an estimated \$500,000,000 which Australia will lose next year, at least \$10,000,000 will be due to computer-related crimes?

(2) What investigations have been carried out in Queensland into computer safeguards to protect investors?

(3) Are any persons in the Fraud Squad or in the Corporate Affairs Commissioner's Office trained to handle this type of white-collar crime?

*Answers:—*

(1) I am aware of reports that Australians will lose millions of dollars next year owing to computer-related crimes.

(2) It is the responsibility of directors of corporate bodies to ensure that investors' funds are adequately protected and such responsibility does include the provision of adequate safeguards against computer-related crime.

(3) I am informed by the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs that qualified inspectors in his office have the capacity to investigate this type of white-collar crime.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

PURCHASE OF PLUMBERS AND GASFITTERS  
EMPLOYEES' UNION TICKETS

**Mr. TENNI:** I ask the Premier: Is he aware that a married man with three children has been sacked at Gladstone? Is he also aware that this man was a member of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees' Union and that his union ticket was purchased while he worked in Adelaide? Is he also aware that, although the Gladstone branch of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Employees' Union was prepared to renew his ticket and even though two other men who commenced work at approximately the same time as this man had their tickets renewed, the secretary of the union in Brisbane advised that the books were closed and no ticket was to be issued? Is the Premier aware that this man's employer is keen to re-employ him? Could he also advise why the honourable member for Port Curtis has allowed this to happen? Does it indicate that the unions are now dictating who will work and who will not work, and in this case the union has no concern for the man's wife and three children?

**Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN:** I certainly was not aware of this situation, but if the honourable member will supply all the information to the Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs I am sure he will have it investigated. I must say that this Government is not going to tolerate a closed shop situation in any section of industry, and we will be legislating in this regard in the future, especially because of the industrial situation applying today. I do not know whether the honourable member for Port Curtis has anything to contribute to the situation.

COMMENTS BY LEADER OF OPPOSITION ON  
SAFETY ASPECTS OF BARRON RIVER  
PROJECT

**Mr. TENNI:** I ask the Minister for Local Government and Main Roads: Has his attention been drawn to a pre-election campaign statement by the Leader of the Opposition reported in "The Cairns Post" of 4 October

in which he questioned safety aspects of the new Barron River bridge project during a tour with party candidates in the area? Despite blatant attempts by the Leader of the Opposition to score political points over the project, what is the true position in respect of the Barron River Bridge works?

**Mr. HINZE:** I did see some reference to the Leader of the Opposition standing on the new bridge at Barron River complaining about a guard-rail. He had a couple of his cronies with him. I got the impression that he might even have staggered and fallen into the Barron River, which would probably have been a good thing for Queensland.

As the honourable member points out, the Opposition Leader has used the Barron River Bridge project in Cairns as an excuse for another exercise in Government bashing, and, significantly, just before an election.

My attention has been drawn to the article to which the honourable member refers. My initial reaction is that I believe that the people of the Cairns district, who strongly support the bridge project and appreciate its tremendous value, will see the Opposition Leader's reported comments clearly for what they are—predictable pre-election drum-beating in an attempt to bolster the very poor electoral prospects of his party's candidates in that area in the forthcoming elections.

It is typical, and a measure of the Opposition's electoral desperation, that the Opposition Leader should in this instance come out not with a constructive statement on the Barron River Bridge project or anything like that but with a statement clearly designed to implant in the public's mind fear of a traffic safety problem that the bridge project itself will in fact alleviate. His comments in this instance are very much in line with the scare tactics that we are coming to expect from members on the Opposition benches lately, so apparently this is going to be the official Opposition approach in its pre-election campaigning.

The facts of the matter are that the decision to connect onto Tully Street was taken early in the life of the project to ensure that the public would have the use of the bridge by Christmas this year and, more importantly, before the wet season early in 1978.

**Mr. Jones:** Before the election.

**Mr. HINZE:** I know that the honourable member cannot take it; I know that it hurts him. I know that the Opposition is disappointed because of the terrific amount of work that the Government has done in the Cairns area.

**Mr. Jones:** It is blatant.

**Mr. HINZE:** There has been a tremendous amount of road expenditure in the Cairns area.

Residents of Tully Street had sought a crossing of the railway line at the end of their street, and a properly constructed crossing with adequate safety features will now be provided. The department's engineers and other experts have acted very responsibly in the design of the bridge and its approaches and, of course, traffic safety was a major consideration in this. It is quite ludicrous to suggest otherwise.

The four lanes of roadway leading towards the bridge will not go as far as the bridge but only as far as the Stratford connection, to cater for the development in the area served by the road.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. HINZE:** I'm stirring them, Mr. Speaker, aren't I? They can't take it, can they? As is said nowadays, they are copping it and crying.

Some 10,000 vehicles a day are expected on the four lanes from the city, breaking down to 7,000 vehicles a day over the Barron River Bridge and 3,000 vehicles a day over the proposed Stratford overpass.

#### SEAMEN'S UNION DISPUTE AT HAY POINT

**Mr. AIKENS:** I ask the Minister for Mines and Energy—and let's hope he can clear up this matter for once and for all—

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member will ask his question.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I ask: In view of the conflicting statements on the matter and the paucity of information published in the Press, and notwithstanding the multifarious words spoken in this Chamber, will he inform the House how many tonnes of coal were shipped from Hay Point since the flamboyantly advertised visit of the members for Mackay and Rockhampton North to Hay Point? Will he tell us how many tonnes of coal are in ships completely immobilised at Hay Point by the ban imposed by the Seamen's Union and whether the two members mentioned made any representations that led to those two ships being moved and, if so, to whom?

**Mr. CAMM:** As I outlined yesterday afternoon, there are two disputes at Hay Point. One is a dispute in which the Seamen's Union refused to man tugs to berth vessels owned by the Utah Company and manned by Spanish crews. This ban has resulted in these vessels having to berth without the aid of tugs, at considerable risk to the loading facilities at Hay Point. Furthermore, they have to wait for a favourable wind and tide to leave the jetty.

Because the Utah Company instituted legal action against the Seamen's Union, the union called an overall strike banning any assistance to any of the ships loading coal

at Hay Point. The Japanese owners refused to allow their ships to berth without the aid of tugs. This has led to the anchoring of about seven huge bulk carriers in the vicinity of Mackay Harbour and Hay Point.

When the members for Mackay and Rockhampton North learned that the seamen were going back to work, they went down and tried to claim that they had convinced the seamen to go back to work. I do not know whether the member for Rockhampton North was even near the place; I will take the newspaper's word for it that he was. He and the member for Mackay claimed credit for getting the seamen back to work. This is like being knocked on the ground, kicked in the belly and then picked up by the man who knocked you down—and having to thank him for it.

The two members apparently believe that the people of the district owe them a debt of gratitude for having broken the strike called by the Seamen's Union. If they claim the credit for getting the men back to work on the tugs so that ships of other nations and not owned by Utah can berth, they must accept responsibility for the continuing ban imposed by the seamen on Utah's ships.

I do believe that two ships were loaded and departed. I do not know how many other ships have been loaded and have left Hay Point.

**Mr. Aikens:** Can you tell me how many tonnes of coal are in those ships that have not left?

**Mr. CAMM:** No, I cannot. I do not know how many ships are tied up at Hay Point.

Tugs were supplied for the berthing of the Japanese vessels. Any of Utah's ships that might berth are forced to wait at the jetty, loaded with coal, until the tides and the winds are suitable for their departure.

I challenge the member for Mackay to go to the Mackay "Daily Mercury" and say, "I am the one responsible for the activities of the Seamen's Union in the Mackay district and I am not going to try to convince the seamen that they should man the tugs so that these vessels can be shifted."

As I said before, if he claims credit—very doubtful credit—for the fact that the seamen returned to work, he must accept responsibility for the industrial trouble that still exists. The seamen continue to refuse to man tugs to berth vessels owned by Utah and manned by Spanish crews.

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

## MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

### ESTABLISHMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHIC ARCHIVE

**Mr. KAUS** (Mansfield) (12 noon): I rise in this debate today on a matter which I believe is of considerable importance at this time, and certainly one that will be in future times—a matter in which I believe many Queenslanders can become personally involved for the benefit of this State.

I believe it is important that we consider the issue at this time, as we are in the formative stages of development of our new art gallery and cultural complex in Brisbane. Recently, constituents of mine drew to my attention a report from America concerning a drive by the National Gallery of Art in Washington, which had launched a project to gather some 2,500,000 photographs. The gallery is seeking to establish photographic archives of the world's great art and architecture, and wants to establish a national visual data bank where the masterpieces of art and architecture can be studied.

My investigations have also revealed that the Courtauld Institute in London has the largest collection in the world of more than 1,000,000 photographs, while the National Gallery in London has recently set up a photography section and this has been received with tremendous interest and enthusiasm.

Further they have established a special mobile unit, which tours centres with audio-visual shows, holding successful art shows and enabling many people to see the works of the masters and the development of special art or architecture themes.

Here is a museum and art gallery at work in the modern concept. They are showing the people the treasures that are available; they are showing them history and development. That could be extended to include exhibitions on, for instance, "Another chance for cities", "What you can do", "Being concerned with arresting physical decay in the city", "Meeting our housing needs", "Starting new communities in new ways", and "Giving our cities another chance". The only record we have of these photographs is something like what we saw in "The Sunday Mail" of 4 September. It contained a magazine called, "The Queensland Annual 1977". It included photographs from all over the State. That would be the only archive we have.

We in Queensland can be extremely proud of our John Oxley Library, our museum and our State archives, for they have kept together many of the historic treasures of the State and its development through history. However, as our city has grown and developed, there has been no concerted effort to keep a treasury of progress on film. I do not think that there is one in Melbourne, Sydney or Hobart. Australian art galleries have many famous works of art, but unless a person becomes a tourist, there is no

opportunity to see these works. A similar problem exists with overseas collections and other famous works of art.

I think all Queenslanders were disappointed that the fabulous Chinese exhibition was denied us. Airline companies put on special flights to take people to Sydney to view this famous exhibition.

I think all members are well aware that by means of modern photography and the wonders of microfilm much data can be stored very conveniently. I believe this to be an important feature of any modern centre of cultural activity. I hope the people of Queensland would be prepared to contribute to this scheme by making available photographs of buildings and other items of interest throughout the State so that they can be shared by their fellow Queenslanders both now and in the future.

I feel that this project could become of considerable importance for future generations and I hope that Queenslanders will contribute to it. Unfortunately over a period of time we have lost the opportunity to capture a record of many of the old developments in Brisbane and other centres throughout Queensland. Let us not waste any more time. Let us establish a central receiving centre for the cataloguing of these treasures that exist in thousands of homes in Queensland. This could be done through our own departmental libraries. I believe it would be a unique contribution to our cultural activities and heritage in Australia. To me, it seems only fitting that this should take place in Queensland, where a fine new cultural complex is under development at the present time.

#### NEWCASTLE DISEASE; BIRD-SMUGGLING

**Mr. JONES** (Cairns) (12.7 p.m.): Late in November 1930 there was an outbreak of Newcastle disease at Inverloch, in Victoria. Within two months this viral disease was rife in the Melbourne metropolitan area. Even with strict control measures and quarantine restrictions, it took until May 1931 to contain the infection. Some 19,000 birds, consisting of poultry, geese, ducks, turkeys and aviary and other birds, died of the disease or were destroyed.

In October 1932, 19 months later, Newcastle disease reappeared at Flemington, in Victoria. By February 1933 a total of 23,271 birds had either died or been destroyed. Quarantine restrictions were not removed until March 1933, six months after the second outbreak. The cost of the eradication programme from 1930 to 1933, and the overall cost to the poultry industry at that time, cannot be ascertained.

Again in Victoria in February 1976 there was an outbreak of a fowl plague which is a closely related disease. Eradication of that outbreak cost \$140,000.

About two years ago there was a massive outbreak of Newcastle disease in the United States. Its eradication cost \$U.S.56,000,000. Such is the magnitude of the problem presented by the transmission of Newcastle disease. Its ramifications within the poultry industry are disastrous and the incidence of this disease in Australia threatens not only the poultry industry and aviary birds but the birds and other wildlife that are unique to Australia.

Newcastle disease is considered to be as dangerous and damaging to birds and poultry as is foot and mouth disease to animals. The virus has been found to cause conjunctivitis in man. Cases have been reported, the first in a laboratory worker in Australia. Later two others became infected. The last known case was a veterinarian in the United States.

Clearly anyone responsible for introducing such a disease ought to be incarcerated. If any difficulty is found in pronouncing that word, another of similar sound could be substituted and that action, too, would be applicable and is recommended. Apparently some human feathers were ruffled recently when the story broke last month of an outbreak of Newcastle disease in the Cairns area. The Press and television channels tended, probably unwittingly, to play up the story and lean towards sympathy for those responsible for this outbreak. Noises of concern were made about the loss of valuable birds. There were even demands for compensation for the loss suffered by those who introduced the disease.

As the story unfolded, it was revealed by the investigating officers that complaints had been made about their actions and they complained bitterly about political interference. They said that they wished the politicians would get out of it and let them get on with their job.

As a matter of urgent public importance, I want to know who these politicians were, who they were trying to protect and why this obstruction occurred. It smacks of typical abuse of power and smells of a cover-up in line with the usual National Party arrogance. The National Party was again being used—wittingly on this occasion—as a front, and had there not been Commonwealth departmental involvement, and had the situation not been so extensive and serious, these actions may have again succeeded. But those responsible bit off a bit more than they could chew, and apparently justice is now taking its course.

As I said, on this occasion the National Party politicians involved definitely bit off more than they could chew, and I hope they choke on it. I do not want any cover-up. I want to know who tried to obstruct justice, and why. Who were they trying to protect? On Tuesday, 22 September, I asked a question about this matter. The answer from the Minister for Primary Industries on Thursday, 29 September,

avoided detail, yet the information was available to be read in Friday's Press. Who were the villains in the piece?

Each of the three people directly involved has a one-third share in a reconditioned lugger, the "Torres Pearl". The first is named Kevin Ranger. He is the Australian national skin-diving champion and South Pacific spear-fishing champion. He was selected to represent Australia in the world championships to be held in Sicily later this year. He was also nominated as a contestant in a Sportsman of the Year contest in Cairns. He has also been charged in New South Wales with illegal importation. The second man is Gary Grant, the son of Bob Grant, who is the local convener of the National Party. He was the fellow who put up money on his unemployed son's behalf to buy his third share in the boat. This fellow did some work on the reconstruction of the boat. The third partner is Graham Taylor, the proprietor of the Australian Bird Park. He is the provider and location finder for National Party fund-raising functions and meetings and a staunch member of the National Party.

Who were the National Party members involved? I can nod and National Party members can point, or they can nod and I can point, but I leave it to their own evaluation of the situation. I want these members to come out and deny that they were involved in this obstruction or that they were involved with Neville William Walsh, also a confrere and associate of National Party members. He is presently facing three charges of fraud involving approximately \$48,000. He sent Burnells and Maxmor and the Northern Electric Contracting Company into liquidation. I believe he is presently associated with a charter aircraft that came in to Weipa from Thursday Island and was found to contain birds.

Both the "Torres Pearl" and this aircraft have been confiscated by Customs and are presently impounded in Cairns. Within the last few months a U.S. publication written by someone from a Hawaiian bird park alleged that exotic birds were being exported from a North Queensland bird park. Apparently the *modus operandi* was to obtain a licence for an authorised bird-park operator to trap one pair of birds. In effect, if they carried, they fetched; and if they exported, they imported, too. These bird-park operators apparently obtain permits to trap one pair, and having gained that authority it is comparatively easy to trap as many pairs of the species as possible and then illegally export them.

One such collector organised a trip up into the Peninsula and Gulf with all expenses paid before the Wet in 1976. The Australian Broadcasting Commission was unwittingly host and party to a giant confidence trick, because he was guide and mentor to a camera crew from the programme "A Big

Country". The producers of this programme were set up and the programme was used as a facade for a logistics reconnaissance for later illicit operations. He staged, sited and set it all up on this spotter exercise with the A.B.C. Returning this year with two of his mates, he cleaned up the areas previously staked out, taking birds such as the golden-shouldered parrot and other exotic species now close to extinction that are valuable on overseas markets. Birds with high local permit royalties were the prime targets. I refer honourable members to my question on bird-smuggling as far back as 9 October 1970 ("Hansard" vol. 254, pages 959-960).

However, markets had to be secured, so the people concerned took a two-week trip during the wet season this year to seek out interstate bird fanciers, particularly in New South Wales, and arrange for illicit buyers for overseas birds. They set up their contacts, orders and prices.

In March this year they took an overseas trip, combining business with pleasure, to Indonesia and Bali and visited South-east Asian bird parks for contacts and sources. Of course, one of them took his wife to give that overseas trip an air of respectability.

In August he took a party, ostensibly to go fishing in the Torres Strait. Although he arranged papers to land in New Guinea, obviously he landed in Indonesia, where previously he had made contacts during his overseas trip.

He then took the vessel "Torres Pearl", with birds and his three partners aboard, and arranged for it to be moored off Trinity Beach, Double Island, for about four days and cooked up a good story about the vessel being damaged in a storm and needing to have the bilges pumped out for two hours daily. That gave a cover under which to go out daily and feed and water the illegally imported birds.

He sent off to contacts made previously one of the partners in a car carrying illegally imported birds. The birds were taken to Wyong, Cessnock, Wollongong, or wherever there was a market. Never mind the risk of disease so long as the profit margin is right!

Then Ranger was arrested in New South Wales, after driving to Sydney with his wife on 2 or 3 September.

(Time expired.)

#### RETIREMENT OF MEMBER FOR WARWICK

**Mr. CORY** (Warwick) (12.17 p.m.): I wish to make use of my time in this debate to say a few words of appreciation on the eve of my retirement from this Chamber.

First I express my appreciation to the people of the Warwick electorate for their unqualified support over the last 14 years, particularly on a personal basis. I believe

that people will beat policy every time. There have to be certain bases in politics—one may believe in socialism or in private enterprise—but I think that a member will win out provided that he respects the decision of the people and treats everybody as a human being. In that regard, I have appreciated very much the support I have received from my electorate. I have made many friends and I do not think I have made any enemies over that period. What I have been able to achieve and the opportunity to help many people over that period has been very rewarding.

I wish Mr. Des Booth, who will be my successor, every success, and I trust that he will be given the same type of reception as I have had both in the electorate and in this Chamber.

After 14 years it is with regret that I have come to the conclusion that I have no option but to retire. I have always worked hard to achieve things in life and I have been happy to continue to do so; but as I cannot achieve any more in this place—and I believe that I am still young enough—I intend to try to achieve something in other directions.

Before leaving this Chamber I wish to say a word of thanks to the members of this Assembly. There are not very many members—possibly only 10 or a dozen—still here who were here when I came into Parliament. Over the years new members have taken the place of others, and I believe that we have all become very good friends.

I should like to say a particular word of appreciation to both the present Speaker and past Speakers of this Assembly. I have had a very cordial relationship with them all. In fact, the present Speaker was one who came to help me in my campaign to enter this Assembly in 1963. I deeply appreciate your actions, Mr. Speaker, and those of others who also helped. The Minister for Aboriginal and Islanders Advancement and Fisheries (Mr. Wharton) was another one who helped me. I have never forgotten the way that people came to my assistance when I really needed their help. The friendly atmosphere in this House is something that outsiders can never really understand.

I thank also those persons who work under your control, Mr. Speaker—the messengers and others who have been really good friends. I mention Mrs. Thurbon—or Kathy, as she is affectionately known—who was in charge of The Lodge when I entered Parliament and is now over at the Bellevue. Likewise, Miss Glennie and her staff in the Parliamentary Refreshment Rooms have given me very friendly service over the years, and I greatly appreciate it. They make life here very pleasant indeed.

Over the years that I have been in Parliament a good deal has been achieved, and I am quite proud of it. I am particularly

proud of those things that I feel in some way I have been involved in. As I look back I recall that one of the major issues on my plate when I came into Parliament was the entry of country-killed meat into the Brisbane Abattoir area. This was a very sore point with the industry at the time. We were told that protection had to be given to the Brisbane Abattoir and that its throughput had to be guaranteed. However, the newly formed Queensland Meat Authority, in 1965, I think it was, altered the situation so that it became possible under certain conditions and with the observance of certain standards to allow country-killed meat into Brisbane. This was a great breakthrough and a victory for free enterprise.

This principle has been expanded, somewhat slowly, over the years, and has assured the people of Brisbane of a high-quality product, one that they deserve. But a lot remains to be done. The industry should not be held to ransom nor should the high quality of products be sacrificed simply to safeguard the Brisbane Abattoir.

I turn now to other progressive steps, such as the establishment in country areas of industrial estates. Although we have not seen the rapid growth and expansion that we would like to see, it is an important step forward and one that is greatly appreciated. I know that more can be done and will be done in this very important field of decentralisation.

The provision by the Department of Sport of finance to sporting clubs is one of the greatest moves undertaken by the Government, and a great seller for it. It means that the smallest club in the smallest settlement will receive its fair share of funds. Similarly, the abolition of road permit fees, which will have total effect by 1 November this year, is a tremendous step forward. I am very pleased to have been associated in some way with it.

There is not sufficient time to mention all the important issues that have been tackled by this Government, so in the time remaining I should like to offer a few words of advice, if I might, to all members of Parliament. Those of us who are associated with and close to the Government, and Opposition members, too, must always safeguard the rights of people to work hard, to use their initiative and to obtain a fair reward for their endeavours. If we do not do that we will see a collapse in our economic structure. If people are not allowed to use their initiative and work hard we will not see success.

It is fallacious to believe that publicly owned enterprises can make profits equal to those made by similar private enterprises. We must always be alert to, and oppose, any political pressures that strive to denigrate private ownership. I believe that industry should be left in the hands of those who can

make it pay, because it is the industry which pays that rewards the Government and employs people. On that basis it is a far greater asset to both the Government and the community. Through successful private enterprises, tax example and activity, the Government and the country will derive rewards and, as I said, there will be money to share.

If we allow people to make a profit they will look after themselves. We are inclined to adopt the attitude that whenever things go wrong in business or elsewhere we should approach the Government for help. We should foster the attitude that provided industry makes a fair profit it should help itself. Any businessman who goes to the Government for help, or gets money elsewhere, should not kid himself that the policy of his company will not be dictated in some way. If a man can make a fair go of his business, make his own decisions and back them with his own activity and initiative, he will not have to worry about somebody else dictating policy. When people ask for help they must ensure they are not asking someone else to dictate policy. Such dictation takes away the rights and responsibilities which most of us cherish. Whether they be businessmen or pensioners, most people cherish the right to make their own decisions and take the responsibility for doing so. I hope this practice will always be encouraged, and that all Governments will have to do is provide basic guide-lines to allow this attitude to prevail unhindered.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this opportunity, and for your friendship in the past 14 years.

#### CONTROL OF WOMEN'S CRISIS CENTRES

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG** (Townsville) (12.27 p.m.): Recently another violent rape-murder was committed in Townsville. It brought to mind figures given by the Minister for Police, which make appalling reading. In six years, drug offences have increased by 1,043 per cent, murders by 276 per cent, attempted murders by 237 per cent, serious assaults by 233 per cent and robbery by 212 per cent. That happened in a period in which the population increased by 13 per cent. The Minister for Police pointed out that a large measure of responsibility for the upsurge in crime "must lie deeply embedded within a changing society and the continued erosion of respect for the family system, the law and morality." How very right the Minister is.

The recent murder shocked the people of Townsville. It is not the first of such murders; we have had a couple in similar vein. It appears that the same person may be responsible or that another person has imitated the original offender.

I suggest to the Minister for Police that a radical change be effected in police surveillance. When I was a lad most after-hours eating joints and billiard rooms were

visited by a policeman who sauntered in, talked to the local boys and got to know them. He knew who they were, and if there were any strangers he soon found out who they were. Today it should be much easier for policemen in patrol cars to survey the after-hours joints. They are in telecommunication with headquarters and, if they see persons about whom they are a little doubtful, they can relay registration numbers, vehicle descriptions and personal descriptions to headquarters. In this way they can keep close tag on the drifting population in the North.

Recently, a strong movement has been under way to create rape centres. On looking at the recent Health Department Estimates I noted that, of a total State Health Budget of \$249,000,000, almost \$34,000,000 is to be spent on psychiatric services and, so far as I can dissect the expenditure, the community health budget is about \$10,000,000. On perusing this year's Commonwealth Budget I noted that it allocates \$68,000,000 for community health services. I have not been able to dissect that amount. However, I know that 19 women's centres have been funded by the Commonwealth Government—two in Queensland and 17 in other States.

I have been approached by various organisations to carry their bag for them, as it were. However, when one dissects their requests for aid, one finds that they are virtually asking the Government to make funds available, uncontrolled, unaccountable and unanswerable to the Government and to the taxpayer. In those circumstances, I do not feel at all inclined to carry their bag for them, so I intend to make the following suggestions. That these centres are necessary is not in doubt. However, they should be correctly supervised by being tied to the community health service or to the local hospital. Recently I asked the Minister for Health about the costs and the staffing of the community health service in Townsville. I was told that 40 personnel are employed, ranging from a psychiatrist down to a switch-board operator, and including three social workers, 13 community health nurses and four community health aids—a very broad spectrum of people trained in medical and paramedical work, taught to work in conjunction with a legally qualified medical practitioner. They have 19 vehicles, which gives them great mobility. Considering the costs of running the centre, we should get something for it. In the year 1976-77 it cost \$394,000. If that cannot give the service to the community that is required by these people who have approached me, I just do not know how we can cater for them.

Everyone wants money from the public purse. The people running some of these shelters want to practise medicine in their own way. They have set themselves up almost as lic-lic doctors, or witch doctors.

They do not accept the ordinary methods of treatment. It is obvious that treatment for women who have been raped or bashed and for battered children is obtainable from the normal medical services provided by this Government. It is silly to duplicate them. I will quote from a letter seeking request to set up a centre—

"This building is also seen to fulfil a secondary and important need for Townsville women and make it a living centre. Organisations like the National Council of Women have over the years acquired considerable material, files and equipment that is extremely valuable, which is presently moved around from one home to another and things have been damaged or lost.

"A permanent home is badly needed by many other womens organisations whose records and meeting places are in a constant mobile state."

That is not the responsibility of the taxpayer. I do not consider it to be the responsibility of a State Government to provide meeting places and funding for organisations whose aims may have a political slant. I do not think they fully appreciate the deep underlying problems of a woman who has been bashed, neglected children who are battered and women who are raped. In many cases these groups and organisations are looking at this as an emotional reward. They consider that they are doing a job for the community, and some of them are definitely working against the community for other organisations; they do not fully appreciate the trauma suffered by the victims. As long as they get their organisation off the ground, they think they have done everything. The whole emphasis should be on the victim.

I think the Government should look very, very closely at incurring expense in setting up these centres. It should by all means fund them, but keep them in close proximity to or under the direct control of the hospital or the community health service. That applies even in major areas such as Brisbane, which has a women's refuge, the funding of which is rather interesting. The figures reveal that in 1974-75 the amount given to the Women's Community Aid Association was just on \$12,460. In the year 1975-76, \$183,000 went to the same organisation. This is obviously bad and careless management of funds. It is not the association's funds. It does not have to work for them and, obviously, it does not have to account for them.

Therefore, I strongly recommend that this Government think seriously before opening these centres. It should, by all means, establish them, because I think they are necessary. However, it should make sure that they are correctly controlled and ensure that all funds are accounted for. Strict audit must be made of the books.

#### STALEMATE IN NEGOTIATIONS ON LONG-TERM SUGAR CONTRACT WITH JAPANESE

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (12.35 p.m.): One of the most important matters in Queensland today is the situation regarding the Japanese long-term sugar contract. We all know that a stalemate has been reached. The consequences of Japan's decision to default have finally hit the sugar industry and we can classify it as a default and nothing else. It is obvious to everybody concerned that the Japanese do not intend to pay the price they agreed to pay for our sugar. They will hold out as long as they can under the agreement regardless of the suffering endured in Queensland.

The sugar is owned by the Queensland Government. The Government has the power to acquire the sugar and has in fact acquired it. It is now sitting in 14 ships either in Japanese waters or on the way there. This 200 000 tonnes of sugar is valued at approximately \$81,000,000.

Our crushing season is about two-thirds of the way through. We are faced with the prospect of additional tonnages of sugar sitting on the water before we can decide to keep it in the available storage in Queensland rather than forward it. As we are in a cleft stick we have to continue to forward some sugar to the Japanese under our contractual agreement. We must do that so that we do not breach the contract.

Last year our agents—CSR—bent over backwards to reschedule shipping so that the Japanese sugar refiners would not be embarrassed. This was done at great inconvenience to the sugar industry and was not appreciated by the Japanese sugar traders, particularly Mitsui and Mitsubishi, which are the two groups which organised the sugar contract with CSR on behalf of the 33 Japanese sugar refiners.

Because of the low world prices for the balance of our sugar—other than the sugar sold on fixed contractual arrangements—and the lack of payments coming from the Japanese, funds in the sugar industry will become low in the near future. This will soon filter through to the mill pays. The sugar industry is now starting to wake up and realise that a very serious situation exists.

Unless something is done very quickly finance will have to be arranged and by the look of things it will not be for only the \$80,000,000 but for \$240,000,000, which should be the total return from our sugar sales to Japan this financial year.

This Government's delay in taking positive action is resulting in a great lack of confidence in the towns and cities associated with the sugar industry in Queensland, particularly among the business community because there is a distinct and definite decline in that community in sugar towns and cities in these areas.

The lack of real action by this Government, as the owner of the sugar, and by the Commonwealth Government, has put at risk the sugar industry's investment to expand production to meet the Japanese contract. There was considerable expansion by mills, farmers and many others in the industry to meet that contract. Considerable sums of money were borrowed through various lending institutions. Some mills are looking seriously at the problem.

The prospect of considerably lower returns to the industry is now starting to hit the service industries in sugar areas. Equipment, tractor and machinery companies, which had previously been enjoying buoyant sales through expansion in the sugar industry, are now experiencing a severe decline. For the first time in many years throughout Australia no primary industry is sufficiently buoyant to carry these service industries. Every one of our primary industries in Australia has problems today. The sugar industry was the one industry that was helping to carry all of these service industries and supply industries. This lack of buoyancy is already leading to a slump in production in some of the factories of these groups. This will have a snowballing effect and will create more unemployment not only at the production source but in firms engaged in the sale and distribution of items of equipment such as tractors.

Sugar mills are also reviewing their maintenance and repair programmes. A visit round the mills will soon reveal that they are trying to cut back on work to be done in this financial year because they realise that they will not have the money to do more. In cutting back their activities they will not be employing as many as they did previously in the slack season.

The Premier and his Ministers have made a lot of noise about the seamen at Hay Point and what has been going on there. They were prepared to make use of Central Queensland Coal Associates, to give the company its correct name rather than Utah, because Central Queensland Coal Associates, which owns the coal at Hay Point, is 12 per cent owned by Mitsubishi. This is the very group that negotiated the long-term Japanese sugar contract. The Government was prepared to use that company in an attempt to stand down employees at the mine as a political publicity stunt for electoral purposes. Yet this same company is the sugar importer that is holding up the sale of sugar to Japan.

The simple truth is that the refiners in Japan are on strike, and have been since 1 July. It was about 12 months before that date that they indicated that they were not going to accept Australian sugar this year at the agreed price and wanted to negotiate on it. Protracted negotiations took place between CSR and the Japanese on this contract. It might be said that this is a commercial action but, commercial or industrial, it is still a strike.

The Government is very good at throwing out challenges. It holds the steering-wheel in this State at present and it should be dealing with the situation. The sugar industry is now experiencing what would perhaps have happened in the mining industry. Employment in Queensland is suffering. The Federal and State Governments waited too long. They pussyfooted around on this issue when it was known months and months ago that the Japanese were not going to buy our sugar at this price.

Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Anthony had a meeting in Canberra early in June and they reassured the Queensland sugar industry that everything would be all right; but they knew then that everything would not be all right. Both should have gone straight to Japan as soon as the first ship was held up early in July and laid it straight on the line with the Japanese Government.

**Mr. Row:** What about Dr. Patterson?

**Mr. CASEY:** The honourable member for Hinchinbrook asks about Dr. Patterson. He signed the letter of agreement on behalf of the Queensland sugar industry and the Australian Government that ratified the agreement with the Japanese Government. The Japanese Government agreed to those terms. It is now up to the Australian Government to see that that agreement is honoured. Terms in relation to tonnages, supply and all other aspects of the agreement were laid down by the Japanese. One of the requirements of the Japanese was that the agreement be ratified by the Australian Government by way of an exchange of letters. That was done, but the Japanese Government has not accepted its full obligations, nor has the Australian Government, and the Queensland Government has not stood up as well as it should have done as the owner of the sugar.

As I have already said, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Anthony should have gone to Japan early in July and pressed the Japanese Government to honour its agreement. If it was not honoured, it should have gone straight to the arbiter. It was left to Mr. Fraser to talk to the Japanese Prime Minister in Kuala Lumpur in August last, but to no avail. Finally, in late September, the Queensland Government says that it will take the matter to the arbiter. We now know that it will be at least six weeks before a decision is made by the arbiter. That will be almost the end of the crushing season. And, when there is a result, the Japanese Government is going to take the matter to the British High Court. We all know how long those proceedings will take. All these delays will further aggravate the position in the sugar industry and the Queensland Government has helped to jeopardise its future.

I said on 5 July that there was a need for quick and positive action in this matter and I called on the leaders of the industry to

pressure the Government. But unfortunately many of them would not put their industry ahead of their politics and the result could be disastrous throughout the sugar industry in this State.

With the current probability of the breakdown of the international agreement the future of the sugar industry is very bleak. Japan was swift to secure sugar for its refineries from other countries, including Brazil. Brazil is the country that is trying to get a better deal on the international agreement today in Geneva at our expense. That is the same country that this Government is seeking favours for in other areas.

(Time expired.)

#### TORRES STRAIT BORDER ISSUE

**Mr. DEERAL** (Cook) (12.46 p.m.): I rise to ask honourable members to ask themselves what the Prime Minister meant in recent Press reports when he said that he would "drop or shelve indefinitely" the Torres Strait border issue. If they can find an answer then I wish they would tell me, because I honestly do not know what it means. But I do have a strong suspicion that the Prime Minister is attempting to divert attention from the issue; he is attempting to defuse an electorally-explosive situation.

The problem over the border arose almost 10 years ago, and since that time the Islanders have lived not knowing what would be their future. Naturally, they are running out of patience and have been pressing the Prime Minister to make a decision which respects their wishes—in other words, a declaration that there would be no change in the border. During his visit to the area last year the Prime Minister told the Islanders on 22 November at Yam Island—

"No Government of which I am the leader will ever enter into any agreement with the Government of Papua New Guinea which does not protect your traditional rights."

The Islanders took this promise to mean an end to their fight and a recognition of traditional boundaries; but no, it was just another twist in the constant wrangle over the issue. The people are finding it difficult to believe in a Government that, as far as they are concerned, does not keep its promises, and Mr. Fraser knows that his previous attitude towards the border issue is extremely unpopular in the Torres Strait. I feel that he is sweeping the dust under the carpet, but even if the problem is out of sight—"to be resolved at some time in the future"—the situation will remain the same as it has for almost a decade—uncertainty, doubt and anguish for the people.

The Islanders want a decision, not promises. Today we have in the gallery two distinguished gentlemen Mr. Getano Lui, chairman and central island representative of the Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders Commission and also Mr. Acgum Odide, I.S.M., chairman, N.P.A., Bamaga. Both gentlemen are very concerned about the double talk of the Prime Minister, especially as one third of the population of the area they represent are Islanders. The Islanders resent the release of this information in Cairns without their having been given any prior notice of the Prime Minister's decision. Government Ministers can go to the Northern Territory to talk to the Aborigines about uranium but they cannot be bothered going to the Torres Strait to talk to the Islanders about their whole future. This is very shabby treatment of the Torres Strait Islanders by members of the Prime Minister's Office. If the Prime Minister would state with some assurance of finality that he will drop the border issue once and for all so that it cannot be dragged up again in the future then the people would be satisfied. They would want this assurance in writing. But to say that the issue will be shelved indefinitely does not go far enough. It means the fateful day has been postponed; it means the people still do not know what their future is, and it means that once again the voice of the people is being ignored. I feel that the Prime Minister may be shelving this plan to ease electoral pressure on a very unpopular issue. To shelve these plans indefinitely means the future of the people has been shelved as well. And who wants to be left on the shelf? The thousands of Queenslanders living in the Torres Strait deserve a better fate than that. They are tired of being on the shelf. They want to jump down and live normal, happy lives, the same as all other Australians who are sure of their future and, more importantly, the future of their children and the generations to follow.

The people have said over and over again that they will share, but they will not give. Surely, then, this extremely fair attitude should be the basis of settlement. Delaying the moment of decision is no way to solve the border issue. It must be resolved once and for all.

The Islanders welcome the Prime Minister's indication that there would continue to be consultation at officer level. However, in any negotiations to resolve this problem, the voice of the Islanders must be heard and included. As well, I would insist that the Queensland Government be included, as it was this Government that stood behind the Islanders and foiled any plans to hand over territory and people to New Guinea without concern for the people, their feelings, and, most importantly, their traditional rights.

## SOCIAL STUDIES COURSE, "MAN: A COURSE OF STUDY"

Mr. POWELL (Isis) (12.51 p.m.): Mr. Deputy Speaker—

"It is not that our society is absolutely evil, or that others are not evil also; but merely that ours is the only society from which we have to disentangle ourselves."

The emphasis there is on the word "have". I would hope that that quote might surprise members of the House. It is taken from the words of Claude Levi-Strauss, a French Marxist and one of the philosophers behind the social studies course, "Man: A Course of Study".

People in the community might wonder why all the fuss about "MACOS". Perhaps they have seen the publicity brochure put out by the Australian publishers of the course, Educational Media Australia. That little booklet demonstrates quite clearly how the courses are undertaken.

The first part of the course is a unit on the life cycle of the salmon, and no doubt it would be hard to find very much wrong with that. The second unit focuses on the behaviour patterns of herring gulls, and the third on free-ranging baboons, "man's close primate relatives", according to the people who publish the course. The fourth is a unit on the Netsilik Eskimos, "the purest surviving examples of traditional Eskimo culture".

My reason for speaking on this matter today is not necessarily to criticise "Man: A Course of Study" but rather to question the way in which it has been brought into our schools and why it has been brought into our schools.

On 9 April 1975, in the House of Representatives in Washington, Congressman John Conlan from Arizona moved an amendment to a Bill then being discussed by the House. The amendment read—

"No funds authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation under this or any other Act shall be available to implement or market course or curriculum programs or materials unless the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate have first been provided a complete prospectus for each course or curriculum project proposed for such funding by the Foundation . . ."

In the House of Representatives in Washington in 1975 there was an argument similar to the one raging in Queensland today—that, is, about establishing the authority of Parliament over school curricula and other programmes that it seeks to implement.

I believe that members are elected by the people to look into the Government's actions, and it is our responsibility to make sure that, particularly in schools, the education material that is being passed on to the children is compatible with the sort of things that the community wants the children to learn. It is my firm belief that parents today send their children to school to learn the basics of the communicative skills—reading and writing in particular. But in this course, apart from the four units to which I have referred, in seminar 3 on page 13 of the book called "Man: A Course of Study—Seminars for Teachers", Jerome S. Bruner is quoted as saying—

"We seek exercises and materials through which our pupils can learn wherein man is distinctive in his adaptation to the world, and wherein there is a discernible continuity between him and his animal forbears."

It goes on to say that part of the course is designed to establish the relevance of man's humanity. So we are led to believe that it is a humanist course.

I would suggest that we can ascertain very easily the fact that man has dominance over the animals of the world by reading Genesis chapter 1, verses 26 to 29. There it is clearly stated that man is created superior to the animals on earth.

The philosophy of the course is clear from pages 53 and 54 of seminar 8, wherein, when talking about the Netsilik Eskimos, this is said—

"What seems to me the most significant common traits in these peaceful societies are that they all manifest enormous gusto for concrete physical pleasures—eating, drinking, sex, laughter—and that they all make very little distinction between the ideal characters of men and women, particularly that they have no ideal of brave, aggressive masculinity."

From the various seminars I could pick a number of quotes that exhibit the philosophy behind the course. It might be remembered that last week I asked the Minister for Education and Cultural Activities a question concerning Book 9. The Minister told me that no Book 9 existed. Well, I have it here with me. It exists in a very real form and I shall table it for the benefit of those honourable members who are interested enough to read the philosophy behind the course.

The Australian producers of the course do not include Book 9 within the new kits. The reason for that is obvious; the philosophy behind the course is, in my opinion, anti-Christian and certainly against our way of life. I table this Book 9.

*Whereupon the honourable member laid on the table the book referred to.*

I hope that honourable members will take notice of the philosophy behind the course as espoused in that book.

If we look at the course in a completely altruistic manner, we will find very little wrong with it. The structured materials are all very good. There is, after all, nothing wrong with examining the life cycle of a salmon or a herring gull or the life-style of the Eskimos. But surely a better and more relevant course for Australian schoolchildren would be one dealing with the Aborigines. One dealing with Eskimos has no relevance whatever.

This course is aimed at 10-year-olds, and that is another of my objections to it.

**Mrs. Kyburz:** Would you agree that the course is being implemented at too early an age?

**Mr. POWELL:** It certainly is being implemented at far too early an age. Children up to the age of 10 years are fairly uncomplicated and straightforward. It is not until the ages of puberty and adolescence that children become complicated and possibly possess the ability to understand some of the problems confronting them.

"MACOS" deals with such things as: adultery and wife-swapping, in "The Netsilik Eskimos", in volume 1, page 117 and in "A Journey to the Arctic", in booklet 18, page 23; cannibalism, in "The Netsilik Eskimos", in volume 1, pages 97 and 98; female infanticide, in "A Journey to the Arctic", in booklet 18, page 24; and so on.

My main objections to this course are—

(1) It is being introduced to children who are too young to properly understand it;

(2) Children cannot cope with it; and

(3) Children should not be forced to study material such as this when far better material is produced by, and is available from, the Research and Curriculum Branch of the Queensland Education Department.

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

## PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

### INITIATION

**Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Deputy Premier and Treasurer), by leave, without notice: 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 Pay-roll Tax Act 1971–1976 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gunn, Somerset, in the chair)

**Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Deputy Premier and Treasurer) (2.16 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Pay-roll Tax Act 1971–1976 in certain particulars."

As honourable members will recall, in the 1977–78 Budget speech I announced certain proposals aimed at providing further relief in the pay-roll tax area for employers generally, and for the smaller employer in particular.

In brief, the proposals provided for an increase in the minimum pay-roll tax exemption from \$24,000 to \$27,000 as from 1 January 1978 and an increase from \$100,000 to \$125,000 in the level of annual pay-roll below which pay-roll tax is not payable, effective from 1 July 1978. The Bill I am now presenting will give effect to these proposals.

Business has been under severe pressures for some time now, not only in Queensland but throughout Australia generally. The problems of escalating wage rates, rapidly rising prices and continuing unemployment have weighed heavily on business expectations and planning. However, there are signs that the economic problems which have so beset business are reducing and there are increasingly real prospects for recovery.

The pay-roll tax concessions which were provided for in the Budget last year have made a significant contribution to the ability of business, particularly small business, to meet these problems. Some thousands of taxpayers have benefited already. The last step in the concessions will take place on 1 January 1978, when the maximum pay-roll tax exemption will increase from the present \$83,200 to \$100,000.

I have always been firmly of the view that if business is to operate successfully, it must be able to plan ahead with confidence. Governments can, and should, have a real role to play to assist business in this regard. It was with this in mind that last year's Budget provided for stepped increases in the pay-roll tax exemptions so that business was aware of what the Government's plans were in the pay-roll tax area. My announcement in this year's Budget speech of a further increase in the maximum pay-roll tax exemption as from 1 July 1978 represents a continuation of this policy.

The Bill therefore contains provision for the maximum pay-roll tax exemption to increase to \$125,000 as from 1 July 1978. Where the annual pay-roll is between \$125,000 and \$164,200, the maximum benefit of \$125,000 will be reduced by \$5 for every \$2 by which the annual pay-roll exceeds \$125,000 so that the new minimum exemption will apply to all employers whose annual pay-roll exceeds \$164,200. In effect,

this will mean that in the comparatively short space of three years, the maximum exemption will have increased by over 500 per cent.

In the Budget speech last year, I also gave an undertaking that the then new level of minimum pay-roll tax exemption of \$24,000 would be reviewed prior to 1 January 1978. The review has been carried out. In keeping with the Government's policy of endeavouring to maintain the real value of pay-roll tax concessions to taxpayers, the Bill provides for an increase in the minimum pay-roll tax exemption from \$24,000 to \$27,000. The increase in the exemption in percentage terms is approximately equal to the rate of inflation for the period. The increased exemption will take effect as from 1 January 1978.

I believe the Government can be justifiably proud of its achievements in the pay-roll tax area. The concessions provided in the last two Budgets have placed Queensland at the forefront of pay-roll tax reform in Australia. The new maximum exemption of \$125,000 compares with the \$60,000 maximum level proposed in other States for this year, while the new minimum exemption of \$27,000 is similar to that now provided in the other States that do allow a minimum exemption to all taxpayers.

The concessions in the pay-roll tax area flowing from this and last year's Budgets are significant and will mean a saving to industry of about \$17,000,000 annually.

I commend the Bill to the Committee.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER** (Archerfield) (2.21 p.m.): In his Budget speech the Treasurer boasted that the State would continue with its programme of pay-roll tax relief to business that was implemented in last year's Budget. He also said that it will be effective from 1 January 1978. The Opposition has no quarrel with that. What we are concerned with is that two weeks later, because either the Minister or his staff did not do their homework properly, he has had to rush this Bill through in the dying stages of this Parliament.

I want to make it quite clear, speaking on behalf of the Opposition, that we have had a gutful of this flash legislation introduced without notice in the dying hours of the 21st Parliament. I think you will agree with me, Mr. Gunn, that this is typical of the Government. It is rushing this legislation through without giving any notice whatsoever of it. Each morning, the Government Whip comes along to me, as the Acting Opposition Whip, and gives me a list of the business of the day. We used to take it for granted at one time that the Government was honest when the Whip or the Leader of the House presented us with the day's Business Paper; but they cannot be trusted at all these days. They say one thing and do another. This Government is not to be trusted.

I want to make it quite clear, whilst I am on my feet, that this will be the last Budget introduced by the Bjelke-Petersen Government. It is quite obvious that next year it will be introduced by me as Treasurer of a State Labor Government.

**Government Members** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Let them have no fear about that, Mr. Gunn.

In my opinion the whole principle of pay-roll tax is wrong. As we all know, it is a penalty against the employment of labour. It is really a fine imposed on labour-intensive industries.

**Mr. Hales:** You wanted to put a surcharge on it for housing last year.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I will take the interjection from the honourable member for Ipswich West, who is regarded in this place as the lightest of lightweights. I am quite certain—and I think most honourable members would agree with me—that he is serving his one and only term as a member of this Parliament. I know, Mr. Gunn, that his electorate adjoins your electorate of Somerset. Whilst you may come back, there is no way in the world that the honourable member for Ipswich West will return after 12 November.

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Gunn): Order! I suggest the honourable member return to the Bill.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Thank you, Mr. Gunn. I bow to your ruling.

The imposition of pay-roll tax is a \$212,000,000 penalty against the employment of labour. On an average, in Queensland it costs \$240 for each member of the workforce, or near enough to \$5 a week. This Tory State Government, despite its boast of being a champion of the business interests, makes it unattractive for businessmen in Queensland to employ more people because of the imposition of this iniquitous pay-roll tax.

The Fraser Federal Government, with its introduction of an investment allowance, encouraged business to install machinery and, in so doing, shed workers. It is a conspiracy between the State and Federal Governments to make it expensive for small businesses in particular to employ labour.

**Mr. Porter:** Get your script-writers to—

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Mr. Gunn, I just heard an interjection from the honourable member for Toowong. When I first came into this Parliament I was under the impression that Adolf Hitler perished in the Reichstag fire. However, when I looked across the Chamber and saw the honourable member for Toowong, I saw a similar haircut and a similar moustache and had some doubts. No doubt the honourable member is a lot younger than Adolf Hitler would have been today.

**An Honourable Member** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** The attitudes and the outlook are identical. There is no difference there.

As I was saying, this Government believes it is preferable to sack men and women and replace them with machines. This is a two-edged sword to attack the labour force. Pay-roll tax places an imposition on employers based on the number they employ, so the more people they employ the more tax they pay. This discourages employers from employing the full complement of the work-force which they require. This creates the industrial unemployment climate beloved by the Tory Government. It desires to have a permanent pool of unemployed to keep the poor old worker in his place.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** They do not even take that into consideration.

Pay-roll tax should be abolished. If it is not abolished, the money should be put to better use than penalising small businessmen who are just trying to make a living in Queensland. As I said in my opening remarks, the Treasurer and the party he represents always put themselves forward as the champions of the small businessman. Nothing is further from the truth. It is common knowledge that all they represent are the big multinationals and the wealthy combines that are controlling the economy of this country.

**Mr. Prest** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** As the honourable member said, the week before an election they come up with this type of Government propaganda. They have no policy at all. I read in the paper today that the Premier is going to the people on his record. If he does, the Australian Labor Party will gain office at the next election, because the Premier has no record.

On behalf of the Opposition I say I believe that pay-roll tax should be abolished.

**Mr. Alison** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** I am trying to catch the interjection from the honourable member for Maryborough, who has the reputation of being a lead-pencil accountant.

**Mr. Alison:** After the next election you might have just enough members for a hand of bridge over there.

**Mr. Powell** interjected.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** The A.L.P.'s record is impeccable. Wait until after the next election. I know, Mr. Gunn, that you will bear with me—

**The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN** (Mr. Gunn): Not for much longer.

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER:** Very briefly, Mr. Gunn, I think you would agree with me that, as I have said on numerous occasions, we will find a lot of Government members missing after the election.

The Opposition does not find anything controversial in the Bill. We will peruse it when it is printed and have more to say at the second reading.

Motion (Mr. Knox) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

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

LEAVE TO MOVE SECOND READING AT A LATER HOUR

**Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Deputy Premier and Treasurer): I move—

“That the second reading of the Bill be made an order of the day for a later hour of the sitting.”

Motion agreed to.

#### URBAN PASSENGER SERVICE PROPRIETORS ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### INITIATION

**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 the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act 1975–1976 in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gunn, Somerset, in the chair)

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (2.31 p.m.): I move—

“That a Bill be introduced to amend the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act 1975–1976 in certain particulars.”

Honourable members will recall that in his speech in this Chamber on 22 September 1977 in introducing the State Budget for the present financial year, the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Treasurer gave details of financial assistance to local authority and private urban transport services.

In respect of local authority services, an entirely new scheme of assistance to the Brisbane City Council and the Rockhampton City Council will apply retrospectively to 1 July last. So far as local authorities are

concerned, this will be a matter for the Honourable the Treasurer in connection with the making of funds available for this purpose in the usual way.

So far as private urban transport services are concerned, this Bill is necessary to extend the present authority of the Minister under the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act 1975-1976 to give effect to an improved subsidy scheme which will replace the existing scheme of assistance.

The new scheme authorised by this Bill will provide for a general subsidy of 15 per cent of fare collections for a service of satisfactory standard, which includes also an approved pensioner concession for travel within the urban area. In addition, a special further subsidy of up to 10 per cent of fare collections may be made where this is necessary to maintain viability and to assist those private operators with a low profitability.

Apart from this, as announced by the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, the Government will continue to guarantee loans for bus replacement in approved circumstances and will continue to pay subsidy towards the interest costs for a period of five years on loans raised for this purpose. This is already provided by the existing Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act.

The Bill will also provide for a new scheme of assistance to allow fare concessions to pensioners living outside urban areas to travel to and from their nearest centre of population, including an urban centre, for journeys up to 32 km, so that these pensioners may have reasonable access to shopping and other community services. At the present time this assistance applies to an urban passenger service for the carriage of passengers at separate and distinct fares within the metropolitan district, a provincial city, or an urban centre, as defined in the Act. Pensioners living outside these areas will be able to obtain the same fare concessions which apply to pensioners living within these areas.

As I have indicated, these measures follow the previously announced policy of the Government to assist private urban transport operators to remain viable in the face of rising costs, while at the same time giving some relief from the necessity to continually increase passenger fares, which would otherwise be necessary under present circumstances.

I want to make it clear that the Bill concerns only private urban transport services and does not deal with the new scheme of assistance to the Brisbane City Council and the Rockhampton City Council. The Bill is therefore simply one to enlarge the scope of assistance which may be given to private urban transport operators and, at the same time, in affording such assistance, provide

a benefit to pensioners outside urban areas on similar terms to the scheme which is operating at the present time.

The Government recognises the difficulties being faced by local authority bus passenger undertakings, as well as private urban transport undertakings, and in the light of experience gained over the last few years it has recognised the need for further financial assistance to these particular areas. I commend the Bill to honourable members as a practical piece of legislation deserving their support to give effect to the provision made by the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Treasurer in this year's Budget.

**Mr. JONES** (Cairns) (2.36 p.m.): I did appreciate the fact that the Minister mentioned this Bill to me immediately upon the resumption, but the lack of notice of the introduction of a Bill of this nature, and the manner in which it is being rushed through during the last stages of the Parliament, add up to a rather inefficient way of legislating for this State.

We realise that in his Budget speech the Deputy Premier and Treasurer did promise the provisions set out in the Bill, and no doubt the Government feels that in a period of election fever it should be seen to be honouring its Budget commitments. I see that the provisions of the Bill are retrospective to 1 July last and that existing private urban transport operators will benefit from these provisions.

I did not quite catch what the Minister said about extensions of his authority, but I will be having a look at that point and probably commenting on it during the second reading.

I am sure that private bus operators throughout the State will appreciate the improved subsidy scheme of 15 per cent of fare collections if they are providing fare concessions to pensioners. I would say that over quite a long period since more and more people began to use their private motor vehicles the position of private bus operators has deteriorated, particularly in some provincial areas where their capital costs in the purchase of new plant and equipment were so high that they were unable to provide a satisfactory standard of service. Of course, this 15 per cent subsidy means a cash inflow which will be greatly appreciated. The further subsidy of 10 per cent of fare collections to operators still working on a low margin, and guaranteed loans to purchase buses, are of great value to these operators. The scheme which allowed them to borrow at low interest rates over a period of five years was gratefully accepted.

The Minister referred to a new scheme of fare concessions for pensioners living, I think he said, within a 32 km radius of an urban population centre, and I am sure this will be greatly appreciated by all pensioners. It seemed an anomaly to have, for example, in

my own area, pensioners living within the city of Cairns being able to participate in the scheme whereas pensioners at Edmonton, Gordonvale or on the northern beaches across the Barron River such as Machan's Beach, Clifton Beach, Yorkey's Knob and Buchan Point could not participate.

In most instances, pensioners moved away from highly rated urban areas and tried to get the benefit of rural rating, thus lessening their burden of rates. The burden of high transport charges that then fell on them when they came to town once a week needed to be alleviated, and in our society today we should be doing everything possible to assist the pioneers who devoted their lives to making Australia a better country for us to live in. I believe that people in that situation will be very grateful for a concession similar to that provided for urban pensioners.

I realise that, with an election coming up, the Government will be out on the hustings telling the people of Queensland how good it is and how much work it has done. Apparently it decided that it could not wait to include this concession in its policy speech.

I am pleased that the assistance to bus operators has been made retrospective to 1 July. It is a pity that the concession to pensioners could not also be made retrospective to 1 July, because in effect pensioners were jinked out of that concession when the legislation was first introduced.

Members of the Opposition will automatically support measures that are brought forward on a welfare basis or on a basis of concessions to pensioners, who are a very deserving section of the community. We hope that the amendment now proposed might herald the introduction of legislation of the type that the Australian Labor Party contends should be in the minds of all Parliaments. Legislatures should be looking after the less affluent people in the community. Personally, I should like to see similar concessions extended not only to pensioners of all types but also to those who are suffering from social handicaps and disabilities.

The Opposition supports the introduction of the measure.

**Dr. LOCKWOOD** (Toowoomba North) (2.43 p.m.): Honourable members will recall that this measure was promised in the Government's policy speech in 1974. Legislation was first introduced in 1975, and it was amended in 1976. Because of inequalities in the application of subsidies, which depended upon the length of a bus run, the number of workers on the run, whether the owner also ran school-bus services, and the number of pensioner passengers on the run, there was a need to bring down amending legislation. That was promised by the Treasurer, and that promise is being implemented today.

The proposed amendment will make a great difference to runs such as those to Wynnum and Inala and to some of the smaller runs

into cities such as Toowoomba, where it was found that the Act did not provide sufficient compensation to keep them going if the run had a high ratio of pensioners to workers. In the final stages of this Parliament, I think we should congratulate the former Treasurer (Sir Gordon Chalk), the former Minister for Transport (the late Keith Hooper), and the honourable Fred Campbell for bringing right up-to-date the election promise made in 1974. It will now be sound working legislation, and it will enable public servants to put the money where it was intended that it should go under the earlier legislation. It will iron out all the little peculiarities and wrinkles about which some of us have made many representations.

I congratulate the Minister for introducing the proposed amending Bill.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba) (2.45 p.m.): I am afraid that I must consider the introduction of this measure as a rather pathetic attempt by the Government to buy votes in the forthcoming State election. As the honourable member for Toowoomba North stated quite clearly, it was as long ago as 1974 that the Government decided to do something about helping private bus operators, particularly those who transported large numbers of pensioners. Since then the Government has taken action in three stages; it has trickled along.

The Federal Government made available to the State Government substantial amounts of money for distribution to local authorities and private transport operators. That was done with the object of improving our transport system. The State, too, contributed some of its own money, but the bulk of the finance came from the Federal Government. Because both the Federal and the State Government treated the Brisbane City Council in a most miserable manner, money was left over and was available for other purposes.

The whole crux of the matter is, of course, that the Brisbane City Council should have been given a fair deal. The private operators should be given a fair go, too; no-one would deny that. But the point is that the city council was robbed of money that it was entitled to receive. The Lord Mayor made the position quite clear. And now, on the eve of the election the Government boasts about the assistance it is providing.

As the honourable member for Cairns said, this Bill is being brought forward without notice. We were not told even this morning of its introduction. Earlier today the Leader of the House spoke with me and said that the Government would be introducing two Bills that did not appear on the Business Paper, one dealing with national transport and the other with pay-roll tax. No mention whatever was made of this Bill. Now, at the last moment, the Government realises that it cannot go to

the people in the election campaign saying that it will do something that it promised it would do back in 1974. The Government has not honoured that promise, so this Bill is brought forward. I hope the people of Brisbane do not fall for this three-card trick.

No-one would deny that the private bus operator needs assistance. But isn't it strange that only a week or two ago the Treasurer was reported as having stated that if the Brisbane City Council did not want to continue operating its buses they would be handed over to private enterprise? As I say, private enterprise apparently is not able to run its bus services.

The main consideration in providing a public transport service should be service to the public. Knowing that, why would the Treasurer threaten the Brisbane City Council with taking from it its bus services and handing them over to private enterprise? A far better course would be to pay adequate subsidies to local authorities to enable them to conduct their transport services.

If a transport service is in the hands of either a State Government or a local authority, at least the public, through their aldermen or members of Parliament, can have a say in its operation. A private operator, on the other hand, is responsible to no-one. I will admit that the Transport Commission comes into the matter in the allocation of certain responsibilities; but generally speaking a private transport operator is responsible only to himself.

The honourable member for Cairns has asked a number of searching questions concerning the operations of the Queensland Railways. Could similar questions be asked of private bus services? Could answers be given to those questions? Of course not. So it is idle for the Treasurer to threaten the Brisbane City Council with taking over its bus services and handing them over to private operators.

Simply because the council is required to give service to the public, it has to conduct some of its bus services at a loss. The tragedy is that that loss has to be paid for by the ratepayers. I am firmly of the opinion that any losses incurred by public transport should be financed directly by the State Government. Any losses incurred by the railways are financed by the Government. A few days ago I asked a question about losses on the suburban rail passenger service. At the time the Minister admitted, quite correctly, that losses had been incurred. The point is that those losses are taken up by the State Government from general taxation revenue. In the same way, losses incurred by the Brisbane City Council should be covered by the State Government.

As the honourable member for Cairns said on behalf of the Opposition, we have no fight against keeping private operators viable provided they give service.

I do not know why 32 km should be the distance set in the Bill.

**Mr. Moore:** Millimetres, centimetres, or kilometres—it does not matter.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I am sure that the honourable member will agree that 20 miles is still a current term.

I am sure that the honourable member for Toowoomba North will agree that bus services extend for more than 20 miles from the city of Toowoomba. What will happen in those circumstances? I am told by my colleagues from the country that many bus services, particularly on the coast (where many people retire to) run for more than 20 miles from the cities. I wonder what wisdom was exercised when this limit was set. Surely a suburban bus service is one that runs from a city to surrounding areas. I see no point in setting a certain distance.

Opposition members naturally support the 10 per cent provision. We also support any assistance that is being given to pensioners. I agree with the comments made by the honourable member for Cairns. As a member representing part of Brisbane, and knowing the bad deal given by the State Government to the Brisbane City Council and Brisbane ratepayers, I felt that it was incumbent on me to point out what I did to the Minister, and impress on him the need to start looking after the Brisbane City Council as well as the private bus operators.

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (2.53 p.m.), in reply: I thank the Committee for the way in which this measure has been received. It will confer benefits in addition to the very massive subsidy the Government provides for public transport. I am tempted to deal with the comments made by the honourable member for Bulimba, but I will content myself by saying that he made one of his lesser contributions in this Assembly.

In reply to the honourable member for Cairns, I shall repeat what I said about the necessity for this measure. It is necessary to extend the present authority of the Minister under the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act to give effect to the improved subsidy scheme that the Treasurer announced. He could not announce it until the Budget. As I said, it will provide a new scheme of assistance to allow fare concessions to be given to pensioners living outside urban areas so that they may travel from where they live to an urban area. It will ensure that they get the benefit of the concession while travelling in the area. The measure also authorises a general subsidy of 15 per cent of fare collections for a service of satisfactory standard.

**Mr. Jones:** Did you say 50 per cent?

**Mr. CAMPBELL:** 15 per cent.

In addition, a further subsidy of 10 per cent of fare collections may be paid where it is necessary to maintain viability and to assist those private operators with low profitability.

I do not want to get involved in a discussion on private and public transportation. I simply say that I do not think the Brisbane City Council should adopt a churlish attitude towards the massive subsidy that the Government gives to it and to other local authorities. That subsidy is given in recognition of the difficulties involved, in an endeavour to maintain those services as viable operations. This legislation extends the existing subsidy provisions, and I am sure that it will be welcomed by all concerned.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING

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

#### LEAVE TO MOVE SECOND READING AT A LATER HOUR

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

“That the second reading of the Bill be made an order of the day for a later hour of the sitting.”

Motion agreed to.

### ANIMALS PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. T. G. NEWBERY** (Mirani—Minister for Police) (2.58 p.m.): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

As indicated during the introductory debate, the basic aim of this Bill is to increase existing penalties for acts of cruelty against animals. It also proposes further provisions aimed at ensuring the humane treatment of animals.

The major elements of the Bill are—

1. An increase in the maximum penalty for offences of cruelty from \$200 to \$1,000.
2. An increase in the minimum penalty for cruelty from \$10 to \$50.
3. An increase in the existing penalty of \$10 per day for each day the offence is continued to \$50 per day.
4. An increase in the maximum level of compensation payable from \$300 to \$1,000.
5. A provision which will require the owner of any animal suffering from injury, disease or illness to provide treatment for the animal or humanely

put the animal to death; unless it is likely the animal would recover without treatment.

6. A requirement for any person who confines an animal to ensure the animal is confined in such a manner so as not to cause the animal undue suffering.

Other provisions of the Bill are included to clarify certain clauses of the Act.

It is considered that the maximum level of compensation of \$1,000 proposed in this Bill should be sufficient in most circumstances. However, I would inform the honourable member for Bulimba, who raised this matter during last night's debate, that there is nothing to prevent an aggrieved person from also seeking compensation by civil action. In other words a complainant could be awarded a level of compensation by a magistrate hearing a charge under this Act and then could proceed in civil action to recover further damages in another court hearing.

I can assure the honourable member for Merthyr that members of the Queensland Police Force are very conscious of all provisions of the Animals Protection Act and their responsibilities in the enforcement of the Act. A thorough study of the Act is part of the course for probationaries and cadets and the Act is included in qualifying examination material for promotion to all ranks.

The honourable member's suggestion for a special unit, such as the Stock Squad, to police the Act has been noted and could be considered in the light of the availability of manpower and suitable officers in the future. However, I would point out that all police, not just members of the Stock Squad, are alert to intercept and apprehend offenders under the Act and actively seek the co-operation of members of the public in reporting such offences so that suitable action can be taken.

I am aware of some of the problems experienced in the Cannon Hill sale yards as outlined by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, but can assure him that members of the Stock Squad are active in that area. This is particularly so in the enforcement of the section of the Act which covers the separation of calves and swine during transport and the detection of instances of overcrowding of animals in transit.

The interest of the honourable member for Salisbury in this Bill is well known to me. As an active worker for the Queensland Society for the Prevention of Cruelty, she expressed concern that perhaps even the increased penalties for cruelty proposed in this Bill were not strong enough.

I would like to point out to the honourable member that this is not the only Act which would allow the prosecution of offenders committing acts of cruelty. In the case of more serious offences, such as unlawfully killing, wounding or maiming

an animal, police could choose to proceed with a prosecution under the provisions of the Criminal Code. Section 468 of the Code covers the offences referred to and provides a maximum penalty of seven years' hard labour with or without solitary confinement. Penalty provisions of the Criminal Code are available in addition to those provided in the Animals Protection Act.

I would like to thank the honourable members for Windsor, Toowoomba South, Townsville and Murrumba for their contribution to the introductory debate. I share their serious concern for the proper treatment of animals and birds and I feel that the provisions of this Bill will act as a strong deterrent to those who would indulge in acts of cruelty and ill-treatment.

Finally, I would like to record my appreciation of the work of officers of the Royal Queensland Society for the Prevention of Cruelty appointed to assist police in enforcing the Act. They deserve the sincere thanks of this House and of the whole community.

**Mr. HOUSTON** (Bulimba) (3.3 p.m.): As was indicated at the introductory stage, the Opposition supports the Bill. I have gone through it. I will mention a couple of points during my speech. Basically it is a Bill to increase the penalties for proven cruelty. It was good to see so many members rise to speak on this matter.

I was rather disappointed to find that quite a few saw fit to become greyhound bashers during the course of their speeches. They were the honourable member for Toowoomba South, the honourable member for Townsville, the honourable member for Salisbury, the honourable member for Merthyr and the honourable member for Murrumba. I do not know why they spent so much time trying to have recorded in their speeches their knowledge of so many things that they said were going on within the greyhound industry.

If they have any evidence and it is not hearsay based on what some unknown person about the place said, they should let the proper authorities know. I have every confidence that either the R.Q.S.P.C. or the Greyhound Racing Control Board would take the appropriate action. Listening to the speeches I realised how, in one particular case, the situation would be practically impossible, if one knew anything about what goes on.

The honourable member for Toowoomba South said that the R.Q.S.P.C. had 50 to 80 complaints. That is a fair range. If he received that report from an officer of the organisation he should be able to say that there were 52 complaints in six years or that between 50 and 55 complaints had been received. But a range of 30—between 50 and 80 makes one wonder about the accuracy of such an assessment. After all, if the

R.Q.S.P.C. did in fact receive 80 complaints, something must be wrong, because to my knowledge only a couple of complaints have come up for hearing. When members make statements in this place about an important industry, they should make certain that they are accurate.

**Mr. Warner:** You can certainly check those figures because they came from the R.Q.S.P.C.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not doubt the honourable member's word. I do not doubt anyone's word. All I am saying is that if I said that there were a lot of complaints and the honourable member asked, "How many?", he would think that I was giving a rather wide range if I replied, "Between 50 and 80". It should be possible to give a more precise figure than "between 50 and 80". That is the point that I am making.

I do not think 80 complaints have been received. If they have been, I have not been told of them. No-one from that organisation came to me on this matter, and I think they know fairly well my association with the greyhound racing industry. I do know that one club wanted to talk to this organisation but we have not quite caught up with each other yet.

**Mr. Warner:** Some were substantiated and some were not.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not know how many were substantiated. What concerns me is the knocking of an industry; that does not do any good.

The honourable member for Townsville said that it was a week-end pastime for some greyhound owners to take their dogs along river-banks and use wallabies and other small marsupials instead of possums for bleeding their dogs. I can hardly imagine any sensible person allowing a valuable greyhound to run along creek beds or over open plains. After all, a reasonably good racing dog would be worth a minimum of \$3,000 to \$4,000. An owner would be hardly likely to let such an animal run wild along creeks.

**Dr. Scott-Young:** That was on my own property.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** All I can say is that there would not be many people who would do that. No sensible person would run such a risk with a valuable dog. If the honourable member for Townsville knows of this, I take it he has reported it to the proper authorities so that action can be taken. If he saw it, no doubt he knows the identity of the persons concerned. Again my concern is the making of statements designed to discredit certain sections of the community. I could not let that point pass without referring to it. When people have valuable animals, they do not let them run wild in paddocks. Some valuable dogs are injured during trials on

proper trial tracks. Not many are injured, thank goodness, but enough are hurt to make owners very upset about the situation. I am making no reflection on the tracks; this is just one of those things that can happen when dogs are travelling at over 40 miles an hour.

The honourable member for Salisbury said that not enough people were being charged for bleeding greyhounds. I say to her that if she has evidence of bleeding, let her pass it on to the authorities and I will support her. The control board would, I know, take action. Its action is banning, which is effective at all clubs.

**Mr. Warner:** There have been three or four cases already this year.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** There have been two, I think. There may have been two people involved in one case and one or two in the other. I am not certain of the details, because the cases have not come before the court and, to my knowledge, no final arrangements have been made. I can, however, give the honourable member an assurance that the control board will take appropriate action. I am not a member of the board but I have great faith in its ability to keep the industry clean.

**Mr. Warner:** The Bill will help them.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It will not be any great help to the control board. It has the power now to deal with people who are convicted of any offence that is against the interests of the industry. It can ban them for life.

**Mr. Warner:** After conviction.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No, they do not even get that far. The board has very wide powers under the Minister in charge of racing. The Minister for Police knows that is true. The board has very wide powers; I am not disputing that at all. So it would not matter to the board whether a fellow was fined \$50 or \$500, or the maximum amount provided in the new Bill; it could still impose the same punishment, although no doubt it would be influenced by the statement of the magistrate who heard the case.

The honourable member for Salisbury also referred to what she called "pay-offs". Again, I have no evidence of that, and if she has evidence I suggest that she consult the club concerned and let it know where it is being carried on. She also said she is constantly being told about it, but I suggest that next time she is told about it she should advise the person concerned to put the evidence not before her but before the appropriate authorities. I am sure they will take any action that is necessary.

The thing that concerned me most about the honourable member's contribution was her assertion that no-one could convince her that there are so many people in greyhound racing just for the love of the game or, as

she said, "whatever they like to call it." But there are people in greyhound racing just for the love of the game, just as there are people in galloping and trotting racing for the love of the game. But perhaps a better illustration which is just a little bit different, although it still concerns dogs, would be those thousands of families throughout this State who are interested in breeding and showing dogs. There is no monetary gain and there is no betting, just the great thrill of having a dog which is better than seven, eight or 10 others, or even only one or two others. They compete for the love of the game. They breed the animals and care for them but they receive no monetary return. In fact, those who go into breeding purely to show dogs find that it costs them money, but they get a great thrill out of the companionship of the dog and the fact that they are able to show it.

**Mrs. Kyburz:** That is very different.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No; it is not very different at all.

**Mrs. Kyburz:** I think it is.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** No; it is not different, and I would like the honourable member to appreciate this. I am not trying to be nasty to her or anything like that, but people in responsible positions who say things in all sincerity are listened to and people outside tend to get the wrong impression; that is what worries me. As I said, people get a great thrill out of showing their dogs and, after all, a greyhound is only another dog. Many people who set out to show dogs move into greyhound racing. They are not great gamblers—not great betters at all—but the thrill then is not so much having a judge place a dog first, on what is virtually a personal opinion—

**Mr. Lindsay:** Are you making a speech or giving us a lecture?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** The honourable member could do with one because it will be his last opportunity to be lectured. He will not be here after tomorrow. It is no credit to him to make an interjection like that. As I said, the situation—

**Mr. Lindsay:** Get on with it. God help us!

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. HOUSTON:** As I was trying to indicate to the honourable member for Salisbury, the situation with greyhound racing is exactly the same as that with showing dogs, except that people get a thrill out of the dog racing and it is the dog's performance only that carries the day.

I would also like to point out that we do not hear any complaints from people who follow gallopers or trotters. In the case of gallopers there is a jockey urging the animal along and getting the last ounce of effort

out of it, yet it is accepted as the sport of kings. The same applies to trotters; someone sits in a gig and uses a whip to get the last bit of effort out of the horse. Yet greyhound racing is different because the dog performs entirely on its own merits with nothing more to urge it along than its own instincts. So I suggest to those honourable members who have attacked greyhound racing that it would be in the interests of the sport if all the facts were known.

Last but not least, the honourable member for Murrumba went further than most other honourable members. I will not refer to the practice that he mentioned of putting a gramophone needle into the neck of a horse. If that is what he believes, he can take that up with the galloping authorities. As to drawing claws out of cats and then feeding the cats to greyhounds—I do not know whether a greyhound would even bother to eat a cat, but, again, one hears stories such as that around the place.

I am not denying that, human beings being what they are, there is some cruelty. But the reality is that there are far more domestic dogs and cats killed on the roads every day than there are animals hurt by greyhounds in any situation. I did not hear one speech—and I listened to all of them—in which an honourable member said to people, “If you get yourself a domestic dog, for goodness’ sake keep it in your own yard”; nor did I hear any honourable member say to people, “When you buy a domestic dog, buy one that suits your own environment and your own conditions.” How often do we find, Mr. Speaker, that a person brings home a small puppy that is fluffy and looks nice but it grows up into a huge or gawky dog.

**Mr. Lowes:** An English sheep dog, about 4 ft. across.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It is all right if you know how to handle the dog and do the right thing by it. Often a puppy will grow into something entirely different from what a person really wants and then, of course, the dog is discarded. I think that the honourable member for Salisbury and the honourable member for Murrumba both mentioned the dumping of dogs, and their comments were quite justified.

**Mr. Frawley:** Brisbane people dump dogs at Redcliffe every week-end.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not know about that, but I know that it was a regular feature when I had boarding kennels. There were always a few kennels set aside for such cases. Unfortunately, in those circumstances animals quickly pick up diseases and become a menace to one's own stock; I appreciate that only too well. That is the type of problem on which we should be concentrating.

Of course, getting down to the real nitty-gritty—far more children than animals are abused from day to day. It is all a question of human nature.

The Minister may be able to answer this point quickly now instead of waiting till the Committee stage. I notice that the Act is being amended to widen the definition of a horse by omitting the words “or stallion” and substituting the words “stallion, ass, mule or hinny”. I wondered why “donkey” had not been included. The Minister might recall that two or three years ago quite a few wild donkeys were brought to Queensland, and I think they were dispersed round the country. I know of a family that has one and they are looking after it very well. I do not wish to criticise them, because they and their kids have a lot of fun with it. As the hinny is being included, I should like to know why the donkey is not being included.

I should also like to know why it was decided not to increase the gaol sentence. It has been six months for many years, and although the monetary penalty has been increased to \$1,000, the gaol term has not been increased.

**Mr. Newbery:** Inflation has not done anything to six months' gaol.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not think anyone has been put in gaol.

**Mr. Newbery:** No; I don't think so.

**Mr. HOUSTON:** I do not think that gaol sentences are a real deterrent. As I said at the introductory stage, I doubt very much whether the monetary penalty is a deterrent. I do not think that accidental cruelty, or cruelty committed on the spur of the moment—say, when someone training for running kicks a dog that happens to get in his road, or something like that—can be put in the same category as deliberate cruelty. Deliberate cruelty occurs without any thought of the penalty that might be associated with it.

**Mr. Lowes:** What do you think about the export of large numbers of live animals—sheep to Iraq, and cattle to Manila?

**Mr. HOUSTON:** It depends on the economics of the situation and the conditions under which they are being sent. I have not actually visited the ships or the aircraft. I know that the police are responsible for checking on that. The inspectors in the Department of Primary Industries are most conscientious. As a matter of fact, very recently I sent a four or five-month-old puppy to New Zealand and found that the requirements imposed by the Primary Industries Department were very stringent indeed. The crate in which the dog was carried had to be a certain strength and size and a very strict veterinary check on the dog was made. The cost to the people who were importing the dog into New Zealand

was perhaps more than would be expected, but in my view the cost was well worth while. Everything was done for the welfare of the animal.

I am sorry to have delayed the House, but I wanted to put some members right in the matter of a most important sport.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (3.21 p.m.): In his long speech the honourable member for Bulimba went up every little byway and highway. He reminded me of the old saying that a dog is not man's best friend, rather is man a dog's best friend. Some time ago we heard the honourable member for Bulimba speaking in this strain.

I have always been highly amused at the attitudes and actions of a lot of people who show dogs. I do not sit in judgment on them, nor do I criticise them. I give them the right to go through their antics, particularly if the honourable member for Bulimba is out in the middle as a highly paid judge of the show. I only hope that he will continue as a judge of show dogs. Some day he may attain the stature and eminence of Bill Duckworth.

**Mr. Houston:** A good judge and a good gentleman.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Of course he is. If the honourable member had studied some of his techniques he would have learned a lot and would have been a better judge than he is. But still, he is progressing. I will say this: the honourable member is not as bad a judge as he was a couple of years ago.

I have an idea of freedom that certainly does not accord with that of the A.L.P. or of the university louts and loutesses. I believe that everyone has the right to do what he wants to do as long as, in doing it, he does not transgress on the freedom of someone else.

Those people who show the little pedigree dogs, as mentioned by the honourable member for Bulimba, do no harm to me or anybody else. In fact they bring a lot of pleasure to themselves and amusement to others. There is nothing funnier than a staid matron going through all her tricks with her dog, making him stand the right way, making him hold his tail the right way and making him trot around the ring. She gets a lot of pleasure out of doing it, and I get a lot of pleasure out of watching her do it.

I do not intend to talk of the Canine Control Board, which apparently is much more tyrannical, oppressive and dictatorial than even the Q.C.E. of the Australian Labor Party. How the board ever got the powers that it exercises, I would not know. It probably arrogated most of them to itself. I hope that sooner or later this Parliament will take on the board and cut it down to size.

I want to say a few words on behalf of a very fine organisation in North Queensland, the North Queensland Society for the Prevention of Cruelty. It is similar to the Royal Queensland Society for the Prevention of Cruelty, but unfortunately cannot attain anything like the status of the State body. It cannot raise money by asking for donations, nor are donations to it regarded as deductions for income tax purposes. The R.Q.S.P.C. holds a complete monopoly on that type of fund-raising. Consequently, the N.Q.S.P.C., which does a fine job, has to raise money the best way it can. People who make donations to it are not allowed to claim those donations as tax deductions. I should like to know why. I do not know why the prefix "Royal" could not be inserted before the words "North Queensland Society for the Prevention of Cruelty". Why is that confined to Brisbane? Why should Brisbane have a monopoly on the "Royal" prerogative? When I made inquiries about this many different arguments were put forward. I believe that on more than one occasion the honourable member for Bulimba was the shove-up man to stop giving North Queensland the same degree of status and lustre as that enjoyed in Brisbane. The North Queensland society looks after the monges, the half-breeds and so on which, I understand, the elite show in Brisbane does not do. I cannot imagine an organisation with which the honourable member for Bulimba is connected—and, of course, he is one of the leading lights in it—providing kennels to look after mongrels and take them off the streets to get them out of the way.

**Mr. Houston:** To whom are you referring?

**Mr. AIKENS:** To you.

**Mr. Houston:** With which organisation am I supposed to be connected?

**Mr. AIKENS:** One of the organisations would be the Canine Control Board.

**Mr. Houston:** I am not on that.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The other organisation would be the R.Q.S.P.C.

**Mr. Houston:** I am not on that, either.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The honourable member is only a member of the dog judges' association, at so many guineas a judging.

**Mr. Houston** interjected.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The honourable member is not interested in the breeding of dogs; his interest is purely mercenary and pecuniary. At least he is honest enough to say that. Will the honourable member tell us how much he gets for judging?

**Mr. Houston:** Yes, I will tell you.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Would the honourable member like to tell us how Percy Tucker kidded him into going away for a three months' holiday to judge dogs and then,

metaphorically speaking, slipped the dagger in between his shoulder-blades while he was away?

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** The honourable member walked into that.

The ordinary, average mongrel dogs are the big problem today. Their owners do not think of them as mongrels but as faithful dogs or pooches. We have one at our place which is registered and has been spayed.

**Mr. Lester:** They are beautiful family pets. My old dog is a mongrel and he goes everywhere with me in my car.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I will guarantee that if anyone attacked the honourable member or one of his family his old mongrel would jump to give assistance but some of the pedigreed dogs would go up the first drain pipe and would not be seen again until the next day.

That is not the point. We must do something to protect the people of Queensland from the worst nuisance of all, that is, the barking dog and the one which attacks innocent pedestrians, children or cyclists. I ride a bicycle and I know what a nuisance they can be. I have never been attacked by a pedigreed dog. Like the honourable member for Bulimba, owners of pedigreed dogs probably think that they are too precious to run loose and they keep them tied up in the yard. I have been attacked frequently by dogs of all ages, shape, size and colour, but apparently we do not intend to do anything about that. It is time that we did.

The other night I returned home from a function at about 12.15 a.m. I had scarcely got in the door when the phone rang and a fellow in an agitated voice said, "I want you to come to my place, Tom, and do something about this so-and-so barking dog." I said, "Is he barking now?" He said, "No, he is not barking now." I said, "When did he bark last?" He said, "When I came home from work at 5 o'clock this afternoon." I said, "Why didn't you ring me then?", and he said, "I did not want to disturb you." After the dog attacked him through the fence at about 5 p.m. I suppose he went down to the pub and got half sozzled—he said that the dog did not bite him—and after thinking over it he rang me at 12.15 a.m. to come and have a conversation with the dog. Unlike the honourable member for Bulimba I cannot talk to canines in doggy talk. I would talk to them only as a plain old North Queenslander would talk. Perhaps I would say a few words that you Mr. Speaker, would not allow me to use in the House.

What are we going to do to protect the people in our towns who are being menaced every day by all sorts of dogs—all shapes,

and sizes and colours; by half breeds and quarter breeds? I imagine the councils are supposed to look after them. The Townsville City Council—that wonderful organisation!—charges \$15 or more a year to register a dog. I do not know what my daughter pays to keep the treated bitch that she has—but it is a nice little dog. The council sends out a card or a form to be filled in. The person registers his dog for \$15 (if the dog is treated), and that is the last time anybody bothers about it. That dog can make a pest of itself, it can bark, it can urinate, it can do anything it likes up and down the street. There is nothing worse in the cool of the morning while out watering the lawn than to stand on these things, particularly if one has no boots on. But nobody does anything about it.

Surely to goodness, if we are going to spend all this time and energy, and all the time of this House, dealing with the aristocrats of the canine breed—if we are going to deal with the Jack Houston type of dog—then let us deal with the ordinary average battler's type of dog that makes an absolute pest and nuisance of itself.

I was going to ask the Minister to let us know in his reply if he has any thoughts about trying to protect the ordinary people of this State from all the whims and idiosyncrasies, shall we say, of the ordinary dog. Further, as I said earlier, are we going to take some steps to put the North Queensland Society for the Prevention of Cruelty on the same basis as the exalted Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty?

**Hon. T. G. NEWBERY** (Mirani—Minister for Police) (3.32 p.m.), in reply: I thank the two honourable members for the contributions they have made. The honourable member for Bulimba asked why the donkey is not mentioned. The Bill says—

"Section 3 of the Principal Act is amended by, in the meaning of the term 'Horse', omitting the words 'or stallion' and substituting the words 'stallion, ass, mule and hinny'."

So it is mentioned there.

**Mr. Houston:** Do you say that's a donkey?

**Mr. NEWBERY:** An ass is a donkey.

The honourable member also raised the matter of an additional penalty beyond six months' imprisonment. He asked why we did not increase the penalty. The penalty of six months' imprisonment was considered to be sufficient. In the case of a serious offence, action could be taken under the Criminal Code. As I stated earlier, that provides a maximum penalty of seven years' imprisonment with hard labour, with or without solitary confinement. I would also point

out that sentences of six months' imprisonment have been handed down by the court on charges laid under the Animals Protection Act.

In reply to the honourable member for Townsville South, I refer to the Act, which says—

"Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, every dog which on any public road, street or place in any manner causing danger or injury to any person, rushes at or barks at any person or at any animal, vehicle, bicycle, or tricycle, upon or in which any person is riding, may be then and there killed or attempted to be killed by such person, or by any other person then present, without liability to any action or other proceeding whatsoever by any person whomsoever for or by reason of such killing or attempted killing."

**Mr. Houston:** That's a pretty vicious section, really.

**Mr. NEWBERY:** It is already in the Act.

**Mr. Houston:** I know, but the point is that if a dog barks it gives anybody authority to kill it.

**Mr. NEWBERY:** Action can be taken under the Criminal Code as well.

Once again, I thank the two honourable members for their contributions.

Motion (Mr. Newbery) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gunn, Somerset, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 6, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—Amendment of s.13; Destruction of certain animals in certain cases—

**Hon. T. G. NEWBERY** (Mirani—Minister for Police) (3.36 p.m.): I move the following amendment—

"On page 3, line 5, after the word 'killed' insert the words—

' , where it occurs in subsection (1), '."

The reason is that the word "killed" occurs twice in section 13 of the Act—in subsection (1) and in subsection (3). The insertion of the words "by or" is required only in subsection (1). The words "by or" have no relevance to subsection (3). Owing to an oversight during the preparation of the Bill, it is not clear that the amendment applies only to subsection (1). This amendment to clause 7 is therefore necessary to correct that oversight.

Amendment (Mr. Newbery) agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

#### THIRD READING

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

#### BRISBANE MILK BOARD EXTENSION BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. K. B. TOMKINS** (Roma—Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service) (3.38 p.m.): I move—

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

As I indicated when introducing this Bill, its two functions are, firstly, to continue the operations of the Brisbane Milk Board and its membership until such time as the Queensland Milk Board takes over and, secondly, to put beyond doubt the validity of acts done by the Brisbane Milk Board from 1 July to 31 December of this year.

In reply to the member for Mackay, I would point out that the only connection between this Bill and the Milk Supply Act is that the Queensland Milk Board has to take over the operations of the Brisbane Milk Board and for this to happen the Brisbane Milk Board has to be in existence at the time of the take-over. It is only a matter of continuity.

The member for Carnarvon made this crystal clear and the only point I could add to his remarks would be to express appreciation to the members of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation for the service they have provided during the life of this Parliament.

The matters raised by the member for Cunningham, although not the concern of this Bill, will be passed on to the Minister for Primary Industries, as I have already indicated.

The Bill is short and not complicated and I would commend it for consideration.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (3.59 p.m.): As was explained last night, the Bill is a simple measure. We must have legality for the continuation of the Brisbane Milk Board. This is a principle of the Bill that I accept. I do not accept the comments of the Minister today and of the honourable member for Carnarvon last night during the introductory stage of the Bill. I am surprised that it was a Government back-bencher who drew the Minister's attention to this point. There was certainly no recognition of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation in the Minister's speech. The honourable member for Carnarvon aired his knowledge of that committee. It is a pity that not many more knew of the action of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation on this matter. Certainly the information was not passed on in the proper parliamentary way. The honourable member for Carnarvon may think that

this was a great achievement of the Committee of Subordinate Legislation, but I see it as the act of someone blowing up a balloon—eventually it will explode in the person's face and it contains only hot air, anyway.

Clause 9 of the Milk Supply Bill referred to the position of the Brisbane Milk Board. I believe that the simple way of doing what is now being done would have been to extend the provisions of that clause. Unfortunately, as I said last night, we did not have a proper opportunity to consider that Bill. If we had had more time to study it properly, justice would have proceeded normally.

I have further considered the Milk Supply Bill and I believe that what is being done under the Bill before us could have been done simply by the addition of a paragraph to clause 9 of the Milk Supply Bill.

**Hon. K. B. TOMKINS** (Roma—Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service) (3.42 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable member for Mackay for his remarks. What he says is probably correct, but the main point of interest is that he agrees with the Bill. Its purpose is not to cover a point that was missed in the Milk Supply Bill. The honourable member is well aware of that.

Motion (Mr. Tomkins) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gunn, Somerset, in the chair)

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Tomkins, by leave, read a third time.

### BRISBANE FOREST PARK BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. K. B. TOMKINS** (Roma—Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service) (3.44 p.m.): I move—

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

The Bill proposes the declaration of a Brisbane Forest Park and provisions for the planning, development and management of it for park and recreational purposes. As I indicated in my introductory speech, the motion encompasses a statutory creation characterised by unique and novel proportions. Our objective is to take advantage of this eminently suitable stretch of country for the benefit (in terms of relaxation and enjoyment) of the public but, at the same time, to ensure that the land, subject to these new-found constraints, remains available for the essential utilities and purposes to which it was appropriated in days gone by.

For instance, in the case of watershed protection, it will be abundantly clear that a large area of land must be "locked up" to achieve that very objective. If usage were permitted by activities which would create and promote pollution of the area, the whole exercise would be negated, and such a situation would be untenable.

Similarly, then, when land is earmarked as a State forest, a lot of country must necessarily be incorporated, some parts of which do not really grow much commercial timber. But good management requires that this large slab of country be declared State forest not only for the purposes of orderly logging but also for general spin-off protection from fire. Many other situations could act to the detriment of the forests from a professional management point of view if the Conservator of Forests were not permitted to administer the sporadic stands of commercial timber in the park.

I must emphasise that withdrawing the land in the proposed park from traditional use, by whatever processes may be available, with the intent of turning it over purely and solely to a park could not be allowed and any purported evidence adduced to the contrary would not pass muster.

However, we have the situation where, after lengthy negotiations with the Brisbane City Council and parallel consultations with the responsible departments, we hit upon a plan that we confidently expect can work.

All parties, that is the Brisbane City Council, the Forestry Department, the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the Land Administration Commission, agree that there is good reason why this expansive stretch of scrub country should be permanently appropriated to multi-purpose usage; that is, permanently appropriated to a park and recreational area while the lands will still, in effect, be appropriated to their present usage.

Upon declaration, the park as such could not be demolished in whole or in part except by approval of this Parliament and any change of usage or disposition of any land that would take it out of the superimposed park setting would thereby meet the supreme challenge of the authority of this Parliament. Surely any expression of goodwill could not be based on a better recipe.

The appropriate goal of multi-purpose use can only be achieved by co-operative input on the part of all parties and, as I have indicated, this intention has been clearly consummated in a situation where everyone's rights and obligations are clearly spelled out. We are in a new situation altogether and we have to consider where the respective authorities lie in so far as the administration of the park is concerned.

There are, in fact, two primary contributors in terms of the land bank, that is, the Brisbane City Council in respect of its

freehold lands and trust lands, on the one hand, and the Crown, in respect of State forests, national parks and reserve land, on the other. The Government land—I call it that for the purposes of expression—is broken up into distinct areas of departmental administration in respect of State forests, national parks and Crown land. The proposed area involves a number of shire areas as distinct from the Brisbane City Council (a land owner in its own right) and it is immediately clear, then, that there are a lot of interested parties.

The resources of the park and the availability of areas for recreational use will, in a way, require a goodly amount of research and planning in the initial stages. For this reason, in-depth consideration has been given as to how a desirable level of planning may best be achieved and the considered conclusion is that wide representation should be afforded to all interested parties who, through their special brands of individual expertise and knowledge, could mount a wholesome and most worthwhile information bank out of which policy determinations and decisions can be made.

The Bill proposes representation from Government departments and local authorities on an advisory planning board under the chairmanship of a person to be selected by the Government. The chairman is to be a person not subject to or even, indeed, associated with any department or local authority which is subject to the act.

In this way, the broadest coverage can be given. Everyone will know what the other fellow is doing and planning can proceed on a comprehensive and consensus basis.

This situation automatically, then, requires that someone has to make policy determinations and decisions. Quite obviously, the Minister for Lands, for a host of reasons, should be given this responsibility. However, the authorities of the Minister for Lands, under the Land Act and Forestry Act, do not apply to freehold land and, as I have already said repeatedly, a substantial parcel of freehold land is included in the proposal. The obvious approach, then, is to constitute the Minister for Lands as an authority in such a manner that he can guide the destinies of the administration and management of the park.

The Bill proposes that the Minister for Lands be constituted a corporation sole by the name "The Brisbane Forest Park Administration Authority", shortly called the "Administration Authority".

The function of the Administration Authority will be to plan, develop and manage the lands forming the park with a view to the recreational use of parts thereof in a manner and to an extent consistent with the preservation of the lands forming the park

for their permanent appropriation to such use and for the use by the proprietors of land forming the park for their purposes.

Honourable members will appreciate that it is not a case of 25 000 hectares of country, by a transitional thrust, being immediately made available as one big park whereby people will have a right, as of right, to go there and do what they will even for what might be reasonably held as recreational purposes. Public use of the park for public recreational purposes will be phased in. Already, of course, there is the Brisbane City Council's park development at Mt. Coot-tha, which will not be impeded or otherwise affected by the provisions of the Bill. Likewise, to a limited extent, the Forestry and National Parks people have provided some facilities, and very good ones at that, by way of picnic sites and barbecue areas and the like. Walking-track construction has already been effected in some parts of the national parks and all of these things will go on. The whole idea is that this sort of activity can be immeasurably augmented by the proposals contained in the Bill.

As conditions and circumstances permit, special fund allocations will be made available for park development purposes.

As I have said before, co-operation and planning will be keynote aspects. The land contributors, if I might call them this for the time being, will act of their own volition and in consonance with the planning activity continue within financial and technical limits to maintain existing facilities and provide new ones, and the Park Administration Authority, within its overall powers and responsibilities, will foster this growth and maintenance of the public areas.

As areas are designated and allocated to the public use, they will remain so, but, of course, in the multi-purpose context, there may have to be some alternation of areas from time to time. For instance, periodic logging of the State forest under sustained yield practices adopted by the very professional Forestry Department will occur over parts of the area. But this is no impediment to the plan; it is an enhancement of the plan. Under properly regulated conditions, people walking through a timber stand and bird-watching or simply refurbishing their smog-filled lungs with refreshing mountain air do nothing, of course, to interfere with the value of the valuable trees or the soils that sustain them; but it does a lot for those particular characters who, in great numbers, relish that sort of thing.

The Bill clearly establishes where all the rights and obligations lie in true relationship to all contributing parties and their particular interests.

Of course, the possibilities are tremendous, but all possible factors cannot be reasonably comprehended or foreseen at this stage. No soothsayer could be trusted to do so. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the

authority be statutorily empowered to make by-laws not inconsistent with the Act to guide and govern administration procedures and practices; but it is distinctly appropriate and absolutely essential that the scope of the by-law-making powers be statutorily expressed, and the Bill provides accordingly.

The proposed Brisbane Forest Park not only is big in area but will require some big management attention in both practice and theory, and ways and means need to be found by which this can be achieved without unnecessarily setting up some mushrooming departmental organisations. The Bill proposes that the Secretary of the Land Administration Commission, a statutory post pursuant to the provisions of the Land Act, be the secretary to the Administration Authority and, that, with the normal administrative resources available to him, he constitute the secretariat to whom and by whom the business of the authority may be conducted.

The situation is so public-interestedly important that the establishment of a specific park fund is connoted. Ideally, the fund should be administered in an area which is part and parcel of the enveloping administration which provides the secretariat. It may reasonably be contended, then, that the accounts branch of the department which is particularly geared and has traditionally proved its competence to administer situations of this nature should attend to the accounting affairs of the authority and, of course, such fundings would thereby be subject to audit by the Auditor-General in the normal run of events.

Sadly we recall that the community today, in a variety of ways, is being subjected to wanton vandalism by some few irresponsible individuals in our society. Parks and public property seem to come in for special attention, much to the heart-break of many public authorities and public-spirited people.

Particular steps must surely be taken, then, to statutorily safeguard a park of this nature which, for obvious reasons, is very sparsely inhabited and thinly patrolled by officialdom. People who recklessly indulge in despoiling vegetation, land and property in any manner whatsoever and those who would rape property and people—and recent history of some terribly disturbing situations epitomise my story—should, in the public interest, be taken to task. If necessary, the vehicle, be it a thing of any description by which they wreak havoc, should be subject to seizure according to law. This is the only way by which suitable deterrents to other would-be wrongdoers can be adequately advertised.

Reasonable steps must be taken to prevent, as far as possible, drug-trafficking, wild and reckless shooting of fauna, signs and buildings and all the dire results they convey. This is particularly so in an area where the objective is to create a situation

and setting where decent people acting lawfully and responsibly can enjoy the fruits of Mother Nature. The Bill aims at doing this. I commend it to the House.

**Mr. CASEY (Mackay)** (3.56 p.m.): As I indicated last night, the Opposition strongly supports the concept of the Brisbane Forest Park. But unfortunately, once again we are at that funny stage of a session when the Government is rushing legislation through like mad without giving members sufficient time to study it fully and carefully.

We have been given little time to study this Bill, which was introduced at a late hour last night. Quite frankly, because of my commitments in Parliament all day today, I have not had time to examine some of the provisions in the Bill that require closer scrutiny than we have been able to give them. So any future backlash from this legislation must be laid squarely at the door of this Government, which is pushing this Bill through very quickly at the end of this session.

This Bill is an important one in that it is pilot legislation, the first of its type in Queensland. As I said last night, I sincerely hope that it is simply that—the first—and that similar legislation will follow very quickly in relation to other areas of the State.

Despite the expression of thanks by the Minister to the Lord Mayor of Brisbane and also to the councillors of the surrounding shires, and despite certain Press statements that have been released over a period of time by the Premier and others, it would appear that the assistance of the Lord Mayor has not been properly appreciated.

The Bill has at least one flaw in that it carries further a principle that is brought forward so often by this Government, namely, the appointment by a Minister of persons who constitute advisory panels or boards. These bodies are not set up by the normal democratic process.

The advisory planning board that will be set up under the Bill and will act as adviser to the Minister, who, as I understand it, will be the authority, will comprise only persons who are nominated by the local authorities and are acceptable to the Minister.

I want to make it quite clear that I am in no way trying to cast a slur on the integrity of the Minister. He is fully aware of my personal feelings for him. None the less, as a man of integrity, he is put by this legislation into a most embarrassing position.

Neither the Brisbane City Council nor any of the adjoining local authorities—the Esk, Pine Rivers and Moreton Shire Councils and the Ipswich City Council—is allowed to appoint any one of its number to the board. The local authorities in Queensland are

statutory bodies set up under the Local Government Act and they are given wide powers to administer other Acts. Yet in this instance they have no choice whatever. They must put forward nominees, from whom the Minister will make a selection.

The Brisbane City Council must submit a panel of four names, from which the Minister will choose two; each of the other local authorities that I have mentioned must submit two names, from which the Minister will select one. But an even worse principle is embodied in the Bill. It is obvious that, if the Minister believes that a person whose name submitted on the list is not a proper person, he can reject him. The Minister could continue to reject names put forward to him by local authorities until the people he wanted were nominated. This provision could be used as a political weapon or as something else by another Minister. It is but another means by which this Government can reject democracy. I have spoken about this quite often in recent times. I did so when we were dealing with the Meat Industry Act Amendment Bill and the Milk Supply Bill. When we are dealing with clause 14 in the Committee stage, I shall be speaking once more about this matter, which the Opposition cannot and will not accept.

Opposition members believe that the Brisbane City Council should have a right to nominate the two appointees or technical men it wants to nominate. It is surrendering a tremendous area of land for the Brisbane Forest Park. The other councils should also have the right to nominate the officers they want to represent them. They would be technical officers who would not be holding their positions if they were not well respected.

**Mr. HALES** (Ipswich West) (4.2 p.m.): This Bill relates to a large area of land close to the electorate of Ipswich West, and in the electorates of Somerset, Pine Rivers and Mt. Coot-tha. It relates to 25 000 ha close to the Mt. Coot-tha Range. It is a wonderful concept which will be very advantageous to all Queenslanders, not merely those in South-east Queensland. Some very pretty rain forest areas are to be found in the proposed park.

This afternoon I want to tell the Minister about some small sections around Mt. Crosby and Pine Mountain, particularly just north of Ipswich, and a very pretty spot on the bank of the Brisbane River very close to the Mt. Crosby weir. Local residents tell me that this is probably the last little section of this type of country in South-east Queensland. They are hoping fervently that environmentalists and the Minister's officers will ensure that this small area is never desecrated.

I compliment the Minister on the establishment of an environmental park very close to Ipswich—within half a mile of the centre of Ipswich on Denmark Hill—containing quite a number of acres. It was established in co-operation with the Ipswich City

Council. Like the honourable member for Mackay I pay tribute to the councils who have helped to establish the Brisbane Forest Park.

One of my main reasons for speaking today was to express concern about preserving streams, creeks and rivers in national parks. While doing so, I wish to refer to what has happened as a result of dredging in the Brisbane River above its junction with the Bremer River. I hope that the Minister makes absolutely certain that never again will the banks of the Brisbane River, in park areas, be raped and desecrated. In my view, what is happening to the banks of the Brisbane River as a result of the operations of the dredging companies is absolutely illegal and immoral. They can never be repaired. A number of cattle have fallen off the banks into the river and have not been able to get out because of the steepness of the banks. The companies have dredged to an illegal depth, and the banks are falling in.

A programme on T.D.T. on Monday night illustrated perfectly what is happening to the banks of the Brisbane River in that area. I publicly challenge the executives of Pioneer Concrete and the Readymix Group to come to Ipswich and see what their employees are doing. They have already stated that the owners of the land should contact them before contacting their member of Parliament or anybody else. It seems to me that it would be quite useless for anyone to do anything at all, because the employees of these companies will act illegally at all times of the night, dredging right up the banks and even taking away the banks themselves. It is easy to see that that has happened. So I publicly challenge the executives of those concrete companies to have a look at the rape and the desecration of the banks of the Brisbane River. In my opinion, what they have done is no different from one of their employees tearing the front out of my property with a front-end loader, taking it away and selling it by the truckload. I would ask the Minister to make sure in future legislation that a situation such as that never occurs again.

**Hon. K. B. TOMKINS** (Roma—Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service) (4.7 p.m.), in reply: I thank the honourable members for Mackay and Ipswich West for their contributions. As at the introductory stage, I have heard no real opposition to the Bill.

The honourable member for Mackay seemed to be very worried about the appointees. Of course, he adopted the same attitude to a similar provision in the Meat Industry Act Amendment Bill. He said that I did not give Alderman Sleeman proper recognition, or something.

**Mr. Casey:** No. I said you gave him proper recognition; but I think the way in which I expressed it was "not properly appreciated".

**Mr. TOMKINS:** I have had nothing but co-operation from the Lord Mayor of Brisbane on this Bill right from the word go. It is a fact that we had many conferences. I am not saying that we agreed all the time on everything; but I go on record as saying that he agreed with this provision of nominating people.

It is Government policy to bring this in, and it is Government policy to see it work. We take the view that, in putting up four people from the Brisbane City Council, he can nominate them 1, 2, 3 and 4. Probably in nine cases out of 10 we would accept them exactly as he has put them in. However, he did not object to the proposition that, if we want to vary it, we shall do so. I give the honourable member an assurance that the Lord Mayor himself agreed with that.

After all, if a Government breaks new ground and sets up something like this, the Government wants to be pretty sure that it gets the right people on the board. The honourable member for Mackay drew the long-bow so I will do it now. The situation could be reached where, in effect, the Government's wishes were thwarted. Certainly there is protection in the Bill by which I have the authority to exercise a veto. However, surely it is better to get a board comprised of people who have a record of being co-operative and who have some expertise in this field.

The position simply is that the Government has to be very careful when setting up boards to ensure that they reflect the policy of the Government and will genuinely carry it out. If anything goes wrong with this board, it will not be the board that gets the kick. It will be the Government—and in this case, me. This is the way I look at it, and I think the position is the same as I indicated in the debate on the Meat Industry Act Amendment Bill. In the case of the meat industry it is a very sensitive issue and it is vitally necessary—

**Mr. Casey:** As Mr. Sinclair found out.

**Mr. TOMKINS:** That is right. It is very necessary that the Government knows, through its nominees, that the committee will carry out the policy that we support and not deviate into some other field where it might get into a bit of trouble, as Mr. Sinclair did. That is the way I look at it and I make the point that way. I do not accept the suggestion that this could cause any problems in the field.

I am glad to hear that my friend the honourable member for Ithaca has given a great deal of his time to this Bill. I should like to make this point because I did not cover it in my reply last night. People such as the honourable member for Ithaca, who has a real interest in this matter, should get involved with organisations, request permission to appear before the committee

from time to time and make suggestions to it and let the committee see how far it can go along with them. It is essential that organisations in Brisbane and elsewhere should get to know what is going on in a concept that has not been tried before. They should come along and give their views. Many people in the western part of Brisbane have pretty strong views on how this should be run. I imagine the same would apply to the honourable member for Ipswich West. I am quite sure that people in the Ipswich area would have the same views. They would have views on which way the roads should be going and on various other matters.

I mention one matter in passing. The honourable member for Ipswich West spoke about gravel being taken from the river. That subject is not covered by the Bill, nor is it under the control of my department. My suggestion to him is that he put matter before the responsible Minister.

Motion (Mr. Tomkins) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Gunn, Somerset, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 13, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—Panels of nominees—

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (4.12 p.m.): This is the clause that I referred to specifically in my second-reading speech. I do not want to double over the ground I have already covered. We as an Opposition hold certain principles on legislation, and we will continue to hold them irrespective of the feelings of the Lord Mayor or any other person on the committee.

Legislation such as this can get a little out of hand because of this clause. The previous clause ensures that the Minister has a majority of departmental officers on the board in addition to the chairman, whom he shall nominate. The board consists of seven from local authorities and seven from Government departments. I hardly see that a situation will arise where one person appointed by a local authority will become the determining factor in a decision of the committee.

I seek your indulgence, Mr. Gunn, in dealing with another matter now to save my calling on another clause later. I accept the concept of discussions with such an advisory group by various community organisations or persons within the community. Probably there is a provision within the Bill that will allow this, but it is up to the Minister again to ensure that this opportunity is given.

**Mr. Tomkins:** When this body meets, if I am Minister for Lands, one of the things I will be suggesting to it very strongly is that it adopt this principle.

**Mr. CASEY:** I accept the Minister's assurance. I know that he will carry it out. It is a very noble one. In the introductory debate last night I said that there was a need for community organisations to become involved. I feel that the Minister will not draw the line on organisations such as the Queensland Conservation Council and the others that I mentioned last night.

To return to the clause—it is a concept that we do not accept and to which we are opposed.

**Mr. MILLER** (Ithaca) (4.15 p.m.): I cannot believe that the honourable member for Mackay is as naive as he endeavours to make out this afternoon. I believe that he is playing politics just before an election. The Minister and the Government are ensuring that boards set up to do a job in this State will be able to do it without becoming involved in politics. If the right people are chosen, boards consisting of people from different walks of life, different organisations and different political parties can work together for the common good.

Unfortunately there are in some political parties people who would put their party first and the board to which they are appointed last. I have brought before this Assembly two such instances. The alderman representing the Brisbane City Council on the North Brisbane Hospitals Board took knowledge that he obtained from a board meeting back to the city hall and used that knowledge against the North Brisbane Hospitals Board. It has been held in a court in New South Wales that, irrespective of the political party a board member represents, his first allegiance is to the board on which he serves. I am referring now to the case in which a member of the Waterside Workers' Federation who served on the board of a port authority in New South Wales went back to his union and reported to it on certain matters. On appeal following his removal from the board the court found in favour of the board. The court found that he had let down the board on which he was serving and it made the point that his first responsibility and allegiance was to that board.

Because he was a member of a Left-wing union he believed that his first allegiance was to the person who asked him to do a particular job. If his union secretary asked him to do a job, he did it.

In Queensland we are trying to take politics out of the operations of boards. If we believe for a moment that any person put forward by the Brisbane City Council or any other body will not be able to leave politics out of his work on a board, we will not have him on it. The honourable member for Mackay must be well aware of what happened in the case of the North Brisbane Hospitals Board

and the Brisbane City Council representative. If he does not know about that, I am very surprised, because it happened during the time in which he has been a member of this House.

**Hon. K. B. TOMKINS** (Roma—Minister for Lands, Forestry, National Parks and Wildlife Service) (4.18 p.m.): To deal first with the point raised by the honourable member for Mackay—I made the Government's views known earlier and I do not want to say any more on them.

I should like to commend the honourable member for Ithaca on his contribution. He put his point much better than I could have put it. I think that when dealing with a park proposal the further one gets from politics the better it will be. On the new board there will not be, so far as I am aware, one person who is politically motivated. As a result of that, I shall be getting from the board information that will not be coloured in any way. The only time it may assume any colour will be when it strikes the Government. At least we are working in a field in which we do not want politics. How could Alderman Sleeman and I have reached agreement if we were not able to keep politics out of it? I think it is desirable to leave the clause as it is.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (4.19 p.m.): What the Minister said last is probably correct; how would he and Alderman Sleeman have come to a decision if they had not been prepared to get on together? I suggest that he and Alderman Sleeman have come to this point of view because they are elected representatives of groups of people. They have been chosen by the people to carry out this particular task. I did not disagree with the Minister when he said that he does not want politics involved with this board, but the point I am making is simply that he is bringing politics into it in the future by leaving the selection of members to the Minister. Alderman Sleeman and the Minister agreed because they are appointed persons and must report back to their constituents, Cabinet or whatever else it might be. I think that is a most valid point and if these representatives were appointed directly, then my objections would be covered.

The honourable member for Ithaca went on a little bit, but really all he said was that he believed the members of the board should be free to express an opinion so long as they do not express one which is contrary to his.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 49, both inclusive, and schedules, as read, agreed to.

### THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Tomkins, by leave, read a third time.

# AUSTRALIAN SHIPPING COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION BILL

## INITIATION

**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 the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to authorize the Australian Shipping Commission to establish, maintain and operate shipping services for the carriage of goods between places in Queensland and for related purposes."

Motion agreed to.

## 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) (4.24 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to authorize the Australian Shipping Commission to establish, maintain and operate shipping services for the carriage of goods between places in Queensland and for related purposes."

Honourable members will be aware from statements made by the Honourable the Premier and replies given to questions in this Chamber that agreement in principle has been reached for the Australian National Line, which is operated by the Australian Shipping Commission, to carry goods by sea between places in Queensland.

For this purpose, Commonwealth and State Ministers for Transport and officials have met from time to time to resolve certain constitutional difficulties associated with the implementation of the proposal. Unfortunately, these discussions have proved more complex than anticipated. This can be readily understood as in most areas there is a need to ensure that there is no infringement of the constitutional powers of either the State or the Commonwealth.

However, I am happy to say that, following proposals and counter-proposals between the State and Commonwealth Governments, agreement has now been reached as to the form the appropriate State legislation should take which would give the necessary power to the Commonwealth to amend its law embodied in the Australian Shipping Commission Act, under which the Australian Shipping Commission operates the Australian national line.

This Bill is similar to that passed by this Assembly in 1971, and subsequently amended in 1974, in relation to the Snowy Mountains

Authority, which authorised that Commonwealth body to function in Queensland. Here I refer to the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation (Queensland) Act of 1971-1974.

Dealing specifically with this Bill to authorise the Australian National Line to carry on intrastate shipping—it recognises the Australian Shipping Commission as a body corporate for all purposes of the law of the State in the same way as the commission is recognised under the Commonwealth law for all purposes of the law of the Commonwealth.

Under the Bill, the Australian Shipping Commission is authorised to establish, maintain and operate shipping services for the carriage of goods between places in Queensland and services for the carriage of goods by land to the extent that the carriage is incident to the shipping service. The authority will continue in force until such time as the Governor, by proclamation, fixes a date on which the Act ceases to be in force, which would not be earlier than 12 months after the proclamation is made.

The Bill also specifically authorises the State Minister for Transport to approve in writing the establishment and operation of the shipping service or services intrastate by the Australian Shipping Commission. The approval by the Minister may be withdrawn after he has notified the Commonwealth Minister to this effect, but the shipping commission will have not less than six months from the date of notification to discontinue any service.

The Bill will also make the commission subject to any law of the State whereby any tax or fee is levied or made payable as with similar shipping services. Provision is also made, wherever this is necessary having regard to constitutional aspects, to prescribe by regulation any laws of the State which should not apply to the commission as well as those laws of the State which should apply.

As with all legislation dealing with shipping, this Bill must be said to regulate coastal shipping and is subject to the Merchant Shipping Act. Accordingly, it provides that it shall not come into operation until Her Majesty's assent has been obtained, following which it will come into operation on a date to be appointed by proclamation.

As I indicated at the outset, the operation of the Australian Shipping Commission intrastate was not a simple matter but involved complex issues of Commonwealth and State powers. However, I must say that at all times all the ministerial and official discussions have been of a constructive nature and the Commonwealth Government, through the Federal Minister for Transport, the Honourable Peter Nixon, M.P., and his officials, has given every co-operation in resolving any difficulties associated with the

decision to allow the Australian National Line to provide intrastate shipping services in Queensland.

Honourable members will appreciate, of course, that the Queensland legislation is necessary to enable the Commonwealth to enact complementary legislation, and I have been assured that the Commonwealth will move quickly in this direction immediately the State Bill is passed through the House. Indeed, I understand that a considerable amount of work has already been done in this regard.

I commend the Bill to honourable members, particularly those representing the northern electorates who have consistently supported provision of intrastate shipping services to northern ports.

**Mr. JONES** (Cairns) (4.29 p.m.): The Opposition takes cognisance of the fact that the Bill has come before Parliament by way of a motion without notice, and I, as Transport spokesman for the Australian Labor Party and the Opposition in this Chamber, draw to the attention of the people of Queensland and Australia that procedure and also the manner in which the legislation is being placed on the statute-book.

In view of the protracted action that preceded the introduction of this measure, it is quite clear that its introduction has arisen from election jitters. If it were not so important, the Bill could be branded as another example of National-Liberal Party incompetence and termed a gimmick.

On the very eve of the prorogation of this Parliament, with the wave of a magic wand and a few "abracadabras" from the Minister—no doubt with the acquiescence of the Premier—this Bill has materialised like something from Pandora's box.

The Bill will pass through all stages with a measure of indecent haste. As I said earlier today, the Government cannot go onto the hustings in North Queensland without legislation of this type. I am quite sure that the honourable members who will speak to the Bill will be those representing the ports and the provincial cities along the coast of Queensland.

It is a pity that the Premier moved with such haste at the end of the exercise instead of at its beginning. The people of North Queensland, Central Queensland, the Peninsula and the Gulf have had to put up with the Premier's pussyfooting and procrastination, thereby suffering the serious disadvantage of lack of sea-road facilities.

For this I do not blame entirely the present incumbent of the Transport portfolio. I am aware of his predecessor's approach to this matter. Queensland's role should be one of participation in the service with a view to bringing about its complete integration.

As I say, the Premier, for reasons best known to himself, has been guilty of pussyfooting over this issue. Whether that is

because of his initial reluctance to see Australians in Australian ships serving Queensland ports, I do not know. Perhaps, as usual, he is just being perverse. But he is denying to industry and commerce in the northern and central ports an alternative service in the carriage of heavy and bulk cargoes. Sea transportation lends itself to the movement of heavy or awkward cargoes that cannot be carried satisfactorily by land transport without special expensive modifications.

The huge underlying costs of the delays that have occurred are unknown. I would not even hazard a guess at the vast losses that have been sustained by industry and commerce in North Queensland because of the denial of this intrastate service to them. What phenomenal hidden costs and charges are incurred? What freight differentials have been invoked? The tragedy is that all the added costs are a burden on people who live outside the metropolitan area. These costs could have been avoided by the Premier's co-operation at the outset.

It is well known that because of the Queensland Government's attitude, the proposed new port facilities for Cairns were not constructed by the Federal Government. The roll-on roll-off facilities proposed for the port of Cairns were denied them because the capital expenditure was not forthcoming to cope with the intrastate services. That facility and the service was lost to the port of Cairns because A.N.L. was denied the right to trade between Queensland ports; it could only operate interstate and backload interstate. While this was going on, the Queensland Government sat back and said that it was not Queensland's policy to allow Federal Government-owned lines to operate between Queensland ports.

In late 1976 the Government relaxed its policy slightly to allow cargo such as motor vehicles, tractors and trailers to be carried intrastate. During the years that A.N.L. was not allowed to move into general cargo-carrying between Queensland ports, Central and North Queenslanders were beset by higher living costs than those of people in the Brisbane area. The Queensland ban was a contributing factor in the mounting losses suffered by A.N.L. The mounting losses caused a dying back or stultifying of the line—and they were incurred simply because of the Queensland Government's inaction. More Queensland ports were cut off from scheduled A.N.L. services. For a long time we did not know if the proposition had been accepted. Procrastination still took place in negotiations between the Federal and Queensland Governments. As late as May this year, no information was known about the approval of freight rates.

Until today (when Parliament is asked to consider this legislation giving effect to the Queensland Government's agreement to the

A.N.L. line engaging in intrastate trade), this matter has been hung up because of the perverseness and obstructiveness of one man, that is, the Premier of Queensland.

**Dr. Scott-Young:** What rot!

**Mr. JONES:** I suggest that the honourable member for Townsville consult with the honourable member for Townsville West, who, I am sure, will tell him exactly who was the nigger in the woodpile in denying this service to Far North Queensland.

I do not think I am betraying a confidence between a Government Minister and me (as the Opposition spokesman on Transport) if I say that he told me categorically it was the Premier's perversity and obstruction which caused the trouble when the Australian Labor Party was in power in Canberra. The Premier became caught in his own net. The legislation is now before us in the dying stages of this Parliament. The honourable member for Townsville should talk to some of the members of the Townsville Harbour Board. He should examine the resolutions passed at harbour board conferences against the Premier. Those people are not always in our corner. The honourable member should not say, "What rot!" when the blame can be laid only at the Premier's feet. Meanwhile, who suffered? Our decentralised ports suffered. Our service suffered. The people of North Queensland suffered. The development of North Queensland suffered. We were just not given the service we needed.

On 9 August of this year I asked a question about the right of A.N.L. to trade intrastate and got the usual Government side-stepping. I was told that it was still being dealt with in correspondence and that a letter of 23 June had not been answered. The blame was placed on the Federal Government. That was the position two months ago. Now, with an election pending (and a Federal election probably to follow), Government members are not criticising the Federal Government any more. They have dropped that issue. However, two months ago it was a case of "kick the Feds". Government members were doing that all the time. Nixon brought them to heel, of course. They should talk to some of their Queensland Federal members to find out just who the obstructionist was. As far as we are concerned, this issue has been outstanding for far too long.

As recently as a fortnight ago, the Sunday papers were saying that our contention was still right; that any action was back in the Queensland Government's court. They said, in effect, that the Government had broken its promise on the matter of A.N.L. ships. That was the headline, as I recall it, in one of the Sunday papers not more than a fortnight ago. With the coming elections, there has been a cumulative effect. One felt rather like a spectator at a tennis match. Watching the performance of the two Governments was like watching two people who, never having

played tennis before, were flat out trying to get the ball over the net or even keep track of where it was. To the spectators it appeared that the two Governments did not know what court the ball was in. They were just hitting it from end to end, each trying to keep the issue out of its court. Each was trying to place the responsibility somewhere else.

The Opposition has no quarrel with the principles of the Bill. However, we believe that the obstructionist attitude of the Premier has effectively caused a continuance of high freight rates. He has pursued a course of denying progress to Queensland that has resulted in increased costs and freight charges to people in North and Central Queensland, in the Gulf areas, in the Peninsula and in the Torres Strait. The Government claims to champion competition, but in fact it allows the people of the North to foot the bill.

That is the Government's attitude. It talks about private enterprise, alternatives and freedom of choice; yet, when it comes to the crunch, it runs away from action. My attitude on the matter was recorded in "Hansard" on 16 October 1975, at page 125 of Volume 268. In that speech I indicated the A.L.P.'s approach to the right of choice and of access to alternative and competitive transportation by means of A.N.L.

I do not wish to labour the issue or take up any more of the Committee's time. However, I emphasise that this legislation, which is obviously so beneficial to country and provincial Queensland, was left to rot on the shelf until the last stages of this Parliament. Almost as an afterthought it is brought in. I am sure that North Queenslanders and people in the far-flung areas of Queensland, who have been suffering over a long period because of this Government's procrastination, will recognise this pattern of inaction by the Government. The A.L.P. supports the measure.

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER** (Townsville West) (4.44 p.m.): I will not say that this is the most important piece of legislation to have come before us in the life of this Parliament, but it is extremely important for most of the people of North Queensland. It is particularly important from my own personal viewpoint, as it has been an issue with which I have been involved for four or five years—long before I became a member of this Parliament.

For the information of the honourable member for Cairns, who spoke about the Bill being introduced as an election issue because the Government has election jitters, that is the greatest lot of tripe and garbage that I have heard from him in the last three years.

**Mr. Jones** interjected.

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER:** If the honourable member for Cairns will just be quiet for a moment, I will tell him a little about the history of the A.N.L. operations in Queensland. Long before that line operated a shipping route along the Queensland coast, private shipping companies operated between Brisbane and other Queensland ports. When A.N.L. decided to operate along the Queensland coast there was no need for it to operate intrastate. Private shipping lines were already performing that service. So it requested, under its original charter, the right to operate to the capital city and provincial ports from the other States.

John Burke and other companies were operating on the Queensland coast and shipping intrastate. When it became unprofitable and those lines pulled out of the intrastate trade, as is normal business practice, A.N.L. decided it wished to partake and have part of the action. This was long before the advent of the Whitlam Government, so no credit whatever can be given to Whitlam and his cohorts in Canberra for trying to introduce this policy of intrastate shipping for A.N.L. During those days the development bureau, the chambers of commerce and other interested people in North Queensland were trying to convince the Queensland Government and also the McMahon Government of the need to introduce an intrastate shipping service from Brisbane to other Queensland ports. So no new issue was created by the Whitlam Government.

The main reason why the State Government would not support the concept of intrastate trading was that it sincerely believed, on the information it had available from departmental officers, that it would jeopardise a few thousand railway jobs. The honourable member for Cairns, who was a railwayman, should acknowledge the sincerity of the Government's wishes in those days to try to protect the jobs of Queensland railwaymen.

I for one, as a member of the Townsville Harbour Board, was not prepared to accept four or five years ago that it would jeopardise the jobs of railwaymen. I was one of the men who decided to support the development bureau, the chambers of commerce and the Townsville Harbour Board in their submissions to the Queensland Government for intrastate trading to be started in Queensland. It was quite a job to convince departmental heads, who were working for the benefit of Queensland employees, that it would not jeopardise the jobs of railwaymen to any great extent. Certainly there would be some losses from time to time but we believed sincerely, and the Government now accepts, that the initial loss in trade will be made up by natural growth in all forms of transport in this most decentralised and developing State.

As far back as May 1975 the Premier, in discussions with the late Minister for Transport (Mr. Keith Hooper), decided that Mr. Hooper should go to Townsville and meet deputations. The Commissioner for Transport (Mr. Seeney) was at those deputations and would confirm that a few dozen businessmen came along and one by one said that no section of North Queensland industry would be disadvantaged by the advent of intrastate shipping. Those deputations were well received by the late Minister for Transport. The Minister conveyed those sentiments to Cabinet. From there on it became an issue. More inquiries were made into how far Queensland's employees in both the road and rail systems could be disadvantaged if the shipping service commenced. The honourable member for Cairns is so far out it doesn't matter. He is the member for Cairns, a shipping port, and should know about the history of A.N.L. The unions eventually conceded that there would be no loss of railwaymen's jobs.

Let us not forget that there is fair amount of activity because A.N.L. ships come to Townsville, Mackay and Cairns. Permanent staff is employed by A.N.L. in all of those ports. The transport companies which convey goods to and from the harbour have permanent employees. A lot of the goods finish up in the railway goods yards in Townsville and other provincial ports, and from them are dispatched to outside centres. Therefore a lot of jobs would be at stake if the A.N.L. services were terminated.

In all of the ships that have been going north in recent years there has been empty cargo space which could have carried 800 to 1 000 tonnes. This is one of the reasons why shipping charges on the northern coastal route have to be maintained at fairly high levels. They have to make up for the losses incurred by that empty space. It is very costly to run a ship up the coast partly empty when it could be employed in carrying full cargoes, particularly Queensland cargoes. Many Queensland manufacturers are disadvantaged because local and northern people have to place their orders in Sydney and Melbourne rather than in Brisbane. The shipping service gives them a much faster service to North Queensland, and at a reasonable freight rate. All that keeps the service to North Queensland going is the amount of backloading that A.N.L. ships obtain from Townsville. They take south in backloading as much copper as the amount of freight brought north to Townsville, if not more. If that backloading had been lost, this shipping service would have been terminated as long ago as two years.

The introduction of the A.N.L. shipping service will not lead to any great reduction in freights generally. This is where the honourable member for Cairns is again so

incorrect. Shipping costs are not very low. Ships excel over long distances. For distances up to about 250 miles, I should think that road transport would be the cheapest. I imagine that up to about 500 miles rail transport would be the most competitive. But when it gets to more than 500 miles from base, sea transport wins hands down, particularly with bulk cargoes such as motor cars, heavy machinery and containerised goods. This is the type of cargo for which A.N.L. ships are specially built.

It will be cheaper to move some goods by sea from Brisbane to Townsville. The freight on motor cars would be approximately \$100 less—naturally a benefit to North Queensland consumers. We in the North believe that we should receive as much help as possible from Governments and should not be restricted to road or rail transport.

Almost every year North Queensland suffers from major floods. Sections of railway line are washed away; road bridges and roads are damaged, and sometimes for one or two weeks at a time neither road nor rail transport is available. At such times a sea transport service is essential but it has not always been available. Sea transport has not always been agreed to readily by the Government. By the time it has been authorised, quite often roads and bridges have been repaired and it is no longer needed. In future if there is a major breakdown in road and rail transport, or there are industrial stoppages, shipping services will be available as an alternative means of transport.

We believe that the people of North Queensland should be able to choose the type of transport they want. The service by sea is very quick. Ships arrive in the morning and turn round so quickly that they are gone by late afternoon. It is also a clean service. Motor cars transported by rail have to be covered with a coating to prevent damage from flying steel particles on the way North and it costs approximately \$50 to wash down each car when it arrives in North Queensland. The shipping service is quite clean and cars arriving by sea are driven straight from the deck or hold to the wharf.

It is complete twaddle to say that the Premier has never been behind the provision of a sea transport service to the North. I have with me a considerable number of newspaper clippings which show that over the last 12 months or even two years the Premier has given his support to such a service. It is all very well for the honourable member for Rockhampton North to laugh. He should read the Rockhampton papers. One cutting that I have picked up quite at random shows that on 15 March the Premier said quite emphatically that such a service would be introduced as soon as he could make satisfactory arrangements with the Federal Minister for Transport on a basis of agreement that would not disadvantage

Queensland. A.L.P. members would give the whole lot away to Canberra. All they want is a centralist Government and a centralist policy. They would give the whole State away. That is all the A.L.P. ever thinks of.

#### Opposition Members interjected.

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER:** They are all starting to bite now. If they are hit hard, they start to bite. The Premier, the Minister for Transport and the rest of the Government will not give away the right of the State to say how people will operate within Queensland. If they did what the A.L.P. would like them to do, there would be no State left at all.

The crux of the agreement between the Federal Government and the State Government is protection of the rights of Queenslanders. They will be protected because the Prime Minister has now said that he agrees with the Queensland Premier and will initiate complementary legislation so that an agreement will pass through both Houses. In the result, we in Queensland will not be disadvantaged.

While I am speaking of the Government's renewed interest in this matter as a means of assisting North Queensland, I might also add that I think the Government should take more interest in the affairs of decentralised ports. I refer particularly to some of the trade which is being lost to North Queensland ports, particularly that which is coming to Brisbane. Quite a few years ago all the meat that was produced in the Gulf, on the Peninsula and in the west was slaughtered in Townsville and Rockhampton and exported through those ports. In more recent years, because of pressure from Brisbane-based exporters, all the meat is railed down here in refrigerated cars and exported through the port of Brisbane. The exporter and the overseas buyer are not going to pay extra money for that, so it is costing the poor old grower 4c to 5c a lb. extra which comes off his price, as a contribution to the Brisbane exporter. We have copped that for a few years and have not liked it very much.

The latest conflict is over the export of wool. Just after the war the port of Townsville exported 120,000-odd bales of wool each year from North and North-west Queensland wool producers. But over a period the giant octopus in Brisbane finally got the wool brought down to Brisbane to be exported through the port of Brisbane. In an endeavour to save costs to primary producers enterprising businessmen in the North have now introduced a scheme to export wool through Townsville. This has been going on for the past six months. They have established wool presses which compress wool bales to about a quarter of their size when they leave the wool-sheds. They are then loaded into containers and exported to Japan and North America. This service was instituted at a cost of about \$300,000 but it is saving the northern wool producers about \$5 per bale,

which is a very handy sum in times of need. Now, all of a sudden, the wool-dumping people in Brisbane—again the octopus—are saying, “We can’t afford to lose this sort of trade to North Queensland.” They are putting pressure on the overseas shipping conferences to export all the wool from Brisbane and not through the port of Townsville. I think this is the sort of thing our Government should be looking at and saying to these people in Brisbane, “Look, you can’t have it all your own way. We are spending a lot of money on the new port of Brisbane but you cannot have the damn lot.” Let us keep the trade that belongs to our northern regions in our provincial ports of Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns.

With those few words, I would like to say once again that I support the Bill wholeheartedly. I am very pleased to see it being introduced and I know the people of North Queensland will support the Government on its action.

**Mr. YEWDAL** (Rockhampton North) (4.57 p.m.): I would like to take a few moments to speak from some practical experience of the functions of the A.N.L. shipping line on the coast of Queensland. I listened intently to the honourable member for Townsville West and he tended to contradict himself. He began by saying that the Government’s advisers contended that because of the adverse effect on the employment of railway workers they were not prepared to allow A.N.L. ships to pick up cargo at Queensland ports for the purpose of moving it up and down the coast, but in his next breath he said it was quite obvious that the railway unions accepted the fact that everybody else agreed that this would not adversely affect the employment of railway workers. I accept that because it is correct, but why he procrastinated and said that the Government’s advisers had mentioned this drastic effect on employment in the Railway Department I will never know.

The honourable member referred to his involvement for about four or five years in Townsville with, I think, the harbour board, but this argument about A.N.L. ships trading in Queensland has been going on not for the past four or five years, or even the past 18 months, which was the period he said the Premier had been interested in it, but to my knowledge for 10 to 14 years. As an officer of the Waterside Workers Federation in Rockhampton I was involved at great length in the initial discussions with the principals of the A.N.L. in the setting up of the A.N.L. terminal at Port Alma. I am referring to a period before that terminal was ever established when the A.N.L. ships used to trade up and down the coast of Queensland. They used to sail up the Fitzroy River and unload at the town wharves in Rockhampton. That situation existed at least 28 years ago. But the case has been argued for years, as the honourable member for Cairns pointed out very clearly.

When the Whitlam Government came to power it immediately approached the State and wanted to discuss the implementation of such a service, but, no, the Premier would not talk about it. A large number of people all along the coast, members of harbour boards, chambers of commerce, promotion bureaux—you name it—were all concerned about it. No move was made until 12 months ago, and it has taken the Government 12 months to introduce the Bill. The Minister said earlier that, because of all the technical and constitutional problems, the matter had to be considered carefully. It has been given real consideration only in the last 18 months, and now today, some five weeks from the next State election, the Government is introducing a Bill to allow this movement of shipping to take place.

I quickly looked through some Press cuttings relating to this subject. On 11 August this year there was a heading “N.Q. graziers being ‘ripped off’ over shipping demands”, and the chairman of the Townsville Harbour Board, Mr. Field, berated the Queensland Government over the situation.

**Mr. M. D. Hooper:** That was wool.

**Mr. YEWDAL:** It is still cargo. That was what was happening, and Mr. Field blamed the present Government. In January of this year we saw such headlines as “Queensland authorities angry over inaction on ANL withdrawal”, “A.N.L. ships coastal hope” and “Government broke its ships promise”. It is all in print, and these are not my words; they are the words of people right up and down the coast of Queensland who were concerned about the situation. Mr. Field also said that the Government was ruining coastal shipping. One does not have to come into this Chamber and put forward a political argument from the Opposition benches. One only has to state the facts of what has been happening over many years.

People in business, particularly those in Rockhampton, were trying to assist the A.N.L. People in the motor trade were bringing new vehicles up by sea, and I agree with the honourable member for Townsville West that it was a good method of transporting the vehicles. They were moved off the ship and driven a short distance from Port Alma to Rockhampton, and usually the vehicles were in very good condition. I drove the crane on the wharf at Port Alma that picked the vehicles off the decks of the ships, and I helped load and unload many A.N.L. vessels.

The Rockhampton Harbour Board has argued with the Government for more than a decade over the development of a shipping service, particularly a service to Port Alma. It was parochial enough to argue strongly for its own area. Finally, A.N.L. terminals were constructed at Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville and Cairns. But it would seem

to me that because of all this delay and procrastination by Governments, particularly by the present Queensland Government, many people who were moving towards using this type of transport decided that as they could not have other cargo picked up in Brisbane and brought to Rockhampton, or carried from Rockhampton to Townsville, or perhaps from Cairns down the coast to Rockhampton or Brisbane, they would drift away from sea transport, and they went back to road or rail transport, or whatever form of transport was available to them.

The fact is that the Government has been responsible for the delay and for all the problems associated with it. If we keep saying that all the constitutional problems and technical aspects of proposed changes must be considered, we will never get anywhere. The Government has been saying those things year after year. But when an election is about to be held, it can be done today by the reluctant Minister for Transport, who I am sure is not really happy about having to introduce the Bill and try to get it through all stages on the second last day of the sitting of this Parliament. I do not think that is good enough, and I believe that the people of Queensland, particularly those involved in shipping goods up the coast of this State, should certainly be made conversant with the reason for all the delays that have taken place and with all the ramifications of the situation.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG** (Townsville) (5.4 p.m.): I consider that in one way this is an opportune time and in another way an inopportune time to introduce such important legislation. It is inopportune in that the Opposition will say that the Government is using it as an election stunt and that the Premier is grandstanding again.

**Mr. Wright:** I am pleased to hear you admit it.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** That is what the A.L.P. will say. I am not happy that it has been brought before the Committee at such short notice. As has been done with other important legislation, I think it should have been brought into the Chamber, debated, read a first time and allowed to lie on the table for consideration and submissions.

I should also like to defend the Premier's position in this matter. The Premier has criticised the Liberal Party today. I for one have never climbed on anyone's coat-tails, and I do not intend to. Anything I have done, I have done off my own bat. I do not consider that the Premier included me in his attack. But whether or not he did, I must spring to his defence in this matter.

The Premier has acted very thoughtfully and carefully. If members of the Opposition were to attempt to consider the reasons, they would realise that he was influenced by two

factors, firstly, the Commonwealth Constitution and, secondly, the jobs of people employed in the transport industry.

Queensland has a very viable transport industry, and it would be a shame if, because of political pressure and sectional pressure—and do not underrate the sectional pressure—the Premier rushed headlong into legislation that jeopardised the position not only of transport workers but also of others who rely on transport for their goods.

On the constitutional side, because we are surrounded by a Marxist movement, spear-headed by the Labor Party—people who are hell-bent on tearing the Constitution apart and embracing all of the States under one centralist Government—the Premier acted in an extremely cautious manner.

In the Labor Party's 1972 policy speech Mr. Whitlam said—

“A Federal Labor Government will promptly restore the machinery the Constitution intended and vest it with the Commonwealth's constitutional powers to plan and provide modern means of communications between the States.”

To me that sounds like a reference to the Interstate Commission.

Later, in talking about shipping, he said—

“It shall be an objective of a Labor Government that a fair share of Australia's trade shall be carried in Australian-owned and Australian-manned ships. Future development of Australian shipping will be through expansion into the overseas trade, especially bulk cargoes. To enable a smooth transition into overseas shipping, a Labor Government will establish a joint shipping venture between the A.N.L. and the private shipowners.”

**Mr. Jones:** What's wrong with that?

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** You don't take a taipan to your bosom!

He went on to say—

“To encourage further maritime employment, and shipbuilding activity, a Labor Government will introduce a system for ship construction finance along the lines of the Japanese Government's Import-Export Bank operations to enable shipowners to avoid extensive capital outlays before the ship becomes fully earning. To avoid this long-term financing becoming a burden on the Reserve Bank, the private bankers' own bank, the Australian Resources Development Bank, will be encouraged to fund ship construction under Commonwealth guarantee.”

The Labor Party wanted Queensland and other States to be placed under Commonwealth control.

I am a bit frightened that the Minister introducing this Bill has not spelt out the various problems associated with it. From

his very rapid introductory speech—I could not hear half of what he was saying because he was rushing through it—I gather that this Bill will operate only for 12 months. This is too important an issue to be clowning on it. Surely a better Bill than this could have been brought forward.

The A.L.P. has always recommended the nationalisation or the rationalisation of the stevedoring industry. I can just imagine an old group of radical wharfies—to which the honourable member for Rockhampton North no doubt belonged—working as public servants under a nationalised system. I can just imagine a lot of the old free-thinking wharfies and their radical mates kowtowing to a bureaucrat sitting somewhere in Canberra. It is ridiculous even to contemplate it. With due respect to the Waterside Workers' Federation, which is now controlled by a coterie of Communists, I say that at least it has done something. In the early days the waterside workers were imposed upon. They carried very heavy weights. I have never seen so many hernias as those suffered by waterside workers. They were imposed upon by international groups, not only in Australia but in other countries as well. In the Far East they are still imposed upon. In these days of mechanisation and modernisation the stevedoring industry has become virtually a closed shop of technicians.

If the Commonwealth rationalises or nationalises the industry there will be no additional employment for waterside labour. The Commonwealth will fund the wharves and loading facilities and mechanise them, thus creating further unemployment and loss of job opportunities. The waterside workers will be no better off than they are under the present free-enterprise system.

Australia has 90 ports grouped under 30 or more authorities, none of which seem to have a common aim. They all work as individual groups. Over a number of years we lost our ship-building industry. With our extensive coastline we should build our own ships, but we have allowed our shipping industry to fall apart. Commonwealth Governments, irrespective of their political colour, did nothing to help the Australian shipbuilding industry. They had a multitude of theories, but not one of them got off its backside and put money into shipbuilding. We have lost that industry, the techniques, the enterprise and the will to build ships. In Korea, four 10,000-tonners are built in the one dock. The Koreans turn out six 100,000-tonners in a year. We cannot compete with them even though their salaries and wages are only slightly lower than ours. However, their cost of living is a damn sight cheaper, and they are better off than our men. Even the little coastal shipbuilding yard at Maryborough faded away because it was not helped.

I pay tribute to local harbour boards in Queensland, which have often worked under considerable difficulties. The Townsville Harbour Board has been lucky to have extremely good administrators. I pay tribute to Mr. Bert Field and Mr. Alan Hope, who have shown considerable enterprise and ability in juggling dollars and cents. As a result, the Townsville port is far ahead of other ports in Queensland. It is a man-made port, but the stevedoring equipment is extremely good.

Irrespective of whether A.N.L. takes charge, the wharfies are not happy with it. The stevedoring foremen's association is not happy with A.N.L. because it does not employ adequate staff on its ships. It always employs fewer stevedoring foremen than it should, which is a constant source of worry to the men. This matter should be noted, and if we enter into a Commonwealth-State agreement it should be fully investigated.

I view this Bill with considerable trepidation. I see another State matter being given over gradually to a centralist Government. I agree completely with the Premier and congratulate him on the thought and care he devoted to this matter before the measure was introduced. I would like to have seen it introduced and then allowed to lie on the table, but we have to accept it.

**Mr. WRIGHT** (Rockhampton) (5.14 p.m.): I am surprised at the honourable member for Townsville, representing as he does a northern port and northern people, adopting such an attitude to this legislation. I should have thought that he would have been prepared to say that one of the most important advances for the people of the North and those whose economy centres on the 14 ports between Brisbane and the Gulf, concerns the right of the A.N.L. to engage in intrastate shipping services. No doubt this matter will be raised against the honourable member during the forthcoming election campaign. He stands indicted on his own comments.

The real facts were brought forth by the honourable member for Townsville West, who told us that the Premier decided on this matter 12 months ago. Yet the Premier waited all this time, and the legislation has been introduced on the second last day of the Parliament by the Minister for Transport. This legislation has been requested for many years. My colleague the honourable member for Rockhampton North said that this question has been going on for decades. I know that I was involved in it in 1969 and 1972.

In 1974, on 8 August, I again raised the issue with the Premier in my Address-and-Reply speech. I pointed out the problems being encountered by the people in the various areas. But the Premier was adamant that nothing would be done. At that time he had two reasons. One, which

was quite obvious, was that he was against the Labor Government. The second, that which he kept talking about, was the problems for railwaymen. However, that was constantly denied by the A.R.U. and those in the railway industry.

The member for Townsville West said that even in May 1975 the people of Townsville were saying that this link was of vital importance to their economy; that it was a must. They were saying, "We must have these ships involved in intrastate trade." The Premier was still saying, "No." Why? Because Labor was in power in Canberra. That is what it was all about. The Premier does not care too much about what happens to this State, provided he can pursue his philosophy of opposing the Labor Party and chasing his Communists. I am sure he checks around every corner to see if there are any Communists there. That is the attitude he adopts.

The Premier has consistently refused to consider the needs of the ports. The one that concerns me more than any other is, naturally, Port Alma, which is part of my electorate. Because of the Government's policy—because of the attitude that has been adopted by the Premier in particular and by the Government in general—Port Alma has been in serious financial trouble for many years. It has lost millions of dollars and it has forced a debt on the people of Rockhampton through an agreement with the Rockhampton City Council that has been costing the ratepayers in the vicinity of \$100,000 every year. Year after year it has been costing them this money; yet the member for Townsville said that intrastate trading by A.N.L. was unnecessary. I do not believe that the legislation will overcome the problems of Port Alma; but I know that, had it been passed some years ago, we would certainly not be in our present financial situation.

The number of workers in the port itself has dropped from 150 in the 1969-70 period down to 25. The effects have been felt not only by wharfies, but also by clerks and transport workers who are involved in transshipping materials from the city of Rockhampton to the port itself. Dozens of families have been affected. Families have left the city. Men have left the job.

**Mr. Moore:** What about the railways?

**Mr. WRIGHT:** It won't effect the railways. That is the whole point. I discussed this matter with a member of the A.R.U. I went to the unions and said, "How will it affect you, because we don't want to rob Peter to pay Paul?" They said, "We have looked at it very carefully." Just as the member's own colleague from Townsville West has said, it will not affect the railway workers. Regardless of that—regardless of the pleas that were being made by businesses, the pleas that were being made

by ordinary people and the pleas that were being made by city councils and the shires in the various areas—the Premier refused to do anything about it.

That is typical of this Government's attitude to decentralisation. The member for Townsville talked about the centralist policies of the Whitlam Government and Labor generally. There is not a more centralist party or Government in this nation than the one we presently have on the Treasury benches in this Assembly. We only have to look at where the Ministers come from. I know that the country members must be totally fed up with what is going on, but they just can't get a portfolio. Val Bird was given a portfolio mainly because he was a northern member. The Government had to do something about at least getting another northern fellow, so Val Bird was given the portfolio of Education.

**Mr. Jones:** He received it because he opposed the Premier and seconded the nomination of the former Speaker.

**Mr. WRIGHT:** I accept that that was one of the reasons.

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

**Mr. WRIGHT:** The administration is totally centred in Brisbane. We don't see the Government building massive administration centres in country areas to decentralise decision-making processes. Oh, no! All decisions have to be made in Brisbane. The saying used to be that all roads lead to Rome. Certainly under this Government all roads lead to Brisbane, and that is going to continue.

The matter was raised in the Budget. Money that should be spent on the needs of the people of Queensland is being spent mainly in Brisbane. The amount of money being spent on hospitals in Brisbane is four times that being spent in country areas. The same applies in all other areas of Government administration. What do we find Government members doing? They shut up or make excuses for their own Ministers and for the Government. They certainly have no case to put forward. They ought not to be commended for what they have done in this instance; they ought to be condemned. This is what members of the Opposition are doing. Reading between the lines, we see that the member for Townsville West was really condemning his own Government for the procrastination and lack of interest in northern areas.

I started out by saying I am pleased that at long last something is being done. It is long overdue. I hope that some life may now be injected into some of those ports that have been dying under the policies of this Government.

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (5.20 p.m.), in reply: One would really think that the legislation was designed to prevent A.N.L. from operating rather than permit it to function. I assure the Opposition that this is no election gimmick. As I said earlier, whether the Opposition agrees with the proposal or not, it is solely the result of protracted consultation between Federal and State authorities to make sure that the legislation is free from such imperfections as might be the basis of a legal challenge. That comment answers the honourable member for Cairns.

The honourable member for Townsville West has always been a staunch advocate of an A.N.L. service. He gave an interesting history of the trends in coastal shipping. He was a tenacious critic of the Government before entering Parliament and since entering it he has constantly prodded the Government to provide this service. He made reference to the late Keith Hooper, whose death we lamented. Naturally he spent many hours in consultation with his Federal counterpart and his officers. He also pointed out that, being sea transport, economies in freight would be achieved.

The honourable member for Townsville complained of the short notice given of this legislation. I simply say to him that it is better late than never. He inquired whether the legislation will have force for only 12 months. I apologise if I did not articulate clearly on that point. The authority will continue in force until such time as the Governor, by proclamation, fixes a date on which the Act ceases to be in force, which would be not earlier than 12 months. The Bill also provides for six months' notice in the event of any withdrawal from the agreement.

I think that covers the points raised by honourable members.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

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) (5.24 p.m.), by leave: I move—

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

At the outset I must say that I appreciate the co-operation extended to me by honourable members. The criticism by the honourable member for Cairns about the time taken to bring this measure before the House

was ably answered, I thought, by the honourable member for Townsville West. The Government was conscious that the entry of A.N.L. into intrastate shipping could have some effect on other transport services and we wanted to make sure that these were minimal and that no railway workers would be displaced. In addition, as mentioned, there was a need to maintain the State's rights in the transport area.

This was not a matter to be entered into lightly and, as I have said, the means by which it was to be done involved some heavy legal considerations and discussions between Commonwealth and State officials. It took some time to bring to a satisfactory conclusion the correspondence between the Prime Minister and the Premier, apart from correspondence and discussions between the Commonwealth and State Transport Ministers. The Government of this State takes its responsibilities seriously.

I have heard the comments about A.N.L. and its profitability. I suggest that honourable members have only to look at its annual report to see its true position. If the seamen and wharf operators had not made exorbitant demands on A.N.L., there would have been no question about its operations being profitable. Union demands, not the small volume of intrastate carriage of goods, have determined the profitability of A.N.L.

The Bill has had to follow the normal course of important measures and it is fortuitous that all measures were resolved in time for the Bill to be brought before the House today.

Details of the Bill were given at the introductory stage and I think all members are clear on its purposes. I repeat what I said to the honourable member for Townsville; the Bill is not for only 12 months. It operates until it is proclaimed to cease to be in force. That is the roundabout way in which the lawyers draft it. In any case, it continues for at least 12 months after gazettal of the proclamation. This will enable A.N.L. to complete its obligations concerning services and contracts entered into. It is not envisaged, of course, that that will be the limit of its operations.

**Mr. JONES** (Cairns) (5.27 p.m.): In replying at the introductory stage the Minister said that the Bill was solely the result of protracted consultation to obtain perfection. The operative word is, of course, "protracted". I do not want to rehash what I have said already. In the limited time available while the Minister was speaking, I attempted to peruse the Bill in detail. If there were certain constitutional difficulties associated with the implementation of the proposal, the Minister was extremely careful not to mention them and give the House details of them.

The Minister also said that consideration was given to other forms of transport to ensure that the effect on them was minimal. Surely it did not take all those years to decide that issue. I realise, of course, that the present Minister for Transport was not a party to those negotiations. But I still cannot believe that the previous Minister for Transport would have taken all that time to make such a determination.

The alleged rights of the State of Queensland were likewise not elaborated on. I think this was probably the bushel that the Premier hid behind in his procrastination and perversity. I think that is the argument that the Minister should have used and the one to which more credence could have been given. The Australian Shipping Commission operates the Australian National Line under the Commonwealth Constitution and the Australian Shipping Commission Act 1956-1974. The Bill now before us will ratify the agreement with the Commonwealth. This agreement will enable the Commonwealth to amend its own Act and to give the Australian Shipping Commission authority to operate intrastate.

The Minister said at the introductory stage that the discussions between the Federal and State Governments had proved complex. Of course, they may well have been complex. I still cannot understand the delay that was occasioned if that was the only reason for discussion. Provided this service receives the authorisation of the Federal Minister for Transport the Australian Shipping Commission will be granted approval to operate, and I think that is all that is needed. The honourable member for Townsville West let the cat out of the bag. His speech indicated a certain prickly conscience, and I thought he was inclined to protest too much. From my investigations the A.N.L. "Trader" ships have a 600 to 1 000 tonne unused capacity each week when they sail from Brisbane to other Queensland ports while the Queensland Railways carry approximately 2 000 000 tonnes of general cargo each year, although those figures are only approximate. Taking the maximum unused capacity of the A.N.L. ships, if they were sailing every week the total tonnage lost to the railways would be only 50 000 tonnes each year, which would not make much of an inroad into the railway's profitability. Railwaymen give good service, and they will continue to do so, and I am sure that neither the Railway Commissioner nor his servants, as we were called in the early days when I was in the railways, would be unduly concerned about the competition. But the point that I make is that—

**Mr. Moore:** There is only so much cargo capacity to be shared, isn't there?

**Mr. JONES:** According to the honourable member's philosophy, this would be good because it keeps private enterprise moving, keeps the employment situation buoyant and

it also keeps costs down. I think if the honourable member applies that to the private enterprise sector in the transportation field, he must also apply it in the public sector.

The other point I made, and which I wish to emphasise, is that the type of freight which lends itself to sea transport finds itself facing extra built-in charges when it is carried on land, especially if larger cargoes have to be broken down. Road permit fees aside, with increased petrol and oil costs road transport prices will inevitably become prohibitive for people in Central and North Queensland. This measure will at least give an alternative form of transport to people in North Queensland, Central Queensland, the Gulf of Carpentaria, the Peninsula and the Torres Strait islands.

Apparently the honourable member for Townsville does not want to have Australian ships manned by Australian crews carrying Australian cargoes. He would like to have Japanese ships carrying Japanese cars to Australia and Japanese ships manned by Japanese crews taking our coal to Japan. Taking that argument to its logical conclusion, we could have the Chinese transporting our wheat and sugar and inevitably the Japanese will be able to come and mine our coal, load it into their ships and cart it back to Japan. Perhaps the Government will even allow the Chinese to come in and harvest our sugar next. Then the honourable member has the temerity to complain because we do not have a shipbuilding industry in Australia. The arguments put forward by Government members are fallacious. They have no merit at all. I believe that the delay occasioned in bringing this legislation forward is uncalled for and unnecessary.

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER** (Townsville West) (5.35 p.m.): I wish to briefly reiterate that one of the reasons the Government was tardy in introducing this legislation—I use that expression because I was one of its critics in that respect—was that its advisers suggested that railway employment might suffer. When I refer to the Government's advisers, I am not referring to the railway unions; they are always anti-Government whether or not a worth-while proposal is put forward. The Government was advised four or five years ago that the jobs of railwaymen could be jeopardised by the introduction of an A.N.L. shipping service between coastal ports; there is no doubt about that. That was the advice given to the Government, and a responsible Government takes note of the fact that the jobs of 2,500 railwaymen on the coastal route could be at stake. I have to concede that, before Queensland reached its present stage of development, that might have been a possibility.

Later—perhaps three or four years ago—the unions themselves came to realise that sometimes there were delays of a couple of weeks in getting rail cargoes from Brisbane to Townsville. They then agreed that there

would no longer be any trouble in allowing A.N.L. ships to operate between Brisbane and northern ports, and they supported the Chamber of Commerce, the Development Bureau and the Townsville Harbour Board in seeking to have that service introduced. So the honourable member for Cairns is not quite correct on the early history of the railway unions.

One matter that must be considered—and it has not been mentioned in the debate so far—is that the introduction of A.N.L. ships will provide an alternative to road transport, in particular. The roads in this State are being used more and more because the Government has reduced road permit fees over the last three years. That in itself has been of tremendous assistance to rural and provincial towns and cities because it has meant that goods can be brought there a little more cheaply. However, it has also meant that more intrastate road hauliers are using the roads—not only main roads, but local authority roads—and local authorities throughout the State are now screaming about the amount of road transport passing through their areas.

Let us face it, Mr. Speaker; the A.N.L. will have to win back trade, because the railways give fairly hefty concessions on some goods carried from Brisbane northwards. I will admit that they do not give similar concessions on northern goods going to Brisbane, but they do give good concessions on railway freight travelling northwards. Whatever trade the A.N.L. ships win back will benefit the Main Roads Department and some local authorities by reducing the maintenance required on some of the main arterial roads.

Let me say briefly that the Queensland Government has no record of hate against the Australian National Line or a Federal Government of a particular political persuasion in saying that the line could not operate between Queensland ports. What gives the A.L.P. that idea? If Labor members think it is an election gimmick, they are so far wrong that it does not matter. The honourable member for Port Curtis should have some knowledge of this. If he has not, I will give him some information now. Since 1971 A.N.L. ships have been carrying bauxite from Weipa to Gladstone and southern ports, and also picking up alumina ingots in Gladstone and taking them farther south.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER:** Honourable members opposite do not even know that A.N.L. ships have been operating between Queensland ports.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER:** I have to tell the honourable member for Port Curtis because he has not said a word so far. Obviously he does not know anything about it. His

constituents in Port Curtis will be surprised to learn how little he knows about the shipping that goes through the port.

As I said earlier, the John Burke shipping company did have the right to trade intrastate, as did other private shipping companies. When they were operating, the Queensland Government did not want to jeopardise private industry by bringing in a Government-owned line or a Government authority. That is why it did not allow A.N.L. to compete against John Burke in the early days. John Burke still has the right to trade intrastate, and so has any other private company.

**Mr. Casey:** John Burke has already left the trade.

**Mr. M. D. HOOPER:** Yes, but another company could come in and operate on a similar basis between Queensland ports. Because no company has done so, at last the Queensland Government can see that a service must be initiated between Brisbane and North Queensland ports and has made a move to provide such a service. It has been wise in making sure that the jobs of railwaymen were not jeopardised. I have no hesitation in saying that I think it could have acted earlier, but the mere fact that it has acted makes me very happy indeed.

Once again I indicate that I support the Bill.

**Mr. CASEY** (Mackay) (5.39 p.m.): Obviously quite a lot of heat is being generated by some aspects of the debate. That is rather a pity, because I do not think that any northern member would disagree with me when I say that the maintenance by A.N.L. of a shipping service to the North is of vital importance to the whole of North Queensland. The fact is that the A.N.L. shipping service to North Queensland can be maintained only if the company is allowed to trade intrastate with its container vessels to ensure that they get sufficient cargo.

I was a member of a harbour board at the time when the deal was negotiated with A.N.L. to construct container terminals in the ports throughout Queensland. The member for Townsville West has spoken about John Burke and other private shipping companies. John Burke went right out of the east-coast trade long before the container terminals were built in Queensland.

**Mr. Simpson:** He has not.

**Mr. CASEY:** John Burke was well and truly gone long before that.

I am sure that the Minister for Police, the member for Mirani, would remember that just after the war years the old freighter "Time" used to sail regularly from Melbourne to North Queensland with cargo. In fact there was an old story in the North that whenever there was a shortage of something everyone would say, "It's coming on the 'Time'." On one occasion, however,

the "Time" did not even get out of Port Phillip. Down she went, and that was the end of everything on board. And that was the end of the east-coast shipping service until A.N.L. entered the field.

A.N.L. did an excellent job in bringing trade to northern ports at a time when no private-enterprise shipper would become involved in it. Every year, in order to maintain a shipping service to North Queensland, A.N.L. is losing a lot of money. Its losses are being met, of course, by the Federal Government. However it can afford to lose only so much. It is now faced with the prospect of having to curtail its services. This state of affairs led to the recent crisis.

When the deals were negotiated 10 years ago for the construction of the container terminals, the ports in North Queensland were opened up to the most modern form of shipping anywhere in the world. But there was one flaw, and it was obvious at the time to the harbour boards. Overseas container ships that traded to southern ports and to Brisbane could not afford to come on to the northern ports to unload their cargoes. A great deal of money had been sunk into the provision of container facilities at northern ports not only by A.N.L. but also by the harbour boards. Unfortunately, the steel trade dropped off and, as outlined by the member for Cairns, competition from the Queensland railways was so keen that meat cargoes that formerly left Queensland ports were brought by rail to Brisbane for shipment overseas.

I am not going into the way in which the Queensland Government, through the Railway Department, can manipulate freight charges in order to compete against A.N.L. What I am stressing is the need to provide merchants in North Queensland with an alternative method of shipping at all times.

Mention has been made of meat exports. An overseas container ship can come into Townsville and load a meat cargo, but it cannot go to either Mackay or Cairns to load cargoes there. A great number of matters have been talked about, all of which highlight the need for this Bill. At the introductory stage the Minister said that the Bill was similar to one introduced in 1974 in relation to the operations in Queensland of the Snowy Mountains Authority. If it was only a matter of allowing that authority to operate in Queensland under the terms of a simple piece of Queensland legislation, why could not something similar have been done for A.N.L. at the same time? In 1974 the Whitlam Labor Government was in office in Canberra and it wanted to carry out a proper assessment of the Burdekin River project. That could not be done without the legislative approval of this Par-

liament. It became involved in it. There is no reason why we could not pass similar legislation to enable A.N.L. to become involved in intrastate trading. There is nothing specific in this purely enabling legislation, other than the authority that comes back to the Minister of the Crown to approve in writing the establishment and operation of such a service.

As so many cargoes are more suited to transport by shipping than carriage by other means, it is a great tragedy that this legislation was not introduced many years ago, without any hassle. It is a tragedy that the Government has delayed for so long. There is nothing substantive in the legislation; it merely provides a framework. No great constitutional barrier is being overcome by it. The Government stands condemned for procrastinating on the introduction of intrastate shipping by A.N.L. for so many years.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG** (Townsville) (5.46 p.m.): I cannot agree with the last speaker—

**Mr. Moore:** He is a dill.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I would not say that.

The delay has been worth while. It is obvious that the Premier and his officers have gone into the constitutional problems associated with this matter.

**Mr. Casey** interjected.

**Dr. SCOTT-YOUNG:** I will explain it to the honourable member if he listens.

Recently the Commonwealth Constitution has been torn apart by a great new crop of constitutional lawyers. All of it was brought on by Gough Whitlam saying that he could not be sacked, that he could run the country by borrowing finance overseas and not go to the people. From this stemmed the constant tearing apart of the Constitution, which has been carried on by the A.L.P.

I point out to the honourable member for Mackay that under section 51 (i) the Commonwealth can set up a coastal shipping commission and establish, maintain and run stevedoring equipment through a central pool. It can run interstate and territorial shipping services, but it did not do that; it limited it to interstate. Under section 51 (i) the Commonwealth can also set up a stevedoring industry authority to discipline the stevedoring personnel as well as supply equipment. It had it both ways. Under section 90 the Commonwealth can subsidise shipbuilding; under section 51 (ii) the Commonwealth can subsidise shipbuilding by taxation. Other countries do this by direct contributions from taxation. Under section 96 the Commonwealth can promote the establishment of a joint stevedoring board

and provide all the men and equipment in any or all of the States by granting financial assistance to those States which agree to co-operate.

I see quite well why the planners of this legislation trod very carefully; it opens up constitutional matters. Because the States own the facilities at the ports, under section 51 (xxxviii) they could willingly refer any of the facilities and legislation for working them to the Commonwealth. A great deal of work has been done in studying the Constitution to make sure that this legislation is legal. I am very pleased to have the Minister's assurance that six months' warning of cessation of agreement must be given.

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (5.50 p.m.), in reply: Methinks the Opposition doth protest too much! I am surprised at the honourable member for Mackay, who has been a contractor, trying to draw an analogy between a simple Bill permitting contracting and one concerning shipping, which enterprise in itself is subject to the Merchant Shipping Act. As he is no doubt aware, that has to receive royal assent. I think he would be aware of some of the problems that have occurred in the past because not sufficient legal attention has been paid to the fairly complicated system of legally regulating Australian shipping.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 9, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Campbell, by leave, read a third time.

#### URBAN PASSENGER SERVICE PROPRIETORS ASSISTANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (5.53 p.m.): I move—

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

I have already outlined the principles of the Bill, which I have indicated will give effect to the schemes of assistance to private urban transport services announced by

the Honourable the Deputy Premier and Treasurer in his Budget speech on 22 September.

The Bill extends the assistance provided to proprietors of urban passenger services by the Urban Passenger Service Proprietors Assistance Act 1975–1976.

This Act provides—

- A Government guarantee for loans for the purchase of new or up-to-date model buses as additional or replacement vehicles;
- A subsidy on interest paid on such loans;
- A general subsidy of up to 10 per cent of gross fare revenue to maintain the viability of the operator; and
- A concession fare of approximately 50 per cent of the adult fare for benefit-entitled pensioners,

with compensation to the proprietor by way of a Government subsidy of not less than 3 per cent of gross fare revenue.

In many cases, with the approval of the Governor in Council, rates higher than 3 per cent have been approved as pensioner subsidy after determination of the degree of pensioner patronage on the services provided by individual proprietors.

During the 1976-77 financial year, the overall average percentage general subsidy paid to private proprietors represented approximately 7.25 per cent of gross fare revenue, with a considerable number of proprietors receiving the maximum general subsidy of 10 per cent.

The Bill now provides for this subsidy to be increased to 15 per cent of the gross fare revenue where a private proprietor provides an urban passenger service that gives concession fares to pensioners at a prescribed rate based on fares determined by the commissioner in carrying on a satisfactory service. As a measure of the importance that is placed on the need to maintain the viability of the private operator, this general subsidy will be retrospective to 1 July this year and will considerably benefit many proprietors.

In the light of experience gained since the assistance scheme commenced, it has been varied to include in the general subsidy the general subsidy presently payable separately for the pensioner concession, which I indicated was not less than 3 per cent.

A general subsidy of 15 per cent of gross fare revenue will be paid for all private urban transport services which give a satisfactory service and concessions to pensioners at the prescribed rate. This rate, as I have

indicated, is an average of 50 per cent of the adult single fare for any particular journey.

Apart from the general 15 per cent subsidy, the Bill also provides for a special further subsidy of up to 10 per cent of gross fare revenue where it is established after examination of the profitability of a particular operator that an additional percentage is necessary to maintain the viability of his operations.

The Bill also provides an additional benefit to proprietors where the present pensioner concession is given to those pensioners living outside the immediate urban area who travel to and from their nearest centre of population on journeys up to 32 km.

It is appreciated that in the operation of this scheme some pensioners just outside defined urban areas were not entitled to the concession although no doubt in many cases the proprietor of the private urban service did, in fact, give some consideration to them by reduced fares.

The proprietor will now be reimbursed by way of a subsidy if he is the holder of a licence or permit under the the State Transport Act that provides also for a local pensioner service to the extent of a concession equal to an average of 50 per cent of the adult fare for the same journey. In other words, if, during any month, a proprietor is giving a concession, say, to the extent of \$100, he will get a subsidy of \$100.

I am sure this will be recognised as a reasonable approach to enable pensioners to have access to shopping and other community services and at the same time to compensate the proprietor for the concession given to those pensioners who previously did not come under the general scheme for those living within the metropolitan district or an urban centre having a population of more than 10,000 persons.

**Mr. JONES** (Cairns) (5.57 p.m.): It is passing strange that transport legislation always sees the light of day in the twilight of the Parliament. The only pleasing feature is that it is now 5.57 p.m. I remember once leading the Opposition debate on transport matters at 5.57 a.m. So at least in the closing stages of this Parliament we are discussing legislation at a much more respectable hour.

Everybody is inclined to get a little restless when transport legislation comes in at the end of the session and we spend a little time on it and prolong the hours of sitting. I just wanted to mention that to allay fears. I will not be taking too much time of the House.

As I indicated earlier, we support this measure. We appreciate the Minister's ability to authorise now, on behalf of the Government, the declared local pensioners' service areas with a 32 km radius from the approved centres from the principal post office and to provide for pensioners to gain the concessional benefit extending the area of operation to this distance and to an urban area. Could I, through you, Mr. Speaker, ask the Minister if this is cumulative and will perhaps cover a maximum of 64 km in certain circumstances where a person travels 32 km in a rural area and 32 km in an urban area?

**Mr. Campbell:** It just depends on the size of the urban area. It could be in Brisbane.

**Mr. JONES:** What about in a rural area? Suppose the urban area has a radius of 32 km and somebody travels 32 km in a rural area and then the other 32 km in the urban area; does he enjoy both?

**Mr. Campbell:** No. We do not double up. It is 32 km from the urban area.

**Mr. JONES:** Maximum.

**Mr. Campbell:** When he gets to the urban area, he still qualifies for the concession within the urban area.

**Mr. JONES:** In effect he could travel 64 km on a concessional fare? Fair enough. I wanted to have that made clear. I take the Minister's point. The Bill indicates that the provision means single trips on private bus services for pensioners. I take it that, as long as pensioners hold their normal transport entitlement card, the 50 per cent, or as close to that amount as possible, will apply, as it did under the previous legislation. The private bus operator will now be reimbursed by the Government by an amount equal to 15 per cent. Is that correct?

**Mr. Campbell:** Average of 15 per cent.

**Mr. JONES:** Up to 15 per cent on the gross fare revenue as compensation for granting the concessions. I take it that it is a 5 per cent increase on the 10 per cent general subsidy prescribed in the original legislation, where this can be justified, with the additional subsidy up to 10 per cent, whereas previously it was 3 per cent. I take it that when the 7.25 per cent of gross fares over the last financial year was quoted, that was the average, so it is actually to be increased from 3 per cent to 10 per cent if the Governor in Council approves and there is a low profitability rating. That is how I interpret the measure.

I am sure the Bill improves the present legislation. I understand the need for it. It was needed when the original legislation was brought down and it is needed now—and not only because an election is coming up! I am sure that those who obtain the concessions will welcome the Bill irrespective of the Government's motives in bringing it in. The Opposition welcomes the Bill and has no opposition to it.

**Hon. F. A. CAMPBELL** (Aspley—Minister for Industrial Development, Labour Relations and Consumer Affairs and Minister for Transport) (6.2 p.m.), in reply: I assure the House that the Government was actuated by the highest and most honourable motives.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

#### THIRD READING

Bill, on motion of Mr. Campbell, by leave, read a third time.

### PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

#### SECOND READING

**Hon. T. G. NEWBERY** (Mirani—Leader of the House) for **Hon. W. E. KNOX** (Nundah—Deputy Premier and Treasurer): I move—

“That the Bill be now read a second time.”

**Mr. K. J. HOOPER** (Archerfield) (6.4 p.m.): I shall be almost as brief as the Leader of the House. The Opposition realises that it is a machinery Bill and therefore we have no opposition to it. Our main complaint was about the sneaky and sudden way in which it was introduced. We have now had a chance to peruse the Bill and we have no opposition to it.

Motion (Mr. Newbery) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(Mr. Miller, Ithaca, in the chair)

Clauses 1 to 5, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### THIRD READING

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

The House adjourned at 6.7 p.m.