

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 17 APRIL 1958

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

Government, and the inability of pensioners to pay these increased rentals, will his Government give consideration to providing Queensland Housing Commission homes for pensioners at a rental commensurate with their incomes?"

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough) replied—

"Pensioner couples are subject to the points priority system which provides for allotment of accommodation on the basis of need and when houses are allotted to them, 1945 Agreement houses are made available in respect of which rental rebates apply. The minimum rent which may be charged for such houses is 8s. per week."

OBSERVANCE OF PRICE-FIXING REGULATIONS BY BUTCHERS.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona) asked the Minister for Justice—

"1. How many butchers' shops have been checked between March 1 and April 15 inclusive to ascertain if the Price-fixing regulations are being observed?"

"2. How many breaches of the Price-fixing regulations were discovered for (a) non-issue of dockets with all sales of meat and (b) overcharging?"

"3. Will he state the names of the districts visited including country districts?"

"4. Is he aware that certain butchers have stated that they have been advised that it is not now necessary to issue meat dockets?"

"5. Will he instruct his Prices Commissioner to rigidly police butchers' shops to protect the public from the exploitation that is now taking place as a result of the actions of certain butchers who are openly committing breaches of the Profiteering Prevention Act?"

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

"(1) Sixty-two (62)."

"(2) (a) Six (6); (b) Two (2)."

"(3) Brisbane and Suburbs; Cairns and District; Townsville and District; Rockhampton and centres to Blackall."

"(4) No."

"(5) I do not propose to instruct the Commissioner of Prices as suggested in this Question, as I have full confidence in his ability to carry out his duties. In any case I would not give a direction based on a generalised statement of doubtful authenticity. I might add that it is clear that the latter part of the hon. member's question is included, not really for the purpose of obtaining information, but rather as a somewhat subtle piece of political progaganda and innuendo. In these circumstances the Question does not merit any further answer."

THURSDAY, 17 APRIL, 1958.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. A. R. Fletcher, Cunningham) took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTIONS.

HOUSING COMMISSION HOMES FOR PENSIONERS.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona) asked the Premier—

"In view of the big increases in rents being granted to owners of properties as a result of the Amendment of the Landlord and Tenant Act introduced by his

SPECIAL LAND LEASE TO NATIONAL PETROLEUM LIMITED.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Minister for Justice—

“1. Was he aware when he was interviewed by Mr. Oscar Louis Josephson on March 25, 1958, that Mr. Gordon Ralph Kerven had been granted a lien for £63,073 7s. against National Petroleum Products Pty. Ltd., by a Supreme Court Order, dated six days before, viz., March 19, 1958?”

“2. Was the subject matter of Mr. Josephson's interview his proposed visit to America ostensibly to “hawk” Special Lease No. 22019 granted to National Petroleum Ltd. on March 15, 1957, by the Department of Public Lands?”

“3. Did he during that interview give an undertaking to Mr. Josephson that the Government would permit National Petroleum Ltd. to sell this Lease if he were able to find a buyer in America or anywhere else?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“(1) Yes. This matter was reported in the Courier-Mail of March 20, 1958.”

“(2) No.”

“(3) No.”

GOVERNMENT AID TO CONSTRUCT COMMUNITY HALLS.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“As one of the most serious factors contributing to juvenile delinquency in Queensland cities has been the lack of recreational and sporting facilities in suburban areas, and the extreme difficulty being experienced by local bodies and youth clubs in raising sufficient finance to enable them to construct community halls, will he give consideration to the Government's either (a) making available from the Queensland Housing Commission 60 per centum building loans to these bodies; or (b) guaranteeing with banks or finance institutions 60 per centum of the secured value of such buildings being erected by these organisations?”

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Coorparoo) replied—

“The State Housing Acts and other Acts administered by the Commission do not permit the granting of loans for this purpose. If the property is vested in a Statutory local body, such as a Local Authority authorised to borrow money for the purpose of exercising any powers or discharging any functions or duties conferred or imposed upon it, there is power under the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Acts for the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of financial accommodation obtained by such Local Authority from

the banks or financial institutions. Subject to suitable arrangements being made between a local organisation with a relevant Local Authority there should be no reason why such property might not then be used for the purposes mentioned. The matter, however, is receiving consideration. The hon. member for Chermiside has been discussing with the Commission the use of one of the large storage sheds as a youth centre. At New Farm a community movement is being formed round the use of one of the temporary housing huts. At Inala, discussions are now in progress for the housing of a youth movement. These merely illustrate the widespread demand and I have asked my colleague, the hon. member for Chermiside, to have this examined by the committee of Government members which is enquiring into juvenile delinquency and to submit any suggestions as to how the Government can help. I might say that I personally incline to the view that the huts which are at present providing temporary accommodation could provide a useful starting point for youth activity in many of our suburbs. As the Commission proceeds with the progressive clearing of temporary accommodation areas I intend to see that the requirements of youth clubs and sporting bodies will be kept prominently in mind.”

PERMANENT LAND TITLES FOR EMPLOYEES ON RAILWAY RESERVES, CAIRNS.

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Minister for Transport—

“In view of the difficulties that confront a large number of householders in the matter of roads, repairs, &c., in the City of Cairns, will he take early action to assist these men who are railway employees and who have with permission erected their homes on Railway reserves, by arranging for permanent titles in lieu of the short term leases now granted?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice), for **Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer), replied—

“This matter was raised with the Minister for Transport some time ago by the hon. member for Mulgrave, when the Minister informed him that only a nominal ground rental was paid by those employees who had erected houses on the Railway Reserves at Cairns. The Minister further pointed out that it could not be seen at that juncture that their tenancies would be disturbed, but that it was not considered advisable to surrender the land as the future requirements of the Department could not be determined. There has been no change in the position obtaining.”

DECISION OF FILMS COMMISSION; DRIVE-IN
THEATRE, ROCKHAMPTON.

Mr. THACKERAY (Keppel) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“(1) Is he aware that in November and December, 1957, the Films Commission spent seven days and several nights hearing protracted evidence on two applications for a drive-in theatre at Rockhampton?”

“(2) Does he consider the Films Commission hearings are legal picnics, when business enterprises are waiting to invest capital on a Commission decision?”

“(3) Will he take steps to expedite a decision in the interests of the public and the parties concerned?”

Hon. J. A. HEADING (Marodian) replied—

“(1) Yes. If, however, the hon. member is suggesting that the hearing was protracted by any action of the Commission, he is far from the mark. The length of sittings is governed by the quantum of evidence the parties bring. Whilst I desire to see costs and proceedings in such matters reduced to a minimum, I would consider that each party has a right to put his case and the Commission could be subjected to criticism if it were to prevent any party so doing.”

“(2) I believe that the hon. member is being facetious in asking this question. He surely knows, and knew when he asked the question, that my answer is and would be “No.” Might I point out that the decision to bring legal representation before the Commission is the decision of the parties alone.”

“(3) The position is that the Commission heard two applications for drive-in picture theatres at Rockhampton in November and December last. On consideration of the evidence the Commission noted that, in the case of one applicant, a company had been floated and a certain agreement executed between the applicant and the company. Under the memorandum and articles of association of this company and under this agreement certain advantages would accrue to the applicant. The Commission considered that these advantages might be capable of being held to be in excess of what might be considered fair and reasonable in all the circumstances, and might be open to criticism as being contrary to the public interest. It approached me, the Minister, on whom at that time rested the onus of deciding whether a determination made by the Commission should be or should not be confirmed, on the question of general government policy in matters such as this. Cabinet considered the principle of promoter's remuneration and was of the opinion that, whilst an applicant was entitled to a fair and reasonable return

for the expense incurred by him and the time expended by him in pursuing the application, he should not be entitled to an unreasonable advantage. Consequently, section seven of “*The Picture Theatre and Films Acts Amendment Act of 1958*” was enacted to give the Commission proper control in this respect. This Amending Act was proclaimed law on April 8 this year. On the following day letters were addressed by the Commission to each of the applicants in this case requiring a disclosure in terms of section seven. So soon as these disclosures are made, the Commission will be in a position to determine the applications.”

GOODS FREIGHT FROM TOWNSVILLE TO
INGHAM.

Mr. JESSON (Hinchinbrook) asked the Minister for Transport—

“Will he please give the House details of the monthly takings of goods freight from Townsville to Ingham from June, 1956, to the last available figures?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice), for **Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer), replied—

“This information will take some little time to prepare but it will be made available as early as practicable.”

COMMONWEALTH FUNDS FOR HOME
CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. BAXTER (Norman) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“(1) What funds allotted by the Commonwealth for this financial year for the building of homes in Queensland are currently in hand?”

“(2) What plans, if any, are in operation for the expenditure of these funds for the purposes allotted?”

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Coorparoo) replied—

“(1) Loan advances allocated by the Commonwealth for the Commonwealth-State Fund for the financial year 1957-58, including £126,400 supplementary loan for the housing of service personnel, total £2,654,400. Capital expenditure to mid-April, 1958, approximates 1,750,000.

“(2) (a) Day Labour organisation will be kept at present strength. (b) As at March 31, 1958—Tenders called and under consideration for, 347 houses; Contracts let awaiting signature of building agreements for, 95 houses; Houses under construction (including Day Labour), 429 houses; Contracts let and Day Labour approvals—houses not started, 430 houses. Of the tenders for 347, those for 49 houses have been accepted this month and tenders for 295 houses are being dealt with (219 awaiting Executive Approval at noon to-day, and 76 others).”

CONTROL OF PRICES IN ATHERTON.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Justice—

“Is he satisfied that his Prices Branch is doing all that is necessary and possible to maintain an adequate supervision of prices in the town of Atherton of those goods subject to price control?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“Yes. Atherton has had five prices checks in the past ten months.”

CONVEYANCE OF GOODS TO AND FROM MARYBOROUGH BY INTERSTATE HAULIERS.

Mr. DAVIES (Maryborough) asked the Minister for Transport—

“In view of his statement in this House on Tuesday, April 15, 1958, that he has received many protests from the Maryborough electorate about the inroads in transport business of interstate hauliers there, and that appeals have been made to him from Maryborough to prevent these operators annihilating local carriers and completely disrupting heavy industry in Maryborough and that in his opinion these operators would affect railway workers, will he state—

(1) Which transport businesses convey goods to Maryborough?

(2) What amount of business has been taken from the Maryborough railway centre during the first quarter of this year?

(3) What he means by his statement that the interstate hauliers are completely disrupting heavy industry in Maryborough?

(4) If rail concessions are still being granted to any Maryborough firms that have given much of their transport business to the interstate hauliers?

(5) Whether these interstate hauliers are carrying goods into Maryborough from other centres in Queensland?

(6) What measures he is taking to organise the activities of interstate hauliers so that heavy industry in Maryborough will not be disrupted and railway men will not be sacked?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice), for **Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer), replied—

“Summonses for alleged breaches of provisions of the State Transport Facilities Acts were issued on April 10, 1958, against a certain haulier company, and the hearing has been listed to take place in the Brisbane Court on April 23, 1958. Consequently, it would be improper at this stage to supply answers to the questions raised by the hon. member.”

SLEEPING BERTHS AVAILABLE FOR RAILWAY EMPLOYEES, MACKAY.

Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) In view of his answers to my previous questions relative to the rights of railway employees with regard to sleeper-berth bookings, and as Mackay has a quota of sleeping berths both first and second class on all Up mail trains, will railway employees at Mackay now have the privilege of making sleeper-berth bookings twenty-eight days ahead?”

“(2) If not, will he lay down a principle which will give railway employees a fair and reasonable chance of obtaining sleeper-berth bookings when same are required?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice), for **Hon. G. W. W. CHALK** (Lockyer), replied—

“(1 and 2) The sleeping-berth allocation at Mackay on the Cairns-Brisbane mail trains for advance booking by fare-paying passengers is only a limited one and does not permit of railway employees at Mackay being allowed to make sleeping-berth bookings twenty-eight days ahead.”

CERTIFICATES OF ROADWORTHINESS FOR USED MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, and Main Roads—

“(1) In order to protect road users and also purchasers of used motor vehicles, would he consider legislating for the issuing of certificates of roadworthiness before resale of vehicles is effected?”

“(2) If so, but if there is some doubt in his mind as to whether the Main Roads Commission has sufficient staff to carry out all inspections, would he consider instituting a system similar to that which operates in New South Wales, where registered selected garages are empowered to issue certificates?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“(1 and 2) The Main Roads Department is not the authority to control the sale or resale of motor vehicles or the issue of certificates of roadworthiness before registering or renewing the registration of motor vehicles. The issue of such certificates by certain selected garages has already been considered but there are certain aspects of the position which would make the adoption of such a system difficult.”

FAMILY CAMPING SITES ON GREEN ISLAND.

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“In view of the rumour circulating among the people of Far Northern Queensland that the Government intended to

abolish the use of family camping sites on Green Island, would he advise whether there is any foundation for such rumour?"

Hon. A. G. MULLER (Fassifern) replied—

"The question of further dealing with Green Island after expiry of the present lease on August 31 next is at present under consideration and no decision has yet been given in regard to permits to camp on this island after that date."

EROSION AT YORKEY'S KNOB.

Mr. ADAIR (Cook), without notice, asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"Owing to the extensive damage caused by erosion at Yorkey's Knob and the possibility of destruction of several homes in the area, will he have an immediate investigation carried out by officers of the Main Roads Department and the Department of Harbours and Marine with a view to overcoming the grave difficulties that confront the people concerned?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Coorparoo) replied—

"I will have an inspection carried out by an officer of the Department of Harbours and Marine. I do not administer the Department of Main Roads."

CYCLONE DAMAGE AT BOWEN.

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin), without notice, asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"Following his inspection of the damage wrought at Bowen by the recent violent cyclone will he kindly inform the House what recommendations he made to Cabinet and if these recommendations were adopted?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Coorparoo) replied—

"The hon. member rang me and told me that he intended to ask a question. I quite misunderstood what he wished to know. I did not understand he was going to ask me what recommendations I had made and what Cabinet had adopted."

"The only information I have with me is what Cabinet adopted. If that is satisfactory to the hon. member I shall supply it."

Mr. Coburn: Yes.

Mr. HILEY: I propose to read a letter dated 15 April addressed to the Mayor of Bowen, which is as follows:—

"I made a complete report to Cabinet on the results of my investigations at Bowen on the recent cyclone damage. I now set down, for your information, details of assistance approved by Cabinet as far as concerns the town of Bowen.

"Repairs to Houses.

"Approved that the Relief Programme bear the cost of supplying and fixing iron or fibro, where required to houses, not covered by storm and tempest insurance, such term to include the verandas, etc.; that necessary battens, rafters, and posts be included. Downpipes, spouting and minor structural damage to be the responsibility of the owners. Where necessary, the Housing Commission to advance to such owners housing repair loans. In view of security complications, such loans to be on the personal covenant of the owner, without property security. Assistance to be confined to personally owned and occupied dwellings, plus personally owned single dwellings let by the owner due to transfer elsewhere. Multiple landlordism is a business and will be treated as such.

"Rebuilding of Houses.

"Pensioners and People in Poor Circumstances.

"Approved that the Relief Programme provide for the building of small houses at a cost of no more than £1,000 each.

"Those Who Want a Minimum Home but Can Afford to Pay Something.

"Approved that the Relief Programme contribute £750, balance to be provided by the owner or by a loan from the Queensland Housing Commission on the standard security basis.

"Those Who Want a Better Home.

"Approved that the Relief Programme contribute £750, the owner to provide the balance either from his own funds or from a loan from the Queensland Housing Commission.

"Where homes destroyed were covered partially by storm and tempest insurance, assistance will be provided on a proportionate basis. Those who had sufficient storm and tempest cover will, of course, make their own arrangements.

"For Those Who Cannot Afford to Purchase.

"The Queensland Housing Commission to build five rental homes.

"Farm-houses and Outbuildings.

"Assistance will be given as outlined above. However, where a farm is already mortgaged, the source of the loan finance should be the present mortgagee and not the Queensland Housing Commission.

"Temporary Structures.

"These to be confined to a special area set aside by the council and to be let on the following terms:—

(i.) Council to bear the cost of connecting water.

(ii.) Electric light installation, erection of floors, provision of stoves and laundry facilities to be charged to the Relief Programme.

(iii.) Tenant to pay cleansing dues and 10s. per week rent.

(iv.) Huts to be returned when use completed.

“Damage Suffered by Commercial Premises.

“It has been approved that assistance be offered by guaranteed loans through the Secondary Industries Division. If some should fail to comply with the requirements of the Division, these will be examined by the Cabinet with a view to giving special guarantee assistance. Loans will be guaranteed over a five-year term. Any cases of extreme hardship will be examined individually by Cabinet.

“Damage to Council Installations.

“Loan facilities will be extended to the council to carry out reconstruction works. Cabinet will examine the losses and separately approve each reconstruction proposal. Loans will be repayable over a period of 20 years.”

A similar letter was sent to Mr. B. Cunningham, Chairman of the Wangaratta Shire Council which contains three variants from the letter just quoted. These are the variants—

“Temporary structures will be provided on privately owned land with an agreement from the owner to allow removal. Where water is connected, the Council is to bear the cost of connection. The Relief Programme will provide for electric light installations, where applicable, erection of floors, provision of stoves and laundry facilities. The tenant will be required to pay any cleansing dues and 10s. per week rental, the huts to be returned when use is completed.

“Damage Suffered by Farmers.

“Cabinet has approved that advances be made to the farmers by the Agricultural Bank through the Bowen Co-operative Farmers’ Association with repayments by deduction from growers’ consignments. The maximum loan for each farmer will be £450 over a term of not more than five years. The Railway Department will arrange expeditious transport for plant purchased.

“Damage to Shire Works.

“The schedule of damage when known will be submitted to Cabinet for consideration.”

The final letter I think I should read was sent to Mr. E. W. Russell, Chairman, Bowen Harbour Board, Bowen. It reads—

“I made a complete report to Cabinet on the results of my investigations at Bowen on the recent cyclone damage. I

now set down, for your information, details of assistance approved by Cabinet as far as concerns the Port of Bowen.

“Cabinet has approved that repairs be carried out to the wharves and installations to include road and rail transport to Berths 3 and 4 and rail access to Berth 1.

“The estimated cost of repairs is £37,480 which will be provided by the Government. These repairs will equip Bowen to cope with any meat, coal, coke and whatever interstate general cargo trade that may be offering.”

PROSECUTION OF BUTCHERS FOR BREACHES OF THE PROFITEERING PREVENTION ACT.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona), without notice, asked the Minister for Justice—

“In view of his answer to my question this morning, in which he stated that eight breaches of the Profiteering Prevention Acts have been committed by butchers, will these butchers be prosecuted for such breaches?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“Each case will be considered on its merits.”

ENROLMENT ON THE FLINDERS ROLL.

Mr. A. J. SMITH (Carpentaria), without notice, asked the Minister for Justice—

“Will he arrange to have an immediate check made of recent applications for enrolment on the Flinders State roll with a view to ensuring that the applicant in each case really exists and is genuinely qualified to be placed on the said electoral roll?”

“Will he also check the circumstances of each application and in particular, the signature of the witness to such application?”

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong) replied—

“I have received certain reports in relation to the matters mentioned by the hon. member. Action is being taken by Departmental Officers to see that the enrolments are in conformity with the provisions of the Elections Acts.”

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Order in Council under the Labour and Industry Acts, 1946 to 1952.

Order in Council under the Apprentices and Minors Acts, 1929 to 1954.

Orders in Council under the Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1956.

Orders in Council under the Racing and Betting Act of 1954.

DATES FOR BY-ELECTION.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH TOOWOOMBA.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that the dates in connection with the issue of the Writ for the election of a Member to serve in this House for the Electoral District of North Toowoomba will be as follows:—

Issue of Writ—29 April, 1958.
Date of Nomination—9 May, 1958.
Polling Day—31 May, 1958.
Return of Writ—28 June, 1958.

ROADS (CONTRIBUTION TO MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

CANALS BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

VALUATION OF LAND ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

SLAUGHTERING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Stock) (11.28 a.m.): I move—

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

I was pleased with the way in which hon. members opposite received the Bill. I have decided to place the sale of pre-wrapped meats under the control of the Department of Health and Home Affairs. Because of the various points raised by hon. members on the introductory stage I have also decided to defer the inclusion of pre-wrapped meats in the definition of prescribed meats. It is necessary to investigate certain matters concerning the sale of pre-wrapped meats and for that purpose it is my intention to move an amendment in Committee.

Mr. Hilton: I am pleased that you took notice of the points we raised.

Mr. MADSEN: We should make the Act as effective as possible. This is a very important matter. I have considered the points raised by hon. members. As I say, it is our intention to delete pre-wrapped meats from

the definition of “prescribed meats”. That means that the control of pre-wrapped meats will continue as in the past.

Now that hon. members have had an opportunity of examining the Bill, they will be able to add to the observations that they made during the introductory stage.

Mr. DEWAR (Chermside) (11.31 a.m.): I was very pleased to hear the Minister say that he intends to exclude pre-packed meat from the definition of “prescribed meats”. A number of Government members have been investigating the subject matter of the Bill, and within the last week or so some of us visited the abattoir to acquaint ourselves with the method of preparing meat for the Brisbane market. It is our opinion that the deletion of pre-packed meats from the definition of “prescribed meats” is a step in the right direction.

There seems to be no doubt that the retail butchering trade would be placed at a disadvantage if the Bill was assented to in its present form. The retail butcher is required by the health regulations to have a building of a prescribed type and to present his products in an approved manner. That is not the case in many stores that sell pre-packed meats. The only requirement in that instance is that there must be a partition between the section of the store selling pre-packed meats and the other sections. It is necessary for the retail butcher, however, to have a brick cavity wall in his shop.

Over the years the method of presenting goods for sale to the public has changed radically. It is the popular belief that in the very near future most meat will be pre-packed before sale. From inquiries we have found that in the United States of America, which generally leads the way in the presentation of goods for sale to the public, the trend for many years was towards the selling of pre-packed meats in the larger stores. The result was that the small retail butcher was virtually wiped out and the business got into the hands of monopolies. Once the retail butcher was wiped out, the door was open for the monopolies to sell only second-grade meat; the housewife could not get the better grades.

I was speaking recently to a man who is interested in the trade and who has just returned from a visit to the United States. He told me that the present trend there is for the small retail butcher to come back into his own.

The housewife is demanding a higher grade of meat than can be bought in the stores serving meat pre-packed by monopolies. I am glad the Minister has seen the wisdom of going steadily with the legislation before encouraging this type of marketing. Some years ago in New South Wales the inspection of beef and its presentation to the public were taken out of the control of the Department of Agriculture and Stock and brought under the control of the Health Department, and it created so much chaos in Sydney that

I understand there is considerable agitation to have the control restored to the Department of Agriculture and Stock.

Many arguments could be advanced on the danger of the provisions that the Minister now proposes to amend. I will not spend more time on it except to say that I and many of my colleagues very much appreciate the Minister's attitude. We sincerely believe it will be for the betterment of the normal trade in the community. It will protect the small man and ultimately will benefit the public because, with competition between small businesses, it will give a far higher grade of beef in the long run.

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) (11.37 a.m.): I am very pleased that the hon. member for Chermiside and, I take it from his observations, other Government members, agree with the contentions I expressed on the introductory stage. I believe that, having seen something of the preparation of meat for the public, Government members are now fully conscious of the need to withdraw the clause but I should like to ask the Minister a question and I ask him to check on it. Does he know, or is it a fact, that yesterday meat was displayed for sale in a store in Queen street other than a registered butcher's shop or pre-packaged meat shop?

Since I spoke on the introductory stage, I have seen no reason to alter my mind on the Bill. Having had conversations with people competent to discuss and advise on the matter I am more than ever convinced of the need for the deletion of the provision. In my opinion the sale of beef in any shape or form in other than a registered butcher's shop is a retrograde step and taking the control of the retail sale of meat from the department that has controlled it through the years—and controlled it very successfully in the interests of the public—and giving dual control to the industry is also a backward step. Other States have had dual control of the meat industry for 30 to 40 years and it has not been for the good of the industry. I know the people concerned with the meat industry in those States are doing their best to return to control by one department.

I have received information that certain people on behalf of certain organisations have recently made purchases of meat from some of these pre-packaged meat shops. Five packages of meat were purchased from one of these shops and although it had not been open for trading for more than an hour two packages dated "27/3/58" containing rump steak were found to be soft and seeping. That is an indication of what can happen to all classes of meat when wrapped. Once sausages are contained in a skin they begin to deteriorate very quickly. The only method of keeping sausage meat in a skin is by the inclusion of a preservative. Of course, the department prescribes the amount of preservative that can be used. When sausages are placed inside a second skin like plastic

there is a very much faster rate of deterioration. That applies to all meats once they are wrapped in cellophane and people continually handle the packages in open refrigerated counters. One package dated "25/3/58" contained mutton chops which were dark in colour. The package had been pierced by bone extremities and the meat was giving off a very heavy odour. Another package dated "28/3/58" contained pork chops. Again the package was pierced by a bone extremity which had caused the cover to be almost torn off. A further package dated "27/3/58" containing topside steak was unsealed and the meat was protruding. Hon. members will note the varying dates, 25, 27, and 28 March. The purchases were all made on 28 March. Unless the department insists that the sticker is placed inside the package it can easily be lost. Consequently meat could be on display and handled continually by the public for a number of days and become quite unhygienic. I have given hon. members a fair and reasonable picture of what can happen in the sale of meat under this system. As I said the other day, the best method of selling meat to the public is the old-fashioned way where stock are killed in an abattoir, brought to a butcher shop and kept under refrigeration. At the butcher shop it is cut up and placed in trays in refrigerated counters not open to the public. A housewife can buy, say, rump steak in a 1-lb. 2-lb. or larger piece. Under the pre-packaging method it is more than probable that she would get anything up to four pieces of rump steak in a 1-lb. packet.

Mr. Sparkes: Do you not realise that half the meat in America is being packaged like that?

Mr. WALLACE: An hon. member on the Government side has already said that the trend in America is to go back to the old-fashioned method. I believe that is the most hygienic way of offering meat for sale to the public. The meat is sold in a registered butcher shop where it is handled only by people competent to handle it.

We are happy that the Minister has decided to omit certain provisions. I think that is in the interests of the public and the department. I believe the Minister is fully conversant with the wishes of the public generally. The general opinion is that pre-packed meats are not in the best interests of the public. We hope that the Minister will bear in mind the necessity of building abattoirs in the Cairns district. Judging from the remarks of the Treasurer in Townsville on Saturday last, the Cabinet are aware of the necessity of building abattoirs wherever possible. It is possible to build them at Cairns. If the provision in relation to pre-packed meat had not been removed we would have opposed the Bill. In the circumstances the Opposition are happy to support the Bill.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (11.47 a.m.): During the initiation I

referred to the transfer of the inspection of pre-wrapped meats to the Department of Health and Home Affairs. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs intimated that they were drawing up special regulations. Even though there are special regulations, the health inspector would not be as well equipped to carry out the duties of an inspector under the Slaughtering Acts. I am glad that the Government have seen the weakness in the Bill. Otherwise it is quite acceptable. It is not altogether desirable that pre-wrapped meat should supersede the old method, but it is a convenience to a substantial number of people.

Mr. Sparkes: Yes, especially the little people.

Mr. HILTON: That is true. We must be very careful to see that the establishments selling it conform to the provisions for butchers' shops which are laid down in the regulations, and provide the necessary refrigeration.

Dr. Noble: We did not want to bring down hasty regulations.

Mr. HILTON: The hon. gentleman gave an assurance that the Government would frame rigid regulations. I think the hon. gentleman will agree that there is considerable difference between the duties of an inspector under the Slaughtering Acts and those of an inspector under the Health Acts. Pre-wrapped meat will be a convenience for many people. As long as health interests are protected there will be no objection to it. In future people will be able to purchase meat in the old-fashioned method, or purchase pre-wrapped meat.

The average family will purchase meat in the old-fashioned way. The average housewife will want to see the carcass from which the joint is cut. Most housewives would prefer to buy meat in that way.

In view of the amendment that has been foreshadowed, I do not see any objection to the Bill.

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Stock) (11.51 a.m.), in reply: I am only too pleased to note the suggestions that have been made. Our desire is to ensure that food will be hygienically handled. It was considered that the health regulations would ensure the security of customers, but in view of the remarks that have been made, I assure hon. members that thorough investigations into the conditions that operate in other States will be conducted, with a view to finding out what has happened there. Hon. members can rest assured that we will investigate every aspect in order to get the best regulations, whether control will be exercised by the Department of Agriculture and Stock or the Department of Health.

Mr. Wallace: Will you try to answer my question today?

Mr. MADSEN: In reply to the hon. member for Cairns, it is a fact that during the course of routine inspection it was ascertained that a certain manufacturer in the Brisbane area was offering a line of pre-wrapped mincemeat along with other smallgoods. Discreet inquiries were made. It was learned that one or more smallgoods shops were about to obtain supplies of this product. No pre-wrapped mince was found in any smallgoods shop. However, a quantity of this mince was found in a shop and the officers of my department immediately took possession of it. They continued their investigations to find out where it came from. We had to find out why the firm was handling it in view of the fact that it should have known it was breaking the law.

Mr. Wallace: It goes to show what can happen. It could get completely out of control.

Mr. MADSEN: It should not get out of control if it is brought under the health regulations or the regulations of my department. After all, the success of the scheme depends on the policing of it. In this instance it was mince. The excuse was offered that it was thought that mince came under the same heading as sausages, but that is not so. We gain experience from daily happenings. Our officers were right on the ball in picking this up quickly.

Thorough inspections can be carried out with manufacturing firms. I assure hon. members that we shall watch this particular development.

Hon. members have expressed satisfaction with my amendment and the Bill. There is no need to comment further.

Motion (Mr. Madsen) agreed to.

COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—Amendment of s. 6 (1); Meaning of Terms—

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Stock) (11.56 a.m.): This is the clause to which I have already referred. I move the following amendment—

“On page 2, lines 37 to 40, omit the words—

‘trotters and any meat for sale pre-wrapped in transparent wrapping material of a class, kind, description, quality and size approved in writing’ and insert in lieu thereof the words—
‘and trotters’.”

Amendment (Mr. Madsen) agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 9, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

THIRD READING.

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

STOCK ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Stock) (11.59 a.m.): I move—

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

The measure is largely to tidy up deficiencies in administration. One of the new principles is the control of artificial insemination. More and more interest is being displayed in it than previously. I said in my introductory speech that considerable advantage can be claimed from artificial insemination particularly from proven bulls. One of the greatest features of it is that it helps to control disease. We have tried to lay down what we regard as necessary controls. Untold damage could be done if artificial insemination was not controlled, as disease among cattle could spread very quickly. As the department is setting up artificial insemination centres in various parts of the State, it is necessary for it to have full control.

Mr. Hilton: What types of disease have been spread from the use of artificial insemination?

Mr. MADSEN: There are a number of them, associated mainly with the reproductive organs. I know something of the damage that can be caused by uncontrolled artificial insemination. I can assure hon. members that already diseases of the reproductive organs in dairy cattle particularly have had a very great influence on the cost of production. The department is giving special attention to artificial insemination, but at the same time it is making haste slowly. At present the only semen available is that for the Jersey and Illawarra Shorthorn breeds, but the department hopes shortly to be able to supply it for other breeds.

New diseases crop up from year to year, and as they arise it is necessary to include them in the definition of “Diseases” so that the officers of the department can exercise control over them.

As the Bill was discussed very fully on the introductory stage, no good purpose would be served by going into it in detail now.

Mr. SPARKES (Aubigny) (12.4 p.m.): This is probably one of the most important matters affecting the raising of stock to come before the House. Virtually every cattle society in Australia is interested in the subject of artificial insemination. The United Stud Stock Breeders' Association of Australia, of which I am a member, is opposed to it. However, it must come. When it does, it will be necessary for the department to have full control over it.

Artificial insemination is used extensively in other parts of the world, particularly the United States of America. In New South Wales there is a large station property on the Hunter River just below Aberdeen, from which semen is sent to various districts. It is almost impossible to find a bull in any of the herds in the Hunter River district. The semen comes from the Aberdeen station. It is a matter that will have to be considered very carefully.

The Minister did not refer to the breeder of stud stock who has very valuable animals and the effect the Bill will have on the sale of those animals. It is very important to the British Isles, which are looked upon as the stud farm of the world.

I know nothing is likely to be done about beef cattle in Queensland but even in the dairying industry I sincerely trust that, as the Minister has promised, very strict precautions will be taken.

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) (12.7 p.m.): It was rather amusing to hear the hon. member for Aubigny express a fear for the future of the breeder of stud stock because of the introduction of artificial insemination. It makes one realise what a great and compelling force self-interest is. If only it could be harnessed there would be no trouble in launching new Sputniks. However, we must recognise that scientific advances are not confined to one industry and we have to accept automation and other advances that are for the general benefit of mankind. We should be concerned only about the common interest and the general benefit.

Mr. Sparkes: You are talking round your hat. I breed only beef cattle, not dairy cattle. It is not applicable to beef cattle. They will not have it. Moreover, it does not affect the stud breeder here. It is in England where the effect will be felt.

Mr. BURROWS: It is all right for the hon. member to say it is not applicable to beef cattle at present but I do not think we need very much imagination to realise that it is only a matter of time before it will be applicable to beef cattle. It is a wonderful advance. The doubting Thomas will always be with us and so will the man who criticises because of self-interest. Thank goodness the public in general are not influenced unduly by such people.

The provision dealing with the destruction of T.B.-infected cattle is opportune and appropriate. When the Bill is passed it will not be necessary for the dairy farmer to replace his herd before being compensated for diseased cattle. Unfortunately at present many dairymen are leaving the industry because of economic conditions. It might be much better if fewer cows were milked. I regret having to say that but, from the economic point of view, it might be much better for the industry if the output were not quite as great as it is today.

As to the incidence of bovine tuberculosis, I was astonished to hear that we still have some—even in this House we have at least two hon. members—who more or less doubt the efficacy of the destruction of T.B.-infected cattle as a means of eliminating the disease.

I do not set myself up as an authority. When the Bill was introduced an hon. member quoted the case of a very healthy looking family on a dairy farm. On examination the herd was found to be heavily infected with T.B. He used that as an illustration to give weight to the theory that T.B. is not conveyed from the beast to the human. Nevertheless I do not think any intelligent person would feel very happy about milking a cow known to have T.B. let alone drinking the milk or giving it to his children.

I have made further inquiries about the incidence of T.B. It is a little early to say definitely yet, but the general opinion is that the incidence has been greatly reduced. I was somewhat concerned to learn that 20 per cent. of the skin tests made on scholarship students were positive. I have been told by a medical man that it is believed that the pasteurisation of milk has had a great influence on the apparent trend of a reduction in the percentage. If the Minister never introduces a Bill that warrants less commendation than this one, he will be doing a great job.

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Stock) (12.14 p.m.), in reply: On the introductory stage hon. members showed considerable interest in the incidence of tuberculosis in dairy cattle. I realise that there was criticism of the Act when it was first introduced, particularly about compensation to the dairy farmer. However, at this stage it is interesting to note that for the 12 months ended 31 December, 1957, of 380,000 tests carried out only 618, or .16 per cent., proved positive. I think that now most of the dairy farmers are very happy about the scheme, indeed, it is something we can be really proud of. It affects the beef industry in a different way. The responsibility is always on the owner. If a beast is found to be infected when it goes along for slaughter, it is the owner's responsibility, and he loses payment for it. However, it is very often the dairy farmer who is the hardest hit by the test because his stock are fed together, and that aids the spread of the disease. I thought hon. members would be interested to know the extent to which the incidence of T.B. in cattle has been reduced in this State.

Motion (Mr. Madsen) agreed to.

COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 14, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING.

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

RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga—Minister for Health and Home Affairs) (12.18 p.m.): I move—

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

The introductory debate on this Bill made it abundantly clear that every member of the House agreed that it was necessary to control and regulate the possession, sale, transport and use of radioactive substances, and the possession and use of apparatus capable of producing radiation.

The aim of this Bill is to provide a control that will guarantee protection against the harmful effects of man-made radiation, and, at the same time, impose the minimum of interference on the use of radioactive substances and apparatus capable of producing radiation.

The Government subscribes wholeheartedly to the principles of democratic government which lay down that while it is necessary that there be certain interference with the liberty of the individual for the good of the community, such interference must not be arbitrarily imposed, and must be the minimum necessary for the good of the community; and, secondly, that such control and interference shall be imposed or made only after having the benefit of the best available knowledge of the subject.

It cannot be denied that Queensland, with its great potentialities and large area, combined with a relatively low population, can expect to benefit, to an extent that well might have been considered fantastic some few years ago, by the dawning of the Atomic Age.

It is most important, therefore, that this legislation provide a control that, while eliminating the inherent dangers, does not place one unnecessary restriction on the fullest use of present and future discoveries in the field of radioactivity.

This field of radioactivity is being developed by scientists, and the necessary controls must, to a great degree, also be developed by scientists. This fact is fully recognised in the Bill by the provision for the

creation of the Radiological Advisory Council. It is the intention that the best scientific brains in the field covered by the Bill will be recruited to this Council.

In this respect it is relevant to point out that Clause 6, sub-clause (c), sets out that the members of the council, other than the chairman who shall be, *ex officio*, the Director-General of Health, shall upon the recommendation of the Minister, after consultation with such public authorities and such scientific, professional, and technical organisations and persons as the Minister thinks appropriate, be appointed from time to time by the Governor in Council.

Power is also conferred on the Advisory Council to appoint such advisory committees, or technical committees, as it thinks fit, to advise it on matters within the scope of its functions. Membership of these committees is not limited to members of the council, and the way is therefore open for the appointment to such committees of experts in any particular field of scientific knowledge, or of technical experts.

The method of control set out in the Bill is, shortly, that no person shall have in his possession, use, sell, or transport any radioactive substance, otherwise than in accordance with the terms of a licence issued under the Act, and that no person other than a medical practitioner or dentist shall, for the purpose of treating a human being, have in his possession, or use or administer any radioactive substance, unless he holds a licence under the Act, or is acting under the supervision or instruction of a medical practitioner or a dentist so licensed.

It will be seen, therefore, that the issuing of licences, and the conditions imposed by such licences, are the key to the whole system of control.

Such licences can only be issued on the recommendation of the Advisory Council. As I have mentioned previously, that council will have as members highly accredited scientists with a thorough knowledge of radio-activity, its powers and its dangers.

The knowledge of the members of the council can also be supplemented by the appointment of particular experts to committees to consider, investigate and advise upon particular problems.

As the issue of licences, and the conditions imposed thereon, are the key to the control under the Bill, it is clear that the best available knowledge will be brought to bear on the consideration of applications for licences, and of the conditions under which any particular licence should be issued.

Hon. members will realise that it is completely impossible to write into any Bill provisions to control a field that is daily being extended, enlarged, and developed. If this were attempted it is reasonably certain that the result could not be good. Conditions of control that might be considered

satisfactory today might be made completely unsatisfactory by further discoveries and developments in the immediate future.

The Bill, therefore, contains clauses providing for the making of regulations from time to time in regard to necessary safeguards in keeping with new developments.

This is covered by Clause 7 of the Bill which states that the council may initiate and refer to the Minister recommendations for making, altering, or repealing regulations, or any of them, and recommendations for preventing or minimising the dangers arising from radio-active substances and radiating apparatus.

Mr. JESSON: In other words, X-ray plant?

Dr. NOBLE: That is right.

The council must also advise the Minister on any subjects submitted to it, and its advice will therefore be available to enable regulations to be made from time to time.

Other clauses of the Bill provide for the appointment of inspectors and professional officers to do the necessary field work.

Clause 20, sub-clause (b), empowers an inspector to call to his aid any person he may think competent to assist him in making any inspection or examination. In this way an inspector will be able to call to his aid a qualified physicist or scientist if and when required.

It is recognised that very many of the problems that will be met with from time to time will be scientific problems, and the Bill provides that the best scientific knowledge shall be available to enable those problems to be solved.

It is recognised that the withholding of a licence under the Bill, or the cancellation or suspension of such a licence could be a serious matter, and could seriously affect individuals, companies, or firms in the way of their business.

Provision has therefore been made for the right of appeal by any aggrieved person, company or firm. It is also recognised that governmental institutions and departments will use radio-active substances, and that for the protection of the community these departments and institutions should be under the same control as private individuals or companies.

Mr. HILTON: To whom will appeals be lodged?

Dr. NOBLE: A Supreme Court judge. For this reason it is set out in the Bill that the Crown is bound thereby. Hon. members have had the opportunity to study the Bill and I think they will agree that it is a painstaking and comprehensive effort to comply with those principles I mentioned earlier in my speech, that is that the community at large and as a whole, and individuals whose occupations bring them or will bring them into contact with radioactive substances, and

those persons who may be subject to treatment by irradiating machines, are given the maximum of protection, whilst at the same time, there will be the least possible interference with the use of this new and potent force for the development of our State.

I should also mention that similar legislation has been or is being introduced into the Parliaments of the other States, so that by uniform legislation throughout the whole of Australia the advantages and frustrations that have occurred over the years in other fields as a result of conflicting legislation in the various States, will not be experienced in the control and regulation of the possession, sale, transport and use of radio-active substances, and the possession and use of apparatus capable of producing radiation. I have pleasure in commending the Bill to hon. members.

Mr. DONALD (Bremer—Leader of the Opposition) (12.26 p.m.): I think all hon. members agree that the protection of the liberty of the subject as outlined by the Minister in the Bill is of the utmost importance. We know that in the interests of the community generally it is from time to time necessary by Acts of Parliament and regulations to restrict the liberty of the subject to some degree. If we did not take these steps it would not be long before we had arrived at a state of chaos. The appointment of an advisory council as set out in the Bill is a step in the right direction and is absolutely necessary. The provision making it necessary to obtain a licence for the use of radio-active apparatus and the sale or use of radio-active substances will meet with the approval of all hon. members. Great damage could be done to the human race by any accident connected with the use of radio-active materials or by the misuse of them. It is also necessary that the inspectors appointed to do the field work should have power to obtain expert assistance from highly qualified persons. There should be the maximum protection given to users of radio-active substances. It is a step in the right direction that similar legislation has been or is being introduced into the Parliaments of the other States so that there will be uniform legislation throughout Australia. We could not have varying legislation in the protection of the interests of the communities in the different States. It is regretted that the Commonwealth Government have not the power to introduce legislation to control radio-active use and so the request has been made that the individual States introduce uniform legislation.

In introducing this Bill on 20 March the Minister said that certain radio-active isotopes now used in industry unless controlled and subject to precaution, might prove harmful to the user or to other people. This is one of the most serious aspects of the use of radio-active substances so far as the Australian Labour Party is concerned. We know that the Bill appears to make

ample provision for the use of radio-active substances for therapeutic purposes, but we are not satisfied provision is made for the effectual policing of factories where these substances are used. And we know that their use is increasing to very great proportions today.

We are concerned for the safety of workers in those factories, and for the general public whose health and lives can be greatly endangered by any negligence or accident in them. During the introductory stage, the late Leader of the Opposition gave the case history of the sufferings and trials of families who had been affected by radiation because of an accident in an industrial factory in the United States. It revealed that the lives of those people had been virtually torn to shreds by the radio-active contamination that had followed the accidental release of radiation from that industrial plant.

Some of the terrible effects of this happening were that the men who were affected suffered in health, and no-one knows how much they will suffer in the future. They had to leave their homes; they were ostracised by their neighbours, who feared contamination; their children were treated like pariahs, and the men could not find employment when it became known that they had been in the plant where the accident occurred.

I draw attention to another phase of radiation, which was the subject of a Los Angeles cable that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 13 March last. The cable read as follows:—

"By the time a young woman had borne several children she might have accumulated enough X-rays in her body to damage future generations, a Los Angeles surgeon said today.

'It's a pathetic situation,' the surgeon, Dr. Harry Jaffe, told the 11th biennial congress of the International College of Surgeons.

'Unless the doctor is well trained in radiology, he is endangering himself, and the patient.'

"X-rays should be held to a minimum."

We have already cited the concern in the United Kingdom over the accident at the plutonium factory at Winscale, when, according to British scientists, the radio-activity release was as great as that released by the atom bomb that destroyed the Japanese city of Hiroshima. They based their assessment on the statement of the atomic chief in Britain, Sir John Cockroft, that 3 tons of uranium had been burned up in the mishap.

We realise that the ultimate in precautionary measures is taken by plants that deal with the production of radio-active materials. Yet there are accidents—accidents that could do incalculable damage—the end effects of which scientists declare themselves incapable of determining. Does this not indicate only too clearly the serious concern that should be felt by hon. members in their approach

to this legislation, since the inevitable expansion of the use of radio-active appliances and substances in industry must multiply the dangers?

To bring the matter home to our own door let me cite the recent case in Victoria, where a man was so gravely injured by radiation that he lost a leg. Scientific evidence was that his condition will have to be watched very closely for the next 20 years. I am referring now to the case of John Martin Thoonen, a migrant 25 years old with a wife and three children, who was employed by the Victorian State Electricity Commission at Yallourn. Two years ago, while at work, Thoonen picked up an innocent-looking piece of metal and put it in the pocket of his overalls. This capsule, which was violently radio-active, was not missed for nearly three days. When the searchers finally caught up with it, Thoonen had been carrying it at work for six days. That was two years ago, and it was not long before Thoonen began to feel the effects of radiation. He rapidly became a physical wreck, and finally had to have his right leg amputated at the hip. He took action against the Commonwealth last month, seeking unspecified damages for injury from radiation through the capsule. The Commonwealth, who owned the capsule, accepted full responsibility and asked the Court to assess the damages.

Evidence was given that due to the effects of radiation, Thoonen could not be the father of any more children. He himself gave evidence that he saw nothing unusual about the appearance of the capsule when he picked it up and put it in the pocket of his overalls. However, as the result of the damage caused by radiation from the capsule, he had already lost a leg up to the hip.

Thoonen said he had been taken to hospital and holes had been bored in his bones to get samples of the bone marrow; but even after tests the doctors had been unable to stop the progress of the damage from the capsule's radiation. Thoonen went on to tell the Court that finally his right leg had been taken off at the hip, and he had no idea what the future held for him.

In giving judgment for £23,585 damages to Thoonen, Mr. Justice Monahan praised Thoonen for his lack of complaint during the terrible suffering he had already endured and for the courage with which he was facing the possibility of further suffering in the future.

His Honour said that Thoonen had spent months in hospital and had his right leg amputated because the possible destruction of a main artery could have caused a fatal haemorrhage.

The judge said that as the doctors had been powerless to stop Thoonen's skin and flesh from dying in the first year after the radio-active burning they might be unable to stop any future dying of the skin and flesh in the area.

His Honour said he could only take what the doctors told him as informed guesses not yet based on scientific fact. I ask hon. members to take particular note of that view expressed by the judge. Let me repeat it. His Honour said he could only take what the doctors told him as informed guesses not yet based on scientific fact.

Mr. Justice Monahan said that Thoonen would have to be examined every six months for the next 20 years, or until the medical profession was better able to help him if some adverse development occurred.

He said Thoonen had to face the fact that atomic burns and their effects might appear again at any time in the next 20 years. He said he felt sure Thoonen had great fears for his future and the future of his family.

Reporting on an Oxford educational course on the public health aspects of radiation protection, sponsored by the World Health Organisation, the British newspaper "Atom Industry" of February last says—

"The industrial and medical uses of nuclear energy and its by-products are increasing rapidly, and in many countries more personnel are consequently needed to protect workers and the public at large against the hazards of radiation. . . The course was particularly concerned with the protection of the public."

That justifies every word that the Minister for Health and Home Affairs uttered in his second reading speech.

We are informed by the official journal of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, in the December 1957 number, that in 1950 the Industrial Hygiene Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council recommended that the States be asked to establish Radioactive Substances Acts to control the use of radioactive substances and certain irradiating apparatus. Under the constitutional arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States it was not competent for the Commonwealth to pass legislation of this nature to cover activities in the States. The Industrial Hygiene Committee subsequently prepared a model Act which was referred to the States as the basis of uniform legislation. The Bill now before the House conforms to that pattern, and some States have passed the legislation, one of them by way of an amendment to the Health Act.

I do not know that that will be any more effective than this. The Minister is a professional man and I am sure the Bill will be just as effective as an amendment to the Health Act would be. Moreover, it will be more easily obtainable by anyone who wishes to consult it.

Draft regulations were also prepared by the National Health and Medical Research Council to be considered for gazettal by the various States. These regulations were designed to safeguard the general public as

well as the user of a radio-active substance or a prescribed irradiating apparatus against radiation injury.

I assume these regulations will be accepted by the Government, or will be the basis of regulations to be drawn up in implementation of this legislation. Our anxiety is that the general oversight and rigid policing of factories which use radio-active substances may not be sufficiently provided for under the Bill. We must not forget we are dealing with the most dangerous things on the earth. If anyone thinks we are prone to exaggerate the dangers, I quote the words of Heinz Gartmann from his book, "Man Unlimited—Technology's Challenge to Human Endurance," first published in Germany in 1955—

"To the uninitiated it may seem melodramatic to say that the whole of humanity is running into deadly peril. But that is the case."

That is the verdict of this physicist on the dangers of radiation, and we all know it is shared by most of the prominent physicists of the world. Accordingly, I think we of the Opposition are on good ground when we seek the most profound assurances that as radio-active substances become more generally used in industry in Queensland—and this is absolutely certain because of advancing technological processes—the working people and the general public will be protected from such things as happened to the man who innocently picked up a radio-active capsule when working at the plant of the State Electricity Commission in Victoria.

When the late leader of the Opposition spoke on the introduction of the Bill he cited the disastrous events which followed the escape of radiation at the Kellog plant in the United States. On that occasion the Minister interjected that this incident never need have happened with proper control. I think we all agree with that. I think we all agree that the Minister has introduced the Bill in an endeavour to protect everyone in the community. He is moving in the right direction and making a sincere effort to control the dangers that arise from this new industry. That is just our point. We want to be assured there will be proper control in any plants using radio-active substances or irradiating apparatus in Queensland.

We have read of accidents in respect of the escape of radioactivity in the United States and the United Kingdom, but in the absolute sense there are no such things as accidents. Somewhere someone is to blame, and the circumstance is attributable to either inefficiency or negligence. Inefficiency and negligence must be removed in so dangerous an industry. The Minister clearly admits this in his remark concerning the Kellog plant incident, when he declared it could not have happened with proper control. We want proper control here in order to safeguard our workers and the general community.

The introduction of the Bill will not lessen the possibility of people becoming contaminated but perhaps it will go part of the way to protect the workers and the general community from injury from coming into contact with radio-active materials.

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga—Minister for Health and Home Affairs) (12.44 p.m.), in reply: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his commendation of the Bill. It is an Australia-wide Bill for the control of a particularly dangerous substance. There must be strict policing to ensure that the regulations are properly carried out. Radioactivity is not so much a danger to workers but to the race as a whole. It can be a boon and a blessing, but if it is not properly controlled it can mean the end of mankind. I assure the hon. gentleman that the regulations will be sufficient to control any dangers that might arise from the use of radio-active substances. The Government will concern themselves to see that there is sufficient policing to make them effective.

The hon. gentleman mentioned the fact that X-rays could so affect a mother that it might lead to trouble later on with the children. I commend the previous Government for having an Advisory Committee working on the supervision of X-rays for country hospitals. The committee was careful to see that an X-ray that went to a small country hospital where there was no trained radiologist was of such a size that it would be much less harmful than the full-sized X-ray. We will see that instructions are issued and that all those who will have the use of X-ray machines will be cognisant of the dangers inherent in the use of these machines. We will see that all these dangers are policed. I thank the Leader of the Opposition and members of the House for the way they have spoken on the Bill.

Motion (Dr. Noble) agreed to.

COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 35, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING.

Bill, on motion of Dr. Noble, by leave, read a third time.

MINES REGULATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani—Minister for Development, Mines, and Main Roads) (12.49 p.m.): I move—

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

This Bill, which makes a number of amendments considered desirable as a result of experience gained since 1945 and in view of changes in the mining industry, was described clause by clause on its introduction, and I propose now to supplement some of the remarks that I made then.

I was asked if these amendments had been discussed with mine workers. We did what we thought was the proper thing, which is to consider all suggestions made to us by mine workers and management and any other interested persons. In addition to suggestions made in writing, which are on file and were studied, many verbal suggestions have been made to my officers, particularly the inspectors of mines in each district. Drafts of the proposed legislation were studied and commented on by these inspectors, so that their accumulated practical knowledge was availed of without improperly disclosing the contents of impending legislation.

I have had my officers check on the use of automatic winders at Mt. Isa for hoisting ore. This was permitted by the amending Act of 1930. In June, 1931, a Fraser and Chalmers winder with automatic controls was put into commission at Urquhart shaft of Mt. Isa Mine and operated there on push-button control, hoisting ore, until December, 1951, when it was shifted to No. 2 ore shaft. It was not operated on automatic control at No. 2 ore shaft as the control equipment was not suitable for the changed conditions of working.

Another Fraser and Chalmers winder was operated on automatic control at Man and Supply shaft of Mt. Isa Mine from 1931 until about 1937, when the shaft was deepened to No. 5 level. Because of the greater depth, the existing automatic control was unsuitable and the winder was then operated on manual control.

These winders operated safely while on automatic control, during which time they hoisted millions of tons of ore.

I have been informed that a leading Australian mining engineer, recently returned from a North American tour during which he made a study of winding practices, stated that in Canada he found the modern automatic winders so good that whenever he had to travel in an ordinary winder he felt almost as if he had gone back to the horse and buggy days.

It is not expected that automatic winders will become common in Queensland mines. They are very expensive and are economically justified only for large, new installations. However, it would slow down the rate of expansion of our mining industry if we did not permit new equipment of this type to be used where it is better and safer than conventional equipment.

I consider that winder drivers as a class are very competent men with a high sense of responsibility. They have to be or they

could not hold their winding licences. However, every man who has worked on a mine—in fact, every man who has driven a car—knows, that it is easy for even the most careful person occasionally to make an error. We have on record a number of these episodes in connection with winding. Fortunately the consequences were not serious, although they could easily have been.

I shall not deal further with radio-activity, as it has been dealt with very fully by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs and the Leader of the Opposition. However, my officers will continually seek information in order to give further protection to those who have to handle uranium ore or come in contact with it.

Mr. DONALD (Bremer—Leader of the Opposition) (12.54 p.m.): I sincerely regret that I did not hear the introductory debate, as I was attending to my duties elsewhere. I thought I would have plenty of time to read the "Hansard" report of the speeches of the Minister and other hon. members. Unfortunately I have not had that opportunity, but from a perusal of the Bill I should say that provision has been made for safer and better working conditions for mine workers. It deals more with metalliferous mining than coal mining.

If I have read the Bill correctly and if my judgment and interpretation of it are correct, the working conditions of the employees in both the metalliferous and coal mining industries have been improved generally speaking, at least from a safety viewpoint.

For this I sincerely thank the Minister and also take this opportunity of thanking him for what he has done for the coal mining industry and those engaged in it since his appointment as Minister for Mines. The deletion of the word "surveyor" and the insertion of the words "an authorised surveyor, or a certificated mine surveyor" in subsection 2 of Section 8 of the Act with the further amendment to sub-section 3 of that section should give a better result when an inspection of a mine is made and an examination as to the accuracy of the surveying as shown on the mine plan.

The amendment to Section 14 by defining the term "inspector," to include any person acting under lawful authority under and pursuant to the Act will give the inspector, and I sincerely hope the mine check inspector, greater protection and authority in the carrying out of their very important duties. I do not think I can stress too much the importance of the duty of these men which is really to protect their fellow employees. The mine check inspector checks the work of the departmental inspector. From time to time these officers make inspections of every colliery and metalliferous mine in the interests of miners. They have responsible duties and any amendment to give them additional protection and authority is appreciated. I can assure the Minister that it will not be abused.

These men work conscientiously and study the Act and mining in all its phases. They know when danger is likely to occur and know what steps should be taken to avoid disaster and injuries. From time to time the mine check inspector consults with departmental officers and generally speaking there is a harmonious relationship between the check inspectors and the mine inspectors both in metalliferous mines and collieries. My colleague on my right, Mr. Dufficy, who was a check inspector can confirm what I have been saying.

The addition of the words "mine electrician certificates and mine surveyor certificates" and the setting out of the duties and responsibilities of the holders of these certificates in Section 26 is necessary and long overdue. I should like to make some comment on the composition of the Board of Examiners. The Act provides for three or more persons, one of whom shall be an owner or manager, the second an employee at the mine or a representative of the employees and the third a divisional inspector and the fourth the chief inspector of mines. The duty of the Board is to examine candidates desirous of becoming mine managers. At the present time the Board consists of the chief inspector of mines, his assistant, the chief inspector of collieries, a mine manager and an employees' representative. I think hon. members will be astonished to know that the employees' representative is no other than the general manager of the Mt. Morgan mine. This gentleman is fully qualified for the position, and nobody can take objection to that. He is ideally suited for the position, but he is really not an employees' representative. He is a member of the Board of Examiners. I am not advocating—and I do not want to be misunderstood—the removal of Mr. Sheil from the Board of Examiners. He is very competent, and in addition to his ability and standing as an engineer, he is an estimable citizen. Therefore I would not like the Board to lose his services.

To the best of my knowledge neither the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union nor the Australian Workers' Union has ever been asked to nominate on the Board of Examiners a representative of employees in the metalliferous and coal-mining industries. There are men in the Colliery Employees' Union who could serve on the Board with distinction to themselves and the industry. I am sure, too, that there are men in the ranks of the Australian Workers' Union who could serve on the Board. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Fitzroy holds a mine Manager's certificate and is admirably fitted for such service. I think the Minister should ask the Colliery Employees' Union and the Australian Workers' Union each to nominate one of its members for appointment to the Board of Examiners. Such an appointment could be made without disturbing the present personnel, and it would be of great advantage

if the employees in both the coal-mining industry and the metalliferous-mining industry were represented on the Board.

Experience has shown the necessity for adding the new sub-paragraph to Section 28 (4), reading as follows:—

"Any accidental ignition or detonation of explosives."

I am sure that this addition will meet with general approval throughout the mining industry.

I should like some clarification on the amendment to Section 33, by inserting in the first paragraph of sub-section (1) after the words, "any person who," the words, "except under the authority of and in accordance with a permit issued under subsection two of this section, the onus of proof whereof shall rest upon the defendant."

I should like to ask the Minister whether this provision means that an operator will not now need a winding-driver's certificate. If it is necessary for him to have one, I can find no fault with the provision. However, if it is not, I think I would be justified in voicing very strong opposition to the provision. It could cut across safety requirements and result in a serious accident. Does the repealing of the words, "in so far as it relates to the raising or lowering of material" in the third paragraph of subsection (1) of Section 33 mean that a person who does not hold a winding licence can raise or lower men and materials provided that arrangements to the satisfaction of the Minister are made, in lieu of the requirements of the section, for the proper supervision and efficient operation of the electrical machinery connected with such cage, skip or other conveyance? It would be a step in the wrong direction to allow an unqualified man to take charge of winding machinery.

The new subsection to be added to this section for the purpose of enabling suitable persons to get practical instruction in the driving or operating of any winding machinery or any winding engine under the direct supervision and instruction of the holder of a winding licence should not meet with any serious objection. To obtain a general winding licence, the applicant must hold a first-class engine-driver's certificate and have at least 12 hours' experience each week for several weeks in hauling from a vertical shaft.

Strange as it may seem, because of the limited number of vertical shafts in the State it is more difficult to obtain this experience in some cases than it is to pass the necessary examination. For that reason, the necessary number of hours' experience in vertical shafts has been reduced. In my day we had to do considerably more. For some years before and some years after I obtained my general winding licence, candidates for it gained experience in bailing water from a shaft. With the trend moving away from

vertical shafts it has become extremely difficult in some coal-mining districts of Queensland to get the necessary experience.

The repeal of the words, "No person other than a watchman or caretaker of machinery" in Section 36 and the insertion in lieu thereof of the words—"No person in charge of a winding engine" gives additional protection to the winding enginedriver and thus makes for greater safety.

I have some opposition to the amendment to Section 39. I think it would be better for all concerned if the Chief Inspector and not the District Inspector or other inspector approved in writing the other competent person who would make the actual survey upon which the accurate plans of the underground workings of the mine were based. The extension from "not more than three months" to "not more than six months" of the period within which all additional underground working and extensions made since the previous survey was effected shall be surveyed and delineated on the plan is in my opinion a retrograde step. A great deal could happen in six months, including mistakes that could lead to serious accidents. If checks were made every three months instead of every six months these matters could be noted on a plan and accidents avoided. If the amending clause is due to the shortage of surveyors will the Minister explain the reason for the shortage?

I find no fault with the other amendment to Section 39, and I approve of the new subsection 8, providing that if any person makes a false certificate when a survey has been made by a person who is not competent he shall be penalised. I do not think anyone would quarrel with that.

I agree with the proposed new Section 55 A. It will without doubt assist the department and the industry. It would be worth the while of any hon. member to visit the Mines Department's works at Redbank. They will see from the core library there how much the new section will help the department and the industry. It is possible to see, for instance, what is at 10 feet and what is at 20 feet, perhaps shale at 40 feet, coal at 50 feet, and so on. In the past we have had to put down another bore to test an area that had previously been tested.

The amendments to the section dealing with penalties merely brings the various amounts up to present-day values so they should not meet with any serious opposition.

The repeal of Section 66 and the insertion of a new section providing that the Act shall in no way impair or otherwise affect the operation of any of the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Acts or the Inspection of Machinery Acts should meet with general approval. We should not like to see any amendment to the Mines Regulation Acts, or any other Act for that matter, that would interfere with the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Acts

or the Inspection of Machinery Acts. The Inspection of Machinery Acts make for the safe working of people in any industry where machines are in operation and the Workers' Compensation Acts, of course, provide for compensation for workers who are hurt in industry, or their dependants should they meet with death.

Most, but not all, of the amendments dealing with winding appear to make for some improvement.

I can wholeheartedly approve the amendment to Schedule I. It is a step in the right directions. Had its provisions been applied to the coal and metalliferous mining industry many years ago, we would not have had so many cases of unfortunate miners suffering from miner's phthisis or silicosis.

I should like the Minister to define just what is a "lift" in the amendment of Schedule, Part II. and whether they will be operated by persons who do not hold a winding licence. I could not support the Bill if it gave permission for any winding engine or machinery to be operated by any person other than the holder of a winding licence.

The portion of the Bill that deals with radio-active material has been debated at length, therefore hon. members know just how necessary it is to be incorporated in the Bill to give protection to people working in the mining industry.

Generally speaking I approve of the Bill as I believe it will give satisfaction in the coal-mining industry. I cannot speak with authority on the metalliferous mining industry but I think it will meet with approval there too. I hope the Minister can give a satisfactory explanation that will prove my fears to be groundless.

Mr. A. J. SMITH (Carpentaria) (2.27 p.m.): I am authorised to speak for and on behalf of a section of men working in the mining industry, members of the Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association, known as winding drivers. The Bill really contains nothing affecting the safety of miners but mainly makes amendments to the Inspection of Machinery Acts and the Mines Regulation Acts affecting surveyors. When I met the Mt. Isa branch of the Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association last week-end they were greatly concerned about Clause 6 which makes provision for the issue of permits for the handling of winding machines that carry men, material and ore from underground to the surface. The men presently operating these machines have served their time and had the necessary experience. The members of the Mt. Isa branch fear that the issue of permits may interfere with the employment of the present operators and they are also concerned about the safety of men underground. There is not much danger to the men working in the stopes but they are worried about possible interference with the skids or the timbering of the shafts. The lack of experience of an operator could

cause great damage to the mine and injury to men underground who might not be able to get away to safety.

I should like the Minister to explain the fundamental workings of Clause 6. I should also like to know whether he has heard from Mr. Whiteside, the executive head of the Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association in Queensland? Has he had the union's opinion on this portion of the legislation, particularly the issue of permits? I do believe that information given to the House in regard to Clause 6 will be of benefit to the people concerned.

Clause 8 amends Section 39 of the principal Act by repealing subsections 1 and 2 and inserting the following:—

“The owner, agent or manager of every mine where six or more men or, if the Minister so directs by notification published in the ‘Gazette,’ where any less number of men are ordinarily employed below ground, shall keep at the mine accurate plans at the underground workings . . .”

It is essential that there should be an accurate plan of the underground workings of these mines. Many mines have been abandoned for a period and then leased by some other person or company, and it is essential that an accurate plan of the underground workings should be available. This has not always been available.

Mr. Evans: We have corrected that here.

Mr. A. J. SMITH: That has been lacking in the past. The intensification of copper production at Cloncurry has emphasised the necessity for accurate underground plans of the underground workings, drives, stopes and rises. That will lessen the danger, when walking across a drive or a crosscut of falling into a rise or a stope. Accurate plans contain a complete record of distances.

Clause 12 repeals Section 66 of the principal Act and provides the following:—

“Subject to subsection 2 of this section, nothing in this Act shall in any way derogate from or otherwise affect any of the provisions of—

(a) The Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1956;

(b) The Inspection of Machinery Acts, 1916 to 1956;

The lift system affects not only winding drivers but the men who are working underground. The functioning of lifts is not as safe as we would like them to be. This morning's “Courier-Mail” reports the death of four men who were killed in a lift at the Snowy River Scheme owing to a cog in the lift jamming and the lift falling 400 feet. The amendment provides that lifts will be subject to the mines regulations, but the regulations do not ensure complete safety. In the city lifts get jammed between floors and in the mines they become jammed between the levels. If a catastrophe occurred underground numbers of men would rush to the lift and if the lift jammed they would be

subject to great danger. Automation is coming into operation. There is a big automatic haulage plant at Mt. Isa. Winding-engine drivers will become unemployed as a result of the elimination of the lift system. The dangers associated with automatic machinery should be carefully guarded against. When considering any amendment of the Act, the safety of the mine workers, particularly those who work underground, must be given paramount consideration.

The Minister has said that a certified driver will be in attendance so that the lift can be switched immediately to manual control if an electrical or other fault develops. All automatic lifts and hoists should be capable of being switched over immediately to manual control. At Mt. Isa 40 or 50 men are raised or lowered in a lift. The lift may be the means of escape from a fire, a fall of earth, or a crack underground. If the automatic system jammed and there was no provision for manual control, the result would be tragic.

A lift-driver is always in attendance in the city area. He knows the fundamental system of the lift and can immediately switch it to hand control and operate it until the automatic system is repaired. We frequently read of people being trapped in automatic lifts. We have read of people being trapped in the lifts of big department stores overseas when the buildings caught fire.

Consideration should be given to the same precaution for all automatic machinery in and around a mine. In the interests of the safety of men working underground, all these automatic devices should be capable of being switched immediately to manual control.

I have had a great deal of experience on mining fields. I have been a member of deputations to the Under Secretary and Minister for Mines. Those deputations have always been advised that what they seek is covered in the Act. I have advised men working in and around mines to work in accordance with the Act. If they do so at all times, their safety is assured. If an employer persuades an employee to work other than in accordance with the provisions of the Act, and an accident happens, it is the employee's fault. Under the Act he is given as much protection as the employer.

Employers and employees should be consulted when any amendments of the Act are contemplated. In that way we will get the best provisions from the viewpoint of safety.

I ask the Minister to advise whether the attendant on an automatic lift will be a flagman in the cage or an attendant in the winding-house on the surface, whether the provisions of the Bill have been referred to the executive of the Federated Engine Drivers' and Firemen's Association and, if they have, whether the executive gave them their approval. If approval was given by the executive of the union, I shall be able to

tell the employees in my area that everything contained in the Bill is for their benefit and for the benefit of the industry.

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani—Minister for Development, Mines, and Main Roads) (2.39 p.m.), in reply: The Bill has been received very well. I thank hon. members for their comments.

The Leader of the Opposition, in referring to the Board of Examiners, particularly mentioned Mr. Sheil. Mr. Sheil is an employee as well as a mine manger. I should like to read this minute—

“A member of the Board of Examiners must be able to set and mark papers for the annual examinations for first-class mine managers’ certificates and hence he must have the equivalent of a University degree in mining.”

There are very few with those qualifications. Mr. Sheil is a mine employee and has the necessary qualifications but I shall give consideration to the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition.

The matter of winding gear seems to be the most contentious part of the Bill. In my introductory speech I gave all the information available and the advice we have received not only from mine owners but from unionists too. We approached Mr. Whiteside of the F.E.D. & F.A., who told us that after studying the Bill and discussing the matter very fully with our mining officers, that it was approved.

Mr. Donald: Mr. Whiteside is satisfied?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. I got that advice yesterday. I suggested that my officers get in touch with him. They did so and he is satisfied.

As to the accident that occurred recently at the Snowy Mountain project, inquiries will probably reveal that it occurred to a small manually operated lift. It was probably the result of a mechanical fault, something that you can get anywhere.

As to the driving of winding gear, learners have to learn how to operate, and as in the case of shire councils I insisted that grader-drivers give so many hours a week to those learning how to drive. There will be no danger to persons concerned as learners will train under supervision.

Mr. Donald: You will not allow an uncertificated driver to take charge of winding plant?

Mr. EVANS: We will permit him to train under supervision.

Mr. Donald: What about Section 33—the onus of proof?

Mr. EVANS: We can deal with that in Committee.

Motion (Mr. Evans) agreed to.

COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 5, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—Amendments of s. 33; Engine-drivers to be certificated—

Mr. DONALD (Bremer—Leader of the Opposition) (2.45 p.m.): I should like the Minister to explain the meaning of the following provision:—

“By inserting in the first paragraph of subsection 1 of that section being the paragraph commencing with the words ‘Subject to the provisions hereinafter contained’, after the words ‘any person who,’ the words, ‘except under the authority of and in accordance with a permit issued under subsection two of this section, the onus of proof whereof shall rest upon the defendant’.”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani—Minister for Development, Mines, and Main Roads) (2.46 p.m.): The onus of proof will rest upon the defendant. If he can produce a permit, that is all the proof that will be required.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 15, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING.

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

PATRIOTIC FUND OF QUEENSLAND BILL.

SECOND READING.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (2.48 p.m.): I move—

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

I should like briefly to recapitulate the purposes of the Bill. It will give the Queensland Patriotic Fund authority to provide money for the erection of a shrine of memories that will form part of the structure that the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. proposes to build, to be known as Anzac House.

During the introductory stage there was some confusion about whether the proposed shrine of memories would be a part of Anzac House. It will be incorporated in Anzac House, but in reality it will be a separate entity. It will fit in with the general design of the building but it will be a separate part set aside for the purpose of a shrine. As owners of the land on which the building is to be erected, the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. will dedicate to the Queensland Patriotic Fund by a 99-year lease, or some similar instrument, the piece of land on which it is proposed to erect the shrine of memories. The money for

the erection of the shrine, up to an amount of £60,000 will be found by the Patriotic Fund, which will accept the responsibility of seeing that it is built in accordance with the plan that is agreed upon. The R.S.S.A.I.L.L.A. however, will accept the responsibility of caring for and maintaining the shrine. That is very important in a project of the nature envisaged. The shrine will be a memorial to the ex-service men and women of Queensland who served in World War II.

If we build something like that someone must be given the responsibility for its care and maintenance. A number of unit organisations have provided in the crypt in Anzac Square very suitable memorials to members of their regiments or batteries or other units but they have to be locked up because of the possibility of damage by vandals.

Mr. Lloyd: They are open now.

Mr. NICKLIN: Only recently, thanks to an arrangement made, they have been open for most of the day. However, if the shrine is to be an adequate memorial it should be open at all hours of the day and night for people to visit and someone should accept responsibility for its care and maintenance.

Mr. Lloyd: Will this Hall of Memories include recognition of all units?

Mr. NICKLIN: Yes, it will cover all Queensland Service men and women who served in World War II. It will be the property of Queensland.

Mr. Jesson: Who will say what may be put there, and where?

Mr. NICKLIN: I understand the Patriotic Committee and the R.S.S.A.I.L.L.A. have arrived at a basic plan. It is not yet complete. I saw it many years ago. I have been trying to get a copy of it. I have not seen it lately. It is beautiful in concept and it will be a very worthy memorial. It will be the responsibility of the Queensland Patriotic Fund to see that something worthwhile is constructed and I am sure we can leave it safely in their hands.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (2.53 p.m.): The Bill is non-political but all ex-service men are entitled to express their own opinion on a measure affecting the allocation of moneys that have been raised for a particular purpose, in the interests of serving members of the Forces and ex-service men and women. This should never become a political football and it is not my intention to treat it as such, nor would it be the intention of any other hon. member, I feel sure. But any person is entitled to express his opinion on the way £60,000 should be spent from a fund that was established for a very specific purpose. It was designed mainly to alleviate distress amongst service personnel, and ex-service men and women and their families.

Unfortunately the Premier was not able to give us very much information on the composition of the Hall of Memories. As has

now been explained, the Hall of Memories will of course be the property of the Queensland Patriotic Fund not of the returned soldiers. This is very important because unfortunately at present there is a division of opinion amongst ex-service men's organisations throughout the State. One of the most unfortunate aspects is the jealousy that springs from the smaller organisations feeling that they were being squeezed out by a larger organisation. It is only natural that that should occur. We have to consider their opinion in all these matters. It is unfortunate that many of the smaller organisations fear that the Patriotic Fund has not been operated for the benefit of all ex-service men. I have been assured by several of them that on occasions deserving applications have been made to the Patriotic Fund for the alleviation of distress but they have been summarily rejected.

Mr. Dewar: You said "many organisations". Which ones?

Mr. LLOYD: T.B. Soldiers, for one. If the hon. member discusses these matters with the various organisations he will find that I am correct. I am not being political. I am trying to put something forward that I think will be of assistance to the department in the administration of the fund. Many of the smaller organisations have found that their members have not been able to receive the assistance to which they are entitled. We have only to look at the reply to my question in the House yesterday morning by the Premier.

Mr. Hiley: Do not the T.B. Soldiers get more help by way of pension than any other returned service men?

Mr. LLOYD: I would agree but we must not forget that many applications are made because of an emergency—immediate financial distress. It has been explained by the Premier and we realise that repatriation does to a great extent cover the long period of assistance to returned service men because of wounds or illness from war service. But in most cases sooner or later an emergency arises. This fund, like the Canteen Trust Fund, is established to cover periods of immediate emergency, and applications for assistance are made accordingly. I have in mind the case of a member of a T.B. soldiers organisation. He made application for assistance but was rejected. It was necessary for the association to assist to the extent of its statutory limit of £20 in any one case. It was felt by that association at the time, as is the general feeling throughout the smaller organisations, that the Patriotic Fund is a sort of abstract organisation that has no real sympathy for the distress or consideration for the welfare of ex-service men generally. The fund was established under trustees. To many ex-Service men it is a type of "out of this world" set-up. Indeed, very few ex-Service men know of its existence unless they are members of an ex-service men's

association that has a fundamental knowledge of all the methods by which ex-service men can receive assistance.

I would suggest that the whole fund be looked at to ensure that all ex-service men's organisations can have some say in the distribution of the money. After all, as the Premier indicated in his answer to my question, it has assets to the total of £212,000. The fund was established for a specific purpose and again as the Premier said, the expenditure from the fund has been for the relief of distress among ex-service men and women and their families, arising from unemployment, sickness, accident, and other abnormal causes; assistance to blinded ex-service men and their families; painting and repairs to the homes of war widows, and general assistance to needy ex-service men and women, and the provision of additions to the Church of England Sailors' and Soldiers' Help Society Rest Hostel at Coolangatta.

The objectives of the fund are very clear. I suppose there would be a dozen organisations whose members would be involved in the distribution of the finance, and they should have representation. If all ex-service men's organisations were represented there would be greater support for the fund. The Bill provides for the allocation of £60,000 from a total of £212,000 for the purpose of providing a Shrine of Memories. That is a large amount to be taken from one fund which was established for a specific purpose. Under the original Act the money could be utilised for prescribed purposes. We all appreciate the gesture of the Premier in bringing the matter before the House instead of doing it by regulation. A sum of £60,000 or 28 per cent. of the fund will be taken. I understand that the matter was broached to the previous Premier and it was rejected. There may have been good reasons for that. I should like to hear from members on the cross benches why they rejected the original application. I am sure that information would be helpful while we are dealing with the Bill. Ex-service men are divided on the matter of building memorials and statues costing large sums of money for the glorification of war. Fifty per cent. of ex-service men are against it.

Mr. Hiley: Ninety per cent.

Mr. LLOYD: I was very conservative. If they were all of my opinion they would be 100 per cent. against it. We believe that everything should be done to prevent distress amongst the families of service personnel. There are many ex-service men suffering ill-health as a result of injuries received in World War I. and World War II. who do not receive repatriation benefits. These men served their country in time of war and these funds were provided for the purpose of assisting them and their families. The Repatriation Department has no power

to assist these people in the event of an emergency. I am sure every hon. member has been approached by widows of service men who have died recently to see whether they are eligible for war widow's pensions. Their husbands served in the first World War but did not receive any repatriation benefits. Those widows are in need of assistance. In many cases, although there was ground for application, the service man did not apply for repatriation benefits, and the Department of Repatriation was unable to accept his disability as being due to war service. The widow then does not receive a war pension.

Many ex-service men are out of employment. In the last 12 months I think it will be agreed that unemployment has increased. The education of the children of ex-service men and the welfare of war widows and their families are matters of paramount importance. They should be considered seriously before it is decided to allocate £60,000 for the construction of a Hall of Memories, which will not be of substantial benefit to ex-service men and women.

Although the legislation contemplates fund assistance for the erection of buildings such as the one mentioned earlier, the hostel for returned soldiers and sailors, I do not believe that it was ever contemplated that the money would be used for the building of a Hall of Memories. The sum represents 28 per cent. of the fund. We have to take into account that, whereas, in previous years the drain on the fund was £5,000 to £6,000 a year, in nine months of this year payments amounted to £22,000—a considerable increase. In all probability that money was given to organisations that assist ex-service personnel. If that rate of expenditure continues, the fund will not last very long. By this proposal a precedent has been established, and, when a precedent is established, it is difficult to refuse requests for similar assistance in the future.

This action arises from the request of the returned soldiers and sailors organisation. It seeks assistance to build a Hall of Memories. What would happen if a similar request was made by the Limbless Soldiers Association or some other association?

Mr. Hiley: This is not a request from the R.S.L.

Mr. LLOYD: I understood it was.

Mr. Hiley: It is a request from the Patriotic Fund.

Mr. LLOYD: I may have misunderstood the Premier. I have a note of his earlier statement as well as his statement today, that he was approached by the R.S.L. and the Patriotic Fund.

Mr. Nicklin: It is a request from the Patriotic Fund, and the R.S.L. agreed.

Mr. LLOYD: I understood the Patriotic Fund was asked by the R.S.L. to make the request to the Government.

Mr. Nicklin: The Patriotic Fund made the request to the Government.

Mr. LLOYD: It is rather puzzling. The request must have come from somewhere.

Mr. Nicklin: The Patriotic Fund.

Mr. LLOYD: If the Patriotic Fund approached the Government, that strengthens my case. The Patriotic Fund of Queensland should be overhauled and the Committee of Management re-established under a different constitution. The fund was established by statute for the specific purpose of alleviating distress of ex-service men, serving personnel and their families. I cannot see that the building of a Hall of Memories is in accordance with that purpose. If the returned soldiers and sailors organisation had applied for the allocation of this money, for the purpose of building and handing over to the Patriotic Fund a Hall of Memories, in memory of their lost friends, I should think in all probability it would be a reasonable request. For the trustees of the fund to go completely outside the constitution of the fund and request that they be allowed to allocate £60,000 to a memorial when the fund is dedicated to assisting distressed ex-service men and women strengthens my case that ex-service men and women should be represented on the committee of management of the fund.

Mr. Hiley: The Patriotic Fund is doing the work. I served on it for years. The trustees did not make the decision. The committee makes decisions. The trustees only hold the money.

Mr. LLOYD: I understand what the Treasurer is saying. Every ex-service men's organisation should have the opportunity of having a representative elected to the committee at the annual general meeting. They would have to go to the annual meeting to get onto the committee. The trustees having complete control—

Mr. Hiley: They have not. I was treasurer of the fund for 12 years.

Mr. LLOYD: If a person is not suitable to the trustees would he get on the committee? As a matter of fact, he would be kept off it. Sir John Chandler is one of the trustees and I understand he was President for years of the Australian Comforts Fund which has been amalgamated with the Patriotic Fund. Sir Raymond Huish, the State President of the R.S.S.A.I.L.A., is also a trustee and so is Mr. Meynink. They are gentlemen who have done a considerable amount of good for ex-service men but every ex-service men's organisation should have the opportunity of sending representatives to the annual general meeting, and the constitution of the fund should be altered to provide that there should be a certain number of representatives from ex-service men's organisations on the committee. Let the various

associations make their nominations. The representatives could be appointed to the committee by the annual general meeting. It would be virtually impossible for any member of the Returned Diggers' Association or the Totally and Permanently Disabled Soldiers' Association to get on the committee. I do not think it would be possible. Whilst the Patriotic Fund has made application to the Government to spend £60,000 on a Hall of Memories, we have Australian troops serving in Malaya and the fund is doing nothing to assist deserving cases.

Mr. Jesson: I guarantee they have not sent them a parcel.

Mr. LLOYD: The fund was established to send parcels to personnel serving overseas. Queenslanders are serving in Malaya at the present time, but I doubt very much whether the Patriotic Fund is doing anything for them. The fund was established for a definite purpose, and the danger of war is continually hovering over us. The question to be decided is whether the fund should be used to set up a memorial or to alleviate distress among ex-service men and women and their families. If the fund is embarrassed by the size of its resources, there are many worthy purposes for which it could be used. For example, scholarships could be awarded to the children of ex-service men after the application of a means test. If it was found that an ex-service man in needy circumstances had a clever child, a scholarship could be awarded to allow the child to proceed to higher education. There are many other excellent ways in which the fund could be used to help ex-service men. In my opinion it would be better for the fund to use its resources in that way than to set up a Hall of Memories.

The Premier has said that the land on which the proposed shrine is to be built will remain the property of the Patriotic Fund, but we must consider its location. It will be on Wickham Terrace, which is isolated from the city area. The shrine in Sydney is in Hyde Park, and Melbourne's shrine is in the Botanical Gardens. What is wrong with having Brisbane's shrine in the Botanical Gardens? It will be the property not only of ex-service men and women, but of the general public.

I should like to hear expressions of opinion from all ex-service men in the House, from a non-political point of view, on whether it is right for the Patriotic Fund to use its money for the purpose suggested. I should like particularly to hear the views of members of the Queensland Labour Party. They rejected this proposal when they were the Government. It is a great pity that plans of the proposed building are not available for our inspection.

In conclusion, I am strongly of the opinion that all ex-service men's organisations should be represented on the Patriotic Fund of Queensland.

Mr. JESSON (Hinchinbrook) (3.19 p.m.): I agree with the hon. member for Kedron that this matter should be approached from a non-Party point of view. I made it my business to telephone one of the trustees of the Patriotic Fund this morning, and I also discussed the matter with the Premier for about an hour. I am very loth to make it a political matter.

I am not blaming the Premier for introducing the measure. However, I believe that he has been misled. I do not know whether the Patriotic Fund or the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. originated the proposal, but I do know that one of the trustees of the Patriotic Fund is not very happy about it. Originally he did not think there would be any objection to it, but he realises now that it will be what might be termed a sectional memorial.

Unfortunately I was in hospital when the Bill was introduced and I did not read much about it in the paper. It was only this last week that I saw it on the business sheet and since then I have been approached by different people. If I had known earlier it was on the stocks I am sure I could have brought along petitions from at least 12 soldiers' organisations protesting against it. Only last night I was phoned by several soldiers' organisations protesting against the money being spent up on Wickham Terrace without their knowledge and without their being consulted about it. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out, and as the Premier admitted, we have not seen the plans. After the Bill is passed, although the land is being dedicated to the Government or the trustees for 99 years, or something of that description, once the building is started it is possible that the R.S.L. will use offices downstairs or upstairs or somewhere else in the building. I believe they collected £160,000 or more, or they have it in kitty, to rebuild Anzac House. I am not using this politically and I am not against the R.S.L. either. I can get the Diggers' Association, the Limbless Soldiers, the Australian Legion, and five or six other big, strong healthy soldiers' organisations to back me up if necessary.

I suggested to the Premier this morning that there was no great hurry about the matter. Why not defer it instead of antagonising all those people?

I remember when the Queen was here, the uproar there was from different soldiers' organisations over the wreath she placed at the Flame of Remembrance. The R.S.L. wanted to put it up in Anzac House and I believe they have it there. It should be somewhere for everybody to see. It was presented in memory of the fallen of the State. It was not presented to the R.S.L. but they grabbed it and they have it up there. I will guarantee here and now that while Sir Raymond Huish

is in charge of the Imperial League there will be no war relics of the Legion's up there in the place they control.

Let us look at the matter from a broad, national point of view. In every State of the Commonwealth there are war memorials housing flags, curios, guns, explosives, and so on and they have been the responsibility of the State. Who provided the National War Memorial at Canberra, the Comforts Fund, the Patriotic Fund, the Red Cross, or any other fund?

I say it is deliberately misappropriating the money. The people who collected the money on street corners and on chocolate wheels and raffles during the war years built up a patriotic fund to assist those in distress, not to be used as a building fund for an edifice in front of the R.S.L. offices, which is all it will be when all is said and done. It does not matter what is put inside it. It is going to make a magnificent front for that building. The money has been collected by the people of Queensland and by little kiddies with their threepences and pennies at school fetes.

Let us be sensible. What have we got to lose by letting the matter stand over till August? As a matter of fact, not only the returned soldiers' organisations but also every other national organisation should have some say in it—St. David's Society, St. George's Society, the Caledonians, and all of them. Every one of those organisations is represented on the committees and is entitled to some say as well as the various branches of the R.S.L. If they are going to build anything like that, something should be done, as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, down in the Botanical Gardens or some other central place under the control of the various organisations or the All-Services Committee. There is no great hurry. Apparently the plans have gone astray. Here is a building that will cost so much money yet we cannot find the plans. They are lost.

Mr. Ramsden: That is a mis-statement of fact.

Mr. JESSON: The Premier just said it.

Mr. Ramsden: He did not say he lost them.

Mr. JESSON: They cannot be found anyhow. They cannot be presented.

Mr. Nicklin: I could not locate the plans in my office.

Mr. JESSON: Why have the plans not been presented to let us have a look at them to see where the foundations are going?

Mr. Nicklin: I could if I had time.

Mr. JESSON: I should like to know where this building is going to start and finish. Why spend £60,000 on a building for one organisation when so many others are entitled to consideration? Why spend that much money when there is already adequate

housing at the Flame of Remembrance built by the Brisbane City Council. The only reason that is not open is the risk of vandalism.

Mr. Lloyd: It is open now.

Mr. JESSON: It is open now, yes, because there is an election campaign I suppose. The interest on £60,000 would give a job to a limbless soldier as a caretaker. We have already got a suitable place in the heart of the city so why give £60,000 to an organisation to make a nice front on a building which will belong to only a certain section of the community? I beg the Premier to let the matter stand. There is no great urgency. Let us wait and see if we can get unity amongst the various ex-service men's organisations instead of splitting them wide open as they were three or four years ago because of the high-handed methods of a few. Two or three months would not make the slightest difference in the world. In that time the whole matter could be thoroughly gone into. Many ex-service men's wives and widows are in a serious position today. The wives of burned-out Diggers under 50 years of age are being left destitute. They cannot get a pension. Every day in the week ex-service men's organisations are fighting cases for women who seem to be a lost legion. They cannot get any social service. Many of them are too young to get a widow's pension. Ex-service men's organisations are assisting them by handing out a few shillings a week. If I made inquiries I should probably find that many of them are drawing money from the Government Relief Fund at the depot in Edward street.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made a very good point. Australian service men have been fighting in Malaya for over two years but I have not heard of any comfort parcels going over to them. That was the original idea of the fund. The Red Cross should do something for the boys who are over there in Malaya keeping the Australian flag flying and carrying out our contribution to the United Nations. I have just received information that the secretary of the fund is not even an ex-service man. I make a final appeal to the Premier to allow the matter to stand and see what the repercussions are from the various soldiers' organisations. This Bill will create a very dangerous precedent.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (3.31 p.m.): I congratulate the Premier on introducing the Bill. The only reason why I decided to speak was because of the unmitigated twaddle which I just heard from the hon. member for Kedron and the hon. member for Hinchinbrook. When I speak I limit myself to matters of which I have knowledge. I claim that from a practical point of view I have had more experience and knowledge of the Queensland Patriotic Fund and ex-service men's organisations than any other hon. member in this House.

Mr. Lloyd: Tell me how this will help distress?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I shall explain that as I go along. There seems to be a complete misunderstanding of the position. The original charter given to the Patriotic Fund Committee was that it should serve for the relief of distress caused through war. Strictly speaking, if an ex-service man goes to the Queensland Patriotic Fund and applies for assistance on the ground that he is unemployed, he is not eligible to receive it. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition made so bold as to criticise the fund and say that it was not being used for the purpose for which it was set up.

Mr. Lloyd: I said that many ex-service men's organisations held that opinion.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I doubt whether many ex-service men's organisations do share the views put forward by the hon. member. I do not know whether the hon. member is aware of the fact that soldiers suffering from T.B. contracted during the second World War received a grant, without a means test, of £20 from the Queensland Patriotic Fund. Is the hon. member aware that every war blinded ex-service man of the second World War has received very considerable assistance in the matter of building? Is the hon. member aware that every war widow whose house was in need of urgent painting was able to have the work done with money provided by the Queensland Patriotic Fund, and utilised through the Brisbane Legacy Club? I do not know whether the hon. member knows these things, or whether he is closing his eyes to them. The hon. member also mentioned scholarships. As one who has been in the field of relief for eight years, I am qualified to talk about relief organisations.

There is a possibility, unless the matter is considered very carefully, of one organisation overlapping the work of another organisation. There is the type of person—fortunately he is rare—who migrates from one relief organisation to another, and makes a comfortable living until he is caught. For the last seven or eight years to my knowledge organisations such as the Services Canteen Trust Fund, the Red Cross, the Queensland Patriotic Fund, C.U.S.A., St. Vincent de Paul Society, have had an understanding that they will not impinge on the scope or activities of each other, so that when an ex-service man approaches Mr. Hughie Gasteen, the Secretary of the Queensland Patriotic Fund, and puts up his case for assistance, the first question Mr. Gasteen asks himself, out of fairness to the fund and in accordance with the agreement of the organisations, is, "Is this man a case for the Services Canteen Trust Fund? If he is, he is no worry of mine, until that fund has failed to help him further." At that time he is free to make an application for assistance.

If the hon. member for Kedron spoke to the secretary of the Services Canteen Trust Fund, or the Queensland Patriotic Fund, he would find that one of the reasons why the fund has not given as much assistance as the hon. member thinks it should, would be that

many applications for assistance have been cases to be handled by the Services Canteen Trust Fund.

Mr. Jesson: They are all representatives of soldiers' organisations.

Mr. RAMSDEN: You had your say.

Mr. Jesson: You had a lot to say when I was speaking.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member for Kedron has suggested that the money could be better used in providing scholarships. Let me point out that the Queensland Patriotic Fund would be really wasting money, and the Committee know it, if it came into the field of educational scholarships, because that is a province well and truly catered for by the Services Canteen Trust Fund, which this year spent somewhere about £30,000 on education in Queensland. The Queensland Patriotic Fund has acted in accordance with the agreement not to impinge on the activities of other organisations. If it did, I think it would be doing the wrong thing.

Mr. Jesson: Do you think ex-service men are getting too much? You are making out a case for less assistance.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member cannot understand. He could not understand the Premier.

Mr. Lloyd: Have you not heard of cases of ex-service men in distress?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Yes. For the last eight years I have carried out more investigations than any other hon. member in this Chamber. That is why I can speak with authority on the subject.

Mr. Lloyd: Would you prefer a Hall of Memories?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am trying to show, despite the continual interruptions from hon. members on my right, that the Patriotic Fund has been administered wisely and well.

It was said by the hon. member for Kedron that the expenditure of this money will create a precedent. The precedent has already been created.

Mr. Lloyd: Where?

Mr. RAMSDEN: Many years ago. It was created when the Queensland Patriotic Fund spent £60,000 to £70,000 on the war veterans' home at Caboolture.

Mr. Jesson: That is different from a memorial hall.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The precedent has been established.

Mr. Lloyd: That was in the interests of ex-service men.

Mr. RAMSDEN: It was created by the expenditure of another £4,850 on the installation of water and sewerage in the same home.

Mr. Lloyd: The welfare of ex-service men.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The precedent has been established again by the expenditure by the Queensland Patriotic Fund on the building or re-building of a rest home at Coolangatta for £29,000. The second step is nearly finished and, when that is finished, the third step will go on. To say those things do not establish a precedent is entirely wrong.

I am not speaking from hearsay. In view of the interest taken in this Bill, ten or fifteen minutes ago I spoke to the secretary of the Queensland Patriotic Fund and to the general secretary of the R.S.L. and got their views on it. I do not mind the hon. member for Hinchinbrook saying that some trustee is upset about the proposal because I understand from the secretary of the committee—and I am not talking about the three trustees now—that the committee was unanimous in going ahead with this Shrine of Remembrance.

Mr. Jesson: How many were at the committee meeting?

Mr. RAMSDEN: If the hon. member writes to Mr. Gasteen he will tell him. The Opposition are off the beam when speaking about this Shrine of Remembrance being dedicated to men of this service or that service. I said I had a telephone conversation with the secretary of the fund and from him I learned that the Shrine carries these words—"Dedicated to those who served." The concept of service in the minds of those who originated the idea of the Shrine of Remembrance is not only those who served in the Australian Armed Services but in memory of those who served in any capacity in the service of Australia during the last great war. That would include not only the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. but the Y.M.C.A., the Salvation Army and those who constituted the Australian Comforts Fund. Service would also include the Commonwealth Construction Corps—in fact all people who gave service to the country whether in the armed forces or otherwise. It is to commemorate the memory of those people. To speak about it being necessary to re-constitute the fund to include representatives from all service men's organisations is just nonsense. You might as well have representatives from every trade union. The question of representation of ex-service men's organisations does not solve the problem. From his experience the hon. member for Hinchinbrook should know that the committee of the Services Canteen Trust Fund is made up of representatives from organisations such as the R.S.S.A.I.L.A., the Legion of Ex-Service Men, the Limbless Soldiers' Association, the Ex-Naval Men's Association and the Women's Services. We still get complaints from many organisations with representation on the committee about some decisions reached. I think the idea of the Shrine is a good one

and I repeat that no precedent has been created. Interest at the rate of 6 per cent. only amounts to £360 a year.

Mr. Hanlon: On £60,000?

Mr. Jesson: Go back to school.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I apologise for the mistake. This is not something that should be done in an underhand way. As the Premier told the House it could have been done by regulation but because everybody was in favour of the idea the matter was submitted to Parliament.

Mr. Jesson: Everybody is not in favour of it.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The only ones not in favour of it are the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Hinchinbrook because of his vicious attacks on the R.S.S.A.I.L.A.

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order. I did not make any vicious attack on the R.S.S.A.I.L.A. I was rung by the Diggers' Association and other organisations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Merthyr.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I accept the apology of the hon. member for Hinchinbrook.

Mr. Jesson: I am not apologising to you.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The hon. member made an attack—I omit the word "vicious" on this occasion—on Sir Raymond Huish, and said that while he was there the Legion would have nothing to do with it. I contend that he is approaching the debate from a biased point of view. I commend the Bill.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (3.46 p.m.), in reply: I was rather surprised at the attitude of the hon. member for Hinchinbrook and his irresponsible statements. At the outset he said that he did not want to stir up trouble among the various ex-service men's organisations, and he then proceeded to stir up as much as he could.

The Bill was introduced on 27 March last. It was left on the business sheet purposely so that we could see if there was any unfavourable reaction to it. However, not one ex-service men's organisation has approached me about it. If anyone had wanted to approach me, I was here all the time. It was not until the hon. members for Kedron and Hinchinbrook saw me this morning that I heard of resentment from any ex-service men's organisation.

Mr. Jesson: Why didn't you ring Coates?

Mr. NICKLIN: If anyone wants to approach me, he should ring me.

Mr. Jesson: You said you were going to ring him.

Mr. NICKLIN: I intended to, but I had to go to a meeting of the Executive Council.

Mr. Jesson: You said you were going to ring him. If you had told me that you could not, I would have got him to ring you.

Mr. NICKLIN: It is not my business to ring people. It is their business to ring me if they want to approach me on any matter.

Mr. Lloyd: I did not say that the ex-service men's organisations were objecting. All I said was that they were disturbed at the functioning of the Patriotic Fund itself.

Mr. NICKLIN: If there had been so much objection to the proposal by ex-service men's organisations, one would imagine that some approach would have been made to the Government.

Mr. Hanlon: Why would the previous Government have rejected the proposal?

Mr. NICKLIN: That is their business.

The Patriotic Fund has been functioning very efficiently over the years. It has been guided by a number of people who not only helped to raise funds but took a keen interest in its activities when most other people in the community did not care two hoots about it. But immediately the Patriotic Fund wants to do something with some of its money all sorts of organisations cry out, "We want this and that done." If any subscribers to the Patriotic Fund want to take an active part in its affairs, they are at liberty to do so. I am sure that members of the committee of management would be happy to welcome anyone who is prepared to work as hard as they have over the years.

Mr. Lloyd: Would you not be prepared to see, say, three or four representatives of ex-service men appointed to the committee of management?

Mr. NICKLIN: There is nothing to prevent representatives of ex-service men from being on the committee now. No doubt there are many on it.

Mr. Lloyd: I mean delegated from ex-service men's organisations.

Mr. NICKLIN: I do not see why it should be necessary for us or anybody else to delegate them when there is an opportunity for them to get on the committee if they wish. If they show sufficient interest in the activities of the organisation they can attend the meetings and become elected. I would venture to say that if any prominent member of any worth-while service men's organisation in the State intimated that he would like to serve on it, the members of the committee would be very happy to have his help.

Much has been said in the debate about the activities of patriotic funds. I believe the Patriotic Fund on the whole has done a mighty good job over the years, but such

funds are not the complete answer to the problem of relieving distress and giving assistance to service men. They can be and are in many instances a great help but the people have the responsibility and the Government have done much for the care of ex-service men and their dependants. Australia has nothing to be ashamed of in its legislation dealing with the repatriation and care of service men and their dependants. We are very fortunate in having such comprehensive legislation and in having had such a series of very understanding Ministers in charge of it. What is needed is some means of giving personal assistance to ex-service men such as is given by members of Legacy. Legacy gives personal advice and guidance. They work behind the scenes; they do not advertise what they do. They do the best job possible. They do what governments and funds cannot do. That their work is appreciated is shown by the magnificent response to their appeals. As the hon. member for Merthyr said, the Patriotic Fund also assist the work of Legacy.

Members of the Patriotic Fund approached the Government and said that they had a considerable sum of money on hand and that there was not the call on them for assistance that there had been in previous years and they could not envisage any increase in demand on the fund, so they would like to do something in the way of building a shrine in association with the R.S.L.

Mr. Jesson: That is amazing because there have been applications to the Canteen Fund by the hundred. People think that the Patriotic Fund became defunct at the end of the war.

Mr. NICKLIN: We have the hon. member's statement that hundreds of applications are not being dealt with. I do not believe him. If he can produce evidence of it I should very much like to see it.

Mr. Jesson: It is a bit late now but I will produce it for you next week.

Mr. NICKLIN: I will be pleased to have it. As the hon. member for Merthyr said when he gave details of the workings of the fund, they deal with all the applications that come before them, and I believe they deal with them very satisfactorily. In response to the numerous requests from the committee the Government in their wisdom decided they would allow them to do it. That is the purpose of the Bill. It is a pity that I was not able to get the tentative plans for the proposed Shrine of Remembrance. They have become detached from the file in my office. Although I had an intensive search made, I have not been able to find them. If I had more time I would get the plans from the Patriotic Fund.

Mr. Gair: It is not really a plan.

Mr. NICKLIN: Not really a plan, but an artist's design. It has not got to the

plan stage. I shall get a copy of the proposed design and make it available to the Press for publication.

Mr. Jesson: You will agree that that £60,000 should not be applied to any part of the R.S.L. building?

Mr. NICKLIN: It will not be a part of the R.S.L. building. This will be a part set aside on land owned by the R.S.L. which has been dedicated by them for this specific purpose. It will be the property of the people of Queensland in memory of those who fell in both world wars. It will be something worthwhile of which the people of Queensland should be proud.

Motion (Mr. Nicklin) agreed to.

COMMITTEE.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Taylor, Clayfield, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 3, both inclusive, and schedule, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

THIRD READING.

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

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 13 May, 1958.”

Motion agreed to.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House do now adjourn.”

THE BOWEN CYCLONE.

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) (3.58 p.m.): Before the House adjourns, hon. members should be informed of the thankfulness and gratitude of the Bowen people to the Government for their unprecedentedly generous assistance given subsequent to the recent devastating cyclone at Bowen. From myself personally and on behalf of the people of Bowen and district I offer the Government heartfelt thanks and deepest gratitude for the promptness with which they acted in relieving distress and restoring or repairing battered homes, for the efficiency of the organisation which they set up, and for the assistance given regardless of cost.

To His Excellency the Governor, Sir Henry Abel Smith, who flew to Bowen to make an on-the-spot examination of the damage wrought and to speak with the people, I convey on behalf of the people of Bowen and district their thanks for and appreciation of his sympathetic and kindly interest.

I very sincerely thank the Treasurer, Mr. Hiley, for the masterful manner in which he made his inspection of the devastated town

and district and for the convincing report he furnished to Cabinet with such gratifying results. Praise for Sergeant Mouatt and the other members of the Bowen Police Force was on the lips of almost everyone for their gallant work during the terrifying cyclone and their self-sacrifice in the interests of others during the subsequent days. "Wonderful" was the word used by all in describing the conduct and the work of the police. I feel certain that never in the history of Queensland has the prestige of the police been higher anywhere than it is in Bowen at the present time.

The centre of operations throughout the emergency was the police station, where, with Mr. Bill Hansen in overall command, representing the Premier, red tape was effectively slashed.

An executive group comprised of the Mayor, Sub-inspector McNaught, Sergeant Mouatt, Public Works Supervisor Mr. A. Boettcher, Magistrate Mr. H. Galloway, Sergeant Major O'Hagan and others directed restoration and rehabilitation, and Mrs. Mousally, Townsville Red Cross and Salvation Army and Church personnel took over the issue of bedding and clothing.

The C.P.S. office handled cash assistance to the distressed, and throughout it all the gallant team of police, who worked from daylight to midnight for many days, one being treated in the hospital for exhaustion, provided the staff work which made the success of these operations possible. No praise can be too great for these men.

Bowen hospital suffered severely in the blow, structurally and internally, but the crisis brought out a fine example of courage by several young girls who handled the situation in the wards alone until help came later in the night. They were Sisters Pam Foote and J. Nickson, and Nurses Lesley Eatough, Lorraine Anthony and Fay Erickson.

Bearer Robinson who was duty bearer at the Ambulance went out on eight calls during the cyclone while his own home was absolutely flattened and his family took refuge with neighbours. The Ambulance Superintendent, Bill Meecham, also conveyed a casualty case to the hospital amidst the din of tearing iron, howling wind and torrential rain.

Many there were in Bowen who responded magnificently, and amongst these must be included the local building and electrical contractors who, with their staffs, worked tirelessly to restore wrecked homes. The local

baker, Rupert Wilson, who, when his own bakery was wrecked, walked, hitch-hiked and pushed a rail-pumper truck to Proserpine to get assistance for baking bread and, with the assistance of Francis Maltby of Vennard's bakery, and their helpers restored Bowen's bread supply within 48 hours; the Townsville Electricity Board's workmen and the employees of the P.M.G. Department who restored power and communication within an amazingly short time; and the Red Cross and C.W.A. workers who were in the forefront in relieving distress.

Bowen will be eternally grateful to the volunteers from Collinsville and Proserpine who, with local volunteers, replaced or repaired 130 roofs by Sunday afternoon, and to the numerous, generous donors to "The Courier-Mail" and other newspapers and local-authority relief funds who contributed such a substantial amount.

All told, it was a truly magnificent effort and one which the Bowen and district residents will remember with deep gratitude as long as life shall with them remain.

And so I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying to the Premier and his Government from the bottom of my heart, thank you.

Motion (Mr. Nicklin) agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.6 p.m.

BILLS ASSENTED TO AT CLOSE OF SESSION.

Gazettes Extraordinary were issued notifying the assent of His Excellency the Governor and His Excellency the Deputy Governor to the following Bills:—

(*Thursday, 1 May, 1958*)—

- Liquor Acts Amendment Bill;
- Supreme Court Funds Act Amendment Bill;
- Supreme Court Acts Amendment Bill (No. 2);
- Co-operative Housing Societies Bill;
- Roads (Contribution to Maintenance) Act Amendment Bill;
- Valuation of Land Acts Amendment Bill.

(*Thursday, 8 May, 1958*)—

- Canals Bill;
- Slaughtering Act Amendment Bill;
- Stock Acts Amendment Bill;
- Radio-active Substances Bill;
- Mines Regulation Acts Amendment Bill;
- Patriotic Fund of Queensland Bill;
- Queensland Marine Bill (*reserved for Royal Assent*).

PROROGATION.

Parliament was prorogued by the following Proclamation in *Gazette Extraordinary*, Thursday, 8 May, 1958.

A PROCLAMATION by the Honourable Sir ROSLYN FOSTER BOWIE PHILP, Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Senior Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the State of Queensland, acting as Deputy for and on behalf of His Excellency Sir HENRY ABEL SMITH, Colonel on the Retired List of the Corps of Household Cavalry, Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Companion of the Distinguished Service Order, Governor in and over the State of Queensland and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

[L.S.]

R. PHILP,

Deputy Governor.

In pursuance of the power and authority vested in me as Deputy Governor of the State aforesaid, I, Sir ROSLYN FOSTER BOWIE PHILP, the Deputy Governor, acting for and on behalf of His Excellency the Governor aforesaid, do, by this my Proclamation, Prorogue the Parliament of Queensland to Tuesday, the Twenty-fourth day of June, 1958.

Given under my Hand and Seal, at Government House, Brisbane, this eighth day of May, in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-eight, and in the seventh year of Her Majesty's reign.

By Command,

FRANK NICKLIN.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!