

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 18 MARCH 1971

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 18 MARCH, 1971

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

QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

MURARRIE STATE SCHOOL

Mr. Houston, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

Is it proposed to provide a new toilet block at the Murarrie State School, in lieu of the present E.C. system, to cater for the anticipated sewerage connection and, if so, when?

Answer:—

“Yes. Plans are in course of preparation and work will be scheduled to coincide as closely as possible with the sewerage connection, the date of which is not yet known.”

POLICE PROTECTION OF PUBLIC

Mr. Davies for Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Did he read *Sunday Truth* of March 7? If so, what is being done now that police officers are forced to work to regulations to give the public protection from known criminals?

(2) Why did he shut out the Police Union President, Detective R. Edington, and Police Union Secretary, Mr. M. J. Callaghan, on the morning of March 5 when these men wanted to discuss matters of urgency and public importance with him concerning the Police Force?

(3) What is being done about the shortage of staff?

(4) Why can police officers not attend college courses during working hours or be allowed special time to attend?

(5) Are C.I.B. duties neglected while police officers are attending college courses?

(6) What has he to say about Mr. Callaghan's claim that the public is not receiving anywhere near the adequate protection to which it is entitled?

Answers:—

(1) “Yes. It is not known what the words ‘forced to work to regulations’ intended to convey. As the Honourable Member knows, members of the Police Force are bound by the Police Act and Rules and general instructions issued by the Commissioner. I am informed by the Commissioner of Police that Mr. Callaghan has now claimed that he was misreported in that article.”

(2) "Neither Mr. Edington nor Mr. Callaghan was 'shut out' by myself on the morning of March 5, 1971. At that time, I had arranged to meet a deputation consisting of the President and Secretary of the Branch Union attached to the Criminal Investigation Branch. No invitation had been extended to either Mr. Edington or Mr. Callaghan to be present. Commitments did not permit me to discuss general union matters with those two men on that day."

(3) "A State wide examination of the present deployment of available police man power is presently being conducted. When that examination is completed, it will enable me to establish what shortage, if any, there is in the police strength of this State. In the meantime, despite financial restrictions which necessarily have been placed on other matters of police expenditure, recruiting continues."

(4) "Provided certain requirements are met, members of the Police Force are permitted to attend approved college courses in departmental time."

(5) "No."

(6) "The public is receiving adequate protection from the police."

TERMINATION OF TENANCIES ACT

Mr. Davies for Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) Has he read the report in *The Sunday Mail* of March 7 of the address given by Mr. J. B. Thomas, barrister-at-law, to the Law Symposium held at Surfers Paradise on March 6?

(2) When will the *Termination of Tenancies Act* 1970 be repealed?

(3) Why did the Government not confer with the Law Reform Commission before submitting the Bill to Parliament?

(4) Were most of the anomalies in the Act brought to his attention before the Act was brought into operation?

(5) Did a committee of the Bar Association make submissions on this legislation and, if so, were they ignored?

(6) Did the Queensland Law Society make submissions on this legislation and, if so, were they ignored?

(7) Was the Act drafted for bachelor landlords?

(8) What protection is there in the legislation for sub-lessees?

(9) Did the Law Reform Commission in January, 1970, present a detailed working paper recommending much-needed reforms on the subject of leases? If so, were the recommendations ignored or what happened to them?

Answer:—

(1 to 9) "The views of the Bar Association, Queensland Law Society and some other bodies were examined but it was considered that many of the difficulties envisaged by those bodies would not be encountered in the practical application of the provisions of the Act. The Act has now been in operation since January 1, 1971, and I have received no complaints as to its practical application. Should it be found that the difficulties envisaged are encountered, consideration will be given to appropriate amendments being made."

CANING OF DEAF SCHOOL-CHILD

Mr. Davies for Mr. Bennett, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) Has he read the claim made in *Sunday Truth* of March 7 that a 15-year-old deaf boy was bruised on the buttocks and legs as a result of a caning he was given at a Brisbane school on March 5? If so, has he called for a report on the matter and will he indicate the nature of the report that he received?

(2) What is the name of the school involved?

(3) What actual injuries did the boy sustain?

(4) Why did the boy receive the caning?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes. An investigation was instigated on Monday, March 8, and the report has been received by the Director-General of Education. The inquiry established— (i) that the pupil in question, a boy of 15 years of age, absented himself from class, entered the room of a nursing sister, removed some toys not belonging to him from the room and hid the toys in the back of a television set damaging the set in the process and endangering his own life as the set was turned on at the wall; (ii) that the boy was aware that he had done wrong and that it was clearly demonstrated to him what he was being punished for; and (iii) that the punishment inflicted by the Principal, namely caning on the legs and buttocks was unnecessarily severe."

(2) "The School for the Deaf."

(3) "The boy suffered bruising on the hands, legs and buttocks."

(4) "The Principal considered that the boy should be caned to highlight the dangerous nature of his offence and to impress on him the seriousness of taking articles not belonging to him. Corrective measures taken with the boy in the past have not proved fully effective."

QUARRYING OPERATIONS, ASH GROVE

Mr. Lickiss, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

(1) With reference to a statement attributed to him in *The Sunday Mail* of March 14 referring to the quarry in Waterworks Road, West Ashgrove, are the quarry operations now extending beyond the area zoned for extractive industry, as delineated on the Town Plan?

(2) If the information is not readily available, will he initiate the necessary action to obtain it?

Answers:—

(1) "The information sought by the Honourable Member is not within my knowledge."

(2) "The use of land within the City of Brisbane for extractive industry purposes, including quarrying, is governed by the provisions of the Brisbane Town Plan pursuant to the *City of Brisbane Town Planning Act 1964-1969*. Since the Town Plan is administered by the Brisbane City Council, I consider that the matters raised by the Honourable Member are ones for that Council in its administration of the Town Plan."

TRANSFER OF HOUSING COMMISSION
TENANTS TO FLATS

Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

Are attempts being made by the Housing Commission to transfer tenants from houses to flats? If so, where the tenants, some of whom have been in occupancy of the house for upwards of thirty years with an excellent tenant record, are unwilling to transfer, will they be evicted or compulsorily transferred and, if so, what is the reason?

Answer:—

"I am sure that the Honourable Member will readily appreciate two related facts. One of these is that the Queensland Housing Commission has a continuous intake of applications from families with children, including from deserted wives and widows, who require three or four bedroom accommodation, while on the other hand, as children marry and leave home, the occupancy of an increasing number of three and four bedroom State Rental Houses is being reduced to one or two persons. Because of this the Commission encourages single persons or couples to move to smaller accommodation and thereby release the family house which they obtained in the first instance on the priority granted to a large family. This enables accommodation to be provided to another family which now has the same need for the extra bedrooms as they themselves had originally. To date 19 single

occupants of houses in Brisbane have transferred to one bedroom flats and a further 15 have signified their willingness to do so when the Commission is in a position to make an offer to them. Many of these elderly people have found the care and upkeep of a large house beyond their physical capabilities. The Commission has recently instituted the same procedures in Townsville for the same reasons as in Brisbane. On experience in Brisbane it is expected that the number of single occupants, and possibly couples, willing to transfer to Morrill Court at Townsville will be more than the number of flats becoming available for this purpose. A tenant who does not desire such a transfer will not be evicted or compulsorily transferred."

CLUDEN RACECOURSE LAND, TOWNVILLE

Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Lands,—

(1) Is Cluden racecourse, Townsville, Crown land and, if so, under what terms or conditions is it controlled by the Townsville Turf Club?

(2) Has he been informed that it is proposed to excise a large portion of the racecourse land for leasing to a Townsville firm of liquor merchants as a hotel site and, if so, will this lease be between the Lands Department and the liquor merchants, with the revenue derived therefrom going to the Crown?

Answers:—

(1) "Cluden racecourse is held by Trustees under Deed of Grant upon trust. At the present time the trustees for the trust property and for the Turf Club are one and the same."

(2) "I am aware that there is a tentative proposal before the Land Administration Commission involving excision of an area from the trust land for the purpose of granting the trustees of the Turf Club a Special Lease at a concessional annual rental in order that the club may sublet the leased area for development as a Hotel/Motel. The Special Lease would not be capable of conversion to freehold or Perpetual Lease and upon expiry of the lease the land and improvements would revert to the trust. In view of its present bank commitments and capacity to repay, the subleasing revenue would increase the Trust's capacity to borrow for further improvement purposes. The proposal is tentative and a fully documented submission by the trustees is awaited for consideration."

PUBLIC ROAD TRANSPORT, BRISBANE

Mr. Aikens, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

Has his attention been drawn to an article in *Walkabout* of March, 1971, wherein the Lord Mayor of Brisbane,

Alderman Clem Jones, is reported as stating that the policy of his council is to get rid of public transport? If so, has he been officially advised of this policy and does it involve unloading the Brisbane bus system with its staggering losses on to the people of the State, who are already burdened by the staggering losses on the Brisbane suburban railway system?

Answer:—

"Yes. The statement was made by the Lord Mayor in the March issue of *Walkabout* and I quote—"We are trying to get rid of public transport". The Lord Mayor has on several occasions had the courtesy to inform me of his Council's views on public transport issues. The words I have just quoted were not employed. The burden of losses on railway passenger services is not only in Brisbane but throughout the State. I cannot imagine a City of the stature of Brisbane being without road or rail public transport."

COMPENSATION FOR EXCISION OF LAND,
EMERALD SHIRE

Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

As the Emerald Shire Council has lost approximately \$15,000 p.a. in mine rates and approximately \$14,000 p.a. in rural rates as a result of the excision of part of the Emerald Shire, has the Daringa Shire Council made any effort to compensate the Emerald Shire Council in order to make up, at least, the deficiency of approximately \$14,000 p.a. in rural rates? If not, can the Daringa Shire Council be compelled to do this?

Answer:—

"In accordance with the provisions of the *Local Government Act 1936-1970*, where the boundaries of local authorities have been altered and in any case where it becomes necessary so to do, the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, declare and apportion the assets and liabilities of the respective local authorities between them as appears to him just. In these circumstances, it is the normal practice for the local authorities concerned to confer in the first instance and for representations to be made as to any apportionment of assets and liabilities which they consider should be made. No such representations have been submitted following the recent alteration of boundaries between the Shires of Emerald and Daringa, although it is understood that certain negotiations have taken place between the local authorities concerned. When and if such representations are made, the matter will receive due consideration."

HEALTH SURVEY OF ABORIGINAL
CHILDREN, PALM ISLAND

Mr. Davies for **Mr. Tucker**, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Has any survey been lately carried out to determine whether Aboriginal children on Palm Island, many of whom regularly visit Townsville, are still free of parasites, including hookworm, in the intestinal tract and, if so, what was the result?

(2) If not, is there any intention to carry out such a survey as was done some years ago and who will conduct it?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "A survey of all age groups on Palm Island was conducted as recently as November, 1970. It indicated no hookworm infestation but an incidence of roundworm infection, which is orally contracted, was noted. A mass treatment was instituted and has resulted in a reduction in this latter condition. Follow-up surveys and treatment will be undertaken."

MEDICAL AND DENTAL SERVICES,
ILFRACOMBE

Mr. Melloy, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) What medical and dental services are available in Ilfracombe?

(2) Is any provision made for the operation of dental and/or medical clinics and, if not, will he provide regular weekly or monthly visits to the town by a doctor and a dentist?

Answers:—

(1) "No hospital, medical or dental service is provided at Ilfracombe. I am advised that private medical practitioners from Longreach visit Ilfracombe each Thursday."

(2) "Ilfracombe is connected by bitumen roadway with Longreach approximately 17 miles distant, where full hospital facilities and a dental clinic are available. In view of the town's proximity to Longreach, it is not proposed to set up separate facilities at Ilfracombe."

FISH-STOCKING OF TINAROO FALLS DAM

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

Since it has been decided not to stock Tinaroo Falls Dam with Nile Perch, has any research been carried out with a view to stocking this dam with suitable fish and what are the details and, if not, will he have research and investigations made into this matter in the near future?

Answer:—

"I am not aware of a decision having been made not to stock Tinaroo Dam with Nile Perch. In any case the matter of

whether or not Nile Perch should be introduced into this country has not yet been resolved by the Australian Fisheries Council. Research into the stocking of Tinaroo Dam with other species is a question for my colleague, the Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs. However, technical advice would be available from my Fisheries Branch."

CHARGES FOR STOCK CROSSINGS ON ROADS

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) What is the charge made for establishing stock crossings on (a) highways and (b) other roads?

(2) In view of the effect of the re-routing of our road systems and the increase in the size of farms, will he waive or reduce the charge if any is made?

Answers:—

(1) "Where the establishment of a stock crossing requires no structural construction but only the erection of 'Stock Crossing' signs, the cost of such signs is borne by the Department where the primary consideration is that of safety of vehicular traffic. Where the signs are provided for the convenience of the landholder, he is required to pay the cost of supply and installation."

(2) "There does not appear to be any justification for a departure from the existing policy."

ATHERTON HOSPITAL

Mr. Wallis-Smith, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

(1) Have any plans been made for major alterations to the Atherton Hospital and, if so, what are the details?

(2) If it is not intended to carry out major works, will he have a lift provided in the hospital to ease the burden on staff who have to carry stretcher cases up and down stairs?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "Approval has been given for the Atherton Hospitals Board to have sketch plans and estimates of cost prepared for a new ward block of three floors to provide approximately 70 beds and operating theatre facilities. The lower ground floor of this proposed block will initially be constructed as a 'shell' only, with a view to ultimately providing facilities for a kitchen and dining room. I am advised that the Board has issued instructions to its architect to proceed with the preparation of the necessary plans and estimates of cost."

MEANS TEST, DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Health,—

In relation to the means test at dental clinics in Queensland—

(1) Is the test standard throughout Queensland or are there variations?

(2) What is the amount allowed for rent and does this amount compare with current rentals throughout Queensland?

(3) Is the allowable amount for dependants more or less than the amount allowed for income tax purposes?

(4) Does the applicant have to produce a pay slip or can he sign a declaration that the amounts stated by him in relation to income are correct?

(5) Will the Government liberalise this test to allow more Queenslanders to use the services of dental clinics?

Answer:—

(1 to 5) "The means test as applied to patients attending dental hospitals and dental clinics is designed to permit flexibility in its application. Hospitals Boards controlling dental clinics have the discretionary power to determine, on its merits, the eligibility of each individual case seeking treatment taking into consideration such factors as total family income, number of dependents, rent or house repayments, expenses associated with recent prolonged illness, loss of income due to sickness or unemployment or other extraordinary expenditure. The means test, as it is presently applied, permits the provision of dental treatment to those least able to afford private treatment—those on pensions, small incomes or with large families. Any person who considers that he is unable to pay the fees assessed for treatment may make application to the Hospitals Board for a remission of the fees charged."

Mr. Casey: If I resubmit the same question tomorrow, will it be answered in the form asked?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) May people living in the country areas of Queensland claim, for income tax purposes, the necessary expenses incurred in travelling to receive specialist treatment?

(2) If not, has the Government made any approaches to the Commonwealth Government to enable such travel expenses to be included in the approved income tax deduction list and with what result?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "I am sure the Honourable Member knows that State Governments have no jurisdiction or authority where income tax matters are concerned. Frankly, I am amazed from time to time at the lack of knowledge displayed by certain Members of this House of the lines of constitutional demarcation between Commonwealth and State powers. However, I can inform the Honourable Member that in 1970, after receiving representations from a North Queensland organisation on the subject now canvassed, I wrote a letter to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister saying that I felt sure this question would be carefully considered by the relevant Commonwealth Authority which reviewed income tax concessions from time to time."

Mr. Chalk: Don't tell me Casey doesn't know how to dodge tax!

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CASEY: Mr. Speaker, I direct Question No. 17 to the Minister for Labour and Tourism.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I purposely refrained from calling for Question No. 17 because the honourable member did not seem to be very anxious about asking it. I remind the hon. member for Mackay that it is a habit of his to interject during question time. This morning I allowed him a little latitude deliberately to see how long he would continue with his haggling across the Chamber before he realised that he had another important piece of business on the sheet.

I remind the hon. member also that it is not the right or prerogative of any member to dictate what kind of answer he should receive to a question. I will permit him to ask his next question, but in future I will definitely disallow any further question by him if he interjects before asking it.

Mr. CASEY: I am sorry to upset you, Mr. Speaker, but the Treasurer provoked me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not upsetting me. He is upsetting the orderly conduct of the House.

COMPLAINTS TO CONSUMER AFFAIRS BUREAU

Mr. Casey, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

(1) Has the Consumer Affairs Bureau received many complaints which relate to excessive or unfair charges?

(2) If so, has any action been taken in such cases to ensure that (a) the complainants receive refunds from the firms which have overcharged and (b) the firms concerned reduce their charges to a fair

and reasonable level? If not, what action is taken by the Bureau other than to write to the complainants and inform them what they already know, that is, that they have been overcharged?

Answers:—

(1) "The Consumer Affairs Bureau has received complaints in which the complainant indicated that he was of the opinion that the price charged for an item purchased or the charge made for servicing was higher than he considered it should have been. I am informed that a feature which has emerged from certain of these complaints is that the consumer would not have complained had the appliance purchased or serviced, performed as efficiently as he had anticipated it would. This comment applies to motor vehicles as well as to electrical appliances. Thus it may be assumed that the complainant was concerned more with the quality of the item purchased or services rendered than with the price paid, which was accepted by the purchaser in the first place."

(2) "The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has been successful in effecting adjustments in many cases. In view of the general nature of this Question it is of course also directed at business people in the Honourable Members own electorate. If the Honourable Member is able to place before me details of any transactions in respect of which proof can be supplied that such firms or persons have overcharged I shall cause appropriate investigations to be made."

DRINK-DRIVING CONVICTIONS

Mr. Bousen, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

How many persons were convicted for driving under the influence of liquor or drugs and what was the amount collected from them in fines, as at December 31, 1970?

Answer:—

"The period for which the information is desired has not been stated. However, during the period June 30, 1970 to December 31, 1970, 1,722 persons were convicted of offences under section 16 of the Traffic Act. Information concerning penalties imposed in relation to these convictions is not readily available. It would have to be obtained from each Clerk of the Court in Queensland. I do not propose to take this action."

CLERK-TYPIST AND TWO-WAY RADIO, TULLY POLICE STATION

Mr. F. P. Moore, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) What is the cause of the delay in the appointment of a clerk-typist at the Tully Police Station?

(2) When will the two-way radio installations at this station be in operation?

Answers:—

(1) "The Police Department has a number of police stations throughout the State listed, including Tully, for the appointment of clerk-typists. Funds do not permit of the appointment of any additional clerk-typists during this financial year, but as soon as appointments can be made, the position at Tully will be considered."

(2) "Arrangements are well in hand for the installation of two-way radio at Tully, and as soon as a small building is available to house base equipment, the installation will be finalised."

EQUIPMENT FOR SCHOOL ROAD-SAFETY PATROLS

Mr. F. P. Moore, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Transport,—

Is the equipment for road-safety patrols, which operate before and after school and which have flags illustrating "Children Crossing", provided to all State and denominational schools on request?

Answer:—

"The procedure for the appointment of properly authorised school patrols is laid down in the Traffic Regulations. A patrol when on duty may wear a uniform, insignia or badge of office of a type approved by the Commissioner of Police. It is usual for this equipment to be arranged locally with bodies such as Service Clubs. A patrol sign is required to be as specified in the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the flags are supplied through the Main Roads Department. If the Honourable Member is concerned with the supply of flags to a particular school, would he give me the details?"

DEREGISTRATION OF SOLICITORS

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) How many solicitors in Queensland have been investigated by the Law Society for alleged malpractice in each of the last five years and how many have subsequently been debarred or removed from the Register?

(2) Of those debarred or deregistered, how many were found guilty of the misappropriation of trust funds?

(3) What was the total amount involved and how much has since been recovered?

(4) What was the type and severity of punishment meted out to those convicted?

Answer:—

(1 to 4) "The information desired by the Honourable Member is being obtained and will be furnished tomorrow."

ETNA CREEK PRISON

Mr. Wright, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

With regard to the Etna Creek prison—

(1) What is the present number of inmates?

(2) What is the ratio of prison officers to prisoners?

(3) How many prisoners are at present involved in (a) the release-to-work programme and (b) week-end detention?

(4) What has been the cost to date of the prison facilities provided?

(5) What proposed extensions are envisaged in the next five years?

(6) In view of the success being obtained in the rehabilitation of prisoners through the teaching of farming skills and the general environment of this prison, will he consider extending this programme to cater more for the young offender, who is fast becoming the main category of prisoner, by expanding the instruction given in the spheres of (a) farm equipment and machinery maintenance, (b) welding and associated skills and (c) farm management?

Answers:—

(1) "Ninety-two."

(2) "One officer to 3.54 prisoners."

(3) "(a) One; (b) at present—nil."

(4) "The Prisons Department does not have figures of costs as these are kept by the Department of Works which is the constructing authority. The information supplied by that Department is \$974,357 (to March 15, 1971)."

(5) "The firm Loan Works programme of Prisons does not extend for five years for specific projects, but the next project at Rockhampton, which has been approved, is the building of a kitchen, laundry, and bakery to be followed by additional Industrial sections, Administrative sections and accommodation with the present accommodation programme for 300 prisoners with room for extension in the future if required."

(6) "The farm skills and environment practised at Rockhampton Prison is not peculiar to this prison. In fact, it is applicable to all prisons on the Queensland mainland with the exception of Brisbane Prison. The objective is to have farm areas attached to all prisons, where applicable, to provide training and instruction in the use of farm equipment and machinery, farm management and the varying skills associated in these two fields. In addition, this facet provides employment for a large number of prisoners who are not suited to industrial work and who will follow

rural work on discharge. When Rockhampton Prison is completed it will be comparable with the other prisons with farm areas, as this is the general policy of the Department."

NEW POLICE STATION, CAIRNS

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

Further to his Answer to my Question on October 31, 1969, indicating that a new police station at Cairns was to be considered in the 1970-71 loan works programme, when will tenders be called and the work commenced?

Answer:—

"Funds were not available for inclusion of this project in the current Loan Works Programme, and no indication can be given at this time as to dates for invitation of tenders and commencement of work."

COMMONWEALTH AID ROADS GRANTS TO CAIRNS CITY COUNCIL

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

Further to his Answer to my Question on November 13, 1969, concerning Commonwealth Aid Roads grants—

(1) What amounts were received by the Cairns City Council in the years 1969-70 and 1970-71?

(2) Has any further consideration been given to Cairns City being classified as an urban area and, if not, have any changes or additional roads been declared or approved by the Commonwealth, as rural arterial roads, in the Cairns City local authority area?

Answers:—

(1) "1969-70, \$27,269; 1970-71, \$28,632."

(2) "No, as Cairns City would not qualify as an urban area within the meaning or definition of such under the *Commonwealth Aid Roads Act* 1969. No changes or additions have been made to the declarations of rural arterials in Cairns City, again because no additional roads would qualify for such gazettal."

HEADACHE POWDER PRICES

Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Labour and Tourism,—

Is he aware that the price of Vincents powders has increased by ten cents per large packet, which represents a rise of almost 25 per cent. and that of Bex A.P.C. powders by six cents per packet, a rise of 50 per cent. and that no prior public notification of the increase in the price of Vincents was given? If so, and

in view of these excessive and unwarranted rises, will he have this price racket investigated so that buyers will not be wooed into buying and taking Vincents with confidence in future?

Answer:—

"The prices of Vincents and Bex powders have not been controlled for years and were not subject to control by the previous Labor Government at the time this Government came into power. A comparison of the February, 1971, and March, 1971, issues of *Retailer of Queensland*, the journal published by the Queensland Retail Traders Association, indicates that the price listed in the March issue for a large packet of Vincents Powders (24 powders) is 54c as against a price of 45c shown in the February issue. A similar comparison shows that the price of Bex powders is listed in the March issue as 18c (for a packet of 12) as against 12c in the February issue. So far as I am aware from information obtained by telephone from industry sources, both Vincent and Bex powders are manufactured and packed outside Queensland, and the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Prices in this State does not extend beyond Queensland. The two powders mentioned by the Honourable Member are not the only headache powders or tablets available on the market and the consumer is entitled to select those which he desires and in which he has confidence."

GAMBLING ON SPORTING EVENTS, METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. Bromley, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

Are there any metropolitan boundary areas for sports with which gambling is associated and permitted? If so, how are the areas defined and what are they?

Answer:—

"In so far as my Ministerial jurisdiction is concerned, the Racing and Betting Act defines the metropolitan area as the area of the City of Brisbane as constituted and declared by and under *The City of Brisbane Acts, 1924 to 1960.*"

TRAFFIC RULES AT "STOP" SIGNS

Mr. B. Wood, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Does every vehicle in lines of heavy traffic have to stop at a "stop" sign before proceeding?

(2) When a policeman is on duty and signals traffic to proceed, are all vehicles still required to stop at a "stop" sign?

(3) Do certain local laws apply which require only every second or third vehicle to stop in these circumstances?

(4) Is a policeman able to book a motorist for not stopping after signalling him on?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes. This is a requirement under the Traffic Regulations."

(2) "No. A police direction takes precedence over an official traffic sign."

(3) "No. The Traffic Regulations apply throughout the State."

(4) "No."

TREES IN MAIN STREET OF MAREEBA

Mr. B. Wood, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Mines,—

(1) Is the Main Roads Department considering the removal of trees in the main street of Mareeba?

(2) As these trees are of great aesthetic and practical value, will he give an assurance that they will not be removed while they remain in good condition?

Answers:—

(1) "No."

(2) "The Department appreciates the aesthetic value of these trees and in any future design for works in this street will give full consideration to their retention, consistent always with safety of traffic."

MORVEN AND AUGATHELLA POLICE STATIONS

Mr. Aiken, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Works,—

(1) Does the Police Department intend reducing the manpower strength at Morven and Augathella to one-man stations?

(2) Because of the concern of local people regarding insufficient protection from crime, will he allay their fears with the assurance that these stations will remain at the present strengths?

Answers:—

(1) "The Police Department is examining the man-power strength at Morven Police Station at the present time but no decision has been made. The strength at Augathella Police Station is not under consideration at the present time."

(2) "Many factors are taken into account in determining the strength of police stations. If the incidence of crime together with other factors does not warrant the present strength at Morven, the Commissioner of Police would be obliged to reduce the strength of this station in order to increase the strength of some other station which is operating below strength."

TRAINING OF FEMALE STAFF, COUNTRY T.A.B. AGENCIES

Mr. Aiken, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) Have young females been given training courses at country T.A.B. agencies for periods of up to three weeks without pay?

(2) Because of the malpractices that could result from such action, will he ensure that such practices are avoided?

Answers:—

(1) "I understand that all T.A.B. personnel with authority to engage staff are instructed to pay for all time worked including training. No instance of any departure from this instruction is known to me. In some instances T.A.B. offices are conducted by an agent receiving commission. Under such agreement the agent undertakes to assume responsibility for any staff engaged."

(2) "I have no knowledge on any such malpractice."

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ELECTORAL REPRESENTATION, LOCKYER AND TOOWOOMBA

Mr. BOUSEN: I ask the Treasurer: Can he justify having only 8,733 electors in the Lockyer electorate while there are more than 16,000 electors in each of the Toowoomba electorates, which are adjacent to his? In view of the fact that Lockyer is a small electorate close to Brisbane and has good roads, does the ratio of 2 to 1 in the number of electors suggest that the Treasurer is only half as capable of representing electors as the two Toowoomba members?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Why hon. members spoil what are otherwise reasonably good questions with personal reflections, I do not know. The question is disallowed.

Mr. AIKENS proceeding to give notice of two questions—

Mr. Casey: They call him "Fagin" in Townsville.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the hon. member for Mackay for the last time.

QUARRYING OPERATIONS, ASHGROVE

Mr. LICKISS: I direct a question to the Minister for Local Government and Electricity. Further to my question of even date relative to the Readymix Concrete quarry at West Ashgrove and his reply thereto, and bearing in mind that the Brisbane City Council is on record as refusing to answer representations made by Government members in this Parliament, I ask him: Will he, as the responsible Minister, ascertain through his department the answer to my question?

Mr. RAE: I ask that the question be put on the Business Paper for tomorrow.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

Mr. NEWTON: I ask the Treasurer:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the statement on electoral redistribution in "The Courier-Mail" of 17 March, 1971, by Mr. Eric Robinson, State President of the Liberal Party, that is, that it is not possible yet and that there has to be further consultation between the Liberal Party and the Country Party?

(2) Does the Treasurer, as Leader of the Liberal Party in this Parliament, support this statement by Mr. Robinson?

(3) Will he give an assurance to the House that the Liberals will not back down to the Country Party in 1971 as they did in 1968?

Mr. CHALK: The reply to the hon. member is that apparently there is some confusion, in his way of thinking, as between the Australian Labour Party and the Liberal Party. When the aldermanic salaries in Brisbane were increased by the aldermen, the Q.C.E. called them up to the Trades Hall and laid down certain policy to them.

The discussions now proceeding between the Liberal and Country Parties are in accordance with the policies of those parties. I assure the hon. gentleman that ultimately we will introduce into this House a Bill that will be for the betterment of Queensland as a whole and not a gerrymander, as was done by the former A.L.P. Government.

IMPRISONMENT FOR INABILITY TO PAY FINES

Mr. MURRAY: I ask the Minister for Justice: Is he aware of a judicial decision in the United States of America that no man would be sent to gaol because of his inability to pay a fine? If this decision has been made at a high level, will the Minister consider it with a view to incorporating it in the Queensland statutes as it will allow him to further pursue the course he has always followed towards greater equality of justice?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I am aware of the judgment mentioned. I am also aware that the same procedure applies in New Zealand. It is well known that at present I am exploring, in depth, the alternatives to imprisonment in all spheres because of the failure, over the centuries, for imprisonment to produce the necessary rehabilitation.

SCHOOL BUS ACCIDENT, WOODFORD

Mr. R. JONES: I ask the Minister for Transport: What was the make, model and capacity of the vehicle carrying 26 school-children and the driver which plunged 250 feet down a hillside on the Bellthorpe East Range, near Woodford, yesterday afternoon, as a result of which 23 of the

children were injured and two were killed? Are checks made of the mechanical condition and limits on over-loading of these vehicles, and is there any supervision of passenger capacities and the types of vehicle being used as school buses, and if so, how often?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am a little doubtful about the propriety of the question. There is bound to be an inquiry into the accident, and any discussion on it at this moment would not be in the best interests of such inquiry. I rule the question out of order on those grounds.

LOWERING OF VOTING AGE

Mr. R. JONES: I ask the Minister for Justice: Having regard to the result of the recent election in Western Australia and the enlightened reaction of the 18, 19 and 20-year-olds, who were granted and exercised the franchise for the first time, can he say when the Queensland Government will make a decision in favour of this age group and follow the example set by Western Australia?

Dr. DELAMOTHE: This is a matter of Government policy, which will be announced at the appropriate time.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

Mr. R. JONES: I ask the Premier: Can he give Parliament an assurance that in any future redistribution of electoral boundaries, Cairns, currently with 15,212 voters, will receive the same favourable treatment as adjacent Mulgrave, currently with 7,161 voters?

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: No doubt the hon. member appreciates that it would be quite premature for me to make any statement on this subject at the present stage. No doubt the commission, when it is set up, will look very carefully into the hon. member's suggestion.

INSPECTION OF SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. BROMLEY: I ask the Minister for Labour and Tourism: In regard to accidents involving school-children using public transport, what inspections are made, and at what intervals, of school buses and other means of public transport used by school-children in relation to safety, roadworthiness, etc.?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member is not connecting his question with the one I have ruled out of order.

Mr. BROMLEY: I did not mention that accident.

Mr. HERBERT: In view of the present situation, I ask that the question be put on notice.

ENTRY TO POLICE FORCE

Mr. HARRIS: I ask the Minister for Works and Housing: In view of the acute shortage of police officers throughout Queensland, will he advise me if a citizen of Brisbane or elsewhere, 43 years of age, in excellent physical health, with a Scottish matriculation standard in several subjects including English, mathematics and geography, and with 16 years' service in the British Police Force, would be considered for employment in the Queensland Police Force?

Mr. HODGES: In the first place, I am amazed that the hon. member should ask such a question. I recollect his opposition to the amendments to the Police Act that I brought down on this specific question. In this matter, we are also governed by the police regulations concerning the age limit applied to men employed in the Queensland Police Force. However, if the gentleman to whom the hon. member refers is in the specialist field and he applies to join the Police Force, I am prepared to consider the application under the provisions introduced by the amendment to the Act.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I ask the Treasurer:

(1) Does he recall stating during the 1969 election campaign, "The Liberal Party is pledged to a redistribution in 1970"?

(2) Is the Liberal Party still pledged to such a redistribution?

(3) Does the Treasurer still support the principle, as near as is practicable, of—and I quote him again—"voting equality in any redistribution"?

Mr. CHALK: The words uttered by the hon. member are in accord with views expressed by me. I have not changed those views in any way, and I believe that, when the Bill is brought down in this House, the hon. member will see—and be able to advise Mr. Stanaway, who wrote his question—that it is in accord with policy.

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I am afraid—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Does the hon. member wish to ask another question?

Mr. F. P. MOORE: Yes.

Mr. Chalk: Written by Mr. Stanaway?

Mr. F. P. MOORE: At least we do not have private secretaries as the Ministers have.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Aikens interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn the hon. member for Townsville South. This is the last warning he will get. If he continues to interject, I shall deal with him under

Standing Order No. 123A. There are also hon. members on my right who are interjecting.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION COMMISSIONERS

Mr. F. P. MOORE: I ask the Premier: Recalling that one of the commissioners in the 1958 electoral redistribution was a rather junior Liberal barrister who was rewarded by an appointment to the Land Court, will he give an assurance that if three commissioners are in fact appointed next year—and I say "if" advisedly—they will have no connection with any political organisation, nor will they be offered subsequent rewards?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warn hon. members on my left that they appear to be engaging in a campaign of continuous political sniping on this matter. The question asked by the hon. member for Mourilyan is purely and simply a politically biased question. However, I will allow the Premier to answer it.

Mr. BJELKE-PETERSEN: It is quite clear from the hon. member's question, from other questions that have been asked in this House, and from statements attributed to the Leader of the Opposition, that the Opposition is attempting to run the Government and decide what legislation should be brought before Parliament. I remind hon. members opposite that they are the Opposition in this House and that we on this side of the Chamber, as the Government, will determine when legislation is to be introduced and what type of legislation it shall be.

The answer to the hon. member's question will be revealed at the appropriate time, and I do not propose to give him any assurance he seeks in that regard.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. The Premier saw fit to mention me in his answer. Let me say to him that we may be the Opposition but we represent more people in Queensland than the Government does.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

FISHING INDUSTRY, CENTRAL QUEENSLAND

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister for Primary Industries: Further to my question of 17 March concerning the fishing industry in Central Queensland, and in view of his statement that the Country Party member for Callide had made representations on behalf of these fishermen but that nothing could be done for some years, will he advise when and how such representations were made and why they have been ineffective?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It is purely the private business of the hon. member for Callide.

Mr. ROW: It is purely a matter for the member for Callide. It is a matter of personal correspondence, and personal correspondence between a member and a Minister should remain confidential.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

FORM OF QUESTIONS

Mr. JENSEN (Bundaberg) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am still trying to ascertain just what the question is. It sounded more like a speech than anything else.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH (Tablelands) having given notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The question is facetious. I have already spoken to one hon. member this morning about finishing questions with facetious or personal remarks. If hon. members will not cease this practice, their questions will not be altered; they will be disallowed. The question is out of order in its present form.

Mr. WALLIS-SMITH: I shall omit the third paragraph.

Mr. R. JONES (Cairns) rising to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Cairns has already asked three questions.

Mr. R. JONES: One of them was ruled out of order, Mr. Speaker. The same ruling should be applied to the hon. member for Townsville South.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member for Cairns questioning my ruling? I should like him to repeat his remark appertaining to the hon. member for Townsville South. When have I given him any greater consideration than other hon. members?

Mr. R. JONES: I could quote instances.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Cairns has cast a reflection on the Chair. I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

Mr. R. JONES: I withdraw and apologise.

Mr. W. D. HEWITT: I rise to a point of order. During the question directed by the hon. member for Mourilyan to the Premier, he said that a member of the last Electoral Boundaries Commission was elevated to the Land Court for services rendered. As this is clearly a reflection upon that gentleman's professional integrity, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if such a comment is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Many comments are made in this House that are not in order. Hon. members get away with them sometimes through mumbling. At the time, I felt that

the remark referred to was a reflection not only on the person concerned but on the Government as well. It imputed improper motives. Unfortunately, however, owing to the turmoil during question time this morning, the matter escaped me for the moment.

I again point out to hon. members that a very simple rule applies to questions and answers: "The quality of an answer to a question is induced by the quality of the question." It is a very simple rule, and I hope hon. members will apply it.

Mr. P. WOOD (Toowoomba East) rising to give notice of a question—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Question time is concluded. Hon. members themselves wasted a lot of time this morning, and once again I draw the attention of hon. members on both sides of the House to the fact that question time is limited and that the more time they waste by cross-firing, thus forcing the Chair to call the House to order and make statements, the more time they themselves lose.

I ask hon. members in future to obey the rules governing question time and stop cross-firing, criticising answers and doing all those things that inhibit the orderly progress of the House. These remarks apply to members on both sides of the House.

Mr. HOUSTON: I rise to a point of order. As you know, Mr. Speaker, questions upon notice are vetted, so I take it that they never contain anything of a dirty or unfair political nature. As you attend to that matter, I ask you to ensure also that answers to questions, particularly those upon notice, likewise do not contain derisory comments directed at members on this side of the Chamber, and particularly comments on their personal appearance.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. S. D. TOOTH (Ashgrove—Minister for Health): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider introducing a Bill to amend the Health Act 1937-1968 in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

Hon. S. D. TOOTH (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (12.6 p.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Health Act 1937-1968 in certain particulars."

The proposed amendments deal with a variety of different subjects. These include two matters of major importance and three others which, whilst of lesser importance,

are of some consequence from an administrative point of view. It may be convenient to dispose of them first.

The sick and infirm of our community are nursed in different kinds of institutions—different in name, purpose, function and management. When, however, similar types of premises are described in legislation by different names, confusion often results, not only in the minds of patients and relatives, but also in discussion by authorities. The homes referred to in the Queensland Health Act as "convalescent homes" are called "nursing homes" in Commonwealth legislation. These homes accommodate, for the most part, elderly patients who suffer from infirmities requiring nursing care and supervision. Unfortunately, few of them are likely to respond to active therapy, or are in a state which might be regarded as convalescent. For this reason, as well as to avoid confusion in terminology, it is considered that the term "nursing home" should be substituted for "convalescent home" in our legislation and be adopted into common use in our administration procedures. An amendment will be submitted to achieve these changes.

The term "health surveyor" is being increasingly used to describe those officers who have previously been known as "health inspectors". This is a more adequate description of their purpose and functions, and it is therefore proposed that the definition of "inspector" under the Act be extended to include this new designation.

It is the responsibility of the State Health Department to ensure that drugs and articles of food for sale comply with prescribed standards. The first step in carrying out this responsibility is to establish that a sale actually took place. If a vendor refuses to sell to an inspector, he, the inspector, already has power under the Act to demand, select and take or obtain samples for the purpose of analysis, but this does not necessarily constitute a sale. Under the proposed amendment, if the officer, having taken the necessary samples for analysis, places the appropriate sum of money before the vendor, the sale will have taken place.

The existing legislation further provides that the sample be divided into three parts. One part is offered to the vendor, one is submitted to the analyst and the third is retained by the officer concerned.

This procedure produces certain difficulties when particular food products are the subject of analysis. In the case of the ubiquitous meat pie, hon. members will agree, I am sure, that doubt could be raised as to whether each third of the product was identical so that each contained the same percentage of lean meat, fat, gravy and pastry. Other examples could be cited. It is therefore proposed that legislation be enacted to overcome this difficulty. It will be provided that when there is doubt regarding the uniform spread of ingredients in a particular food product, several of the

articles will be procured. The total number will then be divided into three groups so that a representative average will be obtained for presentation to the analyst.

Under the present Health Act, proceedings in respect of offences punishable on summary conviction must be initiated within six months of the date when the Director-General of Health and Medical Services or the local authority concerned first became aware of the commission of such offence. It is proposed that these provisions be also amended to include relevant procedures laid down under the Justices Act.

The first of the two major amendments proposed for the consideration of hon. members is related to the desire of the Commonwealth Government to adhere to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others. Before this can be effected it will be necessary to remove from the laws of the various States anything which conflicts in letter (and desirably, in spirit) with the provisions of that convention.

I direct the attention of hon. members particularly to Articles 1 and 2 of the convention.

Article 1 reads—

"The Parties to the present Convention agree to punish any person who, to gratify the passions of another:

1. Procures, entices or leads away, for the purposes of prostitution, another person, even with the consent of that person;
2. Exploits the prostitution of another person, even with the consent of that person."

Article 2 reads—

"The Parties to the present Convention further agree to punish any person who:

1. Keeps or manages, or knowingly finances or takes part in the financing of a brothel;
2. Knowingly lets or rents a building or other place or any part thereof for the purpose of the prostitution of others."

As section 60 of the Health Act appears to conflict in some respects with certain provisions of these Articles, particularly section 2 of Article 1, in that while making it an offence for a male person to live with or to exercise control or direction or influence over the movements of a prostitute or to aid, abet, or compel her prostitution, it is not an offence for a female person so to do and thus the madam of a brothel does not come within the ambit of these provisions. The convention requires that it be an offence by either a male or a female person to live on the earnings of the prostitution of another and it is therefore necessary to amend section 60. As, however, the essential provisions of section 60 are also to be found in the Vagrants, Gaming and Other Offences Acts,

it was decided to seek approval to repeal section 60 of the Act entirely. By doing this any technical barriers to Australian adherence to the International Convention arising from the Queensland Health Act would be removed.

A question may be raised as to why it is necessary for Australia to accede formally to this convention as most Australians would assume that the white slave traffic, in the sense of compulsory prostitution, is no part of the Australian scene. Be that as it may, it is certainly not true for many other parts of the world as a succession of international instruments beginning with the International Agreement of 18 May, 1904, for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, all clearly indicate. The convention we are currently considering was adopted on 2 December, 1949, by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and Australia's adherence, so long delayed by legal technicalities, is an affirmation of our abhorrence of the continued traffic in human beings.

I feel it is also incumbent upon me at this stage to direct special attention to the provisions of Article 2 of the convention which require the assenting countries to agree to punish any person who—

(i) keeps or manages or knowingly finances or takes part in the financing of a brothel;

(ii) knowingly lets or rents a building or other place or any part thereof for the purpose of the prostitution of others.

These provisions would seem to have an immediate relevance to any proposals for legalising prostitution. Such proposals would surely involve the setting up of premises or establishments for such purposes and would involve the keeping or managing, financing or renting of the premises for such purposes. It would thus appear that any action to legalise prostitution would be contrary to Article 2 of the International Convention.

During the last decade reports from many countries in the Western World indicate an increase in the non-medical use of dangerous drugs. The reports come from many quarters and through various media. Doctors, paramedical workers, police and journalists have made many contributions on the subject. Articles have appeared in various professional journals and much space has been provided for the problem to be aired through the television, radio and Press channels.

The extent of the problem varies from country to country. One would venture to say that the problem is generally less acute in Australia than in overseas countries and not as serious in Queensland as in some other Australian States. However there is a local problem and also a local potential for its extension. The proposed legislation is one of the many steps necessary to combat the menace.

A recent report revealed that many of the drug offenders appearing in the Australian courts came from the 18-25 years

age group. However, to view the subject of drug abuse by this age group in isolation would be foolish. In fact, the non-medical use of drugs by the younger generation is only one aspect of two very complex problems. It is only a relatively minor side effect of a much wider over-all youth problem and also one phase of the many difficulties relating to the incorrect use of drugs.

If drug abuse by young people is studied on its own, there will be a tendency to overlook the fact that it is only part of the major problem of the alienation of some of our youth from modern society. Some of these young people reject all that is traditional, conventional and stereotyped because they consider acceptance of such views is hypocritical. They become alienated and search for an identity which may be acceptable to them by their own standards. The use of drugs is at first only part of a new identity. Unfortunately in many cases the part ultimately becomes the whole.

From time immemorial man has sought solace in drugs of some kind. Since primitive man soothed his wounds with mud and clay and allayed his pain with leaves from the jungle, the search for relief by medicine has continued. Today it has reached a stage in which many people believe keeping well means a daily dose of medicine. An article in a recent issue of the *World Medical Journal* posed this question:—

“Underlying all the discussions on drug abuse lies one fundamental question—Will man ever be able to dispense with his artificial paradise? The masses need their opium apparently, whether it be cigarettes, alcohol, drugs or just television; but the masses, especially the teenage masses seem to need much more opium than in the past.”

Professor Whitlock, Professor of Psychological Medicine at the University of Queensland, has carried out special surveys in drug dependence amongst patients at Lowson House. Professor Whitlock believes that among younger persons a good deal of experimentation takes place. He believes however, that “compared with the very much larger number of middle-aged barbiturate dependent persons, the young drug dependent person is something of a rarity, although there is no reason to believe that this problem could not become more extensive.”

I have made these comments to emphasise that the problem of drug abuse is a most complex one and I would point out that the associated difficulties cannot be solved by legislation alone. However, legislation aimed at the control of the illicit use of drugs is necessary and such legislation must be amended from time to time to meet changing circumstances. It must be based on the opinion of the people who have made a special study of the subject. Many of the amendments proposed arise from a study of recommendations made by the National Standing Control Committee on Drugs of Dependence. This committee consists of representatives of the Commonwealth Departments of

Customs, Health and Police, and State Health and Police Departments. To all its meetings Queensland has sent full representation.

The present Queensland legislation in this field makes it an offence to have unauthorised possession of, and traffic in, dangerous drugs. However, the penalties for breaches of the relevant section make no distinction between the two offences. It is considered that trafficking is by far the more serious of the two, and warrants a heavier penalty. The proposed amendments make provision for this differentiation.

In legislation of this nature that exists elsewhere, provision may be found making unauthorised self-administration of dangerous drugs an offence. When the present amendments were being framed, the inclusion of a similar clause was debated at some considerable length. It was eventually concluded that such legislation would deter addicts from seeking treatment and, as a result, has not been included in these amendments.

One proposed amendment will answer those critics who in the past have complained of the imposition of gaol sentences on drug offenders. I refer to a provision by which the court may order the offender to be detained for treatment in an approved institution. It is intended that release from such detention will be the responsibility of medical authorities, and ample safeguard for unwarranted continuance of detention will be provided by the appointment of a Detention Review Tribunal, to whom the offender may appeal, and the compulsory medical examination of the detainee at regular intervals.

The Bill also includes clauses dealing with the form of proceedings for offences, and matters of proof, respecting the possession of drugs.

During the meetings of the National Standing Control Committee on Drugs of Dependence, one of the most important concepts to emerge is the need for co-operation amongst the various authorities dealing with this complex problem. The various departments, Customs, Health and Police, at both Commonwealth and State level, must work as a team. The Customs Department deals mainly with prohibited imports, and at times its officers are frustrated because their powers are restricted. States have agreed that it is essential to extend some powers under State laws to customs officers. It is therefore intended that the provision that exists at present for members of the Police Force to detain, search, seize and arrest a person being in unauthorised possession of dangerous drugs be extended to officers of the Customs Department.

In the over-all debate on the drug problem, one aspect which receives considerable attention is that relating to marijuana. There are groups in many countries who press for the legalisation of this drug, demanding that it be freely available or at least obtainable through Government-licensed or operated channels of production and distribution. In

view of these demands, it is considered necessary to comment on this particular aspect at this stage.

Marijuana, along with other dangerous drugs, has been the subject of study by many national and international bodies. Queensland legislation must be viewed against the background of the recommendations of these various bodies. Australia, and thus Queensland, is a party to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1954. Under this international agreement, the parties are obliged to place heroin and marijuana under strict controls, which in effect makes these drugs prohibited substances. The various member nations are at liberty to prescribe their own penalties for relevant breaches of their law relating to the subject.

If any nation wishes to be released from a particular provision of the Narcotics Convention, it may, of course, withdraw from the convention, or attempt to obtain an amendment of the provision which would involve discussion at an international conference. It would be impractical for Queensland as a State to take such action. Any move would have to be taken at a national level.

Of the several studies relating to marijuana, I refer to four—

The La Guardia Report;

The Report of the British Advisory Committee on Drug Dependence;

The Interim Report of the Canadian Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs; and

The Report of the World Health Organization Expert Committee on Drugs of Dependence.

In 1938, Fiorello La Guardia, the Mayor of New York, expressed his desire that some impartial body such as the New York Academy of Medicine make a survey of the existing knowledge of the marijuana problem. A sociological and a clinical study resulted.

The proponents of legalisation of marijuana often quote the La Guardia report to further their cause. However, it is necessary to point out that its findings and the methods used in the survey have been strongly criticised. The American Medical Association, in referring to the report, stated that sweeping and inadequate conclusions were made on a narrow and thoroughly unscientific foundation.

The Wooten report—that is the name by which the British work is known—did, it is true, advocate amendments to the legislation dealing with marijuana, but the first recommendation of the report published in 1968 reads as follows—

“We recommend that in the interest of public health, it is necessary for the time being to maintain restrictions on the availability of cannabis.”

That was a little over two years ago.

The Canadian Report, known also as the Le Dain Report, published in 1970, stated—

“We are not prepared at this time to recommend the legalisation of cannabis.”

The report stated also that there had not been enough informed debate on the subject. Much of the debate on the effects of the drug had been based on hearsay, myth, and ill-informed opinion. The report stated also that there is a body of scientific information regarding the effects of the drug at various dose levels on psychomotor skills such as those used in driving, and that further research in this field could determine its importance.

The Sixteenth Report of the World Health Organization Expert Committee on Drug Dependence, published in 1969, had this to say about marijuana—

“This Committee strongly reaffirms the opinion expressed in previous reports that cannabis is a drug of dependence, producing public health and social problems, and that its control must be continued.”

Those who advocate that marijuana should be no longer controlled claim that its effects are no worse than those of alcohol and tobacco, and that as these substances are available to the community, so should marijuana be available. The hazards associated with alcohol and tobacco are recognised, but to claim that marijuana is no worse than these is surely no argument why our community should introduce yet a third product which may leave similar, if not worse, ill-effects.

At the present time, despite claims to the contrary, there is not sufficient known of the short and long-term effects of the drug to recommend any alteration of the present controls. There would be a risk in lifting restrictions in the present state of knowledge—a risk we cannot afford to take.

Upon completion of the first reading of the Bill, hon. members will be in a position to make a careful study of its provisions, and I anticipate that most of the matters I have mentioned will be canvassed in greater detail at a later stage. I therefore submit the Bill as containing a number of desirable amendments and recommend its introduction.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (12.29 p.m.): In introducing the proposed Bill, the Minister has given a very interesting speech on the problems of drugs and drug-taking. However, I think he will admit that he has given the Committee very little indication of the provisions of the proposed Bill, because in his concluding remarks he said that hon. members will have a better appreciation of them when they receive the Bill.

The Opposition realises the seriousness of the two great social problems dealt with under the Bill—prostitution and the trafficking in and taking of drugs. At this stage he has not given us any indication of the

measures to be taken for the control of trafficking or peddling in drugs or the taking of drugs, nor have we been told whether existing penalties will be reviewed. He has said that by the Bill the Government intends to bring Queensland into line with other authorities. That indicates to me that there will be substantial increases in penalties for offences.

I hope that any action intended by the Bill will not impose any restrictions on civil liberties or the rights of the citizens of the State. Certain provisions are necessary for the control of drugs, but when the provisions impinge on the rights of a citizen we have to take a very close look at them. As I have said, we still do not know what provisions are included in the Bill.

As the responsibility for the present drug situation in this country and, indeed, in every part of the world, must lie with the suppliers, traffickers and pedlars of drugs, they are the people we must control if we are going to face up to the drug problem. Many drug pedlars and traffickers are themselves drug users. There should be no lessening of the severity of penalties imposed on pedlars simply because they are drug users and as such might be considered to be entitled to sympathy. An addict who is being dealt with for distributing drugs should suffer the full penalty of the law. He should then be given treatment while in prison. Before we can properly deal with the problem we must have special facilities in the prisons to treat drug offenders.

The Minister has mentioned that many people do not regard a gaol sentence as a deterrent or as a weapon in stamping out the drug trade. Society cannot buy its way out of the problem. We should not make it easy for those who can afford to pay heavy fines to get away with what they are doing. We have to consider the little people who are caught up in the drug problem. Some drug users have induced their friends to take drugs. They are the little people. The people whom the Government needs to come down on are those who manufacture and/or distribute the drugs—those who control the whole situation and make money out of drug addiction. We must regard the little people in this problem as being socially ill.

There is no doubt that fortunes are being made from drug trafficking, peddling, and supplying. Charges for drugs to users are very high. I have here a couple of instances of the prices being charged. Heroin and morphine are being sold at \$18 a three-hour dose or at up to \$2,000 an ounce. The hallucinogens such as LSD and so on are sold for from \$5 to \$10 a trip. The increase in fines will have the side effect of raising the cost of drugs to users, and will thus provide more income for those engaged in trafficking. It will become increasingly difficult for drug users to obtain them and this, in turn, will lead to further social problems. Anyone addicted to drugs must obtain them

and, if the price increases, the likelihood is that he will lean towards other criminal offences to obtain the money needed to purchase drugs. The drug habit will not be affected, to any extent, by heavier fines. They will simply make the activities more lucrative for some and more expensive for others.

Mr. Aikens: What do you suggest instead of fines?

Mr. MELLOY: The only alternative penalties are gaol or fines. If we do not fine them, we gaol them. That is why I mentioned earlier that a special gaol for drug users or offenders should be established

Mr. Aikens: Bunk!

Mr. MELLOY: What would the hon. member do with them? There is little point in fining these people; they must be given treatment. My suggestion is that those who are responsible for providing the drugs, trafficking in them, and peddling them should be gaoled.

Mr. Aikens: You are suggesting a special gaol. That is bunk. Put them all in the one gaol.

Mr. MELLOY: The hon. member is entitled to his opinion, but I think there are two different types of offence.

The drug situation in Australia is so serious that we must bring down legislation that will deal with it intelligently and effectively. I do not know the terms of the Bill but if the penalties are those applicable in other States, it will provide for fines of \$4,000 or 10 years gaol. Perhaps that is the only way we can deal with the matter, but, frankly, I doubt the effectiveness of fines. Drugs are big business, and \$4,000 is peanuts to the person engaged in drug trafficking in a big way. Whether or not an increase in the size of a fine will deter such a person is hard to say.

It is estimated that 4,000 million doses of drugs are taken in Australia each year and according to my information, 2,000 million of them are prescribed, which means that the other 2,000 million doses are not prescribed and are taken by drug addicts. The situation as we see it is that the legislation must provide for sufficient and adequate treatment of drug addicts. At the present time we do not have in Queensland proper treatment for addicts.

Mr. Tooth: Why do you make that statement? It is not true.

Mr. MELLOY: The provisions we are making are completely inadequate. Last year a statement was made by Brother Norman of the Society of St. Francis, in giving evidence before a Federal body.

He is quoted in "The Australian" as saying—

"Drug addicts would not seek treatment because of the attitude of contempt towards them. They are treated as sub-humans and dropouts."

Worse than this; they are treated as criminals, and therein lies one of the gravest problems that face us.

The situation that exists at Lawson House calls for some comment—we have had a look at it—because many drug addicts are herded into it until they "dry out" and apparently receive very little therapeutic treatment while they are there.

Mr. Tooth: You make that as a statement, do you?

Mr. MELLOY: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Tooth: You make that as a firm statement?

Mr. MELLOY: On experience, yes.

Mr. Tooth: What experience have you had?

Mr. MELLOY: Evidence given to me by people who have been to Lawson House, and my visits to the institution. The place is nothing more than a prison, and its atmosphere certainly is not conducive to attendance by drug addicts for treatment. That is a problem that the Government must solve. An entirely new institution based on the original concept of Lawson House is required, and it must be utilised more effectively than the present institution.

It is imperative that the Bill contain provisions for the proper control of the production, sale, peddling and trafficking of drugs. The whole problem must be faced up to, and it will be interesting to see whether or not the Bill attempts to do that. I appeal to the Minister to devote his efforts to proper control of drugs at their source.

Mr. AHERN (Landsborough) (12.43 p.m.): I support the Bill. Broadly speaking, it can be said that it is designed to give increased power to the police and others in authority to apprehend and prosecute drug addicts, as well as those people who are engaged in drug-trafficking.

Throughout the world drug addiction is a very serious and baffling problem to those people in authority who have the responsibility of trying to solve it. The problem has arisen rapidly, and its impact on the community in Australia, and in Queensland, is being felt at the present time. People who know a good deal about the problem have realised that ultimate control can result only from recognition by every member of the community of the danger of drug addiction. At the present time that recognition is lacking. Additional research needs to be conducted into drug addiction, and the dangers associated with it must be got across to the community. It is a new problem, and it is one that calls for new policies to combat it in both the rehabilitation and the punitive aspects, which are dealt with very intelligently in the Bill.

In my electorate, the problem is difficult and baffling. Recently we have had many convictions—too many—of people found in possession of cannabis and marijuana.

Several local marijuana plantations have been the subject of a police clamp. The mushroom from which psilocybin is obtained grows naturally in certain parts of the electorate, and people known colloquially as "mushroom munchers" have been brought before the court. There is primary evidence of "roll-your-own" toadskin smoking, although I do not know that anyone has appeared before the court on such a charge. We have also had problems associated with the boiling down of cough mixture.

I do not think the problem will become extremely serious within my electorate, but, from the point of view of those in the community where it is happening, it is most baffling. I believe that everyone is wondering why the Maroochydore-Mooloolaba area has become the venue of much of this type of activity, when it is not greatly apparent in many other areas of the State.

Mr. Aikens: You should have been in the Cairns area a while ago.

Mr. AHERN: The Cairns area is a very difficult one. Indeed, the problem is much worse there than in my electorate, and it is causing quite a deal of concern.

The people in my area are not greatly concerned about those involved in the problem at Maroochydore because most of them are visitors. However, they are concerned about the possibility of the habit spreading to an even greater degree among the young people permanently resident in the community.

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't you think it would be better if people were educated well enough to know that this habit is harmful? Or is it some weakness within themselves that leads them into this addiction?

Mr. AHERN: I am inclined to think it is, but the problem is increasing vastly throughout the world. I should naturally think, as the hon. member said, that people ought to be able to recognise the problem, but they do not seem to be able to. The younger people particularly are not aware of the problem, or perhaps they are readily prepared to take the risk and experiment with these drugs. Before they know it, they are deeply involved in an addiction problem.

Mr. O'Donnell: I am advocating that education should be directed against their taking the first step.

Mr. AHERN: That should certainly be done. I am not prepared to completely "rubbish" the efforts that have been made, but more must be done. The efforts initiated in that direction are very creditable. They have been aimed at bringing this dangerous problem to the notice of the young people. However, if we are not very careful in our approach, it seems to me we could bring these practices to the notice of people in areas where they are not yet in vogue. We may tempt young

people, to whom the thought would not have occurred, to experiment with these drugs.

I welcome the suggestion clearly implied in the Minister's speech that there is to be a review of the penalties imposed for possession of drugs and trafficking in drugs. I am sure all hon. members are aware that the existing penalties are not rigid enough. Recently, in my electorate two men were convicted of possession of dangerous drugs. The maximum penalty was imposed. They paid the fine in cash at the court office and their roll of notes was barely dented. They were able to meet the commitment very easily. It was not very big compared with the profits they had been making from trafficking in drugs.

I am pleased that the Minister has seen fit to separate the users from the pushers and to suggest that the pushers ought to be the subject of separate court action, with the penalty to be decided on the merits of each case.

The Minister said that the powers of search will be extended. I hope they will be extended sufficiently. I heard no mention of this in the Minister's speech. One of the great problems in convicting a person of being in possession of dangerous drugs is that when the police officer goes to a suspect's residence and finds some drugs in, say, the corner of a room, the suspect says, "I am renting these premises and living here, but the existence of those seeds in that corner comes as a complete surprise to me." Perhaps the suspect should carry the onus of proving that he had no knowledge of the presence of drugs on either his person or his premises. The situation is so serious and the difficulties involved are so great that this legislation should be extended in that direction. However, this will become evident when the Bill is printed.

Mr. Aikens: If liquor is found on your premises, you are adjudged to be the owner of it.

Mr. AHERN: That is probably so.

I welcome the treatment provisions outlined by the Minister, and particularly his statement that he is not prepared to introduce certain enactments in other areas which provide that a person who administers a drug to himself can be convicted. Such a law would tend to deter people who are addicted to drugs from entering an institution and seeking help. After all, we are trying to encourage young people in this position to rehabilitate themselves and again become useful members of the society in which we live.

The Minister outlined provisions covering detention in an institution other than a gaol for treatment for the effects of drug use. This is a very good idea, as again it aims at rehabilitation rather than punishment. The

Minister said that some form of detention review tribunal will be set up to ensure that this provision is not abused.

If we can educate the younger people and parents, and obtain the co-operation of all those authorities that are trying to prevent this problem before it happens, we will create an awareness among members of the community that this danger is great and that rehabilitation is much more important than punishment. The people involved must be made aware of the need for the measures that are being introduced to apprehend traffickers and pushers and to impose harsher penalties.

I support the measure.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (12.55 p.m.): These days one frequently hears the phrase "submissive society". When I think of some of the people in this community from whom I expect better things, I think that the phrase "submissive society", or "permissive society", whichever one cares to use, should be changed to "gutless society" because we have departed from the elementary principle of a decent society, that principle being that those who will not respect the law must be made to fear it. Whether they will or will not fear this law depends entirely on what is written into it. We have had another masterpiece of casuistry, sophistry and dissimulation from the Minister for Health, who is a past-master of those things.

Let us deal first of all with the gutless section of the community, which includes judges, leaders of commerce, church leaders, and, of course, the scum at the university—I must not leave them out—who tell us that marijuana, and various toadstools and plants that will induce hallucinogenic effects in people, referred to as "taking them for a trip", are not harmful. As a matter of fact, the Minister mentioned that these drugs are proclaimed to the world as being no worse, in their soporific effects, than liquor and cigarettes. And perhaps they may not be. I can speak from the experience of great addiction to cigarettes, because I was an inveterate smoker, and I needed a lot of will-power, and a long period of time, before I was able to knock it off.

There were periods in my life when I was a very heavy drinker. People say that there is nothing wrong with marijuana, and that it will not induce addiction. I remember that, as a boy of 15 or 16 in Charters Towers, I started off by going to hotels with my mates drinking port wine and lemonade. Having had two or three of those drinks, we would go out into the street and pretend to the world that we were well under the influence of alcohol, because in a certain group that was a sign of manliness.

Then, of course, we graduated—I shall not say "elevated"—from port wine and lemonade to light shandies. From light shandies we graduated to beer with a dash, and from beer with a dash we graduated to beer. We then

reached the stage at which we would drink anything brewed, distilled or concocted, and very frequently I finished up in the horrors.

Mr. Jensen: You should have had Bundaberg rum.

Mr. AIKENS: Rum is one drink that I could not drink. I had no particular aversion to Bundaberg rum; I just could not drink rum.

A person graduates from the so-called soft drugs and soft drinks till he becomes the victim of addiction, which is painful, expensive, and very embarrassing to himself and all with whom he is connected.

Mr. Hughes: The Labour Party believes in marijuana.

Mr. AIKENS: This is not a matter of party politics.

The same thing applies to smoking; if a person slips from the "liberal" path, he can finish up, as I did, smoking 100 cigarettes a day, with my fingers, teeth, and probably my insides as black as a stove-pipe on an old wood-burning stove.

It is all very well for people to say that various weeds are not drugs of addiction. I am not suggesting that every person who starts off on these drugs will become addicted to them, but, once a person begins to think that he can "get away" with a soft drug and it no longer gives him a "kick", he will move to a harder drug, just as I graduated from light shandies to straight beer. Why do people graduate from straight beer to whisky and other types of liquor? They do so because the lighter drinks do not give the "kick" that they are looking for. So it is with the movement from light to heavy drugs.

One of the tragedies in the drug problem is the "bleeding heart". We have examples of this in the hon. members for Landsborough and Nudgee. They say, "These poor little fellows should be given every encouragement".

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

Mr. AIKENS: Before the recess for lunch I was dealing with the type of person who is generally referred to as a "bleeding heart" or a "do-gooder", who does not believe in punishment of anybody other than a person who does some harm to him as an individual. As I said, hon. members have had a couple of exhibitions of that type in this debate, from the hon. member for Landsborough and the hon. member for Nudgee. I think it is about time that we stopped talking such nonsense, because, when all is said and done, by so doing we are only inciting stupid young people to begin taking drugs or meddling with drugs.

The hon. member for Nudgee said, "We must see that there is nothing in the Act that will interfere with a person's liberty." I do not know exactly what he means by that—whether he means that if anybody wishes to take drugs we should not do anything to dissuade him, or whether he means

we should not do anything to punish anybody who has drugs in his possession. I shall speak in general terms and say that for far too long we have been drifting into that state, and this Parliament, of course, is probably the worst offender. When we introduce legislation to deal with something that we think is a blot on our society, when we are dealing with people who offend against and break the law, we are far too apt to consider only the lawbreakers. Of course, one sees enough of that in the courts from the judges, lawyers and other people who think that the law should be made for the criminal, that the whole process of law should be for the benefit of the criminal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: I think it is about time we considered the responsible, reputable people in the community and made laws to protect them against lawbreakers of any type.

So it is with the proposed Bill. What is in it, of course, is problematical. The Minister for Health is a remarkably fluent and gifted speaker. The trouble, of course, is that he speaks for so long and says so little. After he has delivered what he is pleased to term an oration in this Chamber, one has to consider for some time what he said to discover the message that he intended to convey. I take it from his long-winded oration this morning that the proposed Bill is intended to deal with those who take drugs or those who peddle drugs.

Let me assure the Minister that, unlike the hon. member for Landsborough, I travel round the State and I believe that the drug problem has to be tackled immediately and strongly. Unfortunately, we do not tackle any of our lawbreakers or any of the law-breaking in this State strongly, and it is about time we did.

Quite recently I was in Cairns. I stayed at the Palace Hotel, a very nice hotel in one of the main streets. One night I walked across the street and went through an arcade to have a meal.

An Honourable Member interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: Unlike the hon. member who has interjected, I pay for my meals in Cairns; I do not take the "knock" for them. When I came back through the arcade on the way back to my hotel, I could not cross the footpath because, spread out across it, reclining, lying down, or sitting down, was perhaps the most motley collection of people I have ever seen outside a university campus—long-haired, bearded, dirty, scruffy, unkempt, smelly. The smell reminded me, in fact, of an A.L.P. meeting, but I knew that it was not an A.L.P. meeting.

As I said, when I came out of the entrance to the arcade and tried to walk across the footpath, I could not do so. I touched

one of these scruffy looking individuals with the toe of my boot and said, "Do you mind shifting out of the way while I walk across the footpath?" He looked up at me as if I were some strange creature. I do not know whether he was "high" or not. After he had looked at me for some time he decided to shift. I had to pick my way across the footpath. Later on a good friend of mine in Cairns took me for a drive around the district. We went up along the bank of Freshwater Creek and various other places. He showed me where the drug addicts congregate. Actually he showed me where one of them had drowned only a few days before. I wondered why it was that these people were allowed to congregate in an otherwise clean city like Cairns. It appears that it is one of the meccas of the drug addicts of this State.

Mr. Bennett: They congregated there because they knew you were coming.

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for South Brisbane lives up to his well-deserved nickname: the man with the brown arm. He has been stirring with it so long that he cannot get the stain off it; it will not wash off. Whether they knew I was coming or did not know I was coming, the fact is that they were there.

I was talking to the hon. member for Cairns just a while ago—I hope I am not breaching his confidence—and he told me that a reputable police officer came up to Cairns and cleaned them up, so that Cairns is now a city where you can walk along the footpath without being molested and without having to step over such a motley, smelly, queer-looking collection of people.

This is something that the Minister might inquire into: all of those people are receiving social service benefits. Like a lot of other no-hopers they go along and register for employment as technicians for this or technicians for that, knowing full well that there are no such jobs available for them. They regularly draw their social service payments and with the social service payments they buy "pot" from people in that area who are growing it extensively. As a matter of fact, I went out with one of the detectives in Cairns and he showed me "pot" growing in an area where it had been planted. Not so long ago, just outside Townsville—at Mount Spec—there was what might be called a "pot" farm where marijuana was growing. No doubt the people who had planted it were selling what they did not smoke themselves.

I want the Minister to tell us whether there is any provision in the Bill to deal with the inciters of those who are smoking marijuana, toadstools or grasses or anything else that puts them into this delirious and dangerous state. I have almost vomited at times when watching programmes on television, particularly A.B.C. programmes where you can

see and hear almost anything. I refer particularly to a programme where various persons appear on a panel. They include people from the university—I refer to that element as the “scum” element; I always have—a prominent churchman, and a member of the medical profession.

On one occasion they were all saying, “Look, we are losing our sense of balance and we are losing our sense of proportion when we are talking about marijuana, cannabis and all these things as being dangerous drugs. That’s all nonsense. They are no more dangerous than tobacco or liquor. Why then should we stop young people having this mild sedative? Why should we stop young people doing these things?” Seeing that I have mentioned smoking, I want to say quite plainly that I would consider smoking to be the most painful and expensive way of committing suicide that I know of.

The people I have referred to made those statements on television. We can hear others burbling and gurgling over the radio, and can read what they have said when it is reported in the Press. They are all urging young people to give cannabis and marijuana a try as it is only a soft drug. Can any drug be “soft” or “hard”? They say, “It is a soft drug. It won’t do you any harm. You may as well smoke it or take it as go to a pub and have a drink of spirits, beer or anything else.” What is this Bill doing about that type of person? Can a prosecution be launched against the television station? Can a prosecution be launched against the radio station? Would the Government be game to launch a prosecution against a prominent churchman? Can prosecutions be launched against all those who are adopting the line that there is nothing wrong with young people taking this type of drug or experimenting with it?

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: There is a “way out” doctor in the Federal Parliament who says all these things.

Mr. AIKENS: There is a “way out” doctor in the Federal Parliament, a member of a political party to which I would not belong, who is advocating the castration of Aborigines and the medically unfit.

Mr. Wright: That is utterly untrue.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: He is advocating the castration of Aborigines.

Mr. Wright: He is not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member for Townsville South to keep to the measure before the Committee.

Mr. AIKENS: I sincerely regret that I am provoked at times, by interjection from the less responsible members of this Committee, into saying things I otherwise would not say. Nevertheless, I have no regrets at having

said it because it is abundantly and indubitably true, just as it is true to say that in the Labour Party there are men who believe in homosexuality and the legalisation of it. They nearly got that through the last Labour-in-Politics Convention.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: Now, let us face up to this fact: the hon. member for Nudgee was doing the best he possibly could, stumbling here and mumbling there, but he asked, “What can we do?” He said, “I do not believe that the fines should be heavy because the young people should not be penalised”. Let me state my position clearly. I do not believe that fines will be effective in dealing with this vicious and venomous type of offence. It is true that some men are making small fortunes through peddling drugs; it is true that those making the small fortunes by peddling drugs are being supported by men in the community who should be ashamed of themselves and who, in their turn, are being supported by men who adopt what we call the general psychological, legal approach to this particular offence.

I believe that there is only one penalty for those who are in possession of drugs; it is gaol, and the longer they go to gaol the sooner they will learn a lesson. I do not know what we will do with those who peddle drugs.

Mr. Baldwin: Chop their legs off.

Mr. AIKENS: I would not be averse to doing that. In addition to receiving a long gaol sentence, they should receive the lash. But the moment anyone suggests that they should receive the lash, some hon. members in this Chamber stand up and say, “Oh no, no, you cannot violate the body; you cannot inflict physical punishment on the criminal”.

Let us be frank. We are getting into all this trouble over drugs, the frightful toll of the road, breaking and entering, stealing, and other offences because we will not face up to the fact that the punishment must fit the crime. Unfortunately, far too many people, earning a very good living for themselves are only interested in their own affairs, and leave the administration of the laws to empty-headed and gutless theorists such as those on the Bench today. Consequently, people get away with things they should not be allowed to get away with.

If this Bill provides for a fine for the possession of drugs—and merely provides a fine for those who peddle drugs—then the Minister for Health may as well tear it up now and throw it in the waste-paper basket, because these people can afford to pay these fines; they can afford to treat the law with contempt and impunity. Unless the Minister writes into this Bill a provision that those in possession of drugs must be sent to gaol for a lengthy period, without the option of a fine, it will not receive my support.

The hon. member for Nudgee dealt with this position. I know he was trying not to fall between two schools. He wanted to

save the reputable section of the community who are going to deal with the drug menace and he wanted to save all the do-gooders, the bleeding hearts and all the rest of them who are not going to deal with it effectively.

(Time expired.)

Mrs. JORDAN (Ipswich West) (2.30 p.m.): First of all, I wish to deal briefly with certain of the minor amendments proposed by the Minister. I am pleased to note that he is endeavouring to clarify the situation relative to what are now known as "convalescent homes". A good deal of confusion exists in the mind of the public as to what is meant by "convalescent home" and "nursing home", and the provision that brings our definition into line with the Federal definition will obviate that confusion.

A large number of convalescent homes—I shall call them "nursing homes"—are being built. Many of them will offer very good facilities at high rates, and they are in demand by people who are prepared to pay for these facilities, whereas the others will provide facilities that people who rely on social service payments and others in the middle and lower-income groups can afford. Whilst the amendment is relatively small, it is, nevertheless, important in that it will obviate the confusion that exists among members of the community.

The Bill provides for the designation of health inspectors as "health surveyors". These health surveyors, whose duty it will be to visit public hospitals, should possess pharmaceutical qualifications and a wide knowledge of the drugs and medicines that are used in hospital laboratories. The insistence upon pharmaceutical qualifications for a health surveyor would be a step in the right direction.

I turn now to the subject that has greatly concerned previous speakers, namely, drug abuse. It is a very serious matter, and it is regrettable that in debating it certain hon. members have indulged in histrionics and endeavoured to be smart with other members. Drug abuse and addiction is a problem about which all hon. members, irrespective of political affiliation, should be concerned. It has assumed huge proportions in Great Britain and the United States of America, and, as well, it is increasing in other States of Australia. We in Queensland are fortunate that, as the Minister has said, it has not yet grown to the same extent in this State. In the light of that fact, it is important for us to do our best now to prevent growth of the problem here. Immediate action must be taken in official quarters to arrive at a solution to the problem.

Numerous Press reports have dealt with drug addiction and it is obvious from them that there is trafficking in dangerous drugs in Queensland—that they are obtainable here and are being peddled. We constantly read reports about robberies from chemist shops,

and they are increasing in number. Most addicts will go to any lengths to obtain drugs on which they have become dependent.

Many people will not believe that their children are, or even could be, involved in drug-taking, yet no section of the community is immune from the illicit drug menace. It affects all families—the rich, the average, and the under-privileged. The problem has reached epidemic proportions in many parts of the world, and we must do what we can to minimise it.

It is a pity that so many young people are involved in this problem. Perhaps they start out of bravado or for kicks. Perhaps it is a form of escapism, or they may be unhappy in their home environment. Many things can lead to drug addiction, but once a person is addicted the road back is very hard and the fight is long. Frequently, although the addict may be full of good intentions, he suffers lapse after lapse.

Although I have no knowledge of any drug-addict group in my electorate, I have knowledge of a number of cases of drug addiction amongst people who are trying hard to beat it, but are finding the road back very difficult. Indeed, I took one young lass who was addicted into my home. At the time I did not know that she was a seasoned drug-taker who was trying to rehabilitate herself and I took her in out of compassion. One night she got "high". It was an unenviable experience, as I was otherwise alone in my home and it was late at night. When I questioned her the next day, she said she did it because she was so happy. If she did that because she was so happy, Heaven only knows what she would do if she was depressed.

Addicts can find all sorts of reasons for taking drugs. This lass gave me the name of her doctor, and I rang him to question him about her. He told me that she was a drug addict and that he prescribed only certain drugs for her and had told her not to mix them. It is ridiculous to tell a confirmed drug addict not to mix certain drugs. When he wants to get "high" or escape his problems, the first thing he will do is mix drugs that are legally prescribed for him. The practice of prescribing drugs for a person whose mind is mentally deranged from drug-taking, and the psychological need for drugs, should be closely examined. It is absolutely useless to prescribe certain drugs for someone and then tell him not to mix them.

I know something of the problems confronting persons who are trying to rehabilitate themselves after treatment for drug addiction. When they move out into the community they find no compassion. As soon as they get accommodation—and accommodation is hard enough for the average person to find, let alone one who carries a stigma—and their neighbours discover their problems, they are shunned and told to leave. They have a rehabilitation problem after drug-taking, as well as a rehabilitation problem in the community.

Thus, their position is doubly hard. Many people who are trying to rehabilitate themselves as well as nurses who are acting on behalf of such people, approach me to find accommodation for them. Their role is not an enviable one, and the community must show them some compassion.

There is a great need for control not only of non-medicinal drugs but also those that can be legally prescribed. There are complexities in the use of many drugs, such as the amphetamines, derivatives of the barbiturates and the hallucinogenic drugs. Some of these are obtainable on a doctor's prescription and some are needed in the treatment of patients. But again we come back to the mixing of different drugs and its effect.

So many different drugs are available that it is difficult for an ordinary person to know which are addictive and which are not, and what quantity would have to be taken by a person before he became addicted to them. It is difficult for the layman taking such drugs to know the effect of the quantity he is actually taking.

The drugs that concern us most today are those that come within the field of addiction. The stimulants—that is, the amphetamines, such as benzedrine, dexedrine, and methedrene—appeal to truck-drivers and students, who want to keep on going and push themselves beyond their norm, and to bored housewives who take them to get a “lift”.

Sedatives can be a blessing to those who use them under medical supervision—they are useful in relaxing people who suffer from various illnesses—but these, too, can be overdone and become addictive, particularly if they are mixed with a stimulant drug. In that case there could be very undesirable side effects.

Opiates are the worst kind of drugs. They include heroin, which is a very addictive drug with a grim list of side effects.

It seems that it is the psychedelics that appeal to those young people who begin experimenting at an early age. These drugs affect the mind, the mood, perception and thinking. To some young people, “taking a trip” is a common term and is quite accepted in the “in” world of today.

LSD and marijuana are the most commonly used drugs in this permissive society. Many young people want to try them. They are dared by their friends, and they think it is exciting to use them. Quite often they take them as an escape from pressures, boredom and the fears of everyday life. They are only an advance on cigarettes, alcohol, etc., the adverse effects of which are widely recognised, although they are still part of our way of life.

Marijuana is by far the most widely used and most controversial drug. As the Minister said, some countries are in favour of legalising its use. It has become more prominent following its use by university

and high-school students. It is the “in” drug with people overseas. However, little is known of its long-term effects and there is much controversy about its immediate effects. Quite often it is the introduction to more dangerous drugs and leads to the use of harder drugs such as heroin.

A few years ago we learnt that thalidomide had a deforming effect on unborn babies. There are indications that other drugs in this non-medical category are capable of altering chromosomes and are responsible for deformed babies being born to drug-takers. Not enough is known of the short-term, let alone the long-term, effects of these drugs. In my opinion, no penalty is too harsh in trying to curb the activities of the drug pedlar. He is the one against whom the strongest action should be taken. There must be control of drugs, and there must be control of the drug pedlar.

The drug addict needs help and treatment to rehabilitate himself. Putting him in prison, where he gets no rehabilitative treatment, is not the answer. A person's well-held beliefs are rarely changed by the aggressive move of imprisonment, and such a move defeats its own purpose. As long as adults attack the beliefs of teenagers, many of whom have strong beliefs, with one-sided arguments, they will always be termed “squares”, and the generation gap will widen. The job of educating teenagers in what can, and does, happen with the taking and abusing of drugs is a very hard one. Drug abuse has developed with affluence and the problems of our modern-day society, and the number of “turn-ons” and “drop-outs” is increasing. Many of them belong to the educated section of society and they question much of what is accepted today, yet it is education that must be the main bulwark in imparting knowledge of the hazards and ill-effects, in both the short and long term, produced by the use of drugs. If it is hoped to control and stamp out the abuse of drugs, there must be strong deterrents to their use.

I welcome the introduction of the Bill, and await its details with great interest.

Mr. MARGINSON (Ipswich East) (2.47 p.m.): I listened with great interest to the Minister's introduction of the Bill. I listened as a citizen of this State, and, in particular, as a member of the Opposition's health committee.

The Minister said that quite a number of amendments were to be placed before the Committee, some of minor importance and others of major importance. He said they dealt with “a variety of different subjects”. I think those were his words. The nursing home proposal is a good one. As the hon. member for Ipswich West said, the provision concerning health inspectors is good, in that they should have the qualifications of pharmacists. If I remember correctly, they are to be designated “health surveyors”. I also commend the proposal to provide more

information about food products. I have no doubt that that will apply to milk, and the Minister said that it would apply to other commodities also.

I agree with the Minister that the two main subjects under the Bill are prostitution and drugs, and it is the subject of drugs that I want to discuss for a few minutes this afternoon. When we spoke of drugs some years ago, we did so in the context of providing assistance in the recovery of good health. Today, and for the last few years, references to drugs have usually been to their being taken in an illegal manner. The feeling that people generally had towards drugs years ago is not the feeling that they have towards them today.

Those who constitute today's drug problem fall into two categories. One category contains the unfortunate addicts, the ones about whom I shall speak later, and the other category contains the pushers, the pedlars, and the traffickers. In my opinion, every State and every country should make an honest and sincere attempt to deal with the drug trafficker, the drug pusher. He is the one who makes use of the emotional condition of the addict to become wealthy. Traffickers in drugs are like vultures preying on the addicts, and every effort should be made to destroy them. If drug traffickers and drug pedlars can be destroyed, I believe that 50 per cent. of the drug problem now facing us will be overcome.

I read in a newspaper recently that the Department of Customs had discovered an attempt to bring drugs worth \$400,000 into Australia. No doubt that was the value of the drugs on the black market. If it was not, the position was even worse. Ten years ago one did not read of anywhere near the number of prosecutions for drug trafficking being instituted today. I do not know whether the problem was there. If it was, it was well hidden. It certainly is not hidden today; nor is the position of the unfortunate addict.

It was as far back as 1966 that the drug problem first came into prominence in local newspapers. I recall reading an article that appeared in "Sunday Truth" in January of that year—I have read it again today—which said that we were then facing a drug problem. In January, 1967, Dr. Lyn Barrow called for an extension of work to assist drug addicts. He suggested at that time the expansion of activities to foster a community spirit among recovered addicts and also addicts who were seeking help. He said that an organisation modelled on Alcoholics Anonymous had been established in the United States of America to deal with drug problems and that its activities were growing. According to him, that organisation insisted at all times on truth and honesty among those being helped, and he said also that the secret of its success was that the addict reached a stage where he became fully aware of his condition.

I wish to add to that by saying that, from what I have read and seen, I believe there should be a tighter policing of the avenues through which drugs are obtained. One of these avenues is the over-prescription of drugs by medical practitioners. I am satisfied that at times drugs are over-prescribed, and it has been suggested to me that doctors do that so that patients will go away and not bother them for some weeks. In addition to that, there is in Queensland the potential for easy purchase of very dangerous drugs and also for drug peddling. In my opinion, the three matters I have mentioned should be considered seriously if an honest attempt is to be made to overcome the growing problem of drug addiction in our society.

I draw the attention of the Committee to a small item that appeared in the last Annual Report of the Director-General of Health and Medical Services. He said that the drug-abuse potential in Queensland was serious and was causing concern but that it had not reached the serious proportions that existed in other countries. I am glad to know that we are making some attempt to prevent its reaching that stage.

About six months ago an eminent psychiatrist in Sydney said—

"People who become dependent on drugs almost invariably belonged to a wide group of people suffering from psychological disorders. These disorders were frequently apparent in these people in early childhood. Potential drug dependence could be picked out in childhood if child psychiatry services were improved."

That brings up the question of the education of people in drug abuse. I am not suggesting that what that medical man said applies to Queensland. Apart from the three points I have mentioned, education must be another factor. Drugs are too easily obtainable. In many cases drugs are over-prescribed.

Strangely enough, there was an article in today's "Courier-Mail" headed "LSD May be From Australia". The article indicated that Auckland Drug Squad detectives regard Australia as a prime source of a recent inflow of LSD. They said, however, that Australia is not necessarily the country of origin; that the drug could have been made in another country and sent to Australia.

I commend the Minister on introducing the Bill, but, unfortunately, he has not gone into much detail. "Sunday Truth" of 18 October last year reported on his visit to the South. The article was headed "Minister on secret drug investigation", and it detailed many of the things he saw in the South. It was a very alarming article and I hope, as was reported, that we have not yet reached the same stage in Queensland. The article indicated that in Queensland gaol sentences and fines of up to \$4,000 would be imposed for drug-pushing. We have not been told about that today.

The Government and the Parliament should strongly attack the problem posed by the drug-pusher, and sympathise with and help to rehabilitate the addict.

Mr. HARRIS (Wynnum) (2.59 p.m.): I am greatly perturbed at the state of the Chamber at the present time. One would imagine that during the introduction of such an important Bill most Government members would be sufficiently interested to be present and listen to the views of the Minister and Opposition members. It is a shocking state of affairs that only two Government members and the Minister are in the Chamber. As a matter of fact, I respectfully request that some members opposite get in touch with Mr. Robinson and ask him if he will release at least eight or 10 Government members so that they can come along and listen to the intelligent contributions being made by the Opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I respectfully suggest that the hon. member deal with the Bill before the Committee.

Mr. HARRIS: I respectfully bow to your advice, Mr. Hooper. May I ask you to glance around the Chamber and advise me whether you consider there are sufficient members present to form a quorum?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair is satisfied that a sufficient number is present.

Mr. HARRIS: Having accompanied my shadow Minister for Health to many hospitals in Queensland, I have been astounded to hear some speakers and the Minister outlining what he and his department propose to do about helping drug addicts. On these visits I have seen the accommodation provided for alcoholics. I particularly mention Wolston Park, where very good provision is made for these people, but when is the Government going to do something to help the drug addict?

I lay squarely on the shoulders of the Minister for Health and his colleagues responsibility for the general failure to realise the seriousness of this cancerous growth that has appeared in the community and has been spreading for some time. I venture the opinion that Queensland would be so far behind in protecting young drug addicts from pushers, about whom we have heard so much this afternoon, that it is not funny. What has the Government done in relation to this matter?

It is all very well for hon. members opposite to rise in their places and say, "We will do something for the addict". The important thing is to take action before people become addicts. Much criticism has been levelled at pushers of drugs but the surest way to combat these people is by educating young people against them. One has only to investigate our high schools and universities to realise that many of our young people today are being brought up on a diet of sex and vice and, in many

instances, those in charge of these institutions do nothing about it. Are they too blind to see it? Is the Government too blind to see it or not prepared to do anything about it?

Much has been said here about pollution and oil slicks. I lay on the Government's shoulders complete responsibility for the shocking pollution by oil in Queensland today, as well as the spread of the drug problem. The Government has not done anything about either problem, yet we all know that it is spreading over this and other States of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Tooth: What is spreading over the State? Was it oil that you mentioned?

Mr. HARRIS: I accept that interjection because I do not think the Minister heard what I said. I said that many oil slicks have occurred and much time has been spent talking about pollution. We have asked the Government to do something about it, but not a great deal has been done. I am also saying that the Government has not done sufficient about drugs. I merely mentioned the fact that oil slicks have occurred. I think the Minister was fully aware of what I meant when I mentioned pollution.

The hon. member for Townsville South said that he had walked along the streets of Cairns and observed dirty and unkempt louts sitting on the footpath. That type of scene is not peculiar to northern towns, but can be observed in all the other major towns of Queensland. The blame for this lies at the feet of the Government, because it has not provided a sufficient number of police in this State. How can drug addiction be prevented without a sufficient number of police officers? Look at what is happening in Brisbane. Every week-end sex and drug orgies are held at Cash's Crossing, Mt. Coot-tha and other localities, and the people who participate in them do so with the knowledge that even Mr. Whitrod is aware of what is going on.

It is all very well for the Government to say that it proposes to take action, but talking about it is not enough. If additional police officers were appointed, fewer breaking and enterings of pharmacies would occur. The Government is neglecting the young people of Queensland. The drug problem must be tackled at its source. Drug education should be carried out, certainly in the high schools and perhaps in the primary schools as well. If school principals and head-teachers could be encouraged to take an interest in students after they left school, it is possible that drug addiction would be controlled.

How can a drug addict be identified? It is all very well for members of the medical profession to say that they can pick a drug addict; it is impossible for the ordinary parent. A child may be taking drugs without his or her parents' knowledge, and may even become well and truly hooked before

the parents are aware of it. Often, when the parents do find out, it is too late to help their child.

What happens to people who are declared drug addicts? Some are sent to mental homes, others are sent to hospitals, and a great number are returned to the care of their parents. I admit that the Government has made some attempts to help drug addicts, but they will be in vain unless an institution is established solely for the treatment of drug addicts. It is essential that the Government should immediately provide proper treatment and care of drug addicts.

A number of hon. members have referred to Press articles and the Minister's Press statements on drug-taking. I ask: what are the responsible people of the State doing? What is the church doing? What are the youth organisations doing? Above all, what is the Government going to do?

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Young Labour wants to legalise marijuana; that's what it wants to do.

Mr. Wright interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not tolerate cross-firing in the Chamber.

Mr. HARRIS: Again I ask: what are the churches prepared to do? A great number of organisations are all talk and no action. Will the subject of drug abuse be investigated by a committee, and then, like pollution, be forgotten? For the sake of the youth of Queensland let someone in a responsible position make available, as quickly as possible, facilities for the full treatment of drug addicts.

It has been said repeatedly that medicos are to blame for many people becoming drug addicts. Irrespective of the type of drug, I venture to say that doctors would not prescribe it simply to keep patients out of their surgeries; it would be on the basis of easing pain or helping them. If drugs are available because there is insufficient police strength to prevent robberies of pharmacies throughout the State, that again is Government responsibility. We should provide enough police to protect the property of pharmacists.

In conclusion, I earnestly request that something be done quickly for the youth of our State.

Dr. CRAWFORD (Wavell) (3.11 p.m.): There are three facets of this subject that I believe should be considered at this time. First, there is the objective legislation that we are discussing today; secondly, there is the specific problem of drugs themselves and their misuse in our modern society; and thirdly, we must consider the facilities offering for the treatment of drug addicts not only in Queensland but in other parts of Australia and the world.

We have very little to be proud of in Australia—or anywhere else—in the treatment of drug addicts. Tremendous research work

has to be carried out in this field. The whole subject must be examined in depth and the extent of the problem so documented that we know exactly with what we have to cope. It is useless to say that the problem does not yet exist here, or that it may only arise next year or at some other time. If we are to cope with it adequately, irrespective of legislation—I do not deny that we need legislation with teeth in it—we have to consider where we will treat these people, how we will treat them, and who is to be responsible for doing so.

It is the habit of Governments to ignore a problem rather than accept it and deal with it in the necessary depth. We need many more acute psychiatric beds in Queensland, and much more extensive facilities for treating alcoholics and other people who require such a service. This service must bear the burden of accepting the drug addict and providing the treatment. The legislation will deal with some aspects of these matters, but it is essential that all our citizens are made aware of the need to provide the necessary facilities. Whatever may be said in this place, or any other place in our land, will not help one iota unless these facilities are provided.

Treatment programmes have been promulgated in various parts of the world. I intend to deal with some aspects of those programmes and correlate them with the problem as it can be seen in various parts of our civilised society. Treatment programmes in other parts of Australia have been modelled on the principle of medical management to voluntary patients. But they have failed in the past because of the attitude of the drug-dependent person towards his own illness.

A commitment to gaol or any other institution for a year or less appears to have no lasting beneficial effect. Longer periods may result in some benefit, but one would decry and deplore a tendency to treat any drug addict, as such, as a criminal; this is irrespective of the fact that he may well have become involved in criminal activities during the progress of his career when he was attempting to obtain either money for drugs or drugs themselves.

The ideal management programme suggested in Australia for the majority of drug dependents who fail to respond to voluntary treatment would seem to involve, first of all, compulsion to motivate the individual towards rehabilitation and to maintain him in treatment, and secondly, to promote management and therapeutic programmes in sufficient depth and, as I remarked before, with adequate facilities. It is no use, for example, leaving this to the Police Department and the Drug Squad, however capable or efficient they may be. They are unable to initiate treatment for which they have no facilities and which, with all due respect to them, is not within their province.

According to a recent publication, heroin addiction has become a major problem in London. Representative numbers of heroin addicts were examined. All of them were being prescribed heroin legally by medical people in that city. Of 111 of them, a sample number were selected. They were interviewed between March and November 1969. Of them, 76 per cent. were men and 24 per cent. were women. The mean age of these heroin addicts was 25 years. Eighty-four per cent. of them reported that, in the month before interview, they used drugs other than those prescribed for them by the clinic, and 89 per cent. regularly used unsterile injection techniques. I repeat that these people were under the control of medical authorities in London, on an out-patient basis, with all the facilities of London available to them.

Thirty-four per cent. of these addicts reported criminal activities, other than those covered by the Drug Acts, during the three months before interview, 51 per cent. had at some time or other been given treatment in an attempt to promote withdrawal from drugs and 36 per cent. had at some time been given hospital treatment for physical complications associated with drug use. The most frequent complications reported were abscesses from the use of non-sterile injection equipment.

It is also a fact that a heroin addict is very unlikely ever to respond to treatment on a permanent basis. World figures indicate that only about 1 per cent. to 2 per cent. of them are ever actually rehabilitated and become normal members of society again. So this is a major problem.

If the present tendencies in Australia continue, irrespective of the fact that it is statistically correct at the moment in Queensland that most drug addicts, so-called, are addicted to barbiturates, within a very short time indeed we will have a full-blown heroin-addiction problem here, just as there is in London. Over recent years, general drug surveys have been carried out in other parts of Australia. One was carried out in New South Wales between 1965 and 1969. In all, 2,182 drug offenders were identified and listed, and various facets and aspects of their addiction were investigated. Nearly all of them had been seen by the Drug Squad, and most had been seen by probation officers and child-welfare officers. Of this number, just under 400 had used marijuana only, and a further 130 had used only the hallucinogens, which include LSD. Since 1966, there had been a rapidly increasing frequency in the abuse of these latter drugs by intravenous injection, and this increase in frequency was particularly noticeable in the 14 to 20 years age group. Among persons who were known to have used narcotics regularly, only four apparent rehabilitations were discovered. If that figure does not indicate that we in Queensland need to provide the facilities necessary to treat drug addicts now, not in 1975 or at some other time, I shall be very surprised indeed.

Of over 2,000 addicts in New South Wales within the last three or four years, relatively few offenders had used one drug only. Although many of them had their particular drug of choice, their stated desire for a new experience had resulted in their having imbibed or injected any drug to which they had access. Of that number of just over 2,000, 968 were looked at in greater detail, and it is claimed that 106, or 11 per cent., were rehabilitated. When that is considered with the other figures it seems that those who have been officially rehabilitated are still in the situation where they will relapse. By the end of 1969—again I remind the Committee that I am referring to New South Wales—27 had died from an overdose, usually injected. The majority were aged 20 years and under, and they gave as their reason for the initial abuse of drugs their desire for pleasurable experiences or "kicks". We are therefore not in a situation in which we can look with complacency at New York or any other part of the world and say, "What is happening there is not happening here". It is happening here, and it will continue to happen.

Although the New South Wales figures for drug dependence among the young appear to be small in comparison with the death and injury rate among young drivers in the same age group, this problem is accelerating at such a rate that, by extrapolation, by 1974 they should present numerically a problem or social situation that is equally serious. The young will always experiment because they are young, and, although they might exercise more self control in their choice of pleasurable experience if they were told the truth, namely, that nobody knows the reasons why drugs lead to dependence in the first place, or why addiction is more likely or occurs more quickly in some than in others, it is known that they become addicted at a much faster rate than has ever been observed in the use of alcohol.

Drug addicts are said to be sociopaths. If this is the case, treatment directed towards the awakening or reawakening of the social instinct is very clearly indicated now. The basis of addiction has been the subject of research throughout the world. One of the major efforts was carried out recently in Canada, where it was concluded that the addiction-prone person has a specific psychological predisposition. He is inadequate, passive and neurotic, and the various drugs help him to cope with the situation in life in which he finds himself. The ideology of addiction, if we knew the exact cause of it, would determine the form of treatment applied. If anxiety was the problem, psychotherapy might help, whereas, if the addict is a psychopath, punishment should be excluded since it is ineffective in such cases.

It is also vitally important that one should consider the stress that occurs when withdrawal from the addictive substance is attempted. Only a person who in himself

can make a strong cognitive connection between the absence of the opiates and the withdrawal of stress will become an addict. If he cannot do so, he will not become an addict. This would apply to people receiving morphia for therapeutic reasons. They do not become addicts, but they do not consciously relate morphia and the withdrawal stress. That particular supposition has enabled some success to be achieved in experimental work, and there is an analogy with alcohol in the same context.

Community control with scare tactics have recently been condemned in the Press in this country. I understand that the authorities in America believe that they did not adopt sufficient scare tactics in the early stages of the problem as it applied throughout the U.S.A. Although scare-tactic-type programmes may run a high risk of stimulating interest towards experimentation with drugs, stressing, as they do, elements of the risk-excitement, clandestine activity, and involvement in an anti-authority culture, it is a risk that I think must be taken to some degree. If applied to other facets of our life such as sex education, a similar argument falls down, because we have been told over the years that unless we educate our young sufficiently—and I believe this to be true—we only allow them to experiment in ignorance. Therefore, one finds that there is great difficulty involved in deciding education levels to apply.

Films, of course, must be used with great care and only under ideal conditions in which a discussion can occur afterwards with people who know something about the subject, and it is very important to the youth of the nation that they should be told the truth under all circumstances. They have a tendency to say to adults, "How do you know that is so?" If the adult says, "I believe it to be so" and cannot produce some form of evidence, experimental or otherwise, young people will not believe it. Therefore, an education programme geared with the highest possible motives and the greatest possible efficiency is needed in the community at this time.

In various parts of the world, action has been taken that is helping to some degree. For example, a report from Great Britain told us that in a town called Ipswich—not the Ipswich in this State—the doctors decided that something should be done about amphetamines. They met together and arranged a public meeting. Having contacted the chemists and others in the area, they banned amphetamines. As a result, these drugs were no longer stocked on the shelves of chemist shops in that city and, therefore, were not available for people to obtain legally, or illegally by breaking into the shops. It is important for us to look upon that little effort with a degree of approval as the type of action that could be taken in our own community.

Mr. Tooth: You would know that amphetamines are prohibited in Queensland.

Dr. CRAWFORD: I am well aware of that.

I should like to refer briefly to LSD, which was used originally by psychiatrists in the United States of America. The food and drug authorities in that country go to great lengths in trying to keep drugs under control—they probably go to greater lengths than any other health authority in the world—but because psychiatrists used LSD, and because some wretched film star was able to "skite" in his circle of friends about the marvellous experiences he was having, the whole process of using LSD began.

Two or three points are important. First, one dose of LSD—one solitary dose—can ruin a brain permanently. It is not in any way comparable with a cigarette, which, in years gone by, could be smoked with impunity by a youngster. Secondly, it is very important for people to know that a person who has had even one dose of LSD can continue having further "trips" throughout his lifetime because of the brain damage that has occurred. Of course, the use of LSD is now banned in civilised communities. Under no circumstances can any action which involves the use of LSD be condoned by anybody.

Various people throughout the world who should know better urge, simply because of expediency, that the use of marijuana be legalised. They suggest, "It is no worse than this; it is no worse than that". Such an attitude must be utterly condemned. I have been distressed by what has been said by various organisations in the community, including the Young Labour organisation, and also by one of my medical colleagues in the Federal Parliament, Dr. Cass, in the matter of legalizing marijuana. I will discuss this drug and other matters related to the legislation during the second reading.

(Time expired.)

Mr. CASEY (Mackay) (3.31 p.m.): Any debate on the Health Act is important because the health and well-being of the people of the State are all important. Compared with many other countries, Australia, I believe, has reasonably healthy people. In the Minister's introduction he mentioned many things relative to the health and welfare of the sick and infirm in this State. I should like to refer briefly to some provisions of the Health Act that I believe are being administered to the detriment of many country people. I feel that many country people are being adversely affected by existing Government policy.

I ask the Minister to take definite steps at this stage to extend to at least one of the northern provincial cities, as a pilot scheme, the new type of assistance being given to aged persons in their homes in the metropolitan area, and in saying that I realise that not all portions of the metropolitan area are as yet being catered for. I ask him to get things under way as quickly as possible so that country people, too, can be given this type of assistance.

I am greatly concerned about the problem facing people in the country who are referred to a specialist practising outside their area. I know that the department does give some assistance.

Mr. Tooth: This comes under the Hospitals Act.

Mr. CASEY: I know that portion of it comes under the Hospitals Act, but a great deal of what I want to say relates to sections of the Health Act. Many of the patients who come to Brisbane for treatment are not hospitalised. They come to Brisbane to consult specialists in a particular field who are not available in their own area. Of course, they do not all come to Brisbane when they are referred to a specialist. Many of them are sent to specialists in the major provincial cities. A patient may have to travel anything up to 1,000 miles to see a specialist. I know that the department does give financial assistance, but it applies a very stringent means test.

When a general practitioner considers it necessary to refer his patient to a specialist in another area, the only thought of the patient, distraught because of his illness, or perhaps a distraught relative who is looking after the patient's interests, is to get there as quickly as possible. They have in mind only the fact that something must be done and that the required treatment is not available in their area. People want to get treatment for their loved ones as quickly as possible, and consequently bypass the normal channels they should follow. This is not entirely their own fault. Their minds are completely occupied with the sickness of the person concerned and at that stage they are not able to handle their affairs adequately.

Quite often this situation involves the administration of the Health Department, the member of Parliament for the area, and even the Minister, in lengthy correspondence. On many occasions the department has been very good and has gone back a considerable time in order to assist people who really needed help and support. However, I believe that members of the medical profession and those in charge of hospital administration in the various areas, together with those administering the Health Acts, should be constantly reminded of the correct manner in which patients or relatives should go about obtaining passes or other Government assistance in order to visit a specialist. This is a vital matter and I believe it should be kept prominently in mind at all times.

Many of these people who take immediate steps and pay out their own money, even though they come within the department's means test for eligibility for assistance, do not realise that the amount they have expended on such travel is not allowed as a taxation deduction by the Federal Government. They do not get much sympathy from the State Government either, because this morning the Premier, in answer to a

question I asked, deliberately tried to evade the issue by accusing me and other hon. members of not knowing the difference between State and Commonwealth authority in this matter. Through you, Mr. Wharton, I remind the Premier that he has a full and direct responsibility to ensure that the people of this State receive their proper tax concessions, or are taxed by the Commonwealth in a proper manner.

The fact that they are required to spend considerable sums of money to reach a centre where they can receive specialist medical treatment should be of great concern to him and he should not consider he has fulfilled his duty merely because last year, after having been approached by a northern organisation in this matter, he wrote a letter to the Commonwealth Government suggesting that this was a good idea. That is virtually what he suggested this morning. I think it is a matter he should be raising strongly at the Premiers' Conferences. The Premier, as leader of this State, has a constitutional responsibility to ensure that the financial interests of the people of the State are dealt with correctly by the Commonwealth, and the fact that these people do not receive a taxation concession for health-travel expenditure is something that I believe he as head of the State is completely wrong in ignoring. It is his responsibility to take the matter up strongly at the next Premiers' Conference. It does not affect the majority of people in this or any other State.

Mr. B. Wood: "The Bulletin" said that he is a man who does not say much in Canberra.

Mr. CASEY: That is probably correct. He said this morning that he wrote a letter to the Prime Minister asking that the question be considered by the Commonwealth authorities. He should be thumping on the Prime Minister's door and insisting on a fair deal for the people of Queensland, but instead he is subjecting himself to the whims of the Federal Government.

Mr. B. Wood: You don't fight your case as weakly as that.

Mr. CASEY: I can assure hon. members that I am not fobbed off by the type of puny reply that was given by the Premier this morning in his attempt to discredit other members of the Opposition and me. The Premier should fight strongly on this issue, and it is disgraceful that he is not prepared to do so.

Mr. Ahern: What has this got to do with the Bill?

Mr. CASEY: It has a lot to do with the Bill, and with the welfare of the people of Queensland. I am surprised at the hon. member for Landsborough, who is a Country Party member, claiming that it has nothing to do with the Bill. Country people are forced to pay very high charges for adequate medical treatment.

Many hon. members have spoken about drug-taking. The Minister himself has said that people who become drug victims will be sent to places where they can receive specialist care and treatment. I doubt very much whether a means test will be applied to those people. I should imagine that they will be grabbed and whipped away as quickly as possible to the various institutions where they will receive treatment. It is a pity that country people who suffer from heart complaints cannot similarly be assisted in receiving treatment and care.

The Minister has referred to the standard of food and the checking by inspectors of food varieties. I am not quite sure whether that type of checking is carried out at present; I do not think it can be, because the standard of foods leaves a lot to be desired. I have in mind particularly the so-called ham sandwiches and ham rolls that can be purchased in cafeterias. In fact, all they contain is a piece of ham delight, which is so thin that it would take 30 square feet to make up 1 lb. The ham delight is added to a little bit of lettuce and a lot of juice and then placed in a bread roll, which is sold at an exorbitant price. By no means can that so-called ham roll be regarded as wholesome food. A higher standard should be insisted upon in the sale of that type of food-stuff.

As a country member, Mr. Wharton, you are very concerned about fruit-growing. I, too, am concerned about the low standard of fruit that is sold to consumers in country areas. Large quantities of fruit are kept in cold storage for a considerable time, with the result that after it is purchased it deteriorates quickly. This matter should be examined very closely.

I am not quite sure whether the Bill refers to canned foods; however, I wish to complain about the large quantity of juice that is found in tins of food. Tins of apricots, peaches and pineapple contain so much juice that if they were tipped out into the sink over half the contents would run away.

Mr. Tooth: It is the responsibility of the Health Department to see that whatever is contained in cans is of good quality.

Mr. CASEY: I am glad the Minister has confirmed my belief that he has a certain responsibility in this matter. Another food-stuff that causes concern is iced confectionery on sticks, which kiddies seem to enjoy. Their standard is very low, and I think that over the years the manufacturers have engaged in the practice of watering them down considerably. I strongly suspect that in many cases artificial sweeteners are used, which could be suspect under the new regulations covering cyclamates and other sweeteners. Their use should be strictly controlled.

Mr. Ahern: This has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. CASEY: I remind the hon. member that it has a lot to do with the standard of food. I believe he is getting married in a few weeks. When he has children of his

own he will be very concerned about the standard of the ice-blocks he buys for his children.

Some provisions of the Bill relate to prostitution. I admit that I know very little about that other than the classic example of the present state in Queensland—in its prostitution by the present Country-Liberal Government.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (3.46 p.m.): The Government, the Minister and the State are paying the penalty for ignoring my warning of some years ago when I spoke about drug abuse in Queensland. I can look up the reference in "Hansard" if anyone disputes my statement. On that occasion I met with a rebuff from a former Minister in control of police, who said there was no such things as a drug problem in Queensland. At that time Government members were sticking their heads in the sand, but now the Government is making a semblance of an attempt to deal with what has become a state of horror in Queensland relative to the abuse of drugs. However, the Government is not dealing with the problem properly.

On 15 July, 1964, President Johnson of the U.S.A., in setting up an institute to deal with the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, laid down three headings under which it could work in the drug world. The first related to the destruction of the illegal traffic in drugs, the second to the prevention of drug abuse, and the third to the cure and rehabilitation of victims of the drug traffic.

I certainly believe that the State is entitled to be harsh and punitive with those who deal in, or peddle, drugs. They are despicable animals not worthy of favourable consideration by any authority. They should serve long, constructive terms in prison. They are prepared to fatten on the dying bodies of victims who have become addicts, and will take the last 10c from them knowing that they are virtually murdering them at a time when they cannot control themselves. With the sole intention and ambition of acquiring wealth, they make illicit gains at the expense of unfortunate sick people whose mental, moral and physical fibres have been totally destroyed. I have no argument in defence of them.

Any of these people who are properly proven guilty should serve a long, hard term of imprisonment. Society does not want them. However, I do not agree with the hon. member for Townsville South, who claimed that they should be whipped, bare, as in the old mid-Victorian, barbaric days which happily, I hope, we have long since forgotten. That is no method of treatment for a prisoner. It serves no purpose other than to satisfy the blood lust and the criminal intent of those warders who used to delight in using the lash. No-one in this modern, civilised world would want to revert to those pagan days, which the hon. member for Townsville South espouses.

Mr. Wright: You can understand why the hon. member wants that.

Mr. BENNETT: I can well understand why. He accused me of having a "red" arm. I understand that his new name is "V.W." because of the position in which he keeps his brains.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: Would you repeat that?

Mr. BENNETT: He is known as "V.W." because of the position in which he keeps his brains.

Mr. W. D. Hewitt: That is very subtle.

Mr. BENNETT: If the hon. member is so mentally obtuse, I shall think of him as a Mark II V.W. As the hon. member for Barcoo prompts me, the whole of the Government is addicted to the practice of self-abuse.

In spite of what we think of these awful, despicable people who peddle drugs, they are entitled to a fair trial. They can be dealt with in a severe fashion only after they have been proven guilty according to the concepts and principles of our jurisprudence, in keeping with the onus of proof. Therefore, the Minister's decision to accept the recommendation and advice of the Queensland Bar Association on the issue of jurisdiction is very commendable. His originally expressed intention to be constant with the decision of his counterparts in other States would have given summary jurisdiction to magistrates to impose penalties of up to 10 years' imprisonment and fines of many thousands of dollars.

I am glad the Minister saw fit to reconsider his decision in this respect and that he will give these alleged offenders the opportunity of trial by jury in a court qualified to deal with matters of grave importance which involve serious crime and heavy penalty. It is only after a man is convicted that he should be dealt with in any harsh fashion at all. Up till then, he is entitled to the right enjoyed by any other citizen, that is, the right of trial by jury.

Because the Minister has agreed to that proposal, I do not wish to tarry too long on the principle of trial by jury. Suffice it to say that I hope public men meeting throughout Australia, and parliamentarians in particular, cease to entertain any prospect of divesting our criminal law of its treasured principles by severing the silver and golden threads that have been woven through it over the centuries, merely to meet a temporary situation of horror or emergency because of the revolting nature of the crime.

I hope that those principles in our law will be preserved. A good Government, with an efficient Police Force that has capable investigators, will be able to acquire and accumulate the necessary evidence to secure a conviction in keeping with the standard of proof, without having to whittle away the fundamentals of British justice that have preserved our democratic instrumentalities over the centuries. We will reach the point of no return if we continue to exclude from

our legislation, certain fundamental protective principles, and we will rear a generation that believes in totalitarianism and comes to the conclusion that because a man is suspected he must be guilty and therefore is not given a fair trial.

The present Minister does not have this tendency. As a matter of fact, he has been good enough to listen to advice in this regard. However, the tendency of many Ministers in other Governments in this country has been to whittle away the fundamental principles of law, and this should cease. We are rearing minority sections in the community which are resentful and rebellious simply because those treasured, traditional principles are being whittled away.

Quite frankly, as one who treasures the fundamentals of democratic instrumentalities and who advocated as a purist in law the preservation of those principles, I go on record as saying that if things get too bad I, too, will become an advocate of totalitarianism. Instead of playing with democracy and its finer principles and following totalitarian concepts in certain aspects, while masquerading as a democracy, we should cut out the hypocrisy and the artificiality and act as a democracy in the true sense of the term, with all the concepts of British jurisprudence, or else have a totalitarian State and not pretend and feign in relation to our laws.

In spite of what the Minister says, I believe that this State does not make adequate provision for the medical and psychiatric treatment of drug offenders. Even if a person is believed by the court to be sick and in need of psychiatric treatment, the only means by which he can be given such treatment is a sentence to a term of imprisonment, and the best that a judge can do is recommend that psychiatric treatment be given during imprisonment.

In order to prove my point, I quote the case of one of my clients, Johannides. Charged with a very serious offence, he was found not guilty on the major charge and was convicted on an alternative count. It was manifestly clear to the court that he badly needed psychiatric treatment. He was a man of middle-age who had led a good and decent life, who had reared a happy family, and who had a loving wife whom, because of his sickness, he attacked. He had been a good citizen and had worked well throughout his life, and there was nothing adverse in his character. He was not a criminal.

The Judge was Mr. Justice Kneipp, one of the northern judges who was presiding temporarily in Brisbane, and he explored all avenues in an attempt to have psychiatric treatment provided for this man without sending him to gaol. I, too, did my best to assist. The laws of this State are such that the judge said, following the taking of evidence and examination of the necessary legislation, that the only thing he could do was sentence this man to gaol, with

the hope and recommendation that the gaol authorities would send him to Wacol for psychiatric treatment.

A Dr. Conomos, from the Wacol psychiatric centre, gave evidence that Johannides could not effectively be treated unless he was given a gaol sentence. If he went to Wacol voluntarily, he could leave voluntarily. In spite of the urgency for psychiatric treatment that Dr. Conomos spoke about in his evidence, this man was left for almost two months, pining away at Boggo Road, worrying about his wife and family. Eventually he was transferred to Wacol, where I hope he is getting satisfactory psychiatric treatment. He says that he has never taken drugs in his life. As a matter of fact, he now says that he is weighed down by the drugs that he is being given. I hope he does not become an addict as a result of the psychiatric treatment he is getting. I have not had a chance to get to Wacol to see him, but I have been approached on his behalf by his wife, who says that her husband, whilst improving in some respects, seems in many ways to be "sozzled". Of course, she did not use that word, but that is the impression I gained from what I was told. Apparently his physical strength is being whittled away. I suppose he has been kept under sedation, which is one way of treating a man who has a nervous disorder, and in that condition he does not give much trouble. But what good is that doing him? However, we hope that he will eventually be released.

The point I am making is that such a person cannot get treatment, whether it be good, bad or indifferent, when he really needs it. A person brought before a court cannot be given treatment unless he is sent to gaol. Let no-one query this. Not only did I explore the law at that time in the interests of my client but Mr. Justice Kneipp did likewise and came to the conclusion that the only thing he could do in the interests of that man was to send him to gaol. Although he did not want to impose a gaol sentence, he had to do so to obtain treatment for him.

I now want to speak on behalf of those found in possession of drugs. They, too, are sick men. In fact, their sickness is probably greater than that of alcoholics. One frequently reads in the Press of personalities being found in possession of drugs. Only recently a well-known person in a southern State—to avoid any embarrassment to him, I shall not mention his name—was again convicted of being in possession of drugs. Obviously, these people are in possession of drugs for only one purpose. They are addicts, and fines, penalties and imprisonment do not help them one iota. They are sick people and something should be done to treat them effectively. And if we write into the legislation mandatory treatment, it should be proper treatment.

The philosophy we have inherited from England of putting people in dungeons and prisons is old-hat. If we are to treat drug addicts properly and adequately, we must do more for them than is being done now. There is a feeling in society that even drunks should not be put in the watch-house but should be otherwise dealt with, and I agree with that suggestion. Their sickness is more difficult for them than is the drug addict's. They should be placed somewhere without the embarrassment of having to go to court.

I am not very happy about the charge "being in possession of drugs". Quite frankly, it gives unscrupulous police—I admit they are in the minority—an opportunity of "getting square" with someone towards whom they may be maliciously disposed. I regret having again to refer to a case that I have mentioned quite often in the past, but I must raise certain points in order to prove what happens and what abuse creeps in when a Government whittles away, as the present Government is doing, the treasured barriers of justice.

In my opinion, the Drug Squad should not have the right to enter premises without a warrant. They can get a warrant within five minutes if they need one. As I have said in other debates, on one occasion police entered certain premises in Gladstone Road. I will admit that it was occupied by "hoons" who warranted police attention, but the police did not need to abuse their authority. Members of the Vice Squad visited those premises. The people occupying it said, "Have you got a warrant?" and the police said, "No, but we are in the Drug Squad for the next half-hour", and they forcibly entered the premises and searched them.

I do not believe in giving an unscrupulous policeman or any other unscrupulous person the opportunity of trespassing on the decencies of our law because of the exigencies of a situation. As I said earlier, it takes only five or 10 minutes to get a warrant, if one is "fair dinkum" about it. If a policeman is not lazy, lethargic, and dull, he will obtain one and get his evidence, and he will be able to prove that he got it in a proper and bona fide way.

Mr. Armstrong: In the vast, sparsely populated areas, where would you get a warrant in five minutes?

Mr. BENNETT: What a ridiculous innuendo the hon. member makes! I gave him credit for being a very intelligent man from the North. Is he suggesting that in the vast Outback one cannot get—

Mr. Armstrong: I am not talking about the Outback.

Mr. BENNETT: What is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. Armstrong: You know as well as I do that there are plenty of towns where it would be impossible to get a warrant.

Mr. BENNETT: Any city with a reasonably large population is infested with justices of the peace. The hon. member should not try to tell me that there are not more justices of the peace than police in any particular town or district.

Mr. Armstrong: They aren't all sitting on posts waiting to issue warrants.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course they are. That is one of their obligations.

Mr. Armstrong: I am surprised that you should make such a statement. I would expect you to know better.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Wharton): Order!

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member is only displaying his ignorance when he tries to castigate me in this field. I have frequently appeared in court on the question of warrants. In fact, if he looks, the hon. member will see a Supreme Court authority in the field of warrants with my name on it. He should stick to speaking about sugar-cane.

If there is not a justice of the peace in a place, one certainly will not see a policeman for several hundred miles. At a conservative estimate, I should say that there are 50 justices of the peace to each policeman in the State. Therefore, any policeman who said he could not find a justice of the peace to issue him with a warrant to enable him to inspect certain premises would not be telling the truth. Irrespective of what I think of some members of the Police Force in Queensland, I do not think that any policeman, right down to the most junior in rank, would argue that he could not get the services of a justice of the peace if he required them.

Mr. Armstrong: In five minutes?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, in five minutes, and in any town. Within a radius of 200 yards of any police station in the State one would find at least five J.Ps. Certainly it could not be argued that not one could be found.

Mr. Armstrong: In some places you wouldn't.

Mr. BENNETT: I should like to know where. If there are no people, no J.Ps. and no premises, what premises are there to be searched for drugs? Does the hon. member suggest that a search for drugs should be made in his cane paddock or somewhere like that, where there are no people and no homes?

Mr. Armstrong: That is just the sort of place to search. I think you had better sit down before you divulge your ignorance.

Mr. BENNETT: The hon. member is saying that as it is impossible to find a J.P., and because there are no citizens and no police officers, a magic wand will be waved to enable anyone who looks to see that certain drug-producing plants are being grown on the banks of Coopers Creek.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (4.6 p.m.): I had not intended to participate in the debate but because of the seriousness of the matter and the illusions of some hon. members opposite I feel it incumbent on me to make a few very brief comments.

I have been fortunate enough to live in an environment in which there have been so few drug problems that, until a short time ago, I did not realise the seriousness of the situation.

The Minister said that until quite recently we did not have a local problem with drugs. For that reason we have not previously assessed the potential effects of drug abuse upon our society. I was amazed last night to read in "Magazine Research" that 7.6 per cent. of university students have had some experience with drugs.

Mr. O'Donnell: They will try anything once.

Mr. MULLER: I realise that. Statements made during the debate indicate that many students who start taking drugs for an experience or for "kicks" continue with drugs until they reach a state of physical devastation which would disturb any serious-minded person.

On a Saturday evening two or three weeks ago I watched an A.B.C. television programme. I was rather surprised to learn the number of people who have moved into the Kuranda area. I know that the hon. member for Mulgrave is very disturbed about the problem. Because of the effects of drug abuse all hon. members should go along with the Minister in any legislation he may see fit to introduce in an effort to curb it.

I know that some people say, "Marijuana is only a soft drug." The hon. member for Townsville South spoke about the way a person can develop a tolerance to one type of drug, and before he realises it he becomes completely "hooked" on a harder drug. There are two aspects to it, as mentioned by the hon. member for Wavell. Many people are "hooked" on drugs unwittingly. Perhaps the starting point was a prescription written by a member of the medical profession. Of course, I realise that it is not the intention of the medical man that the person for whom he prescribes should become a drug addict. However, with a "repeat" prescription a patient can obtain a double quantity of the prescribed drug in a very short space of time and, unfortunately, something that was never intended can be triggered off.

Mr. O'Donnell: Don't you think that those who become addicted as a result of obtaining prescriptions need medical advice? Don't you think they are unstable?

Mr. MULLER: That is possibly so, but as I do not know how that difficult situation can be overcome, I propose to refrain from making comment about people who obtain drugs on prescription.

As I interpret the Minister's intention from his introduction of the Bill, it is to deal with people who are misusing drugs, handling them or selling them illegally. Marijuana has been mentioned on several occasions. I am one of those unfortunate—or perhaps fortunate—people who would not be able to recognise this plant. Therefore, I can say that I know very little about it.

Mr. O'Donnell: So long as you haven't got it growing on your farm.

Mr. MULLER: I would not know; it is a possibility.

Mr. Bennett: Is it that long since you have been on your farm?

Mr. MULLER: I have been down here for some time, looking at and listening to the hon. member. It is a distinct possibility that this plant is growing in a certain locality. I am informed by an authority in which I place great reliance that people who cultivate this plant sow the seeds not on their own property, but in jungles and large forestry reserves that are not visited frequently, where the plants can grow and flourish. The venture can become an industry without other people being fully aware of it. I have no idea what measures the Minister proposes in the Bill, but I would say that such a situation must be covered.

I respect the views of the hon. member for South Brisbane. As a member of the legal fraternity, he always suggests that people should be proved guilty before any action is taken. We all agree, but where do we start in a situation such as this? Reference has been made to obtaining warrants for arrest and so on. If a man is found in a jungle with this plant in his possession, a local J.P., a legal officer or a police officer may not be available at the time he is caught. I believe it is absolutely essential for the police to be able to take immediate action to bring that person to justice and, at a later stage, establish their case.

As has been mentioned earlier, fines would possibly not be the answer when dealing with these people. This may be so, but what can be done? I know that in the type of industry they are promoting they have access to considerable amounts of finance and I suggest that, whatever else is written into this Bill, it should provide that people who are proved guilty should receive the maximum penalty. It is unfortunate that many young people try drugs for "kicks" or experience. Perhaps they could be dealt with somewhat leniently, but it may be in their interest to take severe action against those who supply the drugs.

If when we know the dimensions of the problem, it is seen that we have not the necessary hospital or medical facilities for their treatment, the Minister will, I am sure, make an assessment of the situation and take action to overcome it. I trust that the Government, in a sincere and honest

attempt to deal with a most serious situation, will do whatever is in its power to discourage people who desire to experiment with something new as well as those uncouth characters who are making an industry out of this vice, at the expense of unfortunates whose lives may be destroyed by drugs. I maintain that these latter persons should suffer the full rigour of the law. If it were possible to impose a penalty of life imprisonment it should be imposed. I make no apology for that comment.

I commend the Minister on his introduction of the Bill. It is one of great merit, although I realise that the Minister will face enormous difficulties initially in its administration. A serious situation has arisen and it calls for immediate action. I hope that in taking that action the Minister is successful.

Mr. P. WOOD (Toowoomba East) (4.16 p.m.): To many of us the most puzzling feature of the growing problem of drug-taking is the "why" of it. We may take all preventive measures and punitive action against illegal drug-taking, but we will achieve very little unless we understand why people illegally use drugs and counter the reasons, whatever they are. There is not any one clearly definable and evident reason, but many. They are confusing, sometimes conflicting, and often they are unrecognised. I am sure that many of them are simply unknown.

One factor should be recognised, and it is the one that I wish to deal with this afternoon. Today our young people are, from the time of infancy, educated into the habit of drug-taking. I am not referring to the illegal use of drugs but to the massive consumption by all age groups of an enormous variety of drugs, ranging from harmless medicines that are sold over shop counters to the more potent drugs that are available only on doctors' prescriptions. A great number of youngsters learn very quickly that if they have an ache or a pain they should run for an aspirin or for some form of pill. We are in some sort of "pill" society, and we are now educated to the belief that there is a chemical solution to any problem, unpleasantness or discomfort. The older generation has bitterly condemned the younger generation for drug abuse, yet the younger generation has learnt its habits from the elders. Adults stuff into themselves a multitude of pills, drops and mixtures for the slightest symptom, but then turn round and condemn the younger generation for the abuse of drugs, albeit of a different nature.

In the Medical Journal of Australia of 29 August, 1970, Professor F. A. Whitlock refers to the problem of barbiturate dependence, especially among the middle-aged. It is a serious problem, and I mention it to indicate the extent to which young people are being educated by their elders, their parents, in the use of medication and drugs. It is now an accepted pattern of behaviour that if a person feels a little bit uncomfortable, even for a brief period of

time, he immediately takes something to restore a feeling of comfort. Little thought is given to the reasons for the discomfort or distress or to what might be a more effective means of dealing with it. I believe that a number of patients who visit medical practitioners feel that they are not receiving adequate care unless their doctor scribbles out a prescription. Have we become so drug-orientated that we must always require the services of a pharmaceutical chemist immediately after we have seen our doctor? In many instances I believe this is so.

A recent survey that was conducted in the South showed that there is a tremendous over-use of prescription-only drugs. Perhaps the fault lies partly with the medical profession, but I believe that it lies principally with the public, who see the use of drugs as their right and therefore demand them from their doctors. In this way, in many instances, we can see the use of drugs being taught to our young people. If we look at the the parent-child relationship, we see that young people are taught how to react to feelings of discomfort or pain. If a two-year old falls down and runs to his mother, he may learn from her that he is able to tolerate discomfort and keep right on functioning, and that the pain will go away because of the normal healing process. I should hope that might be the reaction but, unfortunately, this is not always the case, and he is taught otherwise.

Some measure of responsibility must be taken in this whole problem by national advertisers. Too many advertisements, which, after all, are a form of education—desirable or undesirable; especially television advertisements—depict life as being carefree and swinging, free of problems and offering infinite pleasure.

The sort of television advertising to which I refer shows life in a completely unreal manner. Young people are encouraged to desire adult behaviour when they are still in their childhood. It is not to be wondered that when they turn from television they find themselves groping for some form of reality. On the other hand, television could accomplish a great deal by positive, education programmes, but we do not see such programmes.

At another level a youngster may see his parents make use of alcohol and cigarettes, whether in moderation or not. I do not think there can be any argument about these becoming drugs of dependence in one way or another. They are another way of educating the younger generation in drug use. If the older generation wants to stop illegal use of drugs by the younger generation, it must first look to its own drug habits and examples. We must not educate our children to become members of the present generation of pill-takers, however accidental and unwanted that form of education is. I believe that this accidental form of education is one aspect of the "why" of drug abuse

by young people. It is just one aspect—there are many others—but it is one aspect that is often overlooked. We can adopt education programmes of a positive nature to counter drug abuse, but such programmes also have their hazards. The problem of drug-taking has been so highlighted in recent years that it may have become the "in thing" and gained some sort of band-wagon effect.

A poll taken as recently as December last year in the United States showed that four college students in 10 have tried marijuana. The most alarming feature of that Gallup poll was that the figures I have cited were double the rate of those for the previous year. Perhaps even more disturbing is the fact that they were eight times as high as the figures in 1967. In that sample survey, 17 per cent. of those interviewed indicated that they used the drug I mentioned once a week. In addition, one student in six admitted the use of amphetamines or stimulants. Those figures are disturbing. While they relate to the United States of America, in so many respects U.S. patterns of life subsequently become evident in Australia. I do not welcome that situation, but it exists.

We should not consider that a similar situation could not arise in Australia. We must adopt a form of drug education. I mentioned previously an accidental form of education which is having exactly the wrong effect. We can adopt positive education programmes. Education in drug abuse need not be restricted to the illegal use of drugs. We can instil in children at an early age that self-medication with anything is potentially harmful. Children should not be taking aspirin for any real or imagined pain without proper supervision and on proper advice. They must be taught to combat this concept of self-medication and of solving problems by taking drugs.

Education is vital in terms of passing accurate, adequate knowledge of what drugs are and are not, what the hazards of drugs are, and why they become hazards. Schools could work this into a variety of curricula, not treating the problem as simply one subject of drug abuse. Science courses could teach how drugs are developed. Social science and history courses could teach about advertising, gullibility, fads, peer-group pressures and so on which are related in one way or another. I do not believe that we should use scare propaganda. Nor should we use exaggerated forms of argument. The younger generation is well able to analyse arguments and come to considered judgments.

I have discussed only one aspect of a problem which has very many aspects. I have referred to the way our young people are educated, however accidentally and however unfortunately, into an acceptance of drugs and medication as a manner of living. I have suggested that we should revise our own standards in this respect. In itself, this is an enormous problem which I will not

debate now. I have suggested that we should institute education programmes, which should be calm, reasoned approaches to the problem before it becomes too great.

Mr. WRIGHT (Rockhampton South) (4.27 p.m.): The proposals before the Committee are of tremendous importance to this State and its people. They are long overdue. It is rather coincidental that almost a year ago to this very day I raised with the Premier, by way of a question in this Chamber, the matter of drug use and abuse. Irrespective of the apparent widespread abuse of drugs at that time—271 persons had been convicted of drug use and many hundreds had been treated for drug abuse at that time—we were informed that extensive inquiries indicated that there did not appear to be any serious or immediate problem with drug abuse in this State.

The Premier tended to say on that occasion that the position was not as bad here as it was in other States. While this might be a ready answer, I feel that it was in no way indicative of the problem that existed here. At that time articles appeared in the local Press in which the Minister for Health stated that he was concerned at the drug problem. Now, however, judging by the introduction of this Bill, it seems that more people than the Minister are concerned. It is obvious that there is now a recognised drug problem in Queensland and it is hoped that the means of combating this problem is contained in the Bill.

It should be pointed out that in the past two years something like a 750 per cent. increase has occurred in drug use and abuse in this State. As one detective concerned with the drug problem here said, if one person is an addict, we have a problem. Judging by the remarks of other hon. members today, this is certainly a problem in Queensland.

It is important to realise that the drug problem here is not only centred on those young people who use marijuana, LSD, or drugs of that type. Far too often this is the only thought we have. When we think of the drug problem, we think only of a "hippie" with long hair, smoking marijuana in some "beat-out" place in which he lives or on some beach with a gang of young fellows passing round the "grass". This is not the position, as I shall outline later in my speech, although admittedly these young people are a problem.

I am pleased that the Bill does not intend to legalise the use of marijuana. It has been said today on a number of occasions that certain young groups advocate the legalising of its use. Let us be quite clear on this point: one of the greatest advocates of the use of marijuana is the Young Liberal Movement. They base their argument on the claim that this drug is no worse than alcohol. I stress that this is not a valid argument.

It is time that all who advocate liberalisation of the laws against the use of drugs such as marijuana realised that alcohol is still the major drug of addiction in this country. Figures given in reply to a question that I asked in this Chamber show that 5 per cent. of all males, and 1 per cent. of all females, over the age of 15 are problem drinkers. Furthermore, statistics presented in reply to other questions I have asked show that in 1969-70, 1,532 people were treated for alcoholism in this State. I therefore believe that it is wrong to say that legislation should be introduced to legalise the use of marijuana because it is no worse than alcohol. Yet these Young Liberals—not in the sense of politics but in ideology—want to make the smoking of marijuana legal in Queensland, and thus duplicate the sickness caused in an already sick society because some people cannot control their drinking habits.

It is all very well to speak of freedoms. There is a growing trend today for the liberalisation of everything, be it homosexuality, abortion, pornography, drug use, and many other things. This is one matter on which I find myself agreeing with the hon. member for Townsville South. Although I have little in common with him and I want nothing to do with him, I agree that it is time we started building our characters on a far better foundation than simply the freedom of the individual. It is good for people to have freedom, but let us keep in mind that man must lose his freedom of action when, by expressing his freedom, he encroaches on the freedom of others.

This is a very important point. If freedom were taken to the nth degree, it would not be long before people began driving cars on the wrong side of the road. There would be no defamation or libel, because people would merely be exercising their right to say whatever they liked about others. There would soon be slavery and murder because some persons were exercising their freedom to do what they liked to others.

There are, of course, many freedoms that must be protected. There must be the right to demonstrate against hard, harsh and bad laws. There must be the right to strike against poor working conditions, low wages, and industrial laws that discriminate against the wage-earners. But no-one should have a licence to do what he pleases if others suffer by his actions.

The illegal use of drugs is a burden, both social and economic, on the community. The action of a person in taking drugs does nothing positive for the community in which he lives, and the "positive advantage" theme should be the basis of any legislation. From booklets in the Parliamentary Library, I found that there is no therapeutic value at all to be obtained from the use of marijuana. I found that it is simply a stepping-stone to the use of hard drugs. I therefore challenge those, both inside and outside this Chamber, who advocate the legalising of marijuana and similar drugs to tell the people what positive benefits would flow

from such action. What positive benefits would flow not only to the individual but to the community as a whole?

I am one of those who have a lot of faith in the young people of today. They have had, if I may use this expression, many cans tipped on them by the hon. member for Townsville South, and by some members of the Government, over their right to demonstrate, and over other things they have done. But I still have a lot of faith in them, and I believe that time will mould them into good members of the community. However, it is important that we should set the example for them. As the hon. member for Toowoomba West said, today's parents are not always doing that. In other words, we are building a drug-taking society. I therefore feel that one of the most important ways of combating drug usage is to educate parents. Although it is important that education programmes against drugs be undertaken in schools, the emphasis should be on the education of parents. After all, they are the ones who—supposedly, anyway—set the example and mould the characters of their children.

On that point, I wish to read a short extract from a booklet produced by the Government of New South Wales entitled "Drug Abuse in N.S.W. Facts for Parents". It states, very simply—

"The increase in abuse of drugs by young people is a matter of concern to all parents. The Police and Customs authorities are doing all in their power to prevent illegal traffic in drugs, but the most effective approach to controlling the serious threat of drug abuse to our young people is by means of education."

Throughout the booklet the need to educate not only young persons but also parents is emphasised. It is a very interesting booklet, and all hon. members should take time to read it.

In another section, the following conversation between a health officer and a young person convicted of a drug charge is set out—

"How long have you had the habit, son?"

"About 18 months."

"How did you get started?"

"Just a party; got offered a few pills, starters. I liked the idea of it, you know, being turned on and all that."

"What about the hard stuff?"

"After a couple of months I was eating them twenty at a time—always hung up. Then I got the offer of hard-gear, mainlining; I had nothing to lose. This guy showed me how; it was great for a while . . . but now it's just not funny any more."

"How old are you, lad?"

"Eighteen in 3 months."

"Do your parents know about your habit?"

"You must be joking . . ."

I believe that this situation exists not only in New South Wales but in Queensland as well, and other instances set out in the booklet show further that parents know nothing about the habits of young people who take drugs. Cases are mentioned in which a young person has been on drugs for up to three or four years before his parents have even become aware of the problem.

I stress that one of the methods of combating drug-taking must surely be to educate parents, especially in recognising the signs of the drug-user. I outlined some of the signs in a speech that I made in October last year. More are set out in this booklet, and I wish to bring them to the attention of all hon. members. They are—

"Has he become secretive about his friends or activities?"

"Mixed up in some private business?"

"Making mysterious appointments, meeting people?"

"Suddenly disappearing?"

"Making unlikely excuses for all of this?"

"Is he using words like: pot, joint, stick, acid, roach, meths, barbs, hearts, starters, stoppers, white mice, speed balls, goof balls, spike, skin pop, fix, mainline, pill heat, pot head, acid head, freak-out, gear . . . ?"

"Does he think most people are 'squares'?"

"Does he make fun of the standards of people he used to like?"

"Is he slipping at school?"

"Does he no longer enjoy the sports he used to enjoy?"

"Has he given up clubs and social life?"

And it goes on and on. These are all signs of which parents should be aware if they are to combat the use of drugs by young people.

I emphasise again that the education programme should not simply be in schools. It has been found in some States in the U.S.A. that some education programmes in schools have not combated the problem; in fact, they have aggravated it. I suggest, therefore, that greater attention should be given to making parents aware of the problem.

As I said before, young drug-users are not the only ones who pose problems in the area of drug abuse. On 13 October last year I raised the matter of the problem that existed—it still exists—in the abuse of barbiturates and analgesics by people in the 35 to 50-year age group. As was mentioned by the Minister, Professor F. A. Whitlock conducted a survey on this matter in Brisbane. He was assisted by two colleagues, Dr. M. J. Abrahams and Dr. V. Armstrong of the Department of Psychological Medicine at the University of Queensland, and it is not only the fact that a

survey was carried out but, in addition, it is the findings that resulted that we should keep in mind.

Dr. Whitlock and his colleagues emphasised the need for stricter Government control of prescriptions by doctors and the accumulation of barbiturates by patients, and some of the statistics presented clearly show the extent of the problem. In the year ended 30 June, 1969, there were 482 barbiturate prescriptions per 1,000 of population in Australia; yet the proportion in Queensland was 613 prescriptions per 1,000. In addition, in 1968 Queensland public hospitals alone prescribed 13,500,000 barbiturate tablets and capsules. One might well ask: Are the people of Queensland more prone to sickness, or is the scheme worth investigating?

This problem seems to be particularly grave among old people. It is important that we consider it not only from the danger point of view but also from the point of view of cost. I do not deny the right of any person to drugs for medical needs, but the present prescription method is open to abuse. I have had personal experience of this recently. I was called to what we now refer to as a "nursing home" to assist the housekeeper with an old man who was under the influence of drugs. As the effects of the drug wore off, he became very abusive. He pushed the house attendants around and abused the other residents. At that point I was asked to assist. Eventually we had to get the man removed by the police. The unfortunate thing was that the police could do nothing other than take him to the police station, remove his belongings and tell him to go somewhere else other than the nursing home. They could not give him treatment; they did not fine him and they eventually let him go.

That occurred on the Saturday. On the Monday I went to a chemist shop to raise the matter with the chemist and I found the same fellow sitting there. He had nowhere else to go; he had no treatment available to him. Some people might say, "Why didn't you let him stay at the nursing home?" Had he stayed there he would have been continually abusing the other residents. He had been stealing drugs from them. While he was there he was always in a drunken-like stupor. It was a serious problem.

We decided to investigate the matter fully. When we went to the nursing home we found that he had accumulated 20 or 30 bottles of drugs and medicinal concoctions. They all bore a recent date. It was apparent that this man had gone to several doctors and several chemists. When we checked it out we found that four or five different doctors had prescribed the same drugs and four or five different chemists had dispensed the same drugs.

We contacted the various doctors to make them aware of what had happened. One doctor told the housekeeper, who telephoned

him, "Now you've got this off your chest, I suppose you'll be happy". One chemist told me to mind my so-and-so business, that he would decide whom he would dispense drugs to.

We have no control over chemists; we have no control over doctors. I believe that what is necessary is some type of card system. A friend of mine who is a chemist in Rockhampton keeps a list of every prescription dispensed, and every patient. He can tell at a glance exactly what a patient has had. I believe that greater checks should be made by the authorities who administer the free medical scheme to learn what doctors are prescribing certain drugs. Checks should be made on the regularity of requests for drugs by certain patients. It is very important to do that. It is important to have some type of check on patients, and it is equally important, once patients have been found out, that they be prevented from continuing their practice. We cannot prevent a patient of that type going to any doctor he may want to; we cannot stop him going to any chemist he may want to. He can go to six or seven chemists if he wants to. If what he is doing is unlawful, he does it anyway. When a person is found to be engaged in this practice his name should be circulated to every doctor and every chemist. He should be told that he can go to only one chemist and one doctor. That way, we would be able to control it.

We must also tighten up on agents who collect drugs for people. In the case I have referred to, a taxi-driver collected most of the drugs. The patient was an old man who could not get around all the chemist shops, so he arranged for a taxi-driver to get the drugs for him. The taxi-driver was overheard to say on the very day that the patient was "turfed out" of the nursing home, "Don't worry, I've hidden it in the usual place".

I feel that this matter should be looked at very carefully. Although the Minister has previously told me that the prescription problem does not come within his purview, I believe that the matter should be investigated and the methods of prescribing and dispensing drugs reviewed. It should not be left to the doctors and the chemists. I therefore ask the Minister to investigate the present methods of prescribing and dispensing drugs and that such an investigation be made immediately.

Mr. KAUS (Hawthorne) (4.44 p.m.): I rise to commend the Minister for Health for introducing the Bill. It covers several subjects including two matters of major importance and three matters of lesser importance.

I agree with the proposal to substitute the term "nursing home" for the homes now referred to as "convalescent homes".

This amendment is in conformity with action taken in other States, where these institutions are called "nursing homes". Undoubtedly, it has been discussed at the

Health Ministers' Conference. I agree with the action the Minister has taken because some confusion resulted from the use of different names.

Health inspectors will in future be called health surveyors. These people do a wonderful job for the Health Department. I notice that health surveyors, as they will be called in future, can, if they so desire or if any breach is reported to them, enter any shop and buy any goods off the shelf. I should like the Minister to inform me of what the position would be if a health surveyor's request to purchase any particular goods was refused.

I congratulate the Minister on the repeal of section 60 dealing with prostitution. I have listened closely to most speakers this afternoon and I do not think anyone touched on this subject.

Mr. R. E. Moore: We are not experts on it.

Mr. KAUS: I am not an expert on prostitution or anything of that kind, but I was wondering if drugs and prostitution might not go hand in hand, with drugs being sold at places where prostitution is being practised illegally in certain districts. This amendment is also in conformity with the provision in other States. The provisions in this part of the Act are a duplication, with minor differences, of the provisions in the Criminal Code and the Vagrants, Gaming and Other Offences Act. The repeal of this section would probably be in accordance with recommendations from the conferences of Attorneys-General relative to exploitation of the prostitution of others, such recommendations being preceded by discussions in 1968 of the Health Committee in Canberra. A meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General agreed to a request from the Commonwealth that the States amend their laws to allow the Commonwealth to accede to a decision of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others. I agree with the Minister's action in repealing this section of the Act.

I should like now to deal with the question of drugs. Much publicity has been given to drugs that, it is claimed, are used in Queensland. No doubt, marijuana is grown freely in this State. We hear and read reports that people in North Queensland are living in small communities and growing and using this plant. I would not know what the plant looks like and I have never seen anybody on drugs, but I should like to congratulate the Health Council on the booklet it produced on 24 March, 1970, entitled, "Drugs—the Queensland Scene". In its introduction the booklet describes parents as being naive and claims that they fail to give their children a sound education in the dangers associated with illegal drugs. The booklet is a worth-while publication, provided it is read and understood by both parents and children.

In October, 1970, in raising a matter of public interest, I spoke about advertising of drugs that can be purchased over the counter. I referred to a television programme entitled "No Roses for Michael". Although the film was not a very pleasant one, nevertheless it was educational and showed how young people can become "hooked" on drugs. It dealt with a young man who had tried LSD and then progressed through other drugs to heroin, which killed him.

On 22 February, 1971, "The Courier-Mail", under the headline "M.H.R. sees no harm in drug", reported Dr. Moses Cass, a Federal Labour Member, as saying that he would like to see the drug marijuana legalised. He also said that marijuana was pretty harmless and made people feel good.

The report goes on—

"Dr. Cass was speaking at an annual conference of the Young Labor Association in the Melbourne Trades Hall. All delegates were under 25."

Mr. R. E. Moore: What a shameful thing to say!

Mr. KAUS: It is a shame that people in his position should give that type of advice to young people. Speaking as a member of the medical profession and a politician, he says he would like to see marijuana legalised. He went on—

"Marijuana is better than sedatives doctors give people to help them deal with their problems. It is really a very benign sedative. I don't see why young people using it should be criticised by cigarette-smoking and alcohol-swilling older people."

Two days later, Mr. Chipp, the Federal Minister for Customs and Excise, criticised Dr. Cass in this way—

"While the Government was spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on an educational programme to dissuade children from taking marijuana, statements by Dr. Cass at the week-end would have left hundreds of thousands of young children wondering whether they 'should have a go.'"

A Labour senator, in making submissions to the Senate committee of inquiry, also recommended that marijuana should be legalised. I wonder whether he has seen the damage that can be caused by that drug.

Mr. Davis: Who is this?

Mr. KAUS: Senator Georges. Drug-taking is a world-wide problem, but, fortunately it is not as serious in Australia as it is in America or the United Kingdom.

In "The Courier-Mail" of Monday, 22 February, 1971, under the headline "U.S. schools face huge drug taking", the following report appears—

"Security guards patrolling school corridors, students 'freaked out' on drugs in

classrooms and school bashing-robberies are just a few of the problems faced by schools in the United States."

That was stated by a Pakenham, Melbourne, high-school teacher who had just returned from a nine month's overseas trip on a 1970 Churchill Scholarship to study school systems in the United States, Canada and England. He also said—

"The drug problem in U.S. schools was fantastic.

"I have no doubt I am in the right country as far as raising children is concerned."

I certainly agree with him. He is reported later as stating—

"The pattern is that drug taking is more prevalent in the better class neighbourhoods. As you walk through a school you could see kids slumped over their desks and they were completely turned off."

He also said—

"Some schools had said that about two-thirds of their students dabbled with drugs."

That is shocking, and I should hate to see that situation here. Under this legislation imposing heavy penalties for drug-trafficking, I am sure we will nip the problem in the bud, although I know that it is difficult to catch anybody in the act of trafficking or passing drugs. A heavy responsibility rests on the members of our Police Force, officers of the Customs and Excise Department and any others who are involved in drug control.

I now wish to refer to the situation in England relative to the taking of LSD. The hon. member for Wavell said that in America, when LSD was first used, many psychiatrists prescribed it for patients. I wonder how many patients were in that way started on the road to harder drugs. We will probably never know what effect such prescriptions by psychiatrists created and, no doubt, quite a few of the psychiatrists themselves became "hooked". The hon. member for Wavell also pointed out that LSD was removed from the list of prescribed drugs.

Later in my speech I will refer to a pamphlet that came into my possession on my overseas trip last year, dealing with the effects of certain drugs.

The "Telegraph" of 13 January, 1971, contained an article headed, "Taking of LSD spreads in UK". It reads, in part—

"A new wave of LSD drug-taking is spreading through Britain, a national daily newspaper has claimed.

"It said statistics were impossible to produce because only the takers who came to harm became known.

"But interviews with psychiatrists, social workers, police and users throughout the country all produced the same picture.

"There was a dramatic rise everywhere during the last few months contrasting sharply with the earlier situation when the use of LSD seemed to be dying out."

The important point to remember is that people who use marijuana may "spike" it with LSD when they attend parties, and the poor, unfortunate, unsuspecting victim will not know anything about it until it is too late, when he is "hooked".

The article continued—

"Also there was a strong suspicion of cannabis smokers escalating to LSD.

"The paper said that although, with any drug, it was impossible to attribute increased misuse to any single cause, easy availability seemed to be playing a great part."

Our problem is tracking the suppliers—catching those who traffic in drugs. Trafficking will be curbed following the introduction of these new penalties and the greater co-operation between the authorities involved.

As I said earlier, I shall indicate some of the effects of marijuana. I have here a booklet entitled, "A Summary for Parents and Students on the Subject of Teenage Drug Abuse". It deals, as it says, in outline form with some of the dangerous drugs, narcotics and volatile chemicals that are being used by some of our teenagers and sub-teenagers, and also briefly details some of the harm that results. It was issued by John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii.

According to this booklet, marijuana is "another mind altering hallucinogen." Evidently it is called "grass", "pot", "weed" and "tea". As leaf, stem, or seed, it can be smoked, drunk as tea, or eaten as pudding or cake. As resin, gum or powder (hashish) it can be smoked, chewed or sniffed, and is 9 to 10 times stronger. As a synthetic liquid, it is injected, and may be deadly. The article then reads—

"The intoxicant in Marijuana is T.H.C. . . . a very unpredictable and hazardous intoxicant.

"Hashish . . . may cause harm to both mind and body.

"The intoxicant from any Marijuana product, T.H.C., disorganizes and confuses the central nervous system.

"The user may have:

Dilated pupils (large and wide). Dark glasses are often worn to hide the dilation, blood shot condition and also to combat the excessive sensitivity to light caused by Marijuana.

A craving for sweet foods and liquids.

Emotional extremes—emotional lows (drowsiness to depression) and emotional highs (anxiety to hysteria).

A very talkative disposition and will be more prone to suggestions.

Marijuana products will have a heavy sweet musty odor. This odor remains and clings to the user, his clothing and surroundings. Incense is often used to cover the odor.

A frequent user will most generally have a lower or decreasing self achievement level.

"Smoking marijuana or 'blowing pot'—
 Releases inhibitions;
 Impairs judgment—creates illusions;
 Causes distortions—distance and time;
 Alters reality—making temporary
 escape from personal 'hang-ups' (prob-
 lems) easy."

Mr. Sherrington: It sounds as though the boundaries committee has been affected by it.

Mr. KAUS: No doubt the hon. member has a few "hang-ups".

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): Order! The hon. member for Salisbury will have his turn in a few moments.

Mr. KAUS: It continues—
 "Can create psychological dependence
 (mentally hooked);
 Can cause chronic bronchitis;
 Creates a 'sense of well being' even
 in the face of 'real danger'."
 (Time expired.)

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (5.5 p.m.): I entered the Chamber in a perfectly healthy condition. However, after listening to the long and dreary dissertation of the hon. member for Hawthorne, I feel positively ill. When the hon. member was detailing the various effects of marijuana, I thought he was referring to the Electoral Redistribution Commission. It seems that one of the reasons why electoral redistribution legislation has not reached the House is that the Government committees are probably affected by it.

Mr. Wright: Is that what they call "Cabinet Ministers' phobia"?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have not heard it described in that way. As the Young Liberals have said, Ministers remind them of ventriloquists' dummies—all talk and no guts.

In my humble opinion, the Government's approach to the question of drugs is archaic, primitive, uninformed and—what is probably worse—unenlightened. This afternoon we have heard from the hon. member for Hawthorne a dissertation on whether we should legalise the use of drugs.

Mr. Kaus: The A.L.P. thinks so.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member referred to Dr. Moss Cass, but he omitted to say that many members of the Liberal Party hold views similar to his. If the hon. member wants to say that everyone in the Labour Party subscribes to the views of some of its members, he must associate himself with the attitude of the former Federal member for Adelaide, Mr. Jones, who was quite an embarrassment to his party. If the hon. member wants to blanket, as it were, all members of the A.L.P. with specific statements emanating from A.L.P. members,

which they have a right to make, he must similarly blanket himself with all the stupidities that have come from Liberal members over the years.

The point I want to stress is that we are not debating whether we should legalise the use of marijuana or any other drug. That is not the purpose of this legislation. The proposed Bill sets out what the Government is going to do about those who peddle drugs, and those who use them. The legislation merely sets out how the Minister for Health intends to deal with this problem in Queensland.

I repeat that, from my point of view, the Government's attitude is archaic, primitive, uninformed and unenlightened.

Mr. Tooth: You will deal with the matter under those four headings?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: No, I shall deal with it as I want to—and I shall do it far more competently than the Minister, with the aid of all his advisers, has been able to.

Mr. Tooth: I would be interested to hear you deal with it under those four headings.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I shall deal with it; don't worry about that. I might say to the Minister, too, that I shall not be acting as he acted towards pressmen—dressing up the Baillie Henderson Hospital and then inviting them to go and have a look at it. We are all awake to what the Minister did. There was too long a space of time between the raising of the matter and the issuing of the invitation to the Press. I shall be speaking on this subject before the Chamber as I feel and from my heart.

The time is long past when attempts should have been made to discover and analyse the reasons why people turn to drugs.

Mr. Tooth: That is right. They have been doing that all over the world.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: We should be looking at why people take drugs. We should be endeavouring to ascertain whether drug-taking is engendered by a feeling of hopelessness, and whether it is engendered in young people because the world faces the awful prospect of atomic warfare. We should be investigating whether it is engendered by a feeling of hopelessness because of poverty in the community. It is well known that 600,000 families in the Commonwealth live either in, or verging on, poverty. We should attempt to discover whether it is brought about by a general hopelessness at the failure of the Government and older people to understand the psychology of the younger generation.

As the Minister has been asking me to answer him, let me say this: I have no brief, nor have I any compassion, for any person who preys on and makes money out of the weaknesses of the unfortunates in the community. I have no brief for them whatsoever. The Minister should justify his

action in combating the problem by merely gaoling the unfortunate victim who falls prey to drugs.

Mr. Tooth: That is quite untrue; you should know that.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: It is very easy to say it is untrue. I have referred cases to the hon. gentleman, and he knows that I have referred cases to the Minister for Justice. We should be analysing what turns people away from wanting to enjoy the zest of healthy living and what causes them to be drawn to the use of drugs. Why, in a spirit of hopelessness, do they turn to drugs as a form of alleviation of their problems?

While I have no compassion whatever for people who prey on the unfortunates in the community, I have a great deal of compassion for those who become victims of circumstances. I believe that many people who resort to the use of drugs do so only because of circumstances that arise from time to time. If the Minister feels satisfied that he has an enlightened or informed approach to the problem of drug addiction, let him try to go through the mental torment that must have been suffered some months ago by the parents who realised that their children were taking drugs.

I recall very vividly the Press reports of the day. Let the Minister go through the mental agony and the torments of those parents when confronted with the fact that their children were drug-users and they had to decide whether or not they would report them to the police.

Can the Minister tell me that any parents confronted with the knowledge that their children are drug-users can find any comfort or consolation in the fact that the only avenue available to them is to report their children to the police, knowing full well that subsequently they will be gaoled for the offence? Yet the Minister has the colossal audacity and temerity to say that this approach to the drug problem is neither uninformed nor unenlightened.

Mr. Tooth: You are talking the greatest rot imaginable. I will deal with that point.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I hope you will.

Mr. Tooth: I certainly will. All you can do is make a noise.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The Minister didn't make a bad effort in that direction the other day when the hon. member for Nudgee had him pinned "dead to rights". The Minister can answer this.

Mr. Tooth: I certainly will.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: He cannot answer for the feelings of those people who were confronted with this situation.

Mr. Tooth: I am not responsible for the feelings of all the citizens of this State. I am certainly not responsible for your feelings.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Of course not. Quite frankly, I am never worried about any criticism that comes from the Government benches, particularly the Minister for Health, whom I have never held in high regard.

Mr. Tooth: It is a mutual attitude.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have witnessed that. The hon. gentleman has heard me make irrefutable points in this Chamber in speeches on many subjects. Only the other night, when we had the Premier "dead to rights" over a division, he said we were being petty; he wanted to deny the Opposition the right to divide the Committee on a question.

Mr. Tooth: I have never said anything like that.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Some of the Ministers—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): Order!

Mr. SHERRINGTON:—on the front bench—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SHERRINGTON:—have the audacity—

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member for Salisbury resume his seat. I have said before that if the hon. member provokes the Chair I will deal with him. I warn him not to. I warn the Minister also. I will not allow the Chamber to become a chaotic brawl between parties while I am in the Chair.

Mr. Melloy: Throw the Minister out, then.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want any advice from the hon. member for Nudgee. This is the last time I will warn him.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Ramsden. I think you will agree that I am one of the most orderly members in this Chamber and that I am always prepared to obey the directions of the Chair, but I trust you will bring the necessary restraint to bear on the Minister.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! I have just warned the Minister and I have warned the hon. member. This is the second warning for the hon. member.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: And I will accept it. After all, the Minister was trying to "pinch" a part of my speech. His whole attitude indicates that he has no compassion in these matters. Quite frankly, I believe that the plight of the drug-taker in the community, just as is the plight of the alcoholic—the chronic drunk—is not being catered for, nor does our present system do anything to help these people.

Night after night, when Parliament sits until 10 o'clock, I am sickened to see the police paddy-wagon picking up unfortunate drunks and taking them to the watch-house. Some of them build up 5,000 convictions, and the same thing goes on daily. They are the poor unfortunates of our community who desperately need understanding and help.

Adverting to what I said about the Government's attitude being primitive, what has our system done for the unfortunate victims of alcohol, such as I have outlined? It has done nothing whatever for these unfortunate people who, day after day and week after week, appear in the courts and are convicted of drunkenness. They are picked up in paddy-wagons and dumped in the watch-house, when what they obviously need is help. They are sick people. They need not only compassion but help. We should be looking to the day when we regard the drug-taker and the chronic drinker as sick people who, instead of being sentenced to prison terms, should be given treatment.

The Minister will probably excuse his attitude by saying, "We confine them to prison, where they receive certain psychiatric treatment." The mere psychological effect on these people of being confined to prison does nothing to help them in the state they are in. When we look to modern clinics as the answer, when we look to judicial or voluntary committal to modern clinics which can analyse the causes of drug-taking and alcoholism in these people, that will be the day we advance towards curing them or helping them in their problem.

It is fair to say that if we could rehabilitate 10 per cent. of these unfortunates we would be doing a good job, but I cannot see that the action of committing a person to prison for this type of offence will imbue him with any desire to be rehabilitated. I repeat: when we have clinics to which these people can be sent, when they can be taken to such clinics without the publicity and degradation of being sentenced for drug-taking or drinking, when we can analyse them in such clinics and prescribe not only psychiatric but appropriate therapeutic treatment to help them in their plight, that will be the day we will have achieved something.

I have no hesitation in telling the Minister that he can argue as much as he wants to; I will answer him. I am saying what I believe. I have not seen any evidence to suggest that the present system, let alone this Bill, will do anything to assist materially in the rehabilitation of those unfortunate people who become victims of drugs.

Mr. MILLER (Ithaca) (5.20 p.m.): It is appropriate that our legislation is being updated at a time when, in Queensland, a certain group of people are endeavouring to have marijuana legally recognised. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat said that the Bill does not deal with marijuana. I point out to him that if

that group of people are able to convince a sufficient number of citizens that marijuana should be legally recognised, this dangerous drug will be used even to a greater extent than it is at present. Therefore, we must counter any suggestion that marijuana should be legally recognised in this State.

The community is showing growing concern about the ever-increasing number of people who are dependent upon drugs. I have no doubt that a person who is dependent on drugs subjects his body to actual harm and is therefore a grave danger not only to himself but to society as well. The hon. member for Barcoo made a valid point in his interjection during the speech of the hon. member for Landsborough when he said he thought that, with all the publicity that has been given to drug-taking, young people should be aware of the dangers of the habit. I agree with the hon. member for Barcoo that young people should be aware of the dangers. However, I point out that, on the one hand, doctor, psychologists and psychiatrists tell young people that drugs are dangerous, yet, on the other hand, Dr. Cass and a few other people tell them—

Mr. O'Donnell: Some of those doctors are drug addicts, too, you know.

Mr. MILLER: I agree with the hon. member; however, let me deal with the young people. They are confronted by two points of view. On the one hand, they are told by doctors and psychiatrists not to touch drugs because they are dangerous, and, on the other hand, they are told by Dr. Cass that marijuana is better than sedatives prescribed by doctors for their patients.

Mr. O'Donnell: That is not my opinion.

Mr. MILLER: I am glad to hear it. I have said that the hon. member hit the nail on the head when he claimed that young people should be able to understand the problems associated with drug-taking. Surely Dr. Cass and people like him are making it very hard for young people to be aware of the dangers associated with drug-taking. The seed of doubt is being sown in the minds of our young people.

The hon. member for Salisbury asked, "What causes young people to take drugs?" We could do well to consider the introduction of legislation to prohibit people like Dr. Cass from making such statements. What would be the result if Dr. Cass told people that they could murder? I have no doubt that he would be charged with an offence. Surely his encouragement of young people to take drugs is also a serious crime.

Mr. P. Wood: What you have said about the legalisation of marijuana is correct, but there is a lot of confusion.

Mr. MILLER: There is a good deal of confusion. Dr. Cass happens to be the one whose statements have appeared in the Press, and I am referring to him.

Mr. P. Wood: You could quote other people who support his view.

Mr. MILLER: Unfortunately, other people are not reported in the Press. The disciples of the drug-taking cult are causing grave concern to the community. As well, they are causing untold damage among the young people of this State. It is as imperative for society to be protected from the dangers inherent in drug abuse as it is for the drug-dependent person to be protected from his self-destructive drives.

While we have irresponsible actions of this Labour member, we also have other doctors and other responsible people who are totally against drugs, especially marijuana. Mr. Miros, a highly respected Greek bio-chemist, who has been experimenting with chronic drug users, reported in 1967 that marijuana was another form of hashish, weaker to be certain, but with a similar propensity for damaging brain, liver, eyes and the respiratory tract. Those are the findings of a very highly respected Greek bio-chemist. I find it very hard to dispute the words of a man of his standing.

Dr. Alton Ochsner, a famous New Orleans chest surgeon, is distressed by parallels he sees between today's youth who get on the marijuana band-wagon and those who enthusiastically promoted cigarettes a few years ago. He said—

"In many ways, today, the world stands in respect to marijuana where it stood in respect to tobacco 30 or 40 years ago."

He then said—

"At that time, cigarettes were supposed to enhance digestion, restore energy, expand mental capacity, comfort nerves. Today, we know better. Cigarettes are proven to be a cause of lung cancer.

"I cannot keep silent while the same sort of mistake is repeated with marijuana."

Mr. Davis: Do you think there should be a wine and cigarette tax?

Mr. MILLER: I most certainly do.

I repeat that with drugs we are now in the position we were in 30 to 40 years ago with cigarettes. I admire Dr. Ochsner for making those comments.

He then said—

"What is certain is that the burning of many types of leaves produces carcinogens, and it has been said that marijuana users in India often complain of coughs and bronchitis, symptoms which may precede cancer."

That is the type of statement being made by reputable doctors and bio-chemists. Studies have shown that most people who take drugs have a somewhat poorly organised personality to begin with. It is scientifically impossible to know absolutely what one marijuana cigarette will do. One could ruin a person's life. But we do know that marijuana

intoxication does cause a person to lose control of his mind and breaks down the moral barriers of our community. The threat of a fine or incarceration in a penal institution has never been an effective means of deterring a drug-dependent person from continuing his drug-taking activities. Nor does incarceration serve to reduce such a person's dependence on drugs.

Unlike some members I am pleased to know that more drug addicts, whether they be on soft or hard drugs, will be sent to an institution for treatment, rather than gaol, which has been used previously for drying-out periods. The only humane and enlightened course of action is to ensure that the drug-dependent person receives appropriate rehabilitating treatment. I hope there will be compulsory after-care on his release so that he may be encouraged and watched over during this very vital period when all the challenges are before him.

Mr. Davis: There are 200,000 Yanks in Vietnam on drugs, so we hear.

Mr. MILLER: If all the atrocities in Vietnam can be attributed to marijuana, it certainly should not be legalised, as quite a lot of university students in Queensland are demanding at present.

Mr. O'Donnell: I would not say a lot; it is a small minority.

Mr. MILLER: A substantial number are wanting the legalisation of marijuana.

Any person who is apprehended under the influence, or who appears to be under the influence, or who is in possession of dangerous drugs, which appear to be for his own use, should have the same status at law as persons dealt with under either the Mental Health Act or the Inebriates Institution Act of 1891. It is hoped that the Bill will allow magistrates to make allowances when prescribing penalties for persons found guilty of selling dangerous drugs, and that intent and responsibility will be taken into consideration in relation to this offence. It is unreasonable to suggest that a person who sells to known addicts enough drugs to maintain their drug-taking habits should be penalised to the same extent as a person who sells drugs in order to induce people to addiction, primarily for his own profit.

Such a distinction in intent and responsibility is universally recognised in the unlawful taking of human life and should also be recognised in cases of drug-selling offences. I believe that we should adopt the recommendation of the Brain Committee and supply drugs to the recognised drug addicts at reasonable cost. This would enable the addict to be under constant supervision, which would be invaluable for research. It would do away with the high crime rate associated with drugs and would eliminate profiteering by racketeers who prey on drug addicts.

I congratulate the Minister on the introduction of this Bill, which I support. I look forward to its being printed.

Mr. BALDWIN (Logan) (5.32 p.m.): I have said in this Chamber on many occasions that the three most important areas of Government responsibility and activity are education, public protection and health. It is the third responsibility with which we are concerned at the moment.

Many problems are being thrust upon the people, the Legislature, and the various branches of the Executive. There is an overlapping of responsibility in this problem. Because I am one of those who believe in a holist approach, I have never been a protagonist of high specialisation and compartmentalisation of knowledge, activity, or responsibility. I believe that in a society as highly complex as that of countries of the Western World, we must break through a good deal of our over-specialised outlook and our too-rigid compartmentalisation of activity and responsibility, and adopt a holist attitude to many of the problems that are facing society today.

We have before us a typical example of a department trying to solve its problems as if in itself it is an integral body, internally sovereign, and quite within its rights in passing its responsibility or the execution of its wishes on to other departments. There is much good in what the Minister said. However, regardless of which department introduces legislation containing punitive aspects, the extra responsibility and work involved is thrown onto the Police Department.

I have said before in this Chamber, when speaking of education and industrial matters, what I am now about to say relative to health. Much of the debate on the proposed Bill has turned on punishment. Whenever the Government introduces legislation that contains punitive measures, it influences, of course, the operations of the Police Department. We see in this Chamber an increasing tendency to deal with the punitive aspects of legislation. We saw that, for instance, in the recent legislation dealing with pollution. In all cases, this very unenviable aspect of the law increases the responsibilities of the Police Department, which is obviously overburdened with the task of punishing the misdoings of society.

I do not think that punitive measures will do anything at all to solve the problem. History has shown that the fear of punishment has been only slightly effective in preventing crime. When the death penalty was applied for stealing in England in the 18th century, deaths among victims of robberies increased alarmingly, as those who perpetrated the crimes ensured that there would be no witnesses to testify against them. This meant that people were killed for as little as a half-penny, and killings increased to such an extent that the law had to be amended, and the death penalty was looked at in a much more real light. I mention that as an extreme example of the punitive side of legislation.

I know that the Minister, and many other members opposite, will perhaps take as irrelevant what I am going to say next. However, I have experienced that attitude so frequently in this Chamber that I am now inured to it. If I think it right that I should say something, I say it. The whole field of drug addiction was covered by the hon. member for Wavell and, to some extent, by the hon. member for Ithaca. It appears that we should not be looking at marijuana only, but at the whole range of drugs, including alcohol and nicotine, and considering not only how to control addiction, by punishment and other methods, but how to prevent it. Although the Minister touched on some of those aspects, it is my opinion that he did not deal sufficiently with proposals to combat drug addiction. I am not criticising what he said on other aspects of the Bill, which appear to be quite worthy, progressive and desirable.

On radio and television, on theatre screens, in books, comics and literature of all types readily available to children, whose good we are supposed to have at heart, and even in so-called classics by authors of world renown, the virtues of drugs are extolled. The newspaper companies always seem to be able to sell more newspapers when the headlines deal with something destructive rather than something constructive. The newspapers are ever ready to headline the type of destruction that is caused by alcohol or other drugs. I say that advisedly because alcohol is a drug. It induces dependency as it gets a hold on people. It seems that some of the greatest efforts of well-meaning people tackling the drug problem—I include drinking and tobacco smoking in that—result in the very thing that they do not want. In a sensational manner the mass media—a great educational force—publicise happenings in the hope that the publication will have good effects but, instead, it has bad effects.

On questioning victims of drug addiction I have been told that their addiction did not stem from anything that had occurred in their homes or as the result of associating with friends who were addicts, but from seeing a film on television or the screen, from reading a book or from reading something reported in the Press. That is not the reason for the addiction in all cases, but the percentage that it applies to is too high. That suggests to me that the Press does not go deeply enough into what it publishes about drugs. It does not indicate sufficiently the after-effects of drug abuse or deal with the long drag back to normality. It does not sufficiently mention the tragedy associated with drug abuse or the feelings of the loved ones of those who become victims of drugs. The publication of such details is just as important and newsworthy as the details of an accident, or a murder, robbery or other criminal offence. The Press does not give enough follow-up to the original story by illustrating, by example, the sufferings of

the people concerned, so that what is then published has as much effect as the sensational reporting of the initial incident. That applies equally to many other areas of human frailty.

The hon. member for Townsville South said that the punishment should fit the crime. That raises a very interesting point when we are dealing with drug addiction. If we prosecute a "pot" smoker and we are going to make the punishment fit the crime, are we going to make him smoke himself to death? If we prosecute a drug pedlar, are we to burden him down with a heavy load of drugs and drive him through the streets until he dies from heart failure or physical exhaustion? To me that is just as ineffective as some of the other punishments included in the legislation.

As an after-thought the hon. member said, "Give them the lash." That is peculiarly distasteful to anybody who makes any claim to a Christian attitude or who has any belief whatever that Christian mercy, Christian wisdom and Christian sympathy should permeate all the laws of the land. I am a great believer in the basic Christian tenets and when they are missing from our laws we get to poulticing instead of removing the causes; we get to lashing instead of educating, though I admit that in some cases our attempts to educate become purely lashings of the mind because of the wrong methods adopted in the wrong environment and in the wrong way.

Mr. R. Jones: When you are considering the contributions of the hon. member for Townsville South, you have to be a bit charitable.

Mr. BALDWIN: Yes, I will swallow some of my own statements and say that I realise that he, too, is a victim of another kind of drunkenness, namely, the drunkenness of constant reaction. He needs just as much rehabilitation in his own way as drinkers and "druggers" do in theirs.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ramsden): Order! The hon. member is not in order in casting personal reflections on another hon. member.

Mr. BALDWIN: I was giving a personal opinion of what I thought of his contributions.

Mr. R. Jones interjected.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member for Cairns obviously has not heard my earlier warning, so I ask him to take heed.

Mr. BALDWIN: Mr. Ramsden, if it appeared to be an aspersion, I apologise; I did not mean it that way. I try to be charitable towards hon. members of this Chamber, as I hope they will be towards me when I make mistakes.

From what I have seen given out to the schools, I am concerned that we are not tackling the problem in the right way, but more basic than that to me is that the whole aspect of drug addiction is only a side effect of the fragmentation of society that is taking place today. I accuse this and other Governments with a similar philosophy of accelerating this process of fragmentation. It is not that they mean to; it is because they are narrow in their outlook. They represent only a portion of our society with very clearly defined goals in that society and without much thought for the welfare of the whole of society.

I am concerned about the welfare of the major section of that society—the 78 per cent. of wage and salary earners, small businessmen and small farmers, who always carry the burden and the cost of any legislation brought in by this Government. Whether it be punitive, destructive or constructive, they carry the burden. They are the fathers and the mothers of families; they are the upkeepers of the State, and I ask; what is there in this legislation that is going to ease the burden on them and their children? Nothing! Not a thing! I am sorry to have to say this. Perhaps I have not heard it all; perhaps I have misunderstood some of it. If I have, I apologise, but I cannot see it yet and I will reserve the major part of my criticism in that direction.

I know what the Minister is trying to do. He is trying to achieve a certain goal quickly. He is trying to stamp out something we all want stamped out, that is, drug addiction, but the root cause of this does not lie in this Parliament; it does not lie between the pages of a book of law; it lies in the whole inculcation of our attitudes, brought about by the total force of this Government and its legislation upon society, which is robbing children of their parents and making them failures in a profit-dominated society—a society that always tries to put the responsibility onto the individual; that tries to say that we are individuals in this society each responsible for his own good and that if we transgress it is our own fault.

Never in my life have I heard such an un-Christian, destructive philosophy expressed, and I will fight it for as long as I live, because, whether we like it or not, we are our brother's keeper. We in this Chamber are bound by oath to look into the problems that confront every section of society—not just the big monopolists, not just the lowly workers, but all. While we try to keep going in this capitalist and monopolistic structure, we have responsibility and the contract with it. Even though I will accept the structure while I am in it I will play the game according to the rules from top to bottom. However, I see no rules in this other than those for the top man, who will throw the burden of curing the problem onto the shoulders of the people who are the victims of something that they did not create.

Mr. CHINCHEN (Mt. Gravatt) (5.51 p.m.): It is obvious from the number of hon. members who have entered the debate that the problem of drug-taking looms large in the mind of the community, and I have no doubt that the extent of the problem will become greater as time goes on. I ask: why is it that at the present time the whole world is faced with this problem? The hon. member for Logan endeavoured to identify it with the system under which we are living—and perhaps in some way he is correct. I feel that there is a catalyst which has stimulated this problem.

It is interesting to examine this problem. Emphasis has been placed upon education, and surely it is better to spend money on education than on trying to find a remedy to the problem or on containing it. I am all for education, but I ask: at what level, and why, do we require education?

In my reading of literature on drugs and campus problems that arise throughout the world, I have been struck by one name that pops up repeatedly. It is associated with the development of a type of philosophy that has allowed a certain thinking relative to drugs to permeate our society, particularly the young members of it. The name is that of Herbert Marcuse. Probably his name is known to the deep readers on the Opposition benches. He has written a great deal, and is presently in semi-retirement at the University of California in San Diego. In 1941 he wrote his first important work, entitled "Reason and Revolution". Marcuse has developed a philosophy that has captured the mind of the deep readers among the young people, and these people have exerted an enormous influence on students throughout the world.

I think I can best illustrate my point by reading excerpts from a study of the literature of Marcuse by a man named Irving Kristol, as published in "Fortune" magazine. Numerous people have studied the works of Marcuse, and many of them have come up with different appreciations of it. He is a philosopher, yet his message implies a variety of meanings to different people. Always there is one message—and I shall deal with it later in my speech.

In writing about Herbert Marcuse, Kristol says—

"History is always full of surprises, but the emergence of Herbert Marcuse as the philosophical guru of the New Left must surely rank as one of the least predictable events of our disordered times . . . he is the idol of revolutionary students all over the world and a kind of intellectual counterpart of Che Guevara. He has even achieved that high plane of intellectual influence where he has thousands of enthusiastic followers who haven't read a line by him and who couldn't hope to make their own way through the dense thicket of his prose. It's all incontestably

real; but it's rather incredible, nevertheless . . . he was both a Marxist and a Hegelian."

He then says—

"With the publication of an essay titled 'Repressive Tolerance' (1965), one suddenly had the clear sense that, far from being a bit of an eccentric, Marcuse might be in a mainstream of his own. And, indeed, that essay has been the most influential by far of all his writings. The term 'repressive tolerance' has become a key-stone of the New Left's rejection of liberal democracy as a sham and a fraud."

Later, he said—

"And it has achieved its purpose, which is to provide young revolutionaries with an exercise in what Marcuse rather cutely calls 'linguistic therapy'. The object of the exercise is to attain a good conscience as one uses the freedoms one has inherited in order to trample on the liberties of others."

This man went on to write an essay on liberation. That was quite significant, because that was the stage where we found what he is trying to do, and is doing.

Later, he wrote—

"The aim of this utopian radicalism is to abolish all 'repression'—sexual as well as social—in order to produce a new kind of man and a new society, both hitherto unimagined by political philosophy. This new man will be a **sexual polymorph**, with no sense of guilt, no need for social restraints or indeed fixed social conventions of any kind, no psychic economy of scarcity that requires sacrifice or sublimation. He will have a completely new 'biology', a new 'second nature', a completely new 'infrastructure' of needs. He will not have to dream of unsatisfied longings because life itself will be a kind of daydream in which satisfaction is instant and total. Nor will he need any kind of art, because life itself will be a work of art. He will not labor, neither will he play—the two activities will be indistinguishable."

He then said—

"Our young student rebels are not blind to the tragedy and the farce of socialism, which has always foundered in its efforts to build a redeemed world with unredeemed men. Moreover, their experience with drugs has opened to them a realm of pseudo-transcendence, in which all things seem possible—in which, in the words of the rebellious French students, the imagination has seized power. Campus rebels find Marcuse so especially 'relevant' precisely to the extent that his politics is the politics of the absurd."

Throughout his writings, this man proposes that freedom itself is the important thing; that man should not be contained by any laws, by any authority, or by any social standards; that he is an entirely free being. This permits sexual freedom at one's discretion. He advocates that there should be

no hindrance in the use of drugs; that pornography should be rampant, and that social behaviour is for one's own determination.

That is the philosophy this man is preaching. He is an intellectual gentleman whose writings are read by university students. They have found that they suit their purpose—that is, self-justification. He has the ability to mind-condition people so that they feel free of all responsibility.

This man is a campus hero in the United States, Great Britain and Europe. He is a man on whom the students lean. Many of them have not read his involved, complex writing, but his story is known as a philosophy that they can accept to justify anything that they care to do in the name of freedom. His name crops up everywhere. In the United States he is the hero of the S.D.S., the body that prompted all the campus problems, which were very violent.

He is the students' hero. He is the man who started this new mainstream of thinking that has been accepted by so many intellectuals and students. It has developed radicalism but, in addition, it has developed the thought that there is nothing wrong with a person who, in our terminology, may be irresponsible. That is the basis of what is happening today.

I can well imagine that if we were to visit our own university tomorrow and speak to the radicals there, we would find that they know of this man. They may not have read his works, but they would know his name and his philosophy, and they use it to their own advantage.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.15 p.m.*]

Mr. CHINCHEN: Prior to the dinner recess I was discussing the diabolical philosophy of Herbert Marcuse, which has been accepted by many radical students and intellectuals because it suits their purpose. This is the philosophy which allows an individual adopting such a philosophy to do what he wishes, how he wishes, without any sense of guilt or conscience. I firmly believe that this started the present world-wide drug problem. It allowed people to free themselves of the normal thoughts of human beings so that they could indulge in their own self-pleasure, whatever it may be.

This makes me wonder what motivated this gentleman. There are various theories on this point. One that I think is quite plausible is that, at heart, this man is an anarchist who wishes to pull something down with no desire to rebuild what he destroys. Evidently he came to an early conclusion that the ruination of the Western world could not come about by arms. He realises now that the balance is such that this could not take place; that the ideological battle could not be won quickly enough. His thoughts meandered through what stratum of society could best be used to bring about his aims. In the ultimate, he realised that

the intellectuals and the students were the people he could use to bring about what he required. What he wanted, of course, was to break down the moral fibre of our people and so bring about the destruction of what we call "normal" society. This is extremely serious.

The reason I raise this whole question is that the emphasis is on education. However, I pose this question: what form of education can overcome a philosophy of this nature, which is acceptable to young minds—and many brilliant young minds? As we know, the people becoming involved in drugs are generally those of a high intellect. We learn from the Medical Journal of Australia that the average age of the drug offender is 22.3 years. This is the field. The danger in this is that it will create enormous problems for all countries for many years ahead, and it is a serious danger.

In the Bill, some attempt is being made to overcome this problem. We are somewhat restricted in what we can do. I am a firm believer that personal responsibility is of extreme importance and great emphasis must be placed on it. Parents must realise that they have a heavy responsibility—and so have churches and schools, as has been mentioned in this Chamber today. We cannot allow people to think that we can take care of this problem completely; we are somewhat impotent. There are certain things we can do, and are doing.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much audible conversation on my left.

Mr. CHINCHEN: To the taker of drugs and the experimenter, treatment is the answer. In my opinion, there is no question about this. Where we can place emphasis and achieve something effective is with the trafficker. It seems to be thought that there is the professional trafficker and somebody else who is not as important—the one who will give a friend one marijuana cigarette. In my opinion, one is as dangerous as the other. In fact, having 1,000 people each handing out one cigarette is possibly more dangerous than having one man handing out 1,000 cigarettes, because in the first case 1,000 people would be introduced to the drug habit. In my opinion, such a person should be treated very harshly indeed, so that everyone who traffics in drugs will know that if he is caught he will be in an extremely serious position.

There is a school of thought that minimum penalties should not be prescribed, because the offence with which a person is charged might be his first. I feel that if a person is caught trafficking in drugs, it is certainly not the first time he has done it. In speaking to a member of the Drug Squad recently, I learnt of the weeks and months of work that go into building up a case against a drug-trafficker. Laying a charge for this offence is apparently very difficult.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want to have to appeal again to hon. members on my left to please keep their voices down. I am very interested in the debate, and I am sure other members are too.

Mr. CHINCHEN: Courts are inclined to say, "Here is a young, nice-looking man. He has good parents, he has had a good upbringing, and he has been to a good school. We will give him another chance."

Mr. Houston: What do you mean by a "good" school?

Mr. CHINCHEN: I am saying that this is what could be said about him; I am not saying anything about a "good" school. Because a court takes such an attitude, that person could be let off very lightly. I feel that the courts have to play their part in dealing with this problem, and I do not think this is happening when, after weeks and months of work have gone into preparing the charge that is eventually laid against a person, the evidence is not sufficient and the court decides, "It is a fairly minor matter. It was only one cigarette." It may have been only one on that specific occasion, but what about the previous occasions?

I feel that courts must face up to their responsibilities under this legislation. I should like to think that, right at the beginning, judges view this matter seriously. We all know that under new legislation the standard is set by the judge who hears the first case, and the others then fall into line. I should like to think that the courts will take the attitude that this Parliament holds the view that all drug-trafficking is very serious. It would be of enormous assistance in stamping out the drug menace if everybody knew that all trafficking, even in one cigarette, is a very serious offence. I think this could come about if courts supported the attitude taken by Parliament on this matter.

Mr. Houston: What would you think was a fair sentence for a first offender?

Mr. CHINCHEN: I would not care to say what the length of sentence should be, but he should go to gaol.

Mr. Houston: Over one cigarette?

Mr. CHINCHEN: People who traffic in drugs make a lot of money and to a rich person a fine means nothing. I am inclined to think that anyone convicted of drug-trafficking should suffer some confinement in prison.

Mr. Houston: For a week-end, or something like that?

Mr. CHINCHEN: No, I would not say that. I think it is more serious a matter than that. I should like to think that the period was nothing less than a fortnight, as a minimum. In the case of a real professional who has made a lot of money out of drugs, he is not worthy of a fine and must go to

prison for a considerable time. This sort of treatment may help to stamp out the problem. If there is no trafficking, there is no drug-taking, and preventing trafficking would overcome the need for the remedial aspects of dealing with the problem.

Another question that exercises my mind concerns the drugs themselves. Great emphasis is placed on chemist shops. Certain procedures of locking up have to be followed, and we all know that such shops are frequently broken into. I believe that we must go further back in the line of supply. What controls operate in respect of manufacturers? They deal in tons of these materials. A chemist in Victoria, who has five or six large retail outlets, told me that these drugs are transported in such quantities that they are moved by trucks. The drugs go to wholesalers, and from wholesalers they go to other delivery outlets. Eventually, they go to chemist shops, and that is where the legislative provisions are now concentrated.

I should like to know what controls exist at the point of manufacture. Perhaps the Minister can tell us how all drugs are accounted for from that point on. The chemist I mentioned told me that he had seen large containers, holding the types of drugs we are speaking about, broken and their contents spilled on the floor. Of course, the spillage would be picked up and something would be done with it, but what sort of control exists at that point? There could be an enormous outlet from there on.

These are matters that we, the Commonwealth Government and other State Governments can look at and be responsible for. We know that we are somewhat limited in what we can do. The courts can help, the Customs authorities can help and the police can help. But I should like to think that there is some educational area we can move into. This is very important, but I just do not know how it can be done against the philosophy adopted by people who are influencing others.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (7.26 p.m.): As on many other occasions when he has introduced legislation, the Minister introduced this measure in a subtle, veiled way, giving the Committee little information. At times he spoke in dulcet tones; at other times his perfect articulation during his oration would have earned him high commendation had he been making a speech in a debating society. In any event, he conveyed scant information to the Committee. I presume that at the second-reading stage he will get down to detail and endeavour to explain just what galvanic action the Government proposes taking to cope with the serious problem of drug addiction.

I firmly believe that the Government has been very remiss in not attempting to grapple with the problem long before this. It is

now making a belated effort, one that does not reveal that the Government is fully aware of its responsibilities in this direction. I liken the Minister to a contestant in a bout at Festival Hall. At the end of round three he is groggy from the lefts and the rights of his opponent; now he sits in his corner hopelessly trying to shadow spar in the face of the Opposition.

What research has this Government carried out to find a means of overcoming the difficulty confronting so many people in the community, particularly young people? Very little indeed! It reminds me of a Government on the run or a Government under the influence. It is rattled by the many good arguments and submissions of the Opposition. It is rushing in its hallucinatory state to try to find a solution to the drug problem. Somnambulism prevails throughout the ranks of Government members. At this stage they are trying to solve the drug problem, to ease the pain that is being felt throughout the electorate.

When this Government assumed office nearly 14 years ago, the first dark clouds of the drug problem were on the horizon. Quite a few years before that, a very good film alerting people to the dangers of narcotics was distributed throughout the English-speaking world. I remember very well that in many States and countries Governments gave their imprimatur to this film in order to alert people to the dangers that lay ahead. What was the reaction in Queensland? A very poor performance not only in research and the belated introduction of this legislation but in the decimation of the State's Police Force. Does one member of the Government seriously think that the closure of police stations has helped solve this problem? Has anyone thought that the reduction in police numbers throughout the State has assisted in combating the problem? Has the extra work-load placed upon members of the Police Force assisted in solving the problem?

Mr. Bennett: It has worsened it.

Mr. HANSON: As the hon. member for South Brisbane says, it has worsened it. I am very pleased to see him here tonight. He is here because he views very seriously the problems confronting the youth of our community today. He made a wonderful speech calling on the Government to cease shadow sparring and do something more than the belated, lame-duck effort now before the Committee.

In the dying stages of a ministerial career, sparked and laced with controversy and argument, the Minister is aiming to go out with the achievement of having done something positive about the drug problem, but everybody who has seen the ballet of "Swan Lake" knows that the finale is a graceful death.

The Minister and his Government are not fooling anybody by bringing down this Bill; they do so in the hope that it will prove to be a potion for the people of Queensland and assist them to electoral success or otherwise next year. I can assure them there will be plenty of "otherwise".

We hear a considerable amount of criticism of the youth of today, but anybody who has made a detailed study of the lives of young people—there would be quite a number in this Chamber who have—must surely admit that the young people of today have about them a certain sincerity and that they revolt against sham and hypocrisy. I know that my friend and colleague the hon. member for South Brisbane would be one who has not only made a study of this matter but has assisted many young people. They want to know the truth, to speak it, to be able to live with it and to believe it. If they direct their minds in the right direction, they will find that the exact opposite of all this is the use of drugs, because it involves escapism, the direct antithesis of truth. I believe that the Christian way of life is a constant search for the truth and a delight in living life to the full. Escapism is not part and parcel of this way of life.

Only recently, I read in a very prominent publication a statement on moral issues made by the bishops of the United Kingdom, which condemns as unworthy the use of alcohol or drugs as a means of escape. When drugs are used simply for self indulgence, the problem becomes very serious. Sometimes young people see drugs as an exciting adventure but, as I said earlier, it is a refusal of the truth and an escape from reality. The real adventure is to live life as it is, not as it looks through a haze of drugs or alcohol.

The hon. member for Ithaca was vocal in his criticism of certain personalities associated with the Labour Party. I remind him that for many years New South Wales has had a Liberal Government and that there was within its ranks Dr. David Bell, who was employed as psychiatrist in charge of a certain section of Callan Park Hospital. He has said that the easy way out for the Government by punishing pushers and educating young children is too naive. He may have grounds for making that statement, although I think that, like me, other hon. members would rather see punishment inflicted on the unscrupulous people who wax fat upon the inadequacies of young persons.

I remind the hon. member for Ithaca, too, that Dr. Bell was asked by the Government of New South Wales to make certain recommendations on the drug problem. He pressed for the treatment of drug addicts and urged the New South Wales Government to embody it in its planning. He detailed certain services that could be available for the cure of drug addicts, and recommended that some form of compulsory treatment be undertaken by people who were addicted to drugs. I remind the hon. member for

Ithaca that Dr. Bell was so frustrated in his attempts to do something for drug addicts that he resigned from the New South Wales Department of Health. Instead of the hon. member for Ithaca levelling charges at a solitary member of the Labour Party, let him charge the Liberal Government of New South Wales for shunning Dr. Bell and reducing him to a state of frustration, simply because it did not have the stomach or fortitude to assist him in his work.

Mr. Bennett: That is what this Government does with Dr. Crawford; it shuns him.

Mr. HANSON: That is absolutely true; we have witnessed that in this Chamber on many occasions. Dr. Crawford is one of this State's most eminent surgeons. In fact, if I required surgical treatment I would be only too happy to have the services of the hon. member for Wavell. I have made numerous inquiries about him and ascertained that he is an outstanding surgeon and a credit to the medical profession—even though his politics might be on the nose!

I hope that the Minister will take some advice other than the advice—sometimes very good advice—given to him by his advisers (although this afternoon reflection was cast even upon the advice that they give him at times). Nevertheless, I advise members of the Government to read a book entitled "The Drug Users" by A. E. Wilder Smith, in which submissions are put forward by an eminent scientist, Dr. Shaw.

Initially the book deals with the biological and psychological effects of LSD, marijuana, hashish, the tranquillisers, the amphetamines and the morphine series of drugs. Dr. Shaw's approach to the study involves an examination of intrinsic drug properties, the nature of the person taking the drug and the setting in which it is taken. Dr. Shaw speaks of the low percentage of toxicity of LSD in normal persons, but also raises the very important question of possible chromosomal damage to future generations. I ask the Minister and his advisers to read this book and study the submissions of this eminent scientist.

I bring to the Minister's notice a very important submission made to the American Medical Association many months ago by Dr. Wesley Hall about marijuana-smoking which, incidentally, will be released in June this year. Dr. Hall predicts that when the report is released there will be a considerable lessening in the use of marijuana.

Mr. R. E. Moore: How does that tie up with Dr. Cass?

Mr. HANSON: The interjection by the hon. member causes me to hold the decided view that he is possibly on another one of his "trips".

According to Dr. Wesley Hall marijuana causes impotence and certain birth defects. At a news conference at Las Vegas not long ago he said that study would show a higher

incidence of impotence among marijuana-smoking males and an unusual number of birth defects in babies of marijuana-smoking mothers. I urge young people in their teens, young people contemplating marriage, and young people married for a number of years, to become very conscious of this report that will be available in June this year. As Australians we should be proud of our natural heritage. I urge everyone, particularly officers in the Minister's department, to take cognisance of this report and try to ensure that future Australian generations are fine, healthy people, worthy of being called Australians.

I am very unhappy indeed that the Minister, in the dying stages of his ministerial career, has played politics by trying belatedly to do something about drug abuse within the community.

Mr. Ramsden: Aren't you playing politics?

Mr. HANSON: In reply to the hon. member for Merthyr, I say that there can be no other conclusion. This problem has been with us for the 10 or 15 years the Government has been in power and what has it done about it?

Mr. Hanlon: Nothing.

Mr. HANSON: Absolutely nothing.

In a shadow-sparring attempt reminiscent of the 15th-round efforts the other day of poor Cassius Clay, who was swinging punches without knowing where they were going, the Minister indulged in hypocrisy that we had to put up with. I repeat that escapism is certainly the antithesis of what we should expect in our good way of life. When the Minister and other Government members indulge in it, we can only think that the Government is under the effects of a highly potent drug.

Dr. Hall, in speaking about marijuana said—

"We know marijuana is a dangerous drug. For instance, the report will show that a 15 or 16-year-old girl who has smoked marijuana for a few years has a much higher chance of having a baby with birth defects and mental deficiencies."

As a reminder to young men he said—

"Young men who smoked marijuana could become impotent earlier than non-marijuana smokers."

I certainly believe that we have many decent young men in our community who want to be far from impotent, so that for years and years we may propagate a fine race of people.

I hope that the Government will look at its miserable performance and seek the aid of leaders in this field who, through the various media, have shown that they have a very knowledgeable and scientific approach to this problem. I hope that it comes up with legislation or regulations in the next three or four years to overcome this problem.

I suggest it could be done through the Education Department. In Grade I, pupils are given lessons in good manners, they are told that it is imperative to clean their teeth after meals, and they are advised to eat apples because they are good for the teeth.

(Time expired.)

Hon. S. D. TOOTH (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (7.46 p.m.), in reply: The debate has been interesting. It has been somewhat like the curate's egg—very good, in parts. Before I proceed any further, I express to the hon. member for Port Curtis my appreciation of his concern regarding myself personally. I assure him that his assumptions are ill-founded and that his suggestions about my future are considerably exaggerated.

Mr. Bennett: Will you tell us why you were made a life member of the Young Liberals if you are not retiring?

Mr. TOOTH: They realise I am an asset to any group of young people, and they seek my membership.

One feature of the debate intrigued me very much. I spent a considerable amount of time, when introducing the Bill, in referring to details of Australia's adherence to a certain international convention. I am somewhat distressed that the full significance of this, and the various ramifications that flow from this adherence, have apparently escaped the attention of Opposition members. I trust that when they read my speech in "Hansard" they will give this matter some thought. It would be interesting and probably very helpful to have their views on Australia's adherence to the international convention I mentioned, and the steps we have had to take to enable the Commonwealth Government to make that accession.

I hope I can touch briefly on what has been said by each hon. member. As a particular hon. member's point of view on a subject comes to notice, I think I will be able to deal with the remarks of all other members who referred to that subject. One I wish to deal with immediately was raised by the hon. member for Nudgee, who again asserted that there is no treatment for drug addicts in Queensland. This claim is repeated over and over again by people who I am sure know better. They know it is not true, yet it is repeated ad nauseam. I can only conclude that it is done with fell intent to misrepresent the situation and mislead the people of Queensland.

Mr. Bennett: Why are you so matey with the hon. member for Nudgee?

Mr. TOOTH: He is a very good fellow. It is a pity that he is the fall guy for people who get him to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them—people on the South Coast (young Mr. D'Arcy, for instance) and some people in Toowoomba. I feel that after his two recent experiences he will exercise greater caution than he has shown in the

past, and that he will conduct careful investigations before he is "conned" into the kind of situation in which he recently found himself.

Let me say again that this misrepresentation reached the point where it provoked me to place in the Sunday Press in Brisbane, on two successive weeks, advertisements in which it was stated clearly that there were available to people who sought treatment for drug addiction a number of places to which they could apply for help. There is one in Mary Street, not 200 yards from this building, where people may go in complete confidence, and where their problems will be treated with the utmost discretion. That is the first place—at 40 Mary Street. They can also go to the Out-patients' Department of Lowson House, at the Royal Brisbane Hospital. They can also go to the hospital at Chermiside, to the rehabilitation clinic at Wacol, or to the Wolston Park Hospital.

All those places are available to anyone who seeks help. Let me therefore hear no more repetition of the complete falsehood that no treatment is available for people who have a drug problem.

This gives me the opportunity to emphasise something that is constantly being either misunderstood or misrepresented, namely, that there is in Queensland an offence of being a drug addict. There is no such offence. It is not an offence to be addicted to drugs, and people who propagate such an idea are hindering the treatment of those who have this problem. Young men and women, and middle-aged men and women, who feel that they need assistance are often misled into believing that if they present themselves for treatment they will in some way or other come under the surveillance of the law. Up to the present, the offence has been to be in possession of prohibited and prescribed drugs; it has not been an offence to be an addict. That is not a splitting of straws; it is an important distinction, because it enables a person who realises that he is sick and has a problem to present himself for treatment at any one of the five places I have mentioned. He can do so with complete confidence in the discretion of the medical and therapeutic staff.

Mr. Chinchin: Can parents do it on behalf of their children?

Mr. TOOTH: Most certainly they can. I am glad the hon. member has raised that point, because it enables me to reply to something I gathered during the torrent of words to which the hon. member for Salisbury subjected us. He spoke about parents who were compelled to report a child to the police, that being the only way in which they could obtain treatment for their child. At one stage he said "children", but I have identified the case to which he was referring and there is no doubt that it was a young man who was involved.

Mr. Bennett: Can you tell me where the Country Party members are? There is not one in the Chamber. Surely they must be interested in this important subject.

Mr. TOOTH: I have an idea that they are giving consideration to the problems of the electorate of South Brisbane, which has been seriously neglected in the past.

Honourable Members interjected.

Mr. TOOTH: This matter is particularly important, and I hope hon. members opposite will allow me to explain the situation to the hon. member for Salisbury.

It is possible for a parent to take a child, or, if he be of an age where the parent cannot take him, he can persuade him to go, to the clinic at Mary Street, or any one of the other places I have mentioned, to receive treatment. It is possible for that child, or young man or young woman, to enter a hospital voluntarily. If such a person cannot be persuaded to seek treatment or, having been persuaded to present himself for an initial examination, he then refuses to enter hospital, it is possible, if the parent makes an application, for him to be committed under the provisions of the Mental Health Act. All that is required is the certification of two medical practitioners that he needs treatment, and that treatment will be provided, and it can be compulsorily provided. To assert, as the hon. member did, that there was no recourse to any other means other than to place the boy he mentioned within the ambit of the law, is completely wrong.

Mr. Sherrington: In the case you are dealing with, why was the lad not referred to one of these clinics instead of being charged?

Mr. TOOTH: Because he was reported to the police, not for being an addict but for breaching the law in that he was in possession—

Mr. Sherrington: Why wasn't he referred to a clinic instead of being charged?

Mr. TOOTH: His parents reported him to the police for a breach of the law.

Mr. Sherrington: In other words, there is no liaison between the police and the Health Department?

Mr. TOOTH: How would we know about it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Minister to direct his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. TOOTH: How would we know, Mr. Hooper, that the lad was in difficulties and that his parents intended doing what they did? We are not omniscient; we do not possess second sight.

Mr. Houston: That is obvious.

Mr. TOOTH: Neither does the hon. gentleman.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. TOOTH: I understand why hon. members opposite are annoyed. They are disappointed that this particular point has been dealt with in this way.

Mr. Sherrington: You have not told us why the lad in question was not taken to the clinic.

Mr. TOOTH: Ask his mother. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. F. P. Moore: He's a worse side-stepper than the Premier.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! When the Chair is addressing the Committee, I ask the hon. member for Mourilyan to remain silent.

Mr. TOOTH: The point I raise is a very important one. It is important for the community to know that there are these facilities. They have been available for an extremely long time. Not only have we these facilities for treatment, but there are means of getting treatment without coming within the ambit of the law. I trust that this fact will receive wide publicity, and that each and every hon. member, including the Leader of the Opposition, will make it known.

Mr. Houston: Would the police have known about these facilities?

Mr. TOOTH: I do not want to become involved in an argument on the matter.

Mr. Sherrington: You're getting in too deep.

Mr. TOOTH: No, I am not. I would say, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, "Yes".

Mr. Sherrington: Why wasn't this lad taken to a clinic?

Mr. Houston: Why didn't the police refer him to the clinic or the Health Department?

Mr. R. E. Moore: He was in possession of drugs. That is why.

Mr. TOOTH: My friend from Windsor has given the answer.

Mr. Houston: What is the answer?

Mr. TOOTH: The lad was reported by his mother for a breach of the law.

Mr. Houston: Couldn't the police have taken subsequent action? They didn't have to prosecute. They could have taken other action.

Mr. TOOTH: They would be very foolish indeed if, after having had the boy reported, not by a neighbour, or some stranger, but by his own parents, they did not allow the

normal procedures of the law to take place. They could have been subject to a charge of dereliction of duty. Surely the hon. gentleman can see that.

Mr. Houston: Why couldn't they recommend to the parents that they take the boy to the clinic? They didn't recommend that, did they?

Mr. TOOTH: I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he consult his colleague from South Brisbane, who, I am sure, will explain this to him.

Mr. Bennett: Can I have the opportunity of explaining the pulling out of charges?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. The Minister seems to be treating me as an idiot when he says that the police cannot pull out charges. Tomorrow they are pulling out a charge against Wilson, who was guilty of the very serious offence of dangerous driving, because he has a friend—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. TOOTH: The hon. member will develop laryngitis, and we will have to treat him.

I wish now to turn to the comments of the hon. member for Landsborough.

Mr. Sherrington: You don't want to make it so obvious next time somebody pulls you out of the mud.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! When the Committee comes to order I will ask the Minister to continue his speech.

Mr. TOOTH: I wish now to turn to the comments of the hon. member for Landsborough, who was the second speaker. As I remember it, he said that the principal need was a fuller realisation by the community of the nature and dangers of drug addiction. That is very true, and I point out that this Government is taking, and has taken, very firm action to see that means of education are available.

I direct the attention of hon. members to publications by the Health Education Council of Queensland. I have a number of them here. One, for example, is a very useful document on drugs. It is available to any hon. member who wishes to apply for it. There are a number of smaller ones dealing with the various individual drugs, and, in addition to that, there are technical information bulletins. There is one dealing with the situation at schools, produced by the Director of School Health Services and there are documents concerning other matters that I dealt with in the presentation of the Bill. I refer to the reference by the hon. member for Landsborough to the need for education, and say that these documents are available and that education is being continually pursued.

In addition, during the current year a sum of approximately \$40,000 has been provided for a training and education programme in schools and in the various other agencies where groups of people combine. For the succeeding year, it is hoped that we will have a programme costing over \$50,000.

The hon. member for Landsborough also mentioned that to avoid arousing curiosity and promoting experimentation, care must be exercised in the presentation of the problems and dangers of drug-taking. If my recollection serves me rightly, a number of other members also made that point, which is a very valid one. One of the great problems of education in this field is to know how to strike a fine balance and avoid encouraging people and arousing their curiosity, thus leading to experimentation, and at the same time to get the message across. The difficulty is to know whether a direct approach should be made to young people, or whether the approach should be more to their parents. This is a matter for judgment also, but the great difficulty lies in being selective.

This is illustrated in a rather remarkable way in the current issue of "TV Times". I do not know whether hon. members generally read this publication. The current issue contains a lengthy article headed "Has TV Become a Drug Pusher?" Any hon. member who has not read that article would benefit from doing so.

The problem of drug experimentation among very young people is indeed becoming serious in other parts of Australia. Recently I was in Sydney, where I took the opportunity of calling once again at the Drug Referral Centre, where I spoke to a number of people who have been rescued, as it were, from drug addiction or are in the process of being treated. They are ready to talk to others, and one of them said to me that the real problem developing in Sydney at the present time is the extent to which young girls in their early teens, in the 13 to 14-year age group, are deceiving their parents at weekends by telling them that they are spending the week-end with friends, whereas in fact they go to the "Cross", where they are introduced to drugs. At that stage it is purely experimental. They hear so much about it that they want to find out what it is all about. The appalling dangers that they face must be of great concern to anybody who is interested in this problem.

The hon. member for Townsville South made a very interesting speech. He talked of the "submissive" society and the "gutless" society, but I was struck by the extremely useful analogy that he drew between the development of an alcoholic and the way in which a person moving from the so-called soft drugs can ultimately be trapped into the use of the deadly harder drugs. He referred to his progression from soft drinks to the depths, as he would quite readily

admit, of alcoholic degradation before he recovered. He has often described it in this Chamber.

Mr. Bennett: He performed better than than he does now.

Mr. TOOTH: He has recovered completely. He drew a very accurate analogy and parallel between that sort of movement and the development and movement from the soft drugs to the limits of heroin and morphine addiction.

The hon. member for Ipswich West dealt with a number of matters not related to the drug problem. I point out to her that the majority of health surveyors are local authority inspectors. It was largely at the urging of this fairly large group that this change of title, or addition of title, has been introduced. They do not inspect hospitals; the hospitals are inspected by officers of the department, who are still referred to in our procedures as departmental or health inspectors.

The hon. member for Ipswich East covered ground similar to that covered by many other hon. members. He dealt with traffickers and appealed for strong action against them. I am sure that when hon. members see the Bill they will agree that quite substantial steps have been taken towards the achievement of that object.

The hon. member for Wavell said there was little to be proud of in the treatment in Queensland of drug addicts. I do not know whether he is referring to the facilities that are available or the type of treatment that is given. He said also that it is the habit of Governments to ignore rather than accept problems.

We are not trying to ignore the problems. All Governments in Australia are very concerned about them. Over a period of two years there has been close liaison between the Commonwealth and State Governments, and also between the departments involved in the problems. Meetings were held initially at the invitation of Senator Scott when he was Minister for Trade and Customs, and further meetings were held under the chairmanship of Mr. Chipp.

The National Standing Committee on Drugs of Dependency, which comprises experts of the various Health Departments, Police Departments and the Department of Customs and Excise, chaired by the Comptroller-General of Customs, has been meeting at frequent intervals. It is a watch-dog committee, designed to watch the development of this problem and the results of our attempts to contain it, and ultimately to curb it. That committee will remain in being. This legislation was based largely upon its recommendations. These things are not being ignored.

The hon. member referred to the need for more acute beds in psychiatric hospitals. The statistics I am about to refer to will

interest hon. members. Of 2,500 admissions to Lawson House in the last six months of 1969, 20 patients were diagnosed as being drug dependent; of the 20, only two were dependent upon narcotics. Hon. members will realise that the problem as seen in our hospitals is not of any physical size. Of course, we can be misled by the figures, and I do not suggest that that is the compass of the problem in the community. However, those are the figures relative to the people presented to that hospital, and my inquiries indicate that the proportions presenting in the other psychiatric areas are somewhat similar. As far as the immediate needs in respect of hospital equipment, beds and so on for treating these people are concerned, the suggestion that there is an insufficiency of them is not well founded.

The hon. member referred to treatment programmes in various parts of the world. While we were overseas it was our privilege to visit a number of these places. We went to places that are quite famous, including St. Bernard's Hospital, in London, where the famous Dr. Glatt is in charge, and I gained the impression that there is no clear, well-defined and well-accepted method of treating these people. It is still a matter of experimentation and investigation.

Recently, I was deeply impressed by a comment made to me by the Rev. Ted Noffs in Sydney. He said that the first and greatest essential in approaching this problem was to adopt an attitude of flexibility, an attitude of being prepared to examine every situation anew and afresh, at every opportunity, because it is an area of great complexity in which very few firm guide-lines exist. I was very interested in his remarks, because from time to time he has been represented as one who knows the answers. He said to me quite firmly and frankly that this is a most difficult area and the answers, as yet, are unknown. This accords with what psychiatrists have said in a number of cases.

Heroin addiction, to which the hon. member for Wavell referred, is usually irreversible. The number of heroin addicts in Queensland could be counted on the fingers of one hand. In fact, I do not think many fingers would be needed. In England, the problem has become serious. People there are beginning to question the method adopted, which is of maintenance doses—of identifying these people and providing for them to receive regular supplies of the drug. I can assure the Committee that the authorities there are having very grave doubts and second thoughts about the wisdom of this procedure.

The American system, generally, is quite the reverse. The Americans withdraw people completely, or almost completely, as quickly as possible. Apparently neither method is terribly successful. I understand that nowadays the approach is to wean them off heroin and put them onto another drug

called methadone, which will maintain them but which, although it is addictive, does not have the devastating effects of heroin. This is being pursued, to my knowledge, at Wisteria House, in the Parramatta Psychiatric Hospital, in Sydney.

Incidentally, I made my fifth visit to Wisteria House last month. I have gone there, whenever the opportunity has offered, to see the way treatment is developing. In the course of the five years or so that I have been going to that place, a group of half-way houses associated with Wisteria House has been developed. As patients become more confident of their ability to resist their addiction, they are allowed to go out in small groups. Four or five of them will rent a small house somewhere or other, and they act as a therapeutic community. They support and look after one another. It works on lines somewhat analogous to those of Alcoholics Anonymous. This is a very interesting development indeed.

The hon. member for South Brisbane had a great deal to say. He, too, claimed that there was no adequate provision for the treatment of addicts. He referred to a client of his. If we have identified this person correctly, it would appear that he was convicted on a charge quite unrelated to drugs.

Mr. Bennett: That is granted.

Mr. TOOTH: It was necessary to send him to Wolston Park, but not because of drugs.

Mr. Bennett: No, because of psychiatric indisposition.

Mr. TOOTH: That is so. The reason he appeared to be "sozzled" when the hon. member saw him was that he was on tranquillising drugs.

The discovery of tranquillisers in the post-war years and their development has had one of the most fantastic effects in this field. It has enabled a complete transformation of psychiatric hospitals. It has enabled the removal of custodial activities and the mechanics of custodial care. It has enabled the removal of high fences and brick walls. In most of these hospitals today, the custodial area is relatively small. Some people, because of their psychiatric condition, must be restrained and they probably will be restrained for the remainder of their lives. But the great majority of people in psychiatric hospitals today are not under any custodial restraint at all.

I invite any hon. member to visit Wolston Park. If any members do visit that place, they will find it pretty hard at times to tell the difference between staff and patients. That is no reflection on the staff; it is merely an indication of the extent to which patients are being rehabilitated. This is a tremendous development.

The last note that I have about the gentleman referred to by the hon. member for South Brisbane is that the question of drug dependence has never been raised in relation to him.

Mr. Bennett: It has been raised by him since he has been there. He had never taken drugs in his life, but he is on them now.

Mr. TOOTH: He is on tranquillisers. That is part of the treatment.

Mr. Bennett: It took months to give him any treatment at all. He stayed at Boggo Road for two months after he was put into custody for treatment. He got nothing for two months.

Mr. TOOTH: I do not know the details of that. The hon. member's assertion that the man was "sozzled" and developing drug addiction is not well founded.

Mr. Bennett: He wants to get out of the place so that he can get away from the drugs. I can tell you that.

Mr. TOOTH: He is a psychiatric case receiving treatment. Let us not go any further into that.

There are quite a number of other points that I could talk about, but I feel that I have covered as much as it is reasonable to cover at this time. There is another matter that I would not have mentioned but for the fact that somebody has had a lot to say about the Young Liberals supporting the legalising of marijuana. I was not aware of that. If it is so, let us attribute it to youthful exuberance and inexperience. But that cannot be said for Dr. Moss Cass, and to try to excuse his support for the legalisation of marijuana by referring to the Queensland Young Liberals is to present a very poor argument indeed.

Let me draw attention to another point. The first investigation into problems with marijuana was the one undertaken at the instigation of Mr. La Guardia, once Mayor of New York. The report made to him was such that a permissive attitude developed to marijuana. The bias of the report was that marijuana was nothing much to worry about. What has been the result? Today New York is the hub, the focus, the centre, of the greatest drug problem in the entire world.

Mr. Chinchin: Hard drugs, too.

Mr. TOOTH: Yes. There are 50,000 heroin addicts in New York alone. I assure the Committee that for my part, and for the Government's part, we do not propose to take any risks in dealing with this problem.

Mr. Wright: What are you going to do about the prescribing of drugs by doctors? I raise this because it is going on everywhere.

Mr. TOOTH: If the hon. member is aware of any malpractices by doctors—

Mr. Wright: It is not called a malpractice. Doctors can prescribe what they like, and chemists have a right to dispense it.

Mr. Porter: Are you suggesting that they are not doing the right thing?

Mr. Wright: I am.

Mr. Porter: In that case, it is malpractice.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. TOOTH: All I should like to say is that we hear of these things, and I have no doubt that examples of it could be found. I should be very grateful if the hon. member for Rockhampton South would give us some indication of how this problem can be approached and dealt with. There are all sorts of social problems for which, at the moment, there are no known cures. Can any member tell me, for instance, what can be done with the case of the battered baby? This is a problem that worries me intensely. I know it goes on, but how can it be identified till a baby is found almost in extremis?

Mr. P. Wood: Give doctors freedom from suit for a start. Apparently there is always the possibility that they will be sued.

Mr. TOOTH: Is that the solution to the problem?

Mr. Wright: If it was known that a certain patient was getting prescriptions for drugs from several doctors and having them dispensed at various chemists, couldn't he be restricted to one doctor and one chemist?

Mr. TOOTH: That would be extremely difficult to do. I can assure the Committee that the medical profession as a whole has a very high ethical standard. If that sort of thing is going on blatantly, it will take every possible step to deal with it—and so will we. But there is no such thing as a perfect solution to many of these problems. I assure the Committee that this Government is doing its best in a very difficult area to meet the present problems and those that are likely to arise in the future.

Motion (Mr. Tooth) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads) (8.28 p.m.): I move—

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

In my introductory speech I gave the basic details of this Bill. I feel that most of them are essential and self-explanatory. Nevertheless, I should like to comment a little further on some of the clauses.

I should not like it thought that we moved in haste only after the incident at George Street in July, 1970. In actual fact, following the 1967 amendment, work was commenced on the difficult problem of protecting underground high-pressure mains and, after a number of conferences, the basic set of regulations—almost a code of practice—was gazetted in May, 1970.

The pipeline protection clauses in the amending Bill give greater force to these regulations as well as set the procedure for care and protection of mains.

I also mentioned that the Co-ordinator-General had been asked to convene meetings of interested parties on the underground situation, as some of the problems were beyond the authority of the Government Gas Engineer and Chief Gas Examiner. This was instituted before the George Street incident. However, that incident did accentuate the need for urgent action.

The pipeline protection clauses in the Bill are, as I previously explained, self-explanatory. They require first of all a reasonable alignment allocation, preferably on the footpath. They require notice to be given to the gas company of the likelihood of damage, which should alert the company to be prepared for action. They also require care to be exercised and, as a contractor on his own cannot do everything, the gas company is obliged to give him reasonable assistance in the location of the underground equipment. This seems to be the most balanced approach that will lessen the likelihood of danger.

I shall be pleased to answer queries put forward by hon. members now that they have had the opportunity of studying the Bill in detail.

Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if I would be in order at this stage in asking for a bulletin from the Country Party Caucus on redistribution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member not to waste the time of the House by making facetious interjections.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (8.31 p.m.): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member prepared to speak to the Bill?

Mr. HANSON: Of course I am. I called four or five times and when I call four or five times I presume I will be recognised.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member's colleagues would keep quiet, I might hear him.

Mr. HANSON: Today and tonight in this Chamber the drug problem has been widely canvassed. We are now dealing with the second reading of the Gas Act Amendment Bill. Although the Government members who are now entering the Chamber may not be under the influence of drugs, we could assume they are somewhat affected by gas. In the redistribution room I suppose they were well and truly gassed.

As Opposition members intimated at the introductory stage of this Bill, we wholeheartedly support the principle of the provisions to deal with potential danger from gas. A few major tragedies attributable to gas explosions have occurred in this State and we believe it is highly important to clothe the Gas Engineer with sufficient power to carry out his important functions.

The Minister said that this principle has not been introduced because of a certain happening in George Street, but the Government has been very remiss for a long period in not taking effective measures to guard against the potential danger of gas explosion. At the introduction I said that the Government could be likened to the farmer who did something effective about locking the gate after the horse had already bolted.

Dealing with dangers inherent in the distribution of gas, we believe it is very important to impress upon those in authority—particularly the Postmaster-General's Department—the vital necessity to maintain strict supervision over underground mains. It was lack of supervision on the part of the Postmaster-General's Department which, unfortunately, almost resulted in a major tragedy. No doubt, the blame was passed from the superior officer to his deputy and then down the line to the office boy. When one complains to the head office of a large corporation, or to a Government department, it is strange indeed that the office boy is the one who has always committed the misdemeanour.

Someone has to assume responsibility and I believe that the giving of effective powers to the Gas Engineer will enable him, in a wise and judicious manner, to implement the purpose of this legislation. The Opposition agrees wholeheartedly with some of the major principles that have been enunciated by the Minister; however, at the Committee stage we will be moving an amendment to delete portion of one clause.

The safety of the individual is of paramount importance. I think it will be conceded that people who use gas, particularly housewives, develop some sort of psychological reaction against it and inwardly fear it. Perhaps other hon. members have a similar fear of gas or at least use it cautiously.

A worth-while provision in the Bill is that which provides the Gas Engineer with an indemnity. He is clothed with great

responsibility, so it is only fair that in any action that he considers to be fair and reasonable he is protected by indemnity against liability for damages arising out of alleged negligence.

At the introductory stage the laying of gas mains beneath footpaths instead of lengthwise underneath roadways was fully canvassed, and reference was made to the dangers faced by workmen who are required to maintain and repair gas mains that are laid beneath roadways. However, I ask the Minister to look closely at the matter of laying gas mains even beneath footpaths.

I understand that in Queensland the P.M.G. Department is given a width of 3 ft. 6 ins. in which to lay its cables; that local authorities have a width of 3 ft. 6 ins. in which to lay water mains and electric light lines; and that a gas company is left with only 2 feet or 18 inches in which to lay its mains. It is possible that, as the use of gas gains popularity and 12 inch mains are required, the width of 18 inches will not allow gas employees sufficient room in which to perform their work. The matter could be viewed in the light of experience gained in southern States, where 2 ft. 6 ins. is allowed to the P.M.G. Department and to the electric authorities.

The system of priorities in times of short supply has been referred to. The introduction of that system is commendable, because only 12 to 18 months ago emergency measures had to be implemented in Brisbane to assure gas consumers of a supply during certain hours of the day. However, the Opposition believes that the Government has been remiss in not fully implementing the principles that are necessary to ensure safety to the fullest extent. The Gas Engineer, and other officers responsible for safe working conditions, in their reports on certain stoves and other facilities using L.P. gas, pointed out that many units had certain defects. By the use of a flame-control device they were able to take effective measures to ensure virtually 100 per cent. safety. In that way they allayed the fears of many housewives who use gas in their homes.

The laxity of supervision by many governmental and semi-governmental instrumentalities of underground work is exercising the minds of responsible people. It is essential to impress upon the inspectors that as they are dealing with a gas supply they must take every precaution to assist themselves and, more importantly, the public at large.

I noted the Minister's remarks at the introductory stage concerning what the Government intended to do about increasing the size of the inspectorial staff of the Gas Engineer. The Opposition firmly believes that not enough has been done to ease the pressure of work on the inspectorial staff. We note with dismay that the Gas Engineer has to visit northern regions to carry out

important supervisory duties. While he is absent from the metropolitan area a major defect could develop in the metropolitan gas supply, which would warrant his attention. Because gas will play an important and ever-increasing role as a fuel, I seriously urge the Government to try to get more people to accept employment in the office of the Gas Engineer.

Mr. N. T. E. Hewitt interjected.

Mr. HANSON: In reply to the Minister for Conservation, I suggest that he was well and truly gassed in the redistribution meeting in the Cabinet room. (Laughter.)

The notification of accidents is extremely important. If reports made on accidents after a thorough examination of all factors are not processed and analysed, we will not obtain effective results under this legislation.

As I said in my introductory speech, it is very regrettable that the fire brigade, the Police Department and the ambulance service report only 3 per cent. of accidents. That does not indicate irresponsibility on their part. Pressure of work precluded these fine people from carrying out their responsibilities to the full. In the ultimate, the pressure of work inflicted upon them can be traced to the Government. It is a reflection on the Government that these bodies suffer a shortage of staff. The Government does not encourage many people in government and semi-government service to do their utmost to notify accidents. The Opposition will make certain submissions at the Committee stage in regard to the deletion of a subsection. I am sure other Opposition members have something to say at this stage.

Mr. R. E. MOORE (Windsor) (8.45 p.m.): I have a few remarks to make about safety precautions to be observed in a search for gas leaks. I crossed George Street about half an hour before the recent gas explosion. I saw two workmen, one with a pneumatic drill and the other with a black, three-pint billy from which he was pouring water onto the drill to prevent sparks. I said to my wife, "Let us get past here in a hurry before this so-and-so blows us up." I did not really think for one moment that it would happen. I felt that the safety precautions being taken on that occasion were not good enough. It is reasonable to assume that if a pneumatic drill with a steel bit is used on a blue-metal or concrete road there is a likelihood of sparks. To supply water to the drill in that situation, it would be necessary to use a hose that could stand traffic running over it. I hope that some research is undertaken to discover an additive which can be put into gas mains, cylinders, or containers, so that in the event of a leak the gas will be visible as soon as it comes in contact with the air. I realise that there are gas-detecting devices and that they are somewhat effective, but they are not as good as a dye which would make escaping gas visible.

Mr. HARRIS (Wynnum) (8.49 p.m.): I support and wholeheartedly agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Port Curtis. Irrespective of how many people, under new section 10A, notification of accidents, notify the Gas Engineer of an accident, it will not matter a great deal unless the Act is amended to ensure that full support is given to him.

I recall the explosion in George Street. This matter is very close to my heart, because two of my constituents were involved in that accident. In my opinion, the attention given to those people by the Government, and the Gas Engineer, was a shocking example of maladministration. One person has been crippled, without doubt for life. The Gas Engineer—I think the Government is fully aware of this—was not advised for some considerable time after the accident happened. Unfortunately, as I said earlier, this woman is now crippled for life, and I ask the Minister for Mines to give serious consideration to granting her some compensation.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (8.51 p.m.): I have a couple of points to make at this stage of the Bill. I, like the shadow Minister for Mines, am satisfied that it has many defects, and does not cover all anomalies as we had hoped it would. Why, for instance, should there be differences in the fees payable to the Gas Engineer's section? Why should certain companies be given preferential treatment, as they are? Why should ordinary householders have to pay full charges for all the services that they receive, and virtually shoulder the burden of the big companies that are either avoiding or evading those charges? I should like the Minister to tell me in his reply why Austral Pacific, which should be paying about \$500 a year to the Gas Engineer's section for the services that it receives, is not required to do so. That screams to high heaven of injustice and it stinks in the nostrils of all fair-minded men that such a company should not have to pay its way. I hope the Minister will be able to explain why he does not insist on that company's meeting its obligations.

The present legislation makes no provision for cohesion of the services of the Brisbane City Council, the P.M.G. Department, the Main Roads Department, and the gas authorities. Admittedly some sort of unwritten law is followed, but never do we hear of any legislation under which one body is given the authority to prescribe how work involving digging up footpaths and roads will be done, or allocate priorities in this work. I believe that money is wasted because there is a lack of cohesion between various authorities. How often does one see brand new bitumen footpaths, and sometimes even concrete roadways and footpaths, laid one week and dug up the following week because the gas authority has to lay a pipe, or the P.M.G. Department has to install a line?

Mr. Lee: That does not happen with modern roads.

Mr. BENNETT: Of course it does. I can show the hon. member an example in West End.

Mr. Lee: It might with the Brisbane City Council, but not the Main Roads Department.

Mr. BENNETT: The Brisbane City Council should be advised by the subsidiary authorities of work that they want to do. After all, it is the Brisbane City Council that carries out most of the maintenance and construction of roadways and footpaths. The council publishes its schedule of work each year so that all authorities can see the work that is to be done. I had the unhappy experience of seeing Boundary Street resurfaced with a good bitumen finish, only to be dug up shortly after by the P.M.G. and the gas company and left like a patchwork quilt, as it will probably remain for another 20 years. That is not good enough. It is putting the ratepayer, the gas consumer, and the taxpayer to unnecessary expense because there is not the cohesion of services that there should be.

Mr. Hughes: This happens even when they are putting water mains down.

Mr. BENNETT: That is so, too. It is imperatively necessary that we legislate for mandatory cohesion of services. The present practice leads not only to unnecessary expenditure but also to danger and death. If one authority does not know what the other is doing, there can be unwitting interference with gas mains, thereby causing accidents and exposing people to the danger of injury and death. That has happened before today. It is high time something was done so that we can have cohesive services. This has been going on for a long time. New material is wasted because it has to be torn up when another authority decides that it has to do some work in a given area.

As the Government virtually gives the gas company monopolistic control of the supply of gas in this city—it has the sole obligation and privilege of reticulating gas (at considerable price to the consumer, incidentally)—the Government should supervise its efficiency. The consumer has no alternative but to accept the gas supply he is given.

What I am about to indicate is typical of so many gas connections to new or reconditioned houses. If what occurred had not been so pathetic and costly, it would have been laughable. I have specific knowledge of this incident, which happened within the last few weeks. A newly married couple requisitioned the gas company to connect the household to the gas supply. The house was already piped for gas and the couple had installed a new gas stove.

At the same time as the couple requisitioned for the supply of gas to the house they requisitioned for the connection of their stove to the gas supply. The company said, "We cannot enter your premises unless somebody is at home". I suppose that was

the correct procedure in law. As the new bride had continued in her employment, she had to take the morning off so that the gas supply could be connected. She believed that she would get it all cleaned up in the morning, be able to go back to work at lunch-time, and be able to use the stove when she returned at night. But what happened? The gas man came and he duly connected the house to the supply main. The lady said, "You won't forget the stove?" He said, "Just a minute, lady. My job is to connect the supply outside. I have nothing to do with the stove. Another man will come to do that." She said, "When will he be along?" He said, "I don't know. I've only made the appointment to do this this morning. You had better make another appointment for him."

She had to take two days off to get 20 minutes' work done. The husband was charged for the services of the two men and the housewife had to forgo two days' pay. The husband had to pay exorbitant charges simply because the gas company, which has the sole franchise, was so inefficient that it could not arrange for one man to do the two jobs. That sort of thing is scandalous and a waste of money. Two vehicles had to come to the house, thereby wasting petrol, time and wages. One of the most costly items, of course, was labour based on man-hours, and the husband had to pay travelling time for two men when one could have done the job in 20 minutes.

Mr. Lee: Was that because of union policy?

Mr. BENNETT: What a ridiculous suggestion! It is not union policy at all. As a matter of fact, the men are so dissatisfied and discontented with the system that they are thinking of taking industrial action to protect the householder. Of course, if they do, there will be a scream of "strike" or "threatened strike", with the management saying that the men will not carry out their duties, whereas all they are doing is endeavouring to see that the consumer receives justice and fair play.

Mr. Speaker, I apologise if my earlier manoeuvre, when I took certain action, was not in keeping with Standing Orders, because I am particularly—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is also not making a second-reading speech. His remarks are more applicable to the introductory stage. This is the second reading of a Bill to amend the Gas Act in certain particulars and I ask him to keep to the principles of the Bill.

Mr. BENNETT: I thought one of the main purposes of the Bill was the notification of accidents and one of the real causes of accidents—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the connecting of a gas stove was an accident.

Mr. BENNETT: If one gets the gas connected and does not have the stove connected, one could have a dreadful accident.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I realise that but it is a very moot point. I ask the hon. member to keep to the principles of the Bill.

Mr. BENNETT: In moving the second reading the Minister said that the unfortunate but scandalous tragedy in George Street did not precipitate the introduction of the Bill, but that it was kept in mind at the time the Bill was drafted—no doubt properly so. The Minister and his Government would certainly be lacking in their duty and obligations to the public if they did not keep that terrible disaster in mind when drafting this legislation. I am glad to hear from the Minister's own lips that it was kept in mind when the Bill was drafted because I propose to deal with the aspect of accidents and the notification of same.

I believe that that accident, the death it caused and the severe injuries suffered by some of the citizens involved represented a shocking scandal on the part of the management of the gas company concerned. I endeavoured to get an early and quick report as to the causes of that accident, but it was refused me in this Chamber on the spurious ground that the matter was sub judice, which was a lot of balderdash and poppy-cock, because in law it was not.

When a fatal accident takes place, it should be investigated without waste of time or procrastination. In a road fatality the investigating detectives and police officers have the right, duty and obligation to quickly investigate the causes of the accident and, if anybody is thought to be guilty of gross negligence, or in terms of the law criminal negligence, then that person, without any further equivocation, investigation, or coronial inquest, is charged with manslaughter. That is happening every week in the year, and many citizens, who were perhaps driving at their incompetent best, are now serving sentences in gaol following the findings of juries (based on evidence resulting from investigations) that there was gross or criminal negligence, that the death followed and the person responsible was guilty of manslaughter.

What has happened in this case and what will happen under this Bill? The same old bogging theories are to be pursued. It can be reported to the Gas Engineer. He, in turn, may decide to ask for a coronial inquest, if the coroner agrees. In coroner's inquests big companies usually engage highly paid experts to confuse and mislead the inquiry in its endeavour to ascertain the real cause of the tragedy. I say that with a good deal of consideration; I have been wanting to say it for a long time. I was shocked by the Government's failure to take action at a date earlier than the coroner's inquest.

An ordinary motorist who causes the death of another person is not given the opportunity of calling medical experts before a coroner to say that a bee flew into his eye or that he was suffering from ill health at the time. Nor is he given the opportunity of calling a mechanical engineer to say that his car, unknown to him, was defective. He is interrogated immediately by a skilled detective, who takes down in writing what he says. If the motorist's explanation is such that it contains some evidence of criminal negligence the Crown prosecutes him, and the likely result is that he will end up in prison for a term ranging from 18 months to three years, or possibly five years.

What happened after the gas explosion? A long delay occurred in the investigation. I am not blaming the police investigator, Sub-Inspector Pitt, for that. He is a capable and trustworthy investigator; nevertheless his hands were tied and he was hamstrung in his work. I feel quite certain that he is not happy with the results of his detailed and thorough investigation. The matter was drawn out, thereby enabling the influential authorities that were involved to engage highly paid experts to try and confuse the issue and cover up the real negligence involved, which, in my opinion, would have sustained a charge of manslaughter involving criminal negligence.

I am not claiming for one moment that anybody should have been convicted, because that is a matter for a court and jury, but I believe that on the evidence adduced at the coroner's inquest some person or persons responsible, either singular or plural, should have been charged with manslaughter. Criminal negligence was involved. The contradicted evidence was that for four days there was a strong smell of gas in George Street between Adelaide Street and Burnett Lane. Any responsible authority that supplied gas to that part of the city had a bounden obligation to investigate the matter immediately and at least to shut off the gas supply if not to correct the fault. But what happened? In spite of the information given by the occupiers and owners of the buildings in the neighbourhood, and by passers-by as well, absolutely nothing was done by the gas company concerned.

I do not know the name of the man who received the complaints and did nothing about them—for the purpose of my argument his name does not matter—but the employees of the gas company who are responsible for the elimination and plugging of gas leaks deliberately ignored the complaints that they received and were therefore guilty of criminal negligence.

As I have said, a motorist can be charged with dangerous driving causing death even though he was not criminally negligent in any way but was driving at his incompetent best. The test that is applied is an objective one. If by his dangerous driving he causes

the death of another person he may be convicted and be imprisoned with hard labour for a period of up to five years.

I do not care what flash-point was involved in the gas explosion. Days were wasted in determining whether or not the gas exploded as a result of a spark in the electricity supply system near the corner of Adelaide Street and George Street. I do not care whether a city council truck drove over the gas main that had been leaking, or whether spontaneous combustion of the gas occurred, or whether a cigarette or a lighted match ignited it. It does not matter what caused the accident. The real negligence lay in the fact that the leak was not fixed when the first report was received about a strong smell of gas in the area. Everybody who passed by smelt it, but nothing was done. The conduct of the gas company was reprehensible. A life was lost and, as my colleague the hon. member for Wynnum said, others will carry marks of their injuries for the rest of their lives. There are people in the gas company who are hiding behind the company. Mr. Speaker, you have heard me say so often that companies have no soul to be saved or bodies to be kicked; these people have no consciences to be troubled, and each can blame the other for the defalcation. I am satisfied that something should and could have been done to avoid the tragedy.

One of Queensland's greatest statesmen, my erstwhile leader, Jack Duggan, was nearly killed in that disaster. Much unnecessary argument took place as to whether the gas pipes needed replacement or whether they were suffering from metal fatigue. Personally, after hearing the evidence of one of the company's erstwhile officials, I believe that the pipes should have been replaced long ago. Their non-replacement is evidence of negligence. If a man drives a vehicle knowing it to be defective, he is guilty of negligence. In the first place the gas company was guilty of negligence in not replacing the pipes long before the leaks occurred.

A coroner's inquest was held, but the coroner did not have the powers of a commissioner under the Official Inquiries Act. Because there was a rather substantial explosion a fortnight or so before this tragic, bigger one, a public inquiry should have been held under the Official Inquiries Act to ascertain whether or not the gas company was complying with the safety regulations and carrying out its obligations in terms of the Act to ensure that its pipes, facilities and connections were free from defect.

Whenever the smell of gas is detected now, gas employees, instead of showing confidence in the gas piping, run around with certain apparatus, hold up the traffic, call out the fire brigade and inflict more expense on the ratepayers. But the company is not prepared to examine the pipes until there is a smell of gas. That is not good enough.

It is time that the Government held an official inquiry to ascertain the strength and life left in the old gas pipes.

I know that Country Party members (if not Liberal Party members), at the moment, are not particularly interested in gas, or public safety, because they have gone through the process of being gassed themselves this afternoon in the redistribution chamber, the "Star Chamber" of the Country Party. If a satisfactory suitable inquiry was held by objective, detached experts, the gas company would be ordered to replace most of the gas piping in the inner city because it has been in place too long. I could liken the situation to the old principle in law that it is better that 99 guilty men should go free than that one innocent man should suffer. It is much better to go to all the expense of replacing gas pipes than to risk the loss of one life through any defect in the reticulation of gas in the city.

I know that the Minister gets his instructions from big companies, like the rest of his Government. They realise that this company—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is imputing improper motives to Ministers and to the Government. I ask him to withdraw his statement.

Mr. BENNETT: I believe that the Minister personally is a very decent fellow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member please withdraw his remark?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, I withdraw my unparliamentary remark. I thought that in Parliament, of course, the law was such that I could voice my true—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is qualifying the withdrawal of an unparliamentary statement. If he does not withdraw the statement in an unqualified fashion, I shall ask him to resume his seat—and I shall have no hesitation in doing so.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, I withdraw, but I would like to indicate that I am qualified.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to resume his seat?

Mr. BENNETT: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall order him to do so in a few moments if he does not withdraw, unqualified, and without making any more stupid remarks.

Mr. BENNETT: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw.

I think it is realised in certain circles that there is great concern that the amount of damages as a result of this tragedy will be so great that the gas company could well be put out of operation. Even if I am wrong in regard to criminal negligence, there certainly was civil negligence. It is a matter of

Government concern and Ministerial concern, and if it is not, it should be, because if the company is plunged into a state of bankruptcy and no other authority is prepared to take it over under the new Companies Act and the Securities Industry Act, the Government will have to do something about it.

I am not boastful, but I speak as a well-qualified lawyer when I say that the gas company must surely be particularly anxious about the claims it will have to meet in order to compensate those who were unnecessarily and unfortunately injured in this accident. I believe, furthermore, that if the company had to replace the piping that carries and reticulates the gas, that too would present a serious financial problem and burden for it. But, be that as it may, I do not have any great sympathy for the gas company in that regard because if it had budgeted well, and had not been so grasping with its profits over the years, it would have phased into its budget and skimmed off from its profits annually the necessary money to relay its pipes in gradation, so that in any one financial year over the past 40 years this work would not have been burdensome to the company or to its shareholders.

If it now does what I think it should do, it will certainly suffer great hardship. The same could be said of graziers. There are good graziers and bad graziers. Some graziers make provision for a rainy day or for drought, instead of going down and whooping it up on the Gold Coast every time they get a wool cheque, and they can withstand the hard times. If the gas company had made provision for the replacement of its gas mains, as it should have done, and as it must do because it no doubt writes off a certain amount as depreciation in its tax return, the replacement of mains would not be an imposition on the company.

Mr. Lee: What life do you think the pipes would have?

Mr. BENNETT: From my reading, and from the opinion expressed by a man whom I know who has been with the company for a long time, I should say that they have already lived out their useful life.

Mr. Lee: How many years?

Mr. BENNETT: I think about 40 to 50 years for some pipes, although, from my reading of the opinion of the expert concerned, that is longer than is reasonably safe. Their life should not be stretched to extremes. I think that some of them have been down for much longer than 50 years.

Mr. Lee: A lot would depend on the soil around them.

Mr. BENNETT: One cannot be sure of the soil. I am speaking now about pipes in the inner city. Admittedly it depends to some extent on the soil, but that is not so very important because the soil around pipes in the inner city is, with the construction of new buildings, being shifted daily,

and water mains are constantly being relocated. One also sees staff of the P.M.G. Department working regularly in the inner city, and all of this activity shifts or undermines the substrata of roads and footpaths, and interferes to some extent with pipes laid in the near vicinity if they are not perfectly sound. Admittedly, if there was no disturbance old pipes may not give trouble, but in this modern day and age disturbance to the soil has to be expected.

Mr. Lee: I was thinking more about acidity of the soil.

Mr. BENNETT: That is another point. It would also depend on whether there was any leakage from sewerage pipes, which could cause a lot of trouble. In the inner city, there is also the movement of heavy transport vehicles such as semi-trailers. Only today I saw a large, extremely overloaded railway department truck, carrying a large tree, being driven down Turbot Street and knocking out electric light bulbs as it went along. I reported that to the Brisbane City Council. If any member cares to go to Turbot Street he will see that electric light bulbs have been knocked out.

It is all very well to say that when the mains were laid trams travelled down the centre of the street. Heavy buses now travel the streets. They use the sides of the roads, and the pipes underneath should be strong enough to withstand that strain.

All in all, I am satisfied that what the shadow Minister for Mines has said is absolutely correct. I have no doubt that he has taken careful note of my remarks and will consider them when he is implementing his ideas in 1972. There will then be some good administration under the Gas Act.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (9.24 p.m.): I have no desire to delay the House at great length, but I should like to make a few comments on this principle of the Bill—

“Any coated pipe laid or used underground by the holder shall be coated or coloured, unmodified along its length . . .”

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not entitled to read a clause on the second reading.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to read the whole clause. I wanted merely to pinpoint the principle with which I wish to deal, that is, that piping be coloured yellow as a means of identifying it.

I rise to draw attention to the fact that over the years there has been an increasing tendency for services to be provided underground. At one time high-tension electricity was reticulated mainly by overhead lines, but over the years the mains have been placed underground. Similarly, in the near future many of the low-tension mains that supply normal household electricity will also be

located underground. I do not question the desirability of that, but I draw attention to the fact that previously both high-tension and low-tension lines were overhead. Because of the width of footpaths, and so on, various authorities must be facing a difficult problem. High-tension and low-tension electricity mains, water mains, sewerage mains and telephone mains occupy space in footpaths of various widths. Although I appreciate the thought behind the suggested colouring of gas mains, I am aware that the modern trend towards using equipment such as trench diggers is making damage to all the service mains more likely. The possibility of an accident occurring has been greatly increased by the use of mechanical equipment.

I must draw a parallel between gas mains and electricity mains to make clear what I wish to say. High-tension electricity mains and low-tension reticulation mains to householders have always been heavily sheathed to protect them from the elements and possible mechanical interference. A further precaution is now taken by specifying that when the main is laid in the ground it must be completely covered with a layer of briquettes or similar material. It gives the main further protection, of course, because the operator of earth-moving equipment realises as soon as he comes into contact with the layer of briquettes that the electricity mains are immediately below. Over the years this has proved invaluable in preventing accidents to operators and damage to electricity mains.

I question whether the mere painting of gas pipes yellow is sufficient warning to the operators of equipment, particularly with the limited space available for the various mains. Is the distinguishing yellow sufficient to prevent accidents? Will it prevent the ripping up of a main and the subsequent escape of gas?

Mr. Lee: Certainly it would be a help.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am not denying that it would be a help. The reticulation of gas is probably almost as dangerous as the underground reticulation of electricity. I witnessed what happened in George Street. Such an incident makes one realise what an awful tragedy can occur. The danger is not confined to the escaping gas. Depending on the condition of the air at the time, there is always a possibility of something causing the gas to explode. Because of the danger arising from escaping gas, there possibly is as much risk with underground reticulation of gas as there is with underground reticulation of electricity. Therefore, I again question whether the distinguishing painting of gas mains is sufficient safeguard. I hope that some thought may be given by the Gas Engineer, or whoever is responsible, to the provision of additional protection by the use of briquettes or some other measure to remove any possibility of damage to mains and the possible escape of gas.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads) (9.30 p.m.), in reply: I will not take up very much time in my reply. It is a pity that the hon. member for Port Curtis spoilt the beginning of his speech by making some stupid and inane remarks about hon. members on this side of the House. He went on to make a fairly balanced approach to the matters under discussion, and we will debate his foreshadowed amendment when dealing with the clauses of the Bill. I do not know who influences him to make these inane and stupid comments that emanate from him on occasions, but it is a pity.

To the hon. member for Windsor, I point out that so far it is not technically possible to colour gas so that it can be observed if it is escaping. Under the present Act, gas must be escaping before the Gas Engineer can take any safety action. Under the amendments we are now introducing, if the Gas Engineer is of the opinion that danger exists, he can order that rectifying measures be taken.

To the hon. member for South Brisbane I point out, as I did in moving the second reading, that I convened a meeting of all interested parties associated with the control of services conveyed underground and those responsible for the opening of roads and streets to maintain these services. The Co-ordinator-General has since held many meetings and discussed problems associated with deciding who is responsible for the opening and closing of these excavations.

I also point out to the hon. member that he should know that the price of gas is controlled by a restriction on dividends. No gas company makes exorbitant profits. Dividends are limited to 3 per cent. above the current Government bond rate.

The hon. member referred to the connection of a stove by one workman, while another one was employed to connect the main. The hon. member for Yeronga was quite correct in his assertion that this is due to demarcation difficulties over who connects mains and who connects stoves. That is why it took two men to do the job. If the hon. member wishes to argue with the unions on that point, he can. I notice that he took the opportunity to criticise the coroner who conducted the inquiry, and who has not yet given judgment or issued recommendations. All the evidence has been placed before him, but as yet his findings have not been announced. Without the benefit of a coroner's inquest or other investigation, the hon. member wants action taken against somebody—he does not say whom—

Mr. Bennett: You don't want me to convict anyone in the House, do you?

Mr. CAMM: Surely with the hon. member's legal background he must know that one must commit a misdemeanour before action can be taken. I am sure that the Gas Engineer cannot forecast what the

coronial judgment and recommendations will be. Later in his speech the hon. member found the gas company guilty. He appears to take upon himself the cloak of prosecutor, judge and jury.

Mr. Bennett: I am fair in all respects.

Mr. CAMM: I consider the hon. member's remarks very inappropriate from a person who considers himself to be a learned legal authority, since no recommendation or finding has as yet been given by the coroner, who was charged with the responsibility of inquiring into the accident. I do not know how a man of the hon. member's professional standing can come into this Chamber and pronounce judgment on somebody.

Mr. Bennett: Are you prepared to go into the witness box and let me cross-examine you on the matter?

Mr. CAMM: No. I take it the hon. member will be quite happy if I submit his speech to the relevant authorities?

Mr. Bennett: I hope you will. Will you give me that undertaking?

Mr. CAMM: I am quite happy to do so.

Mr. Bennett: Do it tomorrow, will you?

Mr. CAMM: The hon. member also made allegations about members on this side of the Chamber and mentioned gas in connection with some meeting that we are supposed to have held. I do not know of any such meeting. However, I can say quite honestly that during the hon. member's infrequent visits to this Chamber we see many instances of gas escaping from him.

Mr. Bennett: You read "Hansard".

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will name the hon. member for South Brisbane if he interrupts once again.

Mr. CAMM: Some of his escaping gas has been rather offensive.

I remind the hon. member that the age of a gas pipeline is not the criterion in deciding on a replacement; rather is it the strength of the pipe, the load it has to take and its general condition.

The hon. member for Salisbury made one point that could be taken into consideration when the committee to which I have referred is convened by the Co-ordinator-General to offer advice to the authorities responsible for the laying and maintaining of underground gas mains.

Motion (Mr. Camm) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

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

Clause 6—New s. 10A; Notification of accidents—

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (9.38 p.m.): I move the following amendment:—

"On page 3, lines 11 to 14, omit the words—

'(2) A person required to notify the chief gas examiner in accordance with this section is excused from so doing where, to his knowledge, another of the persons required to notify the chief gas examiner in accordance with this section has done so.'

The remarks that have been made relative to potential danger have been endorsed by members on both sides of the Chamber. The provision that enables the gas examiner to do all such things and take all such steps as he considers necessary or desirable to remove or limit the extent of potential danger is a commendable one. I think it will be conceded that in every commercial and administrative practice it is desirable to plug all leaks, so to speak, and this is applicable to the measure now before the Committee. The gas examiner should not be hamstrung or fettered in any way in the execution of his duties if he considers that there is a likelihood of danger. The Opposition believes that if clause 6 were to be implemented in its present form, it would provide an escape clause to people whose duty it is to notify the gas examiner of the likelihood of any danger.

How would a person ascertain if the chief gas examiner has been notified unless he contacted him? If he makes a complaint he will be told by someone that the matter has already been reported. It is imperative that the people concerned should notify the chief gas examiner. How often in our ordinary daily activities do we hear highly responsible people say, "I asked Jack about that and I understood that he reported the matter.?"

The clause is rather ambiguous, and it is very weak. No difficulty would be created for the chief gas examiner if he were duly advised. When an important matter arises, every member of this Assembly may receive up to five or six telephone calls asking him if he has heard about it or notifying him about it. I am sure that with the facilities available in the chief gas examiner's office, no-one would really mind being notified. Public safety should be paramount in the thoughts of every responsible person. Nothing should be spared to ensure that public safety is adequately ensured.

The chief gas examiner should have all the power he requires. He should not be subjected to shadow-sparring by the Government, as he will be under this clause. The Government should be "fair dinkum" and make this provision quite clear so that no-one has any possibility of "ducking" his responsibility.

The powers of the chief gas examiner are very important. He should not be subjected to the wishy-washy provision in this clause. It is essential that the provision be made clear so that the chief gas examiner will not be subjected to the ambiguous words in the clause. I sincerely hope that the Committee ensures that this provision is deleted.

Hon. R. E. CAMM (Whitsunday—Minister for Mines and Main Roads) (9.44 p.m.): The provision refers to the notification of accidents. It sets out who should notify the chief gas examiner. The gas supplier, the owner, the occupier, or the person in charge of the place where the accident occurs, or any other person prescribed—that is, prescribed under the regulations—would have to notify him. I foresee the possibility that if an explosion occurred in a block of flats, every occupier of the building would have a responsibility to notify the chief gas examiner. The owner would have to do so, and so would the gas supplier. The clause provides that a person required to notify the chief gas examiner is excused from so doing where, to his knowledge—not in his opinion, or where he so understands—the accident has already been reported. The simplest way to find out if it has been reported is to ring the chief gas examiner, to be there when someone does report it, or to have the assurance of someone who can be trusted that the accident has in fact been reported.

If the clause was left without that provision, every occupier of a building, the owner himself even though he might not be there, and the gas supplier would have to notify the chief gas examiner. This would result in a multiplicity of notices whenever an accident occurred. It could be interpreted to mean that every occupier of a home-unit block would have to notify the chief gas examiner. That was why this provision was included. It does not weaken the clause, because it places an obligation on these people to report unless, to their knowledge—not to their understanding or as far as they are concerned—someone else has reported it. They must acquaint themselves with the fact that it has been reported before they are relieved of the obligation contained in this provision. I think the clause is all right as it stands.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (9.46 p.m.): I support the contentions of the hon. member for Port Curtis. His was a logical argument, but it was not dealt with logically by the Minister. Subclause (2) renders nebulous and nugatory the provisions of subclause (1). If the Minister again wants to pin my speech up at the Inns of Court, he may do so. It would save me the trouble. I can inform him that, sitting in all its glory down there at the moment, is my question to the Minister for Justice this morning and his answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I was threatened.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BENNETT: I hope the Minister does not suggest this time that my lips will be sealed because he threatens to report me to what he regards as my superiors, namely, the committee of the Queensland Bar Association. Incidentally, I am senior to most if not all of them.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member please get back to the amendment?

Mr. BENNETT: Yes. I wanted to let the Minister know where we both stand.

If subclause (2) is left in, it will mean that nobody really has an obligation to report an accident, even though it results in someone's death. This relates to an accident involving flammable gas and causing injury or death to any person or damage in excess of \$20.

The Minister has not yet explained why he fixed the amount of \$20. I do not know what magic there is in \$20 worth of damage. I suppose if there was an explosion involving flammable gas, it would be fortunate if the flame was put out before the damage exceeded \$20. The negligence involved and the danger would be such as to justify anybody in reporting it and having the obligation to report it. But simply because somebody with responsibility happens to be in attendance and puts out the flame before it does \$20 worth of damage, there is no necessity or obligation to report.

I cannot understand why there is an artificial limit and barrier of \$20. If, in the same set of circumstances, the householder or occupier is absent and the place is burnt down, there is an obligation on somebody to report. Therefore, I should like to know why this artificial limit, this magical determination of \$20, has been fixed.

The Minister said there is only an obligation on those who have knowledge of the incident. Surely it is to the advantage of the chief gas examiner to have the names and addresses of all witnesses who have knowledge. Surely this provision is dangerous to him. It is better to have too much evidence than not enough.

So often in accidents on the highway, and other incidents involving matters of public importance, there is unfortunately a great reluctance among citizens to give their names and addresses, and thus make themselves available to give evidence to see that justice is done. The gas examiner should therefore be equipped with the authority to demand that all material evidence be notified to him, whether or not he already has knowledge of it.

The Minister is pandering too much to human frailty when he makes one citizen, who has courage, determination and a sense of responsibility, accept the obligation of

reporting an accident (or, in the alternative, be exposed to a fine and penalty) whilst letting all others off the hook merely by their saying that they thought somebody else had reported the incident.

It is simply playing with words to say that the first person with knowledge has to make the report. Under section 24 of the Queensland Criminal Code, it is a defence to any charge to prove on the balance of probabilities, not beyond a reasonable doubt, that one had an honest and reasonable belief in a certain state of things. A person who raises such a defence is then tried as if the state of things that existed according to his honest and reasonable belief did in fact exist, although in fact it did not so exist. A person who had a responsibility under new section 10A(1) could wriggle out of his responsibility by saying he believed that somebody else with knowledge had reported the incident. He would have a perfect defence.

But why should he be given that opportunity? How would the gas examiner be embarrassed by the receipt of reports from more than one citizen? It would simply mean that he would get a fair and accurate report by comparing each version with the others. It might happen that the first person who reported an incident was an elderly gentleman who had died before the litigation took place. The second witness, who did not leave his name and address, would be lost. Is it not advantageous to have a long list of witnesses? Certainly this creates no disadvantage.

Of course, the Minister envisages the extreme case of, for instance, a block of units burning down and 200 calls being received by the gas examiner. What about the case of an isolated unit in a domestic household, when the householder is away and the only witnesses are one neighbour and the milkman who is delivering milk? The neighbour might say, "I thought the milkman made the report", and the milkman might say, "Why should I have to report it? The neighbour was there." In such a case, there are only two witnesses, and there are many more private households than tenement buildings in this State.

The Minister has not convinced me that the hon. member for Port Curtis is other than absolutely correct in his argument, and I do not see why any fair-minded member of Parliament should not support his amendment. In matters of a public nature where tragedy strikes, it is not possible to have too many witnesses. They are all helpful, and they all bring to notice different angles. In the case of an incident involving a number of people, if they all had the obligation to report to the gas examiner, all he would have to do would be to note that they had contacted him, inform them that he had sufficient material evidence, and thank them very much for calling. He would not have to answer the calls personally; his staff could do that. They need not waste any time with the caller.

If there is a lack of evidence, surely the public conscience can be awakened by litigation under this clause against the citizen who has not measured up to his responsibilities and obligations by notifying the authorities and giving a statement in preparation for his evidence. We do not want any defaulting citizen who has not the intestinal fortitude to stand up to his responsibilities to be let out under section 24 of the Criminal Code because of the insertion of this subclause whereby he can say, "I thought somebody else had done the job." I think that is a very weak let-out, designed again to make one law for one section of the community and another law for other sections of the community. I do not like this differential legislation.

Mr. HANSON (Port Curtis) (9.56 p.m.): I think it would be conceded that the Opposition is definitely in favour of the principle of the notification of accidents. All prescribed persons should report an accident.

If the clause terminated at line 10—"notify the chief gas examiner of all details known to him in relation thereto"—there would not be any ambiguity. Subclause (2) is purely an escape clause that will allow people to escape their responsibilities and obligations.

I agree with the hon. member for South Brisbane that there is a great reluctance on the part of many people to report accidents. One sees a similar reluctance to report in other fields. Many doctors do not live up to their responsibilities under the provisions of the Health Act that deal with notifiable diseases such as venereal disease.

It is very important that proper notification become part and parcel of this legislation so that all relevant information may be assembled to prevent tragedies and possibly save lives. The Minister says that it is only a matter of ringing up the Gas Engineer to find out whether someone else has reported. Surely to goodness that is the same as reporting. It does not require a great effort on the part of the person making the notification, nor would it cause serious inconvenience to the Gas Engineer. More time would be spent in finding out whether someone else had reported than in making a phone call to make a report. One of the prescribed persons might be running round here, there and everywhere looking for someone who was absent from Brisbane to try to find out whether he had reported, instead of merely going to the telephone and making the call and asking for official recognition of notification.

One of the prescribed persons—possibly the occupier—may have been responsible for the tragedy. He may have been responsible for the carrying out of faulty workmanship. He may be the only person who telephones the Gas Engineer. Others, realising that they had no obligation under the legislation, would not make any report, and therefore the one person who reported would give his own version of the accident, which could be

a very biased one. His version could be contested by litigation at a later stage; but, being the only one, it probably would be accepted, even though it may be wrong.

The Opposition believes that the clause is very ambiguous and very weak legally. It could also be the means of giving a very wrong version of a tragedy or accident, and I implore the Committee to vote against the clause in the division that will be called for. The Opposition believes that it is not at all helpful to the Gas Engineer and will not contribute to the safety of the public.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (10 p.m.): I did not intend to speak on this clause, but I made a study of it while listening to my colleague. I notice that the new section 10A—Notification of accidents—says—

“Where by reason of an accident caused by or involving flammable gas, injury to or the death of any person or damage to an amount apparently in excess of twenty dollars . . .”

It then says that certain specified people shall notify the chief gas examiner of the accident.

However, the ramifications of the clause are very broad. It refers to an accident involving flammable gas which, of course, must encompass the use of bottled gas. Today, the use of bottled gas is very prevalent in barbecues, and more recently it has been adapted for use by home hobbyists in silver-soldering appliances, flame-throwers for the burning off of paint, and so on. It is reasonable to assume that its use will increase greatly in the near future as large numbers of appliances similar to those that I have mentioned become available. Because of that, I would hazard a guess that, even though this Bill is passed by Parliament tonight—it may or may not receive Press publicity tomorrow—many people using bottled gas for various purposes will be completely ignorant of the provision in the Bill that an accident which causes damage to an amount apparently in excess of \$20 must be reported to the chief gas examiner.

If that provision applies to bottled gas, I believe that the public will be completely ignorant of its obligation under the clause. I suggest seriously to the Minister that it should be made mandatory for people who deal in bottled gas to have printed legibly on each bottle the statement that the user is under an obligation to notify the chief gas examiner if an accident occurs which involves damage amounting to \$20 or more.

The clause states also that the obligation will be on “the owner, occupier or person in charge of the place . . .” It has become customary for many garages to supply bottled gas, and if a person purchased a bottle of gas from a garage and an accident occurred, it would be quite unthinkable that the proprietor should be required to report it. He

might be quite unaware of the accident. The customer might purchase one bottle and the garage proprietor may never see him again. Therefore, I again suggest that notification of the obligation under the Act should be placed prominently on bottles of gas.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from clause 6 (Mr. Hanson’s amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 35

Ahern	Knox
Armstrong	Lee
Bjelke-Petersen	Lickiss
Camm	Low
Chalk	Miller
Chinchen	Moore, R. E.
Cory	Müller
Crawford	Murray
Delamothe	Newbery
Fletcher	Rae
Heatley	Ramsden
Herbert	Row
Hewitt, N. T. E.	Tomkins
Hewitt, W. D.	Tooth
Hinze	
Hodges	<i>Tellers:</i>
Hughes	Bird
Hungerford	Porter
Jones, V. E.	

NOES, 30

Baldwin	Jordan
Bennett	Marginson
Blake	Melloy
Bousen	Moore, F. P.
Bromley	Newton
Casey	O’Donnell
Davies	Sherrington
Davis	Thackeray
Dean	Tucker
Hanlon	Wallis-Smith
Hanson	Wood, B.
Harris	Wright
Houston	<i>Tellers:</i>
Inch	Aiken
Jensen	Wood, P.
Jones, R.	

PAIR

Wharton Lloyd

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 19, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment.

SNOWY MOUNTAINS ENGINEERING CORPORATION (QUEENSLAND) BILL

SECOND READING

Hon. N. T. E. HEWITT (Mackenzie—Minister for Conservation, Marine and Aboriginal Affairs) (10.12 p.m.): I move—

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

Before dealing in detail with the individual clauses of the Bill, there is one aspect arising out of it which I feel merits some reference.

From their remarks, it is apparent that hon. members generally support the measure. But it does appear that some hon. members have misinterpreted the purpose and intention of the Bill. Simply put, its purpose is to authorise the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation to operate legally within Queensland.

The Commonwealth has indicated to the States that its legal advisers were doubtful if the Commonwealth had the necessary constitutional power to authorise the corporation to carry out work in the States for State instrumentalities and private organisations.

The Commonwealth accordingly invited those States whose Governments are desirous of using the corporations services, and of permitting it to work for private organisations within their boundaries, to introduce legislation matching that enacted by the Commonwealth.

The Bill now before the House thus complements the Commonwealth Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation Act 1970, and will enable that corporation to operate at least in Queensland within the limits of its constituting Act.

For the information of hon. members, I point out that the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority still has some three years of major work ahead to complete the Snowy hydro-electric scheme as such and therefore still exists independently of the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation referred to in this Bill. It is this latter corporation that is set up to provide advice and expert assistance to any State that may desire to use its services, which Queensland is now doing and proposes to continue doing.

The Hon. D. Fairbairn, then Minister for National Development, in announcing the proposal to set up the corporation was reported in these words—

"The Commonwealth was fully aware of the services in the engineering field provided by Commonwealth and State works organisations and by private consulting bodies. It did not wish the authority (this refers to the corporation) to intrude into fields already adequately served by existing organisations. Accordingly it will limit the categories of projects the authority (corporation) might undertake in Australia to the following: Dams and other works for the storage and conveyance of water; power stations and pumping plants, underground works for conveyance of water or for other purposes; works ancillary to the above, such as electricity transmission lines and roads; and works in the disciplines involved in the above work such as hydrology, hydraulics, soil and rock mechanics.

"The various limitations I have indicated above will confine the authority to fields wherein it has a special expertise and thus retain the collective skills the authority has built up in the last 20 years".

It is significant, I think, that the first director of the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation is Mr. H. E. Dann, who has a long history of association with the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority since its inception, having been on the committee that produced the final report on the proposals for

the Snowy. He was chief engineer, investigations and major contracts. He became associate commissioner in 1959 and commissioner in 1967, and remained commissioner until appointed director of this corporation.

I now turn to the individual clauses of the Bill.

Clause 1 gives a title to the Act.

Clause 2 provides two definitions: the first is that the Commonwealth Act means the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation Act 1970 and any amendments thereof that may be made in the future; the second definition is that "corporation" means the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation as established by the Commonwealth Act.

Clause 3 recognises the corporation as a legal entity for the purposes of State law.

Clause 4 expresses the main purpose of the Bill in that it gives the corporation authority to exercise in Queensland, in regard to matters for which the Commonwealth considers it cannot legislate, the same functions as the corporation is empowered to exercise by the Commonwealth Act but only to the extent that the legislative power of this State (Queensland) permits.

The functions referred to above are set out in section 17 of the Commonwealth Act.

This Bill, if passed, will clear the way for Queensland to continue in the future to have access to and to use that expertise and know-how, and the specialist facilities built up in the past by the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Authority.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (10.18 p.m.): It is patently obvious that no matter what any hon. member may wish to do, he cannot amend this Bill.

A Government Member: Why?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: If the hon. member was not present and does not know why, why should I explain it to him? Anybody with an ounce of intelligence would know.

Mr. Sullivan: Would you give us your opinion on whether it should go through or not?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Could the Minister put that into English so I can understand it? This is complementary legislation. We have had several previous examples of this. It is not possible to amend such legislation.

The Minister has indicated that the Bill merely legalises the operations of this corporation in Queensland. Because the corporation can sue or be sued, it is vitally necessary to put the matter beyond legal doubt.

The Bill refers to section 17 of the Commonwealth Act, which specifies the acts and functions for which the corporation is responsible. It deals specifically with the setting

up of the corporation as an almost completely advisory body within the Commonwealth of Australia. However, section 17(f) states that the corporation has the function of being responsible for the construction of, or the performance of, any work in relation to the construction of engineering works outside Australia. To me, that makes the measure before the House very hollow indeed. Droughts recur in most States, and throughout the whole of Australia the States are literally crying out for water conservation schemes. Yet here is a corporation which, although it acts merely in an advisory capacity within the Commonwealth, can undertake construction work outside Australia. If it were possible to provide that section 17 of the Commonwealth Act be amended to enable this corporation to become a constructing authority, I am sure that Opposition members would endeavour to have such an amendment carried.

Mr. Cory: By day labour or contract?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: By day labour, of course. If the hon. member took the trouble to examine the performance of day labour on Government projects, he would find that it compares more than favourably with contract work. As a matter of fact, in the supply of material to schools, contracts have a pretty poor performance compared with day labour. However, I do not want to digress on that subject.

The other matter that should exercise the minds of hon. members is the steadily increasing cost to the State of engaging the services of this corporation. I think the information given by the Minister as recently as last year showed that approximately \$250,000 was paid to the Commonwealth for the corporation's services. Personally, I feel that it is completely futile for the Premier to go south and obtain finance for the State if money has to be returned to the Commonwealth to pay the cost of work that could well be borne by the Commonwealth. If the corporation is to function merely as an advisory body, I feel that the States could make better use of the money that will have to be paid for its services.

I indicated at the introductory stage that we felt that there would be no serious objection to the measure. After studying the Bill, I see no reason to alter that opinion. Having made those points, I indicate that the Opposition has no desire to oppose the Bill.

Motion (Mr. Hewitt) agreed to.

COMMITTEE

(Mr. Ramsden, Merthyr, in the chair)

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

Bill reported, without amendment.

The House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.