

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 16 NOVEMBER 1961

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 16 NOVEMBER, 1961

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumba) took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members, I have to advise that I have disallowed in toto a question addressed to the Minister for Labour and Industry of which notice was given yesterday by the hon. member for Townsville South. The reason for disallowing it was that it sought an expression of opinion on a question of law relating to the interpretation of a statute. In consequence, it does not appear on today's business sheet.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. I should like also to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the question I directed to the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity with regard to the action of the Townsville Regional Electricity Board in threatening to discontinue the electricity supply to 165 Kings Road, Pimlico, Townsville, because of rent allegedly owing at 82 Charters Towers Road, Hermit Park, has been so emasculated as to become almost unintelligible. I suggest with all humility, Mr. Speaker, that you might allow questions at least to convey their context before you begin to put the pruning knife through them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members, I believe that, if anything, I have made sense out of the question asked by the hon. member for Townsville South. As it appeared on the notice that he gave to the House, it was so involved with expressions of opinion that it was almost impossible to find the question within the written details. I believe that we have made a question out of a statement that was made by the hon. member.

In regard to questions generally, I am always inclined to extend a great deal of tolerance. In many instances where an hon. member is a new member of this Assembly and does not quite understand the procedure, I allow him some leniency, as I did in the case of the hon. member for Windsor recently—in other words, I treat him as a first offender. Other hon. members like the hon. member for Townsville South who have been here longer and who ought to know better should be treated, perhaps, as habitual offenders. Hon. members know the rules. I am not going to reiterate my previous statement in relation to the rules for questions in the House. It is written in "Hansard".

If hon. members are in any doubt about any question, I ask them to refer it to the Clerks or to myself.

Mr. Aikens: That might make confusion worse confounded. We might reach the stage where we will not be permitted to ask questions at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

ACQUISITION AND SALE OF CATTLE AFTER COURT HEARING AT BOULIA

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

“With regard to the investigations promised in reply to my Question on September 28, 1961, concerning the sale of cattle by Sergeant A. E. Fawkes of Boulia, will he inform the House if such investigations have been completed and of the result thereof?”

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) replied—

“Very thorough investigations have been made into this matter, and I have studied the reports submitted to me by the Commissioner of Police. It is likely that your question refers to either twenty-one cases against Robert Wilson Graham or cases involving Brian McNamara. Graham's cases involved twenty-one head of cattle, which were the property of seven different owners, whose addresses extended over a wide area, four being in the Northern Territory. After the cases were finalised, Sergeant Fawkes contacted the owners, and each completed an indemnity receipt for his stock. It was then a case of negotiation between the owner and other persons regarding disposal of their stock. Of the 21 head, seventeen were acquired by Mrs. Yvonne Fawkes, wife of Sergeant Fawkes. The cattle in this case were all subject to ownership, therefore the matter of public auction did not apply as far as the Police were concerned. The manager of ‘Marion Downs’ Station has advised that the cattle were not agisted on ‘Marion Downs,’ but they were allowed there on a feed concession as, owing to the drought, the feed cut out on Fort William Holding, where they had been running. Regarding the disposal of seventeen head of clean skin weaners, following the conviction of Brian McNamara, it was represented to me in July last that, owing to drought conditions prevailing in the Boulia area and the scarcity of fodder, it was advisable to eliminate the delay involved in a public auction, and to accept an offer of £150, plus payment of droving fee of £5 10s. made by Messrs. Howard and Flood of Boulia. Accordingly, on twenty-first July, 1961, I approved of a recommendation by the Commissioner of Police that the offer of Howard and Flood be accepted. I am quite satisfied, from a perusal of

the file, that Sergeant Fawkes has not been guilty of any offence with which he could be charged, either Departmentally or in a Court, but I certainly think he lacked discretion in permitting his wife to become involved in cattle dealing. Evidence obtained by the Investigating Officers from independent sources indicates that Sergeant Fawkes has done a particularly good job since being stationed at Boulia, in cleaning up offences associated with stock, and in doing so has incurred the enmity of certain people who possibly gave this story to you and also to ‘Truth’ newspaper.”

DEMAND BY TOWNSVILLE REGIONAL ELECTRICITY BOARD FOR COST OF REPAIRING AND CONNECTING DAMAGED METER

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“(1) Does he know that (a) the Townsville Regional Electricity Board has demanded £2 for the repair of a fire-damaged meter and a fee of 10s. 6d. for its reconnection from Mr. R. Johnson, 165 Kings Road, Pimlico, Townsville, and (b) Mr. Johnson is contesting the demands on the grounds that he was merely a tenant and that the fire originated in an adjoining flat, when he was living at 82 Charters Towers Road, Hermit Park?”

“(2) In view of his assurance to the House that the threat to disconnect electricity supply by the Townsville Regional Electricity Board should only be used when there is a failure to pay the electricity account, can he state why this Board has departed from such a policy in Mr. Johnson's case?”

Hon. O. O. MADSEN (Warwick—Minister for Agriculture and Forestry), for **Hon. E. EVANS** (Mirani), replied—

“(1 and 2) I am informed that the Townsville Regional Electricity Board has rendered an account for £2 to Mr. R. Johnson, 165 Kings Road, Pimlico, Townsville for repairs to a meter damaged by fire when Mr. Johnson was the consumer of electricity at 82 Charters Towers Road, Hermit Park. Such action is in accord with Clause 13, Part II., of ‘The Electric Light and Power By-laws’. Mr. Johnson is not now the consumer at the flat at 82 Charters Towers Road, which has not been re-connected since the fire, and he is not liable for any re-connection fee in respect of those premises. I am also informed that, inadvertently, there was attached to the account forwarded to Mr. Johnson the final notice applying to consumers in arrears for electricity supplied, and this would have given Mr. Johnson the impression that he was liable to disconnection. However, Mr. Johnson is still liable for payment of the account as rendered.”

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Regulation under the Apprentices and Minors Acts, 1929 to 1959.

First Report by the Brisbane Market Trust covering the period June 1, 1960, to June, 30, 1961.

Proclamation under the Milk Supply Acts, 1952 to 1961.

Order in Council under the Milk Supply Acts, 1952 to 1961.

Regulations under the Stock Acts, 1915 to 1960.

BRISBANE CRICKET GROUND ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing): 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 Brisbane Cricket Ground Act of 1958, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing): 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 Pollution of Waters by Oil Act of 1960, in certain particulars.”

Motion agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACTS
AMENDMENT BILLINITIATION IN COMMITTEE—RESUMPTION OF
DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 15 November (see p. 1571) on Mr. Richter's motion—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Local Government Acts, 1936 to 1960, in certain particulars.”

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (11.16 a.m.): I do not propose to speak at great length, but I desire to point out a serious aspect, that is, if the provision means what the Minister's statement conveyed to me and other hon. members. I refer to the determination by a council that the whole of the shire is to be the benefited area, and

in those circumstances the council need not get executive or ministerial approval. A dangerous precedent could be established. Councils, for electoral purposes, are divided into divisions. The weight of voting in a council area may be confined to two divisions that would then have the preponderance of representation. Assume some project was calculated to benefit only two divisions. The local authority could declare the whole of its area to be the benefited area. Although the heaviest burden of financial responsibility, because of the rating of the area, could fall on the remainder of the shire area, the ratepayers there would have practically no say in the matter. The Minister said that the practice of a requisition for a poll can still be followed, but I point out that in many instances the weight of voting would be in two divisions and any requisition for a poll on proposed expenditure could be defeated by the voting from the two populous divisions and those who live in the sparsely settled divisions with a ratable value far in excess of the other divisions would have to shoulder the financial burden. I think the Minister should give further consideration to this matter. The right being given to local authorities to declare the whole of the shire to be the benefited area could bring about the results I have mentioned.

I realise that local authorities may think a lot of red tape is involved in the present practice, because Labour Governments in the past have given them the right to a poll on projected expenditure, but at the same time the declaration of a benefited area had to receive the approval of the Governor in Council. If that provision is removed, a council with a preponderance of population in two divisions could declare the whole of the shire to be the benefited area. With the weight of voting in those two divisions, the people in No. 3 division would have virtually no say.

The Minister, by nodding his head indicates that he agrees with me. I think the provision should be considered further before it is accepted. It may open the door to a grave injustice for certain people in local authority areas.

I must confess I am somewhat confused about the common fund referred to by the Minister, the extent to which it is going to operate and what moneys can be paid into it. Did I understand the Minister to say that a common fund can be established and the surplus moneys from a particular undertaking may be paid into a common fund? If the local authority is levying charges more than sufficient to cover the operation of a water supply and sewerage scheme, is it empowered to put the excess into a common fund?

Mr. Richter: I understand the common fund will only be a common sewerage fund. You cannot amalgamate electricity and sewerage.

Mr. HILTON: I do not think the Minister was specific enough. I accept his assurance on that point.

I have no objection to the other provisions. From what I gather from the Minister's remarks, I believe he should look closely into the question of a local authority determining what part of the shire shall be a benefited area without ministerial approval. I think it is necessary to exercise control over certain propositions that may come forward. I see nothing wrong with the procedure that has operated successfully for many years. I should not like to see legislation enacted that would give a majority in one division of a local authority the right to perpetuate an injustice on a minority in another division. I make that suggestion to the Minister because I do not know whether he realises the implications of the proposed legislation. I shall be interested to hear further from him on that point.

Mr. PILBEAM (Rockhampton South) (11.22 a.m.): I support the Bill. Before I proceed to deal with it I should like firstly to congratulate the Minister on his elevation to office and to assure him that whilst he continues to introduce such legislation for the benefit of local government he will have the full co-operation and support of local authorities and, in particular, the authority that I represent in the city of Rockhampton.

The first provision refers to a combined fund for sewerage water supply, electricity and cleansing. I should be against this measure if it were compulsory, but it is voluntary. Therefore it can be availed of on the basis of whether the proposition is favourable or not. It certainly has decided benefits in an accountancy sense. There could be three water supply schemes in the one area and it may be desirable to have the one fund. If it is not desirable the shire would probably have each of the schemes in a separate division, and each division could have its cause advanced by the member representing that division. If it is disadvantageous the shire will not proceed with it, but it at least gives the local authority more autonomy and an opportunity to take action that may be advantageous. It is not compulsory and I cannot see anything really wrong with it. The provision concerning bursaries to Universities could create a dangerous precedent if it was considered that the powers of local authorities were to be extended so that they could give to charities generally. I think most local authorities hide behind the fact that they are not empowered to give donations on a general basis. In my opinion, that is good, because although ratepayers insist that their rates should not be increased, sometimes they get the idea that the Council should give to this or that. This provision is based on a very worthy cause, and for that reason I support it because it is to be the exception to the general rule. But for that, I should oppose it. Cities and shires are already granting bursaries to students attending Universities. So long as

they are reasonable—and I think the ratepayers will keep an eye on that—I see nothing wrong with this. It gives local authorities the opportunity to interest themselves in a subject that should concern them, namely, the advancement of education. In particular it gives those local authorities who have prospects of securing their own university at some time in the future an opportunity to give bursaries to students attending it. I hope I am not being unduly optimistic in my own area.

I do not think the subject of the truncation of 16-perch corner allotments has been covered as fully as it should be. I have heard speakers obviously confusing by-laws with the Local Government Act. The Act lays it down quite clearly that there can be no subdivision for residential purposes with an allotment under 16 perches in area, but various local authorities in their by-laws determine how far they will go in allowing subdivision of land. Most of them agree that the blocks should be 24 perches and they have determinations about frontages, building alignments, and so on, but most of them include in their by-laws an undue hardship clause allowing for the area to be reduced to 16 perches where, if they withheld their consent to the subdivision, undue hardship would be imposed on the subdivider. Beyond that they cannot go because, in the first instance, the Titles Office would not register the subdivisional plan or issue a deed. The present Act is clear that there is no exception to the requirement that allotments on which a house is to be erected cannot be smaller than 16 perches. It is different where subdivisions allow for the erection of shops or other commercial undertakings.

Under the Act, where a subdivisional plan included areas of less than 16 perches the Titles Office would refer the plan back to the local authority and ask for a qualified approval. The plan would have to be endorsed, "For commercial purposes only." What has not been pointed out to the Committee is that, if the amending provisions go through, that right will be taken away from the Titles Office and the whole approval will rest in the hands of local government, where it should rest. It means that on a subdivisional plan a local authority can allow allotments under 16 perches as long as it does not allow the building of a house thereon. It will not need to refer the plan to the Titles Office with a qualified approval. With commercial undertakings it is a different position altogether. There is no need, for instance, for a truncated corner, because in most instances it is in a first-class area in a town, and the volume of traffic and the regulation of traffic by lights do not put the same obligation on the local authority to give clear vision at every crossing.

I want to go on record as saying that I do not altogether agree with the truncation of corners unless it is accompanied by another by-law making it obligatory on householders to avoid positioning trees or shrubs in such a

way as to mitigate against the effect of the truncation. It is no good truncating to give clearer vision and then obscuring the vision with trees or shrubs. The Bill enables a local authority to get a separate title for a corner allotment of less than 16 perches where the area has been reduced by truncation. I think the matter originated in regard to a corner allotment on which there was already a house. The householder would have been in an invidious position, especially if he had two or three houses on the one piece of land and wanted a separate deed for the corner allotment.

I do not think that anyone could possibly oppose this amendment, which is most desirable.

I think that the amendment relating to the liability of owners of land to maintain a section of roadway on each side of a grid was raised at a meeting of the Local Government Association of Central Queensland, and it was certainly supported by the Queensland Local Government Association. It was submitted quite fairly that it would be ridiculous to expect a person to maintain 100 yards of roadway in respect of each grid because the danger area does not extend 50 yards on each side of the grid. If the owner keeps a constant watch on the roadway where the grid impinges upon it, which is the point where danger could occur, we think that people using the road will be quite safe. The amendment reduces the section of roadway for which the owner is responsible from 50 yards to 5 yards on each side of the grid.

I think it is only common sense that the Brisbane City Council should be allowed to vary charges for off-street parking by resolution. We must accept that in small matters local authorities, especially large ones such as the Brisbane City Council, are able to manage their own affairs, and it seems ridiculous that the Brisbane City Council should have to make a special by-law if it wishes to increase the charge say from 1s. 6d. to 2s. for off-street parking. We do not encounter the same difficulty in Rockhampton. We have adopted the quite unusual procedure there of endeavouring to allow free off-street parking, for the same number of commercial vehicles removed by parking meters from the main streets. We are fortunate in having a large area on the river bank that is subject to regular flooding. We are making this accessible to car-owners, and I am sure that we shall never have to ask for the privilege that is now being given to the Brisbane City Council.

I again congratulate the Minister on his elevation to Cabinet rank, and I thank him for introducing the Bill, which is purely in the interests of local government. I have no doubt that it will effect improvements that will be of economic benefit to local authorities, and I assure him that if every piece of legislation he brings down in the Chamber is as soundly based as this Bill, he will have my support at all times.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (11.33 a.m.): I have only a few brief comments to make on the proposed legislation. There is no need to go into the provisions at any length because, generally speaking, they are self-explanatory and are only minor amendments of the Act.

The provision relating to the establishment of a common fund will obviously improve accounting procedures, and I believe that it will also make possible a more economical administration of local authority areas. If it assists in stemming the ever-rising tide of costs incurred by local authorities, I think it will be well worth while. We often complain of the rising cost of administration, and I think all hon. members should support an amendment that will at least put a brake on this rise.

I think the provision making it possible for the Brisbane City Council to fix off-street parking fees by resolution instead of by by-law shows the realistic outlook adopted by the Government in relation to the autonomy of local authorities. I well remember the many occasions in the past when local authorities had to go almost cap in hand to the Minister and wait a considerable time for approval. I am not referring to the present Minister, of course, who is a most recent appointee, but to some Ministers in the past. Local authorities experienced a great deal of frustration in the course of their administration. The Bill will make it possible for the councils to be masters of their own destinies. I think it is most desirable that they be given that little extra autonomy. After all, they have to go before the ratepayers triennially. When they give an account of their stewardship the people will judge whether their administration has been worthwhile. The Government should not interfere in their minor domestic arrangements. By allowing them to fix their own fees we are taking a step in the right direction. There is no iron hand or dictatorial attitude on the part of the Minister or the Government in regard to local authorities. That is a most refreshing aspect of recent times.

There are two matters relating to bursaries about which I have personal misgivings. The Bill gives local authorities the right to grant bursaries to pupils for scholastic attainments at certain schools. I wonder if that is as desirable as it might be. Although I say that we should give autonomy to local authorities I sometimes wonder if it is not always desirable in the best interests of the community to have some general brake on or type of discipline over the extent that they can spend the ratepayers' money.

Mr. Davies: Did you raise this objection in Caucus?

Mr. HUGHES: I raise the objection where I think it is necessary to raise it. I am expressing some personal misgivings

about the matter. Let me put it this way: if local authorities are to be given the right to grant bursaries for scholastic attainments at certain schools I hope that they will not abuse the privilege.

An Opposition Member: Have you no confidence in them?

Mr. HUGHES: I have confidence in local authorities generally but today more than ever their administration is permeated by politics. We see that in the local sphere. Since the A.L.P. made its presence felt in local authority there has been greater political bias associated with administrative acts. I will not pursue that argument very far because I might get outside the ambit of the matter before the Committee. However, I point out that some mayors or aldermen could make good fellows of themselves and try to gain a certain amount of snide political kudos by—

Mr. O'Donnell: Do you say that is politically dishonest?

Mr. HUGHES: Of course I think it is politically dishonest if for the expediency of their return to office they make bursaries available to pupils at various schools. I wonder if that is the right application of the rates paid by the citizens of towns and shires. From the precepts of various local authorities, particularly in Brisbane, an ever-increasing call is made for handouts and donations to charitable organisations.

Mr. Davies: Are you opposed to that?

Mr. HUGHES: I am opposed to local authorities making wholesale handouts to charities. I say that even though I am associated with several charities. I have spoken on the floor of the Council chamber about the help it is to the Q.A.T.B. and other organisations I am associated with, but I sincerely and honestly wonder if that is the real reason why ratepayers are paying rates. It seems to me to be a form of sectional taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member is going to speak about hand-outs, I hope he will confine his remarks to bursaries to schools, because that is the subject matter in the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I am expressing my opinion on how local authorities could spend ratepayers' money in the directions I have mentioned, and I wonder if the ratepayers are always fully informed on and in full agreement with how those moneys are spent. Ratepayers pay their rates believing that they will, in return, receive works and services from the council or the shire in the form of roads, footpaths, general health and other community services. I have expressed some misgivings on the matter of bursaries, hoping that the provisions of this Bill will not be misused by local authorities.

Something has been said about some shires having only one or two schools or educational centres. Be that as it may, it does not affect the principle. The mayor or chairman of a council or any civic-minded citizen at all can make bursaries available. The Bill will not in any way affect that. Such people will still have the right and privilege to do that should they feel so minded. I myself have done it. I make several bursaries available each year but I do so as an individual. However, I merely express the hope that this fund will not be misused or abused by local authorities and that there will not be wholesale donations of bursaries to schools purely for the purpose of gaining some political kudos for a political party seeking honours at the polls in the shire or district.

An A.L.P. Member: How could they put a political label on it?

Mr. HUGHES: Anything associated with the A.L.P. has a political label on it, and a red-coloured one at that.

Mr. O'Donnell: I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: I refer particularly to unity tickets on which I can speak with some authority knowing the Labour Party's connivance of the system.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he must speak only of bursaries to schools. If he has completed his remarks on that subject, he should either resume his seat or get on to his next point.

Mr. HUGHES: I have said that I believe it is not the function of local authorities to disburse ratepayers' funds in this manner. I leave it at that.

The final matter with which I should like to deal is the use of 16-perch allotments when there is a truncation. People may build on 16-perch allotments in many cases, even in the Brisbane area where it is an old survey, and in other areas where 16-perch allotments are still provided for in council ordinances, but, where a truncation is made for road purposes, as the Minister has pointed out, the owner of the property is debarred from building thereon.

This has particular application to seaside allotments, as I pointed out by way of interjection to the hon. member for Kedron. I do not think he took my interjection facetiously, neither do I think he gave it the credence it deserved. I know of seaside areas, 16-perch allotments, being truncated for road purposes. Under the Act at present the owner could not erect a residence thereon. This Bill will overcome that hardship.

Many people have held 16-perch blocks of land at the seaside for many years in the hope of building on them and spending their years of retirement there. If they truncate

the corner of such an allotment, the Act precludes their building a dwelling on it but, with the passing of the Bill, they will still be able to utilise the remaining area of their land.

I should like to carve up the Valuer-General's Department but I know that I will not be allowed to deal with that controversial matter. As seaside land has such a tremendous value, it would be not only a hardship but a negation of the principles of land-ownership and democracy if, by reason of the truncation of a block by a Council, the owner who had held it for years and paid rates on it was denied the use of it in his retirement and was thus forced to purchase another block or go without seaside land. I think most hon. members, therefore, will wholeheartedly subscribe to and support the provision.

Local authorities should be prepared to carry out the physical truncation of property once they have put the plan on paper and declared the truncation to be necessary. I know many cases of people who have been denied the use of portion of their land, and have been made to move the fences, but have still had to mow the grass and keep the foot-path tidy although the truncation is then Council property. The Council should be compelled to go ahead with the physical truncation by providing kerbing and channelling, but in the instances of which I have knowledge that work has not been done. If truncation is important for road development and improvement, speed of traffic and free flow of traffic and the local authority decides on the truncation, it should be made to carry out the physical truncation.

With perhaps the exception of the provision dealing with bursaries, the measure has my full support.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (11.47 a.m.): I shall deal first with the provision to which the Minister referred and lodge my objection to it before proceeding to the other matters outlined by him. I refer to the proposal to empower local authorities to grant a sum of money for bursaries in their areas. During the Minister's speech I said by way of interjection that this was getting a long way from the accepted functions of local government. I can envisage a specific danger in the proposal. In giving power to a local authority to recognise in an individual way in the form of a monetary grant, something that cannot be related to services to the community, I think we are opening up a field that could be fraught with danger in the future.

If our system was similar to the system in England where local authorities have to strike a rate to meet their proportion of the costs of education, the matter would be different, but we have not arrived at that stage in Queensland, much less Australia. In those circumstances there could be no objection to the provision. Ever since the establishment of local government its functions have been

defined as being related to services to the community. The definition could even include public organisations, if I may use that term to describe municipal bands, surf life-saving bodies and so on. They are related in some way to public service.

I hope the Bill, when we see it, will reveal that some power still reposes in the Minister, giving him the final say, to ensure that the power is not abused. I have had some experience of local government, apart from administering the Act for something like five or six years. I have been on a local authority and I know how individuals can be carried away by their emotions in regard to a particular matter. I can envisage that in this field a great extent of individualism will be indulged in, to the detriment of the community in general.

Hon. members would agree that in these days—I do not want to elaborate on it—many public appeals of a charitable nature are conducted, and no-one could take exception to a local authority's making some contribution, as the objects are related to community service. If I may state it publicly, I am against the Cancer Appeal, the Heart Appeal, and other appeals because I believe they should be the responsibility of the Government. The restricted field of worthwhile charities such as Legacy should not be taken up with them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will realise that this provision deals only with schools.

Mr. WALSH: I realise that, but I wished to make my point, and register my thoughts on this subject. I make strong protest against the acceptance of this principle so that if there is no division on the Bill it will be recorded that I am against it.

The Minister explained that the other clauses of the Bill are to meet the representations made by the Secretary of the Local Government Association, or the local authorities themselves. Most of the provisions would apply to shires rather than city areas. One can appreciate the necessity for a common fund despite what the hon. member for Rockhampton said. Whether it is voluntary or not does not matter. I think that the idea of creating a common fund for sewerage, water supply and similar services in a shire area is sensible. Many of the shire areas have little townships that have sprung up over the years under good Labour Governments, and they have been encouraged by Labour Governments to install sewerage and water supply schemes. Instead of the shire treating them as different units, the sensible thing from the accountancy point of view, is that there should be a common fund. That is always, of course, on the understanding that this does not in any way affect the rating for services in particular localities. The Council will still have to have regard to the liability of the particular community within the shire to

meet its financial obligations, even though the fund may be established to provide more up-to-date methods of bookkeeping.

The hon. member for Carnarvon pointed out the dangers in the benefited areas provision, and I agree with him. On my experience of administering the Act, I only hope that I never used the dictatorial powers that the hon. member for Kurilpa seems to suggest were used in the past. However, I assure him that a time will come, even with the present Minister, when he will have to apply the brake, just as every other Minister has had to apply it. There have been many times when a Minister was justified in declaring in the interests of the community, in a shire particularly, that the whole of the area should be a benefited area. I visualise the position at Blackall where the local authority was constituted of fairly wealthy graziers who decided when the sewerage scheme was installed that the whole of the area should be a benefited area. In other words, graziers, pastoralists, and so on were to make their contribution to the installation of water supply and sewerage in the little township of Blackall. If they had not done that the burden on the people in the township would have been terrific. They showed good sense and judgment and realised that these facilities that were being provided in the little township of Blackall were just as much for their benefit as for the benefit of the people living in the township area.

Mr. Hughes: Brisbane cannot do that.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member is talking about Brisbane. I do not know that he did much good for it while he was in the Council.

When the Bill is circulated we shall see just how far the clause goes and if we have any objections we may be able to make further contributions. The Minister said that the provision for truncation will apply mainly in the areas outside Brisbane. In the past most of the city building sites have come under the City of Brisbane Act, but many allotments were surveyed before the introduction of the law and the rights in respect of those have been preserved. I suppose the people would be able to build subject to the Brisbane City Council by-laws. The new provision seeks to serve in another way rather than to penalise the owner of the piece of land. He will still be able to use it, for a shop or something else. I have known that to arise in my own area where the council was taking a very firm stand on a particular corner. It would not allow a shop to be built on a block that provided for a truncation. However, after reconsideration it gave way, which was only sensible. The provision will doubtless enable the owner to put up some sort of small residence on a 16-perch allotment, and no-one would cavil at that.

According to the Minister's outline the provisions of the Bill follow conferences with the Local Government Association, from

which many useful suggestions have come over the years to different Governments and to different Ministers. No doubt more will come in the future. There is always the occasion when the Minister must have regard to the public interest as against the interest of the individual. If he did not do that he would not be carrying out his office as the community expects him to.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (11.58 a.m.): The hon. member for Kedron expressed doubts about the wisdom of giving local authorities power to grant bursaries. I share his anxiety. For many reasons local authorities are, and have been for some time, struggling and starved of funds. Given this new power they will feel obligated to provide bursaries whether or not they can afford them. Furthermore there will be extreme difficulty in deciding on the recipients. If the decision is to be based on personal qualifications there will be no end of deserving cases. We can readily conceive of local authorities giving bursaries to students who seek to become doctors or lawyers and who when they qualify would have no particular connection with any local authority; indeed, no local authority throughout the State would require their services. On the other hand, I can well understand that, in certain fields of engineering, local authorities would require skilled men. The mere granting of bursaries will not assist the local authority unless some provision is made for the students to enter into a contractual relationship with the local authority so that their services can be retained after their graduation.

Mr. Hughes interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: I know provision is already made for that but in this case the bursaries will be granted and the students will be free to do as they please after they gain the qualifications.

Progress reported.

At 12 noon, in accordance with Standing Order No. 307, the House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ESTIMATES—THIRTEENTH AND FOURTEENTH ALLOTTED DAYS

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

ESTIMATES-IN-CHIEF, 1961-1962

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HOME AFFAIRS

CHIEF OFFICE

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga—Minister for Health and Home Affairs) (12.1 p.m.): I move—

"That £1,295,478 be granted for 'Department of Health and Home Affairs—Chief Office'."

Before dealing with the Estimates, I should like to take this opportunity of thanking the various officers of my department for the very loyal service they have given me and the Government in the past 12 months. I suppose that no Minister ever considers what political opinions are held by officers of the Public Service. At least, I do not. A good public servant endeavours to serve the Government at all times and to carry out the policy of the Government loyally and well. I express my grateful thanks to the Under Secretary and the various officers of my department.

I wish to mention, also, my own personal staff—David Pluckrose, Bill Bowen, and the two typists. Many hon. members have been in touch with them during the year with requests on behalf of their constituents, and I am sure that all those hon. members are grateful for the assistance they have received. I take the opportunity of thanking those members of my staff for their loyal help during the past 12 months.

Mr. Duggan: Don't you think you could save time by thanking the staff generally?

Dr. NOBLE: I always believe in thanking everybody who assists me. Probably the hon. member has not many people to thank.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. NOBLE: The appropriation sought under this Vote for the year 1961-1962 exceeds the amount appropriated for 1960-1961 by £240,318 and the actual amount expended in that year by £268,083. The increase in the estimated requirement for the year 1961-1962 as compared with the amount expended during 1960-1961 is accounted for by—

Salaries	£117,108
Contingencies	£150,975

This Vote covers the administration of the department and various health services. A perusal of the Estimates for the whole of the department will show that it comprises a number of more or less autonomous services co-ordinated from the Chief Office. This organisational pattern is in keeping with up-to-date and modern methods.

However, there is a grouping together under the Chief Office of the accounting systems for all branches of the department with the exception of hospitals. Under this system the provision of costly accounting machines in various departments where they would not be used to full capacity is avoided.

On the other hand, the Mental Hygiene Service, the Sub-department of Native Affairs, the Eventide Homes and the State Children Department function under directors or managers who are responsible for the good management and day-to-day operation of their services.

The increase of £117,108 in salaries is made up of—

(a) provision for normal annual increases, the full impact of adjustments in the basic wage during the last financial year, and a full year's provision for the payment of 75 per cent. of the male basic wage to female employees where applicable;

(b) provision for additional staff.

The increases under (a) are normal and usual, with the exception of the amount to provide for the payment of 75 per cent. of the male basic wage to certain female employees.

However, the amount involved in the payment to females of 75 per cent. of the male basic wage is not large under this Vote. But, for the information of hon. members, I might mention that the impact of that decision of the Court on the salaries payable under the Hospitals Vote is indeed significant. There are a very large number of females employed in our hospitals. For example, the nursing staffs are, to all intents and purposes, exclusively female.

An examination of the increased expenditure for which provision is sought for increased staff brings out strongly the expansion of existing health services and the development of promised services.

Provision is sought for an additional 73 officers under the Chief Office Vote, made up of 31 for tuberculosis control, 8 for the general medical section, 33 for welfare and guidance, including 30 for the new Wilson Rehabilitation Hospital, two for the Laboratory of Microbiology and Pathology and two for the Government Chemical Laboratory, offset by decreases in Enthetic Diseases, one, and School Health Services, two.

The increased staff for tuberculosis control is sought to enable the anti-tuberculosis campaign, including the compulsory mass survey, to be accelerated.

The increase in the welfare and guidance staff by 33 is confirmation that the announced revision and extension of preventive measures into the field of child delinquency was not window-dressing or a flight into the realms of fancy, but a firm and fixed determination to attack the delinquency problem at its very roots. In this field, as in all fields, the only sane and reasonable method of attacking an evil is to attempt to find and remove its cause. There is always a temptation towards an immediate and more or less spectacular attack on the symptom, or the result, rather than to follow the slower, surer, and in fact, only right road to success of calm and careful assessment of the problem followed by action planned and calculated to effect a cure by removing the cause of the evil. It requires strength and courage to forgo the temptation to follow the easy but wrong road that leads to spectacular efforts aimed at the symptom or the result, as opposed to attacking the evil itself.

It would have been easy to expend money and effort in the places to which delinquency finally leads, but this would have meant not only money and effort wasted, but in many cases a harvest of unhappiness for a number of young people who eventually will have to go there.

All hon. members will agree, I feel sure, that whilst rehabilitation of the young person who has fallen into serious delinquency is highly desirable, it is much more desirable to attack this evil at its roots and prevent as many as possible of potential delinquents actually becoming delinquents.

The provision for this staff at the new Wilson Youth Rehabilitation Hospital marks a notable step forward towards the goal to which we must all aspire, that is, if not the total elimination of not only delinquency but the unhappiness and ill-health that often follows unattended maladjustments in the young.

Examination of the Contingencies Section of the Chief Office Vote shows the same picture seen when the salaries increases are examined. For example, there is an amount of £13,625 in new expenditure for the running costs for the year of the Wilson Youth Rehabilitation Hospital, in addition to the salaries provision.

There is an increase of £9,080 for expenses of the Flying Surgeon Service. This service, established by me, is unique in Australia—indeed, unique in the world. We were indeed fortunate in obtaining the services of Dr. Cummins for this service. It has brought the services of a highly-skilled specialist surgeon to the remoter areas of the State and saved many lives. The increased provision is to enable a more suitable multi-engined plane to be provided for Dr. Cummins. The plane is to be equipped with navigation aids and devices that will enable the greatest advantage to be taken of the aids provided by the Department of Civil Aviation. In addition, it should allow a greater payload—in this case a patient or skilled attendants for the surgeon. Tenders were called some little time ago but it has not been possible to conclude negotiations up to date because an alternative offer, not provided for in the tenders, is being examined by our aeronautical advisers, the Royal Flying Doctor Service.

Of course, if the new suggestion meets with the approval of our advisers, tenders would be called so that all interested parties would have an opportunity of making an offer to supply the service.

The provision under this Contingencies Vote for the anti-tuberculosis campaign for the year 1961-1962 is increased by an amount of not less than £96,698. This, of course, is in addition to the provision for salaries for the additional 31 staff.

The increased amount includes £59,330 for additional caravans and equipment for extension of mobile unit activities; £7,520 for X-ray unit and accessories for Thursday

Island; £16,600 for additional expenses of existing mobile units in the compulsory X-ray survey; and £15,000 for additional expenses of the chest clinic which is to be moved to portion of the old Lady Bowen Hospital, Wickham Terrace.

The item for social services scholarships being £51,135 is an increase of £4,442 over the amount expended in 1960-1961. Fellowships in medicine and dentistry have been in existence for some considerable period, with the objective of obtaining qualified men for the country districts of the State.

Many hon. members will know of the difficulty experienced in many of our country districts in obtaining doctors for their towns.

Hon. members will also realise that not every student who undertakes a course at the University proceeds to graduate. Although every effort is made in selecting applicants for fellowships in medicine and dentistry, not all fellowship holders proceed to graduation.

When a fellowship holder finally fails his course, or for some reason or other terminates his course, vacancies occur. If no action were taken to overcome this, the number of graduate fellowship holders would be reduced below the number aimed at.

For this reason provision is made in the Vote for four vacated fellowships in 2nd year and two in 3rd year medicine to be filled.

In addition, provision is made for the allocation of four vacant fellowships in 4th or 5th year medicine.

Provision is also made, of course, for the allotment of eight medical and eight dental fellowships to commence with the 1962 academic year. From time to time the department is criticised because of the lack of qualified personnel in our institutions. This criticism is indeed unjust because where there is this lack it is due not to any laxity by my department nor to the lack of funds for the payment of such personnel. The cold truth is that they are just not available! This is mainly the case in such professions as occupational therapy and social workers. We have recently been criticised, and rather harshly, because there are at the present moment no fully trained teachers for subnormal children at the Brisbane Mental Hospital. Hon. members will realise just how unjust this criticism is when I point out that this lack of trained personnel of this category was due simply to the fact that there were no such persons available.

However, we were not content to leave it go at that but arrangements were made with the Queensland Subnormal Children's Association to undertake the training of teachers for this hospital and, in fact, teachers have been undergoing training during the present year under what might rightly be termed a fellowship system.

Mr. Coburn: You are the only one who has ever done anything for subnormal children.

Mr. Ramsden: Hear, hear!

Dr. NOBLE: It was not an easy task. On my first visit to the Ipswich Sandy Gallop hospital I went into the ward where the subnormal children were housed and when I came out I was crying. In that ward there was every type of subnormal child—those who had no I.Q. at all, those with no rapport with the outside world, no control over their bowels, no control of their faeces at all. They are now happily housed in the farm colony at Goodna. Over the years Labour did nothing at all for these children.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. Duggan: You have done nothing either, like everybody else.

Dr. NOBLE: What did Labour do but leave all these children in the ward? No Minister ever went near the ward before. I said to my medical officers, "We must segregate these children from here and get all the better ones together and give them some training." They said, "It will be very hard, Doctor. Every child in this ward is suffering from hookworm." Nothing was done over the years for those children. We cleared up the hookworm and we have them out of that ward. They are now very happily situated in the farm colony at Goodna where they will be trained as subnormal children.

It is recognised today that the trained social worker is necessary in many of the fields covered by my department, and in this year's Vote, for the first time, provision is made for two Social Studies University Fellowships.

It is proposed that these fellowships be made available to officers of the State Children Department for it is felt that great advantages would accrue from this. We would then have officers of this department, that is, State Children, experienced in the administration of the department becoming qualified social workers. That is a very good step. We are offering fellowships to public servants working in the State Children Department in order that they can become trained social workers and come back to the department as trained personnel. It is difficult to get trained social workers.

Mr. Bennett: You had one and sacked him.

Dr. NOBLE: We never had one. As a matter of fact, we gave the opportunity to one of my assistant private secretaries, Jim Howe, and he will graduate this year.

Mr. Bennett: What about Daniel David?

Dr. NOBLE: He was not a social worker. He was not qualified to do the work here.

The nursing profession is not overlooked in our assisted educational programme. Provision is made for a grant to the Queensland Branch of the Australian College of Nursing. This college has been doing a very good job in post-graduate education of the trained nurses in this State.

From what I have said hon. members will realise that no effort is being spared to raise the standard of the service being given by my department to the people of this State. It can truly be said that stones and mortar and equipment do not alone provide a service. The greatest factor will always be the skill and efficiency of the persons working in the buildings and using the equipment.

A State such as ours, with its relatively small population and large area does and will for many years present problems to those charged with the provision of what might be termed social services, that is, the care of the needy young and the needy old, the sick in body or mind and the under-privileged. Not the least of these problems is the finding of skilled staff.

We are doing our best to attract qualified people and in those fields where this is hardest we are assisting promising people to qualify. We are not alone in experiencing a shortage of qualified staff. This problem exists in the whole of the western world at least.

Just a few years ago all who were engaged in or interested in the care of the aged were predicting that in the early 1960's a very grave problem would exist, because of the increased numbers of our population who would have reached old age and who would be in need of care.

By the co-operation of the Commonwealth and the State Governments and the churches the position today in this field is very much better than was envisaged.

Encouraged by generous grants from the Commonwealth and State Governments, spectacular steps have been taken by the various churches in establishing old people's homes. These homes are modern and pleasant and go a very long way indeed towards making the declining years of our senior citizens happy and pleasant.

Encouraged by State capital grants and Commonwealth hospital benefits payments, hospitals for the aged and chronically ill have also been established by churches.

It is indeed pleasant to be able to record appreciation of the active work being done by the various churches in the field of care for the aged.

Our departmental Eventide Homes have felt the benefit of this assistance, mainly, of course, in those sections previously accommodating relatively active and healthy old people. This has enabled the conversion of more beds for the use of hospital-type aged patients.

Eventide, Sandgate, which is a converted R.A.A.F. station, now has reached the stage when action is needed to bring it up to approximate the standard of accommodation being provided in the new church homes. It could be necessary to do quite an amount of building work.

A start towards this goal will be made in the very near future when 80 well patients will be transferred to the new prefabricated buildings which are almost completed at that home. It is hoped that accommodation can be made available in these buildings for some married couples. We strike the humorous side in all proposals, proving that we cannot please everyone. One of the troubles at Eventide homes is that married couples are separated. In church homes, under the new plan, married couples are kept together. Down at Eventide we have quite a few of these separated couples. The manager said to one man, "We will be able to put you in a little flat in this place with your wife." He said, "God, I have been dodging her for the last 30 to 40 years and now in Eventide you are going to throw us together again."

The co-operation of private or outside agencies with the Government is, of course, not limited to care of the aged. The Red Cross Blood Transfusion Service obtains blood from donors and provides transfusion material to public and private hospitals free. The Queensland Government each year give a grant amounting to 60 per cent. of the annual cost of this service, to which is added a 30 per cent. grant by the Commonwealth Government.

In the year 1960-1961 our contribution was £67,293, whilst that of the Commonwealth Government amounted to £33,646.

In addition, the Queensland Government have approved a subsidy amounting to £150,000 towards the cost of a new building for the blood transfusion service. This subsidy is payable in instalments of £50,000 per annum over a period of three years commencing in this financial year. The Government are happy in granting assistance to the Red Cross blood transfusion service who are doing a tremendously good job.

An amount of £35,000 is provided in this year's Estimates for subsidy to the Royal Flying Doctor Service. In addition, an annual grant of £7,500 is paid by the department in recognition of work done by the Flying Doctor Service in supervision of remote hospitals unable to secure medical officers and for services to native missions. The State Insurance Office makes an annual grant of £1,000 to the service from the Workers' Compensation Fund for services in connection with the transport of injured workers.

During the financial year 1960-1961 subsidy amounting to £20,703 was paid towards the cost of replacement of aircraft engines.

This, of course, was in addition to the subsidy paid on subscriptions and donations. I might mention that there was an appeal for funds for the flying doctor service to re-engine their planes completely. It was necessary to give them more power, greater speed, and longer range. Unfortunately that appeal was not entirely successful and the flying doctor service did not get the necessary amount. The Government came good with the balance of £20,703.

The officers of the Royal Flying Doctor Service are in no small way responsible for the smooth introduction of the flying-surgeon service and the continued smooth working of its flying side by reason of the technical advice and assistance given by them in matters pertaining to the aircraft used by the surgeon.

The division of social work in the department has been extended by the appointment of a second social worker. In consultation with social workers in hospitals and guidance clinics the senior social worker has attempted to assess some of the most urgent social needs in this State.

In a limited number of cases, where families have urgently needed help, and where no other social work service has been available, they have been interviewed personally and helped by social workers in this division.

Where this has not been possible, a consultant social work service has been offered for officers of other departments and voluntary agencies. I might say that when I took over the portfolio of Health and Home Affairs they would not have social workers in the department. Over the years of Labour's brain-washing and administration social workers were regarded as meddling busybodies. The only social worker they had was a dear old lady without any special skill, and it took me quite a time to alter departmental thinking about them. I believe that social workers play a great part in the social welfare of the State and that this Government should be commended, after that period of 30 years, for introducing social workers to the State.

Mr. Burrows: Surely you are not looking for applause?

Dr. NOBLE: Everyone wants applause at some time or another. Does the hon. member realise that there was not one social worker training at the university when we took office because there was no social work in the State for them?

During the coming year it is planned that this consultation service will continue, and that social workers will work more closely with the State Children Department developing family casework services.

It has not yet been possible to offer a social-work service to patients of the Mental Hygiene Division, although some patients have very pressing social problems, but this

need is being kept under observation and ways of meeting it are being considered. Before we can start a social service division of the mental hygiene service we need girls trained in social and mental hygiene. At the present time the only way we can do that is to have a senior social worker trained in this division of medicine. We have tried to get a senior social worker in this field but we have not been able to get one. A girl straight out of university with a general social works study going into a mental hospital would be quite useless. We are very hopeful that in the next financial year or preferably during the current financial year, we will be able to obtain a senior social worker in this field.

Up to the time when this Government took office in 1957, no thought had been given to the need for trained social workers in our hospitals. The many cases handled by social workers since their first appointment in 1959 have fully justified the action taken by the Government in this field.

For the first time provision is made in the Vote for the position of Director of Geriatrics.

A walk through the wards of a general hospital will confirm that a large proportion of the patients are elderly people. This is understandable when it is realised that, during the past 50 years, the expectation of life has increased from 56.7 years to 70 years. The problems associated with the medical care of the aged have been receiving world-wide attention and Queensland has not lagged in its progressive approach to these problems. One geriatric ward has been opened at the Princess Alexandra Hospital and another, which is undergoing alterations, should be occupied during this financial year. When the unit is completed, it will make provision for a day hospital, occupational and other ancillary services, and a geriatric outpatients' department.

Although geriatrics should not be considered a speciality—every doctor, particularly a general practitioner, should be a geriatrician as it is he who sees the patient early in his ageing—there should be an understanding of the variation in treatment of the elderly patient as compared with those who are younger.

It was for this reason that arrangements were made for Dr. P. Livingstone to join the staff of the late Dr. Marjory Warren of the West Middlesex Geriatric Unit as a Registrar. I had previously met Dr. Warren as I brought her to Queensland to lecture to the doctors, not only of Brisbane but also at Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and Rockhampton, on the various problems of the treatment of disease of the aged, when she visited Australia two years ago.

Dr. Livingstone has now been appointed Director of Geriatrics and is directing treatment at the geriatric ward of the Princess

Alexandra Hospital. He will visit country hospitals where he will advise the hospital staff on the treatment of the aged. He visited Rockhampton two weeks ago.

Dr. Lionel Cosins, a world authority on geriatrics, is visiting Australia next month. I have arranged for him to come to Brisbane. He will also go to North Queensland where he will give lectures to the medical profession.

Since I assumed office as Minister for Health and Home Affairs expenditure from the Native Affairs Vote and Native Welfare Fund has increased from £805,000 to £1,052,000 per annum. Additional expenditure from Government funds for loan works and hospitalisation brings the total which the State is required to find annually for native welfare to £1,226,570.

It is estimated for the year 1961-1962 that the total expenditure on native welfare from all these sources will amount to £1,300,000.

Some little time ago in answer to a question in the House I mentioned that the Department of Native Affairs had its lowly beginnings in 1904 when a clerk was appointed to assist the Chief Protector of Aborigines. At that time, and in fact for many years after, the great problem was the preservation of the native people of the State. I feel that we sometimes do not realise that the total full-blood population of the other Eastern States has become almost extinct. By the agency of church missions and Government settlements Queensland has been most successful in preserving its native people. I give a great deal of credit to Mr. Con O'Leary. In my opinion he knows more about the aborigines and other native people of Queensland and of the Torres Strait than any other living person, and the great work he has done needs stressing to the Committee.

Mr. Hanlon: He did not do a University course in anthropology, either.

Dr. NOBLE: No. He learned from the practical work in the Torres Strait, where every native loves him more or less as a father.

Mr. Houston: That destroys your other argument.

Dr. NOBLE: Oh no, it does not.

It is not many years since those interested in native welfare in Queensland were concerned lest our native people suffer the same fate as those in Victoria and Tasmania. The picture is completely different today! We have a healthy native population increasing in numbers from year to year.

The old era has passed, but the new era, that is, the integration of these people into our general population, brings with it problems much more complex than previously. Further—and this is most important—the successful conclusion of the policy of integration will require ever-increasing amounts of money.

On our settlements today the populations comprise, in the main, people who have been advanced to the position that they are almost ready for the final step into the community. Much has been said and written in recent years for and against the policy of Government settlements and church missions. That policy provides for the accommodation, care and education of our native people in what may be termed "townships" exclusively for the use of these people.

There is general agreement that a sound native policy must have as its aim the assimilation of the native peoples into the general community as quickly as possible. We realise that over-paternalism and the continued development of native settlements could, if great care is not taken, delay final assimilation. We also realise that precipitate action in enticing or forcing native people from settlements and missions before they are equipped to make their way in the community could be followed by great evils.

Today a number of people, some with the best intentions, and others whose intentions are, to say the least, suspect, are condemning willy-nilly the so-called segregation in settlements and missions. In very recent years we have had an example of what can happen if coloured people are exempted from the Act and leave a settlement or mission when not prepared to undertake the full responsibilities of citizenship. I refer to what happened in a northern city of this State. A number of coloured people left the establishment in which they were being cared for to take up employment in the outside community. It was not long before they had given up or lost their employment and established a sub-standard settlement on the fringe of the institution that they had left.

It is not uncommon to hear or read sweeping criticisms of the so-called segregation, coupled with the suggestion that all native residents of this State be discharged from all control and protection. If this were done, great suffering or hardship would be imposed on many of our native peoples. It is our policy that no person shall suffer any disability because of his colour. But it is also our policy that we do not abandon native people not yet ready to undertake their responsibilities as citizens. We have reached the stage, however, when we feel that the care of our native people is passing from the realms of a State's responsibility and becoming a national problem.

As each successive step is taken from nomadic life to integration into the community, greater and greater financial obligations fall on the authority caring for native populations. In this State we have now reached the stage where it is just not financially possible for us to provide the necessary funds. The social standing and conditions of coloured people is daily coming more and more into the forefront of international

affairs. The central government must become increasingly interested in our problems, if only for this reason.

The right of aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders to consume alcoholic liquor and their right to vote have received considerable publicity in recent months, and these two matters are only part of the general subject of the social rights and standing of our coloured people.

The publicity that is being directed towards these matters is part of a movement throughout the world to raise the standard of coloured races, to give them rights and privileges enjoyed by the white community. Unfortunately, there are people throughout the world endeavouring to exploit any disability suffered by coloured people for their own political advantage. There is no doubt that this is occurring in Australia. In the main it is being fostered by people who have little or no knowledge of the conditions of our native people or of the rights and privileges that they are enjoying, particularly under the administration in this State.

In many respects there is a need to bring our law relating to native people up to date, and it is the Government's intention to do this. The administration of the present law has been carried out having regard to the changing times, and where possible the administration has interpreted the law to meet the circumstances.

There are other matters, such as the right to consume liquor and the right to vote, which must receive very full consideration and on which the most competent advice should be sought. For example, grave difficulties confront the occupier of licensed premises in endeavouring to determine whether or not circumstances prevent him from supplying or allow him to supply liquor to a coloured individual, and in this particular respect persons wishing to bring our legislation into disrepute raise matters such as colour bars and make statements implying that our white community does not wish to associate with coloured people, and that privileges such as the right to enjoy alcoholic liquor are denied to them because of their colour.

The right of aboriginals to drink is a matter that causes some concern to persons caring for and controlling aboriginals in settlements and missions. They feel that grave dangers could arise if alcohol were consumed on these establishments and if the people living on these settlements and missions had easy access to intoxicating liquor.

The liquor question is not peculiar to the conditions of Queensland aboriginals. It is also a concern of the Commonwealth and the other States, particularly the Northern Territory and Western Australia.

The right of coloured peoples to self determination and their right to vote has

been exploited for political considerations throughout the world. It is a matter of serious concern particularly with native peoples who have not attained a standard of education and civilisation that would ensure that they can exercise this right with common sense and reason. While probably it can well be argued that a person managing his own affairs and maintaining his position in the community is entitled to exercise his right to vote, whether he is a full-blood or half-blood aboriginal or a Torres Strait Islander, it also can be argued that a person who, by virtue of the fact that he is unable to take his place in the community, lives and is maintained on a Government settlement or church mission, surely forfeits his right to exercise the franchise.

The problems surrounding these two matters, that is the right to consume alcoholic liquor and the right to vote, are not just confined to Queensland, but are matters which should be considered on a national level. They are matters on which there should be uniformity of policy throughout Australia.

It is the Government's view that these matters are so important that an effort should be made to have a uniform approach by the Commonwealth and the other States, and that a general conference should be called to consider them and make recommendations for a uniform policy. Such a conference would enable the Commonwealth and the States to obtain the opinions of experts on native welfare problems on a nation-wide basis. It would enable a State such as Queensland to obtain the views of these people and consider them in relation to the needs of our coloured people.

The Government will initiate this proposal to call a Commonwealth-wide conference to obtain a uniform policy on these two matters. I shall ask the Premier to approach the Commonwealth and the other States with a view to the conference being convened at an early date. I do consider they are matters that should not be left to wait unduly but, on the other hand, I do not think that they are matters into which we should rush without first obtaining the best advice possible. If this is done I am sure any action taken will be in the best interests of the aboriginals of Australia and the Torres Strait Islanders.

A new approach to the education of our native children should commence as from the beginning of next year. The Government have decided that the educational services on our settlements of Cherbourg, Woorabinda, Palm Island and Yarrabah—at present the responsibility of the Native Affairs Department—become the responsibility of the Department of Education, thus allowing those children the same facilities as other children in the community. The hostel on Thursday Island will be opened next year for Torres Strait Island children. They will attend the schools on Thursday Island.

Consultations will take place later between interested parties for a blueprint for the future education of the children on the missions, etc., so that they can share in the advances that have been made in that field.

When the Government assumed office in 1957, it inherited by way of legacy from the previous administration a hospital system that left much to be desired, particularly in regard to the repair and maintenance of older hospital buildings, the need for new construction in certain respects, and the introduction of innovations which would have enabled our health services to take advantage of up-to-the-minute advances in medical science and progressive thinking. Ageing hospital buildings in a state of disrepair were the order of the day in an outmoded hospital building policy.

The erection of some of the brick buildings at the Brisbane General Hospital by previous Governments had been financed from loan funds on an extraordinary basis. For the first 30 years of the loan, interest only was to be paid. No redemption payments were to be made until the loan matured at the end of its 30-year term. Those loans will mature during the next few years, and it will then be necessary for this Government to raise conversion loans at nearly double the rate of interest payable on the loans during the last 30 years. The matter of redemption, of course, also will have to be faced, and that, along with the higher interest rate, will take a large slice out of future hospital budgets.

One of my first tasks as Minister for Health was to review the previous attitude towards hospital building planning, and by a prudent revision of plans and a pruning of wasteful expenditure it was possible to reduce considerably the cost of a number of hospital building projects, thus enabling us to spread the available funds over a wider area, without in any way detracting from the serviceability or appearance of our hospitals or the medical service provided therein.

Consideration of this matter led me to introduce something which should have been adopted by the previous Government years ago—a standard hospital design. In consultation with architects, medical superintendents, matrons and departmental officers, a hospital design was produced which not only provides maximum hospital efficiency, but also ensures that building costs are kept to a minimum. The new hospital ward at Mackay opened on 20 August, 1960, is a typical example of building to the new standard layout, providing maximum patient comfort in an attractive building designed for Queensland conditions. The ward at Mackay, which was provided at a cost of £70,046, for some 50 to 60 patients, incorporates every possible labour-saving device, with patients hospitalised in a pleasant, friendly atmosphere. The building of this unit marked the beginning of the new trend in public hospital design in this State.

With regard to the metropolitan area, I would say that the North Brisbane and Princess Alexandra Hospitals will be the last of their type to be built in Brisbane for many years to come. In any planning of hospital building projects it would be economic stupidity to ignore the trends in medicine and the advances in medical science—the disappearance of the long-stay cases such as poliomyelitis, the reduction in the incidence of infectious diseases, and the effect of modern developments in medicine which have shortened the average length of patient stay. Also to be taken into account, of course, is the hospitalisation of long-stay chronic cases which has a counter-balancing effect on the average length of stay in hospitals.

Another factor to be considered is the likely availability of existing accommodation which, as the fight against diseases progresses, may not be required for the purpose for which it was originally provided. A good example of this was the old Wilson Ophthalmic Hostel at Windsor, which has now been converted for use as the Wilson Youth Hospital.

In the main chest hospital at Chermide there are 412 beds, most of which my experts advise me will become available for general hospital purposes in the not distant future—at any rate, not very long in hospital planning. The Chermide Hospital is equipped with up-to-date operating theatres and other ancillaries, and we certainly shall not allow this facility to stand there unused, if and when the beds become available for general hospital purposes.

In every part of the world the question of rising hospital costs is causing concern, and this applies even in the densely populated countries. It is self-evident that the position is aggravated in a State of the size of Queensland, with a population of 1,518,859 spread over an area of 667,000 square miles, compared with Victoria whose population of 2,930,244 is contained in 87,884 square miles, and South Australia, where the great bulk of the population of 969,258 is confined to the south-east corner of the State. The problem in Queensland of containing hospital costs is a manifestly more difficult one.

As I said before, the question of rising hospital costs is causing concern to hospital administrators in many parts of the world, realising as they do that if costs are not contained, hospitalisation could become completely out of hand. In certain countries, including, I understand, the United States of America, costs have become so high that the average length of stay of patients in some hospitals is as low as 2 days, and they cannot afford to stay any longer. As these countries do not have a free hospital system, people have to get out of hospital as quickly as possible, because they cannot afford in-patient treatment.

Containing costs in our hospital services does not mean cutting down these services,

but rather efficient planning and control. In an endeavour to meet these rising costs my department has studied closely ways and means of increasing the receipts of the hospitals boards from patients' payments and other local receipts, and has achieved considerable improvement. This has been accomplished without any disturbance of the existing policy of free hospital treatment for public patients and free out-patients service.

The gross expenditure provided in the 1961-1962 Estimates for "Hospitals Generally" and "Other Hospitals and Institutions" as shown in the printed Estimates is £15,311,849, representing an increase of £4,094,810 over the corresponding figure for 1957-1958 of £11,217,039. This will afford an indication of the extent of the rise in hospital maintenance costs during the period the present Government have been in office.

The hospitals boards have co-operated well and have done an excellent job in maintaining efficient hospital services on an economical basis. During last financial year most of them were able to keep within their budget allocations. The overall effect was to achieve a saving in the total Estimates provision for 1960-1961, and the boards are to be complimented on this satisfactory performance. They will be facing a similar task for the current financial year and their loyalty and co-operation must be again relied upon.

The practice in recent years has been for the department to advise each hospitals board of the anticipated amount that will be made available to the board for the financial year's budget expenditure, and to leave to the boards the responsibility for allocating the available money to the best advantage, assessing prudently the relative importance of the various items of proposed expenditure. On the whole this procedure has worked satisfactorily and is favoured by the boards themselves, but, of course, difficulties could arise if prudent decisions are not made.

Figures relating to the number of beds per 1,000 of the population are not available for all States, but those available indicate that the position in Queensland is considerably better than that obtaining in the two States for which figures are available—New South Wales and Victoria—despite the difficulties we face in this State with our small population spread over a very large area.

The latest figures available for the two other States mentioned cover the year 1958-1959, and a comparison between these and the figure in Queensland in that year is as follows:

State	Total Beds	Population	Beds per 1,000
New South Wales ..	26,085	3,725,916	7.00
Victoria ..	16,828	2,775,750	6.06
Queensland (1958-1959) ..	14,791	1,426,019	10.37

The figure for Queensland is more favourable still for the year 1960-1961 and is as follows:—

—	Total Beds	Population	Beds per 1,000
Queensland (1960-1961) . .	15,971	1,518,859	10.5

That is almost double the Victorian figure.

The comparisons I have quoted are all-inclusive, and embrace chronic and senile beds and beds approved for Hospital Benefits in private hospitals, Eventides, and convalescent homes, both general and maternity.

In reviewing the hospital picture generally, one is inescapably drawn to the conclusion that in many hospitals convalescents are occupying beds which should be reserved for the acutely ill. There is no doubt that some patients admitted for periods up to four weeks could be treated as out-patients. To use costly hospital beds for patients under investigation which could well be done on an out-patient basis is obviously very unsound policy.

What is to be the plan for future hospital building in Queensland, taking into account the various factors which influence a decision on this question? In order that the answer might be reached only after careful deliberation, I decided to form a Hospitals Liaison Committee, to be as widely representative as possible of the medical and nursing professions, the University and departmental hospital administrators.

Mr. Hanlon: Do you mean you decided, or was it forced on you by the Country Party conference?

Dr. NOBLE: The Country Party conference suggested it, and I give them credit for it; after all we are one joint party.

Mr. Hanlon: You did not like the resolution they carried.

Dr. NOBLE: We listened to them and considered the matter. We do not adopt the policy of the Leader of the Opposition—that right or wrong, good or bad, he will accept it.

Mr. Duggan: You had to send the Premier up to get you out of the mess you were in.

Dr. NOBLE: The Committee has already met twice, and has appointed sub-committees to make recommendations to me concerning hospital building projects and medical services generally.

As might be expected, there is some divergence of opinion as to the size of the hospital of the future. One school of thought contends that, from the point of view of administration, medical services and economy, the 400-bed hospital is the desirable limit in larger centres. This is one of the problems, among many others, being considered by the Hospitals Liaison Committee.

For many years the Brisbane General Hospital was the only public hospital in Brisbane, and because of this, excessive demands were made upon its accommodation and services. In fact, Brisbane, on a population basis, was worse served for hospital beds than the rest of the State. The general hospital, built for approximately 850 patients, was called upon to accommodate over a long period up to 1,450 patients. Because of the gross overcrowding and the impossibility of vacating any portion for painting and necessary renovations, the hospital became run down. I do not blame the Labour Party for that. They had to put the patients into the hospital and they had to crowd 1,450 into accommodation for 850 which brought about an almost impossible state of affairs.

With the opening of the Princess Alexandra Hospital, substantial relief was given to the general hospital, but the authorities there deemed it wise—and this decision cannot be criticised—to close down some completely unsatisfactory wards housed in old buildings, and we shut them down completely. They were then faced with difficulties in having wards and their ancillary rooms vacated to enable them to be renovated and painted.

Over the last three years a programme of repair and renovation has been in operation, but this could not be implemented as quickly as desired, as it was found possible to vacate only one ward at a time.

Over the same period, a major work of remodelling and renovating the nurses' home has been under way. This work has been slow, because here again rooms have to be vacated before they can be attended to, and only relatively few can be spared for this purpose at the one time. At the General, the rooms for the nurses were semi-partitioned and were not very suitable. When a girl came home late at night and turned a light on all the girls would be awakened. We are now turning them into single rooms throughout.

There has been a great deal of criticism aimed at the lack of maintenance, repair and renovation at the Brisbane General, Children's and Women's Hospitals, but it must be pointed out that since this Government came into office over £600,000 in loan money has been spent at these three hospitals, covering new buildings, renovations, remodelling, and equipment. That is a great deal of money.

With the amount of loan money available to the Hospitals Board in the current year the total loan expenditure on the three hospitals, the Brisbane General, the Children's and the Women's, since this Government took office, will be just on £1,000,000.

Part of the criticism of affairs at the General Hospital has been that repair and renovation work, other than in the wards proper, has not been done because of lack of funds. However, there has not been a year, in the last three years at least, when the Brisbane General, the Women's and Children's Hospitals have not had sufficient

money to cover the maximum amount of renovations and repairs that could be done in any one year. It is true, however, that from time to time work has been stopped on certain jobs because the loan allocations for these particular jobs have been expended.

However, at all times the hospitals were holding large sums of money not at the time required for the purposes for which the loans had been raised.

Hon. members probably know that loan allocations are made for each year, and that when a loan programme for any authority is being considered the amount of unexpended loan funds held by that authority must be taken into consideration. If this were not done, the effective use of the money available each year would be lost to a large extent. It is bad business, for example, to retain, say, an amount of £50,000 loan money unused, because an allocation greater than could be spent in the year was sought for a particular purpose, and at the same time close down necessary and urgent work because the amount of money required in that year from loan funds for that particular job was under-estimated.

Recently a new position of Co-ordinating Officer, North Brisbane and South Brisbane Hospitals Boards, was created and an officer of my department appointed thereto. The need for and value of this position can be seen when I point out that since his appointment the officer concerned has concentrated on this problem of repairs, renovations and maintenance with a great deal of success. By examining the loan position of the hospitals he has been able to recommend that unused loan money raised and held for purposes not urgent, or that will not be expended in this financial year, be made available for additional renovations and remodelling work at the Brisbane and Women's Hospitals. This will mean that in this financial year there will be a sum of £130,000 available for modernising these hospitals.

I am assured that with the limitations on remodelling and renovation work that can be done where patients' accommodation is involved, this sum will be adequate to carry on with such work as can be done in this financial year.

Despite the difficulties to which I have referred, the following expenditure on renovating and remodelling work at the Brisbane Hospital and Children's Hospital has been incurred during the last four years—

	£
Brisbane Hospital	51,658
Brisbane Hospital Nurses' Home ..	63,409
Children's Hospital	93,995
	<hr/>
	£209,062
Conversion of two wards for Neurosurgical Unit with equipment	88,587
	<hr/>
	£297,649

The following remodelling work is at present in hand at the Women's Hospital:—

	£
Extension to kitchen, dining room and refrigeration accom- modation	26,673
Intermediate labour wards re- modelling	2,000
New milk kitchen	4,330
	<hr/>
	£33,003

Work on the labour wards should have been done years ago. Many women were confined in the one room. I never liked that. Even when I was practising there I thought it was a very bad business. That is being overcome at the moment.

With the reduction in the demand on the Women's Hospital following the opening of the new Mater Mothers Hospital, the renovation work in the wards will commence early in the New Year. There have been fewer babies through there. It was not the fault of Labour that that work was not carried out because the wards were in use. Male patients could not be put in those wards when confinements were taking place. Still, it should have been done years ago.

Block 8, which will provide a new Diagnostic X-ray Department and accommodation for the treatment units of the Queensland Radium Institute, will be completed next March. The cost of the building will be £360,000. New equipment, including a second linear accelerator, will cost an additional £130,000.

The new Child Health Unit at the Children's Hospital now under construction will be finished in 12 months and will cost £116,000. It will provide another 38 beds for the Children's Hospital as well as a professorial unit for the university.

Immediate priority is being accorded to our plan for improved facilities for psychiatric services at the Brisbane General Hospital as part of the proposed integration of psychiatric services with general medicine.

The question of providing a new Pathology Department at the Brisbane General Hospital is prominent in our overall planning, and this project is high on the list of priorities. Also to the fore in our planning is a new Casualty Department, incorporating an accident treatment unit.

A continuing policy of renovating and remodelling at the Brisbane Hospital, the Women's Hospital, the Children's Hospital and the Nurses' Homes will be maintained concurrently with the progress of the works to which I have just referred.

During the period 1957 to 1961, exclusive of the cost of the new Princess Alexandra Hospital, which was £5,718,000, the loan fund expenditure by the South Brisbane Hospitals Board will, by the end of the current financial year, have reached a total

in excess of £100,000. Included in this figure are the following items, on which the amounts mentioned have already been expended—

	£
Remodelling Chronic Section ..	32,099
Corinda Maternity Hospital ..	32,000
College of Nursing ..	14,699
Hansen's Disease Ward ..	3,200
Remodelling Beaudesert Hospital ..	8,647
New Laundry—Beaudesert ..	9,661

The complete remodelling of the chronic section at the Princess Alexandra Hospital is estimated to cost £150,000, and the complete remodelling of the Beaudesert Hospital will cost approximately £40,000.

As an added convenience for the benefit of patients, staff and visitors, approval has been given for the provision of a new canteen building at the Princess Alexandra Hospital, incorporating a Red Cross rest room and banking facilities, at an estimated cost of £22,000.

To enable the fuller development of the hospital as a medical teaching unit to be accomplished, consideration is being given to extending the Out-patients Department at an estimated cost of £11,000.

A review of the effect that the progressive opening of wards at the Princess Alexandra Hospital has had on the staff-patient ratio at the Brisbane General Hospital is of interest at this stage. From a figure of 1,319 for the year 1956-1957, the daily average number of in-patients at the Brisbane General Hospital fell to 890 for the year 1960-1961. With regard to out-patients attending the Brisbane General Hospital, the daily average fell from 1,511 in 1956-1957 to 1,053 in 1960-1961.

The reverse, of course, applied at the Princess Alexandra hospital, where the daily average was rising as follows:—

	1956-1957	1960-1961
Inpatients	623	993
Outpatients	298	766

Despite the significant fall in the daily average figures for both inpatients and out-patients at the Brisbane General Hospital during the period to which I have referred, the reduction in medical and nursing staff at that hospital has not been proportionate to the reduction in patients.

The staffing figures are—

	Brisbane General Hospital		Princess Alexandra Hospital		Total	
	1956-1957	1961	1956-1957	1961	1956-1957	1961
Full-time medical staff	80	70	21	48	101	118
Part-time medical staff	84	69	21	51	105	120
Nursing staff	696	656	261	586	957	1,242
Totals	860	795	303	685	1,163	1,480

Mr. Houston: Is not this in the report?

Dr. NOBLE: Does not the hon. member want to hear about what is going on in Queensland?

Turning to the State-wide picture, we have 58 hospitals boards controlling 134 hospitals spread throughout the whole of the State, from Thursday Island to Southport and as far West as Boulia and Thargomindah. As evidence of the capital works carried out by hospitals boards during the Government's term of office, the following figures are quoted:—

1957-1958	1958-1959	1959-1960	1960-1961
£1,357,343	£1,112,901	£1,561,050	£1,474,044

During our term of office, many major hospital building works have been completed throughout the State.

Many hon. members may not know that we pay considerable sums by way of a subsidy of 15s. a day for each occupied public bed in religious and charitable hospitals, and in the case of the Mater Public Hospital, South Brisbane, this has been supplemented by a

grant for operational losses. The figures under this heading for the year 1960-1961 are—

	£	s.	d.
Mater Misericordiae Hospitals, Brisbane	476,346	2	2
Mater Misericordiae Hospital, Bundaberg	218	5	0
Mater Misericordiae Hospital, Rockhampton	1,064	5	0
Mater Misericordiae Hospital, Mackay	819	0	0
Freemasons Hospital, Sandgate	7,092	0	0
Mt. Olivet Public Hospital, Brisbane	47,565	15	0
St. Andrew's Public Hospital, Brisbane	1,105	10	0
St. Vincent's Public Hospital, Too-womba	5,490	15	0
"Greenhaven" Blue Nursing Service Centre, Southport	12,159	15	0
"Lauriston" Blue Nursing Service, Ipswich	4,827	0	0
"Sunsetholme," Kelvin Grove	3,112	10	0
Montrose Home for Crippled Children	9,050	16	0

Senior members of the nursing staffs of Queensland hospitals who desire to do post-graduate study are now able to do so at the Queensland Branch of the College of Nursing that has been established at the Princess Alexandra Hospital, South Brisbane. Previously it was necessary for nurses who wished to further their studies to travel to other States to do so.

During the first half of last financial year, two short courses were held in "Ward Management and Teaching."

In the latter half of that year the first "Sister Tutor Diploma Course" to be held in Queensland was commenced. This course will occupy a period of 41 weeks and will be completed on 13 December, 1961. The college proposes for this financial year a further "Sister Tutor Diploma Course" and a "Nursing Administration Diploma Course."

The cost of providing accommodation for the college and quarters for the nurses who attended the course was met by the South Brisbane Hospitals Board from a loan of £15,000 raised for that purpose.

The department also provides assistance—course fees, travelling expenses and a weekly allowance of £5 a week—for certain approved students for the Sister Tutor Diploma Course. Approval for six such students for the 1961 diploma course was given on the condition that they would give twelve months' service in Queensland hospitals after successful completion of the course.

Assistance is also given to matrons and senior sisters in regard to attendance at other courses conducted by the college.

In addition to the foregoing, the Government meet 90 per cent. of the maintenance costs of the college, including staff salaries. The other 10 per cent. would be in the fees we pay.

I shall deal now with the Division of Mental Hygiene. The trend in world opinion is to treat as many mentally sick patients as possible in the community—that is, in general hospitals—and to avoid thereby the social and legal stigma of certification and admission to mental hospitals. This Government subscribes to that idea and to the belief that mental sickness should be treated and regarded in the same manner as physical illness, and that admission of patients to mental hospitals should be avoided whenever possible.

With this in view, a policy of integration is being implemented. By integration, I mean that the psychiatric services in Queensland will be based upon our general hospitals and our mental hospitals will become, in effect, the long-stay annexes in the treatment of the chronic mentally sick.

To enable the integrated psychiatric service to function efficiently, expansion of the psychiatric facilities in our general hospitals must be made. The Brisbane General Hospital will provide the admission service for

the metropolitan area of psychiatric patients. This admission service will consist of a special out-patients unit which will be built adjacent to Lowson House and will include day-hospital facilities. For those patients requiring in-patient service, Lowson House will be modified to accommodate female patients and the present Ward 16 will be modified to accommodate male patients of the type suitable for Lowson House. The anticipated stay in these wards will be approximately six weeks. There are many patients admitted to the Brisbane Mental Hospital who recover within five to six months (the greater number within three months). Therefore, a neuro-psychiatric hospital is being built as a special facility of the Brisbane General Hospital at Cherm-side, and acceptance of the tender for construction of stage one of this hospital was recently announced.

The type of patient admitted to Cherm-side would be one who it is anticipated would recover within nine months. These wards will be ordinary hospital wards, and patients admitted will not require certification.

Associated with the admission service of the Brisbane General Hospital, Ward 14 will function for the care and supervision of the severely sick and those requiring rather strict supervision. This will be a closed ward. Clinical experience with modern treatments has shown that these patients settle down within 48 hours, enabling an assessment to be made as to what other psychiatric facility they could be best treated in. Should it be assessed that treatment is likely to extend for a period greater than nine months, these patients will be admitted to the Brisbane Mental Hospital. Nevertheless, if it is found that they have responded well to treatment, they will be transferred to Cherm-side to complete their recovery and convalescence. Under such a system of in-patient and out-patient treatment of psychiatric patients, it is obvious that the admission to mental hospitals will be greatly reduced.

Supporting this is a community psychiatric service functioning as the Psychiatric Clinic, in Mary Street, where out-patients are treated.

When the alterations to the new geriatric ward are completed next year, buildings will be altered to accommodate psychiatric services at the Princess Alexandra Hospital. These facilities will include in-patients beds as well as out-patient and day-hospital facilities. Here again, the emphasis will be on the out-patient and day-hospital facilities in order to keep the patient in the community, rather than have him admitted as an in-patient at the hospital or at some other psychiatric institution.

With regard to the extension of psychiatric services into country areas, hon. members will know that for some time a very good psychiatric service has been

functioning as a facility of the Townsville General Hospital. Short-stay patients are admitted to the psychiatric ward of the General Hospital, but other patients, if they cannot be cared for adequately there, are transferred to Charters Towers Mental Hospital, or to southern psychiatric facilities.

A regional type of unit is being designed to give, as far as possible, a complete psychiatric service. That is, it will have an admission service, in-patient service similar to Lawson House for short-stay patients, and a section similar to the Chermide Neuro-psychiatric Hospital for longer-stay patients. It will also have out-patients and day-hospital services, and in addition, accommodation will be provided for children. This type of regional unit will therefore give a comprehensive psychiatric service.

A great deal of thought has been given to this unit by the Townsville Hospitals Board and its architects, in consultation with the Department of Public Works and the Mental Hygiene Department. It is expected that, with minor adjustments, this unit will serve as a model for the Toowoomba, Rockhampton and Ipswich units.

For several years a psychiatric service has been maintained at the Toowoomba General Hospital, staffed by the doctors from the Toowoomba Mental Hospital, and the number of doctors at the Toowoomba Mental Hospital has been increased to enable extra sessions to be introduced at the Toowoomba General Hospital.

During the past year, a psychiatric service commenced at the Ipswich General Hospital. This service is supplying an obvious need, as the number of patients attending is steadily increasing.

Every endeavour is being made to obtain a psychiatrist for Rockhampton and when such an appointment is made, a psychiatric service will be commenced in that city.

It must be emphasised that it is not the buildings or structures that constitute a psychiatric service, but rather the organisation of these facilities into a unified community service.

The psychiatric service is a specialised service and must be staffed by specialists in their particular field. In an endeavour to cope with a world-wide and nation-wide shortage of psychiatrists, this Government realises the need to have medical practitioners in private and in hospital practice who are experienced and qualified in the specialty of psychiatry. To this end, the post-graduate students' fees at the University of Queensland for the Part I course for the Diploma of Psychological Medicine has been subsidised to the extent of £300 per year.

Leave has been granted on special terms and conditions to medical officers of the Mental Hygiene Service to attend courses

in Melbourne before presenting for Part II in the diploma. These study courses extend for six months or more.

In addition, holders of medical fellowships evincing special interest in psychiatry have been given the opportunity of participating in the aforementioned schemes.

Ten medical practitioners have been assisted under the subsidy scheme and nine have remained in Brisbane in private practice or governmental service.

In an integrated psychiatric service, it is essential for the doctors to have experience in various fields of psychiatric practice. In order to achieve this, this Government have increased the establishment of medical officers at the Brisbane Mental Hospital so as to enable two medical officers to do a four-monthly rotational tour of duty at the Brisbane General Hospital as psychiatric registrars.

The increase in the number of medical officers ensures that their services will be available to carry out sessional work at the Psychiatric Clinic, and it further enables special study leave to be granted to medical officers desirous of studying for the post-graduate specialist Diploma of Psychological Medicine.

Associated with the psychiatric specialists, there will be a development of ancillary medical services, including special therapists, psychologists, and social workers.

During the last three years, special attention has been given to psychiatric conditions of childhood. This Government have established special services which consist of a children's psychiatric service at the Children's Hospital for the treatment of psychiatric conditions in children attending that hospital; the Mary Street Child Guidance Clinic for the simpler behaviour problems of children, the Wilson Hospital for maladjusted children and youths, and associated with the final plan for the Chermide Neuro-Psychiatric Hospital, is a complete hospital unit for children. This Government lay great stress on the service it is giving to the children as part of its policy of preventive medicine.

It is my firm opinion that if we can correct disorders and illnesses in childhood, we will have reduced the number of adults requiring psychiatric treatment.

The Government have been blamed for submitting a "sham plan." Such criticism, if sincere, can only come from persons who are ignorant of what our integration policy means. The plan is functioning. The Brisbane General Hospital is the admission and treatment service for the metropolitan area. The Townsville General Hospital psychiatric service gives a similar service for the North. The Toowoomba General Hospital and the Ipswich General Hospital Psychiatric Clinics are the nuclei of similar services.

The Queensland integrated service has been compared unfavourably with the Victorian non-integrated service. More accurately the Brisbane Mental Hospital, a long-stay and chronic patient annexe, has been compared with the admission and acute treatment centre of the non-integrated system.

The non-integration system develops the total psychiatric services as an entity apart from general hospitals. It is true that in the main, most classes of patients are admitted to such an Admission Service, but a brief investigation will show that the chronic and recalcitrant patients only stay there long enough to be recognised and are then transferred to the chronic wards of the outer-lying mental hospitals or to certain country mental hospitals.

We do not have these out-lying mental hospitals in Queensland as they do in Victoria, so the Brisbane Mental Hospital admits and cares for all classes of long-stay and chronic patients except the male criminal insane.

In 1954, when in Opposition, this Government supported what was called then the "honour system," that is, the wards of our mental hospitals were classified into security and non-security wards. Occasionally, harmless patients from the non-security wards would abscond.

Surely no-one has a memory so defective that he cannot recall the furore created by the Press about "escapes" from the Brisbane Mental Hospital. An open inquiry was conducted by the ex-Chief Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr. W. E. McKenna. His findings wholly and completely supported the system and indicated that the administrative policy was completely justified.

Mr. Bennett: What about the escapes from Westbrook. That is what we are interested in.

Dr. NOBLE: When did the hon. member get here?

Mr. McKenna further considered that to revert to a total custodial regime would be to turn the clock back for 20 years. This Government's policy is more advanced than the "Honour System." The policy is "Open Hospital." An open hospital is the name given to mental hospitals that are organised and function similarly to general hospitals. The patients are just as free to come and go, but are expected to observe the conduct and disciplines required in a general hospital. With the type of patients we have to care for in our mental hospitals, it is not possible nor wise to have the hospital completely open. However, a number of wards do function in this manner.

This open hospital policy is not one that can be applied overnight to all the patients in the Brisbane Mental Hospital. I would quote a few examples. A considerable number of severely subnormal patients must be closely supervised. An ever-decreasing

number of recalcitrant patients or patients suffering from episodes of recalcitrant behaviour need security and care. Some patients are extraordinarily difficult to treat and care for. I refer to a group known as the constitutional psychopathic personalities. As the name applies, they suffer from an innate personality defect and in consequence exhibit a lack of or a diminution of those sentiments that make normal people conform to acceptable social behaviour and accepted social conventions. A proportion of these patients seem to be maturation problems as they do respond to a highly-disciplined therapeutic environment.

This Government inherited a state of affairs that relied entirely on church homes to care for the serious behaviour problems of teenage girls. A varying number of these girls developed behaviour problems beyond the facilities of the industrial homes to cope with. The result was that they constituted an extraordinarily difficult problem of management and rehabilitation. At times their conduct became so extreme that they were certified and admitted to the Brisbane Mental Hospital.

A particular kind of approach which combines a strict discipline with rewards for satisfactory behaviour is required. When grouped in numbers they tend to incite each other to exhibitionist behaviour, and on the whole they respond better in a place where they can see and live with adult persons who by their conduct set an example of acceptable pattern of social conduct.

With the pattern of the traditional mental hospital changing so rapidly a Rehabilitation Hospital for Girls, similar to the Wilson Youth Hospital, will be established and should benefit most of these girls, and it is hoped the treatment will lessen the long period of institutionalisation that is now needed.

The female criminal mentally sick are cared for at the Brisbane Mental Hospital. Fortunately these patients are few in number but nevertheless constitute a security problem. The sexual offender may be sent to the Brisbane Mental Hospital by the courts and he is often a security problem. The young criminal mentally sick male who is likely to respond to treatment, who is not considered desirable to be cared for in the special ward at the Ipswich Mental Hospital, is cared for at the Brisbane Mental Hospital. Nothing could be more irresponsible or more unreasonable than to suggest that every part of the Brisbane Mental Hospital could be an open hospital.

In February of this year, at the invitation of the Australasian Congress of the British Medical Association, held in Auckland, New Zealand, I visited New Zealand to give a paper explaining this Government's policy for the care, etc., of geriatric or aged people.

While in New Zealand I took the opportunity of visiting a number of institutions including the old Avondale Mental Hospital. The City of Auckland has grown around

this hospital. Nevertheless, the open hospital has been functioning successfully. There were some patients who had to be kept in security areas. The important feature was the fact that even although the hospital was in the city, the community had accepted the open door policy and was co-operating with the hospital to make it a success. I was so impressed with what I saw in this and other institutions that arrangements were made for Dr. C. R. Boyce, Medical Superintendent, Brisbane Mental Hospital, to visit New Zealand and see for himself. I am grateful to Dr. Blake-Palmer, Director of Mental Health, New Zealand, for the careful itinerary he arranged for Dr. Boyce. Dr. Boyce visited New Zealand in June of this year and saw a wide range of mental health institutions and activities. He returned more than ever convinced that the open-hospital scheme would work in a number of wards at the Brisbane Mental Hospital. Dr. Boyce also saw the great help that community organisations were giving to the New Zealand mental health programme.

It would be appropriate here to express my appreciation of the manner in which the hospital staffs are co-operating with the open-hospital programme here. This is particularly evidenced by the staff and patient ward clubs and by the staff and patient sports and recreation clubs that have developed.

Dealing with the matter of open wards at the Brisbane Mental Hospital, there are three female wards completely open. There are six open male wards including the Farm Ward that has been an open or non-security ward for longer than any present member of the staff can remember, as most hon. members know. One ward, Female 11—is a self-management ward. In this ward a varying number of convalescent patients—the numbers change each day as patients return home, the 25 patients of this week may be 10-12 next week—manage their affairs without any staff. Housekeeping, cooking and domestic managements are carried out efficiently by a committee of patients.

One ward—Male 5—is largely managed by the patients with the help of a token staff. The patients of this ward are largely responsible for the production of the hospital magazine, "Colony Times".

At the Brisbane Mental Hospital there are five female wards that are learning to become open wards, or their patients are learning to graduate into open wards. These wards are not regarded as open wards because although the building is open, the wards open into a large enclosed area. There are four large male wards that give patients free access to a large enclosed recreation area.

The annual report of the Brisbane Mental Hospital for the financial year ended 30 June, 1959, has been adversely criticised

because its language was stated to be unprofessional; it was even called "fictional". An example was cited, out of context, of the medical superintendent reporting with pleasure on the pleasant atmosphere that was developing in the hospital among patients and nursing staff. Despite all criticism this Government claim that a revolution is taking place at the Brisbane Mental Hospital. The most notable feature of the revolution is the change of attitude of nursing staff and patients. This is the result of the gradual development from a custodial regime, or even an honour system, to an open-hospital scheme and must be successful if the scheme is fully implemented. It is most necessary for the medical superintendent to appreciate the atmosphere of his hospital correctly and how else could it be expressed? Atmosphere can be sensed before it can be proven by statistical data.

An aspect that was observed in England in 1959 by the Director of Mental Hygiene and emphasised by all the mental hospital administrators was the importance of staff reactions. The open hospital will succeed only if the staff have confidence in its success. It will fail if too suddenly introduced and the nursing staff, conditioned to years of custody, become anxious and insecure. The insecure nurse can be expected to retain all the security measures possible, that is, measures that have not been specifically banned by authority. The insecure nurse will leave doors and gates open but post staff to guard them and then demand more staff to run the ward. The nursing staff can be easily converted into a totally anxious and insecure staff if senior officers do not accept responsibility for the occasional mistake of placing an unsuitable patient in an open ward. The nursing staff will fail to adjust to the open-hospital policy unless the public is prepared to accept the fact that patients living in open-hospital conditions are socially well behaved people. These patients will leave the hospital at times without first obtaining permission but the hospital staff must be trusted to, and expected to, exercise the greatest care of patients needing security. To have developed so far in the open hospital as has been done at the Brisbane Mental Hospital is a most noteworthy achievement.

The problem of the aged is common throughout the world. For many years the number of patients suffering from senility in our mental hospitals had steadily increased until the number totalled more than one-third of the patients admitted and about one-third of the total hospital population. Most of the old people who were admitted were merely restless or confused or had some physical infirmity as well. All countries in the world have the same problem. We think most of these old people should have been cared for in general hospital facilities. They were admitted to mental hospitals because they were the only places where they could receive care and treatment.

Since this Government assumed office, an active policy has been pursued of developing annexes to general hospitals. Up to 31 October, 1961, 924 aged patients had been admitted to general hospital annexes. This active policy has been so successful that the time is now within sight when the aim will be achieved whereby aged people can be admitted directly to the annexes and so avoid the need for certification and admission to a mental hospital. The attaining of this first aim brings much closer the Government's overall policy concerning geriatric services; that is the rational linking up of all facilities dealing with the aged to provide a total and complete service.

The result of the Government's progressive policy in respect of aged persons has brought about a tremendous impetus in the establishment of religious, philanthropic and convalescent facilities for the aged and a reduced demand for beds in Eventide, Sandgate. It was possible to admit certain patients from the Brisbane Mental Hospital to the open and hospital wards at Eventide. They were suffering from senility and required only physical care and nursing.

When this Government took office, nearly all subnormal children were housed in the Ipswich Mental Hospital and very little was done for them. It was decided to take over both farm colony wards for these children. One serious problem was the increasing rate of admission of very young infants to mental hospitals. They actually needed feeding and nursing care. Two or three years ago it was decided to establish a diagnostic and treatment unit for infant sub-normal patients at Chermide.

The function of the overall organisation is to provide a co-ordinated service for the mentally subnormal. Firstly, infants may be cared for at home or admitted to the diagnostic and treatment unit at Chermide. Secondly, the Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association, as an agent of the Government, takes over for the school-age children. Thirdly, serious behaviour problems are cared for at the Farm Colony Ward, Wacol, and, fourthly, the untrainable and severely sub-normal child is cared for at the Ipswich Mental Hospital. These cases are the most pathetic in the world. They have a very low I.Q. and are untrainable.

Adult subnormals fall into a different category. They at present do constitute a most difficult problem.

Those of trainable potential will come into the group for whom special facilities are being planned in association with the Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association, while the completely untrainable mentally subnormal who may be ambulatory or who may be bedridden constitutes a task that ends with care and supervision.

It is expected that by early training some of the subnormals will achieve some degree of productiveness in the institution. Others

will be able to live in well-supervised hostels, whilst some will reach a percentage of industrial efficiency.

Facilities for the adult subnormal do not exist at present. However, discussions with the officers of the Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association have taken place with the view to finding ways and means to establish these facilities.

Criticism recently published in "The Courier-Mail" is best answered by Professor F. J. Schonell in a letter published in the same paper on 3 November, 1961.

Dr. Alan Jennings, Senior Child Psychiatrist, Psychiatric Centre, North Ryde, New South Wales, also commented favourably on the present organisation and future proposals for the care and training of the subnormal.

Last week-end an overseas psychiatrist visited Queensland and stated that he was very impressed with the way in which Queensland was attacking the problem of the mentally sick. He further stated—I emphasise this—that it was the one place he had visited where positive steps had actually been taken to remove patients from mental hospitals to general hospitals and other areas to which they would have been admitted in the first place had those facilities been available.

The Arthur Richards articles in "The Courier-Mail" completely missed the most important feature of Government organisation for the sub-normal, namely, the integrated activities of Government services with the Sub-Normal Children's Welfare Association. The Government appreciate and encourage the interest of the many friends of the mentally sick, and it is gratifying to know that a Queensland Federation of Mental Health has been formed to co-ordinate the activities of the various bodies. In certain other States of the Commonwealth voluntary bodies and organisations interested in the welfare of the mentally ill have been formed and are functioning.

It is probable that the three special articles published in "The Courier-Mail" by Mr. Arthur Richards stemmed from an approach to that journal by Dr. Beryl Hinckley requesting publicity and support for the aims and objects of the recently formed Queensland Mental Health Federation. Instead of assisting the Federation, Mr. Richards suggested that, in a free-hospital State, such an organisation should be unnecessary and, further, that the Government should have provided the amenities that the Queensland Federation of Mental Health and its affiliated organisations are providing. The article conveys an entirely wrong impression.

The Government's policy is to encourage the public to participate in activities associated with the hospital. It is obvious that earnest and sympathetic friends of the mental hospitals must have aims and objects in order to retain their interest and to make

their participation in mental hospital activities meaningful. A most important point to remember is that such an organisation would not have started unless the atmosphere of the Brisbane Mental Hospital had changed, and it could not function successfully unless the spirit of the open-hospital policy was permeating through the hospital.

In close co-operation with the staff of the hospital, the Federation of Mental Health and affiliated organisations will be holding a fete in the hospital grounds on 25 November. It will be opened by His Excellency the Governor, and I hope that as many hon. members as possible will be present.

It is now three years since the Government established a full-time residential chaplaincy service at the Brisbane Mental Hospital. This service is financed completely by the Government and provides for three chaplains—Anglican, Roman Catholic, and the Council of Churches. The chaplains remain active members of their church organisations and are not members of the hospital staff. The patients at the Brisbane Mental Hospital and associated services will be a pastorate of the respective churches.

This service very definitely brings the hospital closer to the community and has developed a specialised field of social service

that covers the whole of the State. The chaplaincy service has proved to be a great comfort to relatives, more particularly those living in country centres. They can write to the chaplain and ascertain how their relative is progressing and how he or she is being treated. At the end of November a ceremony will be held at which the Government will hand over three chapels to be dedicated to the use of the chaplaincy service.

The Government have been accused of making plans, blue-printing schemes, and then failing to implement them. Criticism of this type can be made of any scheme that requires long-range planning.

The Government have a plan and are implementing it as quickly as their resources permit. Under the States Grants (Mental Institutions) Act, 1955, the Commonwealth Government offered £1 subsidy for every £2 expended by the State on buildings, etc., designed to improve the lot of the patients. Under the provisions of this Act, Queensland has provided equipment, renovations to buildings, etc., and extra accommodation of a total value of £1,680,000. The following expenditure has been incurred on improvements to existing facilities and on construction of new wards and associated services for the direct benefit of patients since the Government occupied the Treasury benches—

	1957-1958	1958-1959	1959-1960	1960-1961	Total
	£	£	£	£	£
Brisbane Mental Hospital	34,614	10,615	31,665	24,872	101,766
Ipswich Mental Hospital	111,584	102,302	57,373	106,184	377,443
Toowoomba Mental Hospital ..	50,148	90,358	52,708	53,131	246,345
Mossman Hall	71,361	103,508	15,171	14,813	204,853
Totals	267,707	306,783	156,917	199,000	930,407

The Government do not propose to perpetuate chronic custodial institutions and have stopped the construction of additional accommodation at mental hospitals.

"The Courier-Mail" special articles state that the Stoller Report found that the Brisbane Mental Hospital was 95 per cent. overcrowded. It is unfortunate that the writer did not make more exact inquiries. The original issue of the Stoller Report published 95 per cent. overcrowding and this figure was obtained by assessing the total overcrowding in Queensland against the then available accommodation in the Brisbane Mental Hospital only.

That arithmetical error was pointed out to Dr. Stoller and Mr. Arscott, and an amendment was then published which showed the overcrowding at the Brisbane Mental Hospital to be 42 per cent.

Mr. Richards visited the Brisbane Mental Hospital on 18 October, 1961. The population figures of the Brisbane Mental Hospital three days previously were—

Male patients	1,180
Female patients	770
Total	1,950

That total included 160 sub-normal children in Farm Colony, a unit not occupied at the time of the Stoller Report, and 100 male patients at the Wacol Pavilion who were not taken into consideration. The total population covered by the Stoller Report was therefore 1,690. The total population (excluding the Wacol Pavilion) according to the Stoller Report was 2,320 patients, so that there were 631 fewer patients in the Brisbane Mental Hospital when Mr. Richards wrote his article.

Development of facilities, for example, the magnificent female recreation ground and cafeteria, and the development of the male cafeteria dining room, has enabled dining rooms to be used as day rooms. The overcrowding commented on in the Stoller Report has been more than overtaken.

The comment that the Brisbane Mental Hospital had no trained occupational therapist is most unfair and is clearly misrepresentation. It is true that there is no-one at the Brisbane Mental Hospital with a diploma issued by some College of Occupational Therapy, but there is a great shortage in Australia of therapists possessing a diploma. There are, however, six female nurses and five male nurses employed full-time in occupational

therapy. There are also 14 female nurses at the female recreation ground. There are two full-time posts for male nurses supervising recreational activities. These officers are men and women who have special aptitude for the special work. One man has been continuously employed in occupational therapy for over 20 years.

There are 27 persons for 1,950 patients which compares more than favourably with Victoria which is stated to have 43 occupational therapists and a total mental hospital population of over 9,000 patients.

Now we come to the Sub-Department of State Children, and again I found that on the whole very little had been done, if anything, in the way of reform for very many years. In our planning as far as Westbrook was concerned, our aim was to keep lads out of Westbrook—to get them before there was a need to send them there. The plan was that prevention was worth a ton of reform, and in our planning I assert that the Government have been successful, as will be discovered as I unfold the story of the State Children Department.

Soon after assuming office I realised that the State Children Department was perhaps the “Cinderella” department of Health and Home Affairs. Rightly or wrongly, it had been the policy of the previous Government to concentrate a great proportion of the finance available to the department on the building of hospitals, to the detriment of sub-departments like the State Children Department.

I am not complaining that the money was so concentrated, but I do say that any wise administration endeavours to see that all sections of that administration receive fair treatment. Despite this, it can be said that the State Children Department has given very good service to the State, but it has moved in the same pattern for many years. There were very few innovations or very few changes for the past 30 or 40 years until the present Government assumed office.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Dr. NOBLE: He did nothing. He never went near Westbrook himself.

Looking over the whole field, it was decided that the first section of the State Children Department needing a great deal of reform was that section dealing with child delinquency. However, in the meantime the various church authorities dealing with orphanages have been subsidised to improve their institutions, and the assistance paid to widows, foster mothers and relatives for maintenance of children has increased. This department, of course, as everyone in the Committee knows, cares for the underprivileged child, the child from the broken home, and parentless children. It administers the Adoptions Act and gives general help and guidance to families in need.

It is not a big department on numerical strength, but the work it is doing is very

important. It works quietly but efficiently and without any flare of publicity. This is as it should be, because it deals with intimate family problems.

An Opposition Member: Who wrote that for you?

Dr. NOBLE: I wrote all of this myself.

The State Children Acts and other laws related to child welfare have not been reviewed for many years, and in many respects need to be brought into line with modern concepts. The present law relating to child welfare is contained in a number of Acts and I feel it would be most desirable if all these laws could be consolidated into one comprehensive Act relating to the subject. A committee has been set up under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Wavell to investigate these matters and submit recommendations on which a Bill for a comprehensive child welfare law can be presented to the House. The Committee comprises the Director, State Children Department (Mr. Clark), the Director of Mental Hygiene (Dr. Stafford), the Senior Medical Director, Welfare and Guidance Clinics (Dr. Phillips), the Assistant Under Secretary, Justice Department (Mr. Matthews), and the Senior Social Worker of my department (Miss Whitley).

These officers are all skilled in their particular departments and, under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Wavell should bring forward recommendations that will give this State a law which could serve as a model.

Mr. Duggan: God help us!

Dr. NOBLE: I hope that members of the A.L.P. will come forward with their suggestions so that the Government will know what they are thinking. They will not, of course. They would not come to the Youth Committee, either.

The problem of the delinquent girl is not being overlooked in this review of affairs of the State Children Department. Unlike the service for boys there is no State institution for delinquent girls. The department depends on the Salvation Army Home for Girls, Toowong, the Convent of the Good Shepherd at Mitchelton, and the Holy Cross Retreat at Woolloowin to accommodate delinquent girls. The demands on those homes for accommodation are heavily taxed, and it is necessary to provide increased services.

The first step in this work is the rebuilding of the Salvation Army Home for Girls at Toowong at a cost of £150,000, towards which the Government are contributing £112,500. The new building will provide additional accommodation and will contain a hostel section to which girls can return after their work. This is a new feature of rehabilitation of delinquents and it will allow supervision after the girls are ready to take up employment outside the home.

An annexe for girls is also to be constructed at the Wilson Youth Hospital at Wilston and the Department of Public Works, in collaboration with my officers, are now planning this extension to the hospital. It will serve the same purpose as the Wilson Hospital serves for boys and will provide from 12 to 15 beds. The girls, of course, will be segregated from the boys.

These two projects, together with the Mitchelton and Woolloowin Homes are excellent services for treating the delinquent girl.

Another new feature in child welfare that we in Queensland are watching with considerable interest, and which has been started in this State, is the cottage system of caring for children. The scheme provides for children being accommodated in small family units rather than in a large children's home.

There are several concepts of this cottage scheme. The Methodist Church has constructed five cottages, three at Bardonia and two at Aspley, to replace the Queen Alexandra Home at Coorparoo. Each cottage contains eight to 10 children under the care of a house-mother and they live as a family. The Methodist Church is building two more such cottages at Toombul and here there is a difference in that each cottage will be under the control of a married couple, and so, by having a house-father as well as a house-mother, older boys, as well as girls, can be accommodated.

The idea in this plan is that the children live as part of the local community, go to the local school, and take part in the normal life of the district.

The concept of Boys' Town, Beaudesert, is on the cottage system, but, unlike the Methodist plan, all the cottages are in one community. I understand that a proposal to rebuild the Tufnell Home at Nundah is also being designed on this principle.

The success of the scheme depends on the calibre of the house-parents and the question is whether sufficient suitable people will be offering to embark on any large-scale cottage plan. Comparatively few children are at present living under this arrangement but whether it will be practicable on a large scale is a matter I am watching with interest.

It seems to me that the cottage plan is the best arrangement for caring for those children who, for some reason or other, cannot be adopted or placed in a foster-home.

If this concept is to be adopted it will involve considerable expenditure and take some years before it could become the principal avenue for caring for children. There is, however, so much capital tied up in existing children's homes, that these institutions must play a big part in our child welfare service for a long time to come. I have mentioned these features of the State

Children Department to show that this department, which I consider was the Cinderella department of the Government, is now vital and active in its approach to child welfare problems, and it is part of the Government's policy that this department shall be brought up to modern concepts of a Child Welfare Department so that children coming into its care will have every facility and encouragement to become good citizens and shall not lack any of the opportunities available to other children. It will be necessary to provide this department with officers trained in the field of child welfare and now that the University of Queensland has created the Department of Social Studies it will be the aim that in future all the field staffs of the State Children Department will be qualified as social workers. The gap between the existing staff and the qualified staff of the future must be bridged. Every effort will be made to do this, to give those at present in the department the opportunity to obtain higher qualifications so that they can take their places in the new concept of the State Children Department.

I think it would be grossly unfair to officers who have given years of service in the State Children Department to be supplanted by trained university personnel, so we are offering an opportunity to officers of the State Children Department, allowing them to retain their salary, to study for a university degree.

Mr. Walsh: They will be all the better for it.

Dr. NOBLE: It is the better way. Any fellowships we give in this field will be to persons from this department.

Persons studying in the Department of Social Studies at the university are mainly females and the State Children Department will have need for qualified male social workers. One male officer of my department will complete his course this year and as I previously stated, to encourage other male officers to undertake this training, two fellowships in Social Studies will be offered next year to officers of the State Children Department.

It is important that field officers of the Child Welfare Department should be mature and capable of exercising sound judgment. Therefore the recruitment of fellowship holders for training in social studies from suitable officers of the department will be the practice, rather than selecting students at Senior level who would graduate in their very early twenties.

We now come to the section dealing with delinquent children, which has been the subject of a great deal of controversy over the past few months, culminating in the magisterial inquiry reported by Mr. Schwarten, the report of which I tabled on Tuesday evening.

Hon. members' knowledge of the incidents leading up to that outbreak will have been

gained in the main from Press reports. Towards the end of last year, complaints and charges were made by a man whose son was an inmate of Westbrook. The complaints were made shortly after this boy's admission to the institution.

The report deals in its first section with the credibility of this man and it should suffice for me to say that he was previously known to myself and my department. His son had previously been an inmate of an institution under the control of the department and he had made very serious allegations against the staff of that institution, members of the Hospital Employees' Union. So serious were these allegations that the matter was placed in the hands of the police who reported after exhaustive inquiries that they were unable to find any substance in the complaints.

The union to which the staff of the institution concerned belong requested that the police report be made available to them so that their members who felt that they had been defamed could take action against him. The report was considered a privileged document and was not made available to the union.

I mention these matters to enable hon. members to picture the background existing at the beginning of the year regarding Westbrook and the publicity pertaining thereto. On the one hand we had a person making charges who had previously been found to have made baseless charges against the staff at another institution and on the other hand staff members who had good records. I put it to hon. members that each and every one of them confronted with this position must have supported the staff. I go further and say that, if notice was taken of all the crank letters against public servants, the life of the public servant would not be tenable.

The report tabled on Tuesday justifies the rejection of the charges made by the man described in the report as a "weak pillar" to base a case on. When, following on the mass outbreak, it was decided that an inquiry should be held, a very serious problem presented itself.

Under the Children's Courts Acts provision is made that protects convicted children from publicity. It is generally accepted that the future chances of a child can be jeopardised if publicity is given to court proceedings in which he is involved. Section 5 of the Children's Courts Acts reads—

"Notwithstanding the provision of any law to the contrary on the hearing of a charge against any child the Children's Court shall order that all persons including representatives of any newspapers shall be excluded from the Court but such order shall not operate to exclude the complainant or Police Officer in charge of the case, or the counsel, or solicitor, or any parent or guardian of the child or the representative of any organisation or institution interested in the care or reform of children."

Most of the boys at Westbrook had been convicted in a children's court and particulars of their names, offences and convictions were not made public.

If an open inquiry were held into the incidents at Westbrook this protection would and must have been destroyed. It could well be, too, that the boys would be deterred from giving evidence if this state of affairs were to exist.

For those reasons the Order in Council setting up the inquiry provided that the inquiry should be conducted as if the provisions of Section 5 of the Children's Courts Acts applied thereto.

That is, the protection provided by the Children's Court was extended to proceedings in the inquiry.

The inquiry was aimed at obtaining a true picture of conditions and circumstances, and it certainly was not an action aimed at adversely affecting the welfare of the boys at the home. It would have been a travesty of natural justice to place the boys in a position where they could be harmed by the inquiry.

There has been publicity criticising the decision to apply the provisions of Section 5 of the Children's Courts Acts to this inquiry, but I am sure that everybody in possession of the facts I have mentioned must agree that it was the correct and only procedure under the circumstances.

Hon. members will see that the document tabled on Tuesday is not the original report submitted by the magistrate. It is a true and exact copy of the report with the exception that wherever an inmate's or an ex-inmate's name appears in the report a code number has been inserted. For the information of the Chamber I might mention that in the report and its appendices the names of 248 inmates and ex-inmates are mentioned. If the original report were tabled these names would be made public.

I might mention here that all boys giving evidence at the inquiry were told that they would not suffer from having given that evidence.

Mr. Burrows interjected.

Dr. NOBLE: It was nice to let them know, wasn't it?

I might also add that the parents of some of the boys, and some of the boys who have since been discharged, have expressed their worry that names might be disclosed and sought assurances that this would not be done.

I realise, of course, that the peculiar circumstances surrounding these boys have demanded unusual treatment in this regard. I have offered the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Q.L.P. every facility to peruse the original signed report.

In submitting his report to me, Mr. Schwarten also handed to me a complete copy of the transcript of the inquiry. This transcript covers 1,892 pages, that is

approximately 20 times as many pages as there are in the magistrate's report. Boys' names are quoted in approximately the same ratio in the transcript as in the report. Thousands of coding alterations would be required if the boys' names were to be deleted from the transcript as has been done in the report tabled.

If the transcript were tabled in its original form with the names appearing not only would the secrecy of the Children's Court be destroyed as far as these boys are concerned, but by the language and other things mentioned therein testified to having been used or done by the boys many boys' names could be impaired and their future chances jeopardised.

It has therefore not been possible to table the transcript but again I offer the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Q.L.P. every facility to peruse all or part of the transcript should they wish to do so.

There has been some criticism at the delay, or alleged delay, in the tabling of this report. The magistrate was faced with a mammoth task. As I mentioned previously the transcript covers 1,892 pages. A very large number of witnesses was examined. In practically every instance the magistrate had only the evidence of the boys and the staff which he had to assess and weigh carefully. It is quite understandable that a considerable period of time was required in which to do this. I might point out that the report itself covers 80 pages single-space typing, with eight appendices.

The report was handed to me on Monday, 9 October, 1961. It was necessary that it be copied and then recopied for the deletion of the boys' names. It was coded in such a way as to make it impossible for anybody to work out the code to ascertain a boy's name.

For example, had the numbers been allotted in the order of appearance at the inquiry, some, if not all, of the names could have been worked out by certain people.

The Government and I were desirous that the Chamber be given the opportunity of speaking on the report. Had it been tabled at the latter stages of the Budget debate, and it could not have been tabled before that, some hon. members who might wish to speak on it might not have had the opportunity to do so.

In the ordinary course of events had it been tabled at the conclusion of the Budget debate there would have been no opportunity for members to speak on it.

Two avenues then lay open—one, to introduce an amendment of the State Children Acts the other to have the Estimates of my department debated. In fact, we had a small amendment drawn up by the Parliamentary Draftsman. But amendment of the State Children Acts to enable this report to be debated was rejected. One of the reasons was that it might so happen that under the scope

of the amendment full debate would not be possible. It was therefore arranged that my department's Estimates be debated in lieu of another department which it had already been notified would be debated.

It will be seen therefore that there has been no avoidable delay in tabling the report. In fact, every effort has been made to enable a free and frank debate thereon.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Dr. NOBLE: The hon. member has not been listening. He has not the brains to understand, anyhow.

The magistrate in his report states that for convenience he has divided it to agree with the terms of reference. The report covers many pages and I would stress that to obtain a true picture thereof it is necessary that it be read as a whole and that passages be not taken out of their context.

Certain passages of the report are unfavourable to certain members of the staff, particularly the superintendent, and it would be unfair to them to read these passages out of their context, particularly without taking into consideration the final remarks of Mr. Schwarten, with regard to Reference No. 2, which read as follows:—

"It must be remembered that of the inmates, all except 5 were there as the result of criminal convictions; but of course it must also be remembered that the intended purpose of Westbrook, 'though a place of detention, was rehabilitative and reformative.'

"At Westbrook there is, and apparently always has been, a small proportion of the inmates whom I regard as being habitually anti-social and anti-authority. They are impatient of the restraint placed upon them by their detention, resentful of the society that placed them there, and determined whilst they are in Westbrook to irritate and annoy the administration and create as much ferment and unrest amongst the inmates as they can hope to get away with. To this proportion of the inmates leniency and the easing of severity of the punishment would be construed as a sign of weakness and the green light to greater efforts (see inmate 21's remarks, p. 914). To the Superintendent's hands there was then no security section, no cells and so no way of segregating the unamenable from those likely to be well-behaved when not subject to the adverse influence of the incorrigibles."

Mr. Mann: Do you condone the punishment meted out to them?

Dr. NOBLE: The hon. member for Brisbane has bashed people on the head in his time. The magistrate continued—

"There was deterioration in discipline and that had been occurring over some considerable time. Actual successful abscondings were becoming rather frequent; 14 in 1958, 22 in 1959, 32 in 1960, and

23 to the 13th May, 1961. There had been a previous mass breakout on the 16-2-1960, (p. 631, 642, 895, 910), during which an axe appeared in the hand of one of the absconders, but apparently not offensively.

"With the frequent abscondings and frequent breaches of discipline, tension and strain upon the Superintendent and his staff must have been severe.

"After all is said and done, the primary responsibility of the Superintendent and his custodial staff is the security and safe-custody of the inmates and Westbrook is run on the honour system. As the Superintendent, in the circumstances existing, probably saw it, to maintain control and enforce obedience he had only one instrument to his hand, punishment; and as he probably saw it only one punishment of any deterrent value—the strap, and unfortunately he appears to have applied the strap with equal frequency for minor breaches to the amenable and unamenable alike. As the Superintendent and his custodial staff saw their duties and no doubt correctly, they were guards only and it was all they knew to be, and their methods were the only means they knew of to perform their task of security and custody of the inmates. Constructive reformation was not part of their functions.

"I am inclined to think that the frequent severe punishments of all types, the frequent and severe use of the strap and the slappings, were perhaps already part of the control and disciplinary plan for Westbrook when the present members of the custodial staff first entered upon their duties, and that they simply carried on a system of control which they found already existing and which they inherited, and to that extent, the custodial staff, like the inmates, could be the victims of a system that had not changed with a changing world.

"I do not for one moment believe that the custodial staff were the 'sadists' that some of the inmates termed them with no understanding of what the word really meant."

"I formed the impression that, on the whole, they were a band of earnest men carrying on their allotted tasks according to methods and means which they probably considered to be the only methods and means giving hope of success and as being essential to the security, control and discipline of the Westbrook inmates. In particular, I was favourably impressed with Deputy Superintendent Kolberg."

Mr. Tooth: Are those Mr. Schwarten's words?

Dr. NOBLE: Yes.

Again, the report is somewhat critical of the diet supplied to the boys, but this must also be taken in conjunction with the following remarks of the magistrate:—

"Though the diet may be rather spartan and somewhat monotonous, to me as a

layman it does not seem to have harmed the health of the inmates. On viewing the inmates, the thing that struck me most forcefully was their look of apparent good-health. I am in agreement with what Dr. Hickey said at (p. 1442, 1443) that overall the Westbrook inmates appear to be of a better physical condition than a comparable group of outside boys."

I consider this section of the report to be most important—

"The thing that struck me most forcefully was their look of apparent good-health. I am in agreement with what Dr. Hickey said that overall the Westbrook inmates appear to be of a better physical condition than a comparable group of outside boys."

As I said, this is a most important statement, because in my visits to Westbrook I too noted the good physical standard of the inmates. No lad can keep condition if he is unhappy, and the fact that these boys were in such good physical condition definitely points to the fact that there was no real unhappiness at Westbrook. I have been in an institution outside of Queensland where the discipline was most severe, where the most incorrigible of delinquent boys were sent. I saw their diet.

Mr. Bennett: Where was this?

Dr. NOBLE: I will not say. It was a good diet, and my first remark to the Superintendent of the institution on viewing the lads was that these boys looked as if they were suffering from malnutrition. It was not the food or the quantity of the food that caused them to be in such a physical state. It was, in fact, the intense discipline and the severity of the discipline that brought this about. So I say again that this section of the report is indeed an important section, pointing out definitely that at least no harm was coming to those who have been inmates of this institution at Westbrook. We watch this very closely.

In considering the report, it is only fair to keep in mind continually the type of inmate at Westbrook. Whilst it would not be correct to imagine that all of the inmates were wholly bad or vicious, it would also be incorrect to overlook the fact that in the overwhelming majority of cases the inmates had a rather lengthy history of criminal offences and included among them a number of inmates who I feel, could be classified as hardened criminals without doing them any injustice.

Mr. Lloyd: How many were convicted of being neglected children?

Dr. NOBLE: All but five were convicted of offences. I agree with the magistrate that this group of inmates could have imposed a very considerable strain on the patience and self-control of the staff.

Since the mass outbreak on 9 June, a portion of the home has been converted to a security unit. Some of the very worst boys have been housed in that unit.

An officer of the Prisons Department was seconded to the institution to undertake the supervision of this section. This officer forwarded a memorandum dated 27 October, 1961, to the Director of State Children reading as follows:—

"Please find enclosed one 'Knuckle Duster' which was found in the dormitory of the Security Section by the Officer on duty searching the Mess Room and Dormitory.

"I claim that this unauthorised article was thrown through the window, or over the fence around the Security, and was hidden there to be used on some later occasion."

So that hon. members can see it for themselves, I have the knuckle duster here. They will see that it is indeed a barbarous weapon. It needs little imagination to picture the damage that could be inflicted by it. It is so constructed that it can be concealed in the palm of the hand and made ready for use instantaneously.

I also show this sharpened metal spike that was produced as an exhibit at the Inquiry. This exhibit, which is a spike gutter bracket straightened and sharpened, was taken from an inmate at the Home. It also could be a deadly offensive weapon.

A mind that could contrive the production, let alone contemplate the use, of such weapons could not by any stretch of the imagination be described as the mind of a relatively harmless boy.

I agree with Mr. Swarten's finding that Westbrook as a rehabilitation institution was, at the time of the outbreak, much as it was 30 or 40 years ago. I further agree that strict and rigid discipline was, in the main, the only method of control available to the staff.

I also agree with the magistrate in his finding that the staff on the whole were a band of earnest men who could be the victims of a system that had not changed with a changing world.

However, it would be completely wrong to assume that nothing was being done to correct that position. Shortly after taking up my portfolio I set in train action to revolutionise and modernise the care and treatment of delinquents in Queensland. I was determined, as the ministerial head of the department, that the foundation of treatment of delinquents should be a sure one, and I was determined to start on first principles. Surely every member of the Committee will agree that the old adage is still a true one, that prevention is better than cure, and that it should be the aim of the department to get these delinquent children at the earliest possible moment before they have become hardened criminals.

With this in mind, the first step was to have a Parliamentary Committee set up to investigate and report on youth problems. That Committee was set up in December, 1957, and it did much valuable work.

Hon. members will understand that before embarking on new projects such as would be necessary in this case, full inquiries and investigations would have to be made.

In January, 1958, I visited child welfare institutions in the South and I arranged also for the Director-General of Health and Medical Services, Dr. Fryberg, to inquire into matters relating to delinquent children during the course of his overseas visit in that year. The Deputy Director-General, Dr. Johnson, also carried out a detailed study of this problem in Australia.

In November, 1958, I announced the decision to set up Welfare and Guidance Clinics in the city of Brisbane and pointed out that later more clinics would be set up in other parts of the State.

An immediate commencement was made to obtain accommodation for the clinic and to convert it to requirements. This clinic is, of course, now situated in Mary Street. A search was commenced also for the requisite staff, and in August, 1959, Dr. B. J. Phillips, the Senior Medical Director of Welfare and Guidance Clinics, took up duty, as well as other professional staff required for the service.

It is not easy to obtain professional staff for this work. The numbers who have been adequately trained are few and we were indeed fortunate to have obtained the services of Dr. Phillips as early as August, 1959. With his coming the foundation and the organisation of the Welfare and Guidance Clinics became possible.

The clinic commenced to function in November, 1959, and at the same time I announced the approval of Cabinet to set up the Wilson Youth Hospital at Windsor. The building had to be converted for the purpose and that hospital was opened on 5 July, 1961. We were indeed fortunate that such a building as the Wilson Youth Hospital was available. Had it been necessary to erect a new building, it is quite possible that the Youth Hospital would not be functioning as it is today. As I said, we were indeed lucky that such a building was available. It is directly under the control of the Senior Medical Director of Welfare and Guidance Clinics.

My overall plan for services to deal with child delinquency involved the co-operation of the churches. The church was already active in this field, but an extension of these services was necessary to provide an intermediate stage between the guidance clinics, the Wilson Youth Hospital and an institution such as Westbrook.

It had long been the complaint that there was no segregation of boys at Westbrook and this overall scheme was designed towards

that end. In the latter parts of 1958 it was brought to the notice of the department by the Director of State Children at that time, Mr. Harris, that the Sisters at the St. Vincent's Orphanage, Nudgee, were having trouble in supervising the older boys in their institution. Again, many of the boys who came before the courts who were Roman Catholics had either to be sent to the Salvation Army Home at Riverview, or to Westbrook, because there was no home within the Roman Catholic community available for them, apart from the Nudgee Orphanage.

Again, some of the boys whom the Sisters were unable to discipline, because of the lack of such an intermediate institution, had to be sent to Westbrook. These, fortunately, were very, very few. Boys Town originated in our office.

The department having been so notified, consulted with Monsignor Steele as to the possibility of an institution being erected under the aegis of the Roman Catholic Church, and fortunately, at that time, the Xavier Society, under the presidency of Dr. Clive Uhr, was ready to help, and as we continued further along these lines we realised that here was the answer for the total planning for the segregation of the different types of delinquent youths—firstly, the Wilson Hospital secondly, an intermediate stage of a Boys' Town, and thirdly, for the incorrigible of these youths, Westbrook.

Mr. Hilton: Are you implying that Boys Town is for one particular religious denomination only?

Dr. NOBLE: No, they can all go there.

Mr. Hilton: Your remarks implied it.

Dr. NOBLE: I do not mean that only Roman Catholics can go there but I should say that the Roman Catholics would like a community of their own, which is only natural, and the Protestants would like a community of their own, too.

Mr. Houston: You said that Boys Town originated in your office.

Dr. NOBLE: We wrote to Monsignor Steele and asked him could he do anything about it.

On permission being given to Monsignor Steele in July, 1959, the Roman Catholic Church presented to me the basic principles of their plan for a Boys Town and just prior to that, in May, the Congregational Church had advised me of a donation to their Church of a large property at North Booval and of this Church's intention to convert it for the purpose of assisting in the delinquency problem and providing a home for boys. Thus we had intermediate sections for both Roman Catholic and Protestant boys.

A considerable amount of planning was again necessary in the development of these

two projects and the two churches worked vigorously to complete them, the Government undertaking to meet 50 per cent. of the capital cost.

The first section of Boys' Town was opened on 25 May this year and this accommodated 12 boys. Additional work has been carried out and the home, which was officially opened on the 5th of this month, will now be able to receive up to 36 boys. The vigour with which the Church is working is shown by the fact that Boys Town was officially opened after completing a £100,000 building project exactly 12 months after the foundation stone was laid.

I might add that these buildings have been subsidised £1 for £1 and that Cabinet has already approved an upper limit of £55,000 for the first section of Boys' Town.

The Booval project of the Congregational Church will also be completed this month. Work on this project was commenced in January last and again speed has been the essence of the contract. It is to cost approximately £26,000; the subsidy will be approximately £13,000. That does not take into account the original gift to the Church.

I have presented all these facts to show chronologically that the Government have been active and I am quite certain that hon. members will agree that four years is not a very long time in which to develop such plans. The aim of the previous Government was to build a bigger and better Westbrook. When we took office they were asking for money to go ahead with the bigger and better Westbrook, perpetuating the present system.

Mr. Bennett: The present system only developed under your administration.

Dr. NOBLE: It would have been very wrong to go ahead with the previous Government's plan to expand Westbrook. Our policy is to send to Westbrook only the incorrigibles, and that is how the present plan has been developed.

One of the basic principles in the plan was to cure the problems of Westbrook. It was the only home available for delinquent boys when I took office, although the Churches were assisting in the care of some of the very young lads. I could have quite easily started at Westbrook and built a new institution, but it is quite logical that this would have been unwise when the services being designed were to classify delinquent boys so that only the most recalcitrant lads reached Westbrook. Much money could have been spent unnecessarily and already the wisdom of this plan has been demonstrated.

In the earlier part of this year the population of Westbrook was in the vicinity of 130, and in fact, in April of this year, it reached 138. Today the number of boys in Westbrook ranges between 70 and 80. The admission rate has been slowed down and this is due to the functioning of the Wilson

Hospital and the collaboration between the welfare and guidance services and the State Children Department.

The old idea of the treatment of delinquents was to lock them up and keep them out of mischief. In the past, children have been locked away from the community for quite a long time and there are still many people who think delinquents need at least one year's institutional training.

I feel that the locking away of a child for a long time is a very serious matter; the child loses years of experience at an age when care and guidance are very important and experience is necessary.

The Policy of the Welfare and Guidance Clinics and of the State Children Department is to try and keep children at home as long as possible and to send to institutions only those who persistently offend. Even then the stay of these children in institutions must be a minimum one. In recent months an experiment has been taking place at Westbrook along these lines. The Director of State Children is taking full advantage of the professional advice now available in the welfare and guidance service.

Where possible boys have been sent into outside communities rather than be detained in Westbrook. As the result of consultation between the department and the psychiatrists of the welfare and guidance service, many boys have been placed in their own homes or some other solution found to get them out of the Westbrook institution. They have been found jobs and attended the Wilson Hospital where necessary; they have been placed on probation so that the State Children Department officers and the welfare and guidance service can guide and help them in their difficulties. Sometimes they would be under the supervision of the Wilson Hospital chaplains.

This experiment appears to be working quite satisfactorily and, although it is too early to make any definite assessment, recidivism has been low and only time will show the success or otherwise of the scheme.

I am firm in the view that with the accommodation which is now becoming available at Boys Town and Booval, as well as accommodation at the Salvation Army Home for Boys at Riverview, a further reduction in the number of boys at Westbrook will be effected in the very near future. It is my determination to keep the number at Westbrook to a minimum and only admit there the most troublesome boys.

Segregation and classification of delinquent boys is not being confined to Westbrook alone. The plan envisages classification utilising the whole range of services which are becoming available.

Every boy committed to the care of the State Children Department by the court is seen by the welfare and guidance service and his future care is planned. He is either retained at the Wilson Youth Hospital for

immediate treatment and early placement back in his home, or, if this is not satisfactory, in a suitable foster home or other environment. If a longer period of institutional care is necessary, then, depending on the individual circumstances of the case, the boy is sent either to one of the church homes or, in the case of the more difficult boys, to Westbrook. The lad is not then lost; the State Children Department and the welfare and guidance service keep him under review so that his stay in those institutions is kept to a minimum.

Officers of the State Children Department and the welfare and guidance service, and representatives of the churches confer regularly, in fact every Wednesday, and go through these cases. The Director of State Children (Mr. Clark) and the Senior Medical Director of the Welfare and Guidance Service (Dr. Phillips) attend these conferences when necessary and, in fact, whenever they possibly can.

The regular meeting and consultation was first in the nature of an experiment but it is now a feature of the co-ordination that must exist between the various departmental services interested in the boys.

With the reduction in numbers at Westbrook and classification of boys prior to admission, the true requirements of Westbrook are becoming clear. Classification and segregation within Westbrook is now taking place and I have already said that a security unit has been set up where the most difficult types of lads are held. I do not know if we will have to go further and erect some other institution for those who cannot be held even there. Time alone will tell. I have also said that there is a privileged dormitory for the better-behaved boys and this is not within any fenced area. It is planned to leave this dormitory entirely open at night-time, depending on the honour of the boys not to leave. This dormitory is shortly to be further improved by providing a lounge and kitchenette; floors will be covered appropriately and boys will have their individual lockers. A new bathroom, toilet block and dressing room will be provided in the near future and in the dressing-room each boy will be provided with facilities to keep his clothing and personal requirements. The facilities in the kitchen are to be improved and the necessary items are now being manufactured. A new laundry is to be built and a manual training block constructed. These projects are well in hand with the Department of Public Works. Funds are available and I anticipate that by the end of the financial year most of the work will be completed.

The manual training unit represents a very important phase in the new concept for Westbrook. Up till now the emphasis has mainly been on farming and animal husbandry and boys have had some experience in the construction of farm buildings.

In our modern world avenues of employment have moved from rural pursuits to industries within our cities and towns. Boys at Westbrook are mainly from cities and towns and have no knowledge or interest in rural life, therefore the boys at Westbrook must be trained in such trades as carpentry, metal work and the like. The manual training unit will provide this service and it is my intention that every feature of Westbrook, even kitchen and laundry work, will be utilised as an avenue of training for employment once the boys leave the home. This should facilitate their rehabilitation and improve their opportunities to take their place again in the community.

The magistrate has also referred to the frequency of abscondings, in fact he states that "absconding is becoming rather a habit at Westbrook", but let me point out that abscondings are part of the routine of a boys' home, particularly if it is conducted on the honour system.

I have looked for comparable statistics and I find that Westbrook's abscondings compare with other similar institutions.

An Opposition Member: How does Adelaide compare?

Dr. NOBLE: As an example, the Boys' reformatory at Magell in South Australia, had 68 abscondings in the year ended 30 June, 1960, as against Westbrook's 71 in the last financial year. A security unit has also been provided at Magell to control the difficult boys.

I have mentioned this in fairness to the superintendent and staff, and because abscondings are not peculiar to Westbrook. Although the past financial year recorded the highest number ever to occur at Westbrook, it is still comparable with other reform homes in other States.

In his report the magistrate has made findings against the superintendent and certain members of the staff for inflicting excessive punishment, or inflicting punishment not in accordance with the regulations. Again I repeat, these findings must be read with the background of page 61 of the report which I have quoted.

The findings by the magistrate which are adverse to the superintendent may be summed up by saying that the superintendent has punished with severity. Apart from this the record of the superintendent has been good. He has had very long service and will retire in two or three years.

Mr. Schwarten has stated that with frequent abscondings and frequent breaches of discipline, tension and strain upon the superintendent and his staff must have been severe. He has drawn attention to the anti-social and anti-authority outlook of some of the inmates, the deterioration of discipline and the frequency of abscondings. The question then arises as to what should be done in the interests of public morale and order.

Having regard to the fact that the superintendent was only the heir to a system that apparently had been in force since the inception of the institution, to the fact that an overwhelming number of boys under his control had been criminal offenders, and that he had carried on under severe provocation, I feel that the proper course of action to take is to transfer the superintendent to another position for the time available to him before he retires.

I propose to appoint a new superintendent who will adequately fulfil requirements and have the requisite knowledge to supervise a home such as Westbrook, and who will thoroughly understand the reformatory aspects of such a home.

I remember saying to Mr. Golledge on my first visit, after having inspected the institution, "The time is coming when psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers will be coming to Westbrook." He replied, "The day they come, that is the day I walk out." I replied, "It won't be today or even tomorrow, but that day is coming."

As a Minister one does not see the superintendent of an institution very frequently. He has under him officers and directors whose duties it is to know what is going on in their directorships. For many years Mr. Harris was the Director of State Children. On all sides I have heard this officer eulogised by the present Government when in Opposition and by the present Opposition when in Government. All who met him would say, and I believe it, that he is an honest man, a sincere man, and a kindly man, who during his term as Director of State Children surely had the interests of his wards at heart. When talking to him almost every week from time to time I questioned him on the various activities of his department. On every occasion when I spoke to him of Mr. Golledge, he stated, "He is a decent man. He is an honest man. He is a just man." He referred always to the ex-Westbrook inmates as, "The old boys of Westbrook," and he asserted that often they had said to him when questioned about Mr. Golledge, that the superintendent was very hard but he was at least just.

Again and again he said to me, "I don't know, Doctor, what we will do when Mr. Golledge goes. To my mind he is the only person who could handle the institution." What was I to believe? The letters and words of such people as Daly and McCarthy, whose record we already knew—records sustained by Mr. Schwarten in that he found them to be completely discredited as witnesses—

Mr. Mann: You mention those names when it suits you.

Mr. Dewar: They are adults.

Dr. NOBLE: I may say that the hon. member for Brisbane took this completely discredited document down to "Truth."

Mr. Mann: Because you said it was not the truth and it was the truth.

Dr. NOBLE: What would any Minister do under these circumstances? What could he do? If, as Mr. Schwarten says, there has been brutality at Westbrook, I, in common with all in this Chamber, am completely horrified, but in the same report he says that on the whole, all the staff, including Mr. Gollidge, were honest, decent men, victims of a system, and that he could find no evidence of sadism.

I believe, as I have said already, that if the report is viewed in toto, public morale will be satisfied if we transfer the superintendent, having in mind also what has been done already at Westbrook, and in the whole field of State children generally, and what is planned to be done.

I refer again to the supplementary report, in which Mr. Schwarten says the Director, meaning Mr. Harris, could have had no knowledge of what was occurring, and if the Director could have had no knowledge of what was occurring how in heaven's name could the Minister, who is administering the department?

Mr. Burrows: You are talking about your Government.

Dr. NOBLE: I doubt whether any Minister could know what was going on in that department. For 25 years a Labour Government were in office and for 25 years they did nothing. We have a proud record of doing something. They had nothing to be proud of.

Very serious consideration will be given to recommendations for improvements to the home made by Mr. Schwarten.

Of course, the recommendations made by Mr. Schwarten for improvements to the home will be given every consideration in any future planning we might have. To the extent that they are not adopted they will be referred to the Committee that has been appointed to inquire into child welfare and to recommend a complete overhaul of the laws relating thereto.

I do agree that over-severity of punishment can fail to achieve its object and I feel that prevention is better than cure at Westbrook. Some of these punishments were not brought under my notice until the beginning of this year. When they were brought to my notice I issued instructions that there had to be alterations. For example, from this time no lad was to be strapped with his trousers down. As a matter of fact, one of the lads when asked what he thought of being strapped with the trousers up said it was "as weak as piss". As to castor oil, which from my reading of the punishment books and also of the evidence at the inquiry, was given only when they had eaten some green vegetables or green fruit out of the farm, and was given in those cases as a medicament—whether there was some

idea of a punishment behind this, as Mr. Schwarten himself considered to be the case, I leave to the Committee to decide. However, very few bottles of castor oil were purchased, and I might remind the Committee that castor oil was a very common medicament until the advent of the antibiotics. However, on learning that it was being given at Westbrook, I ordered that in future it should be given only on the recommendation of the matron, in whom I have every confidence. Kangaroo-hopping and walking the path I excluded as punishments, but later allowed walking the path in moderation. Cutting the hair off was also stopped. I do not know whether this slackening of punishment did have anything to do with the mass outbreak, but I did read in the transcript of evidence the comment I have already quoted about belting with the trousers up. The security unit that has been erected has already been a considerable aid to discipline.

Already a number of improvements have been carried out. The diet has been examined and a menu is in use which has been approved by the Director-General of Health and Medical Services. A privileged unit has been set up and a system whereby privileges are given as an incentive to good conduct is now receiving attention.

The Government have already carried out my plan in connection with the Wilson Youth Hospital and all schoolboys at Westbrook have been transferred to it. There are now no schoolboys at Westbrook and no more primary-school boys will go there.

My attitude concerning this matter is that everything should be done for the welfare of child delinquents with a view to reforming them and making them good citizens.

The great value of the report is that it will have a beneficial effect in that everything is being investigated; it will concentrate more than ever keen attention on the conduct of the home.

My attitude concerning the report generally is that all improvements will be made and everything will be done to put the home on a firm basis and give the public confidence that the institution is being conducted in accordance with modern, humane methods consistent with public safety.

The magistrate has commented on the percentage of recidivism of boys who have been in Westbrook. The report shows that 55 per cent. of the boys who are released do not offend again. The magistrate said that this percentage should be higher. The percentage of boys who offend again, namely, 45, is the same as the percentage of Borstal boys who offend again. Mr. Schwarten points out that the boys who are trained in the Borstal system are older and therefore the percentage of those who offend after discharge should be lower. This may be so, and this important matter of recidivism will receive my very careful consideration

and also the consideration of the committee appointed to inquire into and make recommendations to modernise our child welfare laws.

Hon. members will no doubt agree with me that Mr. Schwarten's report is a document that requires very careful reading and consideration. It can only be read as a whole and not on the basis of isolating particular sections of it. The result of the report will no doubt be a further improvement in our services for the treatment of delinquency.

Mr. Hanlon: Why didn't you have it printed to give every member of Parliament an opportunity to study it fully?

Dr. NOBLE: Hon. members opposite have had plenty of time to study the report. Their leader has had it for a week.

I can assure the Committee that the report, particularly as it refers to the Superintendent, has received very full and careful consideration, and the action to transfer Mr. Golledge to another position is a reasonable and fair arrangement to him and relieves him of the onerous duties and pressures that have fallen on him in recent years.

Other sections of the report dealing with the influence that the publicity in the Press and the inflammatory article in the Sunday "Truth" had in causing unrest I shall leave to other hon. members to discuss. However, even last year in this Chamber, during the debate on my Estimates, I spoke about Westbrook in terms which showed that the Government then had in mind the need for various changes, and I ask hon. members to remember that we have been in office only since 1957. As I have already said, we believe that prevention is better than cure, and we believed in starting at a real beginning with Welfare and Guidance Clinics, Boys Town, and then Westbrook. The Labour Party was going to build a bigger Westbrook and send more and more boys there, but I believe that our efforts are succeeding.

To summarise, Mr. Schwarten's report is such that it must be read as a whole. I am quite sure that the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Brisbane will deal only with the punishment, not with other parts of the report.

It is completely unfair and unjust to the staff concerned to form a conclusion and make charges based on portions of the report dealing with punishments, for instance, without taking into account those portions of the report dealing with staff. For example, the section of the report that reads—

"I do not for one moment believe that the custodial staff are the sadists that some of the inmates termed them."

The statement attributed to the Leader of the Opposition in a newspaper yesterday that Westbrook is a sadistic prison is therefore not in accordance with the magistrate's findings.

Since the earliest days of taking up my duties as a Minister, I have concentrated on the cure and prevention of delinquency by attacking its root causes. It is completely false and untrue to claim that there has been any effort to make improvements and improvisations to forestall the publication of the report. Guidance clinics had been established and were in operation for some considerable time. Work on the Wilson Youth Hospital commenced over 12 months before the Inquiry. Subsidies towards Boys Town and the Marsden Home, Booval, had been approved long before the Inquiry.

I do not wish the Committee to forget that I was instrumental, when I learnt that corporal punishment was being administered with the pants down, in making it obligatory to punish with the trousers up. I abolished the punishment known as "kangarooing"; I abolished the punishment known as "walking the path" but restored it at the request of the staff, provided it was used only in moderation. I repeat that I abolished the administration of castor-oil as a punishment and made it obligatory that it be given only by the Matron. These directions were given before the Inquiry was instituted.

I was also instrumental in having the regulations amended to provide that corporal punishment should be given only on the gluteal regions. This regulation was amended a long time ago.

A Matron and a seamstress were appointed last year on my instructions. At the time of the May outbreak, arrangements had already been made for a sports supervisor to take up duty. Fresh linen and clothing were ordered before the outbreaks. Since the outbreaks, a TV set has been installed and a system of privileges has been instituted.

As I have pointed out, virtually all these improvements were initiated before the Inquiry and thus were definitely not initiated in an endeavour to forestall the report.

The charges made against conditions at Westbrook originated from a man who had previously made charges of a similar nature against another institution, and these charges had been investigated by the police and found to be groundless.

In his report, Mr. Schwarten comments on this person as follows:—

"I formed a poor impression of . . .

In my opinion he was somewhat unbalanced, given to making extravagant and unfounded statements and prone to make unfounded defamatory statements of anyone who opposed him."

Allegations were made in the Press by this man, as also were allegations by an ex-inmate named Boy 114. Of both these Mr. Schwarten states—

"I cannot imagine two weaker pillars to build a case on."

Before the mass outbreak, the foregoing were the grounds on which the requests for an investigation were based. On the other hand,

I had the word of the then Director of State Children that these people were not dependable witnesses and that he believed their charges to be unfounded. The then Director has been accepted by all as an experienced, efficient, keen and kindly man, devoted to the welfare of the children under his control.

In his supplementary report Mr. Schwarten has pointed out that—

“... there is no evidence from which it could be inferred that the Director had any knowledge of certain happenings at Westbrook, to which I have referred in my report.”

Any charge such as attributed to the Leader of the Opposition in yesterday's Press that either I condoned the methods being employed at the home, or that I was hopelessly out of touch with what was happening, is completely unjust and unwarranted.

I again repeat that if, as the magistrate finds, the then Director of State Children would have no knowledge of “certain happenings at Westbrook to which I have referred in my report,” how could the Director be expected to convey this knowledge to me, and in the absence of this knowledge how could I have been aware of the happenings referred to, remembering that the then complainants were, again to use the magistrate's words, “known weak pillars”—friends of the hon. member for Brisbane.

Finally, again I say that our basic plan, which is near complete implementation, was to attack the trouble at its roots, and finally to get the numbers in Westbrook to a minimum. In this we are being successful. Today the number is 68. We hope eventually that it will have an upper maximum at 40.

If this controversy had not occurred, and those few extra months had been available, there would have been no controversy and Westbrook would have been then a model institution, as I hope it will be by the end of this financial year.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Dr. NOBLE: I know there will be complaints about my speaking for 2½ hours, but it seems to me that for a very long time I have been hiding my light under a bushel, and so has my department. We are very proud of what we have done. What I have given the Committee today is a record of great achievement, of which I and the Government are justly proud.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: I rise to a point of order. Have I your permission, Mr. Taylor, to place on the table of the Chamber, the pair of boots worn by the boy, the castor oil—

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. DUGGAN: (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (3.52 p.m.): In the 25 years that I have been in the Chamber I

cannot recall a single occasion when a Minister of the Crown when introducing his Estimates has been obliged to speak for 2 hours 40 minutes, reading verbatim from a report obviously prepared by his officers in defence of his administration. It does not do him very much credit. At the outset I point out that the Opposition enters the debate on the administration of Westbrook with a full sense of its responsibility as an Opposition and its obligations to the people of Queensland.

Dr. Noble interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: Mr. Taylor, I ask for your help, only because of considerations of time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to hon. members that they have only 25 minutes in which to make their speeches. If an hon. member is interrupted and not allowed to express himself as he wishes his time is thereby restricted. Therefore I appeal to all hon. members to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. DUGGAN: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. It is not that I need help but it is unfair for the Minister to speak for 2 hours and 40 minutes and then attempt to interrupt a speech that has only just begun.

I cannot afford to waste a great deal of time in dealing with matters that have led up to the present position. But what are the issues and how did they arise? From a trickle of complaints, slowly percolating through to the public mind, a veritable flood of criticism developed about this matter. Yet we have here a man, after four years in office as a Minister of the Crown, who has had six or seven weeks since the report was submitted to defend his administration, coming along and saying deliberately, coldly, and premeditatedly, that the matter arose because one weak reed committed to the institution had seen fit to complain to the public about these matters. That is completely untrue. I will refer only to some of the very many allegations that were made.

Mr. Mann interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Brisbane interjected while his Leader was speaking. He used an unparliamentary expression. He used the word “lie”. Will the hon. member please withdraw the remark?

Mr. Mann: Certainly. I say it is deliberately untrue.

Mr. DUGGAN: I quote as my first authority none other than a judge of the District Court, Judge Andrews. He said, as reported in “The Courier-Mail” of 16 May, 1959—

“Westbrook Farm Home was a place for turning youths into hardened criminals—what youths learned at Westbrook set them on the road to a life in prison. ‘He hesitated to send anyone to Westbrook because of this’—Judge Andrews in the District Court, said.”

The "Sunday Mail" of 5 March, 1961, stated amongst other things—

"Westbrook is a tough place—18 boys ran away from there last year."

In the "Truth" on 5 March, 1961, and again on 12 March, 1961, the statement was made—

"Westbrook Farm Home described as a hell of brutality and sadism."

"Truth" on 31 January, 1960, said—

"Eighteen-year-old boy claimed he was blind in one eye as the result of injuries he received at the farm and for which he received no medical treatment."

Right through the month of March serious allegations were made to various newspapers regarding the conduct of the administration at Westbrook, yet the Minister has the temerity today to get up in this Parliament and say that it was all due to one boy. I have here the greatest sheaf of cuttings from newspapers, a portfolio of complaints about Westbrook that make that allegation of the Minister's the greatest distortion of the truth. I have never seen such a bundle of literature from every responsible paper—"The Courier-Mail," the "Telegraph", the "Truth", the "Sunday Mail" and the provincial Press—containing such widespread condemnation of the conduct of this home from time to time.

The Minister's attitude towards those responsible for its conduct is to say that he is happy about it. He said in the "Telegraph" of 12 March, 1961, that—

"He was completely satisfied with the past administration at Westbrook."

He said bluntly that—

"He had complete confidence in Mr. Gollidge."

Now he says that he has not complete confidence in Mr. Gollidge and he proposes to transfer him. These things were going on and he said himself that he had a knowledge of them extending over a long period because he also said on the same date that he had made personal visits to Westbrook.

In the "Sunday Mail" of 23 April this year the Mayor of Toowoomba, Mr. McCafferty, demanded a State Government inquiry. I tried to interfere on behalf of the State Opposition and I indicated that I would give the Minister reasonable time to do something positive and put Westbrook in order before I demanded an inquiry. I think I was more than generous in giving the Minister that grace.

On 5 May, 1961, a staff reporter in "The Courier-Mail" had this to say, two months afterwards—this is attributed to Mr. Gollidge—

"If a boy gives trouble I make him drop his trousers and I give him the strap until he submits. If corporal punishment is done away with I'll walk out tomorrow and every man will follow. If they give cheek or steal or swear, I'll flog them—no bargain."

Was that not in the time that the Minister went up there? Then we find the Minister, at about the same time, saying—

"Reforms were being planned to improve conditions at the State Farm for Boys," Dr. Noble said yesterday. "They included plans to give the farm a homelier atmosphere and encourage boys by giving them more incentive to make good. But warders will retain 'the strap' to discipline rule-breakers'."

What was the homely atmosphere? He erected a compound 6 feet high on which he spent almost £15,000 to make an almost impenetrable barrier to the outside. "Homelier atmosphere!" they say. He said he was improving conditions at the home and then he went on to repeat that he had complete confidence in the superintendent and his system of discipline. He said—

"I do not intend to change it."

Yet he comes here and says that he is responsible for these changes. The magistrate, as I shall show in a few minutes, has indicted the Government and the administration and Mr. Gollidge and some of the warders in this matter.

Public criticism in this matter eventually compelled the Government to take action and what action did they take? First of all, despite the exhortation of leading writers in newspapers for an open inquiry they shelved it—they said there was no need for any sort of inquiry; a departmental inquiry had revealed that these allegations were unfounded, but a magisterial inquiry showed that they were well founded. Eventually an inquiry was approved and Mr. Schwarten, a man of very good reputation as a magistrate, a man of quiet demeanour and with a splendid record in the department, one not given to making sensational statements, was commissioned to inquire into the matter. The Bar Association, of which the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt (Mr. Hart, Q.C.) is president, objected. Mr. Hart conveyed to the Deputy Premier the views of the Bar Association, in which they condemned the holding of a closed inquiry into Westbrook. But that was swept aside, despite the fact that a member of the present Government, a respected member of the community and a very distinguished member of the Bar conveyed the resolution to the Government. I can well imagine the embarrassment of the magistrate when he assumed office at learning that the counsel to represent Mr. Gollidge and the staff at the inquiry was Mr. Aboud, whom I do not think, can be regarded as having perhaps justified his selection in this capacity by the contributions he has made at the Bar, but perhaps it was because he was the Minister's campaign director at the last election. For this job at the inquiry he was paid £1,475.

On the retirement of Mr. Spanner, Mr. McGill, another man who is known for his active participation in the Liberal Party was appointed. In the circumstances no-one can say that the Minister was not well

represented at the inquiry—first by his campaign director, and secondly by a well-known member of the legal profession and an active member of the Liberal Party who had to screen the witnesses who went before Mr. Schwarten. If Mr. McGill said a witness was not to go there, he did not, and no witness could go there unless he gave his evidence to Mr. McGill before he went. Mr. McGill had to approve of the evidence before the witness could appear. That was the reason why Mr. Wyvill withdrew from the Commission. Before withdrawing Mr. Wyvill asked for some general power, and he was told only three, four, or five boys would be called. When the implication of his retirement became apparent to the Government, they then called about 20 or 30 additional boys, and the magistrate in his report found overwhelmingly in favour of those boys. Then we find the Minister making the statement that one or two allegations that were made had been refuted by the magistrate.

What did the magistrate find in the matter—not one incident; not one “weak pillar” in the matter. Only consideration of the time available to me prevents me from quoting more extensively, and I could speak for 2 hours 30 minutes on the report alone. Before proceeding to the magistrate’s findings, I want to say I am grateful to the Press for the publicity they gave this matter, because the Minister and the Premier refused to print the document. They paid two Liberal supporters nearly £3,000 to appear for a limited period at this inquiry, but would not incur the relatively small expenditure to print the document that the Minister counsels all hon. members to read. I have had it for four days, and he expects 25 hon. members to read the whole of it. In addition, a supplementary report contains 2,000 pages of transcript, which would take anyone four or five days to read. And the Minister says that this is fair treatment.

Mr. Aikens: You are lucky. I did not even get one.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member is on the outer.

Just what did Mr. Schwarten say? Amongst other things he said—

“I was left with the opinion that the atmosphere at Westbrook was retributive and repressive, where even laughter was frowned upon. I was left with the opinion that the strap was used excessively and over-severely used.”;

“There is truth too in the allegation of kicking and striking.”;

“Frequent and intemperate expressions were used in the punishment book.”;

“Boots never cleaned, leather hard, caused discomfort and blisters, particularly on those inmates who are compelled to submit to the inane and senseless punishment of the walk.”

I emphasise the words “inane and senseless punishment of the walk.”, yet the Minister has restored that punishment at Westbrook.

The magistrate further said—

“There were inadequate clothes, inadequate change, and lack of warm clothes.”;

“Food cold, monotonous, porridge weevily, dried fruit maggots.”;

“Accommodation overcrowded and inadequate.”;

“Showers, inadequate hot water; inmates unjustifiably prevented from taking a hot shower and compelled to shower under cold water.”

Imagine that, in a climate such as we have in Toowoomba. He continued—

“Hot water turned off if boys talked or attendant out of sorts.”

The magistrate found that this was unfair and an unauthorised form of punishment that affects the innocent as well as the guilty.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: If the hon. member was an inmate up there, he would be knocked down without doubt.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DUGGAN: The report continues—

“I think that the over-indulgence in corporal punishment was one of the major contributing factors to the break-out of 14 May, 1961, for I believe that the hope of escape from the strap was a big influence in the minds of some who broke out and attempted to escape.”

Here, we have a man saying he will abolish all this; he will correct all this atmosphere, yet the magistrate, in his report of 9 October says that this was one of the primary reasons for the breakout. Yet the Minister, today, in his speech points to one boy, and names him, and then uses language that he is frightened to think an hon. member of this House would use, but he has no hesitation in using it in this Assembly to get the widest possible coverage through “Hansard.” The magistrate continued in his report and said—

“I have long held the view that in respect of the type of inmate at Westbrook, with his record and poor environmental background that in 99 cases out of 100 corporal punishment is likely to make the incipient transgressor not more penitent but more furtive and defiant.”

Yet the Minister has restored this right to the people out there. Mr. Schwarten continued by saying—

“There is a case for reconsidering the limitations of corporal punishment.”

This was presented to the Minister on 9 October, six weeks ago. The magistrate continued—

“I very definitely believe that a halt must be called to the incessant and excessive way the strap has been used at

Westbrook for degrading public punishment and for punishment for minor and trivial breaches."

Corporal punishment was administered for such infamous crimes as reading in bed, dropping marbles on ward floor, making a pop noise with the tongue, eating carrots, not playing football, making silly remarks, talking in the bathroom, having bread and syrup in bed.

Mr. Ramsden: You would get a hiding, wouldn't you?

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member is one of the hon. members on the Committee, I understand. Is it any wonder, when we have these Liberal members that we have this great number of people going to Westbrook? The number has reached an all-time record, while this Committee has been making its investigations. Then, the magistrate found also that these definite forms of punishment had been inflicted—administering of castor-oil, not in the delicate dosage of one tablespoon, but with the head held back and the bottle emptied down the throat of the person. Yet, on TV, the Minister denied that castor-oil was being used. He said that it was used for animals there. The magistrate found that punishment of walking the path was frequently imposed which resulted in blisters and blood on feet. He found also that hair was shaven as close as possible to the scalp, and kangarooing, down on haunches and jumping up and down.

Mr. Sullivan: That is good exercise.

Mr. DUGGAN: There we have it. There is the hon. member approving of it. What chance is there when the hon. member approves of it?

Mr. Sullivan: You used to do it as P.T. Don't you remember?

Mr. DUGGAN: The magistrate also found that there was a punishment inflicted by getting the boys to stand out in the recreation room, or at the foot of their beds in the ward, up until 2 a.m. The magistrate also found that his faith in the accuracy of the punishment book was shaken. He found, too, that there had been wrongful and discriminating punishment particularly against the coloured inmates. That is a tragic thing for the Superintendent of a home of that kind to do, and it was proven. It was not just a matter of an allegation. The magistrate recommended that frequent and public strappings should be immediately abandoned. He said that he regarded failure to record in the punishment book all corporal punishment administered as being a serious breach of duty. From the transcript that I read this morning, the Minister will know that the Superintendent regarded boxing the inmates over the ears as not being a punishment to be recorded in the punishment book. Hon. members can well imagine a box over the ears from a man who is 6 ft. 2 in. in

height. Because of what has been found against him, this boxing over the ears should have been recorded in the punishment book. The Minister went up there. These are matters of fact and not allegations; they are proven by the magistrate. One would expect a man with the educational standard and experience of the Minister to have seen some of these things that Golledge was neglecting, such as the condition of the clothing. On page 18 of his report, the magistrate said—

"Of 50 per cent. of the inmates I regretfully must say that I have never seen a more poverty-stricken lot."

The Minister refers to them as being tall, husky, strong fellows, yet, on page 18 of the report we find that 50 per cent. of them are a poverty-stricken lot. This should have been seen by an observant man, but apparently it was not.

Subsequently the Minister appeared on TV. Apparently he did not go there like a fearful and tearful bride but he went with all the confidence and assurance of a matinee idol. I have been on TV and I know what it is like. But the Minister talked them down and gave them all sorts of statements. "The Courier-Mail" of 15 May, 1961 had this report of what he said—

"I am certain you would find Westbrook is a very good show," he said.

"The Home's superintendent (Mr. Roy Golledge) was 'a decent, honest citizen with a deep love for boys.' There were tears in his eyes as he told me he got sick and tired of using the strap from time to time," he said.

"The recent controversy over the Home was 'unjustifiable.'"

My daughter does not take a deep interest in politics but she said, "Frankly, Dad, I think the Doctor is going to weep in a few moments about this sort of thing."

The report goes on—

"Dr. Noble said the term 'flogging' should not be applied to the 'corporal punishment' administered to the Westbrook boys.

"He said that corporal punishment was meted out 'in full justice' and was no worse than existed in ordinary homes.

"The punishment was given with a strap, two and a-half feet long and about half an inch wide.

"On an average the boys received from four to six cuts with a strap, and in more serious cases, 10 cuts.

"A boy who hit a warder over the head with an iron bar got 10 cuts," he said.

"Dr. Noble said the cuts were not applied to the bare skin, but across the seat of the pants.

"He said he agreed with this form of corporal punishment.

"A boy who ran away from the home usually received six cuts when he was returned.

"I have had worse than that myself at school," he said."

That just shows how punishment of that sort affects a person later in life. If the Minister had that form of corporal punishment meted out to him it is little wonder that he reacts as he does now.

It is also rather amusing to note that the Minister, as well as having the protection of his campaign director, Mr. Aboud, at the Inquiry, felt that he should have him also on hand when he appeared in "Meet the Press."

Reference was made to breaking the wall of silence but the only wall the Minister appears to have interested himself in was the higher wall erected within the compound at Westbrook.

On 18 May, after the outbreak, this man who hid his light under a bushel for so long, could not wait. With the impetuosity which is one of his characteristics, he told everybody, "I will say nothing about these things until the inquiry is completed." Then he went on to say—

"I am the only bloke in the last few weeks who hasn't commented.

"I would like to fly back at the critics and tell them the truth but I must wait until this inquiry is over.

"If the inquiry had been open to the public, the exhibitionists and criminals at Westbrook would have been the first to get into the witness box and tell all the lies they could think of.

"Many of the inmates don't know what the truth is and would only have black-guarded decent men.

"When the inquiry is over I am going to table the complete evidence in the House.

"I will ask Cabinet to have the transcript printed so that anyone interested will be in a position to read the true position about Westbrook."

The Minister said that he would not give the names of the boys but he had no compunction in registering the name of one of them in the Chamber to be disseminated through the journals of the Assembly.

Dr. Noble: Which boy's name did I mention?

Mr. DUGGAN: The Minister mentioned Daly. I hope he does not attempt to have it expunged from "Hansard" to appear that he did not. He has sought to damn a person in this Chamber under parliamentary privilege to cover up his own weak attitude in these matters.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a point of order. I did not mention the name of any particular boy.

Mr. DUGGAN: The Minister did.

Dr. Noble: The name of Daly was mentioned, and he himself mentioned that in his own transcript.

Mr. DUGGAN: I do not want my time taken up on this matter, Mr. Taylor, so I will accept that. I want to say before time beats me on this that, because of the attitude of strong criticism of this sorry and unhappy affair, which is a serious blot on the administrative record of this inept, complacent, lazy and inefficient group, who masquerade as the Government of Queensland, I propose to move—

"That the Vote for this department be reduced by £1."

I want to say that, on all the evidence available to us, on the magistrate's finding, Golledge should go and Dr. Noble should go with him.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. DUGGAN: I have never heard in my whole experience of a man who is actually well equipped to handle the defence of a matter of this kind but who read verbatim for 2½ hours material written by somebody or other.

Dr. Noble: You read a lot yourself for 20 minutes.

Mr. DUGGAN: I know I read some. If the Minister is so concerned, I will tell him what I will do. I will accept an invitation from him to debate any public issue without any notes at all as long as Mr. Aboud is not the chairman. I have never heard such a weak defence. Mr. Schwarten's report refers to "humbug". We have never heard more humbug than we heard this afternoon in the time taken by the Minister in introducing the Estimates. If the Government want to be judged on this matter, let them go to the bar of public opinion outside the Chamber. The people throughout the length and breadth of the country are very dissatisfied with what has taken place. The Minister has been covering up, but the pressure of public opinion forced him, very reluctantly, to take action and order that an inquiry be held. The findings of the magistrate in relation to the happenings at Westbrook are very much to the detriment of his administration. The Minister does not say he is sorry for what has happened but attempts to defend the Government's actions.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: I say to hon. members opposite, "Give us a chance to be Ministers and we will show you what we can do."

Mr. Armstrong: You had 25 years in which to do it.

Mr. DUGGAN: If the vociferous gentleman who is interjecting would like to know what we could do, if I could get your concurrence, Mr. Taylor, to my speaking for 25 minutes, I could tell him, but I have only one minute left.

The Minister has tried to make out that there is no public interest in this matter. I have received inquiries from "The Sydney Morning Herald" and other newspapers in the South about it. It is not only one boy who is interested in it. What about the pages and pages that the Minister read to the Committee? If the interjections of hon. members opposite are recorded in "Hansard", they can only show people reading them how uninterested Government members are in reform at this institution. If I had 20 minutes available to me, I could outline to the Committee some of the plans that the Opposition has in mind.

I say again that the Government are complacent. They believe that, with public apathy outside, the subject will soon be forgotten and we will see new headlines in the newspaper. They are prepared to ride this out. This represents a serious blot on the record of the Government of the State. They stand indicted as an inactive and inefficient Government because of their failure to take notice of public opinion and to take positive steps for the rehabilitation of boys, 67 per cent. of whom come from broken homes.

I believe that the case I have placed before the Committee justifies the strong motion of censure that I have moved today.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Carnarvon.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. Do I understand that while the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition stands on the business sheet, the rest of the debate on these Estimates must be confined to Westbrook? If so, why have not the four so-called Independent members of this Chamber been provided with a copy of the report when the four so-called members of the Q.L.P. were provided with a copy of it? Why are we being treated like outcasts?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled that as the Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment solely on the basis of the Westbrook institution, that is the only subject that will be discussed on the amendment.

Mr. Duggan: Might I say—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to hear me out. That is the only subject that may be discussed on the amendment. When the amendment is disposed of and the Vote for the Chief Office again comes before the Committee, the operations of the rest of the department may be debated.

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. It is my belief that in moving that the Vote be reduced by £1, I am not obliged to give any reason for doing so. Although I used my time for the express purpose of dealing with Westbrook, I think that I could equally have given reasons why the Government should be condemned on other counts. I do not think I was bound to give reasons in my speech for moving that the Vote be reduced by £1, but merely to move the amendment.

Dr. NOBLE: I point out that when the Leader of the Opposition moved his amendment he gave as his reason what happened at Westbrook. For that reason I believe your ruling is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am maintaining the ruling that the discussion on the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition will be confined to the subject of Westbrook.

Mr. Aikens: I move—

"That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to."

Mr. DUGGAN: I think I was on my feet before the hon. member for Townsville South. The amendment was moved by me and I think it is proper that I be heard on the matter. I argued briefly against your ruling and I wish to indicate that I desire to move that your ruling be disagreed with.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Leader of the Opposition desires to move that my ruling be disagreed with. It must be put in writing. The discussion that can take place is limited to 30 minutes. Each hon. member is allowed 5 minutes in which to speak.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. In view of your ruling that while the amendment is before the Committee hon. members shall be confined to the subject of Westbrook, I demand as a member of Parliament that we four members be provided with a copy of the report.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! When hon. members are silent I shall speak. The question before the Committee is that my ruling be disagreed with.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (4.23 p.m.): I wish to speak in support of the motion. In doing so I point out that the Leader of the Opposition never indicated in writing, or in any other way, that the sole purpose of moving for the reduction of £1 in the Vote was because of the Westbrook inquiry or the findings of Mr. Schwarten. He indicated that there were numerous parts of the administration with which he disagreed and upon which we might have moved an identical motion. Your ruling at this juncture indicates purely and simply that no other hon. member can move for the reduction of the Vote by £1 for any other reason. For instance, we are in violent disagreement with statements made by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs about hospital administration. Right through he endeavoured to accept full credit for much that was done by previous Administrations. We know that there is a great deal of concern in the public mind about hospital administration. The same concern is felt by many of the staff employed at the hospitals, many doctors and members of the

nursing staff. If we had sufficient time we could deal with all those matters in detail. In the limit of 25 minutes available to us we do not have the opportunity to deal with many other parts of the administration of the Department of Health and Home Affairs with which we violently disagree. But to limit us to debating one particular section of the Minister's responsibility is completely undemocratic, I respectfully submit. I would not think you intended it that way. In the interests of free and open discussion of the whole of the Estimates of the Department of Health and Home Affairs we should be given wider scope. If the Leader of the Opposition had put his amendment in writing, under the Standing Orders, we would be bound by the very terminology of that written submission to you. In the discussion of these Estimates it is only necessary for the Opposition to move that the Vote be reduced by £1. We have moved a vote of no confidence in the department and in all of the sub-departments under the control of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. I ask you, Mr. Taylor, to give very serious consideration to the matter before you continue with your ruling. I think we, as an Opposition, have a right to regard any resolution of ours, that is an open resolution, as one by which we can express the dissatisfaction of the Opposition with the administration of the Department of Health and Home Affairs, including conditions at Westbrook.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (4.26 p.m.): I feel too that you erred in this matter, Mr. Taylor, in making the ruling that you did. We are discussing the Chief Office Vote of the Department of Health and Home Affairs and that covers every ramification of the department. It is true that the Leader of the Opposition, by right, spent the whole of his 25 minutes in a denunciation of the administration of the Westbrook home for boys, or whatever the particular place is called. While at the end of it he moved that the Vote be reduced by £1, any vote applicable to the Westbrook reformatory is a vote applicable to the whole of the Department of Health and Home Affairs. So, if we are going to accept the proposition as conveyed in your ruling, that because the Leader of the Opposition has moved that this vote be reduced by £1, he then can dictate to every hon. member of this Chamber what we shall or shall not talk on, on the Chief Office Vote of the Department of Health and Home Affairs, and that would be a negation of democracy. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would be the first to admit that he did not want to impose any restriction on the remainder of hon. members in this Chamber.

So, when we consider an amendment we must consider what the amendment proposes to amend. The amendment has nothing whatever to do with Westbrook reformatory

or with the particular Vote in these Estimates dealing with Westbrook reformatory. That is why I repeat, that is the point you missed.

We are discussing, first of all, the Vote for the whole of the Chief Office, Department of Health and Home Affairs, and, if the motion is carried—which it will not be because of the numbers on the Government side—it will mean that if the specific Vote we are considering is to be reduced by £1, then the Vote for the whole of the Department of Health and Home Affairs will be reduced by £1.

I wish to announce, Mr. Taylor, that because of your tolerance, and the fact that you allowed me to mention that four of the most intelligent members of this Chamber had not been supplied with a copy of the report, I have now been supplied with a copy of it, which just shows what can be achieved if one sings out loudly enough.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (4.29 p.m.): I must admit that I cannot agree with the motion that your ruling be disagreed with, Mr. Taylor. I think we have to separate two important aspects. The fact that there is a limited time to this debate is not your responsibility. You have given your ruling based on the fact that we are discussing the Estimates. The Leader of the Opposition, when he moved his amendment, specifically stated that it was because of the administration of Westbrook, that the amendment was moved.

Mr. Dufficy: No, he did not.

Mr. HILTON: I understood it was because of the Westbrook report. If he did not say that, then I agree with his motion, but I understood him to say it. It is a matter for your determination, Mr. Taylor. If we accept the fact that when going through departmental Estimates such amendments may be moved ad lib., we shall finish up in a very queer position indeed. I think the right procedure to register a protest would be to move or divide against the whole of the Vote for the Department of Health and Home Affairs. To my mind that would be the more effective way. I recall at the commencement of this session an amendment being moved to the Address in Reply and by the time the amendment was debated the Address in Reply debate had concluded. Parliament perhaps should revise the Standing Orders relating to the time for the discussion of the Estimates.

We are now limited to 25 minutes—for very good, sound, Parliamentary reasons, and your ruling, on the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition as I understood them, confining the debate to matters relating to Westbrook only, I think, is correct. I want to make my position clear.

Mr. Aikens: The hon. member for Bundaberg is going to disagree with you.

Mr. HILTON: I am giving my opinion. I have not referred to the Standing Orders since the ruling was given. We have to make up our minds quickly on these matters.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (4.31 p.m.): Mr. Taylor—

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. As there appears to be some misunderstanding as to whether the Leader of the Opposition did use certain words at the conclusion of his speech—he says he did not; the Minister says he did—I suggest to you, Mr. Taylor—and this has been done before—that you send for the transcript of that portion of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not dealing with a point of order at this stage.

Mr. BENNETT: I feel constrained to support the Leader of the Opposition that your ruling, Mr. Taylor, be disagreed with. It will be a sad thing for this Parliament if your ruling is upheld. Standing Order 308 provides—

“When a motion is made in Committee of Supply to omit or reduce any item of a vote, a Question shall be proposed from the Chair for omitting or reducing such item accordingly; and Members shall speak to that Question only, until it has been disposed of.”

The motion is that the Estimates be reduced by £1. That is the motion—that the Estimates be reduced by £1.

Government Members: No, no.

Mr. BENNETT: The Leader of the Opposition moved that the Estimates be reduced by £1 and in so doing he gave one of his reasons. Hon. members may feel disposed to support the motion that the Estimates be reduced by £1, perhaps not only for that reason but for several other reasons. As a matter of fact I for one wish to advance reasons why the motion should be carried, mentioning not only the Westbrook inquiry but also other very cogent and convincing reasons. In all Parliaments this Standing Order is similar. It allows hon. members to move that a Vote be reduced by £1, and in so doing they need not necessarily give any specific reason. They can give several reasons. The mover of a motion may possibly have only one reason for so doing. Other hon. members can support the motion for reasons that occur to them. Clearly and definitely the motion is that the Vote be reduced by £1. There was no other part to the motion—because of such-and-such or by reason of such-and-such. The motion, and the only motion that can be moved, is that the Vote be reduced by £1.

In the “Hansard” of all Parliaments and in other parliamentary procedures we can find precedent for the moving of a motion that the Vote be reduced by £1, and I

challenge and defy anyone to find any authority to say that in the subsequent debate hon. members are confined to the one reason given for the moving of the motion that the Vote be reduced by £1.

There is no such authority, and I venture to say my legal friends on the opposite side of the Chamber could not in truth and honesty support the claim that hon. members in speaking to a motion that the Vote be reduced by £1 are confined to the reason given by the mover of the motion. I make it quite clear that my leader said purposely and specifically in moving that the Vote be reduced by £1, that he was only giving that as one of the reasons for so doing. He made it quite clear that by so moving he did not intend the debate to be confined to Westbrook. I think it is a sorry thing that if a speaker moves that the Vote be reduced by £1 that by your ruling, Mr. Taylor, all other speakers are deprived of the opportunity of advancing further reasons to support and fortify the arguments that have been advanced by the mover of the motion.

Mr. Dewar: Don't you want to discuss Westbrook now?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, I want to discuss Westbrook. In reply to that interjection, I might say that I wish to discuss Cherbourg too. By the time I have finished with Cherbourg the Minister may be prepared to appoint a committee of inquiry into the iniquities there also.

Dr. Noble: You are getting in line with the Comms.

Mr. BENNETT: That is all very well; the Minister is using his old catch-cry.

For instance, I might mention, that when in Opposition, the Minister advocated a surgical survey, but since then he has not been prepared to have a surgical survey, which means only that his original claims against the B.M.A. were untrue, or falsified.

(Time expired.)

Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry) (4.36 p.m.): Some hon. members may be tempted in the light of what has been said, to wonder what we are debating. We are debating one subject, and one subject alone, and that is, your ruling, Mr. Taylor. As I heard the debate I believe that your ruling is strictly correct. However, I have taken the opportunity to ask for a transcript of the comments that were made at that stage. I have it here and I propose to quote it. These are the words that were used—

“Mr. Duggan: I do not want my time taken up on this matter, Mr. Taylor, so I will accept that. I want to say, before time beats me on this that, because of the attitude of strong criticism of this sorry and unhappy affair, which is a serious blot on the administrative record of this inept, complacent, lazy and

inefficient group who masquerade as the Government of Queensland, I propose to move—

‘That the Vote for this department be reduced by £1.’”

Mr. Hanlon: That is a resolution.

Mr. MORRIS: I am trying to give hon. members the actual words that were used, and I want hon. members to hear them. The Leader of the Opposition then continued and said—

“I want to say that, on all the evidence available to us, on the magistrate’s findings, Gollidge should go and Dr. Noble should go with him.”

Then, there was quite a lot of noise in the Chamber. Having obtained the transcript, and having it in front of me, I think hon. members will agree, Mr. Taylor, that your ruling is faultless. I have been a member of this Chamber for a considerable time and I have not always been the most complacent person. I have frequently become emotional and I can well understand that in time of emotion, as we have just seen, many of us are not sure of the words we have used. After all, this is not a matter of great importance except from a superficial point of view in this debate. Although it could be a matter of very great importance so far as precedent is concerned. I am sure all hon. members will thoroughly agree that for 4½ years you have filled the position you occupy not only with great dignity but also with tolerance, understanding and patience. I cannot recall even one other occasion when your ruling has been questioned. I am perfectly certain that when the words that were in fact used, and which I quoted to the Committee, are realised and when hon. members allow them to supersede the emotional atmosphere, they will agree with me that your ruling is completely sound. On behalf of the Government I desire to express agreement with it.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (4.41 p.m.): I strongly disagree with your ruling. I am grateful to the Deputy Premier for securing a copy of the words from the “Hansard” staff because I think the transcript justifies the stand that the Opposition have taken in disagreeing with your ruling. It is not a stand we take lightly. I ask you to note from what the Deputy Premier read of the concluding remarks of the Leader of the Opposition that he said he did not want time to beat him—in other words, he did not want his time to lapse—before he had moved his amendment. He said, as the Deputy Premier read out, “Because of the Westbrook incident, because of the report of the magistrate, and so on, I move, ‘That the Vote be reduced by £1.’” The motion comes after the words, “I move.” I submit it is wrong of you therefore to rule as you have done. I know you have given the ruling but I do not see how you can properly go back and incorporate as

part of the motion that the Vote be reduced by £1, something that the Leader of the Opposition said before he moved the motion.

As the Leader of the Opposition interjects, you could have given a similar ruling on the traditional motion for the reduction of the Vote for the salary of the Aide-de-Camp by £1.

I point out that this is the Chief Office Vote and that the Leader of the Opposition has moved for the reduction of that Vote by £1. The only reason we have been able to discuss Westbrook on the Chief Office Vote is that you ruled we could discuss all departments on the Vote for the Chief Office. In other words, it is more a custom than a rule. I point out that the State Children Department is actually covered by another Vote further down in the list. So you have ruled that we can discuss the State Children Department only on a Vote that it does not come under at all. The Chief Office Vote is the first Vote in the departmental Estimates and then comes the Department of Native Affairs, Charitable Institutions and so on. We go right down to State Children Department, which is £625,328. You have ruled that, because we want to reduce the Chief Office Vote by £1, we can discuss only a Vote six or eight items below the Chief Office Vote on which we are moving a reduction by £1. If your ruling is upheld, as it probably will be by weight of numbers, one of only two things can happen. The debate will be restricted after a few hon. members have spoken on the Westbrook incident, because Government members will rise to a point of order and say that we are repeating matters already mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, or, if we continue to devote our limited time to Westbrook, we will deprive other hon. members of the opportunity of speaking not merely on other grounds for the amendment but on the other items of the department on which they may want to speak.

I submit that the Government’s attitude on Westbrook is inextricably tied up with their attitude on the whole department and it is indicative of the attitude of the Government generally. It is through the secrecy of the Government on this matter that the main difficulty has arisen. Because the Government tried to smother it up and initially refused to have an inquiry, the Westbrook incident developed as badly as it did. This Government have also refused to have an inquiry into hospitals in general. As I mentioned by way of interjection, at the Country Party conference a motion was carried for an inquiry into the administration of the whole department. The Government refused to have that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must speak to the ruling.

Mr. HANLON: The reason why we suggest that the reduction of this Vote by £1 should apply to the Chief Office, and not to the State Children Department, or any other section of the department is, firstly, that in accordance with your own ruling at the beginning of the debate, we can discuss all sections of the department under that Vote, and, secondly, because the Westbrook incident is connected with the whole administration of the department. Because of the secrecy of the Government and their endeavours to smother criticism from any section of the community, this matter cannot be divorced from the Chief Office Vote.

For those reasons, I support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition for the disallowance of your ruling.

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) (4.46 p.m.): I support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition because hon. members on this side of the Chamber believe in democracy and this afternoon a ruling has been given that is most undemocratic.

The Committee is dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Health and Home Affairs, and the Leader of the Opposition moved that the Vote for the Chief Office be reduced by £1. It was possible to discuss the Westbrook inquiry in the debate on these Estimates and Mr. Duggan as Leader of the Opposition took full advantage of the opportunity, but the Chairman's ruling now means that no other portion of the Department's Estimates can be discussed and the hon. member for South Brisbane, who said that he would like to discuss what is happening at Cherbourg, will be deprived of that opportunity. There are many hon. members on the Opposition benches who would like to discuss subjects—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must correct the hon. member and point out that no hon. member will be prevented from discussing Cherbourg or any other relevant matter when we get back to the Vote for the Chief Office.

Mr. BAXTER: I am very pleased that you made that statement, Mr. Taylor. It has clarified the position for me. We are not supporting a motion dealing only with a reduction of £1 in the Vote for Westbrook. We are supporting a motion dealing with a reduction of £1 in the Vote for "Chief Office—Department of Health and Home Affairs."

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (4.47 p.m.): Irrespective of what the last speaker says we are discussing, I think the Committee is bound by the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. That is in clear terms and has been read to us by the Deputy Premier. In the relatively short time that the hon. member for South Brisbane has been in the Chamber, he has made an

inordinate number of speeches, usually full of bombast and inaccuracy. But this afternoon we are indebted to him for the contribution he made, because I think he showed more clearly than anyone else, Mr. Taylor, that your ruling was correct.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SMITH: I go so far as saying that your ruling will be agreed to not on the grounds advanced by the hon. member for Baroona but because the sane construction of Standing Orders will prevail and Rafferty will not rule.

Mr. DUFFICY (Warrego) (4.49 p.m.): I shall be very brief on this point. Despite the fact that the Minister spent a good deal of time dealing with Westbrook, I assume that he presented the Estimates of his department. If that is so, surely the Leader of the Opposition in his speech replied to the Minister's presentation of the Estimates. It is true that the Minister took two hours or two and a half hours—a considerable time, at any rate—to present his Estimates. The Leader of the Opposition was restricted to 25 minutes. In that time he was able to deal with one matter only. It was a very important matter. Many other hon. members on this side wish to deal with other phases of the Chief Office Vote. Surely the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition was that the Chief Office Vote be reduced by £1. Surely he was replying to the presentation of the Estimates by the Minister. There could not be any doubt about that. When he moved the amendment, he moved it in the only way that the Opposition had an opportunity to register a protest against the administration of the department by the Minister, not only as it affected Westbrook but all other phases of his portfolio. If you are suggesting that the Leader of the Opposition moved that the Vote be reduced by £1 only in respect of Westbrook I think you are completely wrong.

(Time expired.)

Question—That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed with (Mr. Duggan's motion)—put, and the Committee divided—

AYES, 27

Mr. Aikens
" Baxter
" Bromley
" Burrows
" Byrne
" Davies
" Dean
" Diplock
" Donald
" Dufficy
" Duggan
" Graham
" Gunn
" Hanlon
" Houston

Mr. Inch
" Lloyd
" Mann
" Marsden
" Melloy
" O'Donnell
" Sherrington
" Thackeray
" Tucker
" Wallace

Tellers:

Mr. Adair
" Bennett

NOES, 38

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Low
" Bjelke-Petersen	" Madsen
" Camm	" Morris
" Campbell	" Munro
" Chalk	" Nicklin
Dr. Delamothe	Dr. Noble
Mr. Dewar	Mr. Pilbeam
" Ewan	" Rae
" Fletcher	" Ramsden
" Harrison	" Richter
" Hart	" Row
" Herbert	" Smith
" Hewitt	" Sullivan
" Hiley	" Tooth
" Hilton	" Wharton
" Hodges	" Windsor
" Hooper	
" Jones	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Knox	Mr. Gilmore
" Lonergan	" Hughes

PAIR

Mr. Pizzey Mr. Newton

Resolved in the negative.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (4.58 p.m.): I should like to make some observations on this very important matter before the Committee. At the outset, I wish to express my regret that the time allowed to each speaker is confined to 25 minutes. I express that regret because of the far-reaching ramifications of this subject dealt with in a comprehensive report that we have not had time to study in detail. We cannot do justice to the subject in 25 minutes. I also express regret that, because of the way situations have developed in the Committee this afternoon, some hon. members will be precluded from discussing this matter, and other matters connected with the department.

In passing I make the observation that my vote just recorded in the division deals with parliamentary practice only and has no political significance whatsoever. I agree that, from the point of view of parliamentary practice, Mr. Taylor's ruling was sound, and, because I have the courage of my convictions, particularly as they relate to the traditions and procedure of this Parliament, I express my opinion accordingly.

Mr. Hanlon: Just as well Mr. Duggan did not sneeze when he was moving the motion or you would have said we could not discuss anything other than a cold.

Mr. HILTON: Be that as it may, I recall having given a ruling somewhat comparable with your ruling Mr. Taylor, when I was Chairman of Committees many years ago.

Mr. Aikens: One of the worst we had.

Mr. HILTON: The hon. member may say that. Perhaps he has good reason to remember it and other rulings that I gave. But I like to be consistent and that being so I supported what I considered to be a sound ruling, purely on parliamentary practice.

I listened to the Minister's statement and, whatever the case he had to make, I think he reduced the substance of it by implying

that he had inherited the unsatisfactory position at Westbrook from previous Governments. At the outset of my speech I want to comment on that statement. I realise a great deal of sensational Press publicity has been given to the matter and that there has been a lot of emotional feeling, aroused by real and genuine feelings, and other purposes, but I take exception to anybody's trying to imply that under previous Labour administrations the sordid aspects of Westbrook, as they have been revealed, were in existence. Nobody with any knowledge of the position there can raise any substantial matter that would warrant any newspaper's claiming, any Minister's saying or any hon. member's saying that the unhappy state of affairs at Westbrook, as revealed by the inquiry, were in existence in the days of previous Labour Governments.

I recall that when I entered Parliament in 1935 Mr. Thomas Jones was in charge of the institution. He gave distinguished service to the State and to the Home and he occupied his position from 1916 to 1947. I recall—I shall not give the details now—that time and time again prominent people visited Westbrook, ministers of religion and others, and spoke in glowing terms of the administration of the Home during the time Mr. Jones was in charge.

Mr. Walsh: And so did the Press.

Mr. HILTON: So did the Press, as the hon. member for Bundaberg points out. On many occasions the Press paid tribute to Mr. Jones for the work he was carrying out at Westbrook, and I think it is despicable to make remarks now that reflect on the excellent record of the institution under Mr. Jones's administration and in subsequent years.

The "Telegraph" of yesterday made this statement—

"In fairness to Dr. Noble, the shocking regime of terror at Westbrook did not originate under his administration; it apparently was something that he inherited with his portfolio. But he cannot escape the indictment of having failed to look beneath the surface to find the facts."

By that article the "Telegraph" tries to convey to the people of Queensland that the state of affairs we have read of in recent times was actually in operation or existing there prior to the advent of the present Government.

"The Courier-Mail" today, in its subeditorial, said, referring to the Minister—

"He accepted what Ministers of Labour Governments had accepted before him. Many people are to blame for this shame being hidden from the Queensland public."

As a responsible member of Parliament I take exception to an attempt by the Press, which claims to have a sense of responsibility in these matters, to indict previous Labour Governments in regard to what has happened at Westbrook in recent times. The Press has

a very great duty in these matters. I agree that the Press, if they consider something is not as it should be, have a bounden duty to intimate to the public what they consider to be right or wrong. They do so in their columns, but I regret that in doing it in recent months they have been somewhat hysterical, and, in regard to one part of Mr. Swarten's report, I think that point is illustrated very forcefully. I think that some of the comments published in certain sections of the Press inflamed, as it were, what was already a very bad position. I should like to approach this sordid and grave matter objectively, and impartially, because I believe that is the right approach. The Minister would have done the Government more justice, the boys in the home more justice, and the people of Queensland more justice, if he had given an assurance that a complete and impartial investigation would be carried out immediately attention was directed to what had happened, and was happening at Westbrook. I appreciate fully the wisdom of keeping the names of these unfortunate boys from the public. I think anybody with humane considerations would agree that the name of any boy confined in that institution should not be revealed to the public so that it may be used against him when he rehabilitates himself. Perhaps the nature of the inquiry may have been justified for that reason. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, the appointment of legal representatives by the Minister may have been a matter for suspicion. I agree that in such a matter, when the public conscience is aroused, no action should be taken by any Minister or by any Government that may further aggravate it, or fail to appease the people who wish to know the truth.

I have no personal knowledge of the present Superintendent. I believe he was appointed in 1952 on the recommendation of the then Public Service Commissioner, the late Mr. Jock McCracken. Prior to his appointment we had never heard any grave comments about the conduct of Westbrook and we heard nothing serious about that institution until very recent times. Whether Mr. Gollidge was responsible for allowing a state of affairs to develop, I cannot, in all truth, say at this stage, because this report is so comprehensive and there are over 1,000 pages of transcript that the Minister has stated he will make available to me, and the Leader of the Opposition, and perhaps any other responsible member who wishes to peruse it. Until one has had an opportunity of perusing this very lengthy document and making one's assessment of the facts, I do not think one is justified in such condemnation. Before we make any decision affecting the man's status and his reputation and future position, we should be possessed of all the facts, but I say, here and now, that the punishment administered at Westbrook was reprehensible in many respects.

Mr. Ramsden: When did it start? How long has it been going on?

Mr. HILTON: The report does not say how long it has been going on.

Mr. Hanlon: There were no abscondings in 1957.

Mr. HILTON: There were no abscondings then. I reiterate that so far I do not believe there is anything in the report on which to indict any person or any officer prior to very recent times and for that reason I will not condemn any man outright. I wish to make these observations in fairness to all concerned: I know that in an institution such as Westbrook there will be boys of a vicious type. Some are really bad, and bad almost beyond redemption. Undoubtedly delinquency varies in degree. On their records, some of the inmates of Westbrook are really bad characters. In the last decade there has been an extraordinary increase in juvenile delinquency and many boys have been admitted to Westbrook. The number of juvenile delinquents has grown and the degree of delinquency has intensified.

Dr. Noble: We will get the number down to about 40 with our new plan.

Mr. Lloyd: It is still increasing.

Mr. HILTON: But in recent years the amount or degree of delinquency has increased tremendously.

Mr. Lloyd: By 5 per cent., according to the report of the Commissioner of Police for last year.

Mr. HILTON: That is in the last year, but in the last decade there has been an extraordinary increase in acts of violence and anti-social behaviour. The problem is much more serious than it was 20 or 30 years ago in many respects. The bad types cannot be handled with kid gloves. True, every effort should be made to reform the boys and to reconstruct their character, but it is obvious that, in the process, on occasions, some very severe corporal punishment must be handed out. It is significant that Mr. Swarten emphasises that in his report. According to him, in many cases the type of punishment was not calculated to reform the boys. I quite agree that it would encourage the wrong attitude of mind. I am not going to join the general public outcry. With delinquency and vandalism on the increase, it would be wrong when lads of this type are brought before the court and committed to Westbrook to suddenly regard them as angels to be treated with kid gloves. In my view appropriate punishment for their misdemeanours must be handed out to them. Of course, some of the forms of punishment in the past were not desirable and I am glad to have an assurance from the Minister that they will not be continued.

Dr. Noble: I stopped all those forms last January when I heard about them.

Mr. HILTON: I did not read of any comment by the Minister in the Press to that effect.

Dr. Noble: I did not say it.

Mr. HILTON: It is not for me to tell the Minister his business but if he had issued an instruction that that type of punishment should cease it would have allayed the public conscience if he had made a statement about it.

Mr. Hanlon: He could not make a public announcement that they had to cease, because he said before that they did not exist.

Mr. HILTON: That is a point for debate.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a point of order. As I have already said, a Minister of the Crown can only learn about these matters by questioning and re-questioning. After these complaints were made I called certain people together and as soon as I learned what had been happening I directed that those forms of punishment be discontinued. If they were continued after that, it was completely against my direction.

Mr. HILTON: If those types of punishment were continued after the Minister had issued instructions that they were not to be inflicted, that is a grave indictment of the Superintendent.

Dr. Noble: I did not say they were. I said, "If they were."

Mr. HILTON: "If they were." That implies something. I think that the Minister should be able to say now whether, when he issued those instructions, they ceased entirely.

Dr. Noble: I was told that they were being carried out as I instructed.

Mr. HILTON: Well, there seems to be a conflict of evidence on that point.

Dr. Noble: I was told that my instructions were being carried out.

Mr. HILTON: Were they in fact being carried out?

Dr. Noble: To my knowledge, they were.

Mr. HILTON: When public attention was focussed on these matters, particular care should have been taken. Perhaps a special officer of the department should have been sent to Westbrook for a time as an observer to ensure that the necessary reforms in regard to punishment were in fact being carried out in accordance with the instructions that the Minister says were issued. If that had been done, the public conscience would have been appeased to some extent in relation to all the statements that were being made about Westbrook.

I repeat that I know it is not possible to deal with some of the lads at Westbrook with kid gloves until they are reformed, if it is possible for an institution such as

Westbrook to reform them. But I think it is appalling that in recent years some young fellows who could be classed, even at this stage, as hardened criminals should have been in a position to influence and demoralise other young lads who had been sent there for what might be regarded as minor offences.

Dr. Noble: Don't you think that our plan to keep them apart, as we are doing now, is a good one?

Mr. HILTON: Certainly I do. But if, as the Minister says, there was a plan in hand when he took office to build a better institution—

Dr. Noble: A bigger one.

Mr. HILTON: A bigger Westbrook, the Government have the responsibility because they made no other efforts at that time.

Dr. Noble: Do you not think our idea is far better—to get them before they reach that stage?

Mr. HILTON: Credit for what the Minister is referring to now is really due to other people.

Dr. Noble: No. We introduced the Welfare and Guidance Clinics, we started the Wilson Hospital, we called in Monsignor Steele and put it to him that he should run a home for the Catholic Church, and we got the co-operation of the Congregational Church.

Mr. HILTON: I agree that welfare and guidance officers might do a good job, but a competent administrator at Westbrook could perhaps do the job much better. He would have practical experience in handling the bad types and the ones who perhaps should not have been sent there. I agree that it is entirely wrong for young lads who have committed only one or two minor offences to be committed to an institution where they can associate with youthful but, nevertheless, hardened criminals. On the evidence that I have read, some of the inmates of Westbrook come within that category, unfortunately. It is said that good comes out of evil. Perhaps there may soon be a saner and better approach to these problems that undoubtedly have been accentuated and have grown enormously in the last decade or so.

It is a very big problem. In addition to a home at Westbrook, we might consider establishing a home for delinquent parents. In examining the figures contained in the report, one finds that the majority of these unfortunate lads have come from most unsatisfactory homes.

Dr. Noble: We are having a look at the idea of supervision orders. Perhaps the hon. member for Wavell might tell the hon. member something about that.

Mr. HILTON: It is no good having a look at it. The Government are obliged to spend so much money on these institutions

that I think it is time the parents who are unashamedly guilty of allowing their children to descend into the depths of delinquency should be brought before the courts for punishment or committed to an institution of some sort.

Mr. Hughes: Surely you must agree that the State cannot make an angel out of a 16-year-old boy in a few weeks if he has become a delinquent after his parents have had him for 16 years.

Mr. HILTON: I have made that observation already. I shall develop it further. If a young lad or a young girl is brought up in a home where the parents are entirely irresponsible, a process or re-education over a long period of years is necessary. When the incidence of delinquency is increasing month by month and year by year are we to allow irresponsible people to continue unchecked to rear delinquents so that the Government, acting on behalf of society, have to spend enormous sums of money to look after them? I sincerely hope that the proposal to commit only bad cases to Westbrook will be given effect to.

Dr. Noble: It already has been done. There are only 68 boys there today.

Mr. HILTON: It is a big reduction.

Dr. Noble: A reduction of 70.

Mr. HILTON: A big reduction. I presume that the homes established by the various religious organisations will play an important role, as they have done in the past. Many orphanages have helped but when boys reach the age of 14 they can be very difficult to control and therefore they are no longer suitable for orphanages. I hope that the Boys Town plan will succeed. I am sure that it will meet with a great measure of success.

The report indicates that in recent years only a very small percentage of those discharged from Westbrook have made good. It is deplorable that after being committed to an institution that type of person is again let large on society to continue his former ways. I should like to see the statistics published so that a comparison could be made with the position when Mr. Jones was controlling the institution.

(Time expired.)

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell) (5.24 p.m.): Along with many other hon. members on this side I had intended to devote some time to the Westbrook matter and then deal with other aspects of the Minister's portfolio. But the Opposition moved an amendment that has created the situation in which the debate must be restricted to Westbrook. Having been hoist with their own petard hon. members opposite argued that they did not want to discuss only Westbrook. Although the Leader of the Opposition had 25 minutes in which to speak he confined himself to the subject of Westbrook. He waved his arms around in a histrionic fashion painting a

picture of the Government of Queensland, no doubt for the Press to take up. No doubt they will. He indicated that the subject was of such great importance that every hon. member opposite desired to discuss it. They then proceeded to move for the reduction of the Vote by £1 so that they could discuss it. But having realised the crass stupidity of the state of affairs they thus created they tried to give the impression that they did not really want to discuss Westbrook at all. Having been placed in the position that they had to vote on the matter, it fell to a back bench member of the Opposition to call "Divide." After the bells had been rung for about 20 seconds, the Leader of the Opposition called "Divide." It was a typical exhibition of what we can expect from the Opposition. It is a disorganised rabble that has decided to call itself an Opposition.

The hon. member for Carnarvon, in his typical fashion of looking at matters sanely and giving a reasoned comment thereon, stated that he did not feel that conditions were as bad in Westbrook as Opposition members had stated and as had been painted in the Press. He went on to say that the magistrate said that the punishments were inherited and had not changed with modern thought. I shall deal with that later.

The Minister for Health and Home Affairs and the Government have done nothing of which they need be ashamed in their approach to the welfare of children in this State. The Minister, Dr. Noble, needs no defence for his handling of the portfolio of Health and Home Affairs in general, and in particular, for his handling of affairs relating to child welfare in Queensland.

The Minister, in his introductory remarks on these Estimates, gave an outline of some of the horror he inherited in the handling of the unfortunate children of this State, particularly at Sandy Gallop where he found that mongoloid types, encephalitics, meningitis types and congenital idiots.

Mr. HANLON: I rise to a point of order. I have no desire to restrict this debate but I understand, Mr. Taylor, that your ruling was that we were confined, in this discussion, to Westbrook Home. Where, in a debate on Westbrook, does Sandy Gallop come in?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Wavell must confine his remarks to Westbrook.

Mr. DEWAR: When we find that particular attitude in regard to one type of unfortunate young person existing in the Labour Party we do not wonder that a reformatory such as Westbrook was established. That is the attitude towards young people that prevailed in the previous Government. It is not hard to understand how something such as Westbrook is today and such as we found it to be in the three or four years since we became the Government. That was the attitude towards subnormal kiddies in this State.

This farm at Westbrook is nothing more or less than another classic example of Labour's maladministration and their chickens have come home to roost. The whole story of their handling of young people follows the same pattern. The matter received no consideration whatever and, as a result, there followed the state of affairs that came to a head recently, mainly because certain individuals whom Mr. Schwarten named as very weak pillars, used lies and fed information to one member of the Opposition and to one allegedly reputable newspaper which blazoned it with headlines. In no uncertain terms the magistrate found that the particular newspaper, although it may not have been aware of the fact, was, by the article, inciting the boys to mutiny on that particular Sunday. He found—and there is no doubt about it—that that article was smuggled in to the boys, was discussed by them and was directly responsible for their breaking out at that time.

Mr. Lloyd: He did not say that it was directly responsible.

Mr. DEWAR: Has the hon. member read the report?

Mr. Lloyd: Yes.

Mr. DEWAR: That is more than I have done. I have had a very cursory look at it but I will show the hon. member that in it.

The volume of cleaning up with which this Government was confronted at Westbrook was terrific. The Minister has indicated that the Government did set up a Parliamentary Youth Inquiry. It was sneeringly suggested that it was a Government party inquiry. Well, we make no excuse for that. We asked members of the Opposition to come and give evidence.

A Government Member: What about Nugget Jesson?

Mr. DEWAR: The former member for Hinchinbrook, Mr. Jesson, asked me if he could give evidence. I said we would be very glad to hear his evidence, but he did not come to give it. We can only assume that he was told by his party not to do so. That indicates the complete lack of interest or concern of the Labour Party when it formed the Government. Labour members did not show any interest in the Government's move to create better conditions for the young people of the State.

I should like to refer to the report we made in 1959. It was tabled in the House. It deals with the reformatory type of establishment.

The CHAIRMAN: I trust the hon. member will be able to link it up with Westbrook.

Mr. DEWAR: It not only links up with Westbrook; it deals directly with Westbrook. I think you know, Mr. Taylor, that I would not step out of line. I want to quote from it because it is very germane to the debate.

The hon. member for Carnarvon stressed the need to bring parents before the court, and the Minister indicated this would be done. At this stage he is thinking in terms of supervision orders. In our 1959 report we set out a graduated scale of handling of young people, from court level down. One of the recommendations was in line with the suggestion of the hon. member for Carnarvon, that of bringing the child and parent before the court. We went on to recommend that reform institutions be in two groups, one, an intermediate institution catering for boys up to 15 years of age; and, two, the present Westbrook Farm Home for Boys to be restricted to boys over 15 years of age. I mention that mainly because of Mr. Schwarten's report. I think it would be fair to assume he had read the 1959 report. His recommendation is printed in his report almost exactly as it was printed in our report of May, 1959.

Mr. Lloyd: What date was that?

Mr. DEWAR: In 1959. The committee was set up late in 1957. It sat throughout 1958. The report took some weeks to compile and print. It was presented to Parliament and the Premier in May, 1959. The committee, comprising seven Parliamentary members, was conducted for less than £5. The general expenses of the inquiry were borne by the members themselves.

Since that time an amazing amount of success has been achieved. The Minister and the Government thought sufficiently of the comments in the report that they have taken positive steps in child welfare work in the community, among them being the establishment of the Wilson Home at Windsor for the handling of young people. That has been the means of taking quite a large percentage of the boys from Westbrook. As a matter of fact, one could almost believe that the timing of the "Truth" article was engineered by those powers who are endeavouring to find some chink in the Government's health programme. Their task is almost impossible, owing to the splendid community service given by the Government through the Department of Health. It is such that no holes can be found in it. I repeat that one would almost think the "Truth" article on a certain Sunday was timed for that day undoubtedly with the idea of seeing that a mutiny was incited at Westbrook just prior to the opening of the home at Windsor, because it was common knowledge to all reputable pressman that the Minister was to open the home and that the home was designed to take many of the younger lads from Westbrook so that at Windsor they could be housed, educated and given the psychiatric treatment they needed. I say again it was almost a deliberate attempt to destroy the whole atmosphere being created by the Minister and the department for the proper and adequate handling of these young people. If the article had been published a fortnight later, there would not

have been an outbreak. Approximately 50 boys would have gone from Westbrook. The Minister indicated today that the number has now reached 68. They have been taken away from the Westbrook type of reformatory and placed in institutions of other types. They are directly attributable to the work of the Minister and the Government, and they were completely ignored by the previous Governments of the State. A fantastic state of affairs is found. While members of the Opposition admit that many of the inmates of Westbrook under their Government were criminally negligent young people, with callous disregard for tender boys, they threw them into Westbrook, yet they say we are neglecting these lads. The only attitude of the Labour Government was to throw all the boys they could not put into Sandy Gallop—because they were not subnormal—into Westbrook. We cannot undo over 30 years of Labour maladministration in four years but we have indicated our sincerity by our approach. We have set up in the short term that we have been in control of this State, child clinics and psychiatric clinics at our courts, and at the Wilson Hostel. The Catholic Church has set up Boys Town and the Congregational Church are at Booval. I am not forgetting the Salvation Army. My colleague the hon. member for Sherwood is the chairman of a committee examining the establishment of a home for girls. We have encouraged all these projects, because they all have a bearing on Westbrook. We have already taken a large percentage of the boys from Westbrook where Labour incarcerated them. They put them all into Westbrook. Instead of putting them in Westbrook we are trying to give them the attention that all boys in Queensland are entitled to receive.

An Opposition Member: How many of them have you taken away?

Mr. DEWAR: Thirty of them are now at Windsor. Under the Labour system they would all have been in Westbrook mixing with other boys. We have placed many Westbrook boys at Beaudesert and in church homes. That has been the Government's attitude since we came to power.

Dr. Noble interjected.

Mr. DEWAR: Exactly. In the last 12 months the Minister has incorporated a system whereby lads who are not bad at heart, but have fallen into bad ways, are returned to the supervision of their parents. That was never done by the Labour Government.

Dr. Noble: They were going to build bigger Westbrooks.

Mr. DEWAR: Yes, exactly. We have to face the facts about this report.

Mr. Graham: Haven't you read it?

Mr. DEWAR: That is the hon. member's opinion.

Mr. Graham: You said so.

Mr. DEWAR: That is what the hon. member says. The hon. member said I could not be factual. In other words he is saying I am a liar, but he is not game to say that outright. We have to be factual about this report. We will excuse the Press for its flamboyant headlines. They have to put that muck out. We will excuse Mr. McCafferty for going along and clapping himself on the back and saying, "What a good boy am I", like little Jack Horner in the corner, and we will excuse the Leader of the Opposition for his histrionics.

I have had a cursory look at this report and I hope that at some time the Minister may let me have a copy of it. I believe that he will think it is imperative that the committee that has been set up for the benefit of youth should read this report and study it. Following my cursory glance at this report, I believe it is quite evident that the magistrate stresses a number of things. I do not disagree with his comments about corporal punishment. I have gone on record and said that I do not believe in it. The magistrate has said that the custodial staff has carried on in the same way as was the practice over the years. In other words, he is saying that the custodial staff has carried on in the same way as was laid down by the previous Labour Government. If hon. members opposite suggest that the present Minister or this Government are directly responsible for every cut that every boy has received at Westbrook in the last four years, then in all fairness they must agree that the Labour Government were responsible for every cut that every boy received during the previous years of Labour administration.

If hon. members opposite suggest that the present Minister and the present Government are responsible for every lash that has been administered in the last three years they must accept for their Minister and their Government responsibility for every lash that was administered in the previous 30 years. They cannot have it both ways. But they are never satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Mackay and other hon. members on my left are consistently heckling and saying the same thing over and over again, not as a form of question that might be answered by the hon. member who is speaking, but rather by making interjections as interruptions.

Mr. DEWAR: The magistrate went on to comment on the better physical condition of the Westbrook boys compared with a group of boys outside. Surely in all fairness the Press and members of the Opposition should consider both sides of the case. But, as Mr. Schwartz said, the continued Press reports kept the inmates stirred up. He referred to Daly and McCarthy,

who were cited in "The Sunday Mail" as having given information to the Press, and he called them very weak pillars. The "Truth" of 14 May, he said, was highly inflammatory. The boys did see it and it triggered off the outbreak. These are comments the magistrate made in his report.

He referred to boy 88, who fired the haystack. Incidentally, it may afford amusement to some misguided people to learn that that incident cost the taxpayers of Queensland £3,000. Mr. Schwarten went on to say that nothing could be said in favour of the boy. I am sure that some of my colleagues will go more deeply into the history of some of the lads. They are types who will be the future inmates of Boggo Road and other gaols, yet members of the Opposition weep crocodile tears on their behalf. The same boy has a long record of criminal acts. After he absconded, a number of such acts were committed. When he was charged it was brought out in evidence that he was one of a group of boys concerned in a fire at Mt. Gravatt which caused damage to the extent of £35,000 to £40,000. These are types who are acknowledged to be bad delinquents. Yet the Opposition are beating themselves into a fervour over them.

Mr. Tucker: There are a lot of other boys besides those.

Mr. DEWAR: We made an investigation—certainly not a very long one because we were investigating—

Mr. Tucker: I would not take any notice of your investigation.

Mr. DEWAR: I would not take much notice of the hon. member, either, so that makes us quits.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEWAR: We made an investigation, not into what was happening at Westbrook, because we were not called upon to do so, but an investigation into all aspects of child welfare in the State with a view to making recommendations on how the young people could get a far better deal than they ever had under the previous Government. After full inquiry we offered a suggestion about the younger lads who had been incarcerated in Westbrook by Labour. And we made this investigation in 1957-1958, just after we became the Government. We were appalled to see 11-year-olds, 12-year-olds, and 13-year-olds, up in this institution. That is why we made the recommendation. That is what we inherited and that is what this Minister and this Government have been striving over the last three years to overcome. They have achieved a great degree of success. Do we see blazing headlines about those successes? Not on your life! Do we see the Leader of the Opposition congratulating the Government on the establishment of the Wilson

Home, on child guidance clinics, and on psychiatric units? Do we receive any encouragement for the work at Boys Town? Not on your life! These matters are relegated to the realm of forgotten things because there is no political advantage to be gained by the Leader of the Opposition or members of his party in highlighting the good that is done by the Government. They look for the measly, mully-grubbing things and keep stressing them. Now that the Leader of the Opposition and his party have been hoist with their own petard and do not want to discuss Westbrook, we will keep the subject alive and see that they do discuss it.

Despite what hon. members opposite may say about the matter, despite what the Press has printed about it, I will go on record as saying that the Government are a humane Government, the Minister is a humane Minister, and the children of Queensland will get a far better deal at the hands of this Government than they ever had a chance of getting from the Australian Labour Party Government, with its dreadful record of neglect of the children of the State. Westbrook, as it was when we became the Government, is just another of the many things that we are attempting to get rid of. Before we leave the Treasury benches—it does not matter whether it is in 18 months or 18 years—we shall establish a proper child welfare system that will give to every child a reasonable chance, something that he did not have under former Labour Governments.

Hon. members opposite sat complacently in the Chamber for a number of years without raising their voices in criticism of what was going on. When we saw what was going on at Sandy Gallop, when we saw what was going on at Westbrook, where young neglected children were put in amongst hardened criminal types, we decided that action must be taken. We inherited these things from former Labour Governments, but we are going to get rid of them as quickly as we can.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (5.47 p.m.): I have never heard so much humbug and sham from anyone as I have heard from the hon. member for Wavell in relation to this subject. The only defence the Government have in regard to the obvious brutalities that have continued at Westbrook for the past four years is an attempt to turn the attack and take us back four and a-half years to the time of a former Labour Government.

It is all very well for the hon. member for Wavell and the Minister to come to the Committee and say that the Government are making a wonderful gesture by contributing to and supporting the establishment of Boys Town and other homes for wayward boys in the State. Similar grants were made by former Labour Governments.

For example, a grant of at least £70,000 or £80,000 was made by a Labour Government to the Home of the Good Shepherd at Mitchelton, where wayward girls are cared for and taught trades and crafts. The Sisters at that home are doing a wonderful job. I am only using that example to reply to the statements made by the Minister and the hon. member for Wavell. That was always the policy of former Governments, and it has merely been continued by this Government.

That has nothing to do with the report by Mr. Schwarten on conditions at Westbrook. The obvious brutality at Westbrook is regarded with a great deal of horror by the Press and by everybody in the community. I do not think it is right that the Minister should come before the Committee and try to belittle the findings in the report by quoting a number of minor extracts from it. The hon. member for Wavell went a little further and said that all the abscondings were due solely to statements made in the Press. Let me quote from one part of the report. At page 65 Mr. Schwarten says—

"In fact I think that the over-indulgence in corporal punishment was one of the major factors contributing to the break-out of the 14 May, 1961, for I believe that the hope of escape from the strap was a big influence in the minds of some of those who broke out and attempted to escape."

Is that not enough indication that the report contains sufficient evidence of brutality to warrant the public's being alarmed and that there should be some form of censure of the Minister and his administration? In opening the debate the Minister said that he had been aware of a number of things going on at Westbrook early this year but had taken corrective action. He believed that his instructions were being carried out. Let us look at some of the statements he made early this year and the statements made by the hon. member for Wavell. The hon. member said that in 1957 the committee of which he was chairman made a report that delinquent children—

Mr. DEWAR: I rise to a point of order. I did not say in 1957. I said the report was in 1959.

Mr. LLOYD: I do not believe that the hon. member for Wavell and the other members of the committee set up by the Government parties ever went to Westbrook.

Mr. DEWAR: I rise to a point of order. That is a reflection on the committee. I stated that my committee went to Westbrook. We went to Westbrook!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Kedron to accept the hon. member's assurance.

Mr. LLOYD: I willingly accept that assurance. All the time the hon. member was speaking I was endeavouring to find out whether the committee went to Westbrook. He said that in 1957 and 1958 they were making that investigation into juvenile delinquency. The report was submitted in 1959. During 1957 and 1958 when the investigation was being made and the report compiled why did they not acquaint the Minister of what was going on at Westbrook? Why wait until now to inform us that they were aware of what was going on at Westbrook? They are condoning the state of affairs that existed.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is casting reflections on the committee of which I was a member. He is saying that we are condoning and did condone whatever happened at Westbrook. The burden of what we said in our report was that segregation should take place. Our investigation did not establish one way or the other the truth or falsity of the allegations about corporal punishment.

Mr. LLOYD: I accept the explanation of the hon. member, but I can only draw my own conclusions. I have the assurance that the committee went to Westbrook in 1957 or 1958.

Mr. Dewar: In 1958.

Mr. LLOYD: Surely the conditions that existed were quite obvious to the committee. If we accept the statement by the hon. member for Wavell that the committee's visit was made in 1958, that was only a year or so after the Government came into power yet no action was taken about the growth of the modern Belsen for juvenile delinquents, which had been created not by any previous Government but by the present Administration. I shall give some figures. From the Minister's recent newspaper statements I expected that he would attempt to shelve the responsibility for the Westbrook incidents either onto his public servants or onto previous Administrations. Therefore I took the trouble to read several of the reports prior to 1957. In the report of the Director of State Children for 1955 it was said that the average boy does not prove to be a problem and usually settles down quite well. Visitors, both interstate and overseas, find it difficult to understand how boys are held where gates and fences are open.

In the 1956 report there is a similar passage in which the Director stated—

"Abscondings are not common. The superintendent stated that Westbrook is conducted as an honour system and has neither high walls no cells. In spite of the fact that many of the boys are not unaware of the means of escape available through modern forms of transport, abscondings are not common."

Those are the 1955 and 1956 reports of the Director of State Children tabled in this Parliament. In 1957 the figure is even

more startling. The Director informed this Parliament that there were no abscondings at all. He stated in 1957 too—and I want to compare this with the five years prior to 1957—that 67 per cent. of the inmates of Westbrook who were discharged never offended against the law again. I compare that item with what appears in Mr. Swarten's report which states that during the past four years, of the inmates who have been discharged from Westbrook Home, 45 per cent. actually reverted to crime. In other words, recidivism increased from 33 per cent. to 45 per cent.

Let us look at the abscondings. I have made a comparison of the past three years with the three years prior to 1957. The 1956 report of the Director of State Children indicated that abscondings were not common despite the open honour system that operated. Although there were no high fences or closed gates abscondings were very few. In 1957 there were no abscondings. In the last year of the Labour Government there was not one absconding. In 1958 the number of abscondings was 14. In 1959 they had increased to 22, in 1960 to 32 and in the last year to 71.

If there had been any excuse for the boys absconding from the home it would be brutality. That is sufficiently clear from Mr. Swarten's report that in his opinion the incidence of corporal punishment that had been going on at the home for four years, was directly responsible for the abscondings that had been taking place for some time.

The first figures I have given are those during the administration of the Labour Government. During the period of this Government's administration abscondings increased from nil to 71, the figure for the last year. That in itself is sufficient evidence that there has been this growing discontent, and while the Minister tried to make an issue of the fact that the Labour Government prior to 1957 had already announced their intention of rebuilding the Westbrook Home, he claimed that as being to their discredit.

Regardless of what has been occurring during the last few years, in intermediate stages of the handling of juvenile delinquents, the fact remains that the Westbrook Farm Home for Boys will have to be rebuilt and the intention of the previous Labour Government carried out.

If the Youth Committee did actually visit Westbrook, they must have seen the same things that I witnessed when I was there—the latrines in a shocking condition, the laundry not fit for animals, the ablutions block in the same condition, the food shocking, the dining-room was unsuitable and inadequate, the crockery, cutlery and all the facilities available to the boys very bad, the sleeping quarters a shell of a building with cracks in between the wooden walls.

Mr. Ramsden: When did you go there?

Mr. LLOYD: In July this year I went to Westbrook. I have referred to the statement of the Minister and that of the hon. member for Wavell who was chairman of the Committee on Youth Problems. I charge the Minister with making excuses in his own defence, in a desperate attempt to make the public believe he is doing everything possible to overcome the problems.

Those who eventually finish up at the Westbrook Farm Home for Boys are young people under 18 years who are charged in the courts. The Commissioner of Police in his report for last year said that 38 per cent. of criminal offences were committed by juveniles, that is, persons under 21 years, an increase of 4.5 per cent. on the figure for the year ended 30 June, 1960. So regardless of the Minister's alleged efforts to overcome the problems we have a continuing increase in the percentage, and that trend has been apparent for the past four years. It is rather strange that Mr. Swarten's report is based only on happenings during the past four years. All hon. members must admire his courage in making the report he did.

Dr. Noble: He probably would not have made that report under Labour. He would have been scared to.

Mr. LLOYD: That is a typical remark of the Minister when he has his back to the wall. It is typical also of other members of Cabinet who have been charged with matters that have cropped up from time to time. They immediately attempt to smear people. Responsibility remains with the Minister, regardless of his protestations.

We have the assurance of the hon. member for Wavell that the Westbrook Home was visited by the Committee on Youth Problems. They must have been aware of the conditions there. The Minister's admission that he knew of the conditions is an indictment of him, having regard to his subsequent statements.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a point of order. I should like to know whether the hon. member is referring to punishments. I told the Committee this afternoon very definitely that when I learned at the beginning of this year of certain punishments I gave instructions that they were to cease.

Mr. LLOYD: That is the point I am coming to.

Dr. Noble: Should I have allowed them to continue?

Mr. LLOYD: No. I have already indicated to the Committee that recidivism has increased by 13 per cent. in the four years since 1957, according to the report of the Director of State Children; further, that there were no abscondings from the home in 1957 prior to when the Government assumed office. There must be a good reason. It must be obvious to hon. members on this side, and, I am certain, to Government

members, that something happened between 1957 and 1961 to create the circumstances that make possible the tabling of a report such as has been received from Mr. Schwarten.

The Minister admits that he was aware of some of the punishments that were inflicted at the Westbrook home, and that he gave instructions that they were to cease. Punishments had not been covered by regulation.

Dr. Noble: They had been going on for 30 years.

Mr. LLOYD: From 1916 only one regulation or Order in Council has altered the system, and that was the one of November, 1958.

A Government Member: What was that?

Mr. LLOYD: When that part of the body of the inmate was declared as being the only part to be struck.

In other words, at that time, the Minister must have known what was beginning at Westbrook. Yet, in March of this year, he said that he was quite happy with conditions there and that he had all the confidence in the world in the administration of the Westbrook Farm Home. But now he tells us he knew what was going on early this year. A statement was made by Mr. Golledge in "The Sunday Mail" of 5 March, 1961, after the Minister gained his knowledge about corporal punishment. Mr. Golledge stated—

"If corporal punishment is done away with I'll walk out tomorrow and every man will follow. If they give cheek or steal or swear, I'll flog them—no bargain."

There was no denial of that, and subsequently the Minister said that Mr. Golledge was a humanitarian, and a lover of children who had made many appeals to him with tears in his eyes. If the Minister had given these instructions to the administrators of the home, why were these statements made subsequently, and why were not these statements sufficient indication to the Minister that an immediate inquiry was necessary?

Dr. Noble interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: I have only a few minutes left, and I wish to make the best use of them.

In 1959, Judge Andrews of the District Court stated that he did not like the idea of sending any boy to the Westbrook Farm Home, that it was more or less primary education for the university of crime. That was substantiated by Mr. Schwarten's report. Have Government members read Mr. Schwarten's report, or have they simply listened to what has been read to them, just picking out a few brief extracts from the report about everything that happened under Labour administration? We are concerned mainly with the

method of meting out punishment to the inmates of Westbrook, and if we are to believe Mr. Schwarten he is concerned only with the past four years of administration.

A Government Member: Where did he say that?

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member should read the report.

I had made a statement to the Press that it was intended to have a full, frank and open discussion on Westbrook when the House met, and within four or five days of that statement appearing in the Press the Minister said that he intended to table the report and have it printed. Is the non-printing of the report an attempt to gag the debate? The hon. member for Townsville South complained that he and the other three independent members had not received a copy of the report and one was then made available to him. The Opposition had 24 hours' notice to examine two copies of the report. What have hon. members on the Government benches done? They have not read the report. At least our two copies have been circulating in the last 24 hours among members of the Opposition. How can hon. members opposite say what they are supporting, or say if anything is right or wrong, if they have just taken brief extracts from the report given to them by the Minister? Are they in a position to say that they have carefully examined and analysed Mr. Schwarten's report? I doubt it. I doubt that they are equipped to vote on the subject.

The assurances given by the Minister were obviously a desperate attempt by him to cover up his own weakness. He made a number of statements and gave assurances publicly that there was nothing wrong at Westbrook. When he was forced into it he declared that an inquiry would be held and he made it a closed inquiry. We criticised that and we still do. The public of Queensland are entitled to know the full story, and they were entitled to that at the time.

The Minister said he did not want to disclose the names of any of the juveniles who might give evidence, but nothing in the terms of reference of an open inquiry would prevent him from informing the Press, on behalf of the Parliament or the Government, that they were not to divulge the names of any witnesses without the permission of the tribunal. So his statement on that falls to the ground.

The Minister produced to the Committee three articles—a knuckle duster, a hinge from some fictitious door and a bolt in the form of a dagger.

Mr. Armstrong: It was not from a door; it was from a gate.

Dr. Noble: It was part of the support of guttering on a roof.

Mr. LLOYD: The Minister said that that part of the support of guttering for a roof—the shank which fits into the fascia board to hold the guttering—which apparently has never been used, was found on an inmate. When the Government had their backs to the wall and when the Minister was embarrassed, suddenly out of the blue he produced those three articles—the knuckle duster, the hinge and the bolt from a gate or a door, whatever it is—but he did not give any evidence that any of them was ever used.

Dr. Noble: Yes, one was.

Mr. LLOYD: I deny that. The Minister said that the dagger was taken from an inmate.

Dr. Noble: Not the dagger.

Mr. LLOYD: The other two articles were never used.

Dr. Noble: One of them was.

Mr. LLOYD: He tells us now that the three items produced by the hon. member for Brisbane—the piece of hosing, the boots and the bottle of castor oil were items that were used—

(Time expired.)

Mr. HERBERT (Sherwood) (7.28 p.m.): In my terms in this Assembly both in opposition and in government I have had to listen to some rather poor speeches, but the Leader of the Opposition subjected us to the worst example of mealy-mouthed hypocrisy we have ever had to listen to. As the leader of a responsible Opposition group he moves an amendment, does not know his Standing Orders, and learns after moving the amendment that he has made a mistake and that he has restricted us to talking on Westbrook. He tells us right up till the time we enter the Chamber that he is going to talk Westbrook until the finish. He moves an amendment and when he realises what he has done he tries to crawl out of it by making a series of excuses. When the question was put to the vote it was not the Leader of the Opposition who called "Divide"; it was one of the boys behind him, who has probably been caned for doing it. All of us have prepared speeches on subjects that come within these Estimates. I have prepared a paper on the Salvation Army Home for Girls at Toowong and I hoped to put it before the Committee under the appropriate Estimates. It is a story the people of this State should know. Now, through the behaviour of the Leader of the Opposition, we are restricted to talking about Westbrook.

Mr. Duggan: Don't you think it is important?

Mr. HERBERT: I think Westbrook is very important but I am drawing attention to the hypocrisy of hon. members opposite.

Mr. Duggan: The Minister took two and a-half hours of the time of the Committee.

Dr. Noble: You have been talking right through, too.

Mr. HERBERT: I remind you, Mr. Taylor, that the Leader of the Opposition began by asking for your protection so that he could make his 25 minutes' speech as effectively as possible. He has not stopped talking since. But what did he do as soon as he began speaking? He attacked two lawyers in this city who have no chance of talking back to him.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HERBERT: He said they were members of the Liberal Party, as if that was something about which they should keep quiet. I have been a member of the executive of the Liberal Party for 10 years, but I have never even met one of the gentlemen mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. He may be a member of the Liberal Party; I do not know.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HERBERT: According to the Opposition, apparently we should have had on the Westbrook inquiry characters such as the hon. member for South Brisbane, who did try to get into it. What have the political affiliations of the men appearing as legal advisers to do with the matter?

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in reflecting on the character of the hon. member for South Brisbane? He is a member of the Assembly and is entitled to the protection of the Standing Orders.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! No hon. member is permitted to reflect on the character of another hon. member. I do not think the hon. member for Sherwood did so, otherwise I should have called him to order.

Mr. HERBERT: I think the Leader of the Opposition is over-sensitive about his absent colleague.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to continue with his speech.

Mr. HERBERT: According to the story that we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy, the people on the staff at Westbrook changed suddenly about 1957. Westbrook came into service in 1900. For 45 years we had Labour Governments running the State and running Westbrook. When we took over on 30 July, 1957, there were 18 male staff at Westbrook, every one of them, including the Superintendent, appointed by Labour Governments. On 14 May, 1961, the staff at Westbrook comprised 23 males and two females, and of those 16 were male members of the old staff that were in office in 1957. Are we to believe that until we took office the men in charge of the Home were doing everything according to the rules and that suddenly, by some Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde change, in 1957 they became sadists? On his own admission, when did the Deputy Leader of the

Opposition go to Westbrook? This year, after the story broke. He had not been there before when he was a member of the Government and when he might have been able to do something about whatever may have been happening there.

Opposition Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HERBERT: I am not here to defend the staff of Westbrook, not by any shadow of the imagination, but I am pointing out that it is not correct to blame a Government that have been in office for only four years for something that may have been happening for a much longer period. As I said, Labour Governments were in office for 45 years. The Superintendent, Mr. Golledge, was appointed to that position in 1952 by a Labour Government. If he was failing in his duty in 1961, he was failing in 1952, also. For 45 years there was no amendment to the rules and regulations relating to the running of the Home, and today an amendment has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition to prevent us speaking on these Estimates about all the other improvements instituted by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs for the benefit of juvenile delinquents—the hospital at Windsor, which takes so many boys that we have fewer than ever at Westbrook; the Marsden Home and the home at Riverview, which are now taking boys who previously would have been sent to Westbrook. If we had talked about them, we should have been giving the Committee a story of achievement by the Minister.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke about the weapons that the Minister produced in the Chamber. He said that they had never been used, and he mentioned particularly the one that I have in my hand. As an example of the type of lad in Westbrook and as an example of how this was used, I shall read to the Committee the case history of the young man who used this weapon. I will not use his name for obvious reasons. We will call him "A". Here is his history—

"8-11-57—Appeared in Brisbane Children's Court charged with stealing. Admonished and discharged.

"6-2-59—Appeared in Brisbane Children's Court on a charge of unlawful assault causing bodily harm. Committed to the Supreme Court for sentence.

"19-2-59—Appeared in Supreme Court and was released on probation to the care of his father at Red Hill.

"3-3-59—Appeared in Children's Court, Brisbane, on a charge of aggravated assault. Complaint struck out on non-appearance of parties.

"21-10-59—Appeared in Brisbane Children's Court on summons for evading bus fare.

"27-1-60—In Children's Court, Brisbane, on charge of assault. Admonished and discharged.

"27-1-60—In Brisbane Children's Court on a charge of attempting to steal. He was remanded in custody to 25-2-60. Admitted to Westbrook.

"25-2-60—Appeared in Brisbane Children's Court (on remand). Admonished and discharged.

"29-4-60—Brisbane Children's Court on charge of unlawful assault causing bodily harm (policeman). Committed for trial to the District Court.

"18-5-60—In District Court, Brisbane. Committed to Farm Home for Boys, Westbrook, until he attains the age of 18 years. Admitted to Brisbane General Hospital with Osteomyelitis.

"3-6-60—Transferred back to Westbrook.

"14-6-60—Admitted to Toowoomba General Hospital.

"11-11-60—Absconded from hospital and returned to Westbrook.

"17-11-60—Refused to obey orders and threatened a warder.

"20-11-60—Struck warder with an iron bar. Removed to Toowoomba Watch-house."

This is the bar he hit the warder with. He hit him on the head. His history continues—

"16-1-61—Appeared in Toowoomba Police Court on charge of unlawful assault. Committed for sentence by District Court, Brisbane.

"17-2-61—In Brisbane District Court. Sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour for eighteen months."

Yet the Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that the weapons are a lot of fakes, that they have never been used. A warder was hit over the head with that instrument and that youth was dealt with for the offence. He was very lucky he did not appear on a charge of murder. I have here a number of cases taken at random involving some of the youngsters at the home. They are sad cases because you cannot very well blame the youngsters—in most cases their environment is to blame. Nevertheless they have been involved in some sordid escapades and terrible crimes. They pose difficult problems for the staff to handle. I am not condoning anything that the staff may have done. In all fairness I should say that they are not dealing with graduates from some exclusive girls' school but with a particular type of youngster that nobody else has been able to control who, after 16 years of heartbreak for their parents and friends, have ended up in that institution. Naturally with a collection of youngsters like that you will have some trouble with the staff running the institution.

Those who have had an opportunity to read Mr. Schwarten's report will know that at page 74 he says—

"The Superintendent and staff at Westbrook have been guards, first, last and always."

Note the "always". They have been in charge of it for 45 years. Continuing he says—

"They are not to be blamed for this; under the circumstances they could not be otherwise; they were employed as such, they were not otherwise trained, and guidance and corrective training of the inmates was not part of their duty.

"I consider that the Superintendent and warders should be required to undergo a course of departmental training. As well as being trained in institutional administration and duties, they should be required to have some knowledge of delinquency and its causes and treatment, and some training in Social Welfare work, that will give them an insight into the problems and frustrations that beset the inmate from his poor environmental background and criminal record and how best to deal with them and such other training as is necessary to guide and help them in achieving the aims of the Institution."

Those are the magistrate's comments on the institution and I think we all agree with them. The Minister certainly does because he has already started work in that direction, long before this inquiry was ordered. That is exactly what is being done at Wilston and it is exactly what is being done by the various church homes. It will be found that, in the comparatively near future, Westbrook will become an institution for the more difficult lads rather than what it has been in the past—every lad who plays up is shot into Westbrook and forgotten about. That is what the previous Government did.

Mr. Duggan: That is completely untrue and the records show it to be untrue.

Mr. HERBERT: The records speak for themselves. The figures and numbers there tell the story of neglect by the previous administration. Hon. members opposite never bothered to go to Westbrook.

Certain accusations were made about the Parliamentary Committee of Inquiry into Youth Problems. I had the honour to serve on that committee and I went to Westbrook with other members of it. I have also read this report in conjunction with the other members of the Health and Home Affairs committee under the Minister's guidance, so I feel that I have the right to speak on this matter a little better advised than the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who, on his own admission has not read the report and only went to Westbrook for political purposes. It is remarkable to see hon. members opposite rushing to the defence of their absent brethren.

Mr. Bennett: Who prepared that brief for you?

Mr. HERBERT: I do not need anybody to prepare my brief for me. I prepared it from my own observations. I have had the opportunity of reading the report and

I read it intelligently. I think a solution of the problem can be founded on one basis and one only, and that is to better the interests of the lads and the community as a whole and not to try to steal some cheap political advantage as has been done by hon. members opposite.

Yesterday in the newspapers, before this matter came before the Committee for discussion, the Leader of the Opposition used extravagant words like "sadism" and others that he knew very well would be attractive to the newspapers and would make good newspaper copy. He goes far beyond what this report does, yet we still have not had a suggestion from the other side of the Chamber about what should be done at Westbrook. Hon. members can compare that with the propositions that have already been put up by the Minister on the manner in which delinquent youth in this State are going to be handled.

For the first time in the history of Queensland there has been a transformation. The Wilson Home is the Minister's second stage in handling the problem, after he had already built up his guidance clinics in the State, under the control of competent psychiatrists and psychologists. In other words, he is tackling the problem of Westbrook before the lads get there, looking after these youngsters before they get to these places where they are a complete charge on the State.

We have had a proposition advanced from the other side of a bigger and better Westbrook as being the answer, but we hope to see Westbrook finally reduced to handling a very small hard core of the types represented by these records that I have here. They are some of the more unfortunate lads from the home. Some of the cases here, although mere boys, have up to 20 and 30 charges against them.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. Is any member of this Assembly entitled to go to the C.I. Branch and get the record of anybody convicted through the courts?

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

Mr. HERBERT: Every time the hon. member enters the chamber he rises to a point of order and then rushes out again.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. HERBERT: I have been accused by the Leader of the Opposition of running away from Inala but at least I did not run around Queensland contesting three different seats to get into this Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Irrelevant interjections and answers to irrelevant interjections are not desirable and I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. HERBERT: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. At times we get carried away when needed by some of the temporary members on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HERBERT: If hon. members opposite had been interested in finding a solution to the problem, they would not have concentrated as they have on seeking cheap political advantage by telling the Minister to resign. They do not seem to realise that the public outside know very well how they suffered under a Labour administration for 45 years and they know Westbrook was there all those years. They know also that the superintendent who is being transferred was appointed a warder and later the Superintendent by a Labour Government. Further, they realise the Minister has not been responsible for the failings that have now become apparent. Hon. members opposite try to say that all these matters have developed in four years during the period of office of the present Government and that nothing happened prior to 1957. If there were no abscondings at that time I hate to think why the inmates were not game to abscond. I have some ideas as to the reason. It may be that they knew that under a Labour Government life outside was pretty tough and therefore they had no desire to escape. That may have had some bearing on their decision.

The plain fact is that institutions of this type have always had a history of absconding. If hon. members read the report they will find that it names the "Truth" newspaper well and truly as being one of the agencies most responsible for the mass break-out, the newspaper having been given to the inmates of the home by certain interested people.

I suggest that Westbrook could be reconstructed on lines similar to those adopted by the Salvation Army in its re-building scheme for the home at Toowong. The home could be divided into sections in the same way as the Toowong home and, with suitable rewards for good behaviour, we may get in the lads a reaction somewhat different from the reaction to date. I realise that the Toowong system would not be quite applicable to Westbrook, because so far we have no homes of the type of Boys Town, Riverview, and the Marsden Home for the girls. If we could have a system of gradation of young people, they would have the opportunity if they desired to take it, of improving their position and possibly of being released at an earlier date. The tougher types could be kept apart. We would find that the conditions would improve.

I should very much like to speak at length about the Toowong home. The story of it should be told in this chamber, but unfortunately, owing to the action of the Leader of the Opposition, I am precluded from discussing it and have to keep to the report on Westbrook. The next time the Estimates

come up for discussion I think the Westbrook home will have settled down and the people will realise they owe a great debt to the Minister for the work he has done by the introduction of social workers and trained personnel to the Department of Health and Home Affairs and the State Children Department. We will then have trained people dealing with young people before they are sent to Westbrook. In other words, instead of letting the conduct of the youths deteriorate so that they have to be sent to Westbrook, we may save them long before then and save them from being locked in Westbrook. The Wilson Home has already proved a success and 30 youngsters are at present there who five, six, or seven years ago, under a Labour Government, would have gone straight to Westbrook, without any hope of getting out until they were 18, although it is possible that they could be sent to a farm if it was believed they could be trusted. The Minister has stated that in later years the 30 youngsters at the Wilson Home will appreciate what has been done for them by the trained people to whom they may refer their problems. This service was never available to them before. As Mr. Schwarten said, they were previously found guilty by the court and shot up to Westbrook. There may have been thousands of reasons for their conduct, and possibly psychiatric causes, but that did not enter into consideration. They were sent to Westbrook and forgotten because, in those days, previous Governments made quite certain that no-one could get up there to see them. There was a very high wall of secrecy kept around them to see that no-one could find out what was going on.

I compliment the Minister on his work and, I am sure, the State will compliment him when the full story is known. I feel sure that this motion will be defeated because it has no foundation whatsoever.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (7.52 p.m.): I support the motion of censure moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Firstly, I point out that it ill becomes the hon. member for Sherwood to accuse the Opposition of trying to make political capital out of these happenings. In fact, we were subjected to some criticism in the Press in the early months of the year because we allegedly were not making political capital out of it. The Leader of the Opposition rightly pointed out that because of our sense of responsibility at that time we did not immediately rush in, boots and all, as hon. members opposite did on so many occasions when they were in Opposition and made charges without any real evidence to support them. We believed that when the evidence was put before the Minister on the charges made that as he was responsible for the home, he would immediately have an enquiry made into the allegations.

The report of the magistrate was tabled by the Minister on Tuesday night. Has

there ever been a more snide political practice than that adopted by the Minister in the tabling of the report? It was given to him by Mr. Schwarten on 27 September, 1961, and today is 16 November. A long time has elapsed since the report was handed to the Minister and he waited until Tuesday last to take the unprecedented step of tabling the report just before the House rose on Tuesday night. Many reports have been tabled during the session, but until Tuesday night I had yet to see any Minister table any report at such an hour. He has been hugging this one to his chest for six or seven weeks. The Minister was obviously hoping that many of the charges would be published in the Press before the Opposition had had a chance of dealing with them. We all know how sour hon. members opposite are on the Brisbane "Telegraph" because it asked the Leader of the Opposition to comment on the report. The hon. member for Sherwood said that it was wrong for the Leader of the Opposition to comment on the report before it came to Parliament, but it was not wrong for the Minister to hold onto it for six or seven weeks. It was not wrong for the Minister not to print the report so that it would not be available to every hon. member, and it was not wrong for the Minister to have a photo of the exhibits displayed in the mid-day Press before he made his speech about Westbrook. All these things are not wrong because they were designed for the political advantage of the Government. When the Opposition make some comments on the matter we are accused of not adopting a responsible attitude.

I strongly endorse the protest of the Leader of the Opposition at the failure of the Government to print the report. We had the spectacle of the hon. member for Wavell pleading with the Minister to give him time to read it later as he thinks every hon. member should read it. If he thinks that, why did he not get his Government to print it? He wants to read it but apparently he does not want the 25 members of the Opposition to read it.

Mr. Dewar: We did the right thing and brought the Estimates on so that you could discuss the matter.

Mr. HANLON: If they really wanted to give Parliament an opportunity to discuss it fully, they could have introduced a Bill to amend the State Children Act, which would have given us 25 minutes each at the introductory stage and 40 minutes each on the second reading and so on. The Minister has indicated that an amendment to the Act is necessary. He could have introduced a Bill.

The history of Westbrook is contained in the report. It is all right for the Minister to talk about the Wilson Hospital and all the other improvements—Boys Town, the

Marsden Home and so on. That is all current history. We are moving an amendment as a motion of censure on the Government for their failure to deal with the position when evidence was put before them. They endeavoured to cover up the situation and to smother all criticism right from the word go.

The Minister claims that in January this year he gave specific orders that certain forms of punishment should cease. He mentioned among others the castor-oil punishment and the strapping on the bare buttocks, yet about that time he went on record as having denied that that went on. When the complaints of these practices were first made by people whom he has since labelled as unreliable witnesses, he denied them. Now he tells us he directed that they be stopped. How could he stop something that did not occur? He condemns himself by his own words, just as the Superintendent does. I do not say that the Minister has not been sincere in his fashion, but he has been endeavouring to cover up for political purposes. He has adopted the attitude that this Government adopt on every other matter. As soon as a complaint is made they think a political attack is being made on them so they try to smother it. They do not give anybody credit—whether it is the Opposition or an ordinary citizen in the community or the Press—for trying to do something purely in the public interest. As soon as somebody criticises any section of governmental administration they go into a double smother because they think they are being attacked politically. That is what happened about Westbrook.

"The Courier-Mail" briefly outlined the history. As has already been pointed out, in 1957 there were no abscondings from Westbrook. Government members asked was there some automatic change that came about in 1957 when the previous Government went out and this Government came in. We do not suggest that there was any magical transformation at that time but it is very significant that until 1957 there were very few abscondings from Westbrook; in 1957 no inmates absconded; in 1958-1959 up to 20 absconded and in the last year there were 71. That shows that there has been some laxity of supervision of the home in the last three years. What has the Minister done? He wants to take credit for the good work of the Wilson Hospital, the Marsden Home, Boys Town and so on, claiming that it was due to his foresight and that he initiated it, but dealing with the bad parts of Mr. Schwarten's report he refers to the previous Director. It is most unfair of him to refer to Mr. Harris in an oily fashion, praising him and saying that everybody respected him—as they indeed did—and more or less shovelling the blame onto a man who has retired, and retired with a great deal of credit, for

his administration of the State Children Department. I think that the Minister was unfair in doing that.

What has been the position in recent times? In 1960 18 lads escaped at various times. In March, 1961, dozens of letters, many from the parents of inmates, alleging brutality by warders and poor conditions poured in to the Press. On 22 April the mayor of Toowoomba made charges relating to Westbrook and called on the Government for an inquiry. On 23 April the Minister for Health and Home Affairs announced a new deal for Westbrook. On 12 May, when a Meet The Press TV session was recorded, Dr. Noble said, "I am certain you would find Westbrook is a very good show." He said that the home's superintendent, Mr. Roy Gollidge, was "a decent, honest citizen with a deep love for boys". That statement was made at the very time when the home was blowing up in the Government's face. I recall the Minister's saying that he had made such a long speech today and taken so much credit for himself because he was tired of hiding his light under a bushel. All I can say is that he must have hidden his light under a bushel at Westbrook, because it went up in flames under this Government on 14 May.

Hon. members opposite have been most unfair in trying to draw from the remarks of the magistrate, Mr. Schwarten, in his report the inference that the entire blame for the unrest at Westbrook lay with the Press. They referred particularly to "Truth" and to the issue of that paper that appeared on the day on which the outbreak occurred. Hon. members opposite applaud the action of people who are oppressed to breaking point, particularly people in Communist countries who are dominated by the government of the day, in rising against a tyrannical government. If there is an outbreak against oppression in a Communist country hon. members opposite say it is very good. But what was the position at Westbrook? Was there not oppression there? Not in our words, but in the words of Mr. Schwarten in his report—

"I am satisfied that at Westbrook the following forms of punishment have been inflicted on the inmates—

- (a) Administering of castor oil.
- (b) Walking the path.
- (c) Hair shorn as close as possible to the scalp.
- (d) Kangarooing (down on haunches and jumping up and down).
- (e) Standing out in recreation room and at foot of bed in ward.
- (f) Corporal punishment with the strap."

To give an illustration of the use of castor oil, Mr. Schwarten says at page 25 of his report—

"The Superintendent admits that the oil was administered by holding back the

head of the inmate and pouring the oil direct from the bottle into the open mouth and down the throat of the inmate. In the process, from instinctive revulsion some of the oil would spill on the inmate's clothes and he would be compelled to wear those clothes until the following Sunday, change day."

In other words, if that occurred on a Monday, he would have to wear his clothes until the following Sunday. We all know what castor oil smells like after half an hour. What would it smell like after a week? He goes on to say—

"The following are instances of castor oil punishment—

- Boy 131 for eating raw cabbage from his own garden bed;
- Boy 142 for eating stolen cauliflower;
- Boy 72 for wetting pants;
- Boy 54 for eating green beans and one pea;
- Boy 2 for eating beans;
- Boys 11 and 7 for eating stolen green grapes. Both denied that they actually ate any grapes."

Whether they did or not, that is an example of the castor oil treatment. If the 78 members of this Assembly were young people and we were in Westbrook, how long do hon. members opposite think we would put up with that treatment? We speak about militant unionists and people living under conditions of oppression in Communist countries and say that they could not tolerate such things. Obviously these boys were driven to the point where they could not tolerate conditions at Westbrook any longer. It may be true that their decision to break out was affected by the publicity they were getting; but it is also true to say that the very night on which they staged the outbreak the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, the man on whom they were depending to look after them, the man to whose care they were entrusted by the children's court or whatever court may have committed them to Westbrook, was appearing on television to say that everything in the garden was lovely at Westbrook and that there was nothing to worry about. Yet the Minister says that the Press incited them into that action. We do not attempt to condone their actions in setting fire to haystacks and causing thousand of pounds worth of damage, but they were oppressed. It has been proved that they were severely oppressed. Had they not taken drastic action and broken out that night they would still be getting the castor oil treatment and other ill-treatment found by the magistrate.

Dr. Noble: They were not getting the castor oil treatment at the time of the outbreak. That ceased in January last.

Mr. HANLON: I do not want to engage in tedious repetition but the Minister continually interjects that all of these things

stopped in January last. I do not see any reference to that in the magistrate's report. He started his inquiry in May. We would be very silly to imagine that these things did not stop when the inquiry started. No matter what else he may be, a person would be an absolute fool to continue to do something for which he knew he would get into trouble, once the magistrate started the inquiry. I have no doubt that they stopped when the inquiry commenced, but there is nothing in the report to show that they stopped in January. As the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have pointed out, Mr. Gollidge is on record some months after, in March, as saying that when corporal punishment and so on stopped he would walk out of the place. His words were such as to indicate that far from having ceased, most of these practices were continuing in much the same fashion as previously. I suppose the only way those boys had of getting public attention was to do what they did. It was most unfortunate that they had to take that action. It seems very much against the credit of the Government that they were forced to do this in order to prevent the smothering up process of the Minister who, after all, was supposed to be their guardian. He was the man who was supposed to be looking after their welfare. But the same night on television he was telling everybody that those practices did not exist. I do not say that he was not going to try to make an effort to correct the position, but he tried to keep it away from the public gaze. We have seen that sort of thing so many times with this Government. We remember the Muller incident when the Premier deliberately misled the people about the resignation of the hon. member for Fassifern.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HANLON: The Prime Minister is asking that his Government be judged on their record. If the present Queensland Government are to be judged on their record, it must be remembered that theirs is a record of trying to deceive the public and keep from them what are matters of public business. These matters contained in Mr. Schwarten's report are public business. They do not belong exclusively to the Premier, Cabinet, the Minister for Health and Home Affairs or the Government Caucus. They are matters of public importance. That is why we commend all sections of the Press for the way they have forced the Government to face up to the position that confronted them at Westbrook. I am not saying that we do not complain about the Press sometimes, but at least in this matter they acted as guardians of the public interest and carried out the highest traditions of the Press in demanding to the bitter end an inquiry into matters that they and all Queenslanders, apart from Government members, considered to be in the public interest.

What was the position when the Minister was finally forced into having the inquiry? He did everything possible to try to keep it secret. He refused to have an open inquiry. In representation before the Commission he put one of his own Crown Law officers, Mr. Spanner, in a very embarrassing position. The Bar Association protested against Mr. Spanner's appearing before the inquiry in his capacity as a Crown employee. What did the Government do? What did these champions of democracy do? They insisted that he had to do it. Fortunately, if we can put it that way, on the opening day of the inquiry Mr. Spanner was ill and consequently unable to appear. I say that, if the Government had any decency, instead of forcing the position to that stage in relation to one of their employees, they would have in consideration for him, withdrawn Mr. Spanner from the inquiry. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, when he was withdrawn, Mr. McGill replaced him. I do not say that he is not a competent man, but he has connections with the Government. So has Mr. Aboud. I do not say that those gentlemen did not do their jobs, for which they were well paid, but it would have been much preferable for the Government to have got someone completely divorced from politics altogether.

We would not have thought it was a good idea if they had asked Mr. Bennett to appear. He would not have appeared, because he would have had too great a sense of responsibility to throw a political cloud across a matter of this kind. We think it would have been far better for the Government to choose someone who had no connection whatever with the Government.

Mr. HART: I rise to a point of order. As far as I am aware, Mr. McGill has no connection with the Government.

Mr. HANLON: I do not want to pursue the point. If that is true and Mr. McGill has no such connection I will not take it further.

Mr. Hart: I do not say that he has not, but I am not aware of it if he has.

Mr. HANLON: At the same time, as I say, it would have been preferable to have chosen someone else, particularly in place of Mr. Aboud. I do not want to bandy his name about the Chamber or embarrass him, but the Government should have got somebody else.

The Minister claimed that the Labour Government were going to build a bigger Westbrook. I deny that.

Dr. Noble: That is on the file.

Mr. HANLON: The Labour Government were going to build a better Westbrook, and there is quite a difference. When this Government came to office the Minister admits that his departmental officers were crying

out for money for Westbrook and he said, "No, let it go. I am going to arrange for a boys' town and the Marsden Home." He told us that he said this in 1957. He denied the departmental officers money for it, money that they could have used with good effect and that would probably have avoided this trouble.

Some hon. members opposite have said that we have never been to Westbrook. I went a month or two after I was elected in 1956, when a Labour Government were in office. I went to visit a boy there because his parents had approached me, stating that he had a good case. They thought he could come out and do the right thing, and he did. They were seeking his release on the grounds of compassion. He was young and was unfortunate to be in there.

I went and saw him. I did not know the boy. We have been told that no-one bothered going. I did. I just drove up without any word that I was coming. I saw this boy and I had a look around at that time. One cannot gauge the position in an institution such as this by just walking around the place. One must have some inside contact. I had the opportunity of looking around the place and observing the attire of the boys that day. They were lined up for drill at about 11.30, when I got there. Their clothing was certainly not of the nature described by Mr. Schwarten, where 50 per cent. of them were poverty stricken, with patch over patch, and so on.

That was not the case then. The position has probably deteriorated in the past five years because the Minister has denied funds to his officers. He attempts to shovel all the blame onto his officers but in the same breath he tells us that they were asking him for more money to provide amenities at Westbrook and he denied it to them because he had some idea in the far distant future of bringing in a completely new system.

The hon. member for Wavell told us that when he went there in 1958 with the committee of inquiry they recommended to the Government that the younger boys should be removed, that numbers should be cut down. But what has been done? What were the numbers this year when this trouble blew up? There were 138 inmates, the peak attendance. The hon. member for Wavell told us that this Committee recommended to the Government nearly three years ago that they should reduce the numbers at Westbrook and get the younger fellows out of there, keep them away from the older and perhaps more delinquent type of boy.

Dr. Noble: There are only 68 at Westbrook today and we hope to get it down to 40.

Mr. HANLON: Of course there are only 68 there today. Good heavens! With all the criticism that has been levelled at the Government after an inquiry by a stipendiary magistrate, with the home virtually blowing up in their faces, something had to be done

in the past three or four months. The Minister comes in here and boasts about what he has done in the past four or five months. The very reason why he has delayed the presentation of the report is that every day he has been able to get another nail hammered in, to show he has done something else here and there, and so excuse himself for losing control of the situation.

In our vote of censure we are not condemning the Minister so much for the position today. We are not saying the steps taken are not a vast improvement. We are censuring him for his attitude up to the time of the outbreak on 14 May, for the way he went about the appointment of the inquiry, and for the way in which he presented the report, refusing to have it printed so that it could be widely available.

Getting back to the inquiry itself, the Australian Labour Party has been accused of trying to get political advantage from the matter. As I pointed out we were criticised by the Press who claimed that we were not taking political advantage of it. When the inquiry was instituted, and it was a secret inquiry, the Australian Labour Party decided that somebody should at least have the interests of the inmates at heart and ensure that they were adequately represented. So Mr. Wyvill was appointed by the A.L.P. to appear at the inquiry and offer to represent lads who required representation. What did Mr. Wyvill have to contend with when he went there in the interest of the boys? I quote from page 850 of the transcript of 14 June, 1961. Mr. McGill said,

"I submit you should not allow Mr. Wyvill to appear for a group of inmates but that you should consider allowing him, if you see fit, to appear for any of the inmates in this list of 68 that I propose to call."

In other words the trend of the inquiry was being dictated by the people who had something to hide. Who was instructing Mr. McGill? Who was he representing? He was appointed by the Government and he was given instructions by the Minister who in turn was getting his information, I should imagine, from the officials at the home. He said that the magistrate should consider allowing Mr. Wyvill, if the magistrate saw fit, to appear, for any of the 68 witnesses he proposed to call. No permission was given to Mr. Wyvill to call anyone; Mr. McGill was the only man who could call a witness. Mr. McGill went on to say—

"But I want to make it plain now that I am not going to call these witnesses unless I know what they are going to say."

Is that justice? What sort of evidence was this? I am not trying to blame Mr. Schwarten, who had to operate under the terms of his appointment.

(Time expired.)

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (8.17 p.m.): I thank whatever gods there be that I am neither a member of the Government nor a member of the Opposition, because if I were—after a debate such as I have listened to today—I hope I would have the decency and courage to go away somewhere and cut my throat, because we have witnessed today two tragedies. The first is the tragedy of the report. Mr. Swarten's report is a tragic, moving, human document and, whoever was responsible or whatever reasons were responsible for the setting up of the inquiry, I think the people of the State should be eternally indebted to Mr. Swarten for making the plain, truthful, courageous report he did. The next tragedy has been the way in which the interests of the children have been forgotten in this debate. In fact, they have been completely submerged by the putrid party political propaganda that has been vomited forth in this Chamber today. I hope to make a temperate and unbiased speech of the whole matter.

In the first place let me deprecate as strongly as I can the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition. I do not mind a crook man; I do not mind a bad man; I do not mind a thief. But I detest and abominate above all things, a hypocrite. We had the Leader of the Opposition standing up here today and adopting a typical holier-than-thou attitude, quoting only those parts of the report that suited his particular party-political advantage. I read the report. I got it from the Minister only this afternoon. I went through it as quickly as I could. It is a scathing indictment of the control of Westbrook not only by the present Government but by the Governments when the A.L.P. occupied the Government benches.

It is a scathing indictment of Westbrook down the years. The Stipendiary Magistrate actually uses the phrase that this Government inherited Westbrook with all its sins of omission and commission from the Labour Government. When hon. members opposite rise and say that the ills and evils of Westbrook shall be heaped entirely on the present Government's shoulders I say they are being as despicable as any party politicians can be.

Then, we have the Leader of the Opposition claiming that the Government appointed, if I may use the term, "legal stooges" to represent certain people at the inquiry; that Mr. Aboud and Mr. McGill were selected by the Government because they happened to have political affiliations with the Country-Liberal Government. I have no doubt they have but fancy a complaint like that coming from a man who was a Labour Party Minister for 10 years. On every Royal Commission and every committee of inquiry that was appointed by the A.L.P., Labour barristerial stooges were appointed. I appeared at one Royal Commission, a Commission into the Golden Casket, and it took me four days to get into the witness box and exactly four

minutes to be thrown out. Who was conducting the Royal Commission into the Golden Casket in exactly the same way as Mr. McGill was conducting this inquiry? None other than Mr. Mack who was rewarded for his legal stoogism by elevation to the Supreme Court bench by the Government of the day. When hon. members talk of the employment of legal stooges I suggest to them—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has made derogatory remarks about a judge of the Supreme Court and I ask him to withdraw them.

Mr. AIKENS: Perish the thought that I should do any such thing. I withdraw them, Mr. Taylor.

When the Leader of the Opposition was talking, and this is a point that has been dishonestly forgotten by A.L.P. members, I asked him by interjection did the magistrate advocate the abolition of flogging at Westbrook? We have heard a great deal about flogging and I hope to be able to deal with it quite frankly and honestly. Did the magistrate advocate and recommend the abolition of flogging at Westbrook? Of course he did not. He recommended that it be kept as an instrument of discipline.

Mr. Duggan: He did not.

Mr. AIKENS: He did so, and if the hon. member cares to read the report he will see that he did do that.

I heard the hon. member for Wavell say that no boy should be flogged, and, when he said that I honestly interjected, "bunkum". Is there a parent here who has not physically chastised his child? Is there a parent here who can honestly say that? I really believe that the best way to get a child to do what you want it to do is to frequently pat it on the back, and the lower you pat it, and the oftener you pat it, and the harder you pat it, the more you will get the child to do as you want. Parents should love a child and chastise a child as an act of loving kindness. I am making an unbiased speech and I think that even the hon. member will agree with me when I am finished. I addressed this House away back in 1945 or 1946 and, to the best of my memory, Tom Foley was then the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. I dealt with flogging at Westbrook to the jeers and sneers of the men who today are members of the Opposition. I said then that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. That applies to flogging just as it applies to anything else. Up at Westbrook we had men living in an isolated community and the controller of Westbrook, or the Superintendent, had power to inflict punishment and apparently his warders also had power to inflict punishment and there was no-one there to say nay to them. Consequently, while they may have started off in the early days to inflict what they considered to be

reasonable punishment—a punishment to fit the crime—over the years, because of that unrestricted and unchecked power, their desire to flog developed and degenerated into sadism.

In the report the magistrate states that if a child committed an offence or a crime he was not given two or three or four or six cuts on the bottom, as we were given two, four, or six cuts on the hands with a big cane when we had flogging masters at school, but the superintendent admitted that he flogged that boy until the boy whimpered for mercy—and that is sadism naked and unashamed! That sadism grew with the system.

I suggested then, and I am going to make a suggestion now, that no punishment should be inflicted on anybody at any time, whether it be in Westbrook or in a gaol or any other Government institution, unless that punishment is witnessed by an independent observer. Bring in a magistrate from outside. Bring in a reputable and competent person from outside. Let him witness the punishment. Let him see that it is not excessive and let him see that an entry is made in the punishment book strictly in accordance with the punishment that has been inflicted.

Mr. Wallace: Do you advocate flogging?

Mr. AIKENS: Yes, for certain types of delinquent. I am not backing and filling about it. I am not a "mush-gut." If I have time I will read to the Committee from the official report of Mr. Swarten about one particular boy at Westbrook. I could read a dozen. I am sure hon. members will agree on what should be done with a human animal like him.

Mr. Wallace: Shouldn't you have been in Westbrook a few times during your youth?

Mr. AIKENS: Possibly, and the hon. member for Cairns would be the first person to greet me as I entered the gate. As a matter of fact I have been a juvenile delinquent but I grew out of it. The hon. member for Cairns never grew out of it and he is the worst example of an adult delinquent we have ever had in the Chamber.

The tragedy of the whole matter is not that the Minister was moving in his own good time to rectify the abuses that were taking place at Westbrook, but that he, actuated by political propaganda, rushed in and attempted to defend the indefensible. When the scandal began to break, the Minister, instead of either keeping his mouth shut or saying, "I will have the matter inquired into," rushed into the Press, went over the air—on TV, and I think he came into the House, and on each and every occasion he defended the setup at Westbrook and said, "Everything in the garden is lovely. I have supreme and superlative confidence in Mr. Gollidge. I know that the punishments inflicted are not excessive and any suggestion that they

are excessive or that anything at Westbrook is not on the up-and-up is pure political spite and spleen." That is the tragedy of the Minister. In his eagerness to defend his party, he was one of those who rush in where angels fear to tread. Had he said right from the start, "If you think things are wrong at Westbrook, let us go up and have a look," that might have been worse than useless, because we all know what happens when officials visit various Government institutions. We who worked in the railways know what happened when the Commissioner came along. He was not blind, deaf or dumb. He could see the rake marks on the ground where they made a special effort to clean up in order at least to convince him that everything was spick and span and high-polished. The only way to inspect Westbrook would be, as I suggested away back in 1945 or 1946, to A.L.P. jeers and sneers, to make snap visits without previously warning anyone about them. That is the only way any Government institution can be effectively inspected by politicians or people in authority if they want to learn the truth.

Now let us deal with the hon. member for Cairns, whose heart is bleeding at the suggestion that anyone in Westbrook should be flogged. I say they should be flogged—some of them, yes. I say that harsher punishments than that should be inflicted on some of the human beasts who are in Westbrook. Read the report and read what Mr. Swarten said about the little children. That is one of the other tragedies at Westbrook. Young boys of tender years—10, 11, 12, 13 and 14—primary school children, were sent to Westbrook. What happened when they got there? Mr. Swarten tells us what happened, and it happened under A.L.P. Governments just as it happened under this Government. The moment those tender little children got there, certain of the big, brutish louts at Westbrook forced their filthy homosexual desires on them.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: It is here in the report.

Mr. Wallace interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: Hon. members opposite have quoted only those parts of Mr. Swarten's report that suit their party political propaganda.

Mr. Wallace interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Cairns to contain himself and cease interjecting.

Mr. AIKENS: I can understand him having sympathy for the homosexuals.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is an offensive remark about the hon. member for Cairns. I ask the hon. member for Townsville South to withdraw it and apologise to the Chair for making it.

Mr. AIKENS: I withdraw the remark and apologise to the Chair. But I put it straight to the hon. member for Cairns and any other hypocritical mush-gut on that side of the Chamber: what punishment would they give to brutish louts of 16, 17 or 18 years of age at Westbrook who, in the considered judgment of Mr. Schwarten, the magistrate, despoiled and defiled tender little children there by making them submit to their brutish homosexual acts? That is the test.

Mr. Wallace interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: Hon. members opposite say, "No, none of the boys at Westbrook should be flogged." I say quite without reservation that, in my opinion, there are a few of the brutes and louts at Westbrook who should be hit on the head with an iron bar now. It would save the State a lot of worry and a lot of money, and it would save their parents and relatives a great deal of anguish.

Mr. Bennett: Any decent person would be disgusted by that suggestion.

Mr. AIKENS: We can understand anything from the hon. member for South Brisbane. We have seen his evolutions and heard his effervescences before. If one gave him a hard tap on the head he would not get concussion of the brain, because one has to have a brain before that can happen. But I think a gentle tap on the head now and again would bring him to his senses.

Mr. Bennett: If the hon. member were in Westbrook, all the warders would walk out.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for South Brisbane is so tender and solicitous that he does not like dealing with the sordid aspects of the report. It does not suit him or the A.L.P. to deal with them because these homosexual practices—brutes inflicting their homosexual desires on little children—went on in their time just as they have gone on in the time of this Government. Hon. members opposite speak about being tender and merciful with all the children. By all means be tender and merciful with those who deserve tenderness and mercy; by all means show tenderness and mercy to those who are capable of redemption. But let us not forget that there is a small hard core of human brutes and animals at Westbrook to whom, in my opinion, no mercy should be shown.

In his report Mr. Schwarten has said quite bluntly that the superintendent, Mr. Golledge, by striking a child over the head with a plastic hose, by cuffing him, by kicking him, was guilty of an illegal assault. If the Government are honest—all I ask is that they should be honest in this matter—they should bring Golledge before the court and charge him with assault. If I may digress a little, we have been told by the Minister for Labour and Industry that any policeman who breaks the law will not be brought before an inquiry but will be charged in open court. Let him be charged in open court so that the

whole of the facts of this particular assault will be brought to light and advertised to the whole world. Could there be any objection to that? If this magistrate—and a competent magistrate—considers that the superintendent of Westbrook, Mr. Golledge, was guilty of an assault against a child, why then should the matter be allowed to rest with the consideration of this report and this debate? If he did assault that boy, let him, like you and me or anyone else who committed an assault on a boy would be dealt with, be brought before the court and tried so that the public would know the whole of the circumstances of the assault, and so that Golledge could receive the punishment that he deserved for having perpetrated the assault.

There has been considerable misconception about Westbrook. As a Member of Parliament I have had exactly the same experience as other hon. members. Once in a while boys from our electorates are committed to Westbrook. The first thing parents do is to go to their Member of Parliament and ask him to intercede with the Minister for Justice or someone else to get their boy freed from Westbrook. I have had several of those cases in my electorate in the years that I have been in Parliament. I have found the following to be true: I have never known a first offender before the Children's Court to be sent to Westbrook; I have rarely known a second offender before the Children's Court to be sent to Westbrook; sometimes a third offender is sent to Westbrook if his offence is a particularly stupid one or dangerous one. Once an offender has been sent to Westbrook I have never known the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, whether a Labour Minister or the present Minister, to keep that boy in Westbrook for more than six months as long as his conduct at Westbrook was good. Before a boy can become an inmate of Westbrook he has to commit at least three separate offences that will bring him before the Children's Court. If he goes to Westbrook and his conduct is good he is released in six months. If he commits another offence after he comes out he goes back again. I think the hon. member for Townsville North interjected, when an hon. member on this side was speaking, "Do you think all the boys at Westbrook are the same?" It was quite a sensible interjection because they are not the same. There are boys up there that should never be there. The tragedy of Westbrook from the start has been that young children have been placed up there with hardened criminals, men who would be in gaol if they were old enough to go before the Supreme Court or a court that could send them to gaol.

Dr. Noble: You approve of the Wilson Hostel?

Mr. AIKENS: Of course I do. I think Westbrook or some other home should be set aside for the really tough guys—those who want to play it tough. If they want to play

it tough those who are in control in that particular home may play it as tough as they like.

I have been responsible for making representations to the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, whoever he may have been at the time, Liberal or Labour, for the release of a boy who was sent to Westbrook after his third or fourth appearance before the Children's Court. I suppose every hon. member has done the same. Never once has the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, whoever he may have been, refused to release that boy after his six months' probation, as long as he had a reasonable record at Westbrook. I can remember one occasion when two boys from my electorate were sent to Westbrook. I saw the magistrate afterwards and asked him, "Why did you send young So-and-So to Westbrook?" He said "He came up with that other villain. I warned that other villain what would happen to him. When he came up for the third time I could not let one of them off and send the other to Westbrook so I sent the two of them." I saw that young boy sitting in the watchhouse in Townsville. He was very chastened in spirit, a very sorrowful youngster, only about 14 or 15 years of age. I said, "Although you have come under the supervision of the State Children Department until you are 18 I think I can promise you release in six months provided your behaviour in Westbrook is good." There was a Labour Minister for Health and Home Affairs at the time. The other fellow was leaning over the desk at the watchhouse saying to the sergeant, bigger than I, "I tell you my so-and-so hat is under the so-and-so counter and if you don't get it you dirty, big, fat, slob, I will lean over this counter and slap you fair across the so-and-so mush."

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: That is all right. Just listen to the rest of the story. The sergeant turned to me and said, "Mr. Aikens, what can you do with a fellow like that?" I said, "I don't know what you are going to do with him but I know what I would do about it."

That boy went to Westbrook a couple of times and came out at 18 years of age. He got in with a gang of thieves and he is now doing two years in Boggo Road for breaking and entering and assault with a dangerous weapon, or some such thing.

Some fellows are beyond redemption right from the start. If hon. members really, honestly ask themselves, "What would we do for any boy at Westbrook?" they should take the report and read this paragraph—

"There is nothing to be said in favour of Boy 88. If any of the inmates owed a debt of gratitude to the State, it was Boy 88. The State gave Boy 88 an opportunity that does not fall to the lot of every honest and well-behaved family boy, and Boy 88 threw that chance away. On

the 29th March, 1957, Boy 88 was convicted on a charge of being an uncontrollable child and committed to the care of the State Children Department until he reached the age of 18 years. He was placed in St. Vincents Home, Nudgee. In the following two months he absconded four times from St. Vincents and on 31st May, 1957, he was placed in the Salvation Army Home at Indooroopilly. In the following two months he absconded three times from that Home, committing six acts of stealing whilst an absconder. On the 23rd July, 1957, he was transferred to Westbrook. At Westbrook he passed the 1959 Scholarship examination with 73.2 per cent."

So he is not a fool. The report goes on—

"On passing the Scholarship he was released from Westbrook and boarded by the State with his aunt at Cannon Hill, and enrolled by the State as a Sub-junior Student at St. Lawrences College, South Brisbane. He was equipped, also at the State's cost, with all necessary clothing and school uniforms, all brand new. As well as a sports coat, hat, tie, shoes and pyjamas, he was supplied with three shirts, two pairs of trousers, school tie, hatband and badge, one sports uniform, one pair of sandshoes, one blazer, one pullover, one raincoat and one portmanteau. At the State's expense he was also provided with all necessary books and materials and his school fees paid by the State. The total outlay for Boy 88 by the State would be within the vicinity of £60 to £70. Boy 88 did not avail himself of this opportunity . . ."

I cannot read all of it. That is the fellow who set fire to the haystack on the night of the break.

Dr. DELAMOTHE (Bowen) (8.43 p.m.): If cant and humbug on the part of the Opposition merited, in the words of the hon. member for Townsville South, an application of strap in a spirit of loving kindness, I think they will agree that they would have fully merited such treatment. We have listened all day to the Opposition crying like crocodiles about the Westbrook wallow. If they have shed crocodile tears at any time during their wanderings in the desert, then today was the day. I suppose the right-hand side of this Chamber has never been so wet.

The Minister has been violently, ruthlessly and callously attacked, and for what? After listening to the windy wailing of the Opposition, the one thing that stands out in their attack is that he rushed to the support of his officials at Westbrook. Day after day and in debate after debate we have held up to us by the Opposition that mateship and sticking to your friends and your fellow workers merits the highest praise. But when it comes to the Minister, it merits the greatest degree of blame. That is sheer hypocrisy on the part of the

Opposition, something of which hon. members opposite should be thoroughly ashamed.

Let me go further. The Opposition very smartly rushed in to provide legal assistance at the inquiry and, whether they ran out of funds they were saving for the Federal or State elections, or whatever the reason, the legal assistance very smartly disappeared. I wonder why the legal eagle in the ranks of the Opposition did not provide the legal assistance.

Mr. Bennett: I will explain that to you in very great detail.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: If we could get rid of the crackling of thorns under the pot perhaps everyone could hear. I repeat there was a quick provision of legal assistance and even a quicker withdrawal of it. Although members of trade unions whom the Opposition claim to represent were involved in the inquiry—the people who worked at Westbrook and whose activities were brought into question at the inquiry—at no stage did the Opposition or the trade union movement provide legal assistance to protect the interests of these people they claim to represent under all circumstances.

I think it is time we brought the debate back to the level from which it should never have departed, that is, a calm examination of all the things that went to make Westbrook.

Mr. Burrows: Was it you who prescribed the castor-oil?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I will tell the hon. member all about castor-oil.

Westbrook started as a reform school for boys away back in 1900, and in 1919 under the control of the Government of the Opposition it was euphemistically called a Farm Home for Boys, and as such it has continued to the present time.

Mr. Gollidge, the Superintendent, who has been subjected to quite severe criticism in Mr. Schwarten's report and quite severe attack by the Opposition, has been at Westbrook since 1924. He was there for 28 years under Labour Governments as a warder, and for five years under Labour Governments as Superintendent. For those 33 years when he worked under the direction of Labour administrations no fault was found with him.

If the Minister can be held responsible in any way for Westbrook, how much more so can Labour Ministers for Health and Home Affairs whose control of Westbrook goes right back to 1915—40 years as against four years by the present Minister? While we are on the subject of what happened in the time of the Minister and in the time of other Ministers, let us look at the report. On page 1 of the report we find that 18 boys broke out in the recent break-out.

Mr. Davies: None broke out in 1957.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I will tell the hon. member something. Does he know that in January, 1950, 10 boys escaped in a mass break-out? Now, laugh that one off!

Mr. Sherrington: How many were there in other years?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I will tell hon. members opposite something.

I refer to their crocodile tears once more. I will tell them something about the type of boys they are weeping these tears over. I heard some of them say that these poor little children have in many cases been cast into Westbrook for some minor misdemeanour. I will let hon. members know what they are like. Hon. members opposite have been quoting from articles in the Press. I will tell them what happened on other occasions. They will remember that some of these "poor little children" after recapture were locked in the Toowoomba watchhouse, and whilst they were in there—

Mr. Burrows: It could have been your boy.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I am glad the hon. member is not my boy.

These boys were confined in the watchhouse for several days during which time their shouting of the most obscene and dreadfully dirty language was so loud that it could be heard in the neighbouring parts. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition would have had it reported to him. Those hon. members opposite who have been in a cell will know—and I am quite sure several of them can confirm this—that a bucket is issued for certain uses. Instead of using these buckets properly, they tossed their contents through the window and fouled the outside of the window with all sorts of human excreta. They were lined up in the morning and proceeded to offer the sergeant out and wanted to fight him. They scratched their names on the walls and took the grease off the door hinges and smeared it all over the walls. These are the dear, innocent little children about whom we have seen so many crocodile tears wept.

I now wish to comment about the castor oil treatment. I am quite sure that there are many Opposition members who would be much better off if they received the old treatment from the blue bottle. Hon. members such as the hon. member for Port Curtis often had it administered as a child and I should be very happy to continue his father's treatment. Those hon. members opposite who have not read the report will have plenty of time to do so and it will keep them occupied for quite a time. When they read it they should look at the castor oil section and they will find that in every case except one, the entries show that the boys had eaten green and unripe vegetables and fruit. I am sure that the hon. member for Port Curtis can recall that when

he used to come home after eating green fruit, such as grapes, or whatever it may have been, the first thing his mother did was to give him a dose of oil. If castor oil was used as a form of punishment, surely it would be reasonable to expect that it would appear as a punishment for some other reason than the eating of raw and green vegetables and fruit and it would appear much more frequently. In fact over the whole period only 11 cases of the administration of castor oil were noted.

Mr. Schwarten states that castor oil as an aperient was abandoned at least 25 years ago. That is not correct, of course. It is still included in the current edition of the British Pharmacopoeia and it is therefore still an authoritatively recognised aperient medicine. If any hon. members are interested, as it is included in the British Pharmacopoeia, it can still be issued on the 5s. 0d. script from the doctor.

The only case where the administration of castor oil was not related to the eating of green vegetables or fruit was that of a boy who, on his own admission, did not feel well and looked pale, associated with an accident to his pants in school. Surely the administration of castor oil in those circumstances can more reasonably be interpreted as being medicinal than as punishment.

Mr. Davies: Do you disagree with the magistrate's findings?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Yes, on the castor oil. I am a doctor and he is a magistrate.

A great deal has been made of the fact that the present Minister was not aware of what was going on in Westbrook. The present Leader of the Opposition has occupied that office for some time and I believe he lives within 15 miles of Westbrook. Did he know what was going on there? Did he ever visit Westbrook?

An Opposition Member: It is not his responsibility.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: It is the responsibility of everyone.

Mr. Tucker: Did you know?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I did not know, and I accept responsibility for not knowing, just the same as hon. members opposite must accept it. A great deal has been made of cruelty and harsh punishment to the inmates. Let me confirm what the hon. member for Townsville South has told the Committee about the many personal cases he knows of discharges from Westbrook. I am sure some hon. members opposite have arranged—

Mr. Burrows: There appears to be a strong affinity between you and the hon. member for Townsville South.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Of course. We are both North Queenslanders. It must be a good place because, irrespective of party,

we all stick together. In spite of all the alleged horrible, harsh treatment at Westbrook, in the last six months 60 boys have been released from there to their homes or to foster parents or to jobs, and of that number only four have been readmitted. Surely that is, first of all, an indication of the generous approach to the release of the boys, and, secondly, a fairly clear proof of the effectiveness of the discipline that they get at Westbrook.

I will admit that, in the terms of the report, the discipline is harsh. I am sure most reasonable people would agree that Westbrook is not supposed to be a place of kid-glove treatment. It is a place for the reformation and improvement, disciplining and punishment, of boys who have shown by their conduct that they are not amenable to the ordinary, decent rules of living. They are not amenable to the ordinary rules of civilised communities and therefore they have to be put in those places. They have to be subjected to discipline that ordinary people do not have to be subjected to.

Mr. Tucker: Do you agree with that discipline?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Of course I do. I believe it is not a place for namby-pamby. It is not a place for kid-glove treatment. It is not a place for the soft-hearts. It is a place where anti-social, badly-behaved young people have to be taught and given a chance to become decent citizens. The very fact that this discipline has resulted in 60 boys in the last six months being turned into civilised human beings and released is surely the greatest answer to any criticism that may be levelled at Westbrook.

The only other matter with which I should like to deal is the suggestion in the report that the superintendent deliberately discriminated against coloured boys—in other words, that he was unnecessarily severe on coloured boys as distinct from white boys. The particular boy dealt with in the report has been examined by at least two psychiatrists.

Mr. Tucker: Who examined the psychiatrists?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I advise the hon. member never to let a psychiatrist get near him. He will not go to Westbrook. He will go to a place that he will never get out of.

Mr. Tucker: I will take my chance, but not with you.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: The hon. member is very wise. I repeat to hon. members the psychiatrist's opinion that this coloured boy should never be let out because in a civilised society he is always likely to steal and to assault females.

Mr. Burrows: Where did you get that from?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I got it from the psychiatrist, of course.

Mr. Burrows: Who is he?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: Dr. Phillips. The hon. member can go and ask him himself.

The responsibility for what has occurred at Westbrook—the neglect, forgetfulness, or whatever it may be—does not lie at the feet of the present Minister. It lies at the feet of a long line of former Labour Ministers who accepted, in fact were responsible for, the rules under which Westbrook was run for so many years, rules which were not altered from 1916, when they were first introduced, until 1958, when the present Minister altered the form of physical punishment. During all those years the type of punishment meted out to the boys under regulations introduced by the party to which members of the present Opposition belong was such that it could have—I suppose if one inquired deeply enough one could prove that it did—cause serious physical injury to the boys. Those hon. members whose parents were wise and sensible parents had the strap applied to the softest part of their anatomy and they suffered no injury. But for 40 years or longer Labour arranged and condoned a type of physical punishment that could have, and perhaps did, result in physical injury to the inmates of Westbrook.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (9.5 p.m.): The debate has produced some startling revelations of the Government's attitude to the findings made by a senior, well-respected and able magistrate who presides over courts in Queensland. Obviously he was appointed because of his ability, integrity and fearlessness. Yet because he had the courage, fearlessness and integrity to report on things as he found them according to the evidence, Government members from the Minister down, have been endeavouring one by one to discredit him as a magistrate and find fault with his findings.

Dr. Noble: Never once during the whole of my speech did I try to discredit the magistrate. Let the hon. member show me one instance.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. BENNETT: I accept the Minister's denial. Of course, what he said is in "Hansard".

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will accept the denial unreservedly.

Mr. BENNETT: I accept it unreservedly, Mr. Taylor, at your direction.

I was surprised to hear so many gross inaccuracies. In his cheap political speech the hon. member for Sherwood made idle accusations against me and others. I do not care what he says about me because my character is so well established that I

have not got to worry about what the hon. member for Sherwood says about me. But he made the baseless claim that nobody from the Australian Labour Party on this side has ever visited Westbrook. Let me inform him because he apparently does not know—if he does know he was deliberately misleading the Committee—that the Leader of the Opposition regularly visits Westbrook, and certainly does each Christmas, at which time the boys and the staff are happy to meet him, greet him and discuss their problems with him. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has made a visit to Westbrook. He is well acquainted with the circumstances prevailing there. He certainly used his endeavours to the best of his ability in keeping with the instructions placed in front of the boys by the Minister, to ensure that they got able representation at the inquiry. The administration of Westbrook will go down as a sorry scar on the history of gaol administration in Queensland. An endeavour has been made to smear past Labour administrations with the defects found to have arisen four years after the present Minister assumed office. As a doctor and as an aspirant for the position of Minister for Health and Home Affairs the hon. member for Yeronga obviously paid very close and strict attention to the affairs of the department during his many years in Opposition. Not once during those many years that he spent in Opposition as an aspirant for the position of Minister for Health and Home Affairs did he suggest that all was not well at Westbrook under Labour's administration. Therefore it ill behoves him at this late stage to claim that the circumstances that prevail at the present time are an inheritance from the Labour administration when in fact he saw no wrong and no evil practices and never raised a voice or hand in protest when sitting on the Opposition benches.

Dr. Noble: Labour would never allow you to go to Westbrook.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not believe that. If that was true why did not he stand up and protest about it if he was refused admission? He never once protested. As a matter of fact he never made any application to go to Westbrook. That also is a faulty claim. There have been many scars on his administration; this is another sorry one. Although there have been many revelations in the findings of the magistrate, no doubt the one most discredited in the whole escapade is the Minister himself. He has played, right from the beginning, a purely deceptive part in the commission to expose the wrongdoings at Westbrook. If his claims are correct, that he inherited all these evil practices, why did he not frankly admit that when he was first taxed by public, Press, and those complaining about the treatment they were receiving, instead of claiming that he inherited some evil that he was going to correct? He falsely claimed that all was

well and that he had the utmost confidence in Mr. Gollidge and his conduct of Westbrook.

Therefore, he was either satisfied that what he inherited was all well, or alternatively, he was dissatisfied and was not prepared to take the public of Queensland into his confidence and tell them the truth. First of all, he conducted a departmental inquiry following which, he again falsely claimed that there was nothing wrong at Westbrook. Eventually, by sheer public pressure and because his arguments began to prove futile, he was beginning to get timorous and fearful about what might be exposed and he eventually decided to constitute a magisterial inquiry to determine whether or not the claims and accusations were correct.

The inquiry, although gerrymandered to a large extent by the terms of reference, was held. In the first place, it was a closed inquiry, for various specious and spurious reasons. It was ludicrous to claim that because they were children in the law they could not be dealt with in open court. Admittedly when they appear before the magistrate under the State Children Act the court is a closed court and neither Press nor public are admitted, but, if they are charged with an indictable offence and committed for trial, whether they are children or adults, they appear in court before a judge and jury and the Press is in attendance and the public in the gallery.

All those who are in Westbrook, or most of them, are there as a result of committing an indictable offence and being convicted of it in open court. That applies to the vast majority of them, so they had nothing to lose by having a public inquiry because all offences of which they have been convicted in the past have already been exposed to the public when their convictions were sustained in open court. So that particular claim and defence, that it must be a closed inquiry, is a pure hypocritical deception and I am ashamed of the Minister for setting that up as a reason for claiming that the inquiry should be a closed one.

The previous speaker, the hon. member for Bowen, asked why did I not, as one of the leading barristers in this State, offer my services to defend the boys.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. BENNETT: Let me make my position quite clear. True it is that Mr. Doug McGill was briefed, as it were, to appear to assist the magistrate—in effect to act for the department. True it is that Mr. Jack Aboud was briefed to defend the controller at Westbrook, Mr. Gollidge.

Mr. Smith: He was briefed to appear.

Mr. BENNETT: He did not agree to appear. He was briefed to appear.

Mr. Smith: I said he was briefed to appear, not to defend.

Mr. BENNETT: I will adhere to my first claim that he was briefed to defend. I will say, without making any observations about Mr. Aboud in his legal capacity—I refrain from doing that at this stage—that it has been a well-known axiom in the law and in its practice that justice must not only be done but appear to have been done. That is well understood and it is a principle that is adopted in all courts and has always been adopted since time immemorial in the practice of the law.

Every barrister knows, because Mr. Aboud makes it quite clear, every boy in Westbrook knows, and the Press and public know, that Mr. Jack Aboud is campaign director for the Minister. When one applies his position, and his appointment to that particular hearing, then it would seem that the Minister was not carrying out the fundamental principle of legal practice when he did not take into consideration that justice must not only be done but must appear to be done. Would not the boys believe that Mr. Aboud was there to protect his candidate, for whom he had acted as campaign director on more than one occasion?

Dr. Noble: One of the best campaign directors you could get, because he has plenty of brains, which you have not.

Mr. BENNETT: Seeing that the Minister chooses to so insult me in public and compare my brain with that of Mr. Aboud, let me say about Mr. Aboud that he openly boasts around the court that he tells the Minister what to do, that he tells the Minister what judges to appoint, that Mr. George Lukin from the Queensland Club was about to be appointed to the District Court and that he got on the telephone and told the Minister Mr. Lukin should not be appointed.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a point of order. I completely deny those statements. They are offensive to me and I ask for their withdrawal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. BENNETT: I am only recounting what I heard with my own ears in the court.

The CHAIRMAN: Nevertheless the hon. member must accept the denial of the Minister.

Mr. BENNETT: I accept his denial. Talking about people being supersensitive and tender, it would seem that he can cast any reflection on my character and ability but that immediately I say something which he apparently knows to be true he is so sensitive that he rises to his feet and demands an apology.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a further point of order. I deny the truth of the statements made by the hon. member.

The CHAIRMAN: I have previously told the hon. member for South Brisbane that when he is asked to accept a denial he must do so unreservedly. I ask him to accept the denial of the Minister unreservedly.

Mr. BENNETT: I do so.

I proceed now to the suggestion by the hon. member for Bowen that I should have offered my services. I assure the Chamber that I, holding the distinguished position of president of the Labour Lawyers' Association, arranged very able representation for those boys, incidentally without charge, and I did so through the agency of a very able barrister in the person of Mr. Lew Wyvill. Secondly, another very able barrister appeared for them, a Rhodes Scholar, Mr. Cedric Hampson. Let me assure the Chamber that they were both shocked by the attitude of those who appeared for the Crown. I do not wish to go any further into the details of it, unless the Minister would like me to tell him of their opinions. They were shocked by the attitude of those who appeared for the Crown.

I did not personally accept any brief, because I considered, having regard to my position as a Labour Parliamentarian, that it might be embarrassing for the magisterial inquiry if I was in attendance. I felt that those who appeared should be completely divorced from the active practice of politics, and for that reason, in keeping with the best traditions and spirit of the Bar, I refused to make an appearance at the Westbrook inquiry, although I could have gained a lot politically from so doing.

Dr. Noble: Silly rot.

Mr. BENNETT: I will tell the Minister of the feelings of another barrister, Mr. Rex King Q.C. He offered his services for the boys and he too was astounded at the attitude, an attitude unprecedented in the practice of law in Queensland and certainly unprecedented in commissions of inquiry.

Dr. Noble: Then how did Mr. Schwarten produce such a good report? You praised the report a moment ago.

Mr. BENNETT: As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition points out, an ex-warder paid for representation for three of the boys. As the Minister had arranged for Mr. Golledge to be represented by counsel paid for out of the taxpayers' money, if he was fair would it not be proper and reasonable for the boys serving a term of imprisonment to have representation paid for by the State? It was certainly a one-sided and one-eyed attitude to justice.

Dr. Noble: They were not being accused.

Mr. BENNETT: They were accused by the Minister before the inquiry, he has not

ceased to accuse them since the inquiry, and he has even circulated their records to his Liberal colleagues in the Chamber so that they can read them out.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a point of order. There is no truth in the hon. member's last statement.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. BENNETT: I accept the Minister's denial. I merely say that their records have been read out by Liberal Members of Parliament who have spoken tonight, so obviously they have obtained their records from someone. Even defence counsel in court is not able to go to the police department and get his client's record. I ask you, Mr. Taylor, where did the Liberal Members of Parliament get the boys' records?

Dr. Noble: They are in the report.

Mr. BENNETT: I should say that the man who comes out of this inquiry most discredited is not Mr. Golledge. He has certain standards and, although he acted in a brutal fashion, I think he acted according to his concept of discipline. I believe that he acted sincerely, although brutally. However, the Minister who is an educated man and a qualified doctor, has tried to defend him. He should have been able to look at the scene with a detached and objective eye, but he has endorsed and condoned everything that has happened and is still trying to defend the happenings.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a point of order. Once again the hon. member has made a false statement. He said that I condoned some of the punishments that were regarded as excessive. I point out to the Chamber that when I heard of these punishments in January last I stopped them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for South Brisbane to accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. BENNETT: I accept his denial.

In the short time at my disposal I think I must refer to the extraordinary, barbarian speech, made by the hon. member for Townsville South. In my opinion he is a psychopathic ratbag, and I do not normally use such terms.

Dr. NOBLE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is using unparliamentary language.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I assure the hon. member for South Brisbane that the word "ratbag" as applied to hon. members is an unparliamentary expression, and I ask him to refrain from making such statements so that I do not need continually to rise and ask him to withdraw them. I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. BENNETT: I withdraw it, and amend it by referring to him as a psychopathic fool.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw it without reservation.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, without reservation.

I think you will agree, Mr. Taylor, that I have never used such language in my 12 months in this Chamber, but I have sat in this Chamber and listened to the hon. member for Townsville South use language that in my opinion is certainly obscene and impure. I have heard him making vulgar references in the presence of women and school children in the gallery.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I shall be obliged to ask the hon. member to resume his seat if he pursues this line of thought. He is reflecting on the Chair when he suggests that the Chair has not reprimanded the hon. member for Townsville South for certain remarks. The point the hon. member does not understand, or appear to understand, is that a member of Parliament is not allowed to make derogatory statements about another member of Parliament in the Chamber.

Mr. BENNETT: I can assure you I did not intend to reflect on you, Mr. Taylor.

There were several references in the speech of the hon. member for Townsville South to which I take strong exception as a member of the community and as a parliamentarian. I think it is an absolutely heinous offence for a parliamentarian to claim that any soul should be hit on the head with a bar. It is shocking that we have men in public life who would even entertain such a thought, let alone express it publicly and let alone receive the adulation and the laughter of members of the Liberal Party, particularly the hon. member for Windsor, who seemed to think he was a hero for so saying.

I think the hon. member for Townsville South adopted an altogether incorrect approach. I sincerely hope the Minister does not go so far as to share his mental attitude to the inmates of Westbrook. Irrespective of their record and their past, they are souls, as the hon. member for Bowen said, who can be saved from the scrapheap. There is no reason why we or the Minister should relegate them permanently to the moral scrapheap. Most of them, if not all, can be saved from ruination with the right and proper treatment. In the words of a man who is famous throughout the world as a social worker, and who is well known for the saying, who puts it into practice and proudly claims it to be proved by cold and hard experience, there is no such thing as a bad boy.

In the brief time at my disposal, for the edification of the Minister, who perhaps allows his mind to descend permanently to mundane matters of medicine without ever allowing it to rise to higher literature, in which he will find some thoughts that will lift his spirit and give him confidence and

an understanding of his fellow men, I refer him to Charles Dickens's "Nicholas Nickleby." I will read a passage from the chapter headed, "Of the Internal Economy of Dotheboys Hall." It reads—

"How the last faint traces of hope, the remotest glimmering of any good to be derived from his efforts in this den, faded from the mind of Nicholas as he looked in dismay around! Pale and haggard faces, lank and bony figures, children with the countenances of old men, deformities with irons upon their limbs, boys of stunted growth, and others whose long meagre legs would hardly bear their stooping bodies, all crowded on the view together; there were the bleared eye, the hare-lip, the crooked foot, and every other ugliness or distortion that told of unnatural aversion conceived by parents for their offspring, or of young lives which, from the earliest dawn of infancy, had been one horrible endurance of cruelty and neglect. There were little faces which should have been handsome, darkened with the scowl of sullen, dogged suffering; there was childhood with the light of its eye quenched, its beauty gone, and its helplessness alone remaining; there were vicious-faced boys, brooding, with leaden eyes, like malefactors in a gaol; and there were young creatures on whom the sins of their frail parents had descended, weeping even for the mercenary nurses they had known, and lonesome even in their loneliness. With every kindly sympathy and affection blasted in its birth, with every young and healthy feeling flogged and starved down, with every revengeful passion that can fester in swollen hearts, eating its evil way to their core in silence, what an incipient Hell was breeding here!"

That is the feeling that prevails in the hearts and souls and minds of many of the boys who end up in Westbrook. Admittedly they may have been sent there because they have committed several offences—perhaps one or two offences. Nevertheless, it is not for us sitting here to judge them. We do not know what their background was, what the attitude of their parents was to them, or what their school environment was in their early years. We do not know what difficulties they had to endure, what obstacles they had to overcome.

(Time expired.)

Hon. A. R. FLETCHER (Cunningham—Minister for Public Lands and Irrigation) (9.31 p.m.): I find it a little difficult to carry on, after listening to the moving passage that has been read by the hon. member for South Brisbane. It was so much in character with the benign, beneficent attitude and the loving kindness that is a natural part of the hon. member that it really affected me.

The fact is that I have been listening to the debate all the afternoon with a feeling that it was time somebody spoke on a subject of which they knew something

instead of fulminating politically on matters of which they knew very little and out of which they were determined to make the greatest amount of political capital, no matter who suffered. It has been patent to me that nobody cares what happens to the boys or the staff at Westbrook who may be damaged by this. The Opposition says, "Here is something out of which, come hell or high water, we are going to get a bit of political advantage, and to heck with anybody who is damaged in the process." It could damage many boys and some young fellows who have had the misfortune to fall foul of the law.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. FLETCHER: I ask hon. members opposite at least to be temperate, considerate and dispassionate, not to take one point of view and discard the other. If we are to look at the whole deplorable picture—and I am not saying that there are not things that are bad about it—at least let us be fair and dispassionate and consider both sides of the argument.

I have the advantage of other hon. members because Westbrook is in my electorate and for eight years I have had entree to it. I have gone there regularly, I have seen the place develop, and I have taken an interest in the boys. I know something about what it was like when I went there eight years ago and what it has developed into. I tell hon. members, as the honest expression of opinion of an honest man, that it has not deteriorated in that time, except that the increase in the number of juvenile delinquents in Queensland, in common with other countries of the civilised world, has overtaken its capacity and overloaded it before the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, Dr. Noble, who takes a very sympathetic and active interests in all these matters, could complete the reorganisation that he began several years ago. If he had had a chance to do all that he had in his mind, with the good will of the Government, before this boil-over occurred, a great deal of trouble for many boys and many men could have been obviated.

It is a great pity that we do not take advantage of this particular happening in the history of Westbrook to take counsel among ourselves and attempt to do something about it in the future. The attitude of the man in the street to delinquency is better now than it was a few years ago, just as it is to mental deficiencies. Our ability to rehabilitate boys and girls has improved in the past few years. Just prior to reading, in a voice choked with emotion, the moving passage from Charles Dickens to which I referred earlier, I marvelled to hear the hon. member for South Brisbane say that he believed there was no such thing as a bad boy. That is a high-falutin' sentiment. I would agree with it if you take the boy when he is

young enough, but at the age Westbrook gets them there is such a thing as a bad boy. I have seen them. There is no doubt that most hon. members would agree with me. I greatly deplore the intemperate and almost vindictive actions and attitude that the critics of the Minister and the Government have taken right from the start. We are dealing with too important a matter to allow it to become a political football. In the interests of a lot of boys who do not have very many chances in this world, surely hon. members opposite can forbear from getting the ultimate in political advantage from the matter. We have tried. I am telling the Committee that the Minister has honestly tried to improve Westbrook. It has been improved. The whole system has been improved. But for certain unfortunate publicity I do not think what happened would have happened. The future of the unfortunate boys is what I am worrying about most. I know how unfortunate some of them are because I have been there. It is very contemptible for people to bang the table and say, "We need a new Minister. It is his fault." They have a one-sided look at what happened and what was reported, forgetting what might have been said in favour of the Minister, Mr. Gollidge, and members of the staff up there. There is another side to it, and it is not a bad side at all. It is a record of long, painstaking, difficult, and devoted service on the part of a few who have been doing for the community at no very great cost to the community, because they are not highly paid, a service that not many men are prepared to give. The environment is not a good one, not a happy one, not an easy one.

The position that has arisen has created an opportunity—to use an Australianism—to put in the boot. The boot is being put into the Minister, Mr. Gollidge the Superintendent, and anyone else about the place. Nobody is prepared to look at the other side of the picture. Nobody apparently is wondering if out of all this publicity and unpleasantness perhaps many of the unfortunate boys for whom so many crocodile tears have been shed today, might be done a very great disservice.

It is most distressing for the staff. I know the staff. I know that by and large they are pretty good blokes. They may not be perfect. Of course they are not perfect—any more than we are. But they are pretty good blokes doing a pretty good job under circumstances that are not ideal. I admit that they are not ideal. I recognise that the whole system is not perfect. We recognised that the buildings were inadequate. But the Minister was doing something about it. The pity of it was that he did not get a chance to do everything. He started before the boil-up occurred. It must be remembered that in all this there are a whole lot of interests. As part of our code in Queensland we have something that the Australian has nailed to the mast called "a fair go." Give

a fair go to both sides of the argument. Do not let us criticise without having a good look at the other side. Remember there may be another side. I am telling the Committee that there is another side. When talking about Westbrook remember the sort of boys there are up there. There are bad boys at Westbrook—very bad boys. They are not sent to Westbrook until they are incorrigible. Many people, including the Salvation Army, various churches and social services have done their best for the boys. The boys have been through the courts to the stage where the courts have said, "We can do nothing with this boy. He will have to go to Westbrook." A collection of sometimes more than 100 of those boys is very difficult for any staff to handle. It is all very well to blame the intemperate actions of the staff for what has happened but just remember that it would be very difficult to put up with the sort of actions, remarks, attitude and habits that many of these boys have brought there. I am not running them down. Many of them, poor little beggars, never had a chance in all their lives.

I know much of the background of these chaps because quite often when I have been there I have talked about cases that have come in, with Mr. Gollledge and Mr. Kolberg who were very willing to discuss all the very interesting problems of the place and to tell me something of the background of some of these poor little beggars—the fact that they never had enough to eat before they came there, that they were almost pushed out onto the street by their parents to get something to eat for themselves and that they were not so much to blame if they fell by the way. I got to the stage where I had a very great respect for these men, including Mr. Gollledge, for all his faults.

Dr. Noble: Would you say he had a love for the boys?

Mr. FLETCHER: I would say he had a very deep concern for them because he showed it to me on many occasions. His actions have been eulogised by the Director of the State Children Department, and Mr. Schwarten himself has made comments on the other side of the ledger which go to show that Mr. Schwarten felt he had done a long and valuable service for the community.

It is a hard job to deal with this sort of boy and to get suitable staff to tolerate the conditions that are automatic at places like Westbrook. It is not a happy place in which to earn a living; it is not a happy environment, and it was a hard job for Mr. Gollledge to keep the institution's staff. He often did not have enough staff and had to do long stretches of service himself, even staying up nearly all night. He was doing the best he could in the circumstances and the circumstances are perhaps some of our fault. I humbly say that I have not taken as much interest in it nor pressed many of the things I thought about it as much as

I should have. Whilst changes were being made, Mr. Gollledge and his staff were doing the best they could in the circumstances. I am not saying that they were perfect and that they did not do many things they should not have done, or that they should not have done things they neglected to do, but they had to take the conditions as they were, as we inherited them.

There is another side to this. Perhaps we could all have done a bit better in this. I humbly feel that perhaps I have not done as much as I could have but at least I was there regularly. I have taken a continuing interest in it and I got to know, not very many of the boys because they were turning over all the time, but some of the staff, and I have, as I said before, often discussed the intimate troubles of the place with Mr. Gollledge and Mr. Kolberg, both officers who took a keen interest in their job.

I have said to them, with regard to discipline, "Don't you think you might be a bit hard?" and they said to me "The only way to run an open institution like this is to have discipline firm and perhaps hard. If you find a chap bullying another boy you have to discipline him on the spot in front of that boy so that he will not have the moral ascendancy he was trying to establish. If you find a fellow committing an unnatural offence in the dormitory you have to humiliate him on the spot in front of the other boys. You have to do it straight away, otherwise we could not run this place without locking cells." I said to them, "What about the chaps who get out and run away? Would not that be an indication that you need cells to lock them in or a better system of supervision?" They said—I can remember very well this particular discussion—"The price of having an open system without giving the boys who are here a feeling that they are outcasts, that they are completely outside the pale, and to at all costs give them a chance to get back into the community, is to take the risk that a few boys might run away. Under such a system they can run away but that is tolerated as a risk to give them a chance to feel that they are not outside the pale." To help with this viewpoint, this matter of keeping the boys feeling that they do not belong to an outcast generation, that they will perhaps be able to get back into the community, I have for a good while been connected with a movement started by a Presbyterian Minister in Pittsworth who took up these boys as a job of work for himself and started to teach them cricket. I have played cricket against them. Indeed, we play regular cricket matches against them and the whole idea is to keep the boys feeling they are not outcasts, that we think they are not bad blokes, that although they are locked up for a time, we do not think too badly of them to play cricket with them. I have nearly killed myself playing cricket against them. They also play football. I

have regularly been to their annual concerts. Somebody said that this was a place of no laughter. If hon. members went to their annual concerts they would find that this is not true. They hold jolly good concerts. I have heard some very good, funny shows put on by the boys. It is not as bad a place as apparently some hon. members opposite would have us believe.

Mr. Sherrington: As bad as Mr. Schwarten found.

Mr. FLETCHER: Mr. Schwarten gave us a two-sided report. In it, I regret, there are some bad things, but there are also some good things that have not been mentioned and I think they should be mentioned.

The worst thing that happened was the publicity that gradually developed over the last few months. Its effect was made worse by the fact that juvenile delinquency throughout the civilised world is becoming a greater problem year by year and in this respect we are no better off or no worse off than any other part of the civilised world. The greatest misfortune occurred when a less responsible element of the public Press took this up as a newsworthy subject and started to report little things about Westbrook and spotlighted Westbrook in the public mind. Even the Leader of the Opposition climbed on the band wagon, apparently thinking there was some profit in this. Finally, the "Truth" newspaper published a wild statement with a prognostication to the effect that a mass break-out was likely. The newspaper was taken to Westbrook and, of course, it precipitated the very thing that the newspaper suggested was imminent. They broke out, but the sufferers were the boys. My considered opinion is that some of the boys who may have had a chance of coming out of Westbrook feeling that they were still part of the ordinary community, feeling that they could get back and rehabilitate themselves as ordinary citizens, have probably now lost that chance. They were praised and publicised and stirred up to the stage that they broke out and, as it were, burned their moral boats and will have to go to gaol, and, having gone to gaol, they will not have the chance of getting back into the community that they had while they were there. The system of keeping an open house and of keeping them with a feeling—because we visited them and others visited them—that they were not completely animals and beyond the pale is lost to them now, and the people who caused their loss were the less responsible element of the Press and the people who saw this as a chance of getting some political advantage and jumped on the band wagon. Of course, they will not be regarded as animals, but that is the attitude of mind engendered in them when nobody is allowed to go and see them. Their chances of rehabilitation have been spoilt. I think that the Leader of the Opposition and some of the men who have given this matter so much publicity have already spoilt their chances. It is a pity that

the Press and members of the Opposition have referred to it as they have. If the Press concentrated on any one of us, and analysed us, to find the least creditable instance in our lives, such as in the disciplining of our children, and took that as the general standard of our conduct towards them, the report would not be bright. However, if they looked at our general care, welfare and guidance of our children, our record would not look too bad at all. By picking out a few instances when Mr. Golledge and his staff, in sheer desperation, petulance, or absolute weariness—having been worn down with a crisis of nerves—took certain action, and using them as average happenings, the Press have made it look very bad. They have left out altogether the history they might have written about Mr. Golledge, with all his faults. For years and years he has taken up the slack, in the deficiency of his staff, working long hours, and disciplining boys with poor morals weighing 12 stone. He has looked after more than 100 of the worst types of boys in the community. If all this had been taken into account the picture would have been much brighter.

Mr. Duggan: You were not so critical of the Press in 1957. You were very gleeful then.

Mr. FLETCHER: I was never very gleeful about the nasty attack of the Press.

Mr. Duggan: Yes, you were.

Mr. FLETCHER: The hon. member cannot say that about me.

I do not think there is anything to be proud of in this whole rotten sorry business. From my personal observations and I have made regular personal observations—

An Opposition Member: You have done nothing.

Mr. FLETCHER: Done nothing, my foot! Done nothing? I am very proud of the record of the Minister and this Government on child delinquency.

Mr. Sherrington: You just said that you have not done as much as you should.

Mr. FLETCHER: I admit that because I am a humble man. I have not done as much as I should, but the hon. member would not understand.

I admit that Westbrook is not as good as it ought to be, but then it is not as bad as the people who are making all sorts of observations would like us believe. If hon. members opposite were to look at both sides of the question they would see that the Government's record is pretty good. We have been pressing on with a complete system of overhaul of the policy on delinquency that will make this State equal to any in Australia. I am certainly not in the least ashamed of, or sorry for, our record.

I think the last speaker claimed that the Leader of the Opposition was a regular visitor

to Westbrook. That may be quite true, but I have been at Westbrook a good deal, and although I am not a bloodhound I have never run across any of his tracks nor have I heard that he was there. Nor have I ever heard that he was out there at a cricket match or took interest in any other sport. As he lived only 8 or 10 miles away that surely was a pre-requisite to someone who has felt impelled to come here and condemn the whole place.

Mr. Duggan: Before I became a Minister I never missed one occasion up there.

Mr. FLETCHER: I accept the hon. gentleman's word. I am just saying that I never saw him there and that I never heard of his being there.

In any case, I appeal to those who are looking so hardly at certain aspects of Westbrook to look at the other side because a great deal of devotion and good work and honest-to-goodness effort has gone into looking after Westbrook, both from the Minister's point of view and from the point of view of those who have served him faithfully and well as servants of the State there.

At 9.55 p.m., under Standing Order No. 307 and Sessional Order agreed to by the House on 25 October, progress was reported.

The House adjourned at 9.56 p.m.