

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 14 MARCH 1962

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 14 MARCH, 1962

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

QUESTIONS

NUMBER OF DEATHS THROUGH ELECTROCUTION

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“What is the number of deaths in the last twelve months of (i.) tradesmen and (ii.) other persons caused through (a) hand power-tools, (b) electric motor-mowers, (c) washing machines, (d) electric irons, (e) electric refrigerators, (f) electric stoves, (g) electric heaters, (h) electric fans and (i) any other miscellaneous electrical appliances?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“The number of deaths in the twelve months ending December 31, 1961, in the categories listed by the Honourable Member were:

	(i.) Tradesmen	(ii.) Other Persons
(a) Hand power-tools	—	2
(b) Electric motor-mowers	—	—
(c) Washing machines	—	2
(d) Electric irons	—	—
(e) Electric refrigerators	—	—
(f) Electric stoves	—	—
(g) Electric heaters	—	—
(h) Electric fans	—	—
(i) Any other miscellaneous electrical appliances	1	2

All except one of the above fatalities were caused by the associated flexible cord and/or plug and not by any fault in the appliance.”

SICK ENGINE DRIVER ON TRAIN 247D, BOWEN TO TOWNSVILLE

Mr. BAXTER (Hawthorne) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) Is it a fact that on December 30, 1961, the driver working train 247D from Bowen to Townsville was taken seriously ill at Guthalungra and had to be returned to Bowen by ambulance car?”

“(2) Was the shedman on duty at the Bowen locomotive engine shed instructed at 11.15 p.m. to secure a driver to replace the sick driver, the new driver to proceed to Guthalungra by taxi? If so, (a) by whom and (b) on whose authority did this officer issue such instruction?”

“(3) Did the shedman notify train-control at 11.55 p.m. on December 30, 1961, that he had procured a driver who was now ready to proceed to Guthalungra by taxi to take over the working of 247D?”

“(4) Was the shedman then notified that the driver, he had procured, was not now required at Guthalungra? If so, (a) who was responsible for the issuing of this later instruction and (b) by whom was such instruction authorised?”

“(5) Did the fireman, who was originally booked on the train, take over control of 247D and work the train from Guthalungra to Ayr without an assistant on the engine? If so, (a) what tuition if any did this fireman have in the working and control of diesel engines on the main line, (b) who issued such instruction to the fireman to carry out such duty and (c) was such an action not a complete contravention of the Departmental rules and regulations governing the safe workings of trains?”

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer) replied—

“(1) Yes.”

“(2) Yes. (a) and (b) By the train control clerk on duty.”

“(3) Yes.”

“(4) Yes. (a) and (b) The instruction was issued to Bowen by the train control clerk on duty consequent upon the locomotive engineer having satisfied himself that the fireman-acting driver was competent to work the goods train on to Ayr—a distance of 41 miles.”

“(5) Yes. (a to c) The fireman-acting driver had passed his theoretical examination in diesel electric locomotive operation. Before working the goods train to Ayr he was questioned by the Locomotive Engineer who after satisfying himself as to his competency to do so authorised him to work the train to Ayr. No opposing trains were running on the section between Guthalungra and Ayr and it is considered no risk was involved but that the officer concerned did what he considered was best to meet the emergent circumstances which had arisen and the delay which would have occurred in bringing a Driver from Bowen was avoided.”

PURCHASE OF COPPER WIRE BY TOWNSVILLE REGIONAL ELECTRICITY BOARD FROM STUART COPPER REFINERY

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

“(1) Since the manufacture of it began, how much copper wire has been purchased from the Stuart Copper Refinery by the Townsville Regional Electricity Board?”

“(2) Since the refinery began manufacturing copper wire, how much copper wire has been purchased from other sources by the Townsville Regional Electricity Board?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“(1) Total copper cable purchased—65,000 lb. for £10,906 5s.”

“(2) Nil.”

COLD-WATER URNS IN LOCOMOTIVE
WORKSHOPS, TOWNSVILLE

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) Has he received any reports as to the unsatisfactory performance of the electrically-operated cold-water urns in the locomotive workshops, Townsville, to the effect that the supply of cold water is very limited and, if so, what action will be taken to remedy the matter?”

“(2) Will he instal an electrically-operated cold-water urn in the Townsville running shed?”

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer) replied—

“(1) There are twenty electrically-operated water coolers in the Workshops and Diesel Shed at Townsville. I have not received any report as to their unsatisfactory performance. Upon enquiry, however, I understand that if, as happens at certain times during the day, as, for example, at the end of a rest pause period, during very hot weather employees congregate around the coolers causing an abnormal draw-off, the water obtained by those last to draw it off has not had time to cool to the same extent as that obtained by those obtaining the first draw-off. So far as is known, these coolers are operating satisfactorily in other Workshops.”

“(2) Approval already has been given for the provision of two electrically-operated water coolers in the Townsville Running Shed.”

SUPPLY OF PEDESTALS AND GULLY TRAPS,
SEWERAGE SCHEME, TOWNSVILLE

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“In view of the fact that home owners in the new western suburbs sewerage scheme area are being notified by the Townsville City Council that they will have to bear the full cost of the installation of sewerage to their homes—

(1) Why did every home in Townsville previously seweraged have one pedestal and all gully traps installed free?

(2) Is there any restriction or prohibition imposed by the Government that prevents the Townsville City Council continuing this desirable practice?”

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset) replied—

“(1 and 2) The matter of installation of sewerage is a function of the Local Authority and accordingly matters related thereto are ones for decision by the Council concerned.”

REVENUE FROM PARKATAREA METERS

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

“(1) What is the estimated earning capacity of installed parkatarea meters on a weekly basis?”

“(2) What are their average weekly earnings?”

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

“(1) With full capacity use at all times, approximately £2,800, but the normal use of similar units elsewhere is approximately 70 per cent., which allows ample facilities for abnormal peaks. On this basis, income would be £1,960.”

“(2) Approximately £1,300 at present, but is increasing each week. It is expected that the normal 70 per cent. usage will be attained in the near future.”

PUBLIC LIBRARY AT INALA CIVIC CENTRE

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“Will he give consideration to setting aside portion of the Inala Civic Centre, such land to be made available at a minimum cost and to be used by the City Council for the establishment of a public library?”

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth) replied—

“The Civic Centre as the Honourable Member will appreciate is valuable land which has been developed at considerable cost to the Queensland Housing Commission as a business proposition to meet the requirements of this area. Applications for sites in the Civic Centre have been advertised to close on April 24 next. The Brisbane City Council may make a submission in regard to its desire to obtain any of the business sites and any submission which it may make could only be considered in conjunction with tenders received from other interested parties. I would remind the Honourable Member that the State affords most generous subsidy treatment to Local Authorities establishing public libraries. New buildings are subsidised at the rate of 50 per cent. with a limit of £4,000 in any one year. Annual expenditure on books and equipment is also subsidised at the rate of 50 per cent.”

CONTRACTS LET BY HOUSING COMMISSION
FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

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

“(1) How many contracts have been let within the City of Brisbane by the Queensland Housing Commission to private contractors for the purpose of land development for housing purposes since June 30, 1958?”

"(2) In what localities were these contracts let and who were the successful contractors?"

"(3) Were tenders called by the Queensland Housing Commission for each job?"

"(4) How many quotes were obtained by the Queensland Housing Commission for each job?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth) replied—

"(1) Twenty-four."

"(2) Localities—Rocklea (1 contract), Stafford (3 contracts), Inala (7 contracts), Holland Park (4 contracts), Acacia Ridge (3 contracts), Grovely (1 contract), Mt. Gravatt (2 contracts), Gaythorne (2 contracts), and Manly (1 contract). Contractors—G. & J. Gilmour Pty. Ltd. (2 contracts), Earthmovers Pty. Ltd. (2 contracts), Thiess Bros. (Qld.) Pty. Ltd. (4 contracts), Mains Construction Co. (1 contract), K. D. Morris and Sons (1 contract), H. J. Smith (1 contract), F. Fleming and Son (1 contract), Delta Construction Co. (Qld.) Pty. Ltd. (3 contracts), Swift Bros. (1 contract), L. S. Frost Earthmoving Pty. Ltd. (1 contract), H. J. Lee and Son (Earthmoving) Pty. Ltd. (2 contracts), Blondells Pty. Ltd. (1 contract), J. George (2 contracts), W. A. Horne and Sons (1 contract), C. H. Sims Enterprises Pty. Ltd. (1 contract)."

"(3) Tenders were called in 22 cases; in one case due to urgency to permit houses to be erected on land for defence personnel, tenders were invited from five contractors by the consulting engineers in May, 1961, for road works at Gaythorne when four tenders were received, the lowest, which was accepted for £7,745, was £600 below the engineer's estimate, while the highest was £1,260 above the estimate; and in one case four quotes were obtained for clearing and grubbing approximately 20 acres, the lowest price which was accepted was £320, whilst the highest was £810."

"(4) The number of tenders received were—13, 12, and 11 for three jobs, 9 for two jobs, 7 for three jobs, 6 for two jobs, 4 for six jobs, 3 for five jobs, 2 for two jobs and 4 quotes for 1 job. I might add that with the exception of three of the cases, the tenders which were accepted were below the engineer's estimates."

RESUMPTION OF PROPERTY FOR NEW ROAD THROUGH REDBANK

Mr. DONALD (Ipswich East) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"(1) Is it the intention of the Main Roads Commission to construct a new road through the township of Redbank, leaving the Darling Downs-Brisbane highway a short distance west of Goodna Creek and rejoining this highway a short distance east of Six Mile Creek? If so, how many homes and other buildings will have to be removed?"

"(2) What is the estimated cost of the compensation that will be paid to the people whose homes will be removed?"

"(3) Will the road pass through property purchased by the Department of Education to provide additional playground area for the pupils of the Redbank State School? If so, will that department be compensated for the loss of this ground?"

"(4) Will compensation be paid to the Commonwealth Government if the road goes through the Rifle Range property?"

"(5) What other property will be resumed?"

"(6) What is (a) the estimated cost of the construction of the road, (b) the estimated cost of resumption of property and (c) the estimated cost of compensation paid to property owners?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

"(1) Yes. Nine houses, possibly one Church of England and an acquisition of an additional house in conjunction with the Department of Education request for additional land."

"(2) Could be £25,000 on the basis of total dispossession. If owners elected to have their houses removed and replaced elsewhere this figure would be reduced."

"(3) Yes. There has been discussion with the Department of Education regarding adequate compensation."

"(4) The road is going through a part of the Rifle Range and compensation will be paid to the Commonwealth Government."

"(5) Parts of properties owned by the Queensland Housing Commission, Commissioner for Railways, Noblevale Collieries and some individuals."

"(6) (a) Estimated cost of road construction, £210,000; (b and c) Estimated cost of resumption of property and compensation, £75,000."

MAINTENANCE COSTS AND RENTAL INCREASES, HOUSING COMMISSION PROJECTS

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"Further to his reply to my question on March 7, 1962, in relation to increased rents on Queensland Housing Commission homes—

"(1) Why has the rent of a widow, who has taken up tenancy with the Commission during the past three months and who paid 8s. 6d. more than the previous tenant, again been increased by the same amount following the recent rental increase?"

"(2) Is there any period of time allowed before new tenants can again have their rents increased?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth) replied—

“(1) In this case when on November 20, 1961, there was change of tenancy the rent was increased by 8s. 6d. to £3 15s. per week. Inadvertently, on February 26 last, the tenant was advised that the rent was to be increased to £4 3s. 6d. per week as from 5th instant. However, the tenant called at the Commission's office on 6th instant when the error was rectified and she was informed that the rent was £3 15s. per week and such would be charged. My answer to the Honourable Member's Question (4) of 7th instant reads—‘Other than in respect of changes of tenancies, the previous increase in rents affecting the areas mentioned was made at the rate of 1s. per week on account of Local Authority rates in August, 1959, which was the only other increase since 1957.’”

“(2) The answer to this Question is the same as given to the Honourable Member's Question (5) of 7th instant which read—‘The present rentals will remain in force until such time as it is found necessary to vary the rent to cover increased costs that may occur.’”

ELECTION OF NEW COOK SHIRE COUNCIL

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“As local authority matters in the Cook Shire have been under the control of an Administrator appointed by the Governor in Council over the past three years, when is it proposed to allow the electors of the Cook Shire to elect their own local authority?”

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset) replied—

“There have been no representations for the restoration of Local Government in the Shire of Cook.”

USE OF RAILWAY TRACK FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD FROM COOKTOWN TO LAURA

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

“Before any further expenditure of Federal Aid Roads money is undertaken in the construction of an alternative road from the McIvor area to Laura, will he ask his Department to take up with the Administrator of the Cook Shire regarding the practicability of using the formation of the railway track from Cooktown to Laura as a more advantageous route?”

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

“Yes.”

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT WORKS AT THURSDAY ISLAND

Mr. ADAIR (Cook) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“Owing to the acute unemployment position at Thursday Island, what sum of money has been allocated from funds recently made available by the Commonwealth for the carrying out of local government works on the island?”

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth) replied—

“Nil. I would point out to the Honourable Gentleman that the State is regularly making a special contribution to Thursday Island of no mean order. The subsidy on the shipping service approximates £30,000 per annum and its Local Authority receives a special grant of £3,000 per annum in relief of rates, a situation not paralleled elsewhere.”

CONSTRUCTION OF RAILWAY LINE TO NEW MUNICIPAL MARKETS AT ROCKLEA

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) asked the Minister for Transport—

“Has any provision been made for a railway to be constructed to the new municipal market site at Rocklea? If not, what arrangements are being made for commodities, consigned by rail, to be carried from the nearest rail point to the market?”

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer) replied—

“Preliminary planning of railway siding accommodation at Tennyson to cater for the new municipal markets is well in hand and installation will coincide with completion of the market buildings.”

APPOINTMENT OF PART-TIME MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT AT MOSSMAN PUBLIC HOSPITAL

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

“(1) Is it a fact that the Mossman Hospital Board has called applications for a medical superintendent on a part-time basis?”

“(2) What is the reason for the board's decision which denies the residents of Mossman and district the services of a full-time medical service, and was the decision made after discussions with a Departmental officer who was seeking a reduction of overhead costs at this hospital?”

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer—Minister for Transport), for **Hon. H. W. NOBLE** (Yeronga), replied—

“(1) Yes.”

"(2) This decision was made after careful consideration and in view of the known shortage of doctors willing to accept appointments in country hospitals. It was considered extremely unlikely that the full-time position could be filled and that it was much more likely that a suitable applicant would be forthcoming if the position was advertised as a part-time one."

DOMESTIC SCIENCE CLASSROOM FOR
ATHERTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Minister for Education and Migration—

"(1) In view of the fact that no facilities are available for domestic science instruction at the Atherton State High School and students have to make their own arrangements for travel to and from the primary school, a distance of approximately one mile each way, will he arrange for transport to be made available by his Department?"

"(2) When is the addition of a domestic science classroom to be proceeded with?"

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis) replied—

"(1) My Department does not institute transport services to convey students a distance of one mile."

"(2) With reference to the provision of a domestic science section at the Atherton High School, all necessary action has been taken to have the project included in next year's Works Programme, following strong representations made many months ago by the Honourable Member for the Tablelands, Mr. T. Gilmore, M.L.A."

MEDICAL CERTIFICATES AND PAYMENT OF
WORKERS' COMPENSATION

Mr. WALLACE (Cairns) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

"(1) In view of his reply to my personal representations on behalf of Mr. Robert Quick, 16 Water Street, Cairns, requesting the reopening of his claim for compensation, and also the fact that further surgical treatment to his scalp was quite recently found necessary, just what standing do medical officers not employed by the Department of Health and Home Affairs have in relation to the issuing of certificates relating to accident cases for compensation purposes?"

"(2) Has a decision been made and by whom not to pursue the long-established formula of paying workers' compensation when a doubt exists?"

"(3) Does he consider that only medical officers employed by the Department of Health and Home Affairs are competent to issue certificates acceptable to the State Government Insurance Office?"

"(4) If so, what steps, if any, has he taken to advise the Australian Medical Association that certificates issued by members of that association will not be recognised for compensation purposes if they are in private practice?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth) replied—

"(1) The Honourable Member should realise that the worker has a choice as to his medical attendant. The State Government Insurance Office accepts medical certificates from any legally qualified medical practitioner. I am advised that a majority of claims are admitted on medical certificates issued by private practitioners and I would be loath to place any restriction on the free choice of workers in this behalf. As to the particular case mentioned, the State Government Insurance Office is not aware that the claimant has received further surgical treatment. If details in this respect are supplied, the Office will look further into the case."

"(2) No. Where there is a reasonable doubt, the benefit of that doubt is extended, as always, to the claimant."

"(3) No. As already stated, the majority of claims are met on the certificates of other than the staff of State hospitals."

"(4) Where medical opinions differ, obviously some will be accepted and others rejected. In such cases, the State Government Insurance Office makes a determination after weighing both opinions and often after seeking specialist advice. I am not unfamiliar with medical men who take the rejection of their certificate as a personal affront and express resentment accordingly. It would be quite wrong to allow these occasional incidents to be accepted as the general picture. I can assure the Honourable Gentleman that the vast majority of medical certificates are accepted, often in cases where the Office entertains some considerable doubt."

APPROACHES TO MOORES CREEK BRIDGE,
ROCKHAMPTON

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) asked the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity—

"Has any allocation been made for the approaches to the Moores Creek Bridge, Rockhampton, now under construction? If so, when will this work be completed?"

Hon. E. EVANS (Mirani) replied—

"Funds will be provided to complete the approaches, work on which will be completed as soon as possible after the completion of the bridge."

CONSTRUCTION OF 2000-CLASS RAIL MOTORS

Mr. THACKERAY (Rockhampton North) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) Are any 2000-class rail motors at present under construction?”

“(2) Will any of the 2000-class rail motors be allocated to Rockhampton branch lines to replace the obsolete motors operating on these lines?”

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer) replied—

“(1) Five.”

“(2) The disposition of these rail motors has not yet been decided upon.”

HOUSING COMMISSION RENTAL HOUSES
IN GLADSTONE

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) asked the Treasurer and Minister for Housing—

“(1) Are there any Housing Commission homes available on a rental basis in Gladstone at present?”

“(2) When were the last homes for rental erected in Gladstone and has the Commission any plans for additional homes there in the near future?”

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth) replied—

“(1) One rental house in Gladstone was vacated yesterday and will be re-let by the Clerk of Petty Sessions.”

“(2) The last rental house constructed in Gladstone was one of a group of two houses completed in March, 1960—the other house was purchased under Contract of Sale. Commission building sites are available for selection by persons desiring houses for purchase and tenders for such houses are called following receipt of applications. The Commission has provided a pool of eighty rental houses which is considered adequate in view of the fact that only four applications with points priority for rental houses are held by the Clerk of Petty Sessions, Gladstone, and all of these are of low priority.”

SALE OF HOUSES FOR ARREARS OF RATES
BY GLADSTONE TOWN COUNCIL

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) asked the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—

“(1) Is he aware of the fact that in accordance with its effort to collect outstanding rates the Gladstone Town Council is advertising for sale the homes of pensioners and others living in its area?”

“(2) Will he investigate the matter with a view to exercising his Ministerial authority to defer any further action pending enquiries as to the possibility of

giving some relief to necessitous cases and providing alternative homes on a rental basis?”

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset) replied—

“(1 and 2) The matter of levying and collection of rates is one for the Local Authority concerned. In case of default in the payment of rates a Local Authority is vested with certain power to enforce payment thereof including in the case of arrears of rates extending over a period of three years the power of sale subject to the provisions of the Local Government Acts. I would have no power to direct a Council in such matters.”

SALE OF RAILWAY GOODS SHED AT
LITTLEMORE

Mr. BURROWS (Port Curtis) asked the Minister for Transport—

“(1) In respect to the answer given by him that certain officers had valued buildings which were subsequently sold by private negotiation on the Boyne Valley branch of the Railways and that the goods shed at Littlemore had been sold for £50, is he aware that the buyer immediately resold this building without touching it for £150?”

“(2) In view of the foregoing, will he take steps to see that any future disposals be dealt with in a more competent manner?”

Hon. G. W. W. CHALK (Lockyer) replied—

“(1) No.”

“(2) Every endeavour will continue to be made consistent with circumstances existing to obtain the best possible prices when arranging such disposals, but the possibility of a purchaser being able to realize on his purchase at a profit will always exist.”

FORM OF QUESTION

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) having given notice of questions—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I advise the hon. member that one of his questions reflects on the judiciary and I will not allow it. In no case will such a question be allowed.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table—

Order in Council under the Agricultural Bank (Loans) Act of 1959.

Order in Council under the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Acts, 1923 to 1957.

Order in Council under the Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1961.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

INALA HOTEL

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I have to announce that this morning I received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition—

"The Hon. D. E. Nicholson, 13 March, 1962.

Speaker,
Legislative Assembly,
Parliament House,
Brisbane.

"Dear Mr. Nicholson,

"I beg to inform you that, in accordance with Standing Order 137, I intend on Wednesday, March 14, to move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

"My reason for moving this motion is to give the House an opportunity of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the Government's action in confirming a decision of the Licensing Commission in accepting a tender of Kevin Francis Ward for Licensed Victualler's License in respect of premises to be erected in Freeman Road and Rudd Street, Inala.

"This decision has—

- (a) Undermined the confidence of the people in the Government;
- (b) Appears to be against the weight of evidence;
- (c) Adversely affects Crown revenue;
- (d) Destroys the confidence of the public in the system of public tender;
- (e) Is contrary to the wishes of the majority of the residents directly concerned;
- (f) Is urgent because large sums of money involving the transaction could be expended in contravention of the public interest; and,
- (g) Furthermore, unless the matter is debated within the next two or three weeks the opportunity of doing so will be lost for several months.

Yours faithfully,
John E. Duggan."

As I regard this matter as being of public importance I propose to allow the motion.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South): I rise on a question of privilege. That means that the whole business of this House and the State of Queensland is to be suspended for several hours while we talk about the siting of one pub. in Brisbane. I should like the people of Queensland to know that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

Not fewer than five members having risen in their places in support of the motion—

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (11.41 a.m.): I move—

"That the House do now adjourn."

It might be inappropriate to waste very much time on the hon. member for Townsville South but I should have thought that on a matter of such public importance as this, particularly when Standing Orders provide for the opportunity of ventilating in Parliament matters that are unquestionably of public importance, he would welcome Standing Orders in this regard, especially as he so frequently states that we are denied the opportunity of dealing with these matters.

I am very grateful to you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity of raising what unquestionably is a matter that is exercising a good deal of public interest outside. I shall outline substantial reasons for the motion. However, in addition to the public interest that has been manifested it is obvious also that the Press—and this represents all sections of the Press including the daily Press and the week-end Press—have indicated that they regard it as a matter of very great public importance, because I have clippings here extending over a period of weeks, most of them in bold type, indicating that they feel it is a matter that should be discussed a little further.

I think I should deal very briefly in chronological sequence with events leading up to this matter. Pursuant to Section 48 of the Liquor Act action was taken to remove a licence to the locality of Inala, and notice was duly given of the intention giving the people in the area the right of exercising a local option poll in accordance with the requirements of the Act.

The local option poll was duly held and, by a very substantial majority, it was approved that a hotel be established. A request for a hotel was filed, for it to be at Inala. The notice published by the Licensing Commission specified the boundaries of the locality to which it proposed to remove the licence and called for objections to the removal of the licence as required by the Act. No objection was lodged. The owner and licensee of the Oxley hotel, the hotel situated nearest to the proposed site of the Inala hotel, did not object because—and I have made it my business to ascertain the reason—it was assumed that the licensee of the new hotel would be given premises in the heart of Inala, even though the boundaries of the locality as specified in the "Gazette" extended up to Ipswich Road to a point within approximately a quarter of a mile of the Oxley hotel.

In the month of November last the Commission called for tenders for the licence in accordance with the provisions of Section 49. It is understood that the Commission was aware of the unusual circumstances existing at Inala where practically the whole of the land in the locality is owned or controlled by the Queensland Housing Commission. It is understood that the Housing Commission first offered a site for the hotel in the Civic Centre. The Housing Commission has recently called

tenders inviting persons wishing to erect shops at the Civic Centre to tender for a purchase of a lease of land therein. It is understood that the Licensing Commission inspected the site in the Civic Centre suggested by the Housing Commission and expressed the view that it was unsuitable because it was comparatively small. The Housing Commission then suggested an alternative site, in all, 10 acres, which is situated 200 yards from the Civic Centre. It is understood that the Licensing Commission indicated that this particular site would be suitable for an hotel. Accordingly, when tenders were called in accordance with Section 48, the official instructions for tenders issued by the Licensing Commission contained the following provision—

“Tenderers may tender in respect of any site available to them in the locality.

“In so far as land owned by Queensland Housing Commission in the locality is concerned, Subdivision 180 of Portion 361, County of Stanley, Parish of Oxley, City of Brisbane, containing 10 acres 0 roods 20 perches, or any part thereof, which land is owned by the Queensland Housing Commission, will be made available to a successful tenderer (if so desired) at a rental to be agreed upon between the tenderer and the said Queensland Housing Commission.”

Tenders closed on 4 December, 1961. The Commission announced that it had received 10 tenders. Of these tenders five were in respect of the Housing Commission site.

The tenders received were as follows:—

Tenderer	Price Offered £
Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd.	20,200
Messrs. Fitzgibbon & Mann	20,000
Messrs. Pradella & Degiovanni	11,200
Messrs. Pradella & Degiovanni (alternative site)	10,200
Inala Hotels Pty. Ltd. . .	10,000
K. F. Ward	7,500
D. Catsoulis (late tender)	5,000
Queensland Brewery Ltd.	3,500
Sales Finance Pty. Ltd.	2,000
Inala Industries Pty. Ltd.	1,000

Under the provisions of Section 48, the Commission is in effect obliged to announce its acceptance or otherwise of a tender within two months from the date on which the tenders closed, as the Act provides that a tenderer may withdraw his tender after two months. The Commission announced the acceptance of Mr. Ward's tender on 1 February, 1962.

It is understood that Mr. Ward had applied to the Brisbane City Council for site approval of his site and that the City Council refused site approval on the ground, *inter alia*, that the site was close to a main traffic artery and that the residents of Inala would have to cross two sub-arterial roads.

It is further understood that Castlemaine Perkins Limited, who took out the option

over the land in respect to which Mr. Ward tendered, exercised its right of appeal under the City of Brisbane (Town Plan) Act. The Minister for Public Works and Local Government appointed Mr. George Lukin to hear the appeal, and he upheld it. I think that undue haste was exhibited in exercising this right of appeal to enable the Licensing Commission to give its decision on the matter. At least one of the applicants for the Housing Commission site applied to the Council for site approval but did not receive any reply and did not receive any decision on his application.

It is understood that after tenders closed the Licensing Commission was in touch with the Council regarding its approval or otherwise of the Housing Commission site, and it is believed that the Commission was informed that the Council did not favour the site. However, the Council did not refuse site approval to any applicant for the Housing Commission site, and in its decision the Commission expressly announced that it had proceeded on the assumption that site approval would be given to all the prospective sites.

In announcing its reasons for its decision (the Commission gave no reasons until after Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. had petitioned the Governor in Council) the Commission stated that it considered three main considerations—

1. The suitability of the site.
2. Nature of the premises.
3. Amount offered by the tenderer for the purchase of the licence.

The Commission further stated that it was influenced to some extent by the fact that at some time in the perhaps not too far distant future a further hotel or hotels would be required in this area.

It is pointed out that if the Commission proposed to transfer a further licence to Inala the residents could seek a further option poll, and in the light of recent events it is most likely that the residents would refuse the licence. It is obvious that public interest in the area was completely disregarded, because the poll was for a hotel in Inala and the reaction to the Commission's decision as shown by a canvass of the people in the area by the hon. member for Salisbury, by other interested bodies, and by the Press, indicates clearly that there is grave dissatisfaction, and it has been stated by the President of the Progress Association and several other people interviewed that the Licensing Commission has approved an unsuitable site, a site which is contrary to the wishes of the people living in the area. In the light of this, there is no guarantee that an application for an alternative site would be approved. In any case, the important point is that the application was for a hotel at Inala, not for a proposed second hotel at Inala at some distant time in the future. Yet the Commission states that this was one of the factors that influenced it in its decision.

In its judgment the Commission, by implication, further condemned the Housing Commission site, notwithstanding the fact that in its original instructions to tenderers it indicated that this site would be suitable to it.

The Commission made no mention in its judgment of the fact that it had awarded the licence to a brewery so that the only hotel in Inala would sell the products of one brewery only.

There are several other reasons that I think I should give to the House indicating why the matter should be ventilated and the House should adjourn as a measure of protest against what I believe to be a most unusual decision, a decision which does not seem to be reinforced by common sense, by the facts of the case, or by the various matters that I have covered in my letter to you, Mr. Speaker—public interest, Crown revenue, and the other attendant matters to which I have referred. The additional reasons are—

1. That the Government's action in confirming the decision of the Licensing Commission accepting the tender of Kevin Francis Ward for a licensed victualler's licence in respect of premises to be erected in Freeman Road and Rudd Street, Inala, is a direct negation of the will of the majority of the residents of Inala who voted in favour of the establishment of an hotel in Inala at the recent local option poll.

2. That the tender by Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. of the sum of £20,200 for the licence was the most advantageous to the Crown financially, as it was £12,700 greater than the successful tender.

3. That the building offered by Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. was at least equal to that offered by Kevin Francis Ward.

4. That Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. proposed to build its hotel on a site approved of by the State Housing Commission and stated by the Licensing Commission to be acceptable to it in the official instructions for tenderers.

5. That the tender of Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. was the most advantageous to the Crown and to the State Housing Commission as it proposed to rent all of the site offered by the State Housing Commission at a rental of between £3,000 and £5,000 per annum.

6. That the successful tenderer, Kevin Francis Ward, is an agent of Castlemaine Perkins Ltd. so the patrons of the hotel will be able to purchase one brand of liquor only whereas Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. would supply all brands of liquor.

7. That the Licensing Commission did not inform tenderers it had in mind the establishment of a further hotel or hotels in the locality in the not too far distant future.

8. That the Commission and the Government acted unreasonably in allowing choice of the site to be influenced by considerations of the granting of a second licence in the locality as the residents of Inala would be entitled to demand another local option poll if it be proposed to remove a further licence to that locality and it cannot be assumed that the residents would at some later date approve the establishment of a second hotel in the district.

9. That very substantial revenue has been lost to the Housing Commission in that Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. proposed to rent the Housing Commission site at a rental of between £3,000 and £5,000 per annum whereas the successful tenderer will erect its hotel on freehold land from which the Crown receives no revenue.

10. That the site to which the Commission has granted the licence was rejected by the Brisbane City Council unanimously and was stated by the Council to be the most unsuitable of all the prospective sites.

11. That there was undue and exceptional haste in the hearing of the appeal against the Council's decision to reject the site of Kevin Francis Ward.

12. That the Commission and the Government did not have regard to the fact that the land adjoining the site of the successful tenderer is undeveloped and is not likely to be developed in the foreseeable future.

13. That the Commission and the Government did not have regard to the fact that the new hotel will be built in close proximity to the existing Oxley Hotel which has been recently remodelled at a cost of £80,000.

14. That the Treasurer recently held a cocktail party at Lennons Hotel to arouse the interest of the business community in the commercial development of the Civic Centre at Inala and now the tender of Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. for a site adjacent to the Civic Centre which would in every way meet the Treasurer's wishes has been rejected.

15. That the Government's action in rejecting the offer of Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd. to pay the Crown a rental of between £3,000 and £5,000 per annum is in marked contrast to their decision to increase the rental of Housing Commission tenants in Inala by amounts varying between 4s. and 10s. per week.

16. That there is grave public misgiving in this matter as no satisfactory reason has been given for this decision which has caused the loss to the Crown of the sum of £12,700 in revenue plus an amount of £3,000 to £5,000 annually in land rental and which has imposed on the residents of Inala a "One Brand" hotel on a site which is entirely unacceptable to them.

All the logic of the case suggests very strongly that the best that can be said about it is that there has been a very grave error of judgment. So far the Minister's explanation since he has been called upon to justify the decision of the Governor in Council when the petition was presented has been completely unsatisfactory. I have met many people who feel that the Government are deserving of the strongest possible condemnation for this decision. I am not going to have the argument used that it is a quasi-judicial body and that therefore we cannot discuss these matters. The action of the Minister in taking it to the Governor in Council indicates that he accepted the fact that it was a public responsibility that he had to shoulder. As I pointed out in my Press statement he showed an acceptance of that obligation but was completely contemptuous of the wishes of the people concerned by the rejection of the appeal. The position calls for a most searching inquiry. I indict the Government for their action in this regard. I have strongly criticised the Government for many of their administrative decisions, but for the reasons I have given this as one of the worst. They have been completely contemptuous of all of the reasons that have actuated the public in these matters. If we are going to have Crown revenue lost and confidence in the system of public tendering undermined, what is going to be the use of people submitting tenders in the perfectly legitimate way for Crown benefits? If this sort of consideration is influencing the Government the people are entitled to know why. So far the defence offered by the Government has not been to my satisfaction nor to the satisfaction of the many other people concerned. Since this decision was given by the Governor in Council, rejecting the appeal, there have been further editorials in the Press on the matter showing that they too consider that the Minister's explanation was unsatisfactory.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (11.55 a.m.): In seconding this motion for adjournment I should like to reply briefly to the hon. member for Townsville South who said that the matter was not important. It is not now just a question of whether or not there will be an hotel at Inala. Such a situation will develop throughout Queensland and the wishes of the people will be ignored completely by the Government. By their very actions the Government have shown a complete contempt for the people of Inala; they have displayed a despotic attitude by forcing the people of Inala to accept something that they did not, in the first place, desire and on which they exercised their prerogative and privilege by vote under our democratic laws.

The action of the Governor in Council in confirming the decision of the Licensing Commission must throw upon the Government the responsibility for the bad decision

that has been made and from the consequences of which they cannot escape. The odours emanating from the circumstances surrounding this decision lead me to support the motion for adjournment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

At no stage has the Minister given any good reason for supporting a decision which, in effect, will mean forcing upon the residents of Inala an hotel which will not serve their needs, which is contrary to the requirements of good planning, which is outside the developed area and also the area for proposed future development, and in which customers will have no choice of the liquor they wish to drink. I remind hon. members that that lack of choice is subscribed to by a Government that, over the years, have always said that freedom of choice must be preserved to the people. So, it is complete hypocrisy on behalf of the Minister to force upon the people of Inala an hotel which will not supply them with the liquor they desire.

In addition, the Minister has not satisfactorily explained many of the aspects of the decision—why this decision is denying the Crown revenue of approximately £5,000 per annum, why was a tribunal appointed and a decision bulldozed through that tribunal to set aside a refusal of the Brisbane City Council Planning Committee to grant site approval to a site which in their view was the worst site of all? Furthermore, I understand that this licence was granted for an area that required subdivision, which subdivision had not been carried out prior to the granting of the licence, and which, I understand, up to the present time has been refused by the Brisbane City Council because a 3½ acre subdivision is not, in their view and that of the Surveyor-General, a suitable subdivision in a non-urban area.

The Minister has failed also to explain why the chairman of the Licensing Commission based his decision on the assumption that another licence would be granted in the area in future when, in fact, his decision should have been based on the fact that a local option poll was held in Inala on the basis of one hotel for the area. On what grounds does he base his assumption that the people of Inala would vote for an additional hotel? I say quite frankly that if the same circumstances surrounded a local option poll for a further hotel these people would know that instead of a further hotel being provided in Inala it would possibly go to Goodna, and they would reject such a move at a local option poll in that regard. The people of Inala are behind me in this matter. They feel that, because of the bad decision and the Government's subsequent confirmation of it, the Minister should have the courage now to hold a local option poll in respect of a suitable site.

Failing this, he should have a survey made of the area, with a listing of possible sites, and allow the people to express their views

where the hotel should go, the hotel that they voted for, not the hotel that is now to be located outside the Inala residential area.

Might I also add that if the Brisbane City Council—I say it is true—has refused to accede to a subdivision of this site, are we, the people of Queensland and the people of Inala to be subjected to the exhibition of another tribunal being appointed to upset the decision of the Council not to allow subdivision of the land? Are we going to be treated to the spectacle of another decision being bulldozed through a tribunal so that the decision of the Brisbane City Council will be set aside and so that the tenderer will be able to carry on with the construction of the hotel?

To date the Government's only answer has been a weak and ineffectual statement by the Minister concerned that the answers to the pertinent questions of a one-brand-liquor hotel, the creation of a traffic hazard by the erection of an hotel on the site, and so on, would mean an inquisition into the affairs of the Queensland Housing Commission, the City Council, a very suspect tribunal, and the Licensing Commission. The statement by the Minister is complete hypocrisy, because he and members of the Government have never at any time been loth to have an inquisition into anything when it suited their complete purpose to do so.

I refer hon. members to the Press statement containing the Minister's weak and lame excuse for the decision. He said—

“The commission's view is that it should endeavour to have the most suitable hotel offering erected on the most suitable site and that it should not merely sell the licence to the highest bidder.”

Nobody with any stretch of imagination, having studied the plan that I intend to table and having seen the site of this hotel, could say that it was in the most suitable position. Nobody with the most vivid imagination could sustain an argument that an hotel located on this site is in the most favourable position to satisfy the needs of the people of Inala. The Minister will have to do much better than that if he is going to allay the fears and disquiet of the people generally, including the people of Inala. Everywhere I have travelled in Brisbane I have been complimented on the stand taken by the Opposition in this regard. Even Government members in the corridors of Parliament House have whispered to me, “Get stuck into the Government, because their decision stinks.” I defy Government members to deny my statement that they have approached me in the corridors and said, “Get stuck into the Government, because their decision stinks.”

Government Members interjected.

Mr. Dewar: Name them.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am not going to waste time. (Government laughter.) I am not going to be sidetracked on this issue.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member makes an assertion he should be prepared to carry it out.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: If they want it I will lay it on the table. I tell them to ask the Minister for Mines and ask the hon. member for South Coast what was said to me. I will lay it on the line. I have the courage of my convictions.

Mr. Dewar: Tell us what they did say.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Exactly what I said, that the decision stinks. Further, one Government member disagrees so much with the decision that he has been advising the owner of the Oxley Hotel in his objection to the granting of the licence. Unfortunately, he accepted that advice, so is it any wonder that the owner of the Oxley Hotel failed in his application, having regard to the calibre of the gentleman who represented him?

(Time expired)

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (12.5 p.m.): I rise to support this motion for the adjournment of the House. This is a most important matter and should be discussed by this Assembly as this is now the final avenue for probing it. To my mind this subject is amazing in all its aspects. I have been deeply puzzled since the first Press announcements were made about the proposed hotel. Frankly, as a person who has been in public life for quite a number of years, and having carefully studied the different announcements that have been made—and, of course, they were supplemented with greater detail by the Leader of the Opposition today—in all honesty I cannot accept that the Licensing Commission has been correct in its attitude in this matter. I cannot understand why the Governor in Council has supported the decision.

As a person who likes to approach such disputes objectively, particularly an important one like this, I should say that unless some very far-reaching and penetrating evidence can be produced to support the Licensing Commission's stand, and to support the Governor in Council's backing of that decision, then I, and all the people of Queensland, will still be seeking the right answer. In view of what has happened, I believe that certain public civic rights of the people in Inala and district are being affected, and also the rights of those people who legitimately tendered for the right to erect this hotel.

As this matter has crystalised up to date, it is in absolute contrast with the ideals that were promulgated in this Assembly, some few years ago, when the much-vaunted Bill of Rights was brought to this House. Of course, that Bill was withdrawn and it has never since seen the light of day. However, I ask the Premier and members of the Government to contrast what has transpired with this project with the aspirations and the ideals that were enunciated to the Assembly

when the Bill of Rights was introduced. There can be no reconciliation of the two. I am open to conviction. I do not pre-judge anything. I am approaching this matter objectively. I wish to know if there is evidence to support the extraordinary decision—and that is expressing it mildly—that has been arrived at on this project.

I believe that the people of Inala have much cause for complaint. I was associated with the inauguration of that satellite township. I recall in the early days that we made provision for light industries, civic centres, and all such amenities that make up a township. All these amenities were provided for by the Housing Commission in its planning. Why should the people of Inala be denied this amenity after they have voted for it by an overwhelming majority? In my opinion they are being denied it on the decisions that have since been made.

I do not wish to repeat anything that has been dealt with already by the mover and seconder of the motion, but I stand here today as a responsible public man and express the view that there is disquiet throughout Queensland on this matter. It is my belief that it should be debated from A to Z—that the whole position should be clarified. Because this is the only method of clarification left to us, I support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) (12.10 p.m.): I am mainly concerned with the justice, if any, of the decision. I pose this question to the Government: would they know the meaning of justice?

In years gone by, justice was one of the most important pillars of society. Philosophers have been debating the meaning of the term right through the ages—as far back as the Greek philosophers of the fifth century B.C. It would not be remiss if we of the Opposition were to point out to the members of the Government, including the Minister, the meaning of justice.

Daniel Webster tells us that justice is the “chiefest” interest of man on earth. I do not think anyone can deny that. Are the people of Inala receiving the justice to which they are entitled and for which they voted in the referendum for the Inala hotel, which, as the previous speaker mentioned, is not in Inala at all? I repeat, I am mainly concerned with the justice of the decision of the Government and the injustice of the decision of the Minister for Justice. Justice is the constant and continual purpose which gives to everyone his own. It is a principle of rectitude and just dealing of men with each other. I do not think the people of Inala have received that just right to which they are entitled and which men of the calibre such as the Government claim to be should have delivered to them.

Furthermore, “conformity of conduct to that principle, integrity, is one of the cardinal

virtues” of justice. I indict the Government by saying that, judging from their actions in this matter and from legislation introduced by them. “Integrity” is a word they do not understand, just as they do not understand the word “justice”.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is treading on very dangerous ground in using such expressions and I ask him to refrain from it. It is unparliamentary to impute to the Government a lack of integrity.

Mr. BROMLEY: Thank you very much for putting me on the right track. Perhaps in deference to you, Mr. Speaker, I should withdraw those remarks about the integrity of the Government. But I am concerned mainly with the justice and the cause of the decision on the site of the proposed hotel at Inala. In my opinion we should conform to truth, right and fairness for the wishes of the people. At Inala a referendum was held, or a local option poll, and the people had the right to decide whether they wished to have a hotel built in Inala. The result of that referendum is well known to all hon. members and equally well known to everybody outside the House. We have had plenty of proof of a white hot public opinion about the proposed site of the hotel. In “The Courier-Mail” of 14 February, 1962, it was reported that a street poll conducted at Inala had brought forth certain comments, which I shall quote.

Mr. Jim Lebeter, Skylark Street, said—

“My house was one of the first here and I voted for a hotel. Most people here are workers, and if they want a drink they have to find a lift or hire a taxi. If they have to go as far as where the new hotel is to be built they might as well go to the Oxley Hotel.

“A lot of people round here are bitter about it. We reckon if they are not going to build the hotel in the centre of Inala they might as well give it away and not build it at all.”

Mr. S. J. Slack, Goldfinch Street, said—

“Why did they not build it near the new civic centre? That way on Saturday morning shopping a man could go for a drink if he wanted one while his wife was shopping.”

Those are the comments of some of the residents of Inala.

Mr. Col. New, Serviceton Avenue, which is in the heart of Inala, said—

“If they put it where they propose Inala people will not have a hotel at all. I work with a lot of men from Inala, and they say they might as well go to Oxley as go that distance.”

Mr. J. W. Morrison, Deodar Street, said—

“It seems ridiculous to have a poll for a hotel at Inala then put it in the Oxley area.”

The people of Inala and the people of Queensland generally are beginning to distrust the Government because of the decisions that have been given against the wishes of the people. Again I pose the question: are the Government just and wise in disregarding the wishes of the people? If local option polls are taken and we do not abide by the decisions, we will develop a regime under which nobody in the metropolitan area or in country areas will have any rights. If referendums or local option polls are to be taken in regard to the establishment of hotels or anything else and the results ignored by the Government, it is a waste of public money, a waste of time, and a complete disregard of the wishes of the majority of the people of Queensland.

Mr. MELLOY (Nudgee) (12.18 p.m.): The only subject on which I wish to speak is the location of the proposed hotel. I point out to hon. members that on this occasion a local option poll was held to give people within the vicinity of the proposed hotel an opportunity of expressing their wishes in regard to its establishment. To be fair to everybody, if a hotel is to be established in any area I should say that people within a certain radius of the proposed site should be given an opportunity of expressing their opinion. If a poll is held within a certain area and the hotel is established on the boundary of the area, the people who are just outside the boundary have no opportunity of expressing their opinion. It appears that when this hotel is established it will be within three-fifths of a mile of one part of the boundary of the area in which the local option poll was taken. If that is so, it means that people 2 miles to 2½ miles from the hotel would be given an opportunity of expressing their opinion, whereas people only three-fifths of a mile away would not be given a similar opportunity. If a hotel is to be established, I think it is desirable that it should be established in the centre of the area in which the local option poll is held. That would obviate the situation we have now of certain people within walking distance of the hotel not having been given the opportunity to vote on whether they desired a hotel in the area. If the wishes of the people had been carried out whereby provision was made for the location of the hotel, it would have been a fairer implementation of the wishes of the people in the local option area. But located as it is on the boundary of the area we are denying the views of people in close proximity to the hotel. In all fairness to the people in the area, the hotel should be located right in the centre of the local option area, in the locality of the shopping centre as originally proposed by the Brisbane City Council. The Government should give consideration to that angle of the problem.

Mr. MANN (Brisbane) (12.21 p.m.): I rise to support my Leader on the motion for the adjournment of the House on this very important matter. It is a matter of very

grave public importance. Although the Treasurer has been sitting here listening to the debate I am very surprised that he has made no attempt to get to his feet to explain to the House and to the public the reasons why the Queensland Housing Commission site offered for a hotel was refused. There are three or four very pertinent questions that should be answered. First of all the Minister for Justice should answer why the hotel site in the Inala township offered by the Queensland Housing Commission was refused by the Licensing Commission. Why did they allow a freehold site to be taken as the hotel site? The Minister should have insisted on the acceptance of the site set aside at Inala by the Housing Commission. That site is in the heart of the business centre at Inala, the right and proper place for the hotel. It should have been mandatory that the hotel be built in the township of Inala. I should like to hear from the Minister why the hotel was not built there.

In view of the Brisbane City Council's decision to refuse permission to build a hotel on the freehold site, why were the wishes of the Brisbane City Council not agreed to? Of course, he will say that there was an appeal to a tribunal and the tribunal upheld the appeal. I think that is a hole-and-corner method, as do many other members of the public. Had it been a matter coming under the Treasurer's portfolio I am sure he would have been on his feet long ago. Why did not the Licensing Commission accept the offer to build an hotel on the land which would have meant that the Government could receive from £3,000 to £5,000 a year in rent from the proprietor? I am not pushing any barrow for Mr. Whitehouse. If I had my choice between the two, Mr. Whitehouse or Mr. Ward, I would give my vote to Mr. Ward. I know both of them. I have been in both hotels. I have nothing against Mr. Ward at all. I know that he is an excellent "mine host." I do not want it to be said that I am making an attack on Mr. Ward as a proprietor or successful tenderer for the hotel. Nor do I want it to be said that I am pushing a barrow for Mr. Whitehouse. But I am condemning the Government for their attitude towards the tenders for a hotel at Inala. That is what we are condemning the Government for. We are asking that the House adjourn because of the actions of the Government. Might I say that the actions seem very underhanded. Unless some ministerial statement is forthcoming it will always be said that there is an odium about the letting of the successful tender for the Inala Hotel. We have heard many stories about the ballot box scandal in New South Wales; we have heard about the scandal at Mungana mines. There was litigation over those. Men were charged in relation to the Mungana scandal and they went before the Supreme Court on the matter. They were members of the Parliament too. Only recently we heard charges about land scandals but members of the Government sit there as silent as the tomb without a word to say.

Mr. Tooth: There was the tobacco scandal too.

Mr. MANN: Yes, when we were the Labour Government and hon. members opposite raised a matter, we immediately ordered a Royal Commission into it, and a Minister of the Crown was relieved of his portfolio, and found guilty of violation of his office. I make no apologies for that. He was a member of our Government and our Government did that. But members of the present Government sit there with their heads bowed. I am sorry for the poor old Premier because they have him worried.

I know that members of the public will not get an answer from the Minister for Justice, because, in his usual way, he will put it on to Mr. Kelly and talk a lot of legal jargon as he always does. I say that it is up to the Treasurer, who is the most capable man on the front bench opposite in regard to financial affairs, to tell this House why there was a refusal to accept £3,000 to £5,000 in rental which would have gone into the coffers of the Crown. God knows they need the money badly enough! £3,000 to £5,000 per annum would have been placed in the coffers of the Crown by the acceptance of the tender of Queen Street Hotels Pty. Ltd.

A Government Member: How do you make that out?

Mr. MANN: They have offered it; my Leader has told hon. members that in his statement.

Mr. Nicklin: On the basis of the tender?

Mr. MANN: Yes, on the basis of the tender.

Mr. Hiley: You are assuming that we will never rent that land?

Mr. MANN: Of course it will be. I venture to say that the Treasurer will rent the land for a business of any type, but that is not the point; the point is that the hotel was canvassed throughout the whole area, the local option poll was canvassed, and the people of Inala voted for an hotel there. The tenderers looked forward to an hotel at Inala, and then we find that the Licensing Commission, for some unknown reason, accepts a tender of £12,000 less than the highest tender. That in itself is sufficient to warrant an inquiry; but in addition to that it approved the building of an hotel that is not even within the area of Inala at all! The whole matter reeks of the same odour as the land scandals hon. members opposite complained of, the Mungana scandal and the ballot box scandal, but the Government hang their heads and are not game to do anything about it.

Mr. Herbert: What about the Redcliffe scandal?

Mr. MANN: There was a Royal Commission into that, and it was found that there was nothing wrong in relation to what the hon. member calls the Redcliffe scandal. That occurred while we were the Government, in relation to a previous Labour speaker who was the main witness at the Commission and was exonerated by the Commissioner. Now we are asking for a commission into this. Call it the Redcliffe scandal if you like; we are now asking for a commission into the Inala scandal. That is what my leader says it is, and I support him in his contention that the Government should have a commission into it, a full and complete inquiry into the matter, and not allow it to rest on Mr. Kelly. If I had the time I could tell the Minister of a story I saw on television. It emanated from Tammany Hall in America and was entitled "Dan McGinty". I looked at it one night, and when I got up next morning I read in the newspaper that the Minister had supported the Commission's decision to approve the building of an hotel on this site. I wish the Minister had seen the story of Dan McGinty. He was an agitator who wanted to get a bus run. The mayor of the town told him that he could get a franchise for a bus run and said to him, "It will cost you 75,000 dollars. I will have my bus inspector up there in the morning." After looking at "Dan McGinty", I got up in the morning and on reading of the Commission's decision and the Minister's statement in support of it I came to the conclusion that the position was on all-fours with that of "Dan McGinty".

Mr. Hooper: What channel is that story on?

Mr. MANN: Channel 9. I commend it to the Minister. If he had seen it I am sure he would have said, "Dan McGinty has had a hand in this somewhere."

This matter is a very serious one in the view of the public. It reeks of Tammany Hall tactics, and with my leader I challenge the Government to do something about it. I challenge them to have a public inquiry, to appoint someone to go into the whole affair and to give the public the whole story, because I know the Minister will not tell the full story. He will just ramble on in his usual old style.

(Time expired.)

Mr. NEWTON (Belmont) (12.32 p.m.): I rise to support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, and in doing so I wish to deal with the protests of the people living in the Inala area, and the similar protests of the people living throughout the length and breadth of the State at the various actions of the Government, the legislation introduced by them, and the steps they have taken against the public interest.

There is no hotel in my electorate, but some day I could be faced with a position

similar to that confronting the hon. member for Salisbury. It may arise in my area in the future.

During their period of office, the Government have never, except on one occasion, taken any action in response to protests against their legislation and their form of Government. In the field of unemployment it was 15 months before they did anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is dealing not with unemployment but with a specific motion about the site of the Inala hotel. I ask him to confine his remarks to that matter.

Mr. NEWTON: I was just giving examples of the protests made by the people and the way the Government have fail to heed them.

The Inala area is well-known to me, just as it is well-known to the Treasurer. The area has been built up by the Queensland Housing Commission; it is known to us as a satellite town. Of all the Housing Commission projects in the metropolitan area, a great deal of attention has been paid to this satellite town. We find on the one hand that the Treasurer holds the portfolio of housing and that the Minister for Justice on the other hand deals with hotels. It is shocking to think that complete co-operation does not exist between them as to the site of the Inala hotel. If they had any ability at all in town-planning, they would not have agreed to a site on the border of the satellite town of Inala, a site that is closer to the Oxley area than it is to Inala. Since the war, irrespective of the Government in power, much has been done to improve the condition of hotels in the State. A number of hotels that were close together have been abolished because the owners would not carry out the necessary improvements. Overall, there has been a general cleaning up. We have noticed too, that when new hotels have been built, irrespective of the party in power, they have been granted for specific areas and they have been built in those areas. I recall that a similar position arose in relation to Manly and Lota. The people in that area requested a hotel. However, it was not built at Wynnum North or Wynnum Central, but at Manly. The same principle applies at Inala. It is true what other hon. members on this side have said. A local option poll was taken in the area. The residents used their democratic right to cast their vote for a hotel in that area. If the Licensing Commission made a mistake about the siting of the hotel, why was that decision not rescinded instead of being endorsed by the Minister, and then by Cabinet? Anybody can make a mistake. There may be some hidden features concerning this site that I do not know about, but if a mistake was made it could have been rectified early in the piece when the protests were made by the people in the area. The Minister could have said that a mistake was made, but he immediately supported the

decision of the Licensing Commission and then, to make sure that the Minister was not left out on a limb, Cabinet also supported the Minister. I believe that it is not yet too late for the Government to reconsider their decision on this important matter and so take notice of the people of Queensland when their voices are raised in protest.

Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowong—Minister for Justice) (12.37 p.m.): In replying at this stage to the points put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, and other hon. members, in the first place, we should consider the background to the choice of this matter by the Opposition as the subject of a want-of-confidence motion in the Government. We must ask ourselves if this is really a matter of public importance. I want to deal with this very briefly. We must try to see this problem in its proper perspective. I think my good friend, the hon. member for Townsville South, put the matter very lucidly when he referred to this matter—I may not use his exact words—as being a question of the siting of one pub.

Mr. Aikens: The people of North Queensland do not know where Inala is, and they do not care.

Mr. Hanlon: It could happen in North Queensland too, you know.

Mr. Aikens: Not while I represent it, it would not.

Mr. MUNRO: It surprises me that in a responsible Parliament, with a responsible Opposition, with all the problems there are in the State of Queensland, that the Opposition when seeking to move a vote of no confidence in the Government could think of nothing better than this to absorb the time of the House.

Mr. Duggan: If you make that assertion I am going to say something I did not say when I moved the motion; in my opinion, and in the view of hundreds of people who have seen me, this stinks to the high heavens.

Mr. Aikens: Why didn't you lay a charge of corruption?

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask hon. members on both sides to give the Minister a fair hearing so that he may reply.

Mr. MUNRO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I point out that I am limited to 15 minutes. The way the Opposition are behaving at the moment I will have only about half of that time for my speech.

To get down to the kernel of the matter, the motion, in the terms used by the Leader of the Opposition, sets out the case in seven sub-paragraphs. The important part of it is that it takes exception to what is described as the confirming of a decision of the Licensing Commission, and then it goes on to say that this decision of the Licensing Commission has undermined the confidence of

the people in the Government. How absurd! In the first place, it is not quite correct to say that we have confirmed the decision of the Licensing Commission, although that is fairly close to the mark. What has happened is that the Cabinet and the Governor in Council have considered the matter very fully and, in a few words, we have come to the conclusion that no sound case has been established for the Governor in Council to take action in accordance with his powers to rescind the decision.

So that we can see this in its proper perspective, let us consider the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the Licensing Commission and the Governor in Council and of this Parliament. The Licensing Commission is a quasi-judicial tribunal. It is a tribunal in which this Parliament has vested very important duties and responsibilities. In some limited circumstances—and, I emphasise, only very limited circumstances—the decision of the Licensing Commission may be reviewed by the court. That is in the very limited circumstances where, either by writ of certiorari or otherwise, a decision of the Licensing Commission might be reviewed on the ground that it has exceeded, is exceeding or is about to exceed its jurisdiction.

Before we leave the Licensing Commission, let us have a look at its personnel. This is not a decision of one man; this is a decision of a tribunal consisting of three men. The first of those three men is the Chairman, Mr. Jack Lawrence Kelly, barrister-at-law, who was first appointed to the Licensing Commission in January, 1958, and who has been chairman since 2 December, 1960. Mr. Kelly is a barrister of standing and experience, who is held in the highest respect not only by the legal profession but also by the community at large.

The second member, Alan Thomas Fullagar, is a very experienced and trusted public servant. Most hon. members know him as Commissioner of Prices, but in addition he is chairman of the Fish Board, Government representative on the board of the Southern Electric Authority and a member of the Secondary Industries Assistance Board.

The third member is Mr. John Francis McCoy, who has been a member of the Public Service since 1914. He is qualified to act as a stipendiary magistrate and he has in fact acted as a stipendiary magistrate and acted as coroner in Brisbane.

I think the hon. member for Norman interjected. In his speech he went a little further than the Leader of the Opposition and he challenged the integrity either of the Government or of the members of the Licensing Commission. I should like the House to understand the complete sense of irresponsibility of the hon. member.

Mr. BROMLEY: I rise to a point of order. The Minister is imputing improper

motives in relation to my speech. He said I reflected on the integrity of the Licensing Commission, which I did not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. the Minister.

Mr. MUNRO: I said that he reflected on the integrity of either the Licensing Commission or the Government.

Mr. Bromley: Why don't you withdraw?

Mr. MUNRO: In all the circumstances, seeing that the Licensing Commission is much more directly concerned with the matter than the Government, if there were any charge it would be against the Licensing Commission. I say that this irresponsible member has made a charge of that sort in the House without one shred of evidence to support it. It is an indication of the type of irresponsible statements that are made in the House by hon. members opposite.

Dealing now with the Governor in Council, the legislature has also given the Governor in Council certain rather limited powers to review determinations. One hon. member charged that by taking this matter to the Governor in Council the Government had accepted responsibility for it. I wonder what the charge would have been if we had disposed of the comments and criticisms in this case without taking them to the Governor in Council. Of course we took them to the Governor in Council. We took the proper action, and the matter was given very careful and mature consideration. The Governor in Council considered very detailed reports from the chairman of the Licensing Commission and further detailed memoranda from the Acting Solicitor-General in relation to the legal aspects of the case. If I have time, I shall tell hon. members more about that later. Is the Governor in Council to be in this position: that in matters of this kind he should have a complete rehearing of the matter, in the same way as the Licensing Commission did, and substitute his judgment for the judgment of the Licensing Commission? That is not the position. I suggest that the hon. members opposite who have spoken on this subject have only a very elementary understanding of what is involved in this decision.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. MUNRO: If I were to go through all the pros and cons of this matter, I could not do it in 15 minutes; it would take hours. What the Governor in Council has done, and done quite correctly, is consider the matter on the basis of the data available to it, and I have told hon. members of the decision.

It seems that hon. members opposite would like me to make some comments on the merits of the case. Obviously I cannot do that very quickly, but to sum it up in a few words there are three basic matters which are required to be considered by the Licensing Commission in cases of this type. The first is the amount of the premium

tendered, the second is the type, quality and extent of the premises proposed to be erected, and the third is the question of site. I will pass over the question of premium very quickly. The general policy of the Licensing Commission in dealing with this very difficult question is not to get as much money out of it as possible. It has to consider what is the right thing to do for the development of the area. Dealing with the premises, the Licensing Commission thought that these premises were the best. If I had not had so many interruptions I would have been able to give hon. members a more detailed comparison, but I may ask another speaker from this side of the Chamber to do that.

In considering this matter and in deciding the terms of its advice to the Governor in Council, Cabinet has to take into account very particularly the fact that the Licensing Commission is a semi-judicial body with statutory powers. Substantially the matter for consideration by the Governor in Council was whether the Licensing Commission had acted properly and had taken into account all appropriate factors in making its determination. Cabinet, in considering the matter of its recommendations to the Governor in Council, also had before it the report of the Acting Solicitor-General, which indicated that there was no evidence of the Licensing Commission either having acted in bad faith or of having failed to comply with any of the procedural requirements of the Liquor Act. To that I might add, as time is indeed very short, that it appeared to the Licensing Commission on a consideration of all those relevant factors that the tender of the successful tenderer was, in the opinion of the Commission, the most advantageous. I realise that this was a very difficult decision for the Licensing Commission to make. Had I been one of the three members of the Licensing Commission I should have found it extremely difficult to decide between the relative advantages of this particular site and some of the other sites. However I am completely satisfied that first of all the Licensing Commission are most capable and experienced in dealing with this type of problem. There is not the slightest doubt about their complete integrity. There is not the slightest doubt that they applied their minds to the problem. They examined all the relevant factors very carefully and arrived at the conclusion which, as I have said, they regarded as being, in terms of their authority, in the best interests of the people of the State.

(Time expired.)

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.52 p.m.): Any hon. member who has ever been to the race-course would agree that it would be difficult to have seen a better example of a horse dying on its feet to get to the post than the Minister in endeavouring to complete his 15 minutes on this most important matter raised by the Opposition by way of an adjournment motion. Indeed, his speech confirmed the validity of the action that the Opposition

are taking in keeping the spotlight on this matter. When the decision was originally made by the Licensing Commission they did not expect half the interest to be taken in it that has eventuated since. First of all the Government endeavoured to pretend that they did not even know the problem existed or what was going on about it. But having been forced into action, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, they then took the matter to the Governor in Council. They did not voluntarily take the matter to the Governor in Council as the Minister suggested, but they were forced to take it there by the petition of some of the people concerned. Having been forced into that position they thought by using the term "Governor in Council" that people would consider that that was where the matter was going to end, and they would be well rid of the political odium attached to it. The Opposition are not going to allow that to happen. As the hon. member for Salisbury pointed out, whilst it is a matter that very greatly concerns the people of Inala, it is a matter that will arouse the interest of people throughout the State. If the position were to go unchallenged what has happened at Inala in this instance could happen anywhere else in Queensland, including Townsville or anywhere where there was a possibility of a new hotel site. To my mind it is one of the most remarkable decisions of the Licensing Commission that I have known. It is even more remarkable that the Governor in Council saw fit to confirm that decision in view of the very lame excuse put forward by the Commission to justify it, and which has been repeated almost word for word by the Minister. I want to use the terms of a former Parliamentary Member of the Liberal Party when speaking about a statement of the Licensing Commission at that particular time to describe what I feel about the Minister's remarks this morning, and the justification put forward by the Government. Mr. Peter Connolly, a member of the Liberal Party, speaking on the Financial Statement on 17 October, 1957, said—

"That is either a piece of crass ineptitude on the part of the Commission or a deliberate attempt to have this Chamber believe something which is simply not the fact and of which the contrary is notorious in the State of Queensland."

He was referring to the subject of tied houses and the Commission's statement, in its 1957 report, that it was not true to say that breweries had a monopoly of the hotel trade in Queensland. He went on to say—

"All political parties profess not to believe in the tied-house system, and I believe that the party to which I belong is genuine in its belief that that is an undesirable system."

Mr. Connolly has since left this House but, apparently, this Government are not averse to the tied-house system because one of the points of objection mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for

Salisbury was that of the tenders received the one selected was actually a tender of a brewery through a nominee. The Minister's remarks and the justification he endeavoured to make for the decision can be described in the same fashion as Mr. Connolly described that statement by the Licensing Commission some years ago—either there has been ineptitude in this matter or there is a deliberate attempt to have this Chamber believe something that is not the fact, and of which no doubt the contrary is notorious in the State of Queensland.

The Minister objects to our raising this matter in Parliament. You, Sir, as Speaker of this House, have recognised it as a matter of public importance and this is not the first occasion on which the Government have seen fit to ignore your position as Speaker in recent times.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HANLON: As Speaker of the House, you, Sir, saw fit to recognise this as a matter of public importance, so what right has the Minister to suggest that you are not a judge of that? He saw fit to take it to Cabinet and to the Governor in Council. He wants to say to Parliament, which after all, is supposed to be the supreme body of this land, "You keep out of it; it has nothing to do with you, as representatives of the people. It is a little club matter among members of the Liberal and Country Parties and other people who may have some influence on them."

We make no apology for bringing the matter forward today. We shall take every opportunity to keep on annoying the Government on their record in this respect.

A Government Member: Nasty little boy!

Mr. HANLON: Nasty little boy over there, tell me the circumstances which led to the submission of the tender by Mr. Ward for this particular site. I ask hon. members, particularly the Treasurer and Minister for Justice and some of the business men among Government members, what they would say if a person who intended to submit a tender for a hotel at Inala under the terms tenders were called by the Licensing Commission, came to them and said, "I am going to submit a tender for this site" (for which Mr. Ward submitted a tender?) I do not think it would be denied that anybody with a grain of common sense advising Mr. Ward or the Castlemaine Brewery would have said, "Don't be a ratbag, you have no chance of getting a tender accepted there. Tender where these other people are tendering because that would be the obvious place where the Commission would feel that a hotel would be erected."

Mr. Duggan: The hon. member for Windsor has represented one of the unsuccessful tenderers.

Mr. HANLON: I am not denying the hon. member for Windsor the right to act for

these people if he wants to, but he has been making submissions on their behalf and I feel he has a great deal of belief in the validity of the case he has been putting forward, even though he has not been successful.

I think some explanations should be given of the circumstances in which the tender was submitted for this site. Was there some leak from the Licensing Commission, accidental or otherwise, to suggest that the Licensing Commission generally and on good grounds, if they maintain they are good grounds, did not consider that the licence should have been granted at the various places in Inala where the Housing Commission itself and most other people believed it was most logical?

It seems remarkable to me how one tenderer should go bush, more or less, and say, "I am going to submit a tender here." I do not consider Mr. Ward to be a ratbag. I am not suggesting any improper motives to him. I do not consider Castlemaine Perkins to be ratbags, particularly in matters of this nature, but there should be an explanation by the Government of the circumstances under which a tender was submitted for this site. Let us be fair about it. We do not want to throw idle statements around which reflect on the integrity of the Licensing Commission, the Government, or anybody else, but it has been said around the place that someone must have had advance information that the Commission was considering a site elsewhere than in the actual town of Inala.

What circumstances led knowledgeable people such as Mr. Ward and Castlemaine Perkins Ltd. to tender for a site that no-one in his right senses thought the Commission would even consider for a moment? If there was an accidental leak to the tenderers for this particular site, there must have been some negligence on the part of the Commission. I do not say the tenderers would not naturally take advantage of it, if they got some leak from somewhere that there was a possibility of the site being accepted, but for them to get that information there would have to be negligence on the part of the Commission. If they got the information deliberately, there would have to be collusion of a very serious nature which would call for a most searching inquiry. Was there any governmental pressure on the Commission? These things are being suggested, and the Government cannot ignore them. In fairness to all interested parties, Mr. Ward, Castlemaine Brewery and more importantly the Licensing Commission and the Government, let the Government institute an open inquiry into the decision of the Licensing Commission, for the purpose of examining the circumstances of the long-shot success, and that is what it was, of the tender that was accepted, and the circumstances of the whole matter.

The Minister has accused us of an elementary knowledge of this particular matter.

From his speech I should say that the Minister has an even more elementary knowledge of the matter than the Minister for Transport has of the Railway Department. He runs his railway timetables on the same basis as most people run their laundry, that is, on the change-daily basis.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HANLON: I am drawing an analogy. There is no doubt that the Minister for Transport runs his timetables on the change-daily basis, in the same way as most people run their underwear.

I ask a further question: are the Government's assurances on this matter as hollow as the assurances given by the Minister for Health and Home Affairs about Westbrook before the Government were forced to institute an inquiry? Let the Treasurer or the Premier answer that question. If the Government refuse an inquiry into this matter, a smog of suspicion will hang over this incident and over the interested parties, the tenderers, the Licensing Commission and the Government themselves, a similar smog of suspicion to that which hangs over the Department of Transport and the Department of Public Lands at the present time because the Government refused inquiries, in the latter instance, into charges made by one of their own ex-Ministers.

If the Government are determined to stand on their dignity, on this matter, they should at least indicate that in future the Licensing Commission will very narrowly pinpoint the area where it thinks the licence should be granted.

(Time expired)

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (2.18 p.m.): I support the remarks of my leader and other hon. members on this side of the House. Without question the Government's decision on this matter stinks in the nostrils of all fair-minded men in Queensland. I deprecate the attempt by the Government to pass the buck to the Licensing Commission in suggesting by way of smear that, if anything is wrong, it is the fault of the Licensing Commission. I deprecate the Government's failure to shoulder their responsibility as a Government for the decision in this matter.

The matter was reopened by way of petition. I was amazed at the speech of the Minister for Justice. As a matter of fact I thought I had heard him incorrectly, but I have checked since and have ascertained that my impression or my interpretation of his remarks was correct. He claimed that the Governor in Council has no supervising authority over the Licensing Commission unless the Licensing Commission has acted on wrong principles. The claim is completely untrue and amounts to arrant humbug. The claim by the Government that the Governor in Council can correct the Licensing Commission only if the Licensing

Commission has acted on wrong principles is absolutely untrue and could not be substantiated by any legal opinion of any man of stature practising law in Queensland today.

I do not know whether the Minister was deliberately or unconsciously misleading the Chamber, but I refer him to Section 8 (2) of the Liquor Act. Incidentally, Section 8 (2) states—

"The Governor in Council may at any time rescind any determination or order of the Commission and may in relation to any such rescission give such directions to the Commission as to him seem mete."

It is true that that section was repealed by Section 3 of the amending Act of 1952, but it was reinserted by Section 7 of the amending Act of 1954, and since then has not been taken out. In any case, the Act clearly confers on the Governor in Council a defined and unfettered power to do what he deems proper or mete, and the Act expressly says that the first part of Section 8 takes away from the people the right of appeal against the Licensing Commission, through the ordinary processes of law. In other words, the Act expressly states that if people are dissatisfied with the decision of the Licensing Commission, that it has not been made in accordance with the ordinary legal forms and technicalities of the law, instead of having to go through the ordinary processes of legal machinery, they may appeal by way of objection to the Governor in Council by which method they are not restrained by any legal formalities at all.

The only duty imposed on the Governor in Council is to do what he thinks proper, and he is not bound to follow any legal technicalities. The discretion of the Governor in Council is completely open. He can have a virtual rehearing of the matter. The decision he makes is his and not the Licensing Commission's. He has not to determine whether or not there have been any wrong principles involved. In effect he considers the matter *de novo* and, as the Governor in Council he is entirely and completely responsible for the decision that has been made. The Government and the Minister cannot shelter behind the skirts of the Licensing Commission. I defy and challenge the Government to produce any information from any legal men of any stature in this State who will support the Minister's contention that the Governor in Council has no power to review the decision of the Licensing Commission and can only interfere if some wrong principle has been involved. It is arrant nonsense, and complete humbug to suggest that that is the position and the Minister is either misconceiving his duty, or the duty of his Government when he makes such a claim, or he is obviously proceeding without legal advice, or ill-conceived legal advice. I dismiss that particular aspect by saying that it is the duty of the Governor in Council, when an appeal is made to him, to supervise

completely the decision that has been made. Let us not pretend that we are dealing with any decision of the Licensing Commission. Quite clearly and definitely we are dealing with a decision made by the Governor in Council following certain advice tendered by his Ministers. The Ministers who gave him that advice have not been courteous to this House, to the people of Queensland, or the electors whom they individually represent. What was the reason for recommending, seemingly without any good purpose, that one of the lowest tenders should be accepted? Of course, we on this side of the House do not understand all the circumstances that led to their decision on this because as the Minister assured us this morning, we are not aware of the full case by any means. In other words, the Minister has made a public confession or admission, that he is deliberately withholding from this House the full circumstances and facts that surrounded their seemingly iniquitous decision. It behoves the Minister as a responsible man, and it behoves his Government to remove this ever-thickening cloud of disquieting rumours that surround their decision in this matter. Whether they are true or false is not for me to decide because the Minister refused to give me or to give the House the evidence. Speaking in support of my Leader's motion I can only act on the little evidence that has been brought to me and I can only decide on the circumstantial evidence of the mounting rumours that we hear from day to day.

Mr. Mann: Some of them are very strong.

Mr. BENNETT: Some of them are exceedingly strong, and unless the Minister is walking round the State with his head in a cloud, he must have heard them. Let me inform him of some of these rumours that are circulating throughout Queensland. One of them is that the Liberal Party's slush funds will be considerably swollen by this decision.

Another rumour is that the hon. member for Windsor was so irritated by the decision that he decided to attempt to help one of the appellants who was also dissatisfied with the decision of the Government of which he is a member. I can only say that the quality of the preparation that went into the appeal was one of the reasons why it was not accepted.

Then we hear that there are other hon. members around the lobbies of the House who are completely dissatisfied with the Government's decision. Apparently Cabinet Ministers themselves have not been unanimous in the decision that has been made and at least one of them has even voiced his disapproval in the lobbies to such an extent that he has urged others to protest vehemently about the decision that was made by his own Government. That selfsame Cabinet Minister must know, and surely does know, more than we do about the position.

Having no doubt been informed of the facts as they were presented to him as a Minister of the Crown, he then decided to urge all those to whom he spoke, or some of them, to use their utmost endeavours to have the recommendation of his own Cabinet upset.

Then there is another rumour.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BENNETT: I was going to speak of Sir Arthur Fadden, who has been mentioned in this connection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member does not obey my call I will deal with him under Standing Order No. 123A.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (2.28 p.m.): After listening to the debate I can only come to the conclusion that the Opposition should be accused of false pretences in moving the motion for the adjournment of the House. In asking you to accept the motion, the Leader of the Opposition submitted seven different reasons for it. I have listened closely to the debate and hardly any speaker has touched on any one of those reasons. That is why I accuse hon. members opposite of false pretences. All that I have heard here has been just a tirade of innuendoes and half-truths in an endeavour to create the impression that there was something radically wrong with the decision of the Licensing Commission to grant an hotel license at Inala. We have heard it said time and time again by hon. members opposite, "The people of Queensland are demanding this." and, "The people of Queensland are demanding that." As one who moves about the State more than hon. members opposite, I can say quite definitely that nobody outside the narrow confines of this city cares two hoots whether there is to be an hotel at Inala or where it is to be built.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NICKLIN: Opposition members are setting themselves up as experts.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NICKLIN: The Opposition are setting themselves up as experts to decide whether there should be an hotel at Inala on a particular site. May I ask, what qualifications have hon. members opposite to make a decision on this subject on which they are so voluble? I should say they have none.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. As the member for the electorate concerned, I say that I have every right to question the Government's decision.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NICKLIN: I do not question the hon. member's right; I question his qualifications.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: That is an inference, and I ask the Premier to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The question asked by the Premier related to the qualifications of members of the Opposition.

Mr. NICKLIN: From what the hon. member said, I should say that he has no qualifications whatever to make a decision. He has not the evidence before him that the Licensing Commission had. The motion has been submitted for political purposes.

Mr. Sherrington interjected.

Mr. Bennett: You are concealing the evidence. That is what you are doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask hon. members on my left to cease interjecting. I have already warned the hon. member for South Brisbane, and I now warn the hon. member for Salisbury that I will deal with him under Standing Order 123A. Persistent interjections will not be tolerated.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. I feel that the Premier is trying to make inferences on my integrity and—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no inference in regard to the hon. member's integrity. If there were, I would ask the Premier to withdraw it.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. Mr. Speaker, you have not already warned me for interjecting. This is the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I warned the hon. member that if he did not obey my call to order I would deal with him under Standing Order 123A. I warn him again that if he persists in interjecting I shall have no hesitation in removing him from the Chamber.

Mr. NICKLIN: I hope that allowance will be made for my time that is being wasted by hon. members opposite.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. NICKLIN: The hon. member for Salisbury said that I had been drawing inferences in regard to his integrity. What I am complaining about is the inferences that have been drawn by hon. members opposite without any evidence to support them. We have heard statements of scandal—"It is a scandal". We have heard statements of Tammany Hall. We have heard the hon. member for Brisbane quoting from his favourite Channel 9 TV session. We have heard the hon. member for Mackay say, "Who is getting the rake-off?"

Mr. Graham: Tell us and we will know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NICKLIN: I do not take much notice of irresponsible members of the Opposition; we expect that sort of thing from them; but when the Leader of the Opposition, a man in whom one would expect to find some sense of responsibility because of the office he holds in this Parliament, makes a deliberate statement, not a statement in the heat of debate, saying that this thing stinks to high heaven—

Mr. Duggan: Of course it stinks to high heaven. You have not answered one of the 16 allegations yet.

Mr. NICKLIN: The Leader of the Opposition does not deny that. I say quite definitely on behalf of the Government that if any hon. member opposite, including the Leader of the Opposition, will make definite charges of improper conduct—

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NICKLIN: If they will make definite charges of improper conduct against the Licensing Commission as a whole, against any member of the Licensing Commission, or against any member of the Ministry or any member of the Government, and they will make them in writing, the Government will take the appropriate action.

Mr. Duggan: Why don't you answer these 16 allegations?

Mr. NICKLIN: The Leader of the Opposition is waving a piece of paper about. If he thinks this matter stinks to high heaven, let him do what I have suggested—make the charges in writing.

Mr. Bennett: You have not answered them.

Mr. NICKLIN: I have not heard one charge made. I have heard a lot of innuendoes. I heard the hon. member for South Brisbane refer to disquieting rumours. What are they? What right have we, as a Government, to act on rumours? We act on facts and definite charges. I repeat that if any hon. member opposite is prepared to make those definite charges of improper conduct or graft—which has been implied—against members of the Licensing Commission or members of the Government, the Government will take the proper action.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. NICKLIN: Was the decision made by the Licensing Commission right or wrong? Who is to determine it? Hon. members opposite say that it was the wrong decision, but we have in the Licensing Commission a body of responsible men—

Mr. Graham: Irresponsible.

Mr. NICKLIN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that wrong imputation against honourable men.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not know what hon. member made the remark—

Mr. NICKLIN: The hon. member for Mackay.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Mackay to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Graham: I withdraw accordingly.

Mr. NICKLIN: We have a statutory body consisting of honourable men to determine these matters after hearing all relevant evidence. Generally, it may be said that an administrative body must act in good faith, must take into account all proper factors, and no others, in making a decision, and it must comply with the procedural requirements of the statutes in question, and where judicial or semi-judicial functions are involved the rules of natural justice also must be observed.

In making this decision did the Licensing Commission Act illegally? Did they fail to observe the proper function of their office, or did they fail to act in good faith? I am not giving my own opinion but the opinion of the Crown Solicitor. They acted perfectly legally in making their decision. If the protesting parties thought the Licensing Commission had acted illegally they would have exercised their rights under Section 8 (1) which gives the parties concerned an opportunity to appeal to the court to see whether the Licensing Commission exceeded its jurisdiction under the Act. That was not done. A petition was presented to the Governor in Council. I should say that the Licensing Commission did observe all the necessary factors required before they made their decision. A very close and detailed investigation was made of everything that they did. It was not true, as I think the hon. member for Salisbury said, that the Surveyor-General turned down the site that had been selected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I rise to a point of order. The Premier is completely wrong. I said that the City Council had refused to accede to the subdivision. I mentioned the case of a decision of the Surveyor-General—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NICKLIN: He was never asked to give a decision. As to whether they acted in good faith, there has been no evidence produced to Cabinet, after a very close examination of the whole matter, and no evidence has been presented in the course of the debate, that would suggest otherwise. The Government do not exert political pressure or any other kind of pressure on tribunals like the Licensing Commission that make determinations in the public interest. No political pressure has been exerted by any member of the Government on the Licensing Commission. We have not failed to accept our responsibility in regard to the decision that

the Commission have made because we believe that they made the right decision after very close consideration.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (2.40 p.m.): In supporting the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition I state that this is not the first time the Government have arrogantly ignored and completely overlooked public opinion in relation to a particular matter. The speech made by the Premier this afternoon is an indication of the fact that they are again arrogantly ignoring public opinion, as they have done on many occasions in the past four or five years. They did it in relation to betting, liquor and other matters that have been raised. In their legislation, their conduct and administration the Government have either been out of touch with public opinion or have decided to ignore it.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like briefly to refer to the fact that the hon. member for Mackay was asked to withdraw a statement that the decision of the Licensing Commission was irresponsible.

Government Members: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Mackay was asked to withdraw a statement he made that the members of the Licensing Commission were irresponsible.

Mr. LLOYD: Yes, he was asked to withdraw a statement against public servants, not concerning any member of this House. He stated that the decision they made on this occasion is irresponsible.

Government Members: No.

Mr. LLOYD: In regard to this particular matter they were irresponsible. What is irresponsibility except that the people concerned were not completely responsible in the decision they made, not that they were subject to bribery or corruption as the Premier and Minister for Justice have accused us of saying? All we have said on this side is that their decision was irresponsible. If they have placed this hotel, by design, in the wrong position then their decision is just as irresponsible as it would be in any other circumstances. Are we at all times to be sat down when we attempt to criticise a public servant who, we feel, should be criticised? Is that to be the practice in the future? Are we to be refused permission to make such statements? If so, I do not think it is in accordance with true, democratic Parliamentary rule in any country.

The Premier made a number of statements in regard to what we have said. He said that we had not addressed ourselves to the resolution. Has the Minister for Justice or the Premier refuted any of the statements in the resolution placed before the House by the Leader of the Opposition?

Let us look at them. Neither the Premier nor the Minister for Justice touched on No. 1.

The Minister for Justice made a statement, looking at the clock, and did not make one comment in relation to the resolution, the first point of which stated—

“That the Government’s action in confirming the decision of the Licensing Commission accepting the tender of Kevin Francis Ward for a licensed victualler’s licence in respect of premises to be erected in Freeman Road and Rudd Street, Inala is a direct negation of the will of the majority of the residents of Inala who voted in favour of the establishment of a hotel in Inala at the recent local option poll.”

Has that been refuted by the Premier or the Minister for Justice? I should say not. Public opinion has never been answered by either Minister and has not even been referred to. This resolution has been moved as a means by which public opinion can be expressed on the floor of this House and I believe it is the wish of the people of Queensland, not only of Brisbane, that the Government should be given the opportunity of explaining their decision in the matter.

If this tribunal was a quasi-judicial tribunal its decision has already been before the Governor in Council and Cabinet and the decision is no longer that of the Licensing Commission but becomes, once it is confirmed, a decision of the Government. So, we are entitled, just as the public are, to have from the Government an explanation of all the matters of concern to public opinion at present. If there is not any reply on these matters public opinion will be further inflamed in relation to them. On the basis of democracy the Government are expected to reply to the 16 points in the resolution. Neither the Premier nor the Minister for Justice has attempted to explain the first in regard to the suitability of the site. The matter was referred to the Government and the Governor in Council. They confirmed the decision of the Commission. Whether that decision is right or wrong can be decided by public opinion; it is not a matter for decision by the Premier or by hon. members. We are here as the mouthpiece of public opinion, yet the Government are attempting to prevent the expression of public opinion and the public will, through the right channel, that is, their parliamentary representatives in the House.

We have heard no denial of the fact that the tender accepted was lower than other tenders. We have heard no justification by the Minister for Justice or the Premier of the suitability of the site selected. All we know is what we have read in the Press and the statement by the Minister that the site of the successful tenderer was the most suitable. Ten tenders were submitted. In other words, tenderers suggested 10 different locations for the proposed hotel, yet the Minister suggests that the site selected was the most suitable having regard to public convenience and public service. If that is so, why did he

make an announcement that in the future tenders may be called for another hotel or motel?

Tenders were called in accordance with the legislation of the Government providing that a referendum be conducted within an area before a licence for an hotel is granted in that area. If there were to be two hotels, I would have thought the tenders would have been called simultaneously for the two hotels, so that all tenderers would know the position. According to the Minister no other site was more suitable than the site of the successful tenderer, but the Minister has seen fit to announce that tenders will be called for another hotel in the mysterious future.

We have heard references to the land of the Queensland Housing Commission. By way of interjection the Treasurer has indicated that in all probability the Housing Commission will get a greater rental for the site than the rental proposed by the unsuccessful tenderer.

Mr. Hiley: I did not say a greater rental; I said a substitute rental.

Mr. LLOYD: A similar rental no doubt. The site will be subject to valuation and rental will be assessed on the valuation. Even if the Treasurer can secure not £3,000 a year but £5,000 a year for the land, the fact remains that at the relevant time £3,000 a year was the highest amount available to the Housing Commission and, that being so, it should have been acceptable.

We have heard no reply by the Minister for Justice or the Premier to the statement that the Brisbane City Council was unwilling to grant a permit for an hotel on the site proposed by the successful tenderer, but that it was quite happy about the sites of other tenderers. Surely that point should have been taken into consideration by the Licensing Commission in its deliberations. Surely it would have taken into consideration the fact that the Brisbane City Council would in fact give a building permit for other sites. Having regard to that point and the fact that tenders for the other sites were far higher than the successful tender, is it any wonder that questions are being asked by the public?

(Time expired.)

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing) (2.50 p.m.): We have seen a classic example this afternoon of why it was, in one of its wiser moments, that the Labour Party of the day set up the Licensing Commission. It set up the Licensing Commission for one purpose, and one purpose alone, and that was to remove these contentious licensing matters from political control and interference. Today we have had a classic example of the mischief that happens when these things become the sport of politicians. The purpose behind the motion is to assert that the Government should use its power not only to upset the findings of two tribunals, as I

propose to show but to force the use of a site in which the Crown is selfishly interested as a landlord. All I want to say is that if the Crown were to so exert this force, that would cause a real scandal indeed. We would be accused of forcing this into the hands of someone who would be a tenant of the Crown, in respect of which we would get a rental. We have heard some talk about justice. There will be no justice in Queensland if the decisions of properly constituted tribunals are to become the sport of politicians and the other influences of political administration. The matter came before Cabinet, and its advice was tendered to the Governor in Council. There was no evidence to show that the Licensing Commission had acted improperly. The question of whether the Commission's judgment was the wisest, in our judgment, was not relevant, and we thought that for the Governor in Council to impose his decision in the circumstances would be quite wrong. I have been long enough in the House to know that if we had done so—if we had reversed the decision of the Licensing Commission—there would still have been an adjournment motion today attacking the Government for political interference with the Commission.

The Housing Commission set out to be helpful to all applicants and the Licensing Commission, on sites. My Commissioner, Mr. Galvin, showed various sites to the Licensing Commission, and I propose to indicate the advice tendered by the Housing Commission, and later, the nomination of preference, on all sites, by the Brisbane City Council, because it is most interesting that the first preference of sites by the Queensland Housing Commission had all the faults that hon. members are attacking on this occasion. They were fringe sites and they were remote sites. I will show hon. members where they were. Our first suggestion was that they might be satisfied with two blocks at the end of the Civic Centre. They replied that that area was not large enough for what the Licensing Commission envisaged. They wanted more. I could not afford to let them have so much, for it would have taken away our dream of a shopping centre. I could stand it as an incident in the shopping centre but I could not afford to let them grab too much of it. They then suggested that we might redesign this and extend the area that way. That would have upset the whole of our underground preparations. Anyone who knows the Civic Centre site knows that we laid all the stuff underground before we set out to build the roads or anything else. The Licensing Commission told us, "It is not big enough. What is your next site?" We then suggested this site by the picture theatre. Those who know Inala will know where it is. The main access road is there. We were told that they thought it was too detached. The next one we suggested was at the side here, part of the parkland. We suggested that five acres of that should be traded in a deal with the city council, and we would compensate the city

council with an area of extra land here which would be more suitable land—more suitable for them. The Licensing Commission pointed out that that site was right opposite the youth centre and they were averse to it for that reason.

Mr. Duggan: Which is subdivision 180?

Mr. HILEY: That is the worst one of them all. That is the one the council wanted; it is terrible—no roads; no-one near it; away out in the "Woop Woop" on Blunder Road.

The fourth site that was settled on was the one that we were prepared to trade as extra park in exchange for the third but which they would not take because it was opposite the Youth Centre. That is the one that we stuck to and that was the only site we had that was acceptable in the area to the Licensing Commission.

Mr. Bennett: Apparently the Government took a very close interest in the decision throughout.

Mr. HILEY: Seeing that we own the land and that we are invited to make land available, we had to.

Mr. Bennett: You just said it would be improper.

Mr. HILEY: I said it would be improper to interfere with the decisions of tribunals when the hon. member would attack us for studying our own pockets.

The approval went to the Brisbane City Council and they indicated their preferences for sites. Their first preference was for a site in Rosemary Street on one side of the school. Their second preference was for a site in Rosemary Street on the other side of the school. You will understand why the Licensing Commission did not want either of those.

I ask you to observe this. One of the grounds of the objection is that the proposed site is not in a central area but is a fringing site just across the road from houses, but sites Nos. 1 and 2 put up by the Council in their order of preference were not in the developed part of the area; they were fringing sites too, right alongside a school.

Mr. Duggan: Nonsense!

Mr. HILEY: It is not nonsense at all. The Council's third preference was for a site on Blunder Road. The white section of the plan shows that no houses have been built and no roads constructed there. It was a bush-land site and for that to have been developed at this stage would have caused a scandal indeed. We should have had a remote hotel fair in the middle of the bush. The nonsense that would have gone on about that site would be nobody's business. However, those were the three sites in order of preference put up by the Brisbane City Council. They gave no order of preference for any of the other sites.

We have been accused of indecent haste in dealing with the appeal against the Council's refusal of permission. The fact of the matter is that the appeal was lodged on 11 December, 1961, and it was heard on 19 January, 1962. Both the Council and the appellants were represented by counsel. I ask the House to observe that the Court vacation is the time you can get quick hearings because you can get counsel. It is when courts are sitting and counsel are tied up that you have to wrestle with the difficulties of the non-availability of counsel.

This matter came before Mr. Lukin, who was the senior counsel delegated to consider it, and these are his findings.

Mr. Bennett: Appointed by the Minister for Local Government.

Mr. HILEY: Exactly.

Mr. Bennett: And his delegate.

Mr. HILEY: Is the hon. member suggesting that Mr. Lukin's was an improper appointment?

Mr. Bennett: I could have suggested others.

Mr. HILEY: So can I. Anyone can suggest a dozen.

Mr. Bennett: How is it he gets every one?

Mr. HILEY: I do not think the hon. member will find that that is right. Nothing of the sort.

These are his findings after hearing all the evidence. He says:—

"I do not think that the possibility of increased traffic at the intersection near the hotel is a reason for declaring that the site is not a fit site for a hotel or for refusing the application, especially in view of the large parking areas to be provided in the curtilage." He goes on to say—"Nor do I think that the fact that pedestrians would be crossing the road to get to and from the hotel is a reason for refusal."

He concludes with these words—

"I therefore hold that the site is a suitable site for the proposed hotel. What is the best site is a matter for the Licensing Commission under the Liquor Acts. Any permission given by me must be subject to the acceptance by the Commission of the tender in respect of the site."

The point I want to make is that here is a matter that went to one tribunal—and Mr. Lukin was the person constituting the tribunal—and he held, after going through all the pros and cons of the matter, that this was a suitable site. Remember, if the argument is that it was a fringing site, so were the others. Every school is on a fringing site. The first and second preferences of the council were fringing sites. Their third preference was an utterly detached site away off in the bush.

Mr. Houston: Where were the sites of the other tenderers?

Mr. HILEY: I have not got them in front of me now, and I should like to be correct in my answer.

Mr. Houston: How many tenders were for the Housing Commission site?

Mr. HILEY: About six. I repeat that the Government found themselves in a position where there was nothing to suggest that there had been any impropriety by these two tribunals. I say quite candidly that had it been my personal judgment, I think I would have preferred the Housing Commission site, but I might be biased because I am the landlord.

Mr. Hanlon: You have a lot of tenants, you have some responsibility to them, and they want it there. Take that into account.

Mr. HILEY: We are hearing some of the noisy objections. When the Press get their teeth into this and go and take a straw vote—

(Time expired.)

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (3.1 p.m.): I support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Although the Treasurer said in his concluding remarks that his personal view might have been that he supported the Housing Commission site, I think it became obvious while he was speaking that he was very keen that the Housing Commission site should not be selected. That could be one of the reasons why there was a change in the selection of the site. There seemed to be quite a bit of antagonism between the Housing Commission and the Brisbane City Council over the siting of the hotel at Inala.

Mr. Hiley: I made it perfectly clear that I would have been very happy if it had been on the Housing Commission site, and I would still be happy to have it there.

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not think that the Treasurer knows in his own mind exactly where he wants it, because his earlier remarks differed entirely from his final statement.

I should like to reply to one or two points made by the Premier. He challenged the right of the hon. member for Salisbury to be an authority on the question of the site of the hotel at Inala. The Government have become noted for completely disregarding all the opinions expressed by members of the Opposition. We have seen many instances in which the Government have deliberately gone out of their way to side-step suggestions made by hon. members on this side of the Chamber, and this is another indication of their attitude. After all, the hon. member for Salisbury lives in the area. He goes there every day of the week, he knows many people there personally, and he would have a good insight into their opinions and wishes. Apart from that, I believe that

he is experienced in the ways of the world, a man who is well qualified to express an opinion on this matter.

What are the qualifications of the members of the Commission? First of all, let us take Mr. Kelly, the chairman of the Commission. I would not know Mr. Kelly if I bumped into him. He is a barrister. Barristers are very able men in matters of law and able men at other things, but there is nothing to say that Mr. Kelly has any qualifications as a town planner. It is true, as I said, that he is a barrister in his private capacity, and it has been suggested that he does quite a bit of work for Castlemaine Perkins Limited. Whether that is true or not, I do not know; but if we are talking about qualifications, that may be a qualification for making a decision on this matter.

Mr. Davies: Who is going to build the new hotel?

Mr. HOUSTON: I do not know. Let us have a look at the qualifications of the other members of the Commission. Mr. Fullagar is not a qualified town planner, neither is Mr. McCoy. So when the Premier talks about qualifications to express an opinion on this matter, I should say that Mr. Sherrington certainly has far more qualifications to express an opinion than have the members of the Commission.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HOUSTON: It is also quite remarkable in a debate such as this, which is supposed to be of small importance and in which no principles are involved, to note who has spoken on behalf of the Government. It has brought the Premier, the Minister for Justice and the Treasurer to their feet to support the Government. Not one of them has been able to give the House one shred of evidence to support the Government's decision to back the granting of the licence.

Mr. Bennett: The Minister for Mines has ducked for cover.

Mr. HOUSTON: As the hon. member for South Brisbane mentioned—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. member to deal with the subject under discussion and not take any notice of interjections.

Mr. HOUSTON: The whole matter reminds me very much of the popular tune, "The Pub with no Beer." A very unfortunate decision was made in giving a town with no pub. The Government's whole case is based on the idea that it is not a matter of public importance. It is a matter of public importance because important principles are involved. The first important principle is that no commission, whether it is set up by this or any other Government, has the power to make the final decision. The Government must accept

responsibility for the decisions of its various commissions. It is not common nor is it desirable for Parliament to interfere with every decision of the various commissions. The Opposition have no intention of so interfering. But in this case a decision has been made by the Commission following which there was no objection by members of the Opposition, and certainly no objection on this occasion by the hon. member for Salisbury, but by the people who voted for the hotel in the area. They went to the newspapers. After investigating the case very fully the newspaper reporters made reports in the newspapers. Those reports were not denied by the Government. In those circumstances is it not right that the Government should see what is wrong? After all, public opinion is more often right than wrong. I should be more inclined to accept public opinion than the opinion of some of the so-called experts on various matters.

We have had varied accounts of the history of the whole matter from various Ministers. Finally the Premier came in. After all, the Ministers had 10 minutes each. The Government should have used their 30 minutes to give us the full history of the reasons behind the decision to uphold the Licensing Commission's decision. Had the Ministers come in much earlier and given us their answers immediately after the motion was seconded from this side the whole matter could have been cleaned up and the debate concluded, that is if the Government were honest and everything had been made clear. But the Minister for Justice fumbled on through his time without giving us any facts to substantiate the Government's action. He said that there was nothing to worry about. He said exactly the same as other Ministers have said before—that there was nothing to worry about until something blew up. But it is a different story when you go right into it. Some back benchers on the Government side are interjecting. They have had plenty of opportunity to speak. I know that quite a few of the Government back benchers will not be allowed to give their considered opinion on the matter.

The people decided that they wanted the hotel in Inala, not at Oxley. Who decided the boundaries of the local option poll? They were decided in the first instance by the Government. When they laid down the boundaries was it not logical to assume that the people who were entitled to vote would vote on the question of whether they wanted an hotel at Inala, not at Oxley or somewhere else?

Mr. HART (Mt. Gravatt) (3.10 p.m.): As usual, the hon. member for Bulimba has let the cat out of the bag. He gave the reason, the valid reason, for the decision of Cabinet. He said it was not desirable to interfere with the findings of a Commission. Those are his words and that is the truth. It is not desirable and furthermore it would be most improper for a Government to interfere with

the findings of a Commission that has acted properly. If cabinet acted as a general board of review from decisions of the Licensing Commission it would be so cluttered up with work it would have no time to govern this State. After all the members of the Commission are the experts.

Originally, if the Commission went wrong in law over any particular matter, under the Labour legislation there was no power whatever to interfere. There was the power for the Governor in Council to veto but there is no power for the ordinary citizen to go to court. In 1958, this Government provided that if the Commission went wrong in law the ordinary citizen had his remedy through the courts.

The Commission, in this particular matter, acted in the same way as it has acted since it came into being in 1935. It called for tenders and it took them all into consideration and announced its decision.

The hon. member for South Brisbane read Section 8 of the Liquor Act and showed that the Governor in Council had power to veto and to alter. Nothing could be truer. It has that power, but also, nothing could be more irrelevant, because the question is how should they exercise that power? In every appeal from a judge to the Full Court the words used are that it shall be by way of rehearing, and if it be from a judge and jury the Court never alters the decision of the court below unless it is evident that they should act or if improper law has been applied.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HART: Apparently my friend does not know much about law. The other point is that a dreadful charge has been made here. We have three men constituting this Commission, Mr. Kelly, Mr. Fullagar, and Mr. McCoy. Mr. Kelly is an honourable member of the Bar. It was said by the Opposition that he acted for the Castlemaine Perkins Brewery and that there was an insinuation to be drawn from that. Mr. Kelly's honesty and integrity have never been questioned. Mr. Fullagar has been a valued servant of this Government and former Governments for many years. He was the servant who for many years administered the price fixing legislation for the Labour Government. He was their price fixer.

Mr. Newton: He did a good job.

Mr. HART: He did a good job. I did not always agree with his findings but I am certain that everything he did was honestly done, yet the Opposition are bringing charges of corruption against the gentlemen they had fixing prices for them for many years. There were suggestions that because of Mr. Fullagar's decision Liberal Party funds are going to benefit greatly. I say Labour members ought to be ashamed of themselves, every one of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I inform the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt that I must allow the Leader of the Opposition 10 minutes in which to reply.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (3.15 p.m.), in reply: We have had an extraordinary exhibition today of the Government remaining silent for the best part of an hour when a series of allegations were made against them in regard to their upholding the decision of the Licensing Commission on the matter that forms the subject of the motion for adjournment.

The Minister controlling the department rose to his feet, but did he answer any of the suggestions that were put forward for examination, the evidence that was put forward for examination, the 16 paragraphs put forward for examination?

A Government Member: Rumour.

Mr. DUGGAN: It is not a matter of rumour. I challenge the Government to deny the truth of any of the statements appearing in that series of questions.

Mr. Knox: Produce evidence.

Mr. DUGGAN: The evidence is there. What more evidence does the Government want? In the first instance the Minister said that the matter that had to be considered by the Commission was the price tendered. The evidence shows that the successful tenderer submitted a price which was £12,000-odd less than another tenderer who submitted a proposal for a building not less favourable than the proposal of the successful tenderer. I do not care on what basis these matters are examined. The Government are pretty thick in political hide if they will not accept a series of straight questions such as the ones submitted. They were scrupulously examined by me. I checked and cross-checked them to see whether any of the statements I made in the 16 paragraphs could be contested on the grounds of their inaccuracy.

The only person who spoke on behalf of the Government and attempted to deal with any of the matters was the Treasurer. What did the Minister for Justice say? He said that it was a very complex matter and that if the Opposition had an understanding of the complex nature of it they would have found difficulty in coming to any conclusion other than that arrived at by the members of the Licensing Commission. Then he went on to say that the Commission was a quasi-judicial body, and he referred to the record of public servants on the Commission. Those things are known to us and are not being challenged. No-one doubts that the Licensing Commission is a quasi-judicial body, that Mr. Fullagar was Commissioner of Prices and that Mr. McCoy was a public servant with many years' service. Those are not the matters occupying the attention

of the House. The Opposition is demanding some reply to the questions raised, which are matters of public importance.

Mr. Knox: What is the question?

Mr. DUGGAN: You, Mr. Speaker, are the custodian of the affairs of the House. It distresses me to think that, when you fearlessly and impartially exercise your powers as Speaker, the Government inferentially cast aspersions on your judgment. The Minister said it was wrong that we should deal with the matter in this way. The Premier rose to his feet and said that he was sick and tired of all this talk, inferences and so on, and added that if anyone could bring any definite evidence in proof of a charge of corruption he would institute all the necessary inquiries.

On the matter of inferences, let us see what he had to say in his 1957 policy speech—

“For very many years the Labour Government in this State has been surrounded by an unwholesome odour, originating in plebiscites for selection of Labour candidates and pervading the whole realm of governmental administration.

“It is a sad commentary on the long years of Labour rule in Queensland that the average person has now come to regard the average politician as a cross between a rogue and a fool.

“Low cunning and the ability to indulge successfully in slyde political practices are generally regarded as attributes of the smart politician.”

He goes on to say—

“I have heard it said of myself on a number of occasions, ‘Nicklin is too honest to be a politician.’”

He did not substantiate any of those inferences, including the one that he was an honest politician, yet in regard to another inquiry suggested some time ago he said that he was covering up for an old friend in the matter. We are not concerned about the charges made by him against the Labour Party, but in this instance we have given evidence, none of which has been replied to, yet we are charged with making wrong allegations against people. The Premier did not defend any of these decisions despite the fact that they said they had evidence to justify them for lodging a petition. The only comment made by the Treasurer about making some sort of examination was not contradicted. He established, by his spirited defence, that he took a much closer interest in this than the other members of the Cabinet. He pointed out with great detail, with an elaborate map and in his adept manner, what was wrong with this site, and what was wrong with some other site, but the indisputable fact remains that the Licensing Commission, when it called for tenders, advertised for a licensed victualler's licence to be removed to Inala, Brisbane.

They stated in definite terms, in Clause 5, that the land was available and was regarded as being suitable for this purpose and that it had the imprimatur of the Housing Commission and they had discussed rental conditions and conditions as to the size of the area. A man who submitted a tender did not tender for 2 or 2½ acres; he was prepared to take 10 acres. He did not say what the rental was, but we know from other inquiries that have been made, that the Housing Commission told him the rental would be in excess of £3,000 a year. There has been no attempt in any way to answer the allegations that have been made and to say it is not an important matter is just begging the truth. No-one can tell me that responsible newspapers that ordinarily support the Government would write a series of editorials against the Government on this matter if they did not regard it as being of public importance. No-one can tell me that the Progress Association in the area does not regard it as a matter of importance when it has convened meetings to protest about it.

The Treasurer said that they were not concerned very much about this question of revenue. Goodness gracious me, every measure that the Treasurer has brought before the Assembly has been to get more revenue. He taxed the betting people an extra £1,000,000 and he taxed the drinking people £1,000,000 and raised stamp duties and all sorts of things in every direction. On every occasion that he comes here he says the costs of government are going up the whole time. He had an opportunity here to get £12,000 cold and £3,000 to £5,000 a year in rental fees, and he turned it down. Then, worst of all, he said that it is a sad commentary on political life if we have tribunals of this nature made the sport of politicians.

I am casting no reflection personally on Mr. Kelly. However, if the Treasurer wishes to create the atmosphere that we must have complete respect for these tribunals and there must not be any semblance of party politics associated in any way—and I make it clear again that I am not attacking Mr. Kelly's integrity—I think it would remove the cause for complaint if the appointee was someone other than the ex-secretary of the Federal Country Party Leader and secondly, ex-secretary of the Premier himself. He has had a very active party political association. It is desirable that we should have a magistrate, a judge, or someone far removed from politics if we are to carry out the Treasurer's suggestion of having someone in this position who is absolutely free from the influence of party politics.

The Premier said that no-one cares two hoots about this. If he has his ear to the ground, all I can say is that the sooner he gets along to an ear specialist the better because there has been widespread condemnation of this matter. For the Premier to say that the people do not care two hoots

shows how convincingly out of touch with the public the Government are. I believe we have done a public service in drawing attention to the system of public tendering and the administration of the Government in this matter. We indict the Government. I say that at the very least there has been a grave error of judgment. I did not want to say originally that this thing stank a bit, and I withheld comment at that time until I heard some reasonable explanation from the Minister, and I waited for any such explanation from the Minister, or the Premier, but none was given. However, to a minor extent the Treasurer gave some explanation on one point only, the question of sites. In the absence of the Government giving some solid evidence as to why this decision should have been sustained by the Governor in Council we are entitled to draw some other inference. I do not think it is unfair to do that because we could expect a responsible Minister such as the Minister for Justice to give some satisfactory explanation. I again say that I do not know any man whose personal integrity I respect more, and I have said that on many occasions. I have said that many times and I say it again today. But he has evaded his responsibilities as Minister in giving an explanation to the House.

(Time expired.)

Question—"That the House do now adjourn"—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 25

Mr. Bennett	Mr. Inch
" Bromley	" Lloyd
" Burrows	" Mann
" Byrne	" Marsden
" Davies	" Melloy
" Dean	" O'Donnell
" Donald	" Sherrington
" Dufficy	" Thackeray
" Duggan	" Tucker
" Graham	
" Gunn	<i>Tellers:</i>
" Hanlon	Mr. Newton
" Hilton	" Wallace
" Houston	

NOES, 39

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

PAIRS

Mr. Adair	Mr. Camm
" Baxter	Dr. Noble

Resolved in the negative.

POLICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education and Migration): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirability of introducing a Bill to amend the Police Acts, 1937 to 1960, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER ACTS AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

THIRD READING

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

POLICE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

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

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY (Isis—Minister for Education and Migration) (3.34 p.m.): I move—

"That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to amend the Police Acts, 1937 to 1960, in certain particulars."

This is a very small Bill dealing with superannuation for senior members of the Police Force. I have no doubt that, after the stormy debate earlier in the day, this Bill will have the unanimous approval of members of the Committee.

The Police Act was amended in 1959 to increase superannuation allowances payable to members of the Force, such allowances to be calculated upon length of service and salary at date of retirement, the maximum allowance payable being £1,260 with a salary of £2,490 or over and with service of 35 or more years.

Hon. members will recall that action was taken in the first session of 1961 to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act to provide for a ceiling annuity of £1,638 for any employees on a salary exceeding £3,560 per annum. For those members of the Force receiving a salary below £2,490, any increase in salary means an automatic increase in their superannuation benefits. It is on a proportionate basis. Up to £1,290 they get two-thirds of their final salary, that is, if they have had the requisite number of years of service, and from £1,290 to £2,490 they get £430 plus one-third. If their salary goes up, so their contribution and superannuation entitlement increases. There were certain officers at the time who had a fixed limit. When the Public Service Superannuation Scheme was lifted in respect of the maximum available for top officers, it left the senior

officers of the Police Force down on the lower level. The Bill is merely to bring the police officers into line with the public servants.

Mr. Duggan: Are they comparable salaries?

Mr. PIZZEY: Not £1 for £1 but comparable ranges. The Police Superannuation Scheme is not exactly the same as the Public Service Superannuation Scheme. It never has been. It is on a different basis. However, the two schemes are comparable.

It has been the policy to bring the superannuation allowance under the Police Superannuation Scheme to accord approximately with the annuities payable under the Public Service Superannuation Scheme. Consequently action is being taken to amend the Police Acts in accordance with that policy. Such amendments will be operative as from 1 July, 1961, the date from which the amendments to the Public Service Superannuation Act, to which I have referred, also have operated.

The only police officers who are affected at present by the proposal number 22—the Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner, the Commissioner's Inspector, the Chief Inspector, and 18 first-class inspectors.

At present the payment of widow's pensions and children's allowance under the Police Superannuation Scheme are not payable until all periods covered by cash equivalents of leave on full pay have been exhausted. That again is a little different from the Public Service Superannuation Scheme. Under that scheme these pensions for widows are payable as from the date of death of the contributor. Representations were received from the Queensland Police Officers' Union of Employees to adjust the position so that widows' pensions and children's allowances—£39 a year for the children—would be on the same basis as that applicable under the Public Service Superannuation Scheme. The Government agreed that such an amendment is fair and equitable and the necessary amendment is contained in this measure.

The Commissioner of Police has drawn attention to the fact that under Section 62 of the Police Act several offences are listed as being capable of commission by a person who is not a member of the Police Force, and in such cases an essential element of the Crown case is proof that the person concerned is not a member of the Police Force. The element of proof is usually overcome by some admission by the offender—that is a person impersonating a police officer—but it appears that if there is no admission on the point considerable inconvenience could be occasioned, particularly in remote areas, in providing the court with proof that a person was not a member of the Police Force. Probably a senior officer would have to go

out there and take the complete records of the Police Force so that it could be shown that this person is not a member.

Mr. Bennett: You would not have to take the records; you could accept his evidence.

Mr. PIZZEY: This provision will do that. Section 16 of the Police Act provides that common reputation shall be due evidence of the right of a member of the Police Force to hold or execute his office without production of any written appointment or any oath, affidavit or other document or matter in proof of such right.

It is felt that the opportunity should be taken to amend Section 62 to facilitate proof of non-appointment to the Police Force and the formal amendment is consequently being made to this section to provide for the acceptance of an averment in a complaint as evidence of non-appointment or appointment, as the case may be, until the contrary is proved.

That will simplify very greatly cases of impersonation of police officers in remote areas. Those are the two very simple principles of the Bill, one dealing with the payment of superannuation to widows and children of police officers, to bring them into line with the Public Service superannuation provisions and the other to deal with the cases of impersonation of police officers in remote areas.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (3.41 p.m.): The Minister for Education has indicated that this measure, so far as the superannuation provision is concerned, is to bring the officers affected by it into line with public servants who are on comparable salary ranges. If that is the sole purpose of it, I think it is only fair that the adjustment should be made. After all, the Public Service is a career and the Police Force is a career and I feel that, in the matter of superannuation, there should be a general desire on the part of governments to give similar conditions to people on similar salaries.

The only matter that I feel should be canvassed again is that the police fund, unlike some other funds, has to be fairly heavily subsidised by the Crown. I have not had the opportunity of examining its recent position. I will do so in the second reading stages, but it was necessary for a number of years to make appropriations from Consolidated Revenue to make the fund actuarially sound. The Government accept that because of particular hazards attaching to being a member of the Police Force. In addition to that, because of the nature of their calling, where they are subject to temptations, the desire of a sensible government is to see that the pay and conditions of the Force are such as to remove any temptation from police officers generally and also to see that their retirement is not jeopardised because of an inadequate superannuation scheme.

When those conditions are met, it is only proper to see that if there are any people who break their oath of office by succumbing to temptation, they should be harshly dealt with. In the case of an inspector the increase in superannuation is from £1,260 to—what is the amount?

Mr. Pizzey: £1,638.

Mr. DUGGAN: That is getting up into a healthy superannuation payment.

Mr. Pizzey: That is the ceiling in the Public Service.

Mr. DUGGAN: £1,638 is getting up to a healthy amount. I personally should like to see provision made for everybody's old age but the point becomes a little difficult when the person outside who is a member of the general tax-paying public is called upon to provide attractive superannuation benefits for a whole range of people, and for which he does not qualify himself.

Mr. Pizzey: In this case the officer pays high contributions throughout his working life;

Mr. DUGGAN: I am not quibbling about that; I am pointing out that it is a respectable figure on which to retire, whether it be a policeman or a public servant. There should not be any great problems for such a person living in reasonable comfort in retirement. I am not against that requirement being met but we are wasting public funds, to some extent, under the system that has been operating for many years, of retirement of policemen at 60 years of age. I think at some time someone will have to tackle the question and see whether some voluntary arrangement could be arrived at whereby inspectors, commissioned officers or senior non-commissioned officers, or senior members of the force with specialised experience, could be retained in the service until they reached the age of 65. I do not think we are ever likely to see a Commissioner of Police chasing down some back lane after a cat burglar or someone like that, or a Chief Inspector or some other senior officer on beat duty or making routine inquiries by push bike or motor bike. Their duties necessarily are of an administrative character and it is proper that they should discharge their responsibilities in an administrative capacity. I think we are losing the value and the experience of officers at least five years prematurely. I know this is a subject on which the Police Union at different times has had different views, mainly on the ground that such a scheme would retard promotion for other officers of a lower rank, and, while it would have that effect, ultimately they would get the benefit of a longer period of service on the higher classification. There would be no net hardship and the scheme would relieve the superannuation fund. In the first instance it might be possible to come to some voluntary arrangement on the retirement of officers or give them the option

of continuing to 65 years, subject to their furnishing a certificate of good health, and, of course, their desire to continue in the service. I do not think it would harm the promotion prospects of anyone.

Mr. Aikens: For the first five years it would.

Mr. DUGGAN: Obviously it would for the first five years, but ultimate monetary compensation would be received during the extended service of the officer. We know that many men who retire from the police force at 60 then accept other positions. It may be argued, particularly if they are in the lower ranks, that they find it necessary to take other positions to augment their pension. In some cases that would be true, particularly of people who have been retired for some years, who are not entitled to receive increases in pension and to whom retrospective provisions do not apply. However, it is common knowledge that many officers on retirement accept outside positions and I think that is evidence of their physical ability to engage in employment, and, if they are able to perform work for a private employer, I do not see any reason why officers, particularly of commissioned rank and of the senior non-commissioned ranks could not be used administratively for a longer period. We would then have the benefit of their experience, and to some extent the superannuation fund would be made more actuarially sound, as it would not have to meet pension payments as early as at present.

On the averment clause I have not had the practice, experience or knowledge of how it works in the court and am consequently not in a position at this stage to indicate whether in my view the proposal outlined by the Minister is desirable or not.

Mr. Smith interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: If they did, they probably had a use for them, in the same way as the Minister suggests there is need for the clause here. I am not opposing the provision at the moment. I have indicated that I have not had experience as to how these averment clauses operate. No doubt there is justification in certain instances for their application. The Minister has indicated that the department is often obliged to go to a great deal of inconvenience because of the need to produce evidence, the obtaining of which is cumbersome, delaying and costly. If injustice is not being done to anyone in the community, I suppose it is fitting that we should make the alteration. If anyone could show that it could mean injustice, we should have a look at it, but it appears to be a provision that experience dictates is desirable.

Mr. Pizzey: It is hardly likely they would say a person was not a member of the police force if he was.

Mr. DUGGAN: As the Minister has presented the case, it seems to me to be acceptable. I do not want to tie myself

down at this stage by accepting it and having subsequently to alter my views. I accept the proposition put forward by the Minister, but may be other instances can be cited to show that there is a need for a very close look at it. We are in agreement with uniformity of rates. I ask the Minister whether some consideration may be given to making some arrangement for the voluntary extension of the service of senior members so that we may have the benefit of their experience as administrators. The Opposition is appreciative of the work done by senior officers. We are also desirous of seeing that general conditions will attract good types to the job.

On behalf of the Opposition I express thanks for the good job done by the Police Force, from the Commissioner right down through the ranks. It is true that we always find the odd man here and there who steps out of line. Despite the fact that it is fashionable to attack the police, as a collective body they are a fine group of men doing a good job under difficult circumstances.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (3.52 p.m.): The Leader of the Opposition has raised the question of the retiring age for policemen. Over the years I have discussed this with many members of the Police Force and their chief argument against the extension of the retiring age for policemen, as the Leader of the Opposition said, is that they fear it will retard their promotion. There is only a limited number of men in the Force and only a limited avenue of promotion in the Force. If inspectors, sub-inspectors, and so on, carry on until the age of 65, naturally younger men will be put back five years in their avenue of promotion.

Mr. Pizzey: Right down the line.

Mr. AIKENS: Yes, right down the line.

As I interjected, when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking a while ago, it would be only for the first five years after the age limit was extended, and then they would go forward as quickly or as slowly as they are going ahead now. However, I should not like to do anything about extending the age limit for retirement until I was sure that the majority of the members of the Force were in favour of it. After all, it is their job, and they should be given the opportunity to express their opinion on this point before any change is made.

One point has always intrigued me, if I may use that term. On certain occasions when policemen retire, they retire long before they reach 60 years of age. Strangely enough in the Police Force, an officer must finish work and take out all his long-service leave, holidays, and so on, before he reaches the age of 60. I have been told about police officers ceasing work not long after reaching the age of 59. They have then

had to clear up all their accumulated holidays and long-service leave by the time they reach 60 years of age. I do not know if that principle applies in any other branch of the Government service. I worked for many years in the Railway Department—and it has not been much good since I left—and I know that in the Railway Department employees retire on either 30 June or 31 December, after reaching 66 years of age. An employee may have 10 or 11 months of accumulated holidays and long-service leave due to him and he takes all that out after he retires on that date. I have never been able to understand why policemen cannot do the same and work on in the department until they reach the age of 60, and then retire on their 60th birthday. If that is the age fixed for retirement they could then take out their long-service leave, etc., or be paid for it, as they are in the Railway Department and other departments of the service.

Officers of the Police Force make fairly substantial contributions to the Police Superannuation Fund, but notwithstanding that the fund is always in deep financial water. Police officers must be given credit, together with members of Parliament and public servants, for contributing to their superannuation fund. We have one group of Government employees who make no contribution whatever to their superannuation fund, yet they receive a very lavish superannuation payment when they retire through age or for any other reason. We have one particular group of Government employees who are paid, say, 15 per cent. of their salary after five years' service and 2½ per cent. of their salary for each succeeding year of service until they reach the maximum of 40 per cent. of their salary and that is the maximum they can receive as a superannuation payment. I know that one particular Crown employee in this regard, if I may use this harsh term, is deliberately "bludging" on that provision. He is remaining in the job although he is not working.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The term used by the hon. member is not, as far as I know, an English word, nor is it Parliamentary, and I ask him to refrain from using it.

Mr. AIKENS: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. For the moment I was carried away. I thought we were back in Egypt. At least it is a military word.

Mr. Pizzey: Kuridala lingo.

Mr. AIKENS: Yes, Kuridala lingo. I know that in the shadow of the pyramids you have often heard it Mr. Taylor.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: This particular Government employee, although he has not worked on the job for many months, is still hanging onto his job because on 1 May he becomes entitled to another 2½ per cent. of his salary

as his superannuation payment. Naturally he is drawing his salary all the time that he is loafing. He claims that he is not able to carry out his job but he can be seen at the racecourse, at the yearling sales, at Q.T.C. committee meetings and everywhere else of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with a matter affecting the Police Force and I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the Police Force.

Mr. AIKENS: I was merely drawing an analogy between what I should say were the shameful tactics of Mr. Justice Mack—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have asked the hon. member to deal with the Police Force. I now ask him to either keep to the subject of the Bill or resume his seat.

Mr. AIKENS: Then I will resume my seat.

Mr. PIZZEY: I rise to a point of order. I ask that the hon. member be asked to withdraw the remark that shameful tactics are being engaged in by a member of the judiciary.

Mr. AIKENS: He is rubbing your nose in the dirt and you are letting him get away with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member referred to a member of the judiciary in that way I ask him to withdraw it. I did not hear him refer to any particular member of the judiciary.

Mr. AIKENS: I will withdraw it because I specifically said that Mr. Justice Mack was doing that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That is all! The hon. member will withdraw the remark and either resume his seat or continue to discuss the Police Force.

Mr. AIKENS: Then I withdraw the remark. There are one or two other matters in connection with the Police Force that I hope to have an opportunity to deal with and I think perhaps you will allow me the latitude to deal with them.

The first is in connection with the laying of charges against certain people. In my honest and humble opinion, all that a police officer in charge of a district has to do when a constable or someone else of a lower rank prefers a charge against a person is to ensure that, as far as he is concerned, there is a prima facie case to go to the magistrate and later to the Supreme Court, if necessary. In my long experience as a member of Parliament and as a public man, I have struck only one or two officers in charge of police districts—and they have all been honest men and honourable men—who unfortunately set themselves up as legal experts. When I have gone to them and said, "Why was not such-and-such a charge laid against such-and-such a person?" they have

gone into a long, legal dissertation as to what would happen in the court if such a charge were laid. In other words, they have set themselves up more in the capacity of counsel for the defence than of police officer in charge of a district.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is again exceeding the limits of the debate. When the Minister introduced the Bill he dealt only with superannuation funds for senior officers. If the hon. member wants to get beyond that, I am afraid he is out of order. That and that alone will he speak on.

Mr. AIKENS: Very well, Mr. Taylor. I warned you that probably I would be transgressing the strict limits of the rules of debate.

The CHAIRMAN: I assure the hon. member that he has transgressed and I hope he will not transgress again.

Mr. AIKENS: I craved your indulgence, Mr. Taylor, and you granted it to me until such time as you found that I was not in order. If I may finish on that point—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not want the hon. member to continue on that point.

Mr. AIKENS: No, I will not; I will conclude on it. I agree entirely with your interpretation. I am not doubting the honesty and sincerity of these police officers, but I think that the only duty of a police officer in those circumstances is to assure himself that a prima facie case is laid. The points of law should be determined by the magistrate or the judge, not by the police officer.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (4.1 p.m.). I support the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition about the retiring age of police officers in Queensland. I know that the suggestion will perhaps be met with mixed feelings amongst those members of the Police Force, but I am also satisfied that many of them, from the highest to the lowest, believe that they are pensioned off too early, when their experience would be of value to the Police Force and to the State, and when they would still like to engage in an active and constructive occupation. I believe, as the Australian Labour Party has always believed, that the less fortunate sections of the community—age pensioners, invalid pensioners, and those who are not in a position to earn a living—should have their interests safeguarded by superannuation schemes, social service benefits, and so on. We subscribe fully to those measures for persons who need that assistance and attention. Nevertheless, we must be realistic enough to acknowledge that schemes such as that impose a burden on the community and the State and affect adversely the economy of the country.

When we consider the retiring members of the Police Force, we see that we are dealing with a body of men who, to gain entry to

the Police Force in the first place, have to pass a medical test of a fairly high standard. They have to satisfy the authorities that their physical and mental capacity is considerably above average, and from time to time during their career as police officers they have to satisfy those in authority that they have maintained their physical fitness. It seems strange that those who are required to be of a higher than average physical standard throughout their career should be pensioned off considerably earlier than other normal persons in the community. Although it is to some extent a controversial subject with police officers, I believe that the majority of them would favour later retirement. It would temporarily restrict their opportunities of promotion, but in a period of five years a principle will be ironed out and they will be given the opportunity of attaining the position that they would otherwise have attained five years earlier had the proposal not been implemented. It will give them the satisfaction of knowing that they will spend a longer time in their jobs. Obviously they must like their work. They would not stay till they are 60 if they did not. It will also give them the opportunity of maintaining an active and interesting life in the occupation they have followed for many years, and it will give them the satisfaction of knowing that they are being of service to the community. From the point of view of the community, it will lessen the burden on the economy of the State. Although the limit of the deficit that the economy of a country can carry must be somewhat elastic, obviously there is a limit to schemes of this nature beyond which it is dangerous to go. What do we find? They are quite active. They are experienced in their tasks. They have a knowledge of their subordinates at the time. Their services are valuable. Nobody wants them to retire but because of the technicality in the Police Act they have to retire. What do they do? Those who have not retired on the higher scale often find that their income is inadequate or alternatively life hangs heavy on their hands. Therefore they are forced to go into other occupations that do not measure up to the standard of the occupation from which they have retired. Very often they engage in occupations that require greater physical application from them, occupations in which they have had no experience, and very often occupations in which they have to work casual hours at all hours of the night under conditions and circumstances not nearly as congenial as the conditions and the circumstances under which they were working when forced to retire. It is a proposal that should be considered very seriously by the Minister and the Government. The comparatively agile and healthy men who are retiring are men whose services should be retained in the community. We are ever arguing that we should have a bigger intake of migrants. I subscribe to that proposal. We are ever arguing that we should further

increase the population, in effect so that we can improve the numerical strength of our work force. But at the same time we are saying that these healthy, agile, active men should be forced into unemployment because of an artificially set barrier that most of them do not wish to adopt.

Dealing with the superannuation pensions scheme I should like to make one observation about retirement. The amount of superannuation they receive is determined largely by the salaries police officers are receiving at the date of their retirement. Therefore promotion is not only important to the police officer from the point of view of the immediate income he receives, but it is most important from the point of view of the superannuation or pension he receives on his retirement. Therefore it becomes imperatively necessary to ensure that promotions in the Police Force are made on a fair and equitable basis and that justice is done to all seeking promotion. Most hon. members would know that it is the practice in the Police Force to have what is known as the Police Promotions Board. That board is presided over by the Commissioner's representative and comprised of other inspectorial officers of the Force. It is alleged that they go through what are known as "batches" of the police officers who are making application for promotion. The batches in effect mean the personal records or files of the particular officers who have served the Police Force of Queensland for some number of years and who are seeking promotion. It is claimed, I suppose rightly to some extent, that members of the Police Promotions Board closely examine the batches. Very often the batches are about a foot thick. For one I am a little sceptical that the officers of the Promotions Board do in fact examine in detail all the batches of the police officers. I am also sceptical because although the promotions are supposed to be recommended to the Commissioner by the Police Promotions Board, I have discovered from querying officers under cross-examination on oath that invariably the Police Promotions Board has been unanimous in its decision when making recommendations for promotions. It is not humanly possible. It is not practical for any body of men conscientiously performing their task to be unanimous on every occasion in relation to every promotion in the Police Force.

I was startled to discover from a representative of the Police Promotions Board that on all occasions on which he has sat on the board the decision in relation to promotion has been unanimous. Quite frankly, I find it hard to believe or to concede that that is correct. If it is correct, the Police Promotions Board must be purely a nominal board subject to the dictates of somebody outside that board, because no body of men, no matter how friendly they might be, no matter how unanimous they might be on most proposals, no matter whether their minds may be open

to the same thinking or not, can come to the same unanimous decision in relation to other men, time and time again, unless there is something wrong somewhere. I think there must be some weakness there.

The point I am trying to make on the superannuation scheme is that the superannuation an officer gets on retirement depends on his status in the police force at the time of retirement, so promotion becomes very important.

I was startled to learn in some matters in which I have been closely associated with policemen, that they are subject to what is known as confidential reports from their superior officers. I do not know that it is a common practice in the police force but it is a practice adopted by some police inspectors, to write adverse confidential reports about their subordinates without warning the subordinates that such reports are put in.

Each police officer has what is known as a service and conduct sheet which he is not only entitled, but advised, to inspect after it is signed by each individual inspector under whom he serves. He is entitled to see any recommendation or adverse report made by the particular inspector under whom he has served in a particular district. Therefore, he relies greatly on his service and conduct sheet. He is entitled to do so.

I was amazed to discover that in those batches to which I have referred there are further confidential reports made from time to time by some inspectors—adverse confidential reports that blacken the history of the particular police officer and operate against his welfare in the force for many years if not permanently without his being given an opportunity to comment on them.

Mr. Mann: Does anybody make reports on the inspectors?

Mr. BENNETT: I have never known of them. By the time they get to be inspectors they are with the strength in the police force.

There is one final point I wish to make in relation to averment. As the Minister said, there does not appear to be anything seriously involved so far as legal principles are concerned in writing into this particular clause the right to aver that a man is not a member of the police force. It certainly makes the proof easier and it is true that one could not conceive of a police prosecutor claiming that a police officer was not a member of the police force if he, in fact, was. The amendment seems innocuous except for the principle involved. I do not agree with the principle of proving by averment and consider that a defendant should not have to bear the onus of proof. However, I am sure that if any prospective defendant is a member of the police force he will be prosecuted. It will may result, if the observations of the hon. member for Townsville South are correct, in some cognisance being taken of the rights of the defendant so far as prosecutions are concerned. It is not

fair to put a defendant to the expense of defending himself in a police court or anywhere else if it is only a prima-facie case.

Hon. J. C. A. PIZZHEY (Isis—Minister for Education and Migration) (4.15 p.m.), in reply: The measure has been well received. There was some discussion by the Leader of the Opposition and other hon. members about retirement at the age of 60 years. Before lifting the age of retirement to 65 years actuarial investigations would have to be made. The Government would perhaps have to pay just as much in any case. Police officers may have to pay a lower percentage over a longer period of years. In regard to the personal security of police officers, I think they are much happier now in retiring at 60 years than they were years ago. Years ago they had an inadequate superannuation scheme, and so did public servants and members of Parliament.

Mr. Mann: No member of Parliament would want to retire.

Mr. PIZZHEY: Our worthy Chairman of Committees realises that a member of Parliament can serve longer than a police officer.

With the more liberal superannuation provisions that have been made, police officers do not face the disastrous economic situation they faced years ago on their retirement at 60. It must have been a very great worry in days gone by for an officer who was retiring at 60 on a very low pension.

I do not know what the opinion of the union would be. I take it the members would be divided on the matter. Probably the great majority would be against lifting the age of retirement. If the union wants to make representations and if it speaks for the great majority of members of the Police Force, we would be prepared to listen to its suggestions and recommendations. Determination of the proper age of retirement is a very difficult matter. The taking of a chronological age is really an arbitrary way of fixing it. If there was some way by which we could test the physical and mental age of a man, that probably would be more equitable, but a man may be physically not so well at 60 and yet mentally very alert and a great acquisition to any department; on the other hand he may be physically well and hopeless in his mental attitude. It is difficult to find the fairest and best way of determining when a man or a woman is no longer fit to carry on. No Government have ever been game to tackle the matter in any way other than the safe way of chronological age. They say, "Whether they are good or bad, indifferent in health, mentally alert or mentally dull, that is the age limit.", whether it is 60 or 65. There is a lot more to the matter than the mere chronological age.

The hon. member for Townsville South had something to say about long-service leave. I do not know whether he had the correct idea. Members of the Force do take the cash

equivalent of long-service leave after retiring, but they are obliged to take their accrued recreation leave before retirement. The Government have done their very best over recent years to make sure that recreation leave is taken as recreation leave, and as far as possible nearly all servants in the Public Service and elsewhere are obliged to take up to the limit the recreation leave available to them.

The hon. member for South Brisbane said something about promotions. I do not know exactly what the person who spoke to him meant when he said the decisions were unanimous. The Leader of the Opposition would have been in Cabinet for many years. He would have been the first to admit that members of Cabinet look at many problems and that they have differences of opinion, but that without ever taking a vote they eventually come to an opinion which becomes the unanimous opinion. I believe that was what was meant by the person who spoke to the hon. member for South Brisbane about the Promotions Board. The members of the Board would talk their problems over and come to a conclusion acceptable to them. I assure the hon. member that there is absolutely no interference whatever in promotions or appointments in the Police Force by any outside person or body.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. PIZZEY: As a matter of fact, the hon. member probably knows more about the persons getting promotion than I do. I believe it is a job for the Commissioner. He is given the job under the Act, to look after the discipline, good order and conduct of the Police Force. The Promotions Board is set up to consider these matters justly and fairly from the point of view of every policeman and, I believe the union is satisfied that every man is getting a fair go.

Motion (Mr. PizzeY) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

CITY OF BRISBANE TOWN PLAN (EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD FOR INSPECTION) BILL

INITIATION IN COMMITTEE

(Mr Dewar, Wavell, in the chair)

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset—Minister for Public Works and Local Government) (4.22 p.m.): I move—

“That it is desirable that a Bill be introduced to extend the period during which Brisbane City Council shall keep open for inspection the town plan for the city of Brisbane prepared by the Greater Brisbane Town Planning Committee and the report of such committee thereon.”

This is a short measure, the purpose of which is to extend, for a period of 90 days, the period during which the Brisbane town plan has been opened for inspection by the Brisbane City Council. The extension arises from numerous requests made to the Government. Upon the passing of the Bill, the council is required to give public notice of the extension and that objections may be lodged during the extended period.

At the request of the Lord Mayor, the Bill provides that, during the period of the extension, the town plan and the report of the Greater Brisbane Town Planning Committee thereon, may be opened for inspection at a place other than the council's office. Such a place, however, may not be more than one-half mile distant from the City Hall and must, in the opinion of the council be centrally and conveniently situated. If the council decides to take advantage of this provision, it must give public notice of its decision in that behalf.

There are some further provisions which have been added at the request of the Lord Mayor. The functions of the Greater Brisbane Town Planning Committee, as prescribed by the City of Brisbane (Town Plan) Act of 1959 were to prepare a town plan for the city and report to the council on objections received to the plan. During the period the plan was in course of preparation, the council necessarily referred to the committee, for its views and advice, numerous applications made to the council for the use and development of land. This practice may be regarded as a normal procedure since the committee, by reason of its research and investigations, was in the most favourable position to tender such advice. Indeed, it was necessary if there was not to be confusion during the preparation of the plan.

Now that it is proposed to extend the period for inspection of the plan, it is felt that the committee should be clothed with the legal power to tender this advice if so requested by the council or its delegate, and the Bill so provides.

The Bill further provides that the council or its delegate, in considering an application for the use or development of land, shall have regard to the advice tendered by the committee thereon. Neither is bound to accept this advice but the Bill does enable the council or its delegate to have the benefit of the advice.

The relevant provisions of the City of Brisbane (Town Plan) Act dealing with the employment of staff, etc., for the performance of the committee's functions are continued in force for the purpose of the exercise by the committee of the additional functions abovementioned. These arrangements will continue in force until the council, on the recommendation of the committee, otherwise determines. As I have already stated, these later provisions were requested

by the Lord Mayor in discussions with the Government, and the Government had decided to accede to the request.

Statements have appeared in the Press that the Government were discourteous to the Lord Mayor. I certainly had no intention of being discourteous to him or to the office he holds.

Mr. Lloyd: Did you discuss it with him?

Mr. RICHTER: As a matter of fact I discussed the matter of the town plan with the Lord Mayor on Wednesday last and suggested an extension of time. He gave me several reasons why he did not favour this course. Immediately the Government made the decision to give notice of the legislation on Thursday afternoon, I rang the Lord Mayor and acquainted him with the fact.

I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (4.28 p.m.): I do not know whether I would be right in describing the Minister for Public Works and Local Government as an old campaigner, or as a new campaigner, but certainly his technique of introducing Bills is in marked contrast with that of some other Ministers. He prepares his notes very carefully; he keeps to them religiously; he ignores interjections; he tries to be as brief as he can, and he sits down and hopes to weather whatever storm might arise. I have observed him since his elevation to Cabinet rank and he has kept to that course consistently. I suppose he sees the danger of talking too much or of acknowledging too many interjections, as some of his colleagues do.

However, I think we should examine a little more carefully than the Minister's introductory remarks would seem to justify, the reason for the Bill. He has not given the Committee any convincing reasons for the proposed extension, nor has he indicated just how substantial are the objections that have come from various sources. I make this observation because, after all, whether it has been done deliberately or not, I think the Lord Mayor has been shown a great discourtesy in the matter and that some reason other than those the Minister has announced to the Committee this afternoon have prompted the Government to intervene.

The Votes and Proceedings of this Assembly of 28 February record that the hon. member for Baroona asked the Minister a question about the town plan and in his reply the Minister said—

"The Council has advertised that the plan and report thereon is open for inspection. The Brisbane (Town Plan) Act of 1959 provides that the period during which the plan and report thereon shall be open for inspection must be at least ninety days. Any extension of the minimum period of ninety days being a matter entirely in the hands of the Brisbane City Council."

Later he went on to say—

"Until the plan and other material are submitted to me and I have the views of Brisbane City Council on the plan, as required by law, I do not feel that I should make any premature statement. To do so would be discourteous to the Council, as a public elected body which has still to consider the matter and declare its views on the various issues involved."

That is a clear, decisive statement indicating that the matter was entirely one for the Brisbane City Council. It could not be said that that was just a snap decision, because it was part of a fairly long answer that the Minister had an opportunity of preparing after the hon. member for Baroona had given him the requisite 24 hours' notice.

The hon. member for Sandgate, Mr. Dean, asked a question of the Minister for Public Works and Local Government on 6 March.

Mr. Tooth: He gave certain reasons.

Mr. DUGGAN: He is not allowed to give reasons for asking a question. The Minister said in answer to that question—

"I would refer the Honourable Member to my answer to a question on the Brisbane Town Plan furnished on the 28th ultimo wherein I advised among other things that any extension of the minimum period of time of 90 days was a matter entirely in the hands of the Brisbane City Council."

Mr. Ramsden: What was the question that was asked?

Mr. DUGGAN: I am concerned with the Minister's answer, not the question that was asked. Apparently the Minister has a sense of responsibility, something that the hon. member does not know anything about.

Mr. Ramsden: It might have been in answer to another question.

Mr. DUGGAN: I prefer on this occasion to deal with the heavier artillery and not be worried about the smaller weapons. I am dealing with the 25-pounders at the moment, and I think I had better continue dealing with them.

What evidence have we about this matter? On the question of discourtesy, I think we should establish first that this committee has been appointed by the Government. When Mr. Heading introduced a Bill some years ago, we discussed previous town plans and the question of who might have been responsible for the delay in implementing a town plan. The matter was canvassed fairly fully then, but the Government said that they were not concerned very much about who was responsible for previous delays and Mr. Heading said that he wanted some early and positive action on the matter. He said at the time that there were very good reasons why something should be done quickly. "Hansard" of the period—I do not intend to take up much of the time of the

Committee by quoting it—shows very clearly indeed that the committee had been appointed by the Country-Liberal Government and that the personnel had been selected without reference to Parliament. The members of the committee were the Lord Mayor and another nominee from the Brisbane City Council, Mr. Slaughter, the Town Clerk, Professor Cummings, the Professor of Architecture at the University of Queensland, and Mr. Sewell, the Director of Local Government. In introducing the measure, the Minister mentioned that Mr. Heath, the Town Planner, had been appointed for the specific purpose of developing the plan as quickly as possible because the Government regarded it as a matter of great urgency. He said that £2,000 had been expended on the plan and that no impediment would be placed in the way of the committee's implementing its decision and getting a judgment as soon as possible. The Minister said, "There has been too much delay on this matter previously. We want action. We have cleared the decks for action. Space and staff have been made available so that the plan can be prepared."

As I said, I want to establish first that the committee was appointed by the Government. The only thing the Government did not do was accept financial responsibility for the work of the committee. The Act provides that the financial responsibility rests on the Brisbane City Council. I do not intend to go through all the mechanical procedures that are necessary for the examination of objections by various interested people; but having examined them, the committee then submits the matter to the Council, which receives the objections and furnishes its report to the Minister. The Minister is the person who accepts or rejects the plan. The Council can only make recommendations on the matter.

The Government have not accepted their responsibility, and I want to know why the present Government have not accepted the challenge of the former Minister for Local Government, Mr. Heading. I want to see some evidence that the Government have town planning legislation ready. So far there is no evidence that that has been forthcoming. A good deal of newspaper publicity has been whipped up about the objections lodged by various people. The committee, including the Lord Mayor, Alderman Greenfield who succeeded Alderman Groom and Alderman Ord, Professor Cummings, Mr. Slaughter and Mr. Sewell have worked for hundreds of hours in a voluntary capacity. They have worked far into the night. Not on my statement, but on the statement of Mr. Heading, a Minister of this Government, they were men highly qualified to express an opinion. By the demands of the legislation they were provided with trained personnel and staff, some of whom were to be engaged exclusively on this work. I understand that a number of the staff also worked in a voluntary capacity without asking for overtime.

What happened? They learned through a Press announcement of the Government's decision to extend the period of time. What is the reason for the Bill? How valid are the objections? I make it clear that the Opposition do not want to indicate to the people outside that they have any desire to prevent them lodging legitimate objections. We will do all we possibly can to safeguard their interests. When we have examined the Bill, at a later stage I propose to move an amendment that the plan be open for 21 days or such longer period of time as the Governor in Council may determine. It is essential that we should move quickly. Ninety days was the time laid down in the Act—the Government's Act not the Council's—but it has been open for four months. The whole of the basement of the City Hall has been used for that purpose for that period of time. As they have gone one month beyond what the Act provides it means that they have gone $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. longer than the Act prescribes.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. DUGGAN: If a longer time was needed why did not the Government say that at the beginning? The Brisbane City Council complied with all the requirements of the Government's legislation in its entirety. Nobody can deny that.

Mr. Ewan: That is your opinion.

Mr. DUGGAN: It is the opinion of everybody who has studied the matter.

Mr. Ewan: Obviously it is not.

Mr. DUGGAN: It is a case of a little bit of back room pressure by members of the Liberal Party. When they go outside and someone says that there has been a delay, they will not say, "I was a member of the back benchers responsible for this matter being delayed another period." If anyone said to them, "I am glad to hear that the legislation was held over for a while", they would say, "Yes, I was one of the boys that got the Government to hold it up." The boys in the back room of the Liberals have done this.

The Minister has not indicated where he is going to put the plan. Nothing has been done about providing any facilities for displaying the plan. Apparently the Minister has acceded to Mr. Jones's request that it be somewhere within half a mile of the City Hall. People should know where they stand on this matter. One woman I know had a home situated in an area that was shown on the plan as a possible site for a park. Her bank manager told her that in view of the fact that the home was situated on land that might be required for a park he wanted her to reduce her overdraft more quickly than was originally intended. Fortunately she was able to get in touch with the Lord Mayor and the committee made some recommendations after being called together to

excise that portion from the proposed reclamation of the area as a park. In that way the problem was overcome. Some comment has been made about the great number of objections. In the case of a golf club through which a road is apparently to go, 360-odd signatures have been attached objecting to the road going through the area. That only relates to one problem. Naturally, when one reads in the paper about the thousands of objectors, one naturally thinks that every one is dealing with a separate and distinct problem.

In the case of, I think it is the Shell Oil Company, they circularised their employees and 160 of these objections came in mainly from the employees of the Shell Co. about a site where the Shell Oil Company is apparently adversely affected by the town plan.

Mr. Ramsden: Did you read that in the paper?

Mr. DUGGAN: No, I did not, I got it from a very authoritative source. There is other evidence too that roneoed sheets of objections were left in letter-boxes in certain streets, being collected later relating to one specific problem.

We could spend a great deal of time in dealing with cases of that nature, so, when one considers the number of objections that have been received out of a population of about 600,000, the number is relatively small. I think it is essential that the Government themselves should indicate their interest and co-operation in this matter.

Our main objection is that the responsibility is on the Government in the matter. It is the Government's plan; it is the Government's committee. The only thing the Committee got out of it was a lot of work, a slight from the Government, and, of course, ultimately, the Brisbane City Council, a bill for the cost of preparing it.

There are many aspects with which I shall probably deal at the second reading stage. I feel that there is an obligation on me as Leader of the Opposition to object to the way in which the matter has been introduced. There have been no compelling reasons given. At the same time I made it abundantly clear that if the Minister could convince us that there had been valid objections and that they are flowing in, naturally we should see that these people have an opportunity to be heard. But, if one left it open for six months or 12 months there would still be objections coming in.

Another category to which I did not refer and to which I perhaps should have is the people living in the green belt. Those people automatically lodged some objections because they do not want arrangements interfered with which have been acceptable to them over a period. One would expect those people to register objections. When it is all boiled down there is not a great number of cases left open for determination.

However, I do object, as I say, to the general tendency on the Government's part to get themselves into a jam and immediately appoint a committee. In the case of the Brisbane City Council they tried to extricate themselves from their dilemma by appointing their own committee and then they do all they possibly can to frustrate the work of that committee. I certainly would feel aggrieved if I spent hundreds of hours on a matter of this nature and then found the result thrust aside by the Government.

I think the Minister might at least have indicated that when this period of 90 days is ended he will introduce legislation, in the August session, to provide for a town plan. This might go on for ever. Every time the time for objections closes there may be some further pressure applied and the matter further delayed beyond the August session.

I think our main protest is at the way in which the matter has been handled. Having had the opportunity of seeing the Bill, I hope on behalf of the Opposition, to go more closely into these matters on the second reading and give some further evidence on the way in which the Government have acted mainly because some back benchers feel that their election prospects will be jeopardised if they do not move in a particular direction. I think this Bill has been introduced in an unfair manner. Hon. members complain about the Brisbane Town Planning Committee making recommendations. As mentioned by the hon. member for Brisbane it will be recalled that he raised the question of the site for the Main Roads office, in which the Government had no compunction whatever in exercising their authority over the Brisbane City Council.

An Opposition Member: They did the same in relation to the Inala Hotel.

Mr. DUGGAN: They did the same with the Inala hotel. When it suits the Government parties they ignore the advice of these bodies and apparently will continue to do so. In this and in so many other matters they are concerned less with the merits of the position than with the impact on electorates that are a little vulnerable to attack by members of the Labour Party. The prospect of winning these seats by the Labour Party strikes fear and terror into the heart of the Government, and consequently they bring forth this sort of palliative from time to time in an attempt to save themselves from political oblivion next year.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (4.46 p.m.): Since Mr. Jones became Lord Mayor of Brisbane he has made an obvious attempt to work in conjunction and co-operation with the Government, a state of affairs that was apparently impossible when the C.M.O. formed the Council and their Liberal colleagues were in Government in Queensland. The Lord Mayor has attempted to bring about an atmosphere of co-operation and friendship with the Government, purely in the interests

of the people of the city. On the other hand the history of the C.M.O. administration was that Lord Mayor Groom and Alderman Rudd were always at variance with Ministers of the Queensland Government. Lord Mayor Jones has made compromises, even to the extent in some instances of sacrificing his own principles, in an effort to further the interests of the people of Brisbane, but despite those attempts the Minister has introduced a measure such as the one we are considering. The legislation covering the town plan is the responsibility of the Government, and the Minister therefore could quite conceivably have proposed that after the final plan was submitted not by the Brisbane City Council but by the Government a further 90 days could be given for appeal against the decision of the Government.

I intend to quote from the introductory speeches when the Act was originally introduced. It is all very well for the smug Minister over there—

The CHAIRMAN: Would the hon. member repeat that expression?

Mr. LLOYD: It is all very well for the Minister to be smug.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought the hon. member made some other remark.

Mr. LLOYD: The Minister in the past few days has introduced legislation, but has quite obviously refrained from giving full information to the Committee. He has not replied to many of the arguments that have been advanced in the public interest. In this instance I think we should examine the original legislation introduced by the Government.

Mr. Ramsden interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Merthyr has been outside with the Treasurer discussing preferential voting.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has said that I was outside in the lobbies discussing preferential voting with the Treasurer. His statement is untrue.

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

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will hon. members on the back benches please cease talking?

Mr. LLOYD: This is an important piece of legislation, and in my view we should look at the original intention of the Government as expressed in the Bill introduced by the previous Minister for Local Government on 20 March, 1959. The Minister apparently has little knowledge of the intention of the original legislation. For his benefit I shall read extracts from "Hansard".

In recent days the Minister has introduced legislation and has replied to various

speeches, but he has not answered many of the questions that have been asked and has not given full information to the Committee. He has in fact indicated in the last 24 hours that he is living in a coward's castle in an attempt to transfer any political odium for anything that is flowing from himself and his department across to the Brisbane City Council, or any other local authority that might be concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member is referring to a Bill that has been dealt with he is out of order.

Mr. LLOYD: I am not referring to any particular Bill. I never mentioned any Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member referred to something that happened within the last 24 hours.

Mr. LLOYD: Mr. Taylor, you are occupying my time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow the hon. member for Kedron to reflect on the conduct of the Chair. I ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. LLOYD: I withdraw the remark. In fact, I never mentioned any other Bill.

It is typical of the Minister that he refuses to reply to any of the arguments that are raised. I will quote from the 1959 "Hansard" in an attempt to convey to the Minister exactly what the intention was in the original Town Plan Bill. I will quote from page 2,417 of Volume No. 223 of "Hansard" when the then Minister for Public Works and Local Government, Mr. Heading, introduced the Bill. He said that the Bill had been delayed for many years and it was the intention of the Government to expedite it as far as possible. He hoped, within a period of two or three years to have a definite town plan ready for the people of Brisbane. He said that the last concerted effort to obtain a plan was in 1952 and then, he said—

"At that date the Council had prepared a plan but the procedure leading up to its approval was of doubtful validity. Parliament ratified the procedure and required the plan to be laid open to public inspection and objection. This was done and a large number of objections was received. The plan was referred to the Government for approval."

That is a very important remark by the then Minister—that the plan was referred to the Government for approval. He continued—

"It was examined by the Director of Local Government and he recommended that it should not be approved."

That is also very important so far as the people of Brisbane are concerned. The Minister continued—

"The plan and this recommendation remained in the pigeon hole for years.

When the present Government were elected we made up our minds that it was about time something was done to bring matters to finality."

That was said on 20 March, 1959, nearly exactly three years ago. The Minister also said—

"We had the scheme re-examined by an expert committee consisting of the Director of Local Government, the Town Clerk and the Professor of Architecture at the University of Queensland. Their report confirmed the views that the Director of Local Government had expressed some years ago. We then set about getting a proper Town Planning Scheme prepared for Brisbane, and this Bill gives legislative effect to what we have done and propose to do."

He then went on to outline the provisions of the Bill that he was introducing at that time. In the Bill, as outlined by the then Minister, we find—

"(4) On preparing the plan the Committee has to submit the plan and a full report thereon to the Council.

"(5) Forthwith the Council has to lay the plan and report open to public inspection and objection for at least ninety days.

"(6) Objections may be lodged to the plan during the statutory period for objections. At the expiration of this period the Committee has to consider all objections and report thereon to the Council."

Then, we come to paragraph (7) which, I think, was the most important aspect of the legislation introduced by the Government three years ago. It says—

"(7) The Council has to submit to the Minister the plan, the Committee's report, the objections, the Committee's report on objections and any representations the Council cares to make on all or any of those matters. The Governor in Council may approve the plan with or without amendment, alteration, addition or modification. Upon approval of the plan, it has the force of law and binds the Crown, the Council, and all persons whomsoever."

I have stated that the Minister is obviously living in a coward's castle in relation to this matter. He is attempting by extending this period by 90 days to throw the whole of the responsibility for the town plan upon the Council when, in fact, the Council had no responsibility at all except that they had to submit their own considerations to the Government for final approval. In other words, any objections are submitted to the Government; the town plan is submitted to the Government, and it is the Minister who has to make the final decision.

The then Minister, the Hon. J. A. Heading, had this to say in introducing the Bill—

"We will decide very quickly whether it is the town plan we want."

That is to say, "We the Government will decide."

Mr. Ramsden: Constant and tedious repetition.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member is still thinking about preferential voting.

Is there not ample evidence that the City of Brisbane (Town Plan) Bill introduced in 1959 indicated that a Greater Brisbane Town Planning Committee would be established with representation from the Government and the Council, that the plan arrived at would be subject to appeal or objection from the public, and that it would then be resubmitted to the Council and then to the Government? Then in 1959 the Government said, "We will decide very quickly whether it is the plan we want." Where does the responsibility resolve itself? Into the hands of the Government. Once they accept that responsibility it remains with them.

Let us go right through the scheme of the original legislation. Firstly the town-planning committee submitted a plan to the Council. The council submitted it to the public. The public had 90 days in which to object to any of the planning. After that it went back to the Government. Instead of compelling the Brisbane City Council to extend the period for objection by 90 days, the Government should accept their responsibilities under the legislation and say, "We will consider the town plan with its objections; we will make any amendments necessary, and then we will again publish it and give the people of Brisbane a further 90 days in which to object." Why force the Council to do it?

Obviously the Minister has refused to accept his responsibilities. He has refrained from making any Press statements. He has refrained from clarifying for the public the provisions of the original legislation. The public are entitled to know why and how the town plan is to be ratified. If they understand that it is the responsibility of the Government eventually to decide whether the town plan is right or wrong, I can see nothing wrong, once the Government have examined the plan and objections and finalised it, in giving it to the public as a final edition and as their opinion of what the town plan should be and allowing them further time in which to object. As it stands at present, all that the Minister is doing is transferring the responsibility back.

There are many ways of giving the public justice.

The former Minister said—

"Any person dissatisfied by any decision of the Council or its delegate acting under an ordinance made under this power, has a right of appeal to the Minister."

There we have it in a nutshell that any interim decision made by the Council is subject to appeal to the Minister. He went on to say, on page 2418—

"The Minister can appoint some person or persons to hear and determine the appeal. The appeal is a judicial process and the decision on appeal is final and

binding on the Council and the appellant. Costs of action may be awarded and recovered."

On the same page he said—

"The Bill is not a complete code of town planning powers. Such a code is required and will be introduced by the Government at a later date."

Mr. Taylor, where do we go on these matters when the Government are continually trying to put their responsibility onto some other authority? The Minister said at that time that the Government would have to introduce legislation at a later date once the town plan was finally decided upon. It is obviously the responsibility of the Government to introduce a town plan for Brisbane. They have accepted that responsibility, and it is useless for the Minister to attempt to throw the responsibility onto the shoulders of the Brisbane City Council. The original legislation shows conclusively that the plan would have to be referred to the Minister and the Government, and that the Government, having studied the recommendations of the committee, would then decide what type of plan was needed for Brisbane. Instead of coming here and asking this Committee to give an extension of time for 90 days, not for consideration of the recommendations of the Brisbane City Council but for consideration of the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee, it would have been more sensible if the Government had said, "We will give the people of Brisbane a period of 90 days in which to appeal against or object to the final decision of the Government." The Government have failed to accept their responsibility in so many instances that we have become used to this shelving of responsibility. Let them accept their responsibility in this case. The Minister now proposes to introduce legislation to make the Brisbane City Council keep the plan open to the public for another 90 days, at the Council's expense, when the responsibility is really on the Government to decide what the town plan will be and then give the public an opportunity of objecting to it.

Mr. HUGHES (Kurilpa) (5.2 p.m.): There may be a number of other speakers in the debate, so I shall make only a few brief remarks about the proposed legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to speak up. I may be getting a bit deaf, but I cannot hear what he is saying.

Mr. HUGHES: The legislation will give the people of Brisbane every opportunity to make use of their democratic right to voice opinions and lodge objections if they so desire. It cannot be denied—I know of no-one who has denied it—that the committee set up to deal with the town plan has done a good job. The members have not procrastinated or been dilatory. They have applied themselves to their task as diligently as it is humanly possible.

However, let us get to the kernel of this matter. In my opinion it is this: how far are the Government prepared to go, or, for that matter, how far are the Opposition prepared to go, if they are aware of the needs of the public in upholding the democratic right of a person to voice his opinion and lodge an objection? I believe that the Government are doing something worthwhile for the general mass of the people of the City of Brisbane. The citizens should have the right to peruse the plan in an unhurried manner, so that they may consider all aspects of development not only one particular phase of it. The information cannot be assimilated overnight, and should they wish to consider any particular question, they should have the right to consider it before lodging an objection.

Much has been said about the time factor, and it has even been said that an extension of time could hold up the business of the city and delay approval of site plans for houses. Nothing could be further from the truth. Applications for site plans are being dealt with, and I know that the City Council is already applying the principles of the town plan in regard to objections, so it cannot be said that this extension will delay the business of the city or be a waste of time.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member should know that the Council is following that course. Subdivisions are being dealt with by the Town Planning Committee before they go through the normal administrative procedure. It cannot be said that the 3,000 objections will be held up.

An Opposition Member interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: I understand that there are a considerable number associated with one particular golf club. I am not going to analyse them. It has been reported in the Press that there are 3,000. It has not been denied. During the 90 days when the plan will again be open to the public the 3,000 objections can be considered. The administration can deal with them and make its recommendations through the Council to the Minister for final decision. If there are many more objections in the next 90 days surely that will be justification for the Bill. If there are few or none at least full and democratic opportunity will have been given to the citizen to voice his opinion. The few more days for which the plan will again be open will have been the best investment in human rights that the Government could make. It gives an opportunity to every citizen; it affords protection to every citizen. It is for those reasons that I believe the Bill will receive the approbation of the general public.

This is a Town Plan which will be in force, possibly with amendments, for generations. It is not that we are holding up the

full implementation of the plan. That argument has already been stressed by me. Any suggestion to the contrary can be proved by further debate. I would rather hold it up for 90 days than be instrumental in hurting people and property owners in the future.

Mr. Hanlon interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: Why should the hon. member for Baroona deny the rights of citizens?

Mr. Aikens: He would not know the town plan from a pak-a-pu ticket.

Mr. HUGHES: I agree with the hon. member for Townsville South.

In a crowded room it is not possible to acquire a thorough working knowledge of all the ramifications of the town plan in a few hours. If the Council think that the plan is perfect and should not be open for another 90 days why have objections been pouring in by the hundred from professional groups and responsible members of the community? The plan took two and a-half years to prepare. For 18 months survey and investigational work were carried out. We know that origin-and-destination surveys, land—use surveys, and goodness knows, much other statistical data were collated.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. HUGHES: You are about the only one in Brisbane who does not think we should have a town plan. You are out on a limb as usual.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must remember that he is addressing the Chair all the time.

Mr. HUGHES: The first 18 months was taken up with analyses, surveys and investigations; in the last 12 months the plan has been in the hands of the present Labour Council. Fundamentally the plan is undoubtedly theirs. If the citizen is given a full opportunity to make an investigation of the plan he is in a position to object. Many people would want to study, assimilate, digest, think over and talk over the plan. They will want to consider it before they lodge their objections. Although ninety days have passed almost 60 of them were taken up with the December-January holiday period. Why should the Council be averse to having it open for a further period. It would not hold up the plan because they could be processing the 3,000 objections.

It is common knowledge that when the plan was first displayed for public inspection there was a very strong interest in it, in particular, a novelty interest, and then the interest waned because of the holiday period. It was during the closing stages that this upsurge of objections occurred and when public interest was at its height the Labour Council locked the doors preventing further public viewing. That in itself is a sound reason why the citizens should be

given full, and proper democratic opportunity to study it and lodge objections. Where does the Labour Party stand in regard to it? Would they deny the citizens the right to assimilate this knowledge and object?

Mr. Hanlon: Where do you stand?

Mr. HUGHES: It is clear where I stand. The public will want to know the attitude of you and your colleagues. The hon. member for Sandgate should be voting with us because he asked that they should be given a further extension of time in which to view the plan. The Council have been given every right in this matter yet they want to deny similar rights to the citizens. The Opposition said today on another matter that the Government had something to hide but we could justifiably turn the tables on them and ask them now have they anything to hide by pushing the plan through?

I close my remarks with those few pertinent observations. I believe that the plan as it stands at the moment is not as complete as it should be. A set of ordinances should be drawn up to re-embody Chapter 8 of the Council's ordinances. I will not go into details, but under the present set-up it will have to be re-enacted as it will cease to be effective on the approval of the plan.

There should be a Town Planning Act similar to the Town Country Planning Act of England.

Under the Act a number of shires may be allowed to get together and to carry out the principle of regional planning.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Bill has nothing to do with regional planning. Although interruptions have occurred the hon. member has repeated himself many times. Surely he has made his point by now.

Mr. HUGHES: This Bill should be embodied in the State Town Planning Act. The Council should draft a set of ordinances to enable the authorities to prepare a general town planning scheme. They should start off with those express matters that have been included in the Act such as provision as to compensation, provision as to appeals provisions—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Bill relates to an extension of time, not to what other matters might be embodied in the Bill. Will the hon. member discuss the extension of time only? I think he has already expressed himself very fully.

Mr. HUGHES: In that regard the Bill extends to the citizens of Brisbane the democratic rights to which they are entitled in relation to the town plan, rights which Labour in the City Council and in Opposition in this House seek to deny them. In 1937 to 1940 when the Alf. Jones administration had made a mess of the city's affairs the then Labour Government instituted an investigation in an endeavour to put affairs in order

again. That is why those conditions should not return, and they will not if the citizens are given the opportunity to express themselves properly in relation to the preparation of the town plan.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (5.15 p.m.): We have listened today to an amazing exhibition of oratory. First of all we talked for four hours about the site of a pub at Inala.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will confine his oratory to the extension of time for the town plan. If he does so I am prepared to listen to him.

Mr. AIKENS: Now we are going to spend the rest of the evening and probably up to midnight talking about the Brisbane Town Plan. I am beginning to wonder if in addition to the Q.L.P. and the D.L.P. we have not the B.L.P., the Brisbane Labour Party, because I have never seen hon. members opposite as agitated as they have been today. They have been waving their arms around like a praying mantis.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member will not be allowed to review what has happened today. If he has anything to say about the extension of time for the town plan, I am prepared to listen to him but if he does not speak on that subject and that alone I will have to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. AIKENS: I have not the slightest intention, Mr. Taylor, as you know, of disagreeing with any ruling you might give, because you have established in the long years that you have occupied your position as Chairman of Committees, a reputation for justice and fairness that should be the envy of all of us.

What is the purpose of the Bill? As I understand it, after listening to the Minister, it is to extend the time that the people of Brisbane will have to view, examine, and make up their minds with regard to the town plan. In Townsville we have only one town plan and a very simple one it is. If you happen to know the right people, you can build anything, anywhere, anyhow. I see no reason why the people should not be given the extra time proposed by the Bill and for the life of me I cannot understand the violent, vicious and vehement opposition of the B.L.P. to the Bill. What is wrong with it?

Apparently the law at present allows only a certain time for the plan to be laid upon the table or left under the Town Clerk's desk, or wherever it goes, and for the people to see it and lodge objections to it. The Bill merely extends the time in which people can view and study the plan, and what is wrong with an extension of time? There is a very old saying but a very true one, "What are a few moments in all eternity?"

It would appear that the town plan has been hatching for years and years and finally after a good deal of labour it has emerged. For years and years Brisbane has not had a town plan. Now apparently it is to get something that remotely resembles a town plan.

Mr. Smith interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: I am not going to enter into any political dog-fight between the Brisbane Liberal Party and the Brisbane Labour Party. Let them have their own dog-fight if they want to have one. I am merely saying as an ordinary, average citizen who frankly would not care if Brisbane was wiped off the map tomorrow, that I cannot see any reason why the Bill should not be passed and I have failed to hear any argument as to why it should not be passed.

It is necessary to give the people who want to make a study and sensible examination of a particular thing sufficient time in which to do it and, if the people of Brisbane, or many of them, claim they have not had sufficient time to see, study the plan and lodge objections to it, they should be given sufficient time.

Mr. Bromley: You have made your point.

Mr. AIKENS: It may be that a person with the scintillating intellect of the hon. member for Salisbury or the brilliant genius of the hon. member for Norman could look at the plan and in a blinding flash the whole of the plan would be clear in his mind. But it is equally true that there are people in Brisbane who take time to do things and want time to study things. I really think that this is purely and simply a storm in a teacup. Labour members have seized on this matter just as they seized on the Inala pub matter to indulge in a lot of political propaganda hog-wash, and claptrap, and for my part I will have nothing to do with it.

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) (5.20 p.m.): No doubt the Government find themselves in a great state of confusion on this very important subject. Only a few days ago I asked the Minister a question about the extension of time for viewing this plan. My question was prompted by the requests from constituents in my area. When my question was answered the next day the request was turned down completely and I was told that it would not be considered and no approach would be made to the City Council. I sympathise with people responsible for helping to compile a plan because I had the same experience in 1952 with a similar plan. I know the frustration and disappointment that occurs with a plan. I was prompted to ask that question by many phone calls, and strong statements and letters that I have received over the months since this plan has been on display. One complaint was that people had not been able to see it because they were shift workers, or for other reasons they

could not get into town. Some people referred to it in very strong terms, and that influenced me to frame my question in the way I did.

Certain hon. members on my left have tried to create the impression that I am not in agreement with the remarks that have come from this side of the Chamber, because of my question. I assure them that I am completely in agreement with the views expressed by hon. members on this side. We have heard some people describe it as a diabolical plan because of its possible implications. It is a Government plan. Many people who have viewed it, and looked at it carefully, have found that their homes are to be sacrificed for new roads, and that would be one reason for their opposition to it. That must have a bearing on it. That is one of my reasons for rising this afternoon, but the main reason that prompted me to speak on this Bill was to clarify the circumstances surrounding the question I asked. I did what any other responsible person would do for his constituents who made requests to him. That was the reason for my question requesting the Minister to approach the Brisbane City Council to extend the period of time for inspection of the Town Plan.

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset—Minister for Public Works and Local Government) (5.23 p.m.), in reply: I said at the outset that this was a very short measure. Its purpose is merely to extend the time for inspection and objection to the plan for a further 90 days. Any other amendments that are suggested here have come from the Lord Mayor. I do not know why so much noise has been made about it. I believe that the hon. member for Townsville South put his finger on it. In fairness to the people who are asking for an extension, we have extended the time. Why should we not extend it for them? I see nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Houston: What was the Lord Mayor's objection when you asked him?

Mr. RICHTER: He had quite a few objections. He talked for about a quarter of an hour and gave me quite a number of objections.

I assure hon. members that any difficulty about finding a suitable place to display the plan if the City Hall is not available can be overcome.

Mr. Bennett: Where do you suggest it will be?

Mr. RICHTER: For the information of the hon. member, no difficulty is envisaged.

Mr. Houston: Why be so vague? Give us some positive statements.

Mr. RICHTER: I will not decide the place. The city council will decide it. But there will be no difficulty. As to any extra cost that may be incurred in displaying the plan

for the extended period, the Government are quite prepared to discuss the matter and if necessary meet the council on it.

One hon. member complained that I did not take him seriously. I am not sure whether it is his fault or mine if I find his comments uninteresting.

I thank the hon. member for Sandgate for his candid comments. He did raise with me the matter he mentioned and at the time I told him quite plainly and candidly that it was entirely in the hands of the Brisbane City Council. The Act provides for a minimum of 90 days, and naturally, without an amendment to the Act, any extension of time is entirely out of my hands.

Motion (Mr. Richter) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

The House adjourned at 5.29 p.m.