

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER 1963**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

(4) Have civilian employees engaged within the central parking area power to issue tickets relating to all minor traffic breaches other than within parkatareas and will he enumerate those minor traffic breaches?

*Answers:—*

(1 and 2) "It is presumed the Honourable Member, when he says 'Central Parking Area' is referring to the 'Central Traffic Area.' There is no street in the Central Traffic Area, where it is not an offence to park for more than two hours, except in a parkatarea, having regard to other restrictions which might apply, for example, during peak hours, or statutory prohibitions or restrictions."

(3) "To endeavour to answer the Question in the form asked would necessitate the spending of a considerable amount of time by the staff of the Traffic Engineer's Office. If the Honourable Member cares to be more specific, an endeavour will be made to obtain the information sought."

(4) "Yes, but only during fixed hours of parkatarea parking, i.e. from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday to Friday, and 7 a.m. to 12 noon, Saturday. The minor traffic breaches referred to by the Honourable Member fall into the category of 'parking within twenty feet from any intersection from the property line,' 'double parking' and so forth. For a simplified precis of the details of such offences, I would commend to the Honourable Member the Handbook of the 1962 Traffic Regulations, published by the Traffic Commission, Chapter 9, Page 22, which clearly explains the position, a copy of which is tabled for the Honourable Member."

*Paper.*—Whereupon, Mr. Dewar laid upon the Table of the House a copy of the Traffic Regulations.

DAY LABOUR WORK, PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL.—Mr. Sherrington, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health and Home Affairs,—

In view of the disquiet as to their future among members of the day labour force employed at the Princess Alexandra Hospital following the recent dismissals from that project and the opinion expressed in *The Courier-Mail* of September 10, 1963, by Mr. J. Delaney, State Secretary of the Builders Labourers' Federation, that change from day labour to contract work was taking place in State hospital construction,—

(1) When is day labour work to commence on wards S3 and S6?

(2) Are any further day labour force dismissals contemplated?

(3) Do recent dismissals give an indication that when wards S3 and S6 are completed the day labour principle is to be abandoned?

## THURSDAY, 12 SEPTEMBER, 1963

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

### QUESTIONS

APPRENTICES, WILLOWBURN RAILWAY WORKSHOPS.—Mr. Duggan, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

(1) How many apprentices were engaged by the Railway Department for the year ended June 30, 1963?

(2) How many apprentices were engaged at the Willowburn workshops for the year ended June 30, 1963?

(3) What is the estimated number of apprentices to be offered employment at the Willowburn workshops in this financial year following the holding of the usual "end of the year" examinations and in what trade categories will the vacancies occur?

*Answers:—*

(1) "65."

(2) "Nil."

(3) "The number of apprentices to be appointed next year is 135, of whom 4 comprising boilermakers, 2; electrical fitter, 1; sheet metal worker, 1, will be employed at Willowburn workshops."

ARRANGEMENTS FOR PARKING IN CENTRAL TRAFFIC AREA.—Mr. Lloyd, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

(1) How many streets within the central parking area of Brisbane have no signs or markings or parkatareas, indicating to motorists that there will be no parking during certain times?

(2) Is it an offence to park in those streets during certain times of the day?

(3) How many tickets have been issued against motorists for parking in those streets?

Answers:—

"The South Brisbane Hospitals Board has informed me—

(1) "It has not yet been decided when work will commence on ward S3 but it is anticipated that a commencement will be made on ward S6 in four to six weeks."

(2) "That as the work of remodelling the old wards in the chronics section progressively lessens it will not be able to continue to gainfully employ some of the building workers and their services will have to be terminated as the occasion warrants."

(3) "When the remodelling of the wards is completed the Board will retain sufficient tradesmen and labourers for normal maintenance work. The question of the principle of day labour is not involved."

PARTICIPATION BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT IN A.B.C. BROADCASTS.—Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Is he aware that six Members, viz., the Members for Aubigny, Bundaberg, Burdekin, Cook, Fassifern and Townsville South, are debarred from participating in the weekly broadcast of the proceedings of this Parliament over the Australian Broadcasting Commission stations?

(2) If so, does he agree with this persecution and suppression of political minorities by the Australian Broadcasting Commission and, if not, will he make representations to the Postmaster-General to have all Members of this Parliament afforded the opportunity of participating in these broadcasts?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "The Policy in regard to broadcasting the proceedings of Parliament is determined by the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The practice is to give recognition to Government and Opposition Parties. If the Honourable Member would be prepared to organise the Honourable Members mentioned in his Question into a recognised Opposition Party, and could manoeuvre himself into the leadership of that Party, he would then be enabled to make his own representations to the Australian Broadcasting Commission".

CONDITIONS OF LEASE, MARINELAND, GREEN ISLAND.—Mr. Davies for Mr. Adair, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Public Lands.—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a Press statement in *The Courier-Mail* of September 11, 1963, stating that the owners Mr. V. Vlasoff and L. Grigg of Marineland, the main tourist attraction on Green Island, will be forced to close down as the sale of souvenirs, the major source of revenue,

was no longer being made because of legal complications regarding the interpretation of the lease?

(2) Will he, owing to the importance of this tourist attraction to the development of the tourist industry in Cairns and district, have a full investigation into the matter with a view to granting to owners of Marineland the same rights as other parties?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Messrs. V. Vlasoff and L. Grigg are the lessees of a special lease on Green Island granted for business (Marine Zoological Gardens) purposes. The conditions of lease provide that the leased land shall be used for the erection and maintenance thereon of a marine zoological gardens and for no other purpose whatsoever. The conditions further provide that no cafe or kiosk shall be conducted on the leased land and no food or drink of any description whatsoever shall be sold or served on the leased land. Messrs. Vlasoff and Grigg were contravening the conditions of lease by the sale of souvenirs, slides and photographic material on the leased land, and following complaints by other lessees on the island in whom such vending rights are vested in terms of lease conditions, the matter was recently investigated by a member of the Land Administration Commission and an agreement was drawn up between the several lessees on the island whereby Mr. Grigg agreed to sell only unmounted shells at the Marineland lease in consideration of being allowed to sell at the Underwater Observatory colour slides, photographic films, normal retail photographic supplies, postcards, folders and any souvenirs applicable to both the Marineland venture and the Underwater Observatory."

PAROLE AND PROBATION OFFICERS, BRISBANE AND TOWNSVILLE.—Mr. Tucker, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) How many full-time parole and probationary officers operate in the Brisbane area and how many part-time officers are so engaged?

(2) How many such officers are engaged in parole and probationary work in Townsville on (a) a full-time and (b) a part-time basis?

Answers:—

(1) "Six male probation and parole officers are operating full-time in the Brisbane area. There is also one female probation and parole officer operating on a part-time basis of three days per week."

(2) "No full-time officers are engaged in probation and parole supervision in the Townsville area, the work being carried out by the Clerk of Petty Sessions at Townsville on a part-time basis. Pursuant

to approval given on June 21 last arrangements are being made for the transfer of a full-time probation and parole officer from Brisbane to Townsville as from the beginning of 1964."

**BEDS IN SOUTHPORT DISTRICT HOSPITAL.**—Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health and Home Affairs,—

(1) What was the number of public, intermediate and private beds available at the Southport District Hospital at June 30, 1962, and at June 30, 1963?

(2) What was the daily average of occupied beds in these three sections for the twelve months period ended June 30, 1963?

*Answers:—*

(1) "There are no single bed private wards at Southport Hospital. The numbers of public and intermediate beds available at June 30, 1962, were the same as at June 30, 1963, and were 47 and 46 respectively."

(2) "The daily averages of occupied beds for the twelve months ended June 30, 1963, were public 42·8 and intermediate 30·7."

**PROTECTION FOR PEDESTRIANS, REDBANK BY-PASS ROAD.**—Mr. Donald, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

Is it the intention of the Main Roads Department to construct a fence along the edge of the cutting on the by-pass road through the township of Redbank, which will give adequate protection to school children and others?

*Answer:—*

"Yes."

**ROAD DIRECTION SIGNS AT WOOLLOONGABBA.**—Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Industry,—

In view of the fact that many heavy transport vehicles travelling interstate *via* the Pacific Highway turn direct left from Main Street, Woolloongabba, into Stanley Street and their drivers disturb residents, particularly at night, at the end of that street by seeking further directions, will he have erected larger signs at the Fiveways so that drivers can proceed to their destinations without inconvenience to themselves and others concerned?

*Answer:—*

"This matter has been referred to the Chairman, Traffic Commission, for investigation, and, if necessary, for appropriate action."

**SECONDARY SCHOOL COURSES, MOUNT LARCOM.**—Mr. Davies for Mr. Hanson, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Will new buildings sufficient to house proposed enrolments be available at Mount Larcom for secondary students at the start of the 1964 school-year?

(2) If the Answer to Question No. (1) is in the negative, is it the intention of the Department to use the Mount Larcom Public Hall for secondary courses?

(3) At the start of the school-year will facilities be available for commercial, academic, manual training and home science courses at this centre?

(4) If facilities will not be available for all of the aforementioned courses, will he see that satisfactory arrangements are made as expeditiously as possible?

*Answers:—*

(1) "Action is proceeding for the acquisition, by the process of resumption, of a new school site at Mount Larcom and it is proposed to erect the accommodation for the Secondary Department on this land. As this site will probably not be secure to my Department for some time, present indications are that the new building will not be ready for occupation at the commencement of the 1964 school-year."

(2) "Action will be initiated at an early date to obtain a report on the availability and suitability of the Mount Larcom Public Hall for temporary accommodation for the Secondary Department."

(3) "As from the beginning of the 1964 school-year Sub-Junior students will be enrolled in academic and commercial courses and Grade VIII pupils will commence the first year of the new secondary school course. The industrial and home science courses will be made available immediately after the construction of the special accommodation for these subjects has been completed."

(4) "From the three preceding answers it will be seen that arrangements will be made for instruction in the courses in question as soon as satisfactory accommodation, either temporary or permanent, is available."

**SURVEY OF COTTON-GROWING LANDS, TABLELANDS ELECTORATE.**—Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Public Lands,—

(1) Has a survey been made of land suitable for cotton growing in the Georgetown-Gilbert River area? If so, what area was found to be suitable?

(2) Has a similar survey been made of any other areas in the Tablelands Electorate and, if so, where?

*Answers:—*

(1) "No detailed survey has been made in the area. The climate compared with the Callide Valley shows a slightly higher annual rainfall—28 inches compared with

27 inches—with the bulk of the rain, 25½ inches, occurring during the growing period of the crop. Winters are dry with low humidity which is an advantage during the harvesting period. Mr. John E. Stewart, of Tunks Camp, Georgetown, has grown cotton for five years with the following results:—

	Average yield seed cotton per acre
1959—4 acres . . . . .	285 lb.
1960—12 acres . . . . .	1,521 lb.
1961—15 acres . . . . .	518 lb.
1962—40 acres . . . . .	756 lb.
(some irrigated)	
1963—55 acres . . . . .	339 lb.
(heavy frosts reduced yields)	

Owing to the favourable harvesting conditions grades of Strict Middling and even Good Middling are general. These figures indicate that, excluding the first year when experience was being gained, the average production is 780 lb. per acre which is a very satisfactory yield for rain grown cotton. Remoteness of the area is a disadvantage as freight costs could be excessive."

(2) "An examination of lands on portions of Woodleigh Pastoral Holding between Ravenshoe and Mt. Garnet was made in 1959 by a party consisting of officers of the Lands Department and the Department of Agriculture and Stock. The object of the investigation was to determine the suitability of this area for cotton growing. Mr. W. G. Wells, cotton consultant, a member of the party, was not optimistic of the possibilities for cotton production in this area. The main difficulty was considered to be the dangers of (1) crop loss and (2) poor weed control associated with protracted wet periods in the first three months of the year. In his recommendation Mr. Wells concluded that:—'In view of the considerable area of soil which might be suitable for growing tobacco under conditions of supplementary irrigation in this section of Woodleigh Pastoral Holding and their relative proximity to the Herbert River, it would appear more advisable to explore the district's possibilities for developing an irrigated tobacco industry than a rain-grown cotton industry.' Cotton trials are being conducted at Walkamin Experiment Station and the Parada Tobacco Experiment Station has grown trial plots—results are inconclusive."

**REMODELLING OF DENTAL CLINIC, MARYBOROUGH.**—Mr. Davies, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Public Works,—

(1) Have plans and specifications been completed for the remodelling of the dental clinic in Maryborough? If so, when does he expect work to commence?

(2) Will alterations and improvements be carried out by the Public Works Department?

Answers:—

(1) "Plans and specifications for the remodelling of the dental clinic in Maryborough have not been and are not being prepared by the Department of Public Works. The Department has no knowledge as to when work is expected to commence."

(2) "The Department of Health and Home Affairs has not requested the Department of Public Works to carry out the alterations and improvements and it is unlikely that it will do so."

#### PAPER

The following paper was laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report—

The Under Secretary for Development and Mines for the year 1962.

#### DISTRICT COURTS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

#### SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 11 September (see p. 295) on Mr. Munro's motion—

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

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (11.18 a.m.): At the adjournment yesterday I was referring to the argument and debate that had been directed to the salaries of District Court judges. Whilst I readily concede that the District Court has performed a worthwhile task, at the same time I adopt the arguments advanced by my Leader on the subject of salaries. There is further evidence—statutory evidence—to prove that the arguments advanced by my Leader are correct, and that those advanced by the Premier and the Minister for Justice are not in keeping with the underlying motive in the Bill. It has been argued by the Premier that these salaries must be increased to meet the exorbitant taxation that is imposed by the Federal Liberal-Country Party Government, and the Minister for Justice has argued that the salary increases are commensurate with those granted to others in the Public Service on a similar salary scale.

Let me assure the Parliament that the District Courts Act of 1958 provided in Section 15, for the salaries of District Court judges to be fixed at £3,750 a year. Since then there has been only one increase and that was granted in 1960, a little more than 12 months after the reconstitution of the District Courts, when the salaries were increased to £4,500. Now it is proposed to increase them to £5,000, which will mean, in effect, in just a little over 4½ years, an increase in the salaries of District Court judges of 33½ per cent.

I venture to say that the real reason for the necessity of that rather steep increase in salaries has been that, as mentioned yesterday, the Minister discovered that qualified barristers were not prepared to accept appointment on the original scale, and that, in order to attract men of the calibre, quality and experience required, the salary had to be increased. That is the real reason, in spite of the arguments that have been advanced by Cabinet Ministers.

**Mr. Ramsden:** That is why you knocked it back?

**Mr. BENNETT:** That is correct. I know that the Minister would be very anxious to get a man of my standing on the court, but I have more onerous duties to perform elsewhere.

It has been. I think, truthfully argued prior to the reconstitution of the District Court that it would be in effect a cheaper jurisdiction or a less costly arena than the Supreme Court for certain types of litigation—and with that observation I also readily concur—but I think the saving in costs is mainly in relation to the scale of costs determined under the District Courts Act and allowed to be charged by legal representatives. I doubt whether the administration of the courts themselves, from a governmental point of view, is substantially less costly than the operation of the Supreme Court. As the District Courts have now been in operation for a little over 4½ years it would seem highly desirable that the Minister take out some statistics as to costs in order to show just how much has been saved by their operation. As we all well know, in the early 1920's the existence of the District Court was severely, and eventually successfully, challenged. Over the intervening 37 years it had been discussed with a certain amount of scepticism so I think that, in order to convince legal men, in order to convince those in charge of the administration of State affairs, and in order to convince the public generally, it is now time for the Minister himself to produce figures to show just what saving there is, if any—and I presume there is a saving—by the operation of the District Court.

On the other hand, if there is no appreciable saving through the operation of the District Court, we should, of course, revert to the old system of having the Supreme Court embrace the two jurisdictions. If there is no appreciable saving but a cutting down of what is sometimes referred to as the court lag, that could have been achieved by having more judges than we had before 1958. If it is merely a matter of the numerical strength of the judiciary and not a matter of substantial savings, I think we should have those judges operating as Supreme Court judges.

In order to show whether the District Court should be continued or, alternatively, the Supreme Court granted its original jurisdiction in this field with an increase in the

number of judges, figures should be produced by the Minister so that we may be properly apprised of the financial aspect of the operations of the District Court. I do not think that anyone would seriously challenge its efficiency and power to deal with those matters within its jurisdiction, so that it then becomes a question of economics in determining whether arrangements should be made for its jurisdiction to be increased or decreased, or for it to be assimilated with the Supreme Court. Obviously the only consideration must be the cost to the State.

I feel that, because it is successful and has a limited monetary jurisdiction, if substantial savings are being effected by its operation its monetary jurisdiction should be increased. At the moment the District Court has jurisdiction up to only £2,500 in personal actions, and that amount is considerably reduced—to £1,500—in other actions. It has no jurisdiction to try any case in which the title of land is involved, or any action concerning the validity of a bequest or devise, or the interpretation of a will. In personal actions, known as running-down cases, the District Court can determine claims involving sums up to £2,500. As the law involved is no different if the amount of the claim is increased, why cannot the District Court deal with claims up to £4,500 or £5,000? The law is no more complicated if the amount is greater. The only difference is that claims for greater amounts are made by unfortunate people whose personal injuries have been more severe. If a saving is being effected in the operation of this court, in my opinion its jurisdiction should be considerably increased.

**Mr. Aikens:** Is there any saving to the client? Do counsel charge as much for appearing in the District Court as in the Supreme Court?

**Mr. BENNETT:** If the hon. member for Townsville South would only read the Act he would not have to ask that simple question. He reminds me when he makes his speeches of the inebriated Scot who spends some time at the tavern and then goes out and jumps on his steed and gallops off in all directions. That is typical of his conduct.

To answer that simple query, legal fees for counsel and solicitors in the District Court are considerably less than those applying in the Supreme Court jurisdiction, because the fees are fixed by the scale in the schedule to the District Courts Act. The fees are considerably less than those that counsel would charge for appearing in a similar case, involving the same law, in the Supreme Court. I suppose, and rightly so, that they regard their responsibilities as perhaps greater in the higher jurisdiction, just as they would regard them as even greater if appearing in the High Court of Australia.

In any case, I am not saying that their fees should or should not be greater or less. The actual hard, cold fact is that, according

to the scale in the schedule to the District Courts Act, they are considerably less than counsel in fact charge in the Supreme Court.

**Mr. Aikens:** Can Queen's Counsel appear in the District Court?

**Mr. BENNETT:** Queen's Counsel can appear in the Court of Petty Sessions. The only restriction on the appearance of a Queen's Counsel in any court is that he must always be accompanied by a junior, who is entitled to two-thirds of his fee. Anyone who engages Queen's Counsel has to make provision for not only his fees but for two-thirds of them in addition so that the junior can be paid. That is the only qualification for the appearance of Queen's Counsel, who can appear in any jurisdiction.

The point is that the law involved in personal injury cases and many other actions involving sums of up to £1,500 is the same in all courts, even in the High Court. In my opinion, the responsibility of counsel is the same, and my experience is that all counsel would give the same care and attention to the preparation of their cases whether they were appearing in the Court of Petty Sessions, the Magistrates Court, the Supreme Court, or the High Court. I believe, therefore, that the limit of monetary jurisdiction is, according to the claims that are now made and met, rather artificial and should be increased considerably.

We speak of the Supreme Court lag; much is made of it in the House, and reference is often made to it in the Press. I concede that in one sphere of the Supreme Court's activities there is a lag, and if many of the running-down cases were removed from its jurisdiction by increasing the monetary limit of the jurisdiction of the District Court, this would assist materially in reducing the lag in civil jurisdiction in the Supreme Court.

I should like to make one comment in passing. The lag in court cases can be grossly exaggerated, of course. There is no lag in the Court of Criminal Appeal, in the Full Court, or in the Criminal Court other than intermittently, when there is a bank-up because of a long, drawn-out criminal trial—I shall not mention names—and temporary congestion is caused.

**Mr. Thackeray:** Such as the Hally trial.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Yes, such as the Hally trial, and there have been one or two others. The Plomp trial was another.

There is a bank-up, of course, in civil jurisdiction, and there are various reasons for that. Firstly, at times there are not enough courts to enable all the judges who are available to sit. But cases in civil jurisdiction are delayed, in the main, advisedly and purposely by counsel in the administration of justice in regard to the running-down cases to which I have referred already. That is done in the interests of clients who have been seriously injured in motor-car accidents and other serious accidents, because it is not

in their interests, or in the interests of justice, to have their cases determined until doctors can assure counsel and the court that the injuries have stabilised, which sometimes takes from two to three years. Even though that seems to be an inordinately long delay, it is in the client's own interests because the injuries may not have been repaired within that time. In fact, in some instances they are not repaired for a considerable time after that. So, while there are some inexcusable delays, some delays are deliberately sought by conscientious legal men acting in the interests of their clients, and rightly so. Inexcusable delays and delays caused by a shortage of judges and courts could be eliminated, at least to some extent, by increasing the monetary limit of the jurisdiction of the District Court.

The District Court was originally abolished on 31 March, 1922, and within three days the Magistrates Court Act of 1921 came into operation, giving magistrates a certain amount of civil jurisdiction formerly exercised by District Court judges. It has been vigorously argued that some of that jurisdiction also should be retrieved by the District Court judges.

There are other principles in the Bill, one of which provides for the transfer of civil actions from the Magistrates Court jurisdiction direct to the District Court. That, obviously, is a desirable amendment introduced to cure a bad anomaly that prevailed in the original District Court and Magistrates Court rules.

I know that those rules were hastily drafted because, at the time, it was desired to have the District Court operating fully at the beginning of the 1959 court year, and most of the rules—and the Act itself—were taken from the old District Court Act of 1891. Of course, during the intervening period, the practice of law has changed considerably and the modern approach is vastly different. So, those rules need attention in many respects, not only in relation to transferring of these actions from the Magistrates Court to the District Court.

Even up till the present time, if a person commences an action in the Magistrates Court and his injuries worsen, his claim thereby automatically becoming greater, he cannot transfer his claim from the Magistrates Court, in which the maximum jurisdiction is £600, to the District Court. He has to go through the expensive and ridiculous procedure of making application for the action to be transferred to the Supreme Court, because the Supreme Court rules still make provision for actions to be transferred direct from the Magistrates Court to the Supreme Court. Having successfully paid for and made an application to transfer the action from the Magistrates Court to the Supreme Court, the litigant finds that the Supreme Court tells him that his claim comes within the District Court jurisdiction and, in effect, it cannot waste its time dealing with

claims of that nature. The litigant then has to make a further reasonably expensive application to have his claim transferred from the Supreme Court to the District Court, instead of being able to go direct from the Magistrates Court to the District Court. So, obviously, this amendment has been desirable for a long time and I believe that it has been included as a result of representations by the Bar to the Minister. Incidentally, because of the cost involved and the circuitous route that litigants presently have to take, many actions are lying idle in the Magistrates Court pending this amendment, so that they can be taken direct from the Magistrates Court to the District Court.

I have had personal experience also, because of the defect in the rules relating to cross-appeals, with the lodging of appeals. It will be found that in the Magistrates Court jurisdiction, claimants fight out their case and one of them gets judgment. He may not be particularly happy with the judgment that he has obtained—he may be far from content with the decision he received from the magistrate—but he decides, taking the expense and the time factor for appeal into consideration—and the strain of litigation neurosis—to accept the decision. On the other hand, his opponent, who is perhaps more adversely affected by the magistrate's decision, decides that he will appeal against it. The rule, under Section 11 of the Magistrates Court Acts, stipulates that an appeal must be made within the prescribed time, which is 21 days if it is in the Brisbane, Rockhampton or Townsville registries, otherwise within 30 days. I have found to my bitter experience—and so have other legal men and litigants—that very often an aggrieved or discontented litigant will wait until the very last day before lodging his appeal. When the respondent or the person against whom he has appealed is served with the notice of motion, he discovers that it is too late for him to lodge an appeal also. In other words, the man who was not particularly happy with the judgment but was prepared in the circumstances to accept it—he might well believe that he could upset the judgment but decides to rest content—discovers all of a sudden, when it is too late for him to appeal, that the other man has appealed against the decision. Therefore, he is faced with the expense of going on appeal to the District Court. He has to brief a solicitor and counsel. The case may last one, two or three days. It means that he is fighting his case, not to improve or increase the judgment previously given in his favour, or to defend his own position, but against the appellant, who did not give him time to lodge an appeal so that the real merits of the case, and the merits of the case fought out in the Magistrates Court, could be re-determined, as it were, in the District Appeal Court. The way he is fighting his case, it is all duck and no dinner as far as he is concerned. He

has to resist the appellant's case but he has no chance of arguing his own in respect of a judgment which he was prepared to accept but with which he was discontented.

Having fought that case it could well be that under the law he was entitled to an improvement in the decision he got, but he cannot argue that. He has to fight it on appeal purely on the case of the appellant because it was too late for him to lodge an appeal. The appellant who has fought his case on a particular point might be successful. In the past that has happened on many occasions. As a legal man I have been put to disadvantage by it. If the appellant succeeds in his appeal he is entitled to his full costs of the appeal. The unfortunate respondent who is successful in the court of first instance does not even get a chance to argue his case. I have drawn the attention of District Court judges to that fact, and they have agreed, both in court and privately, that the rule requires amending in that regard. I felt that this Bill should have made provision for such a cross-appeal. It is, and was, the intention of the District Court rules to simplify court procedures and pleadings so that the previous possibly ornate pleadings could be avoided or eliminated, but there are certain rules in the Supreme Court rules which have stood the test of time. They prevent injustices and are highly desirable. The Supreme Court rules make provision for that cross-appeal, and I certainly think that this particular court rule should also make provision for it.

**Mr. Walsh:** It should not be very difficult to overcome.

**Mr. BENNETT:** No. It is only a matter of inserting a further sub-clause to the rule presently relating to appeals. I refer to the time limit in which to lodge an appeal—21 days. All that is needed is an addition to that clause to provide that the respondent can also appeal within, say, a further seven or 14 days.

There are many anomalies, of course, one of which concerns pleadings. I am not an advocate for ornate, expensive pleadings where one argues legal technicalities about the merits of the case, which sometimes results in injustice being done to bona-fide litigants. However, there is already provision in the Supreme Court rules for a litigant—to use the legal expression—not to admit a particular allegation in his pleadings. The District Court rules provide that a litigant either admits or expressly denies. If he does not deny, then he is deemed to have admitted. That is an unfair aspect of the pleadings in the District Court. A litigant might have an allegation of fact made against him which he is not prepared to deny in all truthfulness, but at the same time he may have little or no knowledge of that fact so that he is also not prepared to admit it. In effect, he says, "If that is correct and true then I want the plaintiff, or the

defendant, as the case may be, to prove that particular allegation or to establish that fact." He should be entitled to say, "I do not admit," without having to untruthfully deny it, because he cannot truthfully deny it. However, if he does not deny it he is deemed to admit, and if he does deny it, and it proves to be correct, he suffers in costs. I submit that the provision covering admissions should also be corrected.

In the Brisbane, Rockhampton, and Townsville registries both parties to litigation may appeal within 21 days, and within 30 days elsewhere. However, the first party to appeal has to lodge £50 security for costs. When he does that, he sets the appeal in motion. The other party can then appeal within the 21 days without lodging any security. Because an appeal is pending he is allowed to run along, as it were, and have his case argued. Very often it is found that he is the type who will not, or perhaps cannot, lodge security, and he often causes unnecessary delay and prolongs argument in the District Court. I have had appeals running into the second and third day. I have successfully defended them and have found, after they have taken up so much time that I could not recover anything from the other party, not even security for launching the appeal. Whether an appellant gets in first or second, I believe he should lodge £50 security for costs to prove that he has a bona-fide case to argue, and to show that he has some money to pay the other party should he be the successful litigant in the appeal.

**Mr. Walsh:** You had better start a fund like the Medical Benefits Fund for the protection of the legal fraternity.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I assure the hon. member that if we had a legal fund similar to the Medical Benefits Fund legal men would be considerably more opulent than they are.

There is one particularly important aspect in the criminal jurisdiction of the District Courts. It must be conceded that the District Court judges deal with a large volume of criminal work. As a matter of fact, it would be fair and correct to say that due to the existence of the District Court the circuit court work of Supreme Court judges has been virtually eliminated. In the main, circuit court work relates to criminal court work and District Court judges do most of that work.

Although I am not suggesting for a moment that there has been any serious, or real, lag in the hearing of criminal trials—there should not be, of course, in the interests of justice—from time to time small delays are occasioned by the attitude of magistrates in committal proceedings. Committal proceedings are known as preliminary proceedings to decide whether or not, in effect, there is a case to go to a jury. That is greatly simplifying it. Some magistrates are inclined to think that so long as there is a prima facie case they must commit. It does not

seem to matter to them whether anyone would accept a case or believe it, or whether it is impossible to believe it. Instead of carefully studying the case to determine whether the witnesses are worthy, reliable, and honest men who would be believed by a jury, some magistrates decide, if witnesses have given any evidence at all touching on the proposed charge, that the man should be put upon trial. They do not decide whether or not there is any likelihood of a jury convicting him.

Obviously, in law, by virtue of the authorities, that is a wrong attitude to adopt under the Justices Act; but it has been further fostered by the fact—and unfortunately there is provision in the Justices Act for this to be done—that, if the committal proceedings last one, two, three, four, five or six days, one is likely to have one, two, three, four, five or six different magistrates presiding over the daily proceedings. That is simply making committal proceedings in this State an absolute farce. How can you argue to a particular magistrate, say, at the end of a six-day hearing, that the evidence of such-and-such a witness who gave evidence on the third day should not be accepted? How can you put to the magistrate, "If only you had seen his demeanour, if only you had listened to his answers and seen how he hedged and hesitated and avoided the questions, you could not possibly believe him and no jury would."? The magistrate's only answer is, "Well, I didn't see him; I wasn't here."

As a matter of fact, I had the personal experience of telling a magistrate something that happened during the course of certain committal proceedings, and he was the man who eventually determined that the unfortunate accused should be put to the expense of trial in the District Court, the man who, under the Justices Act, had to solemnly determine that the courts should be put to the expense of trying this accused—and the trial will last at least five days. The accused can ill afford the expense of that litigation—litigation of a type that clutters up our District Courts. While I was arguing before the magistrate that it was not a case to go to trial because such-and-such a thing had happened—and he is supposed to have heard and presided over everything, except that there is this loophole in the Justices Act—he said to me, "Yes, Mr. Bennett, I read that in the newspaper." Surely that is making committal proceedings a sham. Surely it is adopting a hypocritical practice in the procedure of committal proceedings, when a man may be committed for trial on a very serious matter perhaps involving him in at least £200 to £300 legal costs, for the magistrate who is determining whether he should go to trial to say, "Yes, I read it in the newspaper."! It is really a shocking situation and I sincerely hope that, in the interests of the District Court, the Justices Act will be amended to ensure that one

magistrate, and one magistrate only, will preside over the whole of a hearing of committal proceedings.

Often in the past the District Court in criminal jurisdiction has set aside two, three, four or five days for a proposed criminal trial and, when the District Court judge has read the depositions, or what is in effect a record of the committal proceedings, he has seen that obviously there is not a case to go to the jury and has made a certain intimation to the Crown Prosecutor appearing in court, who also has appreciated the legal principles involved and has then entered a *nolle prosequi*. Meanwhile the State has been put to the expense of this criminal District Court being delayed for at least one day, or, because the trials had been set down, possibly two or three days without doing constructive work, and the unfortunate accused in the dock could perhaps be spending the interim period at Boggo Road or certainly, alternatively, has been subjected to rather substantial legal costs to answer a case that was not even there in the first place.

So I think, if we are going to have committal proceedings—and I certainly agree that we should have them—they should be conducted in a proper and sincere manner to determine whether or not there is a case to go to a jury.

(Time expired.)

**Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (11.54 a.m.), in reply: I have listened with very great interest to the learned remarks of the hon. member for South Brisbane, although I must confess I have had very great difficulty in discovering those small parts of his speech that were relevant to the principles of the Bill under discussion. Within the very limited time available to me I propose to deal with only those parts that are relevant, and I propose to deal with them in the shortest possible time.

The hon. member raised two main points. First of all, he raised the question of whether the District Courts should be continued and he rather gave the impression that he was initiating a move to have them abolished and to have us revert to the position that obtained before their establishment. I simply say that the hon. member himself provided the answer when he pointed out that the District Court is less costly to litigants. That alone is sufficient reason for its continuation.

He also raised the subsidiary point of whether consideration might be given to enlarging its jurisdiction. I have already indicated that I recognise that the time may be approaching when it will be desirable to consider some increase in the present monetary limits.

The remainder of the debate at the second-reading stage was largely a reiteration of what we heard on the initiation of the

Bill, to which I replied fully at that time. I do not propose to go over it all again. I do, however, wish to draw attention to the inconsistency and lack of logic in the various arguments put forward by the Opposition. Attempts have been made to show that there is a lack of consistency in our thinking in determining the salaries of judges of the Supreme Court, judges of the District Court, and top public servants. I point out that the figures that Opposition members put forward and the arithmetical comparisons with percentages of various increases really have very little application to the terms of this Bill. They merely indicate a superficiality of thinking on the matter.

In the couple of minutes that I have available, let me indicate that those three things are not identical problems; each has different considerations. In the case of judges of the Supreme Court, do not let us overlook the essential point that we had to consider the undue lag there had been in reviewing their salaries, and let me also point out that the District Court was established only in 1958.

**Mr. Bennett:** 1959.

**Mr. MUNRO:** By legislation in 1958. We did not at that time have experience of its operation, and it is perfectly natural that we have on this occasion been guided by our experience since then. A number of considerations apply to top public servants, and in this case it is very clear that the main one must be relatively with the salaries of other public servants.

In view of the state of the clock, I do not propose to take up any more of the time of the House at this stage.

Motion (Mr. Munro) agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hooper, Greenslopes, in the chair.)

Clauses 1 to 4, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

##### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—FIFTH ALLOTTED DAY

Debate resumed from 10 September (see p. 278) on Mr. McKechnie's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

**Mr. BROMLEY** (Norman) (12 noon): Before passing on to more important matters, I wish to make a brief reference to Miss Erica Parker's comments in yesterday's "Telegraph" about parliamentarians and their modes of dress. Perhaps this charming lady does not know—

**Mr. Walsh:** How do you know she is charming? You have not seen her.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I am saying she is charming because she referred not only to hon. members on this side of the Chamber but to hon. members opposite as well. The main reason why some of us are not as well dressed or such pictures of sartorial splendour as the gentlemen mentioned—I can say this honestly—is that most members of Parliament have so many commitments in their electorates that they cannot afford to dress really well. I believe that all hon. members would like to dress much more presentably; but when we feel that we need new clothes or a new suit, we must look over the situation four or five times before deciding whether or not we can afford them. I want to make it clear that we cannot dress as Miss Parker would like us to because we cannot afford it.

When the debate was adjourned last Tuesday, I was speaking of a matter of great importance to the community generally and to the original people of Australia, the aboriginals, particularly, and I had referred to certain clauses in the Australian Constitution relating to aboriginals.

To continue, Section 127 of the Constitution, which relates to census, states—

“In reckoning the numbers of the people of the Commonwealth, or of a State or other part of the Commonwealth, aboriginal natives shall not be counted.”

The Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement believes that this expression of racial discrimination should be removed. I believe, as do the various organisations associated with the advancement and integration of aboriginals, that they are people, in spite of what Section 127 of the Commonwealth Constitution says, and that they have a right to peace, order and good government under both State and Commonwealth Parliaments. Although many people say that matters concerning aboriginals should be dealt with mainly by the Commonwealth, I believe that State Parliaments should also have much to say about them and to do with them. For both moral and practical reasons, therefore, Section 127 should be removed from the Australian Constitution.

Section 51, paragraph 26, means that the laws governing aboriginals are the responsibility of the States, apart from those living in the Northern Territory, and the effect of paragraph 26 is that there is little uniformity between the laws governing aboriginals in the States and those governing them in the Northern Territory. I intend to quote briefly from a pamphlet issued by the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement to show the rights enjoyed by aboriginals on settlements and reserves in five States and the Northern Territory. They have voting rights in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and the Northern Territory; they do not have them in Western Australia or Queensland. They can marry freely in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia, but they cannot in Western Australia, the Northern Territory, and

Queensland. They have the right to control their own children in New South Wales and Victoria, but not in South Australia, Western Australia, the Northern Territory, or Queensland. In New South Wales they can move freely within their own State, but in Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland they have not that freedom.

Another anomaly exists in the various States in relation to owning their own property. In New South Wales and South Australia they have that right, but in Victoria, Western Australia, the Northern Territory, and Queensland they have not.

A very important factor also is that in relation to their ability to receive award wages. In New South Wales, once again aboriginals have the right to receive award wages, but in all other States, including the Northern Territory, they have not. In relation to the use of alcohol they have no rights whatever in any of the States.

So, if we study that table we find that aboriginals, particularly those in Queensland, are not enjoying the rights which, in my opinion, they justly deserve. I feel that such variations and inconsistencies among the various States cannot be justified and must cause a great deal not only of embarrassment but also of confusion among these aboriginal people.

**Mr. Pizzey:** It is the very same Act with which your party was satisfied for over 40 years.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I agree with the Minister for Education and Migration, but the point I am trying to make is that it is about time something definite was done about the advancement of aboriginals. As the Minister has seen fit to interject, I feel that he is interested in what I am saying and, because of that, perhaps something may be done.

I intend later in the session to speak more about these people; I will simply say now that, if it is our serious intention to deal justly with aboriginal people, we must do much more than merely go through the motions of doing the right thing. We could give them the vote in Queensland. That would be a step in the right direction but I do not think that that alone is going to help them; we must do much more.

I should like to congratulate the Australian Road Safety Council on its periodical named “Report”. At the same time, I should like to pay tribute to the various radio stations and television channels for their regular messages on road safety. I feel that these are doing quite an amount of good and, whilst unfortunately the accident rate remains high, without these particular announcements and the information and advice contained in “Report” it would be much higher.

On various occasions in this House I have asked quite a number of questions of the Minister concerned relating to the fitting of

safety belts in motor vehicles. In answer to a question that I directed to the Minister for Labour and Industry, the Premier replied on his behalf that it was not intended to make compulsory the use of safety belts in vehicles. I then made a further suggestion to test whether the fitting of safety belts was a good idea, namely, that the Government should make compulsory the fitting of them in all Government-owned vehicles. This has not been done, except perhaps in the case of two departments. I feel that, if this was carried out, it would be found that the fitting of safety belts would have the effect of reducing the number of serious accidents.

I have here a copy of the Road Safety Council's "Report" which states under "Safety Belt News" that, where these belts are used, injuries are reduced 50 per cent. The survey involved 1,792 company cars in an American commercial enterprise. Figures were compared for the periods 1951-1955, and 1956-1961. That proves to my mind that the fitting of safety belts in all vehicles would reduce the number of serious injuries.

I am pleased that the Minister has taken notice of my numerous requests to increase the number of police motor-cycle road patrols. I am sure this has cut down the number of road accidents, both fatal and non-fatal. As I have said before, the sight of a uniform is a great deterrent to those who become almost maniacs when they get behind the wheel of a motor vehicle. As a further deterrent to these maniacs—a term I use advisedly—I make the further appeal that the Minister make more patrol-men available on the roads. I publicly congratulate the members of the Traffic Branch who have been employed on that duty for their efficiency in patrolling the roads. I also thank them for their display of efficiency and fearlessness at the last R.N.A. show when they gave the public a magnificent demonstration of motor-cycle precision riding.

I draw the attention of the people of Queensland, and all members of Parliament, to how the free-hospitalisation scheme in this State has deteriorated under the present coalition Government. As we all know Queensland owes her free-hospitalisation system to the Australian Labour Party when in government. Without any doubt the only reason that the present Government has not given it away entirely is the fear that if it did it would not retain the Treasury benches.

In reply to a question about day labour we were told that the day-labour system, particularly for work on hospitals, is almost a thing of the past. To my mind that is very upsetting. The figures prove that a great saving is effected by the use of day labour. Because of that great saving, further improvements to our hospitals system are possible. The decay of the present system is only too evident. It is being sabotaged by pin-pricking economy measures which allow equipment and staffing to deteriorate. It destroys the confidence of the voluntary workers who serve on hospital boards in the various

country towns and cities. To my mind they are an integral part of Labour thinking in the field of health. Of course, hospital boards were established by the A.L.P. when in government.

In country areas I have seen the failure to staff hospitals. Patients have been bailed up for money the day after operations have been performed on them, and they have been discharged, unwillingly, before they were well.

**Mr. Pizzey:** Where was this?

**Mr. BROMLEY:** In various country cities.

**Mr. Pizzey:** Name them.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I will when the appropriate Estimates come up for debate. I have not time now because I want to get on to other matters. I can name people who, although dying, have been discharged from hospital annexes. They have been discharged from S Wards and sent to Eventide homes to remain there for only one or two days before dying. If the Minister wants their names I will give them to him.

The Minister for Health and Home Affairs said that the Government is doing away with the Eventide system, or will not extend it. Further extensions of this scheme form part of our policy.

In general building, the Government has demonstrated its anxiety to prostrate itself before private enterprise by gradually eliminating day labour in the construction of hospitals. This is resulting in rising costs, to the detriment of the health services in the community. Last year the provision for hospitals was underspent by more than £54,000. At the 1959 Country Party conference, which the Minister attended, a member of the Bundaberg Hospitals Board stated, that the board has been so drastically treated it had been necessary to cut out morning and afternoon teas. Last financial year, too, the vote for furnishings, plant, and equipment for hospitals, was underspent by £18,000. Only recently, on 30 December, 1962, unrest and discontent was reported in five country hospitals. I ask you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what has the Minister to say in reply to that? He knows it is true.

I appeal to the Premier, and to the Government, on behalf of a grand body of men and boys who sacrifice their week-ends, and sometimes their lives, trying to save others. I am referring, of course, to the life-savers who go down to the sea—not in ships—to help people who get into difficulty. I ask the Government to supply transport for them. I live in a suburb which is on the road to the Gold Coast. When I am proceeding home, on Friday evenings particularly, I am impressed by the shameful sight of young lads trying to hitch-hike. I ask the Government to supply transport, such as mini-buses, to operate from the various termini on the South Coast and North Coast roads so that

these life-savers may get to their destinations without worry. Of course, a fixed time could be set for departure from the termini, and the buses could return to their various depots on Sunday evening. I make that appeal because I believe that some car drivers who would like to pick up the young lads will not because they fear that, in the event of an accident, they may be involved in litigation which could embarrass them and cause them to be absent from work for a considerable time. I think this suggestion is worthy of careful consideration, and I make the appeal now because the life-saving clubs are at present assembling for the coming surfing season.

(Time expired.)

**Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY** (Isis—Minister for Education and Migration) (12.19 p.m.): Firstly, I congratulate all the new members in the House on their excellent contributions to the debate. It is not easy for any hon. member to come before Parliament and make his first speech. I believe that all hon. members have been impressed by the many speeches that have been made by the newcomers and I am sure they will contribute many other excellent speeches during their term in Parliament.

I also join with other hon. members in expressing my loyalty and affection for the Queen and also my great admiration for His Excellency Sir Henry Abel Smith in the tremendous job he has done since his appointment as Governor of Queensland. I do not think anyone else has travelled as widely or has shown such a great and detailed interest in what is going on in the State as our present Governor. He is beloved and admired in every nook and corner. He has been to every shire and every city. He has been down to the wharves, down the mines, and into the meatworks. Wherever he finds Queenslanders at work he makes it his business to go along and meet them and try to understand what they are doing. Queensland is particularly fortunate in having so able a representative of the Queen.

I should like to reply briefly to the hon. member for Norman, who mentioned something about aboriginal welfare and the various organisations, some of them idealists and "do-gooders," who do not know the real story and the real problems associated with aboriginals.

**Mr. Wallace** interjected.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** The hon. member is one of those, too—the Cairns Aboriginals Advancement League. I should like to tell a story or two about that league and how detrimental the actions of some of its members are to the welfare of aboriginals.

**Mr. WALLACE:** I rise to a point of order. The Minister said I was on the Aboriginals Advancement League in Cairns. I deny that. I do not belong to any such organisation.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I accept the hon. member's denial. I said that I should like to tell the House something about the Cairns Aboriginals Advancement League.

**Mr. Wallace:** Just be a bit more accurate in your statements.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Well, there is a story or two that can be told about what happened in Cairns, but those stories can be told at the appropriate time.

The legislation that the hon. member for Norman was critical of is word for word the legislation that his own party was satisfied with for 40 years and, as the hon. member for Bundaberg said, the legislation that was proclaimed far and wide throughout Australia. I believe it is time to re-assess the position and to see whether some better legislation can be provided. I believe it can and will be.

**Mr. Bromley:** That is what I was trying to get before you.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Yes, but sometimes the hon. member was critical of this Queensland Government.

**Mr. BROMLEY:** I rise to a point of order. I did not criticise the Government in any way, as a check of the proof of "Hansard" will confirm. I simply brought to the notice of the House the situation that exists. I did not criticise the Government in relation to aboriginals.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I accept that. The hon. member was critical of Queensland's attitude in comparison with what some of the other States are doing.

**Mr. Bromley:** It is quite true, isn't it?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Some of it is true, and this Government intends to take some action in the near future.

**Mr. Bromley:** I am very happy to hear it.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Hon. members should have an adequate opportunity to express their views in the March session, when we hope to introduce legislation to provide an even better deal for aboriginals than in the past.

But the problems of aboriginal assimilation and welfare are not easy of solution. Recently I have visited areas where I have seen the attractive homes provided by missions and I have seen aboriginals, as soon as it is dark, go outside under the trees and build their fires and sleep beside their dogs. Who are we to say they should go indoors and sleep on beds? Who are we to say that they should be happier living our way of life than their own?

There are many problems. For instance, there is the problem of education. It is very difficult to get the children much beyond the fourth or fifth grades at the very highest, largely because their parents did not have the opportunity to be educated. The aboriginal child goes home from school to a mother

who speaks the native dialect. There are no facilities there for study, and no incentive, and the children wonder what they are going to do even if they pass the examination and get to the eighth grade or to high school. It is going to take a long time to work it out. It will not be done in three years, or five years. I think we will have to wait till the present generation is largely assimilated.

**Mr. Wallace:** Just what do you mean by "assimilation"?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** That is quite a big question. They want to be able to stand on their own feet and take their place in the community, as white citizens can. On many occasions they have said to me, "We want the right to vote and drink and have all the privileges that a white man has, but for heaven's sake do not take us away from the Department of Native Affairs. We want their protection and assistance." A great deal of thought will have to be given to the framing of suitable legislation, and I hope to hear some worth-while discussion on this matter.

The hon. member for Norman had something to say about the hospital system. We heard from him how the Government has allegedly whittled away free hospitalisation.

**Mr. Bromley:** That is quite true.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** It is absolutely untrue. I challenge the hon. member to instance one person in Queensland who has been denied anything that was available to him under Labour administration.

**Mr. Bromley:** I had to go to a sub-intermediate ward when I was hospitalised. I had no choice.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I do not know why the hon. member had no choice. I would be very surprised if a person had no choice about going into a public ward.

**Mr. Aikens:** He probably wanted his private doctor.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Yes.

**Mr. Bromley:** Would you be surprised to know that when I was admitted at this particular time a nurse or sister came up and said, "Will you sign this paper?". I was too sick to know what I was signing, but I signed it and said, "What's it for?". She said, "That is because you have to go to a sub-intermediate ward."

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Your experience is not typical and should not be accepted as general.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You are getting them out into convalescent homes before they are ready to go.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** No-one need talk about our provision for the aged. Surely no-one would want to go back to the institutions that existed under the Labour Government. Surely everyone appreciates that the small

homes for the aged run by churches are much better places for aged people than large soulless institutions run by the State.

**Mr. Aikens:** You haven't got hundreds of old-age pensioners put out of the way at Goodna.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** No. It was very easy to declare them insane and send them to Goodna. Very many of those people have been taken from mental hospitals and put into these homes for the aged. No hon. member opposite should criticise the Government on what it has done for aged people compared with the treatment meted out to them by the Labour Government.

In his Address-in-Reply speech the Leader of the Opposition painted a gloomy picture of Queensland. He played the traditional role of "knocker" of this State. Nothing was good, everything was slipping, and he was determined to write off Queensland in the eyes of migrants and the pocket-books of investors. He did a great disservice to the State. What he said would have no influence at home, but interstate and overseas people, who do not know him, would perhaps tend to believe that there may be some substance in his allegations. Certainly it would have no influence locally because people here know that that is his traditional role. I believe that he is almost alone in Queensland, as he was alone in the Labour Cabinet in 1957 and could not see his way clear to go with the other ten. His own colleagues on his side of the House were squirming as he was speaking. They were uncomfortable because they realised that that type of speech would lead them further into political oblivion. They know very well that whilst the Opposition plays only the role of "knocker", there is little chance of their ever becoming the Government.

His theme, of course, was that Queensland is slipping badly. Again I say that he is living in the past. Obviously he cannot divorce his thoughts from what happened between 1955 and 1957, when he and a few others were too absorbed with internal quarrels to do much about the development of Queensland.

No doubt history will record the Leader of the Opposition as a very great Queensland-lander. He will not be remembered as a Minister for Transport or a representative of the people of Toowoomba; he will not be remembered for many other things that he has done; but he will be remembered, perhaps in 50 or 100 years' time, as the man who changed the course of Queensland's history. At a cabinet meeting when the hon. member for Bundaberg was Treasurer and a document was presented for signature, 10 Ministers signed it but the hon. member refused to sign it. By his decision, by standing alone on that occasion, he changed the course of Queensland's history, and hon. members opposite know it. He freed Queensland from the socialist strait-jacket that it had been in for so

many years. He gave to Queensland a Government that believed in private enterprise, in personal initiative and drive, a Government that is bringing great progress and prosperity to the State. His act on that occasion did give Queensland a chance to take its rightful place in the sun.

He went on blithely and painted a picture of a State unworthy of investment, undeserving of confidence in any way, and unaware of the road to its destiny. The people, knowing and seeing what is going on, are at a loss to understand. They did not believe him at election time, and they do not believe him now. I do not know whom he thinks he is fooling.

Now I should like to deal with certain aspects of the hon. member's speech and canvass the whole picture of this State so that we can see that Queensland is forging ahead at a rate never before experienced. Let me first touch on education. He said that Queensland was spending less per capita on education than it was in 1957. That is an untrue statement.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He did not say that at all. He said you had fallen further behind other States, and you know that is what he said. You are saying he said something that he did not say.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Let us take the report in "Hansard". He is recorded in "Hansard" as saying—I do not believe that this is what he meant to say—that Queensland was spending less per head on education now than it was in 1957. That is what is recorded in "Hansard". I do not think that is what he meant to say. What he meant to say was that we are spending less in comparison with other States. In fact we are not spending less in comparison. We have not made up the leeway.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You have dropped further behind.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I have never denied that we are spending less per head than any other State, and there are very good reasons why that is so. Perhaps I should canvass those reasons.

Taking loans, as soon as our loan allocation is granted, £6,000,000 goes to local authorities, as the hon. member for Bundaberg, who is a former Treasurer, knows. In his time I think it was about £4,000,000, not £6,000,000. That is an allocation which no other State in the Commonwealth makes to local authorities—I think I am right in saying that—and we have elected to continue a policy introduced by a former Labour Government. I do not deny that, and I think it is a very good policy because it has transformed our cities and country towns and given greater opportunities for our people to live a more civilised life, have more of the amenities of life, and be further advanced in development than people in other States. It is a very good policy. But while we put aside immediately £6,000,000

of our loan vote, which might be £30,000,000 or £32,000,000, that is so much that cannot be spent on the other loan requirements of the State. We cannot have it both ways.

Taking revenue, we get back to the question of free hospitalisation, and I deny what the hon. member for Norman said.

**Mr. Mann:** It is true.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** It is absolutely wrong. He has misinterpreted what hon. members on this side of the Chamber have said, in saying that the only reason why we have free hospitalisation is that we are frightened of what would happen to us if we did away with it.

**Opposition Members:** That is quite true.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Hon members opposite are not the only ones with a little humanity in their hearts. I think everyone on this side of the House appreciates that no-one in our State should be denied the best medical attention that can be provided. We believe that mother, father, and child are entitled to the best medical attention that can be given them, irrespective of their financial position, and we are going to keep it so. Whilst we do that, of course, there is less money for other purposes.

**Mr. Bromley:** Don't you think you would be able to build more hospitals by day labour? Those men are used to doing these jobs and know exactly what they are about.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Hon. members opposite have a complex about day labour. It is not always cheaper than contract work. In many cases contract work is cheaper than day labour; it all depends on the foreman in charge of the job and the efficiency of his men. In theory, day labour should be cheaper and in some cases it is, but in many cases it is not. It is not cheaper particularly in times when there are plenty of contractors about and competition is keen.

**Mr. Bromley:** As I said, it should be cheaper in building hospitals and schools where the jobs are often repetitive.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Day labour can be more economical in such buildings, with construction they are doing over and over again.

In addition to money not being available in this State from the revenue grant, in New South Wales, where they charge about 24 guineas a week for a public ward, that is more revenue available to them for other services than is available in Queensland. Then, perhaps, we are the only State in the Commonwealth with a large aboriginal population for which we are wholly responsible, and because they do not count in the census we get no tax reimbursement for them.

**Mr. Bromley:** I made that point.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I know. We are all in agreement on that. The money for that has to be found somewhere. That amounts to

somewhere round £1,000,000 a year, which is £1,000,000 a year less for spending in other avenues. Western Australia has many aboriginals, that is true, and so does the Northern Territory, but the Northern Territory is the direct responsibility of the Commonwealth, and Western Australia gets a special grant because of its activities not only for aboriginals, but also for health and police and all its social services.

**Mr. Walsh:** All those things applied under a Labour Government, too.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I know they did, and that is one reason why the Labour Government was spending less. One just cannot have it both ways, and the hon. member knows it.

**Mr. Walsh:** You would not listen to us when you were over here.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** We listened to you.

**Mr. Hanlon:** You have got farther behind in the last six years.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** We have not got farther behind; we have made up some of the leeway.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Not according to the figures of the Government Statistician.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** The hon. member goes back to 1961. What about going to 1962 and 1963, and what about next year when we have more high-school grades? We always spend less if we have more primary grades than secondary grades.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That applies in the other States, too.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** No other State in Australia has eight primary grades. Most of them move up after sixth or seventh grade into the secondary theatre, which is much more expensive, and when you embark on a five-year secondary course instead of a four-year course you shoot up your costs.

**Mr. Newton:** It will become more expensive?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Of course, and because it does we will make up the leeway. But I doubt whether we will ever totally catch it up while we maintain these other free services, and anyone who comes here and suggests that we have a poor record in the field of education is slipping; he is as blind as anyone can be, that is, if there are degrees of blindness.

The people of Queensland rejected the Leader of the Opposition when he tried to criticise this Government on what he referred to as its shocking record in education. I refer specifically to Toowoomba, where there was then a technical college and a high school as well as another under construction at Harristown. Since then another new building has been erected at Mt. Lofty and the one at Harristown has trebled in size. There is now an Opportunity School with three classrooms, and there have been many

extensions to other schools. What opportunity was there previously for children to attend high school at Oakey, Pittsworth, Milmerran, Crow's Nest, Jandowae, Texas, Inglewood, St. George, Mitchell, Cunnamulla, Injune or Taroom? All those places have not grown greatly in population.

**Mr. Mann:** They were in the blueprint stage.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** That is the greatest joke of all time. There were no plans and no blueprints for any of these extensions. They were nowhere to be found.

Let me come now to the Flinders electorate. Do hon. members know that Labour has never ever at any stage provided any secondary-school facilities in the whole of the Flinders electorate?

**Mr. Dewar:** They never worried.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** No. Hon. members opposite might say, "What about the Charters Towers High School?" That was established in 1912 before there was a Labour Government in Queensland. From 1915 to 1957 there was not a single extension. If hon. members opposite like to go to the department they can see a file 4 inches thick full of representations by the Right Hon. Francis Michael Forde for a high-school top at Hughenden. But over all this time Labour said, "No. We are not interested in educating the children of the West." Since then there has been Julia Creek, Richmond and Cloncurry. Nothing was done there under all those years of Labour rule.

**Mr. Bromley:** Do you intend under your policy to have a great army of educated unemployed?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** The reason why there are so many unemployed is that they are uneducated. That is the very reason that they are unemployed.

**Opposition Members interjected.**

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I am not saying that that is the reason for every single one of them being unemployed, but hon. members opposite know as well as I do that the ones most difficult to place in employment are those without any skill, training or educational background. They know that. I am not saying that they are all uneducated, but there is no doubt that the better educated a person is the better is his chance of getting good, permanent employment.

I have given a picture of the West. What was there previously between Charters Towers and Mt. Isa? What opportunities were there for the children of the railway workers, shearers and council workers? It was all right for the children of people in a good financial position. Parents on properties could send their children away for education, but what chance was there for the son of a railway worker at Richmond, Julia Creek or Cloncurry? I could spend the

time up to 1 o'clock naming the places where we have extended the opportunities for education. Not only have we extended existing educational facilities; we have also provided for secondary-school transport services. The ex-Treasurer on the other side knows that his Government would not approve of secondary-school transport. The hon. member for Condamine and the hon. member for Gregory suggested that opportunity should be given for the children concerned to travel to a high school.

The proposal was rejected by the previous Government because it was not its policy.

**Mr. Walsh:** You mean road transport?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Road transport. There has been rail transport for 50 years.

**Mr. Walsh:** I just wanted to correct you, because there was a free form of transport.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Yes, there was a free form. Today there are over 100 such secondary-school transport services, so much so that there is scarcely a child between Coolangaita and Gin Gin who cannot travel daily to a high school by a school-transport service.

In 1957 Caboolture had only about 60 children attending high school. Today the number is over 400. That is not because the population of Caboolture has grown many times over in that short period; rather is it because we have given the opportunity to children from Bribie, Dayboro, and up along the line to Beerwah and Peachester, and in every direction where it is possible to get enough children, by providing them with school-transport services. What chance did the children have at Tamborine? I could name scores and scores of places. Why should the Opposition tell the people that Queensland has a shocking record? I have just been referring to the opportunities provided for getting to school, but when I think of the previous types of building and the facilities provided, it is an even sorer picture. Before 1957 Labour would not lay concrete under schools, and hon. members opposite know it.

**Mr. Bromley:** I can name a school that was concreted underneath.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Only after the greatest persuasion. I presume it was in a Labour Minister's electorate. Generally speaking, it was not the normal policy.

**Mr. Hanlon:** Most school buildings have to be concreted underneath because they are full of classes.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** This is the State that is supposed to be slipping, according to the hon. member for Baroona. We are getting more children than ever before.

**Mr. Hanlon:** That is happening all over Australia and all over the world because of the post-war birth rate.

**Mr. Walsh:** You should read the speech of the hon. member for Bowen; that will tell you.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. PIZZEY:** When in office the Labour Party had a pretty sorry record west of the Great Dividing Range. There was nothing at Emerald; nothing at Clermont or Winton. Do hon. members opposite think that Winton has doubled in size? There was nothing at Mitchell. There was a small high-school top at Charleville, but since then a completely new high school has been built there at a cost of about £250,000. Only one oval was built by the previous Government. It was built at Cavendish Road because Dr. Dittmer was a little afraid of losing his seat in Mt. Gravatt. That was the first oval built by the previous Government. There was not another elsewhere. That is true, and hon. members opposite cannot name a single oval built by Labour at a high school. Now, ovals are constructed at every new high school, and some cost £10,000, £15,000, or £20,000. Sometimes they are prepared for basketball courts and tennis courts.

Again, schools are now attractively painted. Under the previous Government there was never any attempt to put down pathways. If it rained the children had to walk through the mire. Our schools are at last becoming places of beauty. They are now the most attractive buildings in many country towns and, indeed, in many of the larger cities.

**Mr. Walsh:** In our time you claimed that some of them in Bundaberg were too good.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** It is a pity that the hon. member for Bundaberg did not get around to building a few more schools. He could have saved us a few problems. He had one monument at Walkervale, and the schools at Bundaberg West, Bundaberg South and Bundaberg East will all have to be rebuilt in the next decade.

**Mr. Walsh:** Get on with the job.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I am only sorry that the hon. member did not get into the rebuilding programme much more actively in that area.

In the university field we are about the only State that does not impose enrolment quotas. We have the fastest-growing university in Australia but we have not yet imposed quotas. We have matched the Commonwealth grant on every occasion and we are the first Government in Queensland to decentralise university education. Hon. members opposite should go to North Queensland and tell the people there that we have done nothing in the field of education. Let them look at the new high school at Pimlico, and the new university college. Let them go to the Tablelands electorate and look around there. If ever an electorate has had a wonderful deal in the last five or six years it is the Tablelands electorate. We have had a major educational programme there. So much has been done that the new hon. member will not be able to get anything done as nothing requires to be done. After three years he will not be able to claim that anything has been done because everything was done before he came to office.

People are not blind; they are not fools, as apparently the hon. member takes them to be. On every side they see these improvements; they talk about them; they are pleased with them; they show their interest during Education Week, and no hon. members opposite could ever convince the people of Queensland that their children have not had a better deal in the last six years than ever before.

The Leader of the Opposition went on to say that there had been a grave deterioration in Queensland's financial position. He said that in the nine months to August 1963 our total imports were £83,000,000, while our exports were only £73,000,000. "Look how bad it is," he said. The figure he gave covered the nine months to the end of July. But what is Queensland's best part of the year for exports? When is our great sugar crop exported? It is in August, September, October and November. The second half of the year is the period of our great exports of wool and sugar, and it is very unfair to give a half-truth, to select the worst nine months and say, "Here is a comparison of our exports with imports for those nine months and look how adverse it is." Why not be fair and give the figures for the full 12 months, including every season?

**Mr. Walsh:** He must have got that from a speech that was made when your party was in opposition.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** We would always give the full truth, not a half-truth. At any rate, this season we will have an all-time-record export of sugar. When the full 12 months' period is taken into consideration, the picture will be totally different.

It should not be forgotten that many of our imports are for capital requirements—equipment urgently needed in this allegedly depressed State to increase our primary and secondary, our mining and industrial activity.

The Leader of the Opposition cited a reduction in employment in industry but he neglected to point out that this is an age of automation and intense competition. Perhaps he thinks manufacturers and producers in Queensland should continue with old-fashioned ideas and be inefficiently costly with no markets. Surely efficiency in industry is not judged by the number of men employed? Time and time again hon. members opposite point to the railways and say, "Look how the State has gone back. You have 3,000 fewer men now employed than we had when we were in office." But that in itself is not an indication of deterioration.

**Mr. Wallace:** Of course it is!

**Mr. PIZZEY:** If the tonnage of goods carried and the service given to the community are greater with the employment of fewer men, that is something to be commended. Take the sugar industry in the Mackay area. Where there used to be several hundred men employed on the wharf, sugar

is now handled in bulk, employing only a mere handful of men. Having fewer men doing the job is not something to be decried and deplored. It is giving Queensland an opportunity to sell on competitive terms overseas and to be more efficient in industry.

**Mr. Newton:** Nobody is complaining about that.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Hon. members opposite were complaining about those industries.

There are fewer men producing in the sugar industry, yet they are producing 50 per cent. more this year than four or five years ago. They are producing it with fewer men and they are milling it with fewer men. Where once they had gangs of men working shifts, they now simply press a button. That is a good thing.

**Mr. Wallace:** You do not claim credit for that?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** No, I am not claiming credit.

**Mr. Wallace:** You are claiming credit for most things.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I am not claiming credit for that. All I am saying is that surely hon. members opposite do not suggest that the sugar industry is deteriorating because fewer men are employed.

**Mr. Wallace:** Nobody has suggested it.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** What counts is the productivity per man, not the number of men.

**Mr. Walsh:** Do you know there are only 12 cane-cutters on one plantation at Fairy-mead this year where they used to have 200?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** That is right, and it is a very big problem. However, it is not an indication of inefficiency or that an industry is going backward.

**Mr. Walsh:** I do not know whether you know it, but they are only keeping the 12 old-timers on because they do not want to sack them.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** It is coming swiftly and will require all the wisdom and skill of governments everywhere. It is not something peculiar to Queensland; it is happening all over the world. Consider the increase in productivity of wheat and the lowering of costs. As the result of a survey by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, it was announced that the price of wheat would be reduced, so that our wheat will become more competitive in world markets. That reduction is being achieved by greater efficiency and better farming management and varieties.

We hear much criticism of the Railway Department because it is employing fewer men than when the Labour Party was in power. When the Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Transport, he met every wage increase by an increase in freight rates.

That was the easy way out, and there were eight increases in six years. Higher wages are being paid now, yet there has been only one increase in freight rates in the six years that we have been in office. We have absorbed increased costs by increased efficiency. I pay a great tribute to the wonderful job done by the Minister for Transport.

**Mr. Mann:** Then tell us why railway men in the northern areas are demanding the resignation of the Minister.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Where does the hon. member get that idea from? I suppose some people are demanding my resignation. We had the A.L.P. demanding his at one time at Toowoomba, when he came back in the second round. The Minister for Transport has done a wonderful job not only in rail transport but in road transport too. Rail freights have been increased only once and, as a matter of fact, in some cases have been reduced. More goods are being carried by rail. If the hon. member for Port Curtis would stand in the railway yards at Gladstone he would observe that the traffic moving through them is now many times greater than it was when his party was in power.

**Mr. Hanson:** If it were not for the Gladstone Harbour Board, you would not have the trade. You cannot claim credit for that.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Who provided the money for the Gladstone Harbour Board? Where did it come from? It is guaranteed by the Government. It has to be provided for in our loan and semi-governmental reimbursements at Loan Council meetings. All these things have to be co-ordinated by the State Co-ordinator-General of Public Works. The Gladstone Harbour Board would not have received as much as it has if it were not for the assistance given by the Co-ordinator-General and the Treasurer, and the representations of the Premier in placing loan programmes before the Premiers' Conference. Gladstone is the only port in Australia to receive a special grant from the Commonwealth to develop its facilities. I suppose Mr. Whitlam arranged that? The hon. member would not be decent enough to pay a tribute to a member of the Government.

(Time, on motion of Mr. Houghton, extended.)

**Mr. PIZZEY:** The Leader of the Opposition and other hon. members opposite claimed that Queensland was slipping and that there had been no real advance or development in any shape or form—in education, health, or anything else—during the last six years. How wrong they were. I know they will not be pleased when I tell them what we expect the value of production to be this year, because they are never pleased when things are thriving in Queensland.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** That is the general tenor of the speeches of hon. members opposite. I stress that this year, for the first time, the value of primary production could reach £300,000,000. Queensland's mineral production is expected to be valued at £60,000,000. The highest it ever was under Labour was £30,000,000. Is that indicative of a State that is slipping?

**Mr. Bromley:** Did you take into consideration the value of the £1?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Yes.

We have reached an agreement for increased copper production by Mount Isa Mines Ltd. Ministers in former Labour Governments could never reach agreement for the rebuilding of the Mount Isa railway line. They were incompetent and inefficient, and they could not do it. Within a year of taking office, we had reached agreement.

**Mr. Newton:** How much did you get out of the Federal Government for the Mt. Isa line? Nothing!

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Exactly the same as former Governments received from the Federal Government. Because we were able to negotiate the agreement and build the line, Mount Isa Mines Ltd. has been able to boost its production to such an extent that the value of mineral production this year is expected to be £60,000,000, compared, I repeat, with £30,000,000 under a Labour Government. The value of secondary production will reach £180,000,000.

**Mr. Mann** interjected.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** They were like the blueprints about which the hon. member is talking. They were only blueprints in the minds of former Labour Governments. The State has barely touched its reserves of oil and bauxite; it has huge coal exports; it is getting two oil refineries. Two or three years ago I was laughed at when I said there would be one refinery. Now we are to have two. The hon. member for Port Curtis suggested that the great alumina plant at Gladstone will not be of tremendous benefit to the area.

**Mr. Hanson:** It was being negotiated in the dying days of a Labour Government.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** All these things have been negotiated and planned. It is very nice to say, "We had ideas about it. We should have liked to do it. We planned it." As the hon. member for Maryborough could tell us, under Labour Governments there was not even a bitumen road as far as Maryborough. There was some dirt road between Gympie and Maryborough.

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I remind hon. members, both on my right and on my left, that the Minister is entitled to make his speech in complete quiet.

**Mr. Davies:** The road was bitumened before you came in.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** A bitumen road as far as Maryborough was beyond their capacity.

**Mr. Davies:** It's not so hot now.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Let the hon. member ask the people of Maryborough whether it is not so hot. They have never had a better road from Maryborough, nor a better road to Mossman.

**Mr. Hanson** interjected.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** The hon. member for Port Curtis could never leave home under Labour. He could never get beyond the Kolan River; he could not get to Maryborough.

**Mr. Armstrong:** Do you remember what the road to Gladstone was like a few years ago? Remember when I "did" a tyre?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I once again remind hon. members both on my left and my right that the Minister is entitled to speak without interruption. I will not allow cross-firing. If it continues I will deal with hon. members on both sides of the House.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** When one thinks of these matters it is indeed a poor State, but poor only in the minds of those who want to go back, because they know their only chance of re-election is through depression and poverty. I did not think I would ever see a so-called responsible Opposition seeking to destroy the image of their State.

Hon. members opposite say that we lack planned development, so I should like to canvass in detail what is being done in the various composites of our economy—primary, secondary, and tertiary and also in the mineral field—so that the people of Queensland can take heart and confidence, not despair and depression.

Obviously we need a balanced economy; we cannot have it lopsided, depending on one section or one factor alone. Primary industries are, to a very great extent, dependent on seasonal conditions and any State that has relied wholly and solely on seasonal industries has had some very difficult times. It is necessary to concentrate on the work of developing our secondary industries and the point I wish to make is that whatever we do, as far as I can see, Queensland will, first and foremost, always be a primary producer, a mainly primary-industry State.

**Mr. Tucker:** Bob Menzies wants to keep it that way.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** What is wrong with being a great primary-producing country? Our immediate future lies, more than anything else, in our primary industries, and today I should like to talk about the work of the scientists and what they are doing, and how important it is. I refer not to Dr. Scott, of whom the hon. member for Townsville South spoke, but to scientists dealing with

the soil—agrostologists, agronomists, and such. They are of the utmost importance and value yet what they do is largely unsung and unknown.

When the Opposition talk of planned development they think differently from me. They think in terms of monumental, grandiose schemes like Peak Downs, but I think much more of important localised schemes, endorsed by individuals and backed by scientific effort, that will have a more cumulative and beneficial effect on our State as a whole. For instance, it would take many more manufacturing industries to produce an extra £6,000,000 a year but if a scientist can add only 1 lb. of wool to the back of every sheep, we will have another £6,000,000 a year. I think the average fleece is somewhere about 8½ lb.—between 8 and 9 lb.—and, by adding another 1 lb. of wool, instead of a £50,000,000-odd wool cheque we would get nearer to £60,000,000. That is one thing that would not be noticed visibly—it is not a great monumental and grandiose scheme—but it is something worth pursuing to the utter limit.

The pounds of beef we could produce in a shorter time—

**Mr. Sherrington:** Meat that people cannot afford to buy.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Let us ask the hon. member's Labour friends in Sydney how they get on. They get half the meat we do for the same amount of money. We want more tons of wheat per acre; we want more tons of sugar per acre.

Our great future lies in water. I agree with the hon. member for Tablelands, who had something to say on this matter. Water is one of Queensland's greatest needs—water, grass, and better breeding. The provision of water can be looked at in three ways, not only by great regional schemes. I do not agree with the hon. member who talked about the Bradfield scheme. It is all very nice to conjecture on the spending of £100,000,000 to divert water from the northern rivers into the Channel Country. If you flew over the area you would hardly even notice the area that you could irrigate in that way. You would not be able to identify it on any map of Queensland, even if the map were as big as this Chamber. Rather than engage in such gigantic schemes, we have helped the individual farmer. We have helped every individual property owner to be safe against drought. Under the farm water supply scheme hundreds of farmers have taken advantage of the financial help and technical advice that is available through the Irrigation and Water Supply Commission. Perhaps the greatest thing ever done for rural industry in Queensland was done by the Menzies-Fadden Government, particularly by the Country Party member, Sir Arthur Fadden. I refer to the 20-per cent. depreciation allowance for all these improvements. If ever anything was done to change the face

of Queensland it was the introduction of the 20-per cent. depreciation allowance. In the smaller regional schemes in districts already settled, in order to make the existing settlers safer, and so that they could become more efficient on their farms, we had schemes like the ones initiated by the hon. member for Fassifern when he was a Minister.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** These schemes will be of tremendous value in stabilising the productivity of those areas. There are many such areas which ultimately will have to be the centres of small irrigation schemes. I say with every conviction that to enable the individual landholder to obtain water on his property and to use whatever water resources are available is one of the first and most important things in the field of water conservation. To my mind one of the great advances or romances in Queensland has been in pasture development.

**An Opposition Member:** It died five years ago.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Hon. members opposite would not know. Not one of them has had any experience on the land.

There has been a revolution in scientific knowledge that will transform the face of Queensland in the next decade or so. The greatest change in the use of the land will be in pastures and legumes. We cannot bring about that change without the skill of technical men. When this Government took office in 1957 there was an acute shortage of these men. We could not hold them. The previous Government would not pay them a reasonable salary. It gave them a lousy superannuation scheme. It expected them to use cars seven, eight, or nine years old. It did not house them in their own locality. We had to rectify that. We had to set about making employment in the Public Service attractive.

**Mr. Davies:** Your numbers compare very unfavourably with those of other States.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Let us look at the figures. All hon. members know what an agrostologist does.

**An Opposition Member:** Tell us what he does.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** He is a man who is interested in pastures.

In 1957 there were 13, and today there are 32. There were only 13 after all those long 40 years of Labour rule. That was the greatest number Labour could muster for research into the pastures of Queensland, yet today there are 32, and they are still insufficient. As to agronomists, the men who advise on land usage, there were 11 under Labour and now there are 35—again, not nearly enough. At least we are holding our scientific men and our advisers and we are able to give greater extension services. One

does not have to wonder at what happened under Labour when we remember that in 1957 the starting salary for these men was £1,270. Today it is £2,015.

**Mr. Houston:** What was the basic wage in 1957?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** It was not two-thirds of the present basic wage.

In the field of superannuation, in 1957 these officers had to retire on £7 a week. Now they can retire on £20, and provision is made for their wives. Provision was not made for wives in any of the superannuation schemes brought in by the Opposition, except of course in the parliamentary superannuation scheme.

**Mr. Bennett:** You ask the wives. They prefer not to be in it because it debars them from participation in benefits under social service. Many of them are sorry they are in it.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** The hon. member for South Brisbane is speaking for himself alone.

There are now 13 research and experimental stations throughout Queensland. Although almost 20 per cent. of our cattle and dairying industry is north of the tropic, 40 per cent. of our scientific advisers, agrostologists and agronomists are in North Queensland, so we are not neglecting the North. Constantly these men are trying to improve the pastures in the North. At Parada, Kairi and South Johnstone these men are trying to get a variety of legumes suitable for the dairying industry. The hon. member for Fassifern knows the great value of legumes in pastures; he knows it a thousand times better than hon. members opposite will ever know.

With the development of the spear-grass country it is estimated that with lucerne, legumes, and other introduced grasses, we can treble the carrying capacity in the 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres of spear-grass country. No less an authority than Dr. Griffiths Davies—probably one of the leading C.S.I.R.O. men—has said it could be increased tenfold. That is a fantastic story of achievement following better treatment of our land with grasses. We now have more tropical pasture legumes in Queensland than there are temperate-type legumes in Southern Australia. These advances in the scientific treatment of land will revolutionise the development of Queensland more than any other single factor. In some areas in the North, in the tropical zone, some pastures that have been developed are turning off 500 lb. live weight per acre per year. This is because of our policy of development—vastly different from Labour's. Labour would never concede the right of private capital to develop Crown land without strait-jacket restrictions. According to Labour's policy, land should stand idle for ever; it must never be alienated and must never be made freehold. If it could not be developed under Labour's leases, they preferred that it should remain undeveloped.

**Mr. Mann:** Quite right, too. Why should it go to individuals? It should belong to the State.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** The people of Queensland do not think that. We modernised and made more practical the development of our land in marked contrast with the archaic approach of previous Governments. The Land Bill that was passed a year or so ago was a great step forward in dealing with the problems of land development. Those who risk their capital to develop the land are entitled to a just reward. Hon. members opposite cannot deny that. Take this policy of giving companies an opportunity to develop land. We have seen it on the Gold Coast and on the North Coast. Would hon. members opposite say that Queenslanders would be better off without those developments that have taken place?

**Mr. Houston:** A lot of people would—

**Mr. PIZZEY:** "A lot of people would," the hon. member says. Hon. members opposite do not like it.

**Mr. Houston:** A lot of people would not have lost their all.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** It was this policy which persuaded the Government to allow people to risk £1,000,000 of their capital in developing 50,000 acres of tropical pasture. Those lands have been idle there for years, developed only in isolated cases, but this great experiment will give a lead to others by showing what can be done when a proper land policy is applied.

**Mr. Mann:** Giving the State's assets away!

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Labour had that great State asset in the brigalow area and I suppose it will be said that we are giving it away, too. We are giving another 100 settlers or more an opportunity to get in there on freehold.

The wallum land is another for which the answer has not yet been found. There are many areas between here and Gladstone that would not run a beast to 100 acres but, under certain pastures the subject of experiment by the C.S.I.R.O., they are now running a beast to two acres and, in some cases, a beast to one acre. With new legumes, such as desmodium, and treating the soil with lime, superphosphate and trace elements, the whole picture can be transformed. As yet they have not found the answer to the economics of it but I have no doubt that it will be found.

It is not enough to be sound in theory. We can find the proper treatment for the land and the right pastures to put in but, until we can prove to the grazier or the farmer that it will pay him to do it, he cannot be expected to go ahead and he will not. He must be satisfied that it is economical. Those investigations are being pursued by scientific research workers.

We inherited a legacy of neglect and restriction and frustration.

**Opposition Members:** Oh!

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Just a minute before the bells went after the luncheon adjournment, one of the attendants had to go and tell the workmen to stop hammering on the wall. We are having to rebuild the broken-down verandas of Parliament House. There are many new hon. members in the Chamber. It would do their hearts good if they could compare the kitchen in the Parliamentary Refreshments Rooms today with what the staff had to contend with six years ago under Labour. They would have been appalled at the shocking conditions Labour asked their employees to work under—and under their very noses here in Parliament House. Go up to the Treasury Building and the Executive Building. Go out and have a look at the police stations and the school buildings and recall the conditions under which Labour asked their employees to work—buildings with no paint and no room to work! The whole of the public estate was run down—wherever one looked, the permanent way in the railways, the roads, all were in a shockingly run-down state. So were the lands of the State. There was no incentive for development. If ever there was a story of neglect it was the story that could be told by anyone who critically examined conditions in Queensland in 1957. There has been spectacular growth and development in the land under pasture and the land under farming. Approximately 200,000 acres a year have been brought under sown grass and pasture. In the last few years 400,000 acres of gidgee country round Blackall has been cleared and sown, mainly with buffel grass. There has been great development in the Central Burnett area, too.

**Mr. Houston:** Who set them up?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I am not saying that we set them all up. It is all very well for hon. members opposite to say that they set them up and planned them, but we have put them into effect.

I have not much time left and there is still so much that I should like to say. I should like to refer, for example, to the Roma abattoir. All of these things had to be put right by the Government.

**Mr. Houston:** What have you done about the Brisbane abattoir?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the hon. member for Bulimba to cease his continuous barrage of interjections.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** There is not time for me to tell the great story of what has been done in the field of mining, or to refer to the wonderful record of the Minister for Mines in encouraging and developing the mining industry in Queensland. We have doubled in a few years the best that the Opposition was able to do in the field of mining.

At any rate, I shall leave the Leader of the Opposition to his pipe dreams, and the people of Queensland to wonder at his purpose in knocking the State. It is time he woke up and realised that Queenslanders today are prouder of their State than they have ever been, and far more confident of its development and its exciting future. They gave their answer on 1 June last.

**Mr. TUCKER** (Townsville North) (2.42 p.m.): On behalf of the electors of Townsville North, and all the people of Townsville, I reaffirm our allegiance to the Crown. I believe that we have demonstrated our loyalty on many occasions in welcoming Sir Henry Abel Smith, the Queen's representative.

**Mr. Walsh:** We all take an oath of allegiance when we are elected. If hon. members want to make another one, why don't they turn up at the Queen's Birthday levee?

**Mr. TUCKER:** I should be pleased if the hon. member for Bundaberg would make his own speech, although I must add that on many occasions it is a most boring address. So far as I am concerned, I ask him to leave me alone.

I congratulate Mr. Speaker on his reelection to office, and I congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your appointment as Chairman of Committees. I hope that you and Mr. Speaker are now occupying these positions during your last terms in Parliament.

I thank the electors of Townsville North for returning me in no uncertain fashion. In round figures I gained in primary votes 1,000 more than on the previous occasion. I want that recorded quite definitely in "Hansard". I shall continue to represent the people of Townsville North to the very best of my ability.

My sincere thanks go also to the very many people who helped me in the recent campaign. Specifically I give my thanks to my campaign director and the committee who worked so hard for me during the long period over which the campaign extended. I thank also all members of the Australian Labour Party in Townsville, and all union leaders and rank-and-file union members in Townsville who supported me in my campaign. Not only did they work physically and unceasingly for me, but they also helped the campaign from their own pockets. They supported us very substantially. If I have time, I shall reply to the hon. member for Townsville South, who referred to the money that was spent in my campaign and made certain allegations. I will refute those allegations. The money was obtained, of course, with the help of the union leaders and unionists and the leaders and supporters of the A.L.P. in Townsville.

I wish to pay a particular tribute to the late Mr. Jim Mahoney, my campaign director. He believed in the Australian Labour Party all his life. He was a tremendously hard worker for the party and carried its banner in elections on two occasions. I had a very high regard for Mr. Mahoney's integrity and tenacity of purpose. He directed my campaign in 1959-1960 and was directing it again in 1962 when cancer, that terrible scourge, struck him very quickly in August. He met the challenge, as he always met any challenge, with a smile on his face. He did not let it get him down, and he finally went down fighting, with his head up, just after Christmas. Anyone watching him slowly lose the battle would never have guessed from his demeanour that he was aware he was going to leave this life. Even from his hospital bed he continued to direct my campaign and send advice. As I said, we laid him to rest just after Christmas, and the Australian Labour Party is the poorer for his passing. To his widow and son I again express my deepest sympathy in their great loss, and I will always be available to assist them in any way that I possibly can.

As I said, I survived a very strong campaign against me in Townsville North at the last election—there is no doubt about that—not only by the Government parties but also by the Q.L.P. Those parties were assisted by the Press, which said on every possible occasion that I was going to be beaten and tried to influence the minds of the electors of Townsville North. Despite the thousands of pounds spent by the Liberal Party and the Q.L.P. on television, radio and Press advertisements, I am here today to continue fighting. In spite of vicious personal attacks and smears, I held the seat for the Australian Labour Party, which shows that the people of Townsville North took no notice of those attacks and smears. From April this year till polling day there were seven ministerial sorties to Townsville, including a visit by the Premier, and on each occasion the Press was full of their prepared propaganda. I will deal with that for the benefit of hon. members.

First to come to Townsville was the man now sitting on the Government front bench and smiling at me, the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. He came to Townsville on 4 April—I have here a note of his visit—and raised the great smoke-screen that he always raises—"We are going to build a big psychiatric ward in Townsville." I asked the Minister recently how far it had progressed, and hon. members heard him reply that the land had not yet been obtained. I turned the tables there, because I put an advertisement in the Press the next day dealing with the number of times I had made representations to the Minister for that ward. I might add that that was done at my own expense. Although the Minister tried to attack me, I pulled his teeth in a flash and he left.

The next to come to Townsville was the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Munro. That was on 10 April and he again, through the Press, issued prepared statements. I have them here in all their detail. Any hon. member opposite who likes to walk across and read them can do so. Here is the prepared statement of the Liberal leader. He came to Townsville and the Liberal Party put on a party for him that afternoon. His supporters had to cast around and try to herd various people to the party because they were ashamed of the paucity of numbers there to say hello to him.

**Mr. Mann** interjected.

**Mr. TUCKER:** That is the same one as we had in the West with the cowboy hat on.

After that, on 27 April, came the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity, Mr. E. Evans. He came up ostensibly to open the new T.R.E.B. building in Townsville, and of course, we got the same prepared statement. The Press said that "Big Ernie" had come up to open T.R.E.B. and talk about electricity. But Ernie forgot about those things and said, "I am the best road-builder in the State." That morning the Press said, "Big Ernie" is the State's best road-builder." I do not know what that has to do with electricity, but he was there and he put it across because it was an opportune time, and the Press was with him.

He returned to Brisbane and reported that Tucker was gone, Tucker was beaten. He said it not only among his own friends but also to some of my colleagues. They said, "Have you any money to back it up?"

On 30 April the Minister for Education and Migration, Mr. Pizzey, came up and opened the refectory building at the Townsville University College. One could see that they were keeping all these things for the one purpose. Up he came and opened the refectory building and he took the occasion there, as he did today, to tell about what he had done in the field of education. He said, "What a good bloke am I," and the spate of stuff went through the Press again. He issued a tremendous quantity of statistics. Whether they were right or wrong nobody would know because we cannot find out for ourselves, but he issued this spate of statistics with reference to what the Government had done. He forgot to tell of what they had not done. He, too, hoped to put the skids under me.

**Mr. Armstrong:** It would have been a good thing for Townsville if he had.

**Mr. TUCKER:** The hon. member can have a go some time. I will "do" him like a hot dinner, with one hand tied behind my back.

On 10 May we had in Townsville a disastrous fire in the sugar shed. I repeat that it was a disastrous fire. Just after it the Premier came up. I have no argument with the Premier's presence at that time because

we had had a disastrous fire. It was a disaster of the first magnitude and I believe the Premier did right in coming up and seeing what had happened on that occasion and gaining first-hand knowledge. I give him full credit for that sort of thing, but what amazed me was that he was no sooner there than again we had this spate of propaganda in the Press.

Again I refer to what I have here. This propaganda was under four-column headlines with such things as, "Lion's share of development for North Queensland." I know that the Premier did not set fire to the sugar shed, but he apparently must have had all this stuff behind him waiting for something to happen because, as soon as he came up, we had all this propaganda such as "Lion's share of development for North Queensland." If we got the lion's share, the lion he talked about must have been very sick and completely off its food.

On 16 May the Liberal leader came up again. He got over his previous wounds and came to Townsville again. He galloped up with his cowboy hat to open the new wing of the Pimlico High School. Again that is in my electorate. He arrived in Townsville, but who should follow him? Everywhere he went the same little puppy followed—the Liberal candidate who opposed me. One would have thought he was already the member for Townsville North because he followed the Liberal leader wherever he went. I do not know whether he was invited. I suppose it did not matter, because he was following behind the personality. On that occasion the Liberal leader opened the high school and gave the children a holiday. Everybody said "Hooray!", but the parents later voted for me.

This next one is a beauty. On 24 May came the piece de resistance of all this business. Up came no other than the Treasurer, Mr. Hiley. I cannot remember whether he was wearing that big teacup carnation that he had yesterday. He came up to open the flats in Bundock Street, which had already been occupied for one year, and he also opened the heat laboratory that night. He got about the same attendance as the Liberal leader. They were all public servants who had to be there, anyway, because they were invited. We understand those things. While he was performing the opening ceremony two old ladies looked around. One said to the other, "Who is he?" The other replied, "I don't know. I think he's the Police Commissioner, or something like that." Both then waved across and said hello to me. He himself made no impact. He does not like you to tell the truth, but I am going to do it on this occasion. I took it for nine months from these blokes and I am going to speak here today. I "copped" it from every one of them when they came north. They tried to kick me, and their own little people behind them rushed in like blue cattle-dogs in this star-studded array. I am here to

speak today and I intend to toss it back. I cannot recall the date, but, right in the middle of this star-studded array, up came the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Gordon Chalk. He appeared on television that night. I do not know how many times he mentioned my name. It was obvious that he had come up to do Tucker over. On that occasion he was so obsessed with what he looked like on television that he watched the monitor all the time. Everybody who knew him better as "Gorgeous Gordon" thought on that occasion that he was cross-eyed because he forgot to look at the camera. But he won me another 1,000 votes.

**Mr. Herbert:** Why do they call you "The Duke" up there?

**Mr. TUCKER:** That is one that was put forward by the hon. member for—I will not mention his name, but all of us know him. He always appears on the edges to try to do something to the A.L.P. If you move anywhere with your wife and family he will try and run you down. If he can use these various devices, by calling you certain names and things like that, he does it. I am not afraid. Wherever I turn up I always find that he is there, too.

The Q.L.P. appeared once a week on television, sometimes two and three times a week, for about three months before the election. They used the Indonesian situation and the Communist smear. They deliberately used the Communist smear against my party. They used these smear tactics against me because it was known that their candidate would be standing against me.

I am not afraid of smears, but when one is smeared in this way it inevitably reacts on one's family. On that occasion my character was smeared and there was little or nothing I could do about it. I believe that people who profess to be Christians and do that are acting in a very un-Christianlike manner, and I level that charge against the Premier himself. A spate of propaganda emanated from him throughout the whole of the State. That was reported in the Townsville Press. He passed through Charters Towers and the West on a smear campaign covering Communistic activities and other things. It may be all right for the Premier—for this man who is called "Honest Frank"—to do this sort of thing, but in his own mind he must be worried that he should do such a thing to decent citizens, and I claim that they are decent citizens. I do not think it reflects any credit on the Premier that he should be prepared to try to gain some political and electoral advantage by the use of these smears against us. The people of Townsville North did not accept them; they threw them aside, and I am here.

**Mr. Armstrong:** They are very foolish that they didn't.

**Mr. TUCKER:** I will spare the hon. member because I think he is usually a little below average and one should leave him alone.

I wish to speak for a few minutes about Palm Island, which is just off Townsville. It is not wholly in my electorate, but patients come from there to the Townsville General Hospital, which is in my electorate. On 5 August, I sent a letter to the Minister about conditions on Palm Island and asked for an inquiry into hygiene there. I did so for the good and simple reason that round about 5 August there were, in the Townsville General Hospital, two babies from Palm Island suffering from Flexner dysentery, and one of them, only eight weeks old, had Flexner dysentery and amoebic dysentery as well. I was informed by an unimpeachable authority that there was a disgracefully high incidence of amoebic dysentery on the island. I was told, too, that there is no doubt that if these babies—one only eight weeks old—were suffering from Flexner dysentery and amoebic dysentery there must be inadequate hygiene on the island. As a result, I directed a letter to the Minister on 5 August which I do not think I will have time to read. If time permits, I will read it later.

I will digress for a moment and come to a period early this year and late last year. As we know, Parliament did not sit from the early part of last December until only recently, and therefore this matter could not be aired here. In the epidemic that occurred on Palm Island last January, three babies from the island died in the Townsville General Hospital and one died in the plane when being brought from the island. There were also six who were desperately ill and it was only by good care and good nursing that they survived. I pay a generous tribute to Dr. Harveyson, the senior registrar at the hospital, for the weeks he spent with those children during January. He gave weeks of his valuable time—almost full time—to pull them through the epidemic. Besides his valuable time, hospital space was also taken up by the people who caught the disease which, in my opinion, should never have occurred. I know that Dr. Lind made certain recommendations when he went to Palm Island and found that the sewage was not correctly disposed of. Is it any wonder that everyone at the Townsville Hospital—although they may now run for cover and say something else—was very worried? They were very apprehensive when they observed the recurrence of this awful thing and they still are. They were appalled at babies eight weeks old, and some a little older, coming into the general hospital with Flexner dysentery and amoebic dysentery. They felt that, if something was not done quickly, they might have an epidemic of the type I have mentioned.

After I brought this matter to the notice of the Minister I saw Press reports that the Minister was sending his hospitals inspector, Mr. Stretton, to the island. On 8 August he wrote informing me that he was sending the district health inspector to Townsville. Then I noticed that the Press reports had switched from the main issues that I had addressed to the Minister. I know that Press reports are sometimes misleading. I had also said that there were bad cracks in the men's wards on the island and in the floors so that they were unhygienic, and the accent seemed to move in that direction. The main issue that I wanted to be sure reached the Minister was that there was something wrong with the hygiene over there. So I wrote to him again on 13 August telling him that I thought the matter was being handled wrongly and asking him to make sure that my first submissions were investigated. On 20 August he replied to that letter as follows—

“Regarding outbreaks of gastro-enteritis, I would point out that these outbreaks periodically occur in areas which are sewered and in warm climates these outbreaks will always occur.”

Of course we all know that—as a layman I know it and so does every other hon member—but this was a much more vicious outbreak on Palm Island. I was not talking about the ordinary Sonne dysentery or some of the summer diarrhoeas. I was talking about amoebic dysentery, which anyone who was up in the islands during the war knew and feared. If you contracted it you were hospitalised for months on end.

I want to make it quite clear to the Minister that Townsville and Palm Island are climatically the same, but in Townsville we do not have any amoebic dysentery among the children. We do get summer diarrhoea and occasionally we have this Sonne variety in Happy Valley, a very poor area, but we have nothing like the type I am talking about. Summer diarrhoea is much milder, and that is what the Minister was really talking about. It is not to be compared with what the children on Palm Island suffered from. For a baby eight weeks old to have both Flexner dysentery and amoebic dysentery means, according to authorities that I will quote in a minute, that it got its infection by contact. One of those authorities is the book, “Diseases of Children in the Subtropics and Tropics” by H. C. Trowell, O.B.E., M.D., F.R.C.P., Senior Specialist Physician, Pediatric Unit, Mulago Hospital and Makerere College, University College of East Africa, Kampala, Uganda, and D. B. Jelliffe, M.D., M.R.C.P., D.C.H., D.T.M. & H., Visiting Professor of Tropical Medicine, Tulane University, New Orleans, U.S.A. On page 375 of that book is an article headed “Shigellosis,” which is in fact Flexner dysentery, and it says—

“Prevention. Shigellosis must be regarded as a disease of insanitation. It occurs as the result of direct or indirect

faecal contamination. It may rarely be transmitted by other means, e.g., water, milk, or with household pets as carriers. Thus, humans are the chief source of infection and infection in household contacts of cases is frequent. Hardy (1954) stated that in studies carried out in New Mexico, Georgia and New York, approximately one-half of the household contacts were positive on the basis of single-culture tests.”

I realise that a lot of this passes over the heads of the average hon. member and I am sorry that that is so. The article goes on to say—

“Human to human transfer is also evident in mental institutions or, in fact, almost anywhere where crowding and insanitation occur together.

“Sub-clinical cases are just as potentially dangerous as carriers of the disease as are clinical cases. Rigorous personal cleanliness is necessary to prevent such person to person spread. The importance of water availability for washing purposes was pointed out by the excellent study of Stewart et al. (1955) who found infection rates were highest where water was least available for personal hygiene.”

The next reference is to Amoebiasis. It reads—

“Its occurrence in all parts of the world is better correlated with poor sanitation and low socio-economic standards than it is with climate or geographical considerations. Infected individuals excrete hundreds to millions of infective cysts daily, and flies easily may carry several hundred of these in their ordinary meanderings. Cooking or drying kills the organisms promptly, but in some environments they may survive for many months. Chlorination, as ordinarily employed for municipal water supplies, is not effective, though the amoebae are readily killed by most other common disinfectants and antiseptics.

“Prevention of infection may be difficult in many situations despite proper instructions and precautions as to food and water supplies. Contact studies and at best three follow-up examinations of specimens secured a week or more after therapy from patients, who are apparently cured, are obviously important.”

As this authority states, contact tests should be going on there. If it is not already being done, I ask the Minister to see that it is done. I believe that contact tests should be made at Palm Island and an investigation made of everybody who handled that baby in any manner. From this authority, it is obvious that the baby got it by contact. The Department of Health, administered by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, should see that someone is sent across to make a study of those contacts and run the infection to earth. Questions should be asked concerning who handled the baby, where it

came from, and the source of infection. When hygiene standards in the Army dropped and the incidence of dysentery increased, a host of hygiene men descended on us to find out what we were doing that was wrong.

These people are required under the Act to stay on the island. It is our obligation to see that something is done about this infection. We have an obligation to send our best brains to the island to find out, through observation and questioning, where the infection is coming from, and what is the real root of the trouble. If such an epidemic recurs, it will be a damning indictment of the Government. I am here today to say that people should be sent over to conduct contact surveys and find out the real reason for the trouble. When a prominent citizen of Townsville, whose name I shall not mention, heard of this he said, "Wherever you have niggers, you will always get this sort of thing." That is certainly not the attitude to be adopted, and if I identified that man, I think the House would be surprised. If that line of thinking is followed, God help these people. They have to stay there and something should be done for them.

I believe that the hospitals board in Townsville is flying staff to the island to see what can be done. That is all very good but, as I have said, if something is not done about hygiene it will not matter what sort of hospitals are available, as their only use will be to take in people infected by this disease.

There is a great need on the island for more white staff. It is obvious that these people are their own worst enemies. If we do not send hygiene officers to the island to show them the correct methods, how will they know? Surely difficulties are made to be overcome and we should not merely sit down, wring our hands, and hope for the best. I hope that my request today will not fall on deaf ears and that the Minister, if he has not done so already, will send hygiene officers to the island to eradicate the trouble. Coloured children are just as precious to their parents and to the community as are our own children. Nothing is too good for our children, so I believe that there is an obligation on us to see that the coloured children are also given the very best attention.

I shall refer now to a speech that was made in the Chamber last Thursday afternoon by the hon. member for Townsville South. I have a copy of it here. He spent a great deal of time on me and my election—why I should have been beaten; why I was lucky to get in; why the Q.L.P. did this or did not do that; why the Liberal Party should have done this or that. To use a Shakespearean expression, "Methinks he doth protest too much." It appears to me that he did it to hide the fact that he was 2,000 votes down on the number

cast for him at the previous election. By his meanderings, he wanted to hide the fact that Arthur Trower, a young man—

**Mr. HERBERT:** I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in quoting from a current copy of "Hansard"?

**Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The hon. member for Townsville North.

**Mr. TUCKER:** He wanted to hide the fact that that young man was able to reduce the number of primary votes cast for him by about 2,000. That is the real reason why the hon. member for Townsville South told this long story about me. He said, of course, that I cried for six weeks, in fear and trembling that I was not going to be returned, but he neglected to mention that I got 1,000 more votes at this election than at the previous one. If the hon. member is in the Chamber or if he is in the gallery listening, I say again that what really hurt him was that he prophesied all over Townsville that I would be beaten and I was not, so he came into the House and tried to explain why his prophecies had not been fulfilled.

The hon. member did not have preferential voting in his electorate; it was a straight-out contest. When the hon. member for Townsville South, as he does on many occasions, makes irresponsible attacks on all sorts of people, it irks me to hear the Leader of the Parliamentary Liberal Party deploring this fact when the Liberal Party does not stand a candidate against him in the Townsville South electorate. The solution is in the Minister's own hands, but he does not do anything about it. In my opinion, the hon. member for Townsville South is a member of this Assembly because of the forbearance of the Liberal Party. If it was prepared to stand a candidate against him, we would have him by the throat in five minutes and Arthur Trower would be the member for Townsville South. We will have the hon. member by the throat, anyway, at the next election.

The hon. member's allegation that we received £2,000 from the road hauliers is completely spurious and untrue. We did in fact spend a great deal of money, but nothing like the amount the hon. member mentioned. We raised it all in Townsville by our own efforts. Not only is his allegation untrue; it is also a reflection on men like Mr. D. P. O'Brien, who is the northern district secretary of the Australian Railways Union, and who was on my campaign committee, and Ted Stannett, president of the Combined Railway Unions in Townsville, who was also on my campaign committee and who knew of every pound we raised in Townsville and where it came from.

When this man is prepared to make an allegation that we received £2,000 from the road hauliers and used it, he reflects not

only on my party but also these well-known members of the Australian Railways Union and the Combined Railway Unions in Townsville, and it should not be forgotten.

We did mount a massive campaign. The hon. member, on the one hand, praises us. In one breath he says that he had never seen such an extensive campaign. To read his exact words, he said—

“I have never known an election campaign to be conducted on such an extensive, intensive and massive basis as the one conducted against me at the last election.”

Then he immediately tried to get out of it and said that the A.L.P. in Townsville is on the down-grade. How did we mount an intensive, massive campaign—one the like of which he has never seen in his life before—if we are on the down-grade? He himself answered his own argument by his own words. We are going forward and he knows it, and the knowledge is gall in his mouth. I never enter into personalities, but, politically speaking, I will attack and so will the members of my party up there until we are able to take Townsville South.

Now let me take two remarks by the hon. member to prove how he is prepared to misconstrue and mislead in an endeavour to gain some, shall we say, dirty point. I will impeach his credit by attacking the veracity of these two remarks. First he said, “I did not begin my campaign until 17 May this year.” I have here the “Townsville Daily Bulletin” of 30 March, which carries a £32 advertisement by the hon. member on that day and from then until 18 May. Yet he said he started on 17 May. That is here if anybody wants to check it.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. HUGHES** (Kurilpa) (3.23 p.m.): This debate provides an opportunity for members to cover a very wide field and literally to push the barrow for those things that are most dear to their hearts in the requirements of their electorates.

I commence by expressing appreciation of the Opening Speech which Sir Alan Mansfield delivered in the Legislative Council Chamber at the opening of Parliament, because I believe it was an inspiration to Queensland and a pointer to development in the future.

In this State we are past the stage of saying that development is around the corner. Development is now to be seen at almost every turn, at almost every corner, in almost every part of the State. That has been achieved because we have in Queensland not only the resources but the virility and tenacity of purpose to pursue these objectives to their final and best conclusion in the interests of the economy of our State.

At this juncture I should like also to express the loyalty of the electors of Kurilpa whom I have the honour to represent, to

Her Majesty. We are proud that, as members of a free society, we are able to go about our business under the Throne so graciously occupied by Her Majesty.

I congratulate members of this Assembly on their re-election. All members, during their terms of office, from time to time face criticism, sometimes unjustifiable, sometimes justifiable; but regardless of that they have to wage campaigns which at times in various electorates become even bloody; so members who are re-elected obviously have the confidence of those who return them. I will even be magnanimous enough to say that I hope Mr. Duggan will remain Leader of the Opposition for many years to come.

**Mr. Hanlon:** We will be tearing ourselves away in about three years.

**Mr. HUGHES:** I have heard such wishful thinking before, even from the hon. member for Baroona. It is a pipe dream, but he is entitled to it.

I congratulate all hon. members, particularly members of the Cabinet, because they have had to bear a constant brunt of attack for what were alleged to be the shortcomings of the Government. But those attacks did not hoodwink or pull the wool over the eyes of the thinking citizens who returned the Government. On a basis of merit they have been returned to their places on the Treasury benches.

I extend congratulations to Mr. Speaker on his re-election. It is indicative of the confidence of hon. members in his ability. I also congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your appointment as Chairman of Committees. It is an office of high honour and I wish you well in it.

At this early stage of the Parliament we take the opportunity to pay tributes of appreciation. I wish to thank the many people who helped me during the election campaign. I tender my appreciation to the campaign committee and the 200 people who spared neither time nor effort in helping me. We conducted a clean and virile campaign. It has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and others that at times and at various places the campaign became quite dirty, but I am proud to be able to say that in my electorate the campaign carried out by our members was one at which no finger of scorn could be pointed or any type of criticism levelled. Although my opponent had 18 months' start on me I think we showed by action and deed that we overcame all the obstacles that were placed in our way.

I express my appreciation to the electors of Kurilpa for giving me such a heart-warming vote of confidence. The figures show that in Kurilpa we had the best win in Brisbane. In reciprocation of their heart-warming vote, which showed their confidence in me, I here and now pledge that to the greatest extent of my ability I will give full-time service to the community in every way.

**Mr. Hanlon:** I think your best win was to hold the Liberal endorsement.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That was a long time before. The big thing is what people think in the ballot box. If the hon. member can do as well as I did in Kurilpa he will be able to wear a successful smile.

This debate provides an opportunity to raise subject matters of great importance. There are two such matters I wish to raise at this stage. The first concerns the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. I am a member of the committee and am very pleased to see that the Minister for Health and Home Affairs is in the Chamber. I believe that I won many votes, not because of my work alone, but because of the work of Cabinet members, particularly the Minister for Health and Home Affairs. Although Cabinet Ministers might be tied to their desks to a great extent we enjoy the reflected glory of much of their work. I pay tribute to the Q.A.T.B. I do not think one person in the Assembly would question not only the need for, but also the efficiency and courtesy of, the operation of the ambulance service in this city. However, the state of its finances is such that it is necessary to bring before the notice of the Minister and the House certain matters which require whole-hearted and urgent attention. For years we have been finding it very difficult to meet our expenses, a little over 70 per cent. of which are taken up in salaries and wages. Operating expenses are distinct from administration expenses and the administration expenses represent only 5 per cent. This is a humane service which is a necessity, and wages and salaries make up the great part of the expenditure. I do not think our men are overpaid. On the contrary, I believe they are underpaid for the service they render. By way of interjection the other day I referred to a yardstick for salaries. I cannot justify the tremendously high salaries that are paid to some men in the Public Service and to other officers in the State compared with the wages paid to ambulance people and other employees for the worth-while service they render. They are out of all proportion, but I am not in a position to remedy that.

I pay a tribute to those who helped with the recent door-knock appeal. We conducted an appeal for contributors, as distinct from a charity appeal. We were successful to the extent of raising over £20,000 and we gained 8,000 new subscribers. But for that appeal the ambulance service in Brisbane would have been bankrupt and the Government would have had to take it over or come to its help with emergency funds. Although it was a very wet Saturday, we were successful because so many public-spirited citizens came to our aid. I pay tribute to many union members, particularly those in the Federated Clerks' Union, the A.M.I.E.U., and the A.W.U., who helped

us so well in this appeal. That appeal got us over the hurdle temporarily, but since then there have been wage and salary increases resulting from margins decisions. Again we are faced with the problem of trying to get enough income to meet our responsibilities. The members of the committee who conduct the ambulance service work in a voluntary capacity. We give our time as a community service and I am sure that every member of the committee enjoys giving his time. The hon. member for Sandgate is in the Chamber. He is a member, and I know that he devotes a great deal of his time to the Sandgate branch. I notice that the hon. member for Sherwood is here. He, too, rendered valuable service in raising funds for the Oxley branch. Many hon. members in the Chamber devote much of their time to helping the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade. However, only 60 per cent. of the Brisbane public are contributors, and with wage increases and other increasing costs we will be in a more than difficult position in the coming year. To say the least, we will be in an invidious position.

I should hate to see the time when the Government is forced to take over the ambulance service in Brisbane and I do not think the public of Brisbane would want it because the men in the service are dedicated to it. They are motivated by a humanitarian spirit which they display when attending to those who suffer. At our annual meeting we presented medals to a number of men with 40 years' service, and 20 years' service. Theirs is an admirable record. They are not in the job for the wages they receive; they are there only to give service. The public of Brisbane would not get the present efficient and courteous service from the ambulance brigade if it became a Government instrumentality. I say that because I know that members of the brigade have their hearts in their jobs. Somehow, there is a human feeling, or instinct, that is lost when a person enters the Public Service or is employed by a local authority. In some way there is not the same personal, heartfelt feeling for the job.

At present the brigade receives a subsidy of 10s. in the £1. However, there are a number of anomalies connected with it. I know that the Minister is considering certain aspects of this matter, and, knowing him, I am sure he will give them sympathetic consideration. Of necessity, we have collectors who go out to enlist subscribers and to collect renewals. As I see it, that should be an administration cost, but the cost of collecting is deducted from the amount of the subscription before we get a subsidy. In other words, we receive a subsidy only on the balance. That should be an administrative charge and should not affect our subsidy. Not all centres in Queensland are in the same position as the Brisbane centre.

Brisbane does extra and special work, yet the 10s. in the £1 subsidy on endowable receipts applies to every centre in the State.

**Dr. Noble:** You have the lowest charge of any centre in the State—25s.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Yes.

**Dr. Noble:** Every other centre charges at least 30s.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That could be so. I do not know the charge for every other centre in Queensland. The committees are autonomous and fix their own charges. We charge 25s. for a man, his wife and family. We have been forced to charge up to £2 now for accident cases to try to meet expenditure. We have had to resort to giving people an incentive to join, and to engage in our door-knock appeal and exert every possible effort to enlist subscribers. The problem is one that faces us from year to year. We overcame it last year but it is a continuing problem. In Brisbane we have this special case and I hope that the Minister, after listening to me, will see the merits of it. For Toowoomba, Ipswich, Mackay and some other centres the full subsidy is not sought. Some of those centres would be embarrassed if they did receive it.

**Dr. Noble:** They are very well off.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Yes. But the subsidy applies to every centre irrespective of its financial position, whereas the Brisbane centre is unique in that it has a tremendous number of inter-hospital transports. The capital city requires a great deal of ambulance work and transports here are an entirely different matter from the work of country centres. That is why we feel that the Brisbane centre should be given special consideration, preferably by way of special grant for this work, as distinct from an increase in subsidy because that would apply throughout the State. Our superintendent, Mr. Beech, was in Mackay for seven years and while there he did no inter-hospital transport work, yet the Mackay centre receives the same subsidy as Brisbane.

I could give the House a long history of representations that have been made, going as far back as the days of the former Minister for Health and Home Affairs, Mr. Moore, who said that Government work should be done free of charge. In effect, the committee was told it was just bad luck that it was in Brisbane. That letter from the Minister is on file. I am not taking political advantage of this; I am surveying the history of it. We have not given up on it. We had deputation after deputation in 1953 and in 1954. The deputation in 1954 led to a grant of £1,000 for the Brisbane centre on the basis that it was not to be regarded as a precedent but was to help the centre over the particular period.

I should like to quote some figures from the official report for the year to show how much work is involved for the ambulance in inter-hospital transport cases. First of

all, over 19,000 invalid and age-pensioner cases involving a mileage of over 213,000, represented 22·6 per cent. of the cases treated by the ambulance. The other cases, inter-hospital services, represented 9·5 per cent. of the total work. These two categories account for one-third of our expenditure but only 27 per cent. is Government subsidy. The 12,835 inter-hospital cases, involving nearly 90,000 miles, represent almost 10 per cent. of the ambulance work, but there is nothing in the way of payment for it.

Another anomaly comes in. Recently the ambulance was required to transport from the gaol to the lower court a prisoner on remand. The ambulance sent in an account to the Justice Department and received a cheque in payment; but when the ambulance was called upon to transport the same person from the gaol to the Supreme Court and the account was sent, payment was refused. It was suggested that we receive a subsidy for this sort of work.

I could go on at great length giving many similar examples. Looking over the history of the work done for the State Government Insurance Office, we find that we have averaged something like 12 cases a day for initial treatment in cases involving compensation claims. It may be said that many are contributors to the ambulance. That is so, but there are many who are not. Only 60 per cent. of people contribute to it; 40 per cent. do not. Although the S.G.I.O. makes an ex-gratia payment to the ambulance, statistics show that it falls far short of what it costs the ambulance to render these services. When it is remembered that many compensation cases require physiotherapy treatment and many trips to hospital, the total cost to the ambulance can well be imagined.

This work was never meant to be covered by the subsidy. It was given in the early part of the century as some assistance to the ambulance for the general community service provided. The ambulance in Brisbane is in a unique position, because a third of its work is done for the Government in the provision of inter-hospital transport, the cost of which is not matched by any subsidy. I do not think that the subsidy paid should have any relation to this work. I believe that arrangements should be made for a special grant to cover it.

**Mr. Dean:** You have a very good example of that at Sandgate. The Sandgate ambulance travels 24,000 miles a year attending to patients at Eventide alone.

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member for Sandgate knows something of this matter, and I am happy to bear with him in it. He is sympathetic to this cause because he knows the work that the ambulance does in transporting patients between Eventide and hospitals.

Our administrative costs have increased, and labour costs are high. Ambulance vehicles travelled almost 1,000,000 miles and 130,909 cases were treated for the year. The ambulance cannot continue to provide the peak of service, with cars and staff always ready, willing and able, with the most up-to-date fleet of vehicles, on the contributions of 60 per cent. of the people.

The Melbourne Civil Ambulance, in equivalent to our endowable receipts, received almost £2 for £1, by comparison, or a total of £149,000-odd. Government assistance was at the rate of 15s. 3d. in the £1 compared with our 10s. The Peninsula Ambulance Service received almost £2 for £1. Their endowable income was £22,538, and they received £41,770 by way of Government grant.

I could go on making comparisons with the position in New South Wales and Victoria, but I feel that reference to the figures will show that I have at least made out a case. The Q.A.T.B. provides a necessary humane service. It needs the best in men and machinery. Through the efficiency of the superintendent and staff we are proud of the service provided, which is second to none in the world. There is need for an investigation to see how the Government can be of special assistance to us so that we can continue to render a service for the benefit of humanity, rather than have the Government take it over. I believe that I have made out a case. The Minister for Health and Home Affairs is in the Chamber, and I hope that, having heard my comments, he will give the matter the consideration that it deserves.

**Dr. Noble:** I can tell you that Cabinet is considering the matter. However, I think there is a case for the Brisbane centre to make its charges equal to those of other centres in Queensland. If you increased the charge from 25s. to 30s. a year, it would mean an extra £30,000 a year.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That is so. I appreciate the Minister's saying that Cabinet will consider the matter.

**Dr. Noble:** They have considered it already.

**Mr. Donald:** What about paying for the transport of patients to the mental hospital?

**Mr. HUGHES:** I have already dealt with the matter raised by the hon. member for Ipswich East and inter-hospital transport, but there is a limit beyond which we cannot go in increasing transport fees. That is why we conducted such an extensive door-knock campaign.

**Dr. Noble:** The rest of the centres charge at least 30s. a year. Brisbane is the only centre that charges 25s.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That is so. I think the public of Brisbane are getting a good service at 25s. a year for a man, his wife and

children. We want to keep the charge as low as we can for the family man. There is a charge of £2 for accident cases if people are not subscribers, and rightly so, because this is really a form of insurance.

**Dr. Noble:** That is done outside Brisbane, also.

**Mr. HUGHES:** Yes. If people do not become subscribers, one can have little sympathy for them. Two men and a car are sent to accident cases, and there is a charge of £2 for non-subscribers. If we do that for accident cases, we have a case for similar charges for hospital cases, and so on. However, we want to keep charges as low as possible.

I pay a tribute to Mr. Beech and the staff of the Queensland Ambulance Transport Brigade for the great amount of work that they do, the manner in which they carry out their duties, and the courtesy and efficiency with which at all times they serve the public of Brisbane.

Another matter in which all hon. members have some personal interest is traffic. This has created a good deal of controversy over many years. It is not so very long ago that most of our traffic lights were installed, and some people have described them as a Coney Island forest of lights. However, I believe that the Government has taken very active steps to make the best use of the roads by using traffic lights, one-way streets where practicable, and so on. Had this work not been done, the city would be even more of a traffic jungle and cars would be halted bumper to bumper. We still have some bottle-necks and trouble spots, and I wish to speak about two of those in particular.

As I see it, night after night there is a jungle of traffic at the junction of Elizabeth and George Streets, and in the morning peak period Grey Street is clogged with traffic, making workers late for work. It is hopeless for buses to try to make up time; they just cannot do it. I think Australia is now third or fourth in the world in the number of cars in relation to population, and it is the state of our economy that enables people to own cars. The traffic problem to which I have referred is particularly bad on Mondays and Fridays, and something should, and must, be done about it.

**Mr. Rae** interjected.

**Mr. HUGHES:** The Traffic Commission should go somewhere near the corner of Elizabeth and George Streets at night. The jungle would come in on top of them. I have seen policemen there throw up their hands in despair, and the traffic has eventually sorted itself out. The real point about it is that this is a bottle-neck to incoming traffic from the south side in the morning and to outgoing traffic in the evening, and if ever there was a bottle-neck it is Victoria Bridge. Something will have to be done about it. We cannot allow this state of affairs to go unchallenged or unnoticed.

I notice that the hon. member for South Brisbane is in the Chamber. He has had something to say about Victoria Bridge falling down and being unsafe so he should be supporting me in my arguments for a new bridge.

Traffic snarls occur at Elizabeth Street and George Street with outbound traffic where buses are allowed to turn right at certain times, and a similar state of affairs occurs at the junction of William and Elizabeth Streets. Up to four lanes of outbound traffic form at times at William Street and prevent buses from proceeding down William Street at peak periods. These metal monsters can be seen snarling at each other at the William Street-Elizabeth Street intersection. It does not matter when the lights change because the traffic is across the lines and prevents egress from the other streets to the bridge. I know that time works the problem out but so much time has already gone by without anything being done about it and with public utilities unable to keep to their service schedules that the position cannot be allowed to continue much longer.

I believe it has developed into megalomania with drivers jostling one another for position and blocking the lanes in the cross streets, preventing other traffic from moving. Neither equality nor fairness is shown. I do not think it is the fault of either the lights or the police. The whole fault lies with the bottle-neck created by Victoria Bridge, which was never designed nor built to carry the volume of traffic it at present carries during peak periods. If there is a need that is vital and urgent in this city, it is for a new bridge. There may be other grandiose schemes but I believe that which rates the highest priority is the need for a new cross-river bridge to cope not with the present volume of traffic but with double the volume in years to come.

As I have said, Australia is among the top car-conscious countries of the world.

**Mr. Windsor:** If you are satisfied that there is need for a new bridge, you would have to provide another highway for the traffic to get away from the bridge.

**Mr. HUGHES:** There are lanes on the south side which allow the traffic to disperse, but traffic converges from many directions to the south side of the bridge. At night we have the same problem with traffic waiting to cross the river converging on the south side of the bridge.

The hon. member's interjection is quite relevant. One of my constituents spoke to me about building a retaining wall along the river bank from the Customs House to the other side of William Jolly Bridge. That would allow traffic to be diverted around there without having to cross other traffic. That would alleviate the problem and I do not think it would be tremendously costly. I have sent the suggestion along. It is not my own.

**Mr. Sherrington:** You know it is already in the town plan.

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member speaks about the town plan and the ring road. I think the hon. member for Brisbane, one of his supporters, would tell him what he thinks of the town plan. This is not the ring road and it is not a drive. This suggestion is not in the town plan. It has now been forwarded to the Town Planner and the Traffic Engineer for their consideration. Such a road along the river would provide an expressway for vehicles from the Customs House to Coronation Drive and the other side of the city. It would avoid the problem of cross traffic in the city, which is now causing such chaos and confusion. I know that these matters have been spoken of in other places. It is up to us to raise our voices in places where it counts. The hon. member for South Brisbane has raised the matter before. When we were both aldermen in the Brisbane City Council at the time of the C.M.O. administration I recall his saying that Victoria Bridge was about to collapse into the river, that it was a hazard. Public panic reigned supreme because he has both the vocabulary and the showmanship to put across his argument. The Press featured the matter at the time. I certainly think we need a new bridge. I have felt it bumping up and down. People must suffer from shattered nerves as a result of feeling the motion of the bridge as they have sat in stationary vehicles in the centre of it. I understand that the bridge has some degree of safety but I want to know what that degree of safety is now. These are matters that should not merely be looked at once in a while and then put back into the archives and forgotten.

It is no use saying that, like Topsy, things will grow or that they will come out right in the finish. It is a matter that should be given top priority not only from the safety point of view but also as a matter of expediency in traffic control. Such a bottle-neck has an effect on the economy of the city. It affects the price of consumer goods because of lost time, loading charges, and so on. At this stage it should be determined whether the bridge is safe. If it is safe, is it capable of taking a greater volume of traffic at this stage? What is its present capacity? I am not a panic merchant—I do not suggest that it is going to fall into the river—but we should keep up to date on such matters. Making a test now is a matter of public safety. Admittedly cross-river bridges are the responsibility of the local authority but I do not think the Brisbane City Council should have to go it alone in the matter of cost. We talk about development. The development and progress of a State are often gauged on the performance of the capital city. Brisbane is the capital city. At some time or another most of Queensland's tourists come here. I wonder what they think of a city that has such an antiquated structure that creates such traffic bottle-necks. Victoria

Bridge was built in the early part of the century. I stand to be corrected but I think that on one occasion in the council chamber the hon. member for South Brisbane said that tests were taken a decade ago which showed that the bridge would last five years.

**Mr. Bennett:** That is right.

**Mr. HUGHES:** That was five years ago, and so it goes on. Both motorists and pedestrians suffer not only inconvenience but a nerve-wracking experience when they are caught on the bridge. We speak of development so let us regard this as in the nature of a developmental project. The prestige of the city is often gauged on such a matter. A passenger wants to get from point A to point B as soon as possible, but it is not possible with such bottle-necks. As a Government we should take an interest in it. Apart from subsidy, we should negotiate with the city council so that it can be placed in the financial position to do what is required. We should help the council. I go so far as to suggest that the Commonwealth Government might interest itself in this measure. I do not think we get a fair share of the petrol tax; it should be employed wholly for State projects. We must get things done. The hon. member for Ithaca has just made a suggestion which proves that he is right on the job. He understands the problems.

**Mr. Bennett** interjected.

**Mr. HUGHES:** The hon. member for Ithaca is doing good work, and if the hon. member for South Brisbane gets election figures equal to him he can be proud of them.

We must measure up to this urgent problem because it is costing industry and the community a great deal of money. It is increasing the price of goods, and is affecting the people's health, because it is playing havoc with their nerves. We are living in times of pressure and it seems that we are rushing around faster than we did years ago.

These matters are not receiving the attention they rightly deserve. As a Government, we must realise that we have a responsibility to help the council. We should not say to the council, "It is your department; it is your field, and you will look after it." To my mind we must compromise and work together because, after all, we are all servants of the people and, so far as we are able, we must provide the finance for the requirements of those who put us in office, and this project should rate high in importance. I do not think it should be a parkatarea project; it is far beyond that. I have said here, and in other places, that parkatareas should be entirely the responsibility of the council, and the Government should not be in that field. We should not make the motorists pay for a bridge. We should keep out of it because it is one way of getting revenue to pay for certain desirable projects and it will not show in rates or taxes, and will not affect the political expediency

of the moment, or the voting inclinations of the people. We must be more imaginative. We must look at this objectively and impartially. It is not merely the responsibility of some persons in authority; it is everyone's responsibility. I repeat that motorists should not pay for a new bridge. We should accept it as a developmental project. The Commonwealth Government through some special committee, this Government by financing it on a subsidy basis, and the council, should get together with the Traffic Commission and the State Planning Bureau, and treat it as a matter of urgency. While it remains as it is the problem can never be alleviated, but will become increasingly worse. As it becomes increasingly worse, it will become a worse traffic hazard, with loss of life and limb.

**Mr. BENNETT** (South Brisbane) (4.4 p.m.): I sincerely express my loyalty, and the loyalty of my electors, to His Excellency, but I do so with a certain tinge of sadness because I sincerely believe he should be advised by a wiser Government.

The previous speaker dealt with certain traffic matters. I did not propose to deal with such a mundane subject on this occasion, but certain challenges have been made. Let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member for Kurilpa, that I sincerely believe this Government has done virtually nothing to relieve the traffic problems that exist in Brisbane. Government members have engaged in a lot of claptrap by way of advertisement. They have spoken at large to the Press about various traffic designs that are being proposed or carried out. They speak about the extensive installation of traffic lights while at the same time they have to pay the wages of a policeman to assist those lights on most occasions, particularly at peak hours. As a matter of fact, the traffic lights often impede or handicap the policeman on duty.

In spite of my strong representations about traffic at Kangaroo Point, the lights that were installed some nine months ago are still not working. I do not know whether they were installed before the elections in an attempt to hoodwink the people into believing that something was being done. I do not know what it cost to install them, but they have never been used and we are continually being told that essential parts are not available. I cannot understand why, if they are manufacturing traffic lights, they cannot make all the working parts at the same time.

Certain streets were made one-way streets. Admittedly that effects a temporary improvement by speeding up the flow of traffic in the particular street. At the same time, one-way streets create a bottle-neck somewhere else. It is perfectly logical to any man of common sense, whether he is a traffic engineer or not, that a given area of roadway can carry only a given number of vehicles. No matter how it is designed or redesigned it must reach saturation point.

**Mr. Hughes:** Why do we need a new bridge?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I knew the hon. member for Kurilpa would jump onto the bandwagon advocating a new bridge linking the south side with the city. I advocated that before he was even heard of. I even tried to enlist his aid to force his Government and the C.M.O. administration of the council of the day into doing something about Victoria Bridge. Unfortunately the council and the Government turned a deaf ear to the constructive proposals put forward by the A.L.P. in the Council through my agencies as the then leader.

**Mr. Hughes:** I was not attacking politically. Be fair. Nothing has been raised since.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The hon. member for Kurilpa knows that I have always been fair. I have only made impartial observations. If his assistance had been worth while, I would have given him due credit. Unfortunately, on this occasion I am not able to give him any credit for supported assistance towards the replacement of Victoria Bridge. True it is that we sadly and urgently need a new Victoria Bridge. When I first advocated the reconstruction of Victoria Bridge I was fortified with the written opinion of some of the State's top engineers, who said that it was unsafe and dangerous and that if it was not replaced in the immediate future—and this was some eight or nine years ago—some public catastrophe could be expected. I realise that since that time no catastrophe has occurred, and, further, other engineers have furnished reports to the effect that the bridge is reasonably safe. But I assure you that the engineers on whose opinions I acted have told me that no proper bridge test has ever been conducted of that bridge. No underwater test has been made; no underwater inspection of the piles has been undertaken—certainly none under the mud—so we do not really know the true condition of the bridge. But we know that in pre-war years some of the overburden on the bridge had to be removed because it was considered by top engineers to be dangerous even at that stage. The pedestrian walks on the sides were reduced in width, the concrete on the carriageway was completely removed, and a load limitation, which incidentally is not always adhered to, was imposed. I follow large trucks over the bridge regularly. The load limitation is supposed to be 11 tons, but semi-trailers at times travel across carrying loads much greater than the limit imposed and nothing seems to be done about it. Who is policing the load limitation? Absolutely no-one. I have seen traffic policemen directing these heavily-laden vehicles across the bridge, completely oblivious to the load limitation. Nobody takes any notice of it, but the notice is still there and is supposed to apply.

Putting aside the danger aspect, it is certainly an archaic, decrepit, and obsolete bridge, and its maintenance costs are particularly heavy. There are maintenance men working perennially on the bridge, but, in spite of that, it constitutes one of the greatest bottle-necks for the South Brisbane area. When I refer to that area, I am not restricting my observations solely to the South Brisbane electorate proper; they relate to the whole of the South Brisbane area and to interstate traffic and vehicles from centres such as Ipswich and Toowoomba.

In spite of temporary improvements effected in other areas by traffic layout and design, all traffic converges on the bridge, and the only real means of improving traffic flow is its complete removal and replacement by a bridge carrying at least four lanes of traffic each way. That is a practical and positive approach. It does not matter how much the flow of traffic is improved in Elizabeth Street—and I will concede that it has been improved—it all banks up at North Quay and in William Street waiting to get on to the bridge. The situation is reversed in the morning. No matter how much the flow of traffic along Grey Street and other approaches is improved, it all banks up in front of the Trocadero and in Grey Street waiting to reach the bridge.

Other improvements are merely scratches on the surface. To my way of thinking, they encourage and attract to the inner city drivers who do not realise the time wasted at Victoria Bridge. I would not make any traffic improvements until I had got at the root of the whole thing, which is this important bridge. Subsidiary improvements can be made later. It is no use improving a big toe or little finger whilst one has a weak heart. The first improvement should be to the heart, the real centre of the blood flow.

I know that the Labour administration of the Brisbane City Council in fact prepared, at considerable expense, plans for a new bridge. Soundings were taken during my time as Vice-Mayor of the Brisbane City Council in order to prepare for the construction of a new bridge. It was to be of a design similar to that of the William Jolly Bridge, because it requires little maintenance, and it was to be constructed in pre-stressed concrete.

When this Government took office, it scotched those plans on the pretext that they were unsatisfactory, even though they had been prepared by the top engineers of the Brisbane City Council.

**Mr. Hughes:** This Government?

**Mr. BENNETT:** Yes.

**Mr. Hughes:** It was not in office then.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Yes, it was. It was called a "cow-cocky" Government at that time. It was the Government of the hon. member that scotched the plans.

**Mr. Hughes:** The Government was not in when you were Vice-Mayor.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Those plans were pigeon-holed on the pretext that the design was unsuitable, in spite of the fact that the best bridge-designing brains, both architectural and engineering, were applied to their preparation.

Although the Government claimed that those plans were unsatisfactory, it has done absolutely nothing to prepare alternative plans for traffic crossing from South Brisbane to the inner city in the vicinity of Victoria Bridge. I can well understand the confusion that occurs between parties to a coalition, and it is perfectly obvious that because the Country Party was the controlling body at the time—I do not know whether it still is; its position is in jeopardy—it was able to direct Cabinet to say that the money that would be made available as a result of co-operation between the Brisbane City Council and the State Government—the State Government would have to make its contribution, of course—would be better spent in other parts of Queensland. That is why the bridge has not been constructed. Let us face facts. I suppose many Country Party members would argue that the money could be spent more wisely in other parts of the State, and I acknowledge the sincerity of their beliefs. But it is difficult to understand why metropolitan members of the Liberal Party allow themselves to be pushed round by members of the Country Party when Brisbane is being suffocated commercially by traffic congestion.

The only real way to relieve the congestion is by the Government attacking three problems. We do not need the Traffic Commission; we do not need an increase in the staff of the Traffic Commission. I will admit that the three problems are major ones, but they can be and must be faced. They are at Victoria Bridge, Petrie Bight, and the Normanby. If they are solved, other minor traffic problems will solve themselves. Parkatareas and parking meters mean nothing. They have been installed only to produce revenue. Until those three major problems are attacked by the Government, it is wrong to build new parking areas in the inner city and encourage motorists to come here and create chaos and confusion.

**Mr. Hughes:** This is the best speech you have made.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I have been practising it for years. It has always fallen on the deaf ears of a C.M.O. city council and this Government.

Because of certain observations by the Minister for Education and Migration, I had hoped to deal with industrial development in Queensland, about which we have heard a great deal of skiting. Incidentally, we have also heard a great deal of skiting about the result of the last election. I do not intend to enter that contest. I shall content myself

with the observation that had there been a fair re-distribution the Australian Labour Party would now be the Government. In reply to the claims made by the hon. member for Kurilpa, I say that the results of members of the A.L.P. would have been better had not hundreds of names been removed from the rolls, as they were from the South Brisbane roll, without any police check. The names of people who had been living in the South Brisbane area for many years were removed from the roll for no apparent reason. I believe that they were removed because they were living in a Labour electorate. I am sure it did not happen in Liberal Party or Country Party electorates. If it had, those parties would have been very conscious of how different the rolls were. However, they did nothing about the wrongful removal of names from the rolls.

**Mr. Dewar:** I know of a couple in my electorate.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Only a couple? Incidentally, I can quite truthfully say that with the assistance of a small number in my team, prior to the closing of the rolls I had, at a conservative estimate at least 508. That claim can be checked in the electoral office, yet this Government says that there was no necessity for a police check. I had 500 myself, and do not suggest that they are bogus claims, because they can be checked. The bona fides of my statement can be checked by a study of the claims made at the electoral office. Instead of 500, we could have put on many more but the time factor was against us. It is idle for the Government to say that there was no necessity for a police check of the rolls.

**Mr. Dewar:** It was much easier to get on the roll under Labour than it is now. They had teams going around voting for dead men.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The Minister might know about that. Even if that was possible during the Labour administration, I am quite confident that none of the A.L.P. representatives would have exercised the entitlement the Minister claims was made, as I am sure he did, assisted by his past experience.

I now propose to deal with the empty claims made by this Government about the attraction of industry to this State. I have yet to be persuaded that the claims are correct. I am satisfied, as a matter of fact, that the claims are in keeping with many other of the Government's idle boasts and cannot be supported by statistical figures. I have been endeavouring all day to find suitable figures, in the Library and elsewhere, by which I can compare the record of this Government with that of previous Governments of this State and with those of Governments in other States, and I am told everywhere I go that one cannot get figures after 1960 and in some instances after 1961. Obviously, the only figures that can be obtained are those that are in the custody

of the Minister and the only way they can be got is when he answers questions in Parliament, and then I do not know whether one could get a record to test their veracity.

**Mr. Dewar** interjected.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I become so sceptical because, if figures are easily obtained, why are they not published up to date, so that when we are debating we have not to go back to what happened before 1960 or 1961? We could debate on current figures. Alternatively, if they are not voluntarily published, why is there not some location to which any member of Parliament can go and be provided with accurate and up-to-date figures?

I have been trying all day, but I could not find any place to which to go for such figures. I sit here hour after hour listening to the Address-in-Reply debate, with Government members bragging about the efforts of the Government. I listened this morning to the Minister for Education and Migration, who spoke about every portfolio but his own.

**Mr. Ewan:** What department are you criticising?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I listened to him and he did not produce one actual figure to support his contention that industrial development was flourishing in this State. I challenge his claim on the employment figures and I should say that, if his contentions are to be accepted, we should be provided with concrete, cold, hard figures that we can study closely and compare with the results obtained under Labour.

**Mr. Dewar:** Those figures are available in the Year Book.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Ah, yes, in the Year Book—

**Mr. Bjelke-Petersen:** You just said that the city was being blocked by traffic and choking itself. Obviously it must be growing.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The answer to that, of course, is quite simple. I will concede that the number of people driving motor-cars today is much greater than in previous times, but that is because of the nefarious activities of hire-purchase companies, which have been given a free rein during the administration of this Government. Any poor unfortunate individual, teenager or otherwise, can land home with a motor-car on a 10 per cent. deposit, not knowing how he is going to pay it off. That is possible only because of the hire-purchase racket this Government condones. That is the real reason why so many motor vehicles are getting around at the present time. It is not an indication of the prosperity of the State. If a teenager, or a person in a family who can ill-afford to buy a motor vehicle, gets into any financial difficulties the vehicle is either repossessed

and sold again for more profit or the unfortunate parents have to chip-in and pay in the money owing under the hire-purchase agreement. It is no indication of prosperity at all. It is a positive example of unbridled hypocrisy on the part of this Government in the control of hire-purchase companies.

Seeing that I could not get figures on industrial development, and as so much has been said since the opening of this session about the administration of justice, I thought it would be wise to have something to say on that subject. I do not wish to repeat many of the observations that have been made already. It has been truthfully said by the Minister for Justice that court procedures in Queensland have become out-moded. To some extent that is right—that is, the mechanical procedures. Last year a Bill was introduced to enable the courts to use electrical and mechanical processes in the recording of evidence. I said at the time that no doubt these mechanical processes would be an improvement on the old physical system of using a typewriter, but that they were not to be compared with the efficiency and the accuracy of shorthand writers. I was scoffed at at the time. One of the arguments advanced was that the Government could not get enough shorthand writers. My retort was, "Why don't we train shorthand writers and pay them an adequate salary so that we can attract enough?" That was the first argument disposed of. The second argument was that the Government had tested some mechanical equipment which had proved to be most efficacious. The Minister said that he intended to replace the typewriters and the shorthand writers with this mechanical and electrical equipment. That is some 12 months ago but there is still not one court in Queensland using that alleged equipment which the Government, by way of clap-trap, claimed it had in its possession and with which it was going to improve the method of court procedure in this State. Not one court is using it. I doubt whether any one court will use it. After all, it was claimed that it was 100 per cent. efficient. It is impossible to improve on shorthand writers, but if there is benefit to be derived by the use of this electrical equipment, where is it and when will it be produced?

It is taking the Government a darned long time to produce the articles it said it had in existence. Certainly a great show was put up to the Press. A test case was conducted and they had photographers in court. They had certain counsel there. The court hearing was recorded on some electrical tape-recording equipment, but it has not been heard of or seen since. No doubt it was borrowed from some other State or from some private company. Obviously it was not the Government's property at all because if it was, why is it not being used now? I repeat that there is not one court in Queensland exercising its duties under the alleged improvements that were introduced by the Bill last year.

I have observed that during the history of this Government many Bills are introduced into Parliament in a deceptive fashion. They engage the attention of hon. members who are not in the know. Those hon. members give serious consideration to the proposals contained therein, using up a lot of time in studious research, only to discover at some future time that the legislation was merely a deceptive device to keep members of Parliament talking so that the session would last out. This is one of the Bills about which nothing has been done or heard of since. It is akin to the old Bill of Rights. We would still be discussing it, but it got such a hopeless hiding from the then Opposition that the Government decided it would not bring it up for further parliamentary discussion—it became too embarrassing for the Government.

The Government has spent a substantial amount on the buildings for the District Courts, but none of it has been wisely spent. Travelling along George Street, or, for that matter, along North Quay, no-one would know that over £100,000 has been spent by the Government on improvements built into an old worn-out railway building that is fast falling down.

**Mr. Ewan:** It was built before we came to Government.

**Mr. Duggan:** Don't interject yourself out of the new Cabinet.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I believe he is only the third pea at the moment. He needs to improve his position.

Leaving aside the ground floor, the old railway building is a two-storey building. Litigants in their 80's, or other elderly people under the stress and strain of litigation, have to find their way to the top courts without the assistance of a lift. That in itself is cause for some concern, but the main observation I wish to make is that, when £100,000 is spent on a building, one would think that, in the interests of architectural beauty, it would be spent on an attractive building that would be a credit to the people of Queensland, to those who practise in the law courts, and to visitors from other States and overseas, so that we could proudly say, "This is one of our new court-block buildings. It cost about £100,000. Don't you think it has attractive features?" But what do we see? It is like a rabbit warren. £100,000 has disappeared in that old rabbit warren. It is difficult to find one's way around. One has to traverse stairs like gangways and walk along cat-walks to get to the various places where this £100,000 has been spent.

**Mr. Duggan:** It is very hard to find them.

**Mr. BENNETT:** As my Leader has pointed out, it is very hard to find them. In this unfortunate atmosphere, the District Courts are located in the old railway building which is now the Magistrates Court building.

**Mr. Richter:** It has pretty good accommodation, hasn't it?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I concede that the appointments are very good. The pity of it is that the building itself is not good, so the people cannot consider that their money has been well spent. The vast majority of the taxpayers never go into a court, but over £100,000 has been spent on an old building. Surely it could have been spent so that the taxpayers who provide the money could be proud of the expenditure. It may be good accommodation, but I have not seen inside and I should not be game to go inside.

**Mr. Richter:** If you have not been inside, how would you know?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I have seen it from the outside.

**Mr. Richter:** You do not know what you are talking about.

**Mr. BENNETT:** That is a somewhat challenging and provocative remark for the Minister to make. I should say that he has adopted a cow-cocky's attitude to the construction of our top courts in Queensland. He does not know his job. It is a shocking mess. I will go further and say that those buildings are a shocking mess and that it is scandalous to see public money wasted in such a fashion. It is an architectural headache; it is a lawyer's dilemma; it is a litigant's confusion; and it is a taxpayer's dilemma.

**Mr. Richter:** You do not know, if you have not been inside it.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I have been in all the buildings except the new one, which is not completed. That contains the chambers constructed in the watchhouse yard between the watchhouse and the other house, whose name I cannot use here but it is the house where people go to relieve themselves. It is commonly known in all circles that Mr. Justice Hart's chambers have been constructed between the watchhouse and this other little house.

**Mr. Richter:** A temporary job.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Incidentally, it is in the watchhouse yard. This is a Supreme Court judge's chambers in the watchhouse yard. It cannot be denied that those chambers will cost some £12,000. I have observed the construction right from the laying of the concrete pillars. They are chambers, of course, for Mr. Justice Hart and possibly Mr. Acting Justice Lucas, the judges whose chambers, although temporary, are to cost £12,000 or more.

**Mr. Richter:** They could be removed to some other site later.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Exactly. The Minister himself admits that £12,000 is being wasted.

**Mr. Richter:** Not wasted at all.

**Mr. BENNETT:** Of course it is being wasted. Why does the Government not erect a permanent building? As the hon. member for Salisbury says, at that later stage—and of course it might be necessary—they may reconvert the present construction into a house like that other house, in which, I can assure you, there is extreme congestion.

Those chambers are of pre-fabricated construction. They are built hard-up against the Magistrates Court, but, in order to maintain the difference between the magistracy and the Supreme Court judiciary, they are at a different level, although they are 7 feet up.

**Mr. Ewan:** Is there any sewerage there?

**Mr. BENNETT:** I saw a little pipe coming out of the roof. I do not know whether that is for the judges to blow their smoke up or whether it is for sewerage purposes.

The chambers are roofed with a pre-fabricated metal roofing called Cliplock. It is perfectly obvious that, as the roof is located just outside the poor Magistrates Court, and the courts of petty sessions, in heavy rain the noise will become unbearable. Goodness knows it has been bad enough during the last 12 months.

I can assure the Minister for Public Works that he has succeeded in developing the material construction of our courts like a black-fellow's camp.

**Mr. Richter:** You know all about black-fellows.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I do, because I am charitable enough to all sections of the community and I go into various avenues.

It is true that in the main the appointments are quite reasonable. The Minister has probably never been into the court. He talks about my visits to various places, but he surely has never been into what I think is known as Court No. 8, or it may be No. 7—the top court, nearest Tritton's building. It has benches supposedly for a 12-man jury but they are big enough for only 10 men so every time a jury of 12 is empanelled, in this modern court with the latest developments built by this new Government, two extra seats are put in because the jury cannot fit into the jury box.

**Mr. Richter:** You seem to manage all right.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I can persuade them. Whether they are sitting on benches or on plush chairs, they still agree that I am right.

I have made even further inspection. I have been into the room where the accused have to wait pending their court hearing. In that room they are provided with accommodation of a type to which people in Elizabethan days were accustomed, or even going back to more barbaric times.

When a person is on trial, he is merely the accused; he is not at that stage convicted. He may well be, as many are, completely innocent. Certainly he stands every

chance of being found guilty; nevertheless, according to our code of British justice, he is innocent until proven guilty. In this little waiting room where the accused have to wait, which is only about 8 feet by 8 feet, although I did not expressly measure it, there are sometimes four to eight accused persons, and in one corner, set in concrete, is an open toilet that has to be used by any individual in the presence of all the others. I think that that is shocking and barbarous, and I did not think that any building would be constructed in such a fashion in the year 1963. Here men have to sit and use the toilet with no seat or lid, in the presence of six or eight others, in this little confined space of one room. Those are shocking conditions.

**Mr. Richter:** Your Government gave them a bucket.

**Mr. BENNETT:** I do not believe what the hon. gentleman says, but, if it is true, it does not justify this barbaric attitude in 1963. When £100,000 is spent on court buildings, no poor accused person, who, incidentally, has to pay the penalty if he is found guilty or, alternatively, may be completely innocent, should be subjected to that embarrassment at the hands of the Government. I sincerely hope that no hon. member opposite will be forced to subject himself to such an outrageous indignity.

As another example of how we are returning to the old ball-and-chain days, there is no provision for the accommodation of a full jury panel while waiting to be empanelled. At the moment jurors sit in the builders' shed being used in the construction of Mr. Justice Hart's chambers. What will happen when the shed goes, I do not know. Sometimes jurors get lost, and they certainly get in the way of the building workers, but that is the only accommodation provided by the Government.

Whilst they are sitting there, the unfortunate accused persons are brought over from the watchhouse or the Black Maria. Each accused is handcuffed to another. They could be completely innocent and found not guilty, but they are marched past the full jury panel handcuffed together for the psychological reason of showing the jury, before their cases are heard, that they are the "bad eggs".

**Mr. Smith:** Will you tell us how it has got worse since 1957?

**Mr. BENNETT:** In the short space of time that I have I cannot deal with inane questions put forward by the hon. member for Windsor. I do know that he is in line for appointment to the magistracy out at Burke, or some place like that. Having been defeated for Clayfield he is, of course, not in the race to get in the Cabinet. That is why he is getting nasty and churlish.

**Mr. Smith:** I am not getting nasty and churlish. I should like you to answer my question.

**Mr. BENNETT:** The Minister referred in his speech to virtually everything except his own portfolio of police administration. I have had a lot to say about the police, but he dodged it every time. We have been rightly told, Mr. Speaker, that your position is important for the preservation of democracy. The position of the judiciary is equally important, if not more so, for the preservation of our democratic institutions, and, for the same reason, a clean, decent, 100-per cent. Police Force is imperative.

(Time expired.)

**Mr. CAREY (Albert)** (4.44 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I rise to associate myself with the motion before the House and to express on my behalf, and that of the people of the electorate of Albert, loyalty to Her Most Gracious Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II.

I was very impressed with the address delivered by His Excellency the Administrator when he opened this session of Parliament. I think that we in Queensland are very fortunate to have a man of the ability and integrity of Sir Alan Mansfield who is capable of taking over the office of Governor during the absence overseas of Sir Henry Abel Smith and Lady May.

I also congratulate the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Carnarvon, Mr. Henry McKechnie, and the seconder, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha, Mr. Bill Lickiss, on their thought-provoking speeches. I know that they put a great deal of time, thought and energy into preparing them.

I thank the electors of Albert for again showing their confidence in me by returning me as their representative with a majority far in excess of that which I received on the first occasion on which I presented myself before them. I congratulate the Premier on leading his team to victory, because I am convinced that he played a major part in the Country-Liberal Government's victory in Queensland.

**Mr. Duggan:** You were a bit frightened of Mr. Harley for a long while.

**Mr. CAREY:** I was never frightened of Mr. Harley. I knew that the people in the electorate of Albert had great confidence in me and were well satisfied with the service that I had given them over the past three years.

**Mr. Duggan:** That is why you had Paradise Island transferred to your area at a late stage.

**Mr. CAREY:** I did not have Paradise Island transferred to my electorate. As a matter of fact, it is not in my electorate and has not been transferred to my roll.

I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the high office that you hold. I do not agree with the hon. member

for Townsville North. I am sure that you will retain the Chair as long as you desire to occupy it or until you seek higher honours in this Assembly. I congratulate you on the wonderful improvements that have been effected to Parliament House during your term of office as Speaker. Although I am a comparative newcomer to the House, I believe that you have considered the comfort of all parties and all members in these major improvements.

This is an opportune time for me to offer my congratulations to the Chairman of Committees, the hon. member for Greenslopes, on his election to that position.

I have a generous nature, and I am going to be generous on this occasion and congratulate all hon. members who were returned at the last election.

I also congratulate the hon. member for Hinchinbrook on his appointment as Minister for Agriculture and Forestry. He came into the House at the same time as I did and became a very good friend of all hon. members who had the privilege of being in his company on the top floor of the Lodge. He has a very happy disposition, and his kindly approach to his fellow men and his generosity was always appreciated by us, and we, in return, now wish to show him the same generosity.

I am not prepared to say that it was the Leader of the Opposition, but I think it was he, who said that the Address in Reply was used mainly to work the parish pump. I do not believe that that is exactly what it is. I think it is used to work on behalf of the electors one represents. Therefore, naturally, I shall endeavour to bring before the various Ministers matters that I believe will be of great advantage to my electorate, Albert.

I want to deal briefly with these subjects now. I know I will have much greater opportunity during the Budget debate and when we are considering the various Estimates. I should like to mention that I heard some criticism from the Opposition when the Minister for Education and Migration said that there was great development taking place in this State. Of course, the Opposition rose to the occasion and disagreed entirely with his thinking, but I want to assure hon. members that, as far as my area—Albert—and the Gold Coast, are concerned, great development has taken place, and for that matter, it has taken place in many other parts of Queensland that I have visited. Naturally, that is because of this Government.

I should like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the fact that from time to time you have no doubt read in the Press criticism of our local hospital; not of the staff, the nursing sisters or the medical profession, but mainly of the Government for having failed to build, perhaps some extra ward—a children's ward—or something of that nature.

Whilst I agree that criticism is good, I think this criticism of the Minister for Health and Home Affairs or his department for neglecting to build a children's ward is quite unnecessary. I am aware, as a result of representations made by the hon. member for South Coast, Mr. Gaven, and myself, that in a short space of time this ward will become an accomplished fact.

Prior to the general hospital being built we had a maternity hospital with a mere 18 beds. I feel very confident that at a very early date this Government will be building additions to the maternity hospital, bringing it up to a total of 33 beds.

I am also well aware—and I want this recorded in "Hansard"—that the general hospital and the services rendered by the medical profession, the nursing sisters and the staff leave nothing at all to be desired. I have made inquiries far and wide of various patients who have been hospitalised in Southport and I find that they are all perfectly satisfied with the services that have been rendered at our general hospital.

**Mr. Bennett:** It was a Labour Government that first built the hospital down there.

**Mr. CAREY:** That is not correct.

**Mr. Bennett:** It is; I was on the board when it was done.

**Mr. CAREY:** That is completely untrue.

The general section at present has two wards of 70 beds but I am aware that at the present time the occupancy is approximately 86 per cent. of the total capacity of the hospital. I have been informed by the department that when a hospital gets to the stage of having an 86 per cent. occupancy, the time is ripe for the building of further accommodation.

**Mr. Aikens:** Is it not a fact that the hospital is full of southern tourists who are getting free hospitalisation under the Queensland scheme?

**Mr. CAREY:** That is not correct. Did the hon. member not read in the Press that the vice-chairman of the hospitals board complained bitterly because people from across the border would be charged more than the Queenslanders?

I am very confident that at an early date we will get a new ward, portion of which will be a children's ward. There will also be an increase in the size of the nurses' quarters. Dining-room facilities will be improved. The laundry will be increased in size and a dental clinic will be built on the site of the hospital. At the present time it is in rented buildings across the road from the hospital.

I ask the Minister for Health and Home Affairs to give serious consideration to building a maternal and child welfare centre in Nerang Street, Southport, on ground level, where the department already has land for this purpose. At the present time the maternal and child welfare rooms are on the second

floor of the S.E.A. building. This means that the mothers have to lift their prams up two flights of steps, or leave them unattended on the footpath and carry their children upstairs. I have been working very assiduously to have this new building constructed but although we have had many improvements in the area, unfortunately so far I have not been able to get this one. I will attempt to get it within the next three years.

As I said, I wish to deal only briefly with these matters. I now move on to forestry. I ask the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry to give serious consideration to establishing a reforestation area in the Canungra district. It is well known that in about 1934 Canungra was one of the most prolific timber-growing areas in the State. I have endeavoured to get figures to submit to the House but unfortunately, as the Labour Government did not keep its records in the same fashion and order as we do, the only piece of real information available to me is that in 1934 20,000,000 super feet of pine were carried over the Cainbale Road. I urge the Minister for Agriculture and Forestry to give serious consideration to planning a reforestation plot somewhere in the Canungra district. It is essential to keep timber growing in Queensland, and I am confident that there is ample room for reforestation expansion in the Albert electorate.

Although it may seem only a minor matter in the eyes of some of the hardened members, I ask the Forestry Department to provide camping areas in the mountains and on the banks of the cool mountain streams. I have received many such requests from people who live permanently on the Gold Coast. They enjoy the best of everything in sun, sand and surf but at times they want to take their caravans into the country. They are true Australians and periodically they like to leave the surf, the sand and the sunshine and travel into the clean, fine, mountain-country area. This Government has improved roads to such an extent that it is now very simple and easy—indeed, it is very pleasant—for the family man to hitch a caravan to the back of a car and travel to Tamborine or Canungra Valley and pull up to camp in a shady glen alongside a cool mountain stream. But unfortunately no conveniences are supplied at these places. Because of the absence of conveniences, people are inclined to stop their caravans at a forestry reserve where the Forestry Department people have provided very good facilities for day visitors. However, people are not permitted to camp in these areas unless they have permission from the Forestry Department. I suggest to the Minister that he improves these sites so that caravanners and campers may enjoy the country air as well as the beautiful beaches. I know that a few arguments may be advanced against this, namely, that there is a fire hazard and that sort of thing, but they are small details that I know we can overcome.

I should like to address my next remarks to the Minister for Public Works and Local Government and ask him to do everything in his power to expedite the building of a sewerage scheme for the wonderful city of the Gold Coast, half of which I represent. Everyone will agree that sewerage is a very important public amenity. Under no circumstances can we allow wonderful rivers, such as the Nerang River, to be polluted by the discharge of effluent into them. I know that the Minister, in co-operation with several other departments, has made overtures to his departmental officers to pursue a scheme whereby a sewerage system can be provided for the Gold Coast with the effluent discharged direct into the sea. I ask the Minister to go ahead with this proposal as soon as possible because we have an excellent water scheme, plenty of room for secondary industry expansion, an abundance of power, and good climatic conditions where workers will be happy to establish their homes.

However, the absence of a sewerage system in the area will discourage, or restrict, the establishment of secondary industries in the area, and I again ask the Minister for Public Works and Local Government to go ahead with the scheme as quickly as possible.

I will now deal with a matter that I believe will not come about immediately. I have here some photographs that depict very clearly, and plainly, what could happen if we had the whole of our electricity reticulated underground. This is a new development on the Gold Coast and the results are really beautiful. One of my constituents brought these photographs to me and said that he would like me to take the matter up with the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity to see if he could get permission to reticulate electricity below the surface of the ground. I know the cost will be about eight times as much as for work above ground but he is prepared to meet the extra cost and, in that case, he should be allowed to. I am sure all hon. members will agree with me when they see this photograph.

**Mr. Bennett:** How are you going to have that photograph recorded in "Hansard"?

**Mr. CAREY:** I will give the picture to the "Hansard" reporter. Then hon. members will be able to see it later just as the hon. member for South Brisbane frequently invites us to his electorate to see something there. While this is very costly, it represents forward thinking and forward planning. I am hoping that in due course we may be able to reticulate electricity underneath the surface of the ground.

**Mr. Aikens:** Electricity is reticulated underground in many areas.

**Mr. CAREY:** I realise that.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why can't it be done there?

**Mr. CAREY:** I believe it can be done and should be done, particularly as my constituent is willing to meet any extra cost involved.

I now wish to make a recommendation to the Minister in charge of the Main Roads Department which I feel sure will have the full support of all hon. members on both sides, and that is for a substantial discount or a rebate on the registration of motor-cars owned and driven by pensioners. We know there are many problems to overcome. Pensioners have families and perhaps the son of the family is the driver of the car. But the pensioner of today is the pioneer of yesterday.

**Mr. Baxter:** Do you mean all pensioners?

**Mr. CAREY:** Every pensioner.

**Mr. Baxter:** Pensioners from all services, those receiving the widow's pension, the age pension?

**Mr. CAREY:** At the present time, I know, some pensioners receive a rebate; indeed they are enabled to have a car and receive a number without paying registration. I ask the Minister to investigate fully the possibility of granting this concession. Many pensioners in country areas have not the facilities available to those in the city. Country pensioners have no trams or buses and sometimes no other conveyance. The modern trend is to go to the shop to do the shopping. So these elderly people are forced to own a car. Though they do not use the vehicle as much as other people do, they have to pay exactly the same registration as those who use their vehicles to the full. So I hope to get the support of many other hon. members on this point.

I compliment the Minister on the excellent job being done by the Main Roads Department on the Pacific Highway. Those hon. members who have the good fortune to visit the Gold Coast every week-end will know how much work is going on down there and how essential it is. Frequently during the Easter holidays in particular, thousands of cars are held up because there is not enough room for traffic on the road.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why don't they go to the North Coast, to Dave Low's area?

**Mr. CAREY:** No-one would consider going to the North Coast when there is the beautiful Gold Coast to go to. I suggest that if the work that is now going on continues for the next three years, we can look forward to having a four-lane highway from Brisbane to the border, which is something on which we compliment and commend the Minister.

I should like to ask the Minister to make available each year a substantial sum of money for the construction of the road from Warwick to the coast, passing through

Boonah, Beaudesert, Canungra, the Gorge road, and Coomera. A considerable amount has already been spent on the road, but we want the money to continue to flow to it.

**Mr. Bennett:** Do you think the subdividers should pay the cost of it?

**Mr. CAREY:** This has nothing to do with subdividers. Let the hon. member wait and I shall tell him the story. This road will tap the Moonie oilfield, and workers from that area will be able to travel to the coast for their holidays through fine farming country and enjoy the various facilities that the Gold Coast has to offer. It is very important that this road be opened to avoid any further traffic congestion on the main road between Toowoomba, Ipswich, Brisbane, and the Gold Coast.

**Mr. Bromley:** The Premier wants to develop the North Coast.

**Mr. CAREY:** I am very confident that the Premier's concern is for the State of Queensland and that he has no leanings towards the North Coast. This is a boggy that hon. members opposite have endeavoured to spread from time to time in the Albert and Gold Coast areas. However, it has been without effect because the people there are very confident that the Premier has as much interest in improving our area as he has in advancing any other.

**Mr. Duggan:** You did not have such a high regard for him when he brought preferential voting before Caucus.

**Mr. CAREY:** I have always had a high regard for the Premier. Whilst I held the opinion, and still hold it, that preferential voting is not, in my humble opinion, a good thing, I can take a beating and I am prepared to accept the majority rule at all times, because I believe in democracy.

**Mr. Duggan:** We won't interject any more!

**Honourable Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! There will be other hon. members "put on the spot" in a few moments if they do not stop interjecting.

**Mr. CAREY:** One of my hobby horses that I should like to bring to the attention of the Minister for Transport is the removal of the railway station at Southport to allow free movement of traffic along Scarborough Street.

**Mr. Bennett:** He will cut out the whole line if you want him to.

**Mr. CAREY:** There is no worry about that because it is a very profitable line. Minerals are being moved from the coast in tons and tons. A little later, when we are dealing with the Budget and the Estimates, I shall endeavour to have figures showing the amount of business transacted at the Southport railway station. The railway men are very happy about the way in which the Government is treating them and very happy with the representation that they now have.

**Opposition Members** interjected.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** Order! Hon. members on my left are not honouring the pledge that they gave to the hon. member for Albert a few minutes ago.

**Mr. CAREY:** I shall conclude by again stressing how essential it is that the railway station be moved about 100 yards and Scarborough Street continued through, thus allowing the full development of business houses at the northern end of that street. At present it is a hazard, and a block to development.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Mann, adjourned.

The House adjourned at 5.17 p.m.