

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 1958**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**WEDNESDAY, 5 NOVEMBER, 1958.**

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

**AMENDMENT TO STANDING ORDERS.  
REPORT OF COMMITTEE.**

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): On behalf of Mr. Speaker, Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee, I lay on the table of the House report of the Standing Orders Committee recommending an addition to Standing Order No. 109.

Ordered to be printed.

**CIRCULATION AND COST OF  
“HANSARD.”**

Mr. SPEAKER laid on the table the report of the Chief Reporter, State Reporting Bureau, on the circulation and cost of “Hansard” for the session of 1957-1958.

**QUESTIONS.**

**ALDERMAN FULTON AND OPENING OF TINAROO  
DAM.**

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

“(1) In view of the fact that regional electricity operations are closely related to irrigation projects, is he able to say why the chairman of the Cairns Regional Electricity Board, the Mayor of Cairns, Alderman W. J. Fulton, was not invited to join the official party on the dais at the Tinaroo Dam ceremony on November 1?”

“(2) Further, since the Country Party candidate for Leichhardt in the Federal elections, Mr. G. F. Turner, and the Queensland Labour Party Senate candidate, Hon. H. H. Collins, were guests on the dais, and the Mayor of Cairns, who is the Australian Labour Party candidate for Leichhardt, was not, does not this indicate discrimination against Alderman Fulton for political reasons?”

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

“(1) Alderman Fulton was invited to the ceremony as an official guest of the Commission.”

“(2) Those persons who were invited to speak were provided with seats on the dais. These included Mr. G. F. Turner as Chairman of the Atherton Shire Council in

which Shire the Tinaroo Falls Dam is situated and the Honourable H. H. Collins who had previously officiated at ceremonies to celebrate the commencement of work on the dam and at the Pouring of the First Bucket of Concrete. Other speakers included Mr. T. V. Gilmore who is the representative of the district in the Legislative Assembly and Councillor Davies, Chairman of the Mareeba Shire, in which shire most of the irrigation works are situated. It is considered that Alderman Fulton as Mayor of Cairns and Chairman of the Cairns Regional Electricity Board did not have as close an association with the work as those who were invited to speak, and that only a person with a politically biased mind could suggest discrimination in this case, bearing in mind the close connection the invited speakers have had with the project."

LENGTH OF PAVED ROAD, BRISBANE TO  
CAIRNS.

**Mr. BAXTER** (Norman), for **Mr. DAVIES** (Maryborough), asked the Minister for Development, Mines and Main Roads—

"How many miles of paved road were there between Brisbane and Cairns at October 31, 1958, and how many miles were under construction in preparation for sealing?"

**Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani) replied—

"At October 31, 1958, 1,139 miles of paved roads had been completed under the Main Roads Acts on the declared road between Brisbane and Cairns, and at that date 60 miles were under construction prior to bitumen surfacing."

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTS AMEND-  
MENT BILL.

INITIATION.

**Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani—Minister for Development, Mines and Main Roads) for **Hon J. A. HEADING** (Marodian—Minister for Public Works and Local Government): I move—

"That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Local Government Acts, 1936 to 1958, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF SCAFFOLDING ACTS  
AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE—RESUMPTION OF  
DEBATE.

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

Debate resumed from 4 November (see p. 977) on Mr. Morris's motion—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Inspection of Scaffolding Acts, 1915 to 1955, in certain particulars."

**Mr. WALLACE** (Cairns) (11.7 a.m.): There is a great need to ensure that all tubular scaffolding is made of quality steel, that it is safe and that there should be regulations governing loads on scaffolding. The scaffolding should be limited to a safe load. At the moment there is no guarantee of quality or strength of steel and there is a great need for it. There should also be a guarantee of the quality and efficiency of the fixings, the bolts, the threads and there should be safeguards against the wear on scaffolding. Regulation should provide for steel helmets to be worn on multi-storied jobs as is the case in New South Wales. It should be mandatory for the employer to provide the steel helmets and the employees should be compelled to wear them to guard against accidents.

**Mr. Coburn:** They were supplied to the employees working on the Burdekin River bridge.

**Mr. WALLACE:** But it is not mandatory that they should wear them. They are worn on Government jobs but not on private jobs. The Act should be amended to make it compulsory to wear them on all jobs.

The employer should be primarily responsible for taking the initiative to see that there are no breaches of the Act and to see that the provisions of the Act are carried out. At the present time the onus is on the members of the union on the job to report the breaches, whereas if licensed scaffolders were on all jobs there would be no occasion for them to report that the Act was not being carried out. I suppose there are more accidents in the building industry than in most others, and for that reason the Minister should ensure that all safety measures in the building trade are given effect to.

In my opinion it is necessary to have licensed scaffolders. Because of their specialised knowledge and the responsibility that they must bear, their remuneration should be at least equal to that of leading tradesmen. At present, I understand that if a carpenter is the scaffolder on a job, he gets no increase in pay. However, if a tradesman's assistant is the scaffolder he gets an increase of about 2s. That is why there are not enough licensed scaffolders. There has been a rather poor response from tradesmen to attend the scaffolding course at the Technical College, but I am sure that if the remuneration for a scaffolder was the same as that for a leading tradesman, there would be no difficulty in getting as many licensed scaffolders as are needed.

**Mr. THACKERAY** (Keppel) (11.11 a.m.): In the interests of both employees and employers, all safety regulations in industry should be fully observed. In the United States of America in 1948, accidents in industry cost the workers 1,500 million dollars and the employers 3,500 million dollars. That cost must be passed on to the general community, and the only way of reducing it is to

insist on the use of safety devices and on the observance of safety regulations. Statistics for 1949 show that in the United States of America accidents in industry cost the 65,000,000 working population approximately 77 dollars per person per year through increased cost of production.

It is essential to have close co-operation between employers and employees in the use of safety devices. It has been found in the United States of America that while the number of accidents in large factories is very small, that in the smaller factories increases sharply. Those remarks apply to Australia too. The Minister says that he would like to see close co-operation in this State between the trade unions and the employers. That co-operation should be friendly. However, if an employer does not install safety devices for the protection of his employees, he should be forced to do so by legislation.

While the trade union movement admits that the Minister is trying to co-operate with it in some directions, in others he is going right against it. For example, whenever there is an accident in which a worker is involved a machinery inspector is sent out to the scene, but the Minister will not allow a trade union official to accompany him. The Minister should co-operate more closely with the unions in that regard.

In Tasmania, even the farmers have set up a safety committee because of the number of accidents involving tractors and other farm implements.

As a general rule, riggers on most jobs have previously been seamen. They are chosen for the work because of their knowledge of splicing and rigging. Most of the riggers in the State are seamen. The technical college conducts a 12 months' course for riggers to qualify for their certificate of competency, but I think all riggers should hold a licence issued by the Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding.

Throughout the world many accidents have been caused by explosive power tools and I think legislation should be introduced in Queensland to cover the Ramset gun. In Victoria, with the help of the trade union movement, a measure was passed and explosive power tool regulations were issued on 21 April last. A similar measure for the Ramset tool here would have the support of the movement. As a matter of fact there is another gun, the Helti, a Swiss product, which is far superior to the Ramset gun, but there is a monopoly in its distribution. The Ramset gun is the one widely used throughout the building trades in the Commonwealth. The distributor of it should not have the right to issue safety permits, the Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding should set the course and issue the permit. The distributor should not even be allowed to hire out the gun without the full authority of the department. Some distributors consider that four or five hours' training is enough for a man

to become competent in the use of the gun. Briefly reading the Victorian legislation, I note that seven different charges are available and if only a weak charge, coloured green, were required, and the maximum charge, which is coloured black, were used, it could penetrate a wall and be a danger to others working in the adjoining room.

The Minister tells us that he wants to have more harmony and co-operation among the trade unions, the employers and the Government. Just recently I asked his colleague, the Minister for Transport about setting up a safety committee in the railway workshops at Northgate and he refused the request outright. Safety committees are important and should be set up everywhere because they benefit the employer as well as the employee. I ask the Minister to challenge his colleague on the reason for his refusal.

**Mr. HOOPER (Buranda) (11.20 a.m.):** I congratulate the Minister on introducing this Bill, which has been urgently needed for a considerable time. Thank goodness something is being done about power tools.

Firstly I shall confine my remarks to the safety of scaffolding. Irrespective of what any hon. member might say there is a vast difference between scaffolding used for large-scale construction and scaffolding used for cottage construction. It is essential that all scaffolding be safe. Very often builders engaged on small construction jobs fill in a scaffolding ticket and forward it to the department only to be held up waiting for inspectors to pass the scaffolding. The delay is not the fault of the inspectors. Once a ticket has been submitted the builder knows that his scaffolding will eventually be subject to inspection but he never knows when it will be done. Usually he will erect it according to the letter of the Act. That is very important because, as the Minister will agree, it is absolutely impossible for the scaffolding inspector to be on the job before the scaffolding is erected.

In big construction jobs both wooden and tubular scaffolding are used. Tubular scaffolding cannot be surpassed in any way. I agree with the hon. member for Cairns when he suggests that the maintenance of tubular scaffolding should be strictly supervised. With the correct maintenance tubular scaffolding is everlasting. It is very safe as long as it is erected by a competent person. I draw attention to the accidents that can occur if incompetent people erect tubular scaffolding or if it is interfered with after it has been erected by a competent licensed scaffolder.

**Mr. A. J. Smith:** Does the licensed scaffolder hold a certificate?

**Mr. HOOPER:** He holds a certificate. Scaffolding may be erected by a licensed scaffolder and passed by an inspector but somebody may remove a plank. There might be people working on the scaffolding. Brick-

layers have met with very nasty accidents—some of them fatal—because a plank has been removed without their knowledge. May be it has been removed by a workman who has no thought for his mates. If a length of tubing is in his way, a workman might remove it with a spanner. The Minister is absolutely correct when he says that both the employer and the employee are responsible. Negligence cannot be confined to the employer. Wherever possible a licensed scaffolder or a competent carpenter is employed to erect the scaffolding. Sometimes someone removes portion of the scaffolding. Can the employer be held responsible for the action of someone who, without thought of the danger to anybody, removes portion of the scaffolding? It is the person who commits the act who is responsible for any accident or death that may result from it.

I think it is very important that harmony should exist between the Government, the department and members of the trade unions. The men who work on the scaffolding on these buildings, whether the number be large or small, are trade unionists who have a responsibility to their union and to their employer. I disagree with the hon. member for Keppel who said that there was no harmony between the trade unions and the Government. There is harmony between the Government and the trade unionists. That was shown in the talks held, particularly with the building trade unions. When the explosive power tool was introduced I thought it should be necessary to have a licence to use it. I had the privilege of being one of the first in this State to use an explosive power tool. It is a remarkable instrument and a very effective one, but there is an element of danger if it is used by an irresponsible person. A fatal accident occurred in England when one of these tools was being used. The Minister pointed out yesterday how the tool is operated. The projectile cannot be fired unless the gun is depressed against a firm flat surface.

**Mr. Nicholson:** It must be level, too.

**Mr. HOOPER:** It must be level. This workman in England was working on a building with plaster finish. He was firing into a solid wall of brick. He moved along to an area that was once a doorway but which had been filled in with fibrous plaster, and used the same charge and a fatal accident occurred in the adjoining room. These tools should only be used by those who are conversant with building construction. I do not think that people who are not conversant with building construction should be issued with a licence to use this tool. It is desirable that its use be confined to carpenters because they are more conversant with the construction of buildings. The explosive powered tool if used properly by a competent person is in no way dangerous. I disagree with the statement of the hon. member for Keppel that numerous accidents have occurred through the use of this implement. When the tool is properly used and the correct charge

used in it, accidents will not occur. There are different charges for different types of work. For instance, there are different charges when the tool is used for firing into softwood, hardwood, steel and concrete. The person using it should have a knowledge of building construction.

**Mr. Nicholson:** Two apprentices were using this tool on the Bellevue Hotel this morning.

**Mr. HOOPER:** I do not know the stage of their apprenticeship, but if they are competent to use it and are supervised, well and good. At this stage there is no prohibition on their using it.

I support the Bill and congratulate the Minister on introducing it. It will make working conditions much safer.

**Mr. DONALD (Bremer) (11.31 a.m.):** The Bill has been designed to make working conditions in industry much safer, and because of that it has my unqualified support. I think every Opposition member, indeed every hon. member, will welcome the Bill. We welcome any Bill that will tend to make working conditions safer.

We have over the years struggled to have the hazards of industry lessened and in a number of instances removed entirely. And towards this end the Labour movement has used both political and industrial action. I see no reason for an apology in making that admission. Many a strike has arisen on a safety issue, and the workers have been condemned for ceasing work to win safer working conditions, but unfortunately it was the only avenue left to them to exploit. The provision of reasonable and practical protection for workers in industry is and always has been our objective. The objection raised on all occasions is that industry cannot afford these things, that they will lead to bankruptcy and ruin the employers. Ultimately the request is granted. Industry does not suffer, for the number of man-hours lost through accidents is greatly reduced and naturally production is increased. The emphasis has always been placed on production and more production. If safety measures obtained through legislation or strike action reduce the number of accidents in industry, production must be increased, and objection to either political or industrial action is unjustified.

**Mr. Morris:** That is the key.

**Mr. DONALD:** That is the key. I am pleased the Minister agrees with me. Any time lost by workers through strike action is more than compensated by accident-free periods, resulting in less time being lost through injuries.

That is proved beyond doubt by the figures supplied by the Minister when introducing the Bill. I did my best to take them down while the Minister was speaking. Although they may not be absolutely accurate, they are near enough to prove my point.

These figures show the man-days lost through accidents and industrial action or disputes—

Year.	Accident Man-Days.	Industrial Action or Disputes Man-Days.
1955 .. .. .	716,876	143,318
1956 .. .. .	915,739	217,000
1957 .. .. .	1,049,857	120,984

In 1958 there were 43 fewer fatal accidents and 2,504 fewer non-fatal accidents, yet the man-days lost through accidents exceeded 1,000,000. I agree with the Minister that these figures are alarming. The Minister was not insincere when he said that the figures were alarming and that something should be done to reduce them.

**Mr. Morris:** I said that they had dropped for the year by 47,910 man-days.

**Mr. DONALD:** But the Minister still said that the figures were alarming.

**Mr. Morris:** Yes.

**Mr. DONALD:** I think the Minister was sincere when he said it, particularly when he said that something should be done to reduce the possibility of accidents. I ask the Minister to use his influence with the Press to see that more publicity is given to the man-days lost to industry through accidents and to the urgent need for greater safety measures and protection to workers. The anti-Labour Press emphasises the damage done to the economy of the nation by man-days lost through industrial disputes but remains silent about the economic loss to the nation as a result of injuries to workers following their occupations. If we could have that publicity as to the man-days lost through accidents it would be a step in the right direction and in the direction that the Minister wishes to move. The Press should give greater prominence to the accident rate in industry and the need for greater safety measures, and less hostile and unfavourable criticism of industrial disputes. If this were done it would be better for all concerned and for those engaged in primary, secondary and other industries.

When condemning strikes we must remember that quite a number of them are for the purpose of obtaining safer working conditions for the workers on the job. The reduction in the accident rate last year resulted in £300,000 less being paid by way of compensation to injured employees which enabled the State Government Insurance Office to give a 10 per cent. bonus to employers. That is very pleasing indeed. It is pleasing to know that a fewer number of men and women were injured and that production did not suffer to the same extent as in previous years through accidents in industry. I am not suggesting that accidents can be avoided entirely. Accidents, unfortunately, are not unavoidable, nor are industrial disputes, but

with the application of common sense, caution and with a deep sense of responsibility both can be reduced considerably. Further meetings between the Minister and union representatives is a step in the right direction. Such meetings must be helpful to the Minister, and benefit must be derived by unionists and non-unionists in industry generally.

I think that not enough consultation takes place between the representatives of the workers in industry, the employers and the Government. On numerous occasions there are meetings between employers and employees, with the Government standing aside. I think that the possibility of more consultations between the owner, the worker and the Government will pay rich dividends to the State and all concerned.

The annual grant of £500 to the National Safety Council will meet with the approval of everyone, so will the decision to convene the National Industrial Accident Convention in Brisbane next year.

I understood the Minister to say that the definition of "owner" is to be enlarged to include any contractor or sub-contractor. That is a very desirable provision and one that is necessary in the interests of all engaged on a job. If a contractor decides to sub-let portion of the job to a sub-contractor, the latter should bear the responsibility of ensuring the safety of the men on the job.

**Mr. Morris:** Basically, that is what we are doing.

**Mr. DONALD:** It is a step in the right direction, and I commend the Minister.

I agree also that the definition of "scaffold" should be enlarged in the way that the Minister has suggested. I agree with his statement that scaffolding that is not in use can become very dangerous. It may have been passed by the inspector when it was erected, but if it is not used over a period of time it can deteriorate and be the cause of a serious accident.

Scaffolding in dry docks and slipways, and in the shipbuilding industry generally, should be subject to the provisions of the Act. I think the Minister has decided that that will be so in future.

**Mr. Morris:** That is so.

**Mr. DONALD:** Such a provision is long overdue, and I commend the Minister on his decision.

In my opinion, the protection of inspectors against assault is the responsibility of Parliament. We should see that full protection is given to any Crown employee who is carrying out his duties under legislative enactments. He should not be subjected to abuse or assault by people whom he is interviewing in the discharge of his duties. If a man is beaten up or assaulted verbally in the course of his inspectorial duties, it is the responsibility of those in authority to see that he is protected.

In my opinion, union representatives should be allowed to accompany Government inspectors to a job following a complaint about a breach of the regulations. That was the previous practice and it should be reverted to. If an employer is breaching the Act and the union representative is not allowed to accompany the Government inspector on to the job, the employer is given an opportunity to cover up the breach. My suggestion would give both the inspectors and the workers greater protection, and would result in more efficient administration of the legislation.

Opinions on the use of explosive-powered tools have been expressed by the hon. members for Keppel and Buranda. Although they differed to some extent, I agree with both of them. Everyone must admit that an explosive-powered tool is a dangerous weapon, particularly in the hands of the inexperienced. If it is necessary to have a licence for an ordinary firearm, it should also be necessary to have a licence to operate an explosive-powered tool. It is just as deadly as, and in some instances more deadly, than an ordinary rifle. The operators, the other workmen, and civilians generally should be protected from the dangers that are attendant on the use of these tools.

If it is true, as the hon. member for Murrumba suggested, that two apprentices were using the tools at the Bellevue Hotel, it is time some check was made. I do not know how old they were, or how competent. They might have been very competent and very conscientious, but equally they might have been incompetent and not fully aware of the dangers. I should say that it is courting disaster to allow two apprentices to handle an explosive power tool at a place like the Bellevue Hotel. I do not suggest that apprentices are not competent, but there is a great danger. Insisting on operators having a licence before being allowed to use the tool will be a step in the right direction.

Competent and certificated persons should be the only ones allowed to operate power winches. I speak from some experience. At the colliery we would not tolerate any incompetent man working a winch to haul men or material. The Inspection of Machinery Act provides that the operator must be a competent and certificated person and I can see no justification for allowing any Tom, Dick, Jack or Harry to operate a power winch on a job. All other considerations apart, the safety factor alone is important enough.

The hon. member for Buranda and the hon. member for Cairns have already spoken about tubular steel scaffolding, which has brought about a revolution in scaffolding. Properly maintained, tubular scaffolding would not cause accidents but it is absolutely necessary to pay strict attention to its strength and maintenance. Of course, familiarity breeds contempt and people who

work on it month after month become over-confident, and, because it is almost fool-proof, they think there is no possibility of an accident. To neglect the maintenance of tubular scaffolding is to court disaster; it should be checked constantly.

**Mr. Windsor:** A good illustration of the use of tubular scaffolding is the grandstand at the Milton tennis courts.

**Mr. DONALD:** Yes. I agree that tubular steel has revolutionised scaffolding. Perhaps it was not used so much in the past because of the ready availability of timber.

If I heard the Minister correctly he said that the period of time within which the Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding must be notified of an accident is to be reduced to four hours.

**Mr. Morris:** It used to be 24 hours.

**Mr. DONALD:** That is a step in the right direction. Again I congratulate the Minister. A great deal can happen in 24 hours, even in four, but the new provision is reasonable; four hours is quite long enough.

The suggestion was made that there would be provision in the Bill that in the event of injury to a person some of the scaffolding could be removed to release him.

**Mr. Morris:** No, I did not say that was in the Bill. I said I had considered that aspect. I did not put it in the Bill because it is recognised that the removal of scaffolding to release an injured person would not constitute a breach. It might be a technical breach but no more.

**Mr. DONALD:** After all, the humane element comes into it. Surely we would not leave an injured man in unnecessary pain because the Act says he cannot be removed. It would be stupid. I do not think anyone would worry about the Act at all.

Some time ago I received a request from people in Ipswich and district engaged in the building trade that there should be a course conducted at the Ipswich Technical College for the benefit of people who wanted to become competent scaffolders. Unfortunately the Education Department did not see fit to commence a course because they thought firstly that there was insufficient room and secondly that perhaps there would not be enough students to warrant it. There will be sufficient students beyond any doubt; the desirability of such a course also has been established beyond doubt. Whether there is room at the Ipswich Technical College I cannot say.

From my experience the Act is observed more in the building trade than in the metal trade. It is just as essential that it should be observed in the metal trade as it is in the building trade. The Bill has received the approval of all hon. members who have spoken on the measure but its success does not

depend on what we decide in the Chamber, even though it receives the unanimous approval of the Government and the Opposition. Its success will depend upon the policing of the Act. Amending legislation to make for better safety conditions is not introduced and passed by Parliament merely because we want to make another law that will not be enforced. I think every hon. member, and no less the Minister, wants this legislation to become the effective law of the land. When it becomes law the Act cannot be implemented unless it is properly policed. In the interests of the people for whom the Act is being amended—the workers in industry—and in the interests of the inspectors who will police the amended Act I ask that the inspectors be given every possible assistance in the carrying out of their duties.

I ask the Minister to reconsider his decision not to allow Government inspectors to take representatives of the various unions along with them when they are asked by the unions to investigate complaints in factories, workshops, shipyards and on construction jobs.

**Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) (11.53 a.m.):** This Bill has been introduced for the protection of people engaged in the building trade and employees who are called upon to use power tools. As changes have taken place in the building trade we have seen the necessity to amend the Act. The time was when most buildings were not very high. Their construction did not call for any strong measures to supervise the erection of scaffolding. The multi-storeyed buildings of today call for much sterner measures in the supervision of the scaffolding used in their construction. The introduction of tubular scaffolding has been a great innovation in the building trade. Although the erection of tubular scaffolding needs great care, once it has been satisfactorily erected it gives a greater degree of protection to those who use it. As the hon. member for Bremer said, unless it is continuously maintained it can create a hazard. Many serious accidents have occurred because of improperly erected scaffolding. However, amendments to the Inspection of Scaffolding Act which have required supervision by competent inspectors have had the effect of gradually lessening the accident rate in the building trade.

It is the responsibility of the Government to see that this legislation is kept up to date and that protection is given to all sections of industry. There have been accidents in this State with loss of life and limb. It is important that the Government should keep up to date in introducing legislation to give greater protection to those engaged in industry. I was a little surprised that the Minister should have spent so much time endeavouring to convince the Committee of what the Government had done and what they intended to do. They have been in office for a short period and they have done little. When they were in

Opposition they opposed the introduction of some amendments that were framed to give more protection to employees in industry.

The Leader of the Opposition was quite right when he accused the Minister of using this Bill for political purposes. I am not unmindful of the fact that the Government introduced the Bill to meet the demands of industry, but the Minister should have refrained from endeavouring to make political capital by accusing the previous Government of leaving something undone. It has always been the desire of Labour Governments that full protection should be given to employees and employers in industry. We were the first down through the years to see that the employers faced up to their responsibilities and obeyed the requirements of the law. The time is not far past when employers had to be compelled to obey the law. It is generally found that the employer is the first to break the law.

**Mr. Morris:** Why spoil a good Bill by talking stupid nonsense?

**Mr. GRAHAM:** I am not talking stupid nonsense. The hon. gentleman knows that the employer has always been the one who has had to be reprimanded for neglect and for attempting to evade his responsibilities under this legislation. The Minister knows that. Very rarely have prosecutions been launched against an employee. We know that some employees, at the behest of their employer, have failed to carry out the law, but generally prosecutions have been launched against the employer because he is the first to try to evade his responsibility.

**Mr. Windsor:** The worst employer knows that the Inspection of Scaffolding Acts are an asset.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** There are many who are unwise, and the hon. member may be one of them. It is no use the Minister's putting himself up as the champion of those engaged in industry. We know over the years the hon. gentleman has been supporting those who sometimes have been opposed to such legislation. This legislation has been introduced because the trade union movement demanded that they be given this protection. Similar legislation has been introduced in every other State since the advent of the explosive-powered tool. It was said a few minutes ago that two apprentices were seen using this tool. If they were not competent to do so, an accident could occur, with possible loss of life. In all probability the Bill has been introduced as a direct result of an approach by the trade union movement. The trade union movement is never behind the door in looking after the interests of the workers. The Government realise that trade unions will not stand by idly if the Government take action detrimental to the workers. The Minister has set himself up as a champion of those in industry. I find it very hard to accept that.

We have witnessed vast changes in building methods in the last few years. Consequently Governments have found it necessary to amend the law dealing with scaffolding and building. I am fully in accord with the Bill. Perhaps the trade union movement is responsible for its introduction.

**Hon. K. J. MORRIS** (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry) (12.2 p.m.): I thank most hon. members very sincerely for accepting the principles of the Bill. I was very impressed with the speeches of the hon. members for Buranda and Bremer. They have obviously made a thorough study of the Bill. I shall comment on some of the points raised by them, but first I shall deal with the matters raised by the hon. member for Mackay. Unlike most hon. members on the opposite side of the Chamber, he attacked me on the political aspect of my statements. I shall deal with him when I am analysing the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. I give him warning so that he can be ready for my reply.

The hon. member for Bremer spoke of several important matters. He is as sincere as anyone in Queensland in the statements that he made. He referred to the great desirability of round-table conferences between employers, employees and the Government. I could not agree more with that suggestion. It is tremendously important. To that end I called a meeting some 12 months ago of employers and employees. It was held in this building. It was called to establish a Department of Industry Advisory Council. I thought in the early stages of the discussion, and for some months, that it would be of tremendous benefit to every section of the community. Many employer and employee organisations responded to my invitation, and each agreed that we should have an Advisory Council, but I was disappointed some few months ago to receive a letter from the Trades and Labour Council to say that it did not intend to pursue that policy, that is, to take part in the Department of Industry Advisory Council. I wanted that organisation to take its place, as I wanted all unions to be represented on that body. However, that was the decision of the Trades and Labour Council; it is not my decision. In view of that intimation, I have now invited other unions not affiliated with the Trades and Labour Council to send representatives to the Advisory Council, and they have agreed to do so.

As soon as the pressure of the Parliamentary session is over, having already prepared the charter and laid the foundation for the formation of the Department of Industry Advisory Council we hope to have the first meeting as soon as we can arrange it. I know that employers sometimes think employees are not giving them a fair crack of the whip and that employees think the same about employers, but I am profoundly of the belief that if we can get the two

classes together, with the Government, we of the Government will get a good deal of advice and help. We will be able to discuss many problems which we could not otherwise discuss. I support the comment made by the hon. member for Bremer on that point.

He referred to standing scaffolding that had not been demolished.

**Mr. Donald:** Yes.

**Mr. MORRIS:** That is not in the Bill. I did not consider that such a case would arise. Scaffolding by its very nature is quite an expensive item. I doubted whether such a case could exist, but if any hon. member knows of such a case I would be interested to hear of it. If such a case is reported I can assure the hon. member for Bremer that we will look at it.

Many speakers referred to the explosive-powered tool. When hon. members see the Bill they will find that provision has been made to ensure—and we have done this to the best of our ability—that no-one can use this tool unless he is in possession of a certificate to do so. Unfortunately accidents have occurred as a result of good feeling between the person operating the tool on the job and a work mate. What has happened on many occasions is this: a man comes to the operator of the tool and says, "Today is Friday. I am doing some work at home tomorrow and I would like to borrow this explosive-powered tool of yours which will make my job easier on Saturday morning. Will you lend it to me?" It is done and so the power tool gets into the hands of a man not qualified to use it. That is one of the instances we are legislating against.

**Mr. Graham:** Have you particulars of cases where accidents have occurred at a private home as a result of the use of this tool?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I have not all the details of how accidents happen, but I can assure the hon. member that that is one of the dangers. We are saying that the person who operates the tool shall be licensed and that he must not lend or give the tool to anyone else to use.

**Mr. Thackeray:** Is that the same as the Victorian legislation?

**Mr. MORRIS:** Not exactly. It is good legislation and it ties the matter up.

The hon. member for Keppel referred to the explosive-powered tool and said that it should be controlled by legislation. That is being done.

The hon. member for Bremer referred to power winches. Provision is being made for certificates for power winches. He referred to the training of scaffolders, and I point out that there are scaffolding classes in Brisbane with 80 persons attending them. We hope to be able to extend that number in the future. We have well over 100 waiting

to join the classes but accommodation is the problem. However, we are taking steps to make the training more general than it has been.

**Mr. Power:** What will you do about classes in the country?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I shall deal later with scaffolding inspectors in country areas.

I agree wholeheartedly with the suggestion of the hon. member for Bremer that it is essential to enforce legislation that is passed by Parliament in the interests of safety. We have taken important steps in the Bill to help inspectors in the discharge of their duties. At least one inspector was assaulted when he went on to a piece of land other than that on which the scaffolding was erected.

**Mr. Thackeray:** Are you going to allow trade union officials to travel with the inspectors?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I am dealing with the various points that were raised as I come to them. If I consider that a submission is important enough, I shall refer to it. Of course, I cannot reply to every point that is raised. I think I have covered all the important matters that were mentioned by the hon. member for Bremer, and I thank him for his contribution.

I think the comments that I made on explosive-powered tools answer the points raised by the hon. member for Buranda. He is a practical builder with a knowledge of their operation. I repeat that the purpose of the proposed licence is that only people who know what they are doing will be allowed to use this instrument.

The hon. member for Keppel referred to a question that he asked in the House relating to the formation of safety committees in the Railway Department. There are many ways in which the safety of people engaged in industry can be guarded. I have no personal knowledge of the safety committee to which the hon. member has referred, but I do know that we are getting very great co-operation from all Government departments in the enforcement of this law. Hon. members will recall that frequently when we were in Opposition we spoke about the necessity to put the Crown in a similar position to private industry in the observance of regulations. However, the previous Government would not agree to our suggestion. They may have had good reasons for not doing so, but we have now brought all Government departments within the ambit of the legislation. That is an important step forward. I cannot see any reason why the Crown should be absolved from any responsibility in this matter.

**Mr. Power:** Will the Crown prosecute the Crown for a breach?

**Mr. MORRIS:** The Crown will certainly take very severe action against any Crown employee who breaches the provisions of the machinery and scaffolding regulations.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Keppel say that there was a lack of harmony between the Government and the trade unions. Surely that is not his definite belief!

**Mr. Thackeray:** Quite so.

**Mr. MORRIS:** If it is, I am amazed that he is so out of touch with reality. If he listens to the remarks that I intend to make in reply to some of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition, probably his mind will be disabused.

I move on to what was said by the hon. member for Cairns. I have here a transcript of what he said. This is what he said—

“My information is that accidents from faulty scaffolding are becoming more numerous. They increased by over 300 per cent. between 1950-1951 and 1957-1958.”

He goes on—

“Changed building construction methods are probably largely the cause.”

As he made that statement it is only right that I should give hon. members some figures of accidents with scaffolding. I start with the year that he quoted—1950-1951. Hon. members may be very interested in the figures. They are not as detailed as I would normally have them because the officer of the department who was preparing them suffered a bereavement in his family and was not able to complete them in all detail. I received these from the Chief Inspector of Machinery shortly after 11 o'clock this morning. In 1950-1951 there were three fatal accidents and five non-fatal, a total of eight. In 1951-1952, after the passage of the legislation introduced by the hon. member for Baroona—

**Mr. Power:** Which you commended.

**Mr. MORRIS:** As I will acknowledge in a few minutes. I will tell the story about it. In 1951-1952 there were one fatal and three non-fatal, a total of four. That was probably because of the amending legislation.

**Mr. Power:** But there were difficulties in getting inspectors to do all the work that was necessary.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Yes. The figures for the subsequent years are—

—	Non-fatal.	Fatal.	Total.
1953-1954 .. ..	5	14	19
1954-1955 .. ..	3	17	20
1955-1956 .. ..	1	23	24
1956-1957 .. ..	6	27	33
1957-1958 (to June, 1958) .. ..	2	23	25

I point out that from 1949-1950 to 1950-1951 there was an increase of 33 per cent. and from 1956-1957 to 1957-1958 there was a decrease of 25 per cent., so it is not strictly in accordance with fact to say there was an increase of 300 per cent. I know perfectly well that the hon. member for Cairns

did not use that figure in any attempt to mislead me or anybody else. He had been given it. I know he is very sincere and very interested in the subject. I am glad to be able to give him the correct figures.

I know I will be accused of talking politics but I have to speak of the various stages. When we assumed office there were eight inspectors; today there are 10. On 31 October I received a letter from the Trades and Labour Council of Cairns asking me to do something about appointing an inspector there. I have the file here. On the first working day after 31 October I wrote to the Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding and asked him to examine the matter to see if it was possible to allocate someone to Cairns. Mr. Breguet, the Chief Inspector of Machinery and Scaffolding, tells me that in 1957 there were eight inspectors on the staff and at 17 October, 1958, there were 10. He says that two more scaffolding inspectors recently appointed are under training to take over the inspection of scaffolding in Rockhampton and Townsville at an early date. That is a departure because we have never before had three people away. He is looking into the position at Cairns and as soon as he gets a suitable appointee he will send him there. We are trying to cover the whole of Queensland. We cannot do everything in a day but at least we are going a long way towards increasing the number of scaffolding inspectors.

The hon. member for Cairns said that he wants standard strengths for tubular steel and set standards for bolts, etc. I could not believe that anybody interested in building would not know that we adopt the Standards Association of Australia code. All the bolts used must be up to the standard of the Standards Association of Australia code. Therefore the point made by the hon. member is not very important.

He also asks that licensed scaffolders shall be given a better rate of pay. I have said it on many occasions and I say it again: the salary is a matter for the Industrial Court. We do not interfere with the Industrial Court. If the court in its wisdom decides that they are entitled to greater remuneration—

**Mr. Power:** That is not quite correct. Variations in classifications have been allowed without the matter going to the court.

**Mr. MORRIS:** If the Industrial Court decides that they should get a higher remuneration, it is all right with us. As an example I refer to this morning's "Courier-Mail" wherein junior police officers are referred to. They have been trying to get an increase in their salaries. They have got that increase but not for any reason other than we were willing to see that they got it, and they got it. I know I am out of order but I use that merely as an illustration.

**Mr. Power:** You know that without going to the court the Public Service Commissioner has given increases in classifications.

**Mr. MORRIS:** The hon. member for Baroona and the hon. member for Cairns spoke about protective helmets. While I quite understand that the hon. member for Cairns would not be quite as au fait with this type of legislation as the hon. member for Baroona I am rather surprised that he should raise that matter because he knows perfectly well that there are many industries today wherein the wearing of helmets is compulsory. I am surprised that he should use the term "steel helmet." It is not a steel helmet at all but a safety helmet. There is quite a difference.

**Mr. Power:** Only a matter of a word.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Yes, but there is a big difference. I would oppose the use of steel helmets in many industries. For one thing they are conductors of electricity. The safety helmets now being used in industry are made of a different material altogether.

**Mr. Power:** Are you going to give them safety helmets?

**Mr. MORRIS:** The hon. member for Baroona should know very well that the right way to introduce a measure to deal with safety helmets is not by way of an amendment of the Inspection of Scaffolding Act. It comes under the Factories and Shops Act. The fact that he mentioned a matter which is out of order in the discussion of this Bill does not worry me in the least. The matter has been the subject of negotiation for some considerable time.

**Mr. Power:** You are doing more side-stepping than Harry Lauder.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I served an apprenticeship in this Chamber. I watched hon. gentlemen opposite who previously occupied this bench doing a reel, and I probably picked up one or two points from them. Legislation dealing with the wearing of safety helmets is under consideration, but we want to introduce it in such a way as to give the greatest advantage. I was chided by the hon. member for Mackay, who said that no doubt this Bill was introduced because the unions demanded it. We do not do these things because demands are made upon us; we do them because of requests from unions and because we think they are advisable.

**Mr. Graham:** Did you have a request from the trade union members?

**Mr. MORRIS:** Yes.

**Mr. Graham:** I will take back the word "demand" and make it "request."

**Mr. MORRIS:** We certainly had requests from the unions, and so had the previous Government—time and time again. And they did nothing.

**Mr. Graham:** On that particular matter?

**Mr. MORRIS:** Yes.

**Mr. Graham:** Shame on them!

**Mr. Power:** You must admit that Mr. Devries was all ready to go on with this.

**Mr. MORRIS:** That is not true.

**Mr. Power:** That is true.

**Mr. MORRIS:** It is not true.

**Mr. Power:** I know it is true.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Nothing whatsoever. Let me tell the story. In 1951 the hon. member for Baroona introduced legislation to amend the Inspection of Scaffolding Acts. The Leader of the Opposition quoted the remarks of the Premier and myself at the time and said that we spoke eulogistically of the Bill. And we did. We believed the Bill was a very good one.

**Mr. Power:** You have altered it since.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Of course we have. We have improved it very much. It is a long time between 1951 and now and there was need for improvements, but they were not made. I quoted the figures showing the increase in the number of man-days lost as the result of accidents, and because I did so, the Leader of the Opposition chided me.

**Mr. Duggan:** No, that is not true.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Let me quote them again. It is a very important story. Up to 1955, because of the change in circumstances, there has not been a great need for amending legislation. From June, 1955 to July, 1956, there was an alarming increase—I use the same words as I used before—in the number of days lost. There was an alarming increase at the end of 1956 and again at the end of 1957. At June, 1958, there was a decrease in the number of man-days lost by 47,910. Are not those figures worth quoting?

**Mr. Duggan:** I did not quarrel with your quoting them.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Why should I be jibed with an endeavour to make party political propaganda because I quote figures in this House to show the effect of our administration on this problem?

**Mr. Duggan:** What I said was that you said your predecessors in office had done nothing at all about the matter. That is what you said.

**Mr. MORRIS:** Let us look at what they did. Here is the letter in my file signed by John Egerton, Secretary of the Boilermakers Society.

**Mr. Aikens:** Speak of him with reverence.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. Aikens:** You should genuflect when his name is mentioned.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I ask the hon. member for Mundingburra to obey my call to order.

**Mr. MORRIS:** This letter, as I said, is signed by John Egerton.

**Mr. Walsh:** Is he the fellow who was defeated by 1,200 votes in the Boilermakers' ballot?

**Mr. MORRIS:** Wait till we have the secret ballot.

On 25 March, 1958, Mr. John Egerton, Secretary of the Boilermakers' Society of Australia, wrote as follows:—

“Your files will reveal that my union and other unions have been trying for years to have the standard of our Machinery and Scaffolding Acts raised.” That is what was done for the union under a Labour Government.

**Mr. Aikens:** What date was that?

**Mr. MORRIS:** 25 March, 1958. They requested certain things that are included in the Bill.

**Mr. Walsh:** Is there any evidence on the file that Egerton requested that before? It is all very well to read that letter, but where is the evidence?

**Mr. MORRIS:** If hon. members are happy about my dallying a little, I will go back through the file.

**Mr. Aikens:** If you are going to tip the tin, tip the lot, tin and all.

**Mr. MORRIS:** No, I do not do that sort of thing. Yes, there is evidence on the file of a request. This one is dated 1956, and it relates to one of the very matters included in this legislation.

**Mr. Walsh:** What date in 1956?

**Mr. MORRIS:** What date! I know I have unlimited time, but I shall not go on. The hon. member can peruse the file if he comes down to the office.

The Leader of the Opposition can accuse me of trying to make political propaganda if he wants to, but all I say, and I say it with great pride, is that under this Government there has been a tremendous improvement in the safety factor in industry. I was very disappointed to hear the criticism of the Leader of the Opposition, a man for whom I have had a great liking, of a report made by Mr. McDonnell, who is in charge of industrial safety, on the ground that one of the first references in that report was to the factor of finance. The Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that many factors have to be considered on this subject. Finance is a matter of great importance to an injured person. The hon. member for Bremer touched on the real kernel of the subject when he said that because of industrial accidents there is a great loss in production. Who loses because

of loss of production? Is it the employer? The employer does not lose or gain anything; it is the individual who loses, the man who has been mutilated or injured. He and his family are the losers. The Leader of the Opposition's criticism of Mr. McDonnell because he referred to the aspect of finance was very infantile. I should not expect it from anyone, let alone a person such as the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr. Duggan:** I should be more ready to believe in your sincerity if you had refuted the newspaper article from which I quoted that statement. Why did you not do that six months ago?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I find it simple to answer that question, because I know that every other Queenslander who read the report would realise the effect of it. Apparently the only person in Queensland unpleasant enough to level such a charge against that officer is the Leader of the Opposition. No other person has made such a charge, and it ill becomes the Leader of the Opposition to make such a charge against hard-working officers of my department. He used to rise in his wrath to attack anyone who chose to criticise any of his officers, but he apparently feels as Leader of the Opposition that he can with impunity make charges against my officers. I assure him that the officers of my department are as interested in their work and as keen to do a good job as his officers ever were, and I shall not sit quietly by when those charges are made.

**Mr. Aikens:** We should never fall into the error of believing they are infallible.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I do not even believe that the hon. member for Mundingburra is infallible, although he does.

**Mr. Aikens:** I most certainly do.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I have given a very full answer to those who raised serious points, and indeed to some who did not speak in a serious vein.

Motion (Mr. Morris) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING.

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

### TRAFFIC ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

#### INITIATION IN COMMITTEE.

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

**Hon. K. J. MORRIS** (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry) (12.38 p.m.): I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Traffic Acts, 1949 to 1957, in certain particulars.”

I had intended to make a somewhat historical review in relation to this problem,

but seeing that my friends in the Opposition have chided me about doing so, I shall stick—

**Mr. AIKENS:** I rise to a point of order. I am sure hon. members are interested in what the Minister is saying, but it is impossible to hear him because of the incessant chatter going on on the Government back benches.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope hon. members will allow the Minister to make his speech without interruption.

**Mr. MORRIS:** As I was chided with using a Bill for political purposes, I do not propose to transgress again. It will be interesting to see whether my opponents follow the law that apparently they lay down for me.

This is a simple measure to give effect to the statement of my colleague, the Treasurer, in his Budget speech, that in order to meet rising cost of traffic control, driving fees on motor vehicles should be increased. From 1 January, 1959, the annual driving fee will be 15s. for both private and commercial vehicles to be collected by the Commissioner of Main Roads on the registration or renewal of registration of motor vehicles, excluding trailers. As my colleague the Treasurer said, this will mean an estimated increased revenue of £67,000 for the remainder of this financial year, and £115,000 for a full year. After having heard the Treasurer's Budget speech, I am sure that all hon. members will realise that the increase is necessary. I shall now proceed to give the reasons why it is necessary.

In both Melbourne and Sydney the control of traffic presents a very grave problem; the traffic hazards there are indeed great. It was known years ago that they were becoming greater, but unfortunately the authorities did not act quickly enough with improved facilities. In Queensland we are in a somewhat different position. The matter of traffic control has been under consideration by this Parliament for a long time, particularly since my friend, Hon. Arthur Jones, introduced a Bill on traffic control two or three years ago. It was very fully debated and we gained a great deal of information.

In Brisbane we have not nearly the same congestion of traffic as there is in Sydney and Melbourne but we have our problems. However, they can be overcome if we act at once.

**Mr. Aikens:** What will the Bill do to overcome the problems?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I ask the hon. member to listen to what I have to say. When the Bill is printed he can read it, but by that time he may know what is in it.

It is necessary to have experienced and highly-trained personnel to control traffic adequately, people who understand the basic problems of traffic control and the methods

to overcome them. Over 12 months ago the Government sent me to Melbourne and Sydney to see what those cities were doing to overcome their traffic problems and I must admit that I was very impressed with the work that was being done there. They have set up traffic commissions with traffic engineers to try to minimise the problem and, if possible, gradually eliminate it. After getting as much information as I could in the South, I discussed the matter with my cabinet colleagues and I then recommended to the Government that a traffic engineer be appointed, a man highly trained in the problems of traffic control, with a staff to carry out remedial measures.

We subsequently appointed a traffic engineer, and as the result of his study of the problems here and his suggestions for overcoming them, we have also appointed some highly qualified officers to help him in his work. That should answer the question asked by the hon. member for Mundingburra.

Not only have we to pay staff, but we also have to make provision for physical installations such as traffic lights, road signs, and the painting of road surfaces. That will cost a good deal of money, but it will be money well spent, particularly if we can overcome the traffic hazards before they become too severe. It is our intention to spend three times as much this year on traffic control as was ever spent in Queensland before.

**Mr. Aikens:** Will you tell me what useful purpose is being served by those chaps who stand on street corners with a pencil and a sheaf of paper ticking off the cars as they go past?

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I draw the attention of the hon. member for Mundingburra to the fact that a few moments ago he complained of not being able to follow the Minister because of interruptions. I say now that he is not without fault himself. I cannot follow the Minister because of the hon. member's repeated interruptions. I shall be pleased if he will refrain from further interruption.

**Government Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. AIKENS:** I rise to a point of order. I call your attention, Mr. Taylor, to the provisions in the Standing Orders, which so far have not been excised in order to suppress me, that give me the right to make intelligent, pertinent and informative interjections to any hon. member who is speaking.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I refer the hon. member to the Standing Order that says he is not entitled to interrupt. The Minister is not obliged to acknowledge any interruptions. Consequently I ask the hon. member to refrain from further interruptions.

**Mr. MORRIS:** I was saying that we are spending about three times as much this year as we spent before and I believe we will see the need to spend infinitely more next year on

the further provision of these facilities. On several occasions reports have appeared in the Press about the installation of new traffic lights in various places. We are constantly buying equipment for the installation of those lights. They are installed only at the worst bottlenecks and after a study of the actual number of vehicles using the street or crossing the intersection at different times of the day. Quite often it is possible to reduce the effect of a bottleneck by diverting traffic through other streets. The first requirement is to have a knowledge of traffic flow. After the appointment of the traffic engineer we appointed other people to check traffic movement in the city of Brisbane and in country centres. They are armed not, as the hon. member for Mundingburra would like to have the people think, with pieces of paper and pencils but with what are recognised as being the most up-to-date traffic counters that it is possible to get. By the use of those small machines they are able to check the movement of traffic and they have been doing so for some months. Their work will be followed by the installation of lights in many places, which I am sure will be of great advantage.

We have had requests from many towns throughout the State for the services of the traffic engineer. It might interest the hon. member for Mundingburra to know that a request has come from his own town for the technical and special advice of the traffic engineer.

**Mr. Aikens:** Later I will tell you something about Townsville that will shock you.

**Dr. Noble interjected.**

**Mr. MORRIS:** I do not know whether my colleague the Minister for Health and Home Affairs is right when he says that the traffic problem in Townsville arises from the bicycle of the hon. member for Mundingburra but at least Townsville has a problem that must be solved and will be solved. We are spending money in appointing staff to solve them.

We have also set up a traffic commission, consisting of the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works, Mr. Holt, the Commissioner of Main Roads, Mr. Williams, the Commissioner of Police, Mr. Bischof, and the Town Clerk, Mr. Slaughter. These people meet regularly. They consider reports by the Traffic Engineer, indeed reports from all over Queensland. They do their very best to overcome the problems. I venture to say that the cost of our efforts to overcome traffic problems will be very much greater than the money that is to be allocated for the purpose. But nevertheless we are providing the service and we are delighted to do so. We want Brisbane, Toowoomba, Townsville, and in fact, Queensland generally, to be a part of Australia of which we will be able to say, "Because of the forethought and foresight of the Federal Government we have been spared the traffic problems that we experience in the southern States."

That is the background to this very simple Bill.

**Mr. DUGGAN** (North Toowoomba—Leader of the Opposition) (12.51 p.m.): The Minister seems to be a little sensitive this morning because he apparently has taken to heart the rebuke administered from this side of the Chamber for engaging in an historical survey when he introduced a previous Bill. He said that because of that rebuke he did not propose to adopt a similar practice on this occasion. I know that he has a misfortune—I do not say it in any other sense than one of regret and commiseration—in that he is a little hard of hearing. Apparently that was responsible for his inability to understand precisely what I said. I have always welcomed and always will welcome a Minister's introduction of a Bill that includes the fullest possible information about the purposes of the Bill. If it will give a better understanding of its provisions I welcome a historical survey and I told the hon. member that yesterday. If he reads my speech in "Hansard" he will realise that I welcome any Minister's giving an appropriate survey of the problems that lead to the introduction of a measure. What I objected to, and will continue to object to is that instead of making a survey of the position the Minister in my view improperly engaged in a spate of political propaganda in the process of making this so-called historical survey. I want to make my point quite clear on that. Because he is sensitive on the point he said this morning that he would confine himself strictly to the proposed amendments in the Bill and hoped that those who followed him would do precisely the same. See how unfair the Minister is! He has the advantage of a staff of officers to help him in these matters. Some of them are at the Bar of the chamber at the present time. He has known for some weeks what his intentions are. He has been fully briefed by his officers on all aspects of the proposed measure yet before the Bill is printed he expects us to be able to give an informed dissertation on its contents. He has completed his explanation without saying very much other than that the Bill will provide for increased fees for driving licences. He did give us an interesting survey of the Traffic Commission which I appreciated.

I regret the necessity to impose increased fees on motorists and I registered my protest on the Budget debate. I do not propose to push the barrow to the extent of dividing the Committee but I think it is only right that somebody should draw attention periodically to the very severe impact of increased costs on the motoring community. Irrespective of their political complexion Governments become complacent if protests are not voiced by various organisations when increased taxes are imposed.

Speaking as a motorist and as one who has had a close association with motoring

interests for a long time, I think that the ordinary private motorist has indeed cause for quarrel with the charges imposed and the extent to which he is taxed throughout Australia. Generally speaking, in Queensland we have been able to prove that the total amount spent on roads since the inception of the Main Roads Commission is greater than the total receipts from all sources of motor transport charges—heavy vehicles tax, payments under the State Transport Facilities Act, reimbursement of petrol tax and all the other charges. If the motorist is acquainted with the fact that more is being spent on the construction of roads when he is obliged to pay taxes he is reasonably content. The overall picture is that through sales tax, petrol tax and sales tax on accessories, taxes imposed at a Commonwealth level, the motorist is unfortunately paying dearly for the privilege of using the roads. The Commonwealth have extracted very much more from the motorist than they have given back in the form of motoring facilities. We do not propose to divide the Committee on this increased charge, but I regret the necessity for it.

The other day the State Government Insurance Office was obliged to increase charges on insurance cover. That is a regrettable trend and some corrective action will have to be taken. There should be some incentive to the motorist to observe the law. The motorist who is constantly involved in accidents should pay for the luxury of them, but I do not think the careful motorist who observes the law and is not involved in accidents should have to pay a high premium because of the careless actions of an irresponsible section of motorists.

The Minister directed attention to the traffic congestion in Sydney and Melbourne. Undoubtedly traffic congestion constitutes one of the greatest problems concerning those charged with the responsibility of maintaining traffic and administering a city in this modern age. We still have the fixed width of road which was suitable for the horse-and-buggy age, and when the population was much less. The tremendous increase in population and the fact that the width of the streets are much the same as they were 100 years ago constitutes a great problem to those engaged in facilitating the flow of traffic through our principal city streets. It is timely that an organisation be created, something greater than a recording one or one to make surveys. Mr. Colin Clark was chairman of a committee appointed to collate information regarding traffic congestion in Brisbane. This information was kept up to date. There were several others, members of the committee. Mr. Quinn a very competent transport authority, a former manager of the Brisbane Tramways was engaged on a part-time basis for months making a traffic survey of Brisbane. My view is that until the Government have sufficient financial resources to implement the recommendations of these

bodies their appointment is somewhat premature. I do not think for a moment that the information that the traffic commission collates will prevent us from having problems similar to those confronting traffic authorities of Sydney and Melbourne. The Government should face up to the task of creating a special fund—to this I directed the attention of the previous Government—for the progressive implementation of suggestions that may flow from men trained in designing and setting up lateral roads, underpasses, and overpasses, for the more efficient flow of traffic in the cities. Desirable as a traffic commission, traffic engineers, and collating authorities may be, and, although they serve a useful purpose, unless we have means to implement their recommendations, the work is really ineffective.

To what problems are they applying themselves? The Minister said that at present a traffic count is being taken to determine traffic density. He said that, if these people are made aware of certain traffic hazards and problems, they would then be prepared to go on to the next stage. I have pointed out that I was tempted to submit some recommendations to the previous Government on these matters, because I appreciated the need to do something, but I found that adequate funds could not be made available. There is nothing more frustrating to a traffic engineer or commission than periodical meetings and the collation of information when it is known that the recommendations cannot be implemented. That is one of the problems confronting the people chosen to carry out this work. A start has to be made, and I suppose, in the absence of sufficient funds to implement the recommendations, the information will be readily available when the Government can command sufficient finance, and the problem can be tackled a little more energetically.

I suggest to the Minister that he proceed on the lines of setting up a State development fund. At present the Brisbane City Council, the Police Department, the Main Roads Department, the Railway Department, and the Transport Department refuse to accept financial liability for very desirable traffic engineering improvements. Funds available for roadbuilding work are in great demand to make roads trafficable. My experience is that the people, wherever they live, want, first, an all-weather road. Then, in sequence, there is a demand for a metalled road, a bitumenised road, widened curvature, elimination of traffic hazards, and so on, and this work is very costly.

During my speech on the Budget I dealt briefly with the electrification of suburban railways. I spoke of overbridges in the metropolitan area. In the light of traffic trend, it is desirable to make these overbridges very much wider than the liability of the Commissioner for Railways, which is a 16-ft. carriageway. That was inserted in the Act many years ago. It is foolish to give the right to an authority such as the

Railway Department to use its legislative, protective right to erect only a 16-ft. carriageway, but at the same time we must be realistic enough to admit that the Railway Department could not be expected to transfer money from its funds for the purpose of building carriageways to make it easier for alternative forms of competitive transport to take business from it. The Brisbane City Council takes the view that it is not a Council matter, that the suggested overbridge is to a main road leading out of the city, a highway, and why should the Council spend funds on facilities for people who do not necessarily live in Brisbane.

That is a perfectly logical and reasonable objection to take. I feel that there should be some fund established whereby there might be a substantial subsidy given for the purposes I have mentioned. We have any amount of precedents for it, and I illustrate the overbridge at Clayfield on the Sandgate Road and the one at Bowen Hills where the City Council accepted financial contributions and the Government the remainder. Consequently I think that something like that must be done. The Minister is aware because of his capacity to establish business contacts, that those in charge of Big Business find themselves in a state of great perturbation because of the feeling that the inner city is becoming a dead heart through high rates, traffic congestion, and the inability of people to shop. This is a very general situation which is current in most cities where there are parking problems and blind areas. All these factors are causing people to consider moving out of the city proper. Take for example Allan & Stark and Woolworths who are moving out to the suburbs because they realise that fewer and fewer people are coming into the city to shop. There must be some complementary action to set up some body to override the Traffic Commission. So far as I can see the duties of the commission are largely advisory in character, but I think ultimately the Government will have to face up to the problem of setting up an authority with legislative powers to instruct the Commissioner for Main Roads, the Brisbane City Council and Government departments as to the course to be taken in the interest of providing city planning and traffic engineering. It must come. There will always be a reluctance on the part of people to involve themselves in these operations if some action is taken to give effect to the recommendations of the commission. There must be a flexible but sound city plan. We are moving in an age of great changes and where we have reasonably well-defined areas for heavy and light industries, residential zones, and business centres, they must be adhered to rigidly, but in other directions there should be a measure of flexibility. We find the trend is to get out of the city because of the high costs of flats, the noise factor, and the danger to children. These things flow from the fact that costs are becoming heavy and conditions difficult and they are forced to go

beyond the confines of the city boundary. Parking meters do not help the situation for very long. If the Traffic Commission collects all the information I have referred to and if the Government set up an authority to translate into action the recommendations of the commission and are prepared to clothe that authority with statutory power and regular funds to implement the recommendations, some worthwhile progress will be made. It is only playing with the problem to say that we have two or three traffic engineers. It is a start. I do not want to criticise the start, but the provision of three or four traffic engineers is only playing with the problem. We must do something along the lines of the plan I have sketchily outlined today.

I should like to give a more considered opinion on this matter should the opportunity present itself later. I have been speaking off the cuff, as it were, and have put up these matters in the spirit that they might be welcomed by the Minister and that something might flow from them in due course. Almost every city is faced with the same problem. Some of them have been attacked more intelligently than others. Of course, we cannot avoid inconveniencing and hurting some sections of the people, and naturally the cost will have to be borne by the community generally. In the times in which we are living, the cost of traffic control must not be borne only by the motorists but by the community as a whole. We tax the community generally to meet the cost of education and the losses on public transport, and similarly we must face up to the fact that the cost associated with traffic engineering must also be the financial responsibility of the general community.

It is not necessary to emphasise the tremendous economic losses that are caused by traffic delays. When the Minister was speaking on the previous Bill he drew attention to the losses that are occasioned by industrial accidents. If we multiply the number of vehicles by the number of minutes that they are compelled to stop at Petrie Bight and other traffic centres waiting for the green light and calculate the gallonage of petrol that is wasted, and then if we compute even at basic wage rates the cost of the time wasted by people in traffic delays, the total would represent a stupendous sum. We must try to avoid being placed in the same position as other cities in the matter of controlling traffic; we must not delay until the problem is beyond our financial capacity to solve.

In the meantime, numerous modified steps can be taken. One is to have parking on only one side of the street at specified hours. That is already being implemented. Another would be the introduction of regulations to provide for one-way traffic in certain streets. This suggestion is always resisted by business interests, but in most places where it has been implemented no great loss has been sustained. What is lost in one street is

probably compensated for in another. Those are some steps that could be taken during the transition period.

There is also the matter of declaring new road alignments. Fairfield Road is a case in point. I have noticed new buildings going up along that road, and if it is ever widened the cost of resumptions will be very high. That is only one of the several thoroughfares leading out of the city that should be realigned. Even if it is 10, 20 or 30 years before they can be converted to four-lane highways, if new alignments are declared now the cost of resumption in the future will be relatively small. I was responsible for having new alignments declared on Sandgate Road and in one or two other places. Although there is bound to be some opposition to the proposal, it is a forward step that should be taken in various parts of the inner perimeter of the city. In Sydney it was found necessary to spend about £300,000 or £400,000 to resume a building to make way for the bridge at Circular Quay. When I was in Chicago in 1951 I saw a complete street being demolished to make way for a six-lane highway. On our standards, the capital cost of a job such as that would total many millions of pounds. Much of that could be avoided by declaring new alignments and making people build to them. In the meantime it will be necessary only to meet the cost of the unimproved value of that section of the land between the present alignment and the new alignment.

I sincerely hope that the Minister will direct his thoughts to the matters that I have raised. I do not like to see a dead heart developing in the city area, with insurance companies and banks taking possession of the main streets. I think there should also be regulations compelling the owners of the buildings to provide a certain amount of shopping accommodation on their ground floors and so on, which would brighten up the city. With banks and other financial houses building in the main streets and the drift of trade to the suburbs, it will be only a matter of time before there will be a real dead heart in the City of Brisbane after 5 p.m. I hope that can be avoided.

The steps that have been taken and are being taken will not have a very great impact nor will they effect a very great immediate improvement but at least they represent a start so we should give them all the encouragement we can. If the Minister can persuade his colleagues to make additional sums of money available to carry out the recommendations of the body, he will have made a very worthwhile contribution as Minister of a very important and difficult portfolio, including, as it does, control of traffic in the capital city of the State. I commend the Bill and hope it will achieve the results the Minister expects it will.

**Hon. W. POWER** (Baroona) (2.31 p.m.): From what I have heard about the Bill, I understand it is a proposal to increase the

licence fees for private vehicles from 7s. 6d. to 15s. in other words by 100 per cent., and to increase the fees for commercial vehicles from 12s. 6d. to 15s. It is proposed to spend the moneys so obtained to provide traffic engineers and to help eliminate certain traffic hazards within the State. It is just another attack on the motorists. The legislation is sectional in character. The motorists are being picked on especially to provide revenue.

**Mr. Gilmore:** You should talk!

**Mr. POWER:** I can talk and the hon. member cannot. That is the difference between us.

It is totally unfair to put further imposts on the motorists. No other section of the community is so singled out. It may be argued that not many people will be affected, but there is a motor vehicle in two out of every four homes so there will be a fair amount of revenue collected from the measure. Motorists are already hit to leg. Every time they pull up in the street they have to pay a tax where parking meters are installed and in certain areas where there are no meters parking is restricted. A review of restrictions on parking is long overdue. One has only to go down Roma Street, where there are double tram-tracks, to find that vehicles are allowed to park in the area. On the other hand there is a ban on parking in Petrie Terrace where there is no tram service and the route is only traversed in the early morning and late at night when the buses are leaving and returning to their depot. I brought the matter under the notice of the Commissioner of Police and referred him to Caxton Street. Where there is no tramline they are allowed to park on both sides of the road.

**Mr. Hanlon:** There is a shopping area there.

**Mr. POWER:** There is in both places. I am not suggesting there is anything wrong with the parking arrangements in Caxton Street and I am not asking to have them altered, because parked vehicles do not impede the flow of traffic there; but parking should not be banned in Petrie Terrace, because there are two outlets—one through Countess Street to Kelvin Grove and the other through Petrie Terrace to Red Hill and other suburbs. Although there are no tramtracks or buses there, except in Countess Street, the ban operates. The motorists are getting a raw deal from the Government despite the interjection of the hon. member for the Tablelands who sometimes wakes up when he hears something said. There is no justification for the imposition of sectional taxation.

**Mr. Gilmore** interjected.

**Mr. POWER:** The hon. member wanted to sack Gerry Moriarty. He could not get his Party to agree to the Tammany Hall tactics he would adopt.

Something must be done to eliminate traffic hazards but the money should come from Consolidated Revenue or other sources, not from a special tax on the motorist.

**Mr. Hanlon:** None of the other Ministers would accept the increased fees.

**Mr. POWER:** That might be so. The painting of diamond crossings on streets is costing a great deal of money. We need something of a more permanent nature. Traffic lights should be installed. One has only to look at the corner outside Parliament House. With the diamonds and white lines all over the place it is like a jig-saw puzzle. The installation of traffic lights would overcome the difficulty. The maintenance on traffic lights would be nothing like what it is going to be on roads where diamond crossings are painted. I have mentioned this matter before: if the Minister wants to do something for the protection of the people in areas served by busses let him arrange for zebra crossings to be provided at bus stops for use by people who have to cross the road after alighting in the outer suburbs.

I have always opposed the imposition of sectional taxation when the revenue is to be spent on something that will benefit the whole of the community. Some motorists take their cars out perhaps only once a week or a fortnight yet they will be called upon to pay this additional tax. Why impose this special tax on them? We know that there is going to be an increase in insurance fees—yet a further imposition on the motorist. Now the Minister is singling them out for special legislation.

I commend the Minister for anything he is doing to clean up the traffic problems. He has always been very reasonable about anything I have brought to his notice. He has taken a leaf out of my book; that is why. But it is unfair to pick one section of the community on which to impose special taxation. That is what is happening to the motorist and therefore I am not prepared to support the Bill.

**Mr. HANLON** (Ithaca) (2.38 p.m.): I support the Leader of the Opposition in registering a protest against the infliction of this sectional tax on the motoring community and the motoring trade. As I pointed out in the Budget Debate a tremendous imposition has been put on them, particularly by the Commonwealth Government. It is true, as the hon. member for Tablelands interjected, that registration fees were increased in Queensland under a Labour Government. Everything has gone up in the last nine to 10 years. Since the advent of the Menzies-Fadden Government in 1949 there has been a continuous inflationary trend with the result that almost every charge has gone up. The hon. member's salary and everything else has gone up—all costs of Government. As the hon. member for Baroona pointed out driving licence fees are being increased by 100 per cent.—from 7s. 6d. to 15s. I point out to the hon. member for Tablelands that

by so increasing driving licence fees the Government are reversing completely the benefit given by the Labour Government a few years ago. Hon. members will remember that not so many years ago every person who held a driver's license had to pay a yearly fee of 7s. 6d. but the Labour Government decided that they would give a measure of relief. The Act was amended so that only the vehicle attracted a driving licence fee of 7s. 6d. The charge of 7s. 6d. was made part of the yearly registration fee. The Minister will agree that that was the case. In a household where the husband and wife and one or two members of the family drove the vehicle, instead of paying 15s. or 30s. they were getting away with a charge of 7s. 6d., when the driving fee for the family was reduced to that amount. The Government, by doubling the fee of 7s. 6d., have completely nullified the benefit given by the Labour Government.

**Mr. Morris:** The broad application of it is exactly the same. There is no change.

**Mr. HANLON:** The Minister says that the application is the same. It is quite true that the public of Queensland are very fortunate that the Labour Government took that step otherwise instead of the fee being 15s. a household of four people would be paying £3. It is most unfair that this tax should be doubled.

I am not saying that the extra 7s. 6d. will ruin the motorist; he is paying so much now that he will not notice it. It is to be paid as part of the registration fee. The Government believe that when it is collected in that way the people may not notice it as much as they would if they went to the Police Station or the Main Roads Board and paid the 15s. each year. They may have to pay £18 or £20 in registration fee, and the extra 7s. 6d. will not be noticed as much as it would if it were paid separately every year. There is approximately £140,000,000 being paid in taxation by motorists in Australia. The average working man with a car pays more in motor vehicle taxation to the State or Commonwealth Government than he does in income tax. That is an amazing thing, and I challenge the Minister to deny it. How can the Minister justify a further increase in the taxation that these motorists have to pay?

**Mr. Gaven:** Why didn't you think of that when you raised the registration tax by £118,000?

**Mr. HANLON:** As I pointed out before, surely the hon. member knows that the fees would have to be increased more than they were 10 years ago when the Menzies-Fadden Government came in. Since that time wages and salaries have gone up two or three times. It is only natural that whatever Government were in power they would have to raise the registration fees. That is very evident in view of the fact that State Governments and local authorities are being deprived of the

money the Commonwealth Government collect by way of petrol tax, and which could be used for the improvement of roads. I remind the Minister that if a Labour Government are returned in November we will get enough out of the petrol tax to be paid to the State to make the £67,000 this year and £115,000 next year hardly worth speaking about. I take strong objection to the driving-licence tax, not because it will ruin anybody but because I think it is actually a sham. It is a tax put on to try and bolster up the case which the Treasurer is endeavouring to make in order to support his case for a claimant State. The Treasurer believes he will have to show that he has exhausted almost every avenue of taxation revenue. Despite the fact that he is budgeting for a deficit of £1,750,000—in fact he is budgeting for a deficit of £2,500,000, because reserves in Trust and Special Funds amounting to £600,000 or £700,000 are to be used—he told the Minister for Labour and Industry that he must get another £67,000 this year from motorists to save his Budget. How ridiculous can anyone be! Can the Minister tell us that it is absolutely necessary to collect what is virtually a sprat of £60,000 or £70,000 in view of the deficit of £2,500,000 for which the Government have budgeted.

**Mr. Power:** According to their policy speech, there would be no increase in taxation.

**Mr. HANLON:** Their policy speeches always contain that statement. Mr. Menzies said that in 1949, but we know what has happened in the last nine years. I believe that the Treasurer tried to get some of the other Ministers to sponsor additional taxation, and that they bucked and would not do it. As the Deputy Premier was overseas or somewhere else in the State, the Treasurer was able to slip this through Cabinet.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I hope the hon. member will return to the Bill.

**Mr. HANLON:** My remarks are related to traffic matters. If the Bill is not to be used to raise £115,000 which the Minister has said is necessary for improvements in traffic facilities in Brisbane and other parts of the State, I do not know its purpose. If we could get £115,000, £500,000, or £1,000,000 from some other source, obviously the Bill would not be necessary. I think I am quite in order in pointing out the reasons for the introduction of this measure and the fact that other avenues of revenue, rather than an impost on motorists, were open to the Government.

At one stage I asked the Treasurer about the possibility of a tax on hire-purchase agreements, increased stamp duty, and so on, which is tied to a certain extent with the sale of motor vehicles on hire purchase. The Victorian Government have succeeded in raising a great deal of money by imposing increased stamp duty on those transactions, and it has been claimed by the Premier of that State that by that legislation they were able to

prevent that tax from being passed on to the purchaser of a motor vehicle or other article on hire purchase.

The Government could have examined a number of other avenues of revenue to get this money. I support the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Baroona in the view that this in the large sense is a community responsibility. I speak of the need to spend a great deal of money on traffic control and better facilities for direction of traffic. Traffic problems are created by pedestrians and tramcars as much as they are created by motor vehicles and just as Consolidated Revenue is used in other directions to deal with problems arising from sectional activities, money from Consolidated Revenue should be used for traffic control.

**Mr. Power:** The trams contribute greatly to traffic problems.

**Mr. HANLON:** If there were no trams in the streets, there would probably be no city. The trams make the city, because they carry so many people to the city to do their business, but as the hon. member for Baroona has pointed out, traffic problems would be immeasurably reduced if no trams ran through the city.

I now turn to restrictions in parking in Brisbane. I am still to be convinced that some of these parking restrictions between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. in Elizabeth and Ann Streets are as valuable as the Traffic Branch think they are. I know that a great number of cars on their way out of town in the afternoon and into town in the morning use those streets, thus removing much traffic from Queen and Adelaide Streets, but the prohibition against parking in these areas after 4 p.m. in my opinion does as much harm as good. I do not know if any other hon. member has had the experience of driving up to town at a-quarter past 4 for the purpose of picking up some article, and having to drive around for a-quarter of an hour trying to find a parking position. Those streets have been declared no parking areas after 4 o'clock in the afternoon. The many cars that drive up and down Elizabeth Street and Ann Street between the hours of 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. are doing more to create traffic congestion than if they were allowed to be parked in those streets on the outbound side in the afternoon. The police are apparently of the opinion that the restrictions are necessary in those streets but I think the restrictions irritate motorists who find that no matter where they go they cannot park. I am not attacking the Traffic Branch of the Police Department because it is doing of its best. In many parts of the State parking meters are being installed where at one time the motorist would have been fined for parking. It has been found that benefits to be gained by certain restrictions have been outweighed by the disadvantages that would accrue and so the restrictions have been dropped. I should

like to see a closer investigation made of the no-parking restrictions in Elizabeth and Ann Streets.

I compliment Mr. Leitch the traffic engineer, a gentleman who is going about his job enthusiastically and endeavouring to do his best. In many directions he has been able to study problems which the Police Department have not had time to get round to. He has been able to study suburban difficulties whereas the Police Department has not had time to do that work because of being tied up with the bigger problems in the main city area.

I am disappointed to find that whereas we have had several sets of new traffic lights in Brisbane for some months they have not been installed. The Minister has pointed out that it is necessary to take a census of motor traffic going through intersections and also pedestrian traffic to make sure that lights are not put in places where they will not be of maximum benefit. These lights were ordered and arrived in Brisbane some months ago, but nothing has been done about installing them where there is an obvious need for them. I can refer to places in my own electorate and I illustrate the crossing near the Story Bridge at Kangaroo Point. It calls for pedestrian lights at once. We have them lying idle in Brisbane right now. Some of the more obvious intersections and crossings could be supplied with pedestrian lights immediately. The census could continue in regard to other intersections.

**Mr. Ewan:** Why did they throw a lot of the lights out in Sydney?

**Mr. HANLON:** I may use doctors and perhaps politicians by way of analogy. There are people with strong opinions at a certain time but they change them and get different ideas. For instance, doctors used to believe that it was necessary for every person to have his tonsils out. Everyone thought that street crossing lights were necessary to relieve traffic problems, but in the bigger cities they are not being used now. From my experience they served a good purpose in Brisbane.

The hon. member for Norman spoke of the traffic hazard in his electorate. I support the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the need for realignment of streets as soon as possible. It annoys me to drive through the twisting and turning street at Surfers Paradise. In the last few years expensive buildings, apartments, and shopping centres have been erected along the "Golden Mile," but motorists still have to wriggle in and out of the area like a snake.

**Mr. Gaven:** It shows a complete lack of foresight.

**Mr. HANLON:** It certainly does, and similar examples can be seen in other places. Only five or ten years ago the roadway at Surfers Paradise could have been re-aligned and straightened at a comparatively small

cost. It is becoming more difficult for a pedestrian to cross the roadway there than at Kangaroo Point.

**Mr. Gaven:** The Minister has just told me that he will help me to straighten it out.

**Mr. HANLON:** It would cost a tremendous amount now. If the Minister has enough money to straighten the roadway at Surfers Paradise there should be no need for him to increase the cost of drivers' licences.

I should like to see more police released from the inner city to patrol school crossings and other pedestrian crossings in the suburbs. I know that the police watch some of the really bad crossings, but I think some of those who patrol the inner city streets could be released from those duties.

I point out that a number of policemen watch the parking meters to see that motorists do not stay longer than their allotted time. I realise that they are paid by the Brisbane City Council, but they are continually riding round the inner city streets on their motor-bikes and are always at hand to attend to any nearby incident. Consequently, some of the foot police who are now patrolling in the inner city areas could be sent out to some of the busier suburban pedestrian crossings. Of course, that step may already have been taken. I mention particularly the pedestrian crossing outside the Milton School. A policeman is stationed at the Bayswater Street crossing every afternoon, but there is another bad crossing at the other end of the schoolgrounds at the corner of Fernberg Road and Heussler Terrace. Children from the Milton State School, the Marist Brothers College and other colleges at Rosalie use that crossing. Probably as many children use it as the one where a policeman is stationed.

**Mr. Power:** The Torwood police go there as often as possible.

**Mr. HANLON:** I realise that, but they have other duties to attend to. Foot policemen could be released from the inner city area to look after suburban school crossings.

**Mr. GRAHAM (Mackay) (3 p.m.):** It is a pity that the Government propose to increase the cost of drivers' licenses from 7s. 6d. to 15s. It is rather surprising for them to do it in view of the fact that they handed back revenue to certain sections of the community claiming that the cost of collection was out of all proportion to the amount received. I find it hard to understand why the motorist should be taxed again to provide more funds, which evidently are needed to finance the traffic commission, to pay the traffic engineers and to carry on the Government's traffic policy. The tax is unfair. Thousands of motorists throughout Queensland who live in isolated country areas and rarely bring their vehicles into the city will have their license fees doubled for the purpose mentioned.

I am not opposed to the traffic commission. Something must be done to deal with the ever-increasing traffic problems, especially in the city of Brisbane. The police are doing a good job in co-operation with the local authorities but it is unfair to ask the country dweller to meet some of the cost. There are not the same problems in the country areas because there is less traffic, but in the city the lot of the motorist is becoming more and more complex. I say that advisedly as one who drives a car nearly every day in Brisbane. I am often at a loss to know what I can do and what I cannot, where I can go and where I cannot, which street I can park in and which street I cannot, and what hours of the day I can stay and what hours of the day I cannot.

Only a fortnight ago I went up George Street at 4.30 p.m. I know that parking on the outbound side is banned from half-past 4 to 6 p.m. Sometimes police walk up and down telling motorists to move their cars and people are often booked for over-parking; but in this case I was going up George Street and the policeman at the Ann Street intersection directed me into North Quay. When I reached the William Jolly Bridge I was told that I could not go to the right; I had to go to the left, right away from the direction of my place of abode. So I drove over the William Jolly Bridge and I came to North Quay again. When I got there the policeman tried to send me over the William Jolly Bridge again. I said, "No, I don't want to go over the William Jolly Bridge again; I have just been over there." I live at Ashgrove, I do not see why I should have to travel in a circle just to please a policeman. I did not go over the bridge. I stood my ground. That is an illustration of what happens to motorists today. One has to be a Philadelphia lawyer to understand the traffic laws of Brisbane.

If you come from Roma Street to Parliament House you will pass on one side of the street 365 notices saying that you cannot park between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., or between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m., or from 8 to 4, or from 9 to 5, that you cannot stop here or leave your car there, and so on. Up the other side of the street are 564 of them. If you stop to look at every one of them you will never get anywhere. The hon. member for Ithaca spoke of the ever-increasing number of notices. There is a whole jungle of them in the city streets.

**Mr. Sparkes:** It would be easier for you to walk home.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** It would be wiser to leave the car at home than try to park in some of the inner city streets. As the hon. member for Ithaca said, metered parking has been overdone. I cannot see why in streets like Elizabeth and Ann Streets where there is no great flow of traffic, vehicles should not park after 4 p.m. But because the Police Department say you cannot, you cannot without running the risk of a fine.

Perhaps the Traffic Commission might be able to overcome some of the complexities that have arisen in traffic control.

I am not so much concerned about the difficulties in Brisbane, but what is happening in the country concerns me because the country-dweller has to pay the increased fee to meet the cost of working out a solution of the traffic problems in Brisbane.

**Mr. Sparkes:** Where do you live? You must be concerned about what happens in Brisbane.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** Let the Brisbane people pay for it. I do not think that the Traffic Commission will pay much regard to what happens in little country towns outside Mackay, or even Mackay itself. I do not think the Traffic Commission would think too much about what happens in the West. Only the wealthy grazier can drive his Customline into the city. The poor slave never comes down to the city in his car. The man who lives in the little country town only drives round the country town and may be down to the nearest beach.

**Mr. Sparkes:** I cannot afford to live in Brisbane.

**Mr. GRAHAM:** The hon. member has an aeroplane to fly to his properties in the West. It would not be profitable for him to live in Brisbane. It is unfair that the country dweller should have to meet this increased charge that the Government have seen fit to impose upon the motorist.

I agree with the hon. member for Ithaca that the charge is only on the owner of a vehicle. It does not apply to the holders of driving licences who drive vehicles other than their own. Many licensed drivers drive vehicles in their employment, but they are not being taxed—only the owners of the vehicles. The tax should apply to everyone who holds a driver's licence. The Government are looking for more revenue and they are ready to "slug" a section of the community that is already carrying a great burden of taxation. Motorists are paying a high rate of registration and insurance, yet this additional imposition is being placed upon them, so that the Government can establish a traffic commission whose main functions without question will be to solve traffic problems in Brisbane. I think that much could be done to overcome traffic problems in Brisbane if traffic control were taken away from the Police Department.

I am sure that a separate unit comprised of properly-trained men could do a better job of traffic control. Some police officers are very adept at controlling traffic but others have absolutely no aptitude for this work. Indeed, some of them hold up traffic rather than keep it flowing smoothly. I lodge my protest against the introduction of this measure. I think it is entirely unfair to tax

the people who are already overtaxed for the use of a motor vehicle for pleasure or for business.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Mundingburra) (3.11 p.m.): The principle of the Bill as explained by the Minister were, goodness knows, sketchy enough. The hon. gentleman told us the Bill proposed to raise the licence fee for people driving a motor vehicle. I have no objection to that. The Minister stated how the extra money is to be collected, but how the money will be spent is another matter. Apparently the Minister believes in the old saying, "Give a public servant a pencil and a piece of paper and he will set up a fresh department." It would appear that we are to use the money from the extra licence fees to establish another department. Whether that department will be any use in the solution of our traffic problems remains to be seen. I am prepared to let the Minister go along and try out his scheme with his experts and counting machines on each corner counting the cars that go this way, the cars that go that way and the cars that do not go any way. If the Minister thinks that will solve the problem I am prepared to let him go along until he has convinced himself it is no good or that we have convinced him it is not any good. Let us be frank about the traffic problem. The control of traffic rests entirely on the shoulders of the police. I am pleased that the Commissioner of Police is in the lobby listening to what I have to say. I hope that he and every hon. member who is a responsible member is concerned about the mounting toll of the road, the number who are injured and killed on the roads every day, and that does not go for the hon. member who is indulging in particularly asinine guffaws. We know the toll of the road is increasing everywhere. I have often said, and I will keep saying it until I am convinced otherwise, that the greatest menace on the road is the psychological case who believes that once he gets behind the wheel of a motor-car the rest of the road belongs to him and that everybody else should get out of his way. Such a man at heart is a coward because when not behind the wheel he is usually a meek and humble person. When placed in charge of a death-dealing machine weighing 30 cwt. or 2 tons he says, "I am going to make my presence felt." We have heard and read over the air and in the Press what certain people say about the way that police officers speak to them when they commit a traffic breach. They believe that the police officers should be namby-pamby and almost apologise to them for speaking to them. I believe that the days of soft measures and courtesy and consideration for the road hog are gone for ever, and the sooner the police realise it the better. The great majority of motorists are decent law-abiding citizens and they do not incur the displeasure of the police. The person who needs the attention of the police is the psychological case who is a potential killer, and by nature a road hog. When the police

have occasion to speak to such a man or woman—and road hogs are not confined to the male sex—they should speak to him or her in a voice that will permit of no ambiguity and the Commissioner should launch prosecutions against road offenders on every conceivable occasion. While we are fiddling—Nero fiddled while Rome burned—and trying out the so-called educational schemes, the so-called soft-glove scheme and the so-called courtesy scheme, what do we get—a mounting toll of death and injury on the road. Townsville has the highest road death and accident rate of provincial cities in the State, and that is nothing to be proud of. I should say that it is because those in control of the Police Department in Brisbane have not taken into consideration the topographical features of Townsville. It is a provincial city with a population approaching 45,000. Toowoomba is a city of virtually the same population, Rockhampton also has about the same population as Townsville, or perhaps slightly more. It may even be lower, but that is not the point at issue. Ipswich is of the same size, but the population of Townsville, because of the peculiarities of the city, is spread over about five or six times the area of Toowoomba. Because of Castle Hill and the river, the creek and the salt pans, the area of Townsville is about five or six times larger than Toowoomba, larger than Rockhampton and larger than Ipswich. I am informed that Townsville has only the same number of traffic police as Toowoomba, Rockhampton and Ipswich.

**Mr. Roberts:** A law-abiding place.

**Mr. AIKENS:** It is not because it is a law-abiding place. I am sure this is the first time this aspect has been pointed out to the Commissioner. It is so because the Commissioner quite honestly has assessed the traffic police requirements of Townsville purely and simply on a population basis, and not on the particular or peculiar layout of the city. It is obvious, if traffic police have to control a town five times the area of another town, that the larger town should have more traffic police than the town of smaller area. Anyone with the most primitive mental processes would agree with that. That is the trouble in Townsville. It is a peculiar town as the few hon. members who have been there will admit, although very few of them have stayed more than a few hours. It has one main street with only two main arteries leading out of the city, Flinders Street West and Charters Towers Road. Those two arteries have become veritable speedways. Speeding on Coronation Drive and other speedways in the city of Brisbane has been mentioned, but I point out that the traffic on these Brisbane highways travels at a snail's pace compared with the great majority of cars using Flinders Street West and Charters Towers Road.

**Mr. Graham:** Why should they have to speed?

**Mr. AIKENS:** I want to know the answer to that question. They seem to have got into that habit. The motorists seem to have developed it during the war years. I know a fair amount about traffic and its control, because in the dark days of the war in Townsville when traffic conditions became absolutely chaotic, a traffic co-ordination committee was formed to try to evolve order out of chaos. That committee comprised representatives of the Australian military forces, the American forces, the Australian Air Force, civilian police, and the Townsville City Council. As deputy mayor of Townsville at the time, I was elected chairman of the war-time Traffic Co-ordination Committee and, with the assistance of all the bodies I have mentioned, including the civilian police, the death and accident toll was cut very considerably. The committee received tremendous assistance from such men as Brigadier North, the Lines of Communication Officer in charge of the A.I.F. and Australian Forces, Colonel Brown, later Brigadier Brown of the American Forces, Wing-Commander Cobby of the R.A.A.F., and the two senior police officers in Townsville at the time. For the moment I have forgotten the name of the inspector, but the traffic inspector in charge of the civilian police in Townsville at that time was a man named Gannon, who did a particularly fine job. We received magnificent assistance from the American authorities, the Australian authorities, and the civilian police. Our greatest bugbear, and I shall not mention this at length, was Mr. Justice R. J. Jeffriess who, as I have said very often, was biased in favour of the motor murderer and the motor maimer, and we could do nothing about that.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. AIKENS:** If we are to reduce this death and accident toll in Townsville—and hon. members would be appalled at the figures—we must have sufficient police there to control the traffic. We have not enough at the moment.

**Mr. Gair:** Did you say Mr. Justice R. J. Jeffriess?

**Mr. AIKENS:** R. J. Douglas. Did I say R. J. Jeffriess?

**Mr. Gair:** Yes. He was not there.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I was speaking about the war years. I am glad the hon. member drew my attention to that misstatement. I am glad to withdraw it. I was speaking of Mr. Justice R. J. Douglas. I was talking of the war years when Mr. Justice Jeffriess was probably still at school. The police at Townsville are doing a splendid job with the manpower at their control. We need more traffic police in Townsville and more vehicles for them so that they can go after traffic offenders. We have on the magistrates bench in Townsville Mr. Baker, who is prepared to play his part

in dealing with the road hog. He does the job very well and an offender does not get away with a peanut fine if he appears before him on a serious traffic charge. On the Supreme Court Bench we had during the war years, as I mentioned, a person biased in favour of the motor-murderer and motor-maimer.

Now I shall come out on to ground where I like to speak. I like to get on to ground that others are not game to walk on. The great increase in motor-killing and maiming on roads in Queensland today is due to the spineless and gutless attitude adopted by many of the juries who will not convict the motor-killer or the motor-maimer when the evidence before them is clear and concise and black as hell. We see instances of the motor-maimer brought before the Supreme Court. In the first place the police do their job in launching the charge, the Crown Law Office play their part and the Crown Prosecutor does his job in presenting the case, and the Judge in seeing that the trial is conducted according to the best traditions of British justice. We see irrefutable evidence of careless driving, speeding or criminal negligence brought against the man in the dock, but for some reason best known to themselves and their God the jury return a verdict of not guilty. I am speaking of the road hog, the maimer and killer who can kill with impunity knowing full well that when he goes before the court no matter what evidence is produced against him the jury will spinelessly return a verdict of not guilty. When we have this state of affairs we will have an ever-increasing toll of the road.

I do not mind the Minister having a little plaything if he wants to play around with it, but let us not lose sight of the fact that there are three or four instrumentalities responsible for the safety of the people on the highways of the State. The first is the police, then the magistrates, then the juries, and the Justices of our Supreme Court. I should say that each is carrying its share of responsibility reasonably well and with a fair degree of honesty with the exception of most of our juries.

I know that hon. members must be astonished, as I have been, to read of cases in the newspapers from time to time, where an innocent person is run down and killed by the drunken driver. There is no doubt about the driver being drunk. The case comes before the Supreme Court but the jury finds the defendant not guilty of any charge in connection with the offence. I think, although this is perhaps irrelevant, that the law should be amended to state that drunkenness is ipso facto criminal negligence. I think it should be made part and parcel of the criminal law that a man drunk in charge of a motor-car is criminally negligent in respect of any accident which occurs while he is in charge of that car.

**Mr. Hanlon:** How do you define "drunk"?

**Mr. AIKENS:** If he cannot handle the car as well as a sober man would handle it. Let me refer to a case we had in Townsville recently where a sister at the Townsville General Hospital was riding home one night with her husband side by side on cycles on the correct side of the road when along came a drunk with another fellow in a utility. They had been having a pub crawl from pub to pub and were driving at about 50 miles an hour.

The driver ran up behind the nursing sister and her husband, smashed the sister almost to fragments and seriously injuring her husband. He was represented in the Townsville Supreme Court by a very able barrister, who bulldozed the jury into believing that although the man was hopelessly drunk the accident could have occurred even if he had been sober. Naturally, he mentioned that drunkenness of itself does not constitute criminal negligence.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! I remind the hon. member that he himself said a few moments ago that the subject matter with which he is now dealing is somewhat irrelevant. I should be glad if he would return to the subject matter of the Bill.

**Mr. AIKENS:** I had finished with that point, but the hon. member for Ithaca interjected and I had to go over it again to get the message over to him. He seems to be rather obtuse on the point.

Let us face the facts. The toll of the road is a serious problem and we are not tackling it as we should; we are not dealing with the road-hog as we should. I do not know that I would go so far as to say that motor killers and motor maimers should be deprived of the right of trial by jury. But many people in the community hold the opinion that a motorist, particularly one under the influence of liquor, who is charged with unlawfully killing should be tried not by a jury but by either one or three Supreme Court Judges. I have not yet formed that opinion, because I realise the inherent danger in removing the right of trial by jury.

**Mr. Gair:** Do you think juries are got at?

**Mr. AIKENS:** I do not know whether they are got at, but I believe that most jurymen today are themselves motorists and when they see a motorist in the dock charged with killing or maiming they say to themselves, "There but for the grace of God stand I."

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member told me a few moments ago that he had finished with that point. There is nothing about juries in the Bill. I ask the hon. member either to return to the subject matter of the Bill or conclude his remarks.

**Mr. AIKENS:** There is a feeling by all jurymen who are motorists that with a couple of extra drinks some night and a little

bad luck they would be in the dock instead of the accused person. They reach their verdict not on the facts of the case but on fear and sentiment.

**Mr. ROBERTS** (Whitsunday) (3.29 p.m.): If we had a few canoes and row-boats here we could stage a great aquatic carnival. Never have I seen so many crocodile tears shed by the Opposition as they have shed today over the increase of 7s. 6d. in the cost of a driver's licence. Over the years, no party has bashed the motorist more severely than the Labour Party. When I first took out a driver's licence 34 years ago, it cost me 7s. 6d. It is now being increased to 15s.

**Mr. Gair:** We could not have increased it very much.

**Mr. ROBERTS:** I am talking about the way in which the Labour Government increased registration fees. In their days every person who drove a car had to pay a license fee of 7s. 6d., whereas today it costs only 7s. 6d. a car and many hundreds of thousands of people who have driving licences do not own a car. They hold licences for 10 years, 5 years and one year at no cost whatever.

**Mr. Gair:** The Labour Government reduced it.

**Mr. ROBERTS:** I told the hon. gentleman that.

**Mr. Gair:** You said we hit the motorists.

**Mr. ROBERTS:** I said that nobody bashed the motorists more than the Labour Government, which they did by increasing the registration fees.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Are you going to reduce registration fees?

**Mr. ROBERTS:** I am dealing with licence fees and I am giving the figures. I will give hon. members opposite a few more figures if that is what they want.

The hon. member for Ithaca made quite a story of petrol tax. If he wants to know something about petrol tax let me refer him to the Labour Government's performance in New Zealand. Labour were out for many years and they were returned in November, 1957. Already they have increased the petrol tax by 1s. a gallon, bringing it to 2s. 3½d. a gallon as compared with the Australian duty of 1s. 1d. on imports and 11½d. on excise or local production. There is no doubt about it that similar action will be taken by Labour here if by some stroke of misfortune the electors go mad and return them to power on the 22nd of this month.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Don't you think the petrol tax should come back to the States?

**Mr. ROBERTS:** As a matter of fact, 90 per cent. of the petrol tax does come back to the State. When it is all boiled down

more money comes back to the State than 100 per cent. of the petrol tax. You will remember, Mr. Taylor—and I am being provoked into this—at the last elections when they went to Bundaberg Dr. Evatt conveniently went to bed. He has gone to bed again this time while the election campaign is on.

The point I want to make is that while the driver's licence fee is being increased to 15s., those who do not own a car do not have to pay it. For instance, I will be paying 15s., but my son, who does not own a car, will be able to drive my car and he will have to pay nothing for his licence.

If hon. members want a comparison, let us go back some 20 or 30 years to the days when the A.W.U. ticket—which is a licence to work because a man cannot work without it—cost 12s. 6d.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. ROBERTS:** That has been increased.

**Mr. Power:** At least you get something for your union ticket.

**Mr. ROBERTS:** That has gone up to about £3.

**A.L.P. Members interjected.**

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! The hon. member for Whitsunday.

**Mr. ROBERTS:** The driver's licence, which covers many drivers, is being increased from 7s. 6d. to only 15s. By comparison it is a very trivial amount and it will not affect the people or worry them in any way. To show how little it will affect them, let me recall the 1953 election, or perhaps it was 1956, but I think it was 1953, when it became part of our platform and policy to reduce registration fees by half. People were not interested in cutting registration fees in half because they did not return us as the Government. Are they going to be worried about 7s. 6d.?

**Mr. Graham:** You would not be there now if they believed anything you said.

**Mr. Gair** (to Mr. Graham): You crossed the floor and voted with them.

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order!

**Mr. ROBERTS:** We shall not go into the merits of that but we are here and it will be many, many years before we are shifted from this side of the Chamber.

**The CHAIRMAN:** The Minister for Labour and Industry.

**A.L.P. Members interjected.**

**Q.L.P. Members interjected.**

**Mr. Aikens interjected.**

**The CHAIRMAN:** Order! Hon. members are guilty of unparliamentary conduct in

shouting across the Chamber at one another. I should be very pleased if hon. members will listen to the Minister in reply.

**Hon. K. J. MORRIS** (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry) (3.36 p.m.): I have been very interested in the remarks of all hon. members. At the moment we are making a complete examination of the Traffic Act for the purpose of introducing an amending Bill next year. Many people are spending hours in considering all aspects of the law that need to be amended. Obviously hon. members have given us the benefit of their advice. I am very glad to receive it, even though many of their suggestions were not related to the Bill. Everything that has been said today about traffic control will be considered carefully when the Bill that I propose to introduce next year is being drafted.

The Leader of the Opposition made some very sound suggestions about the creation of a special overall fund and about new alignments. I sincerely thank him for his comments. Several hon. members, including the hon. member for Ithaca, and I think the hon. member for Mackay, and as the hon. member for Whitsunday said, shed crocodile tears about the 7s. 6d. I do not think they are very seriously disturbed about it because it works out at approximately 1½d. a week for car owners.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Is it not strange that in 1953 you were going to cut registration fees in half, but now you are doubling the license fee instead? How can you reconcile the two?

**Mr. MORRIS:** I did not intend to mention registration fees, but I would remind the hon. member that in 1952 his Government increased registration fees. For instance, the registration fees on a Holden car were increased from £8 4s. to £12 6s. a year—an imposition of £4 2s. Now the hon. member is doing a little weeping about the 7s. 6d.!

In his airy-fairy way the hon. member for Baroona says that we should have traffic lights all over Brisbane. The implication was that at almost every intersection there should be traffic lights. Traffic lights cost anything from £1,000 for a simple installation to £2,000 for a more complex system. We must consider carefully before we spend so much money on traffic lights. The hon. member for Ithaca commented on the fact that we had traffic lights for four months. I do not say the hon. member is responsible for the misapprehension, but we have not all the parts for the traffic lights that we require. There are certain technical parts that are not yet to hand. The hon. member did not know that. As soon as the components are here several will be installed. We are not rushing their installation. We want to be quite sure that the ones we have are installed where they will be most valuable. I would rather not rush the installation of these plants and then find that they would be better somewhere else.

**Mr. Hanlon:** There are one or two obvious places where they should go straight away.

**Mr. MORRIS:** There are several obvious places where they will go as soon as the components arrive. I do not want to talk about party political matters—I never do—but I point out that the pedestrian traffic lights installed in Toowoomba a few weeks ago were the first installed in Queensland over the past 20 years. Be that as it may, the point is that we are demonstrating once again that we are very progressive in our outlook. I do not think you will permit me, Mr. Taylor, to reply to the other matters that had no relation to the Bill. Having said what I have about the matters that have relation to it, I now commend the Bill to the Committee.

Motion (Mr. Morris) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

#### FIRST READING.

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

The House adjourned at 3.44 p.m.