Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 27 NOVEMBER 1968

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 27 NOVEMBER, 1968

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

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 2

Assent reported by Mr. Speaker.

QUESTIONS

JOINT JAPANESE-AUSTRALIAN OFF-SHORE OIL SEARCH

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

Further to his Answer to my Question on November 13, is Japex (Australia) Pty. Ltd., which is involved with Ampol in a search for oil off the Queensland Coast, owned by the Japanese Government through the Japan Petroleum Development Corporation? If so, what percentage of the well will the Japanese Government own on its completion and why has the Queensland Government not taken steps to retain a percentage of the holding?

Answer:—

"Yes. Depending on Japex's arrangement with Mitsui, Japex could own some 40 per cent. interest in this off-shore permit if they drill the proposed well. The Queensland Government does not, as a matter of policy, risk public funds in speculative commercial activities of this nature. However, if there is any production from this off-shore permit, the Queensland Government will obtain 6 per cent. to 8 per cent., depending on the terms of the licence granted, of the gross value of such production as royalty payment."

BURGLARY AND BREAKING AND ENTERING OFFENCES

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

(1) Between January 1 and October 31, 1968, how many cases of burglary or breaking and entering of (*a*) dwelling houses and (*b*) buildings were reported in the metropolitan area and the rest of the State, respectively, and how many have been solved?

(2) How many of the cases in the same category and in the same areas which were reported in 1967 still remain unsolved?

Answer:—

"The information sought is not readily available from Departmental records. I have asked the Department to see what information they can extract from their files and I shall advise the Honourable Member when this comes to hand. However, I suggest that a study of the Annual

Reports, with their accompanying statistical tables, of the Commissioner of Police might be helpful."

ROAD FATALITY CAUSES

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

What have been the principal primary causes of road fatalities in Queensland expressed in percentages for each year since 1960?

Answer:—

"The information required by the Honourable Member is not available in the form sought by him. However, the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Police will give him details from which he can calculate the percentages he requires."

LAUNDRY WORK AT TOWNSVILLE PRISON

Mr. Walsh for **Mr. Aikens,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Justice,—

(1) For the last twelve months for which figures are readily available, how many articles were laundered at Townsville Prison for (*a*) the prison and (*b*) other State instrumentalities, and what was the aggregate weight of each?

(2) What aggregate price was paid to the prison by other State instrumentalities for laundry services for the year and what are the names of the instrumentalities?

(3) How many (*a*) staff members and (*b*) prisoners are employed in the laundry and what are their average hours of work each week?

Answers:—

(1) "For the twelve months ended June 30, 1968, there were (*a*) 193,867 articles laundered for the prison and (*b*) 1,135,677 for other State instrumentalities; the aggregate weights being 75 tons and 432 tons respectively."

(2) "During the year $22,327.16 was received from Townsville General Hospital and $99.40 from the Police Department."

(3) "Two staff officers and thirty-two prisoners are employed with the laundry working an average of sixty-two hours per week."

LIABILITY FOR OVERLOADING OF VEHICLES

Mr. Newton for **Mr. Sherrington,** pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

In view of the widespread dissatisfaction expressed by members of the Transport Workers' Union concerning the fining of their members for breaches of the Traffic Act in the overloading of vehicles—

(1) Has any investigation been carried out into placing the onus for such breaches on the owners of the vehicles and the possible effect that such legislation would have in reducing the number of breaches?

(2) For what reason does the Government consider it desirable that the onus for correct loading of vehicles should be placed on drivers?

(3) Has the union made any submissions to him regarding the matter? If so, what has been the nature of their submissions?

Answer:—

(1 to 3) "For the information of the Honourable Member, the representations made by the Queensland Branch of the Transport Workers' Union of Australia in this regard have been the subject of careful examination and the present position is best described in the contents of a letter forwarded yesterday by me to the Branch Secretary, the text of which read as follows:—'Your letter of 7th November relative to the administration of the Weights of Loads Regulations under the Main Roads Acts has been receiving the Government's consideration. I am advised that investigations to date reveal that there could be some merit in aspects of your Union's approach. In the circumstances, I am writing to advise that our examination of the subject is continuing and, in due course, I shall let you know the Government's decision.' "

INVESTIGATION OF NEW SITE FOR BOTANIC GARDENS

Mr. Newton for **Mr. Sherrington,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Primary Industries,—

In view of his indication during the consideration of his Department's Estimates that he concurred with the idea that an enlarged and modern botanic gardens was necessary in Brisbane—

(1) Is any investigation being carried out by his Department regarding the possible siting of a future botanic gardens and, if so, are any areas under consideration?

(2) Has any consideration been given to the possibility of making a commencement on such a project by developing an arboretum?

(3) Has an estimate of the cost of new botanic gardens been undertaken?

Answers:—

(1) "No official investigation has been carried out by my Department in this regard, although the Government Botanist and some of his staff have given some thought to the possible siting of future gardens. No areas are at present under consideration, but I understand that there are a number of sites in the Greater Brisbane Area which would appear to be suitable from an environmental and topographic viewpoint."

(2) "I consider that the development of an aboretum in the first instance could be a most desirable means of establishing a new botanic gardens."

(3) "No local estimate has been undertaken. Establishment and maintenance costs would depend largely upon the size and site of the garden and the scope of the botanical work to be undertaken. Apart from establishment costs, one Australian botanic garden of moderate size is known to have an annual budget of about $300,000. Larger gardens would undoubtedly be still more expensive to maintain."

MARKETING OF ULTRA-HEAT-TREATED MILK

Mr. O'Donnell, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

Further to his Answer to my Question on October 29 regarding U.H.T. milk production—

(1) Has he read the statements by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. Anthony, castigating the State Government, as published in *The Courier-Mail* of November 8?

(2) When will this anomalous position be rectified?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No anomaly exists. If the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry has been correctly reported, then he obviously is not in possession of all the facts in regard to the matter."

OIL EXPLORATION WELLS

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

What is the number of wells completed and what is the footage drilled on petroleum exploration in Queensland for each calendar year since 1964 and to date in 1968?

Answer:—

"Year	Number of Wells Completed	Footage Drilled
1964	155	743,816
1965	128	673,996
1966	62	376,052
1967	36	214,956
1968 (to mid-November)	42	223,600"

ALLOCATION TO SCHOOLS OF COMMONWEALTH SCIENCE GRANTS

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

(1) What (*a*) State schools and (*b*) private schools in Queensland have received Commonwealth Science Grants since 1965?

(2) What was the amount received by each school?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "(*a*)—

(i) Expenditure on Buildings for State Secondary Schools in Queensland during period 1-7-65 to 30-6-68.

School	Expenditure $
Balmoral	16,089.67
Banyo	103,086.31
Bremer	106,444.09
Brisbane	17,936.84
Bundaberg	152,019.98
Cairns	109,420.04
Camp Hill	107,927.76
Cavendish Road	93,362.00
Charters Towers	13,599.72
Coorparoo	6,776.59
Corinda	156,001.96
Dalby	28,959.48
Gympie	115,845.55
Harristown	79,774.77
Inala	103,200.48
Indooroopilly	118,224.44
Ipswich	103,757.27
Kedron	143,470.46
Kelvin Grove	300.00
Mackay	117,527.04
Maryborough	87,881.45
Mitchelton	112,979.75
Mount Gravatt	107,915.37
Mount Isa	2,786.37
Nambour	139,981.65
Pimlico	102,358.35
Redcliffe	76,408.21
Rockhampton	132,905.86
Rockhampton-North	128,684.59
Roma	2,000.00
Salisbury	121,110.46
Sandgate District	89,004.21
South Coast District	102,498.87
Southport	103,760.56
Toowoomba	115,188.98
Townsville	108,448.38
Trinity Bay	120,948.33
Wavell	95,574 50
Wynnum	108,205.37
Sub Total	3,661,019.42
(ii) Expenditure on Equipment for Laboratories for all State Secondary Schools in Queensland during period 1-7-65 to 30-6-68	398,388.96
Grand Total	$4,059,408.38

(*b*)—

Expenditure on buildings and equipment for Private Secondary Schools during period 1-7-65 to 30-6-68

School		Expenditure $
Slade School	Warwick	9,438
Presbyterian and Methodist Schools Association	Brisbane	18,952
St. Barnabas School	Ravenshoe	28,154
St. Hilda's School	Southport	85,898
St. Peter's Lutheran College	Brisbane	81,050
St. Edmund's College	Ipswich	30,264
' San Sisto ' Dominican School	Cairns	30,000
St. Laurence's College	South Brisbane	11,966
St. Catherine's College	Warwick	39,508
Toowoomba Grammar School	Toowoomba	3,546
The Southport School	Southport	56,100
St. Teresa's Agricultural College	Ingham	18,496
St. Faith's School	Yeppoon	11,242
Padua College	Kedron, Brisbane	30,536
Presbyterian Girls' College	Toowoomba	64,083
All Souls' School	Charters Towers	43,066
St. Anne's School	Townsville	36,742
St. Aidan's School	Corinda, Brisbane	24,500
Convent of Mercy	The Range, Toowoomba	14,092
Christian Brothers' College	Gympie	14,400
Rockhampton Girls' Grammar School	Rockhampton	24,000
Somerville House	Brisbane	46,595
Dominican Convent School ' San Sisto '	Carina, Brisbane	1,000
St. Joseph's High School	Stanthorpe	6,034
Christian Brothers' College, St. Kieran's	Mount Isa	1,500
Convent High School	Mackay	27,212
St. Saviour's Convent	Toowoomba	26,000
St. Margaret's School	Albion, Brisbane	2,000
Glennie School	Toowoomba	4,750
St. James's School	Brisbane	8,972
Brisbane Girls' Grammar School	Brisbane	4,160
Christian Brothers' College	Ipswich	11,442
Christian Brothers' Aquinas College	Southport	28,000
Clairvaux College	Brisbane	42,000
Downlands College	Toowoomba	22,034
Marist Brothers', Campions College	Ayr	13,564
Cardinal Gilroy College	Ingham	13,690
Gladstone Co-Instructional High School	Gladstone	27,212
Iona College	Lindum, Brisbane	30,464
Loreto School	Coorparoo, Brisbane	26,100
Marist Brothers', St. Augustine's College	Cairns	35,400
Mount Carmel College	Charters Towers	20,964
Mount Carmel College	Wynnum Central, Brisbane	514
Mount St. Bernard College	Herberton	1,000
Mount St. Michael's School	Ashgrove, Brisbane	16,000
Our Lady's Secondary School	Annerley, Brisbane	28,212
Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College	Corinda, Brisbane	4,034
Padua College	Kedron, Brisbane	4,000
Sacred Heart College	Sandgate, Brisbane	3,022
San Jose Secondary School	Mount Isa	5,250
Christian Brothers' College, St. Columban's	Albion Heights, Brisbane	30,222
St. Columba's School	Dalby	6,550
St. John's High School	Roma	2,800
Christian Brothers' College, St. Joseph's	Toowoomba	1,558
St. Mary's College	Charters Towers	2,500
St. Mary's High School	Maryborough	50,256
St. Mary's School	Goondiwindi	4,800
St. Mary's Secondary School	Kingaroy	4,000
St. Monica's College	Cairns	1,044
St. Patrick's High School	Bundaberg	6,080
Convent High School	Gympie	15,524
St. Ursula's College	Dutton Park, Brisbane	15,866
St. Ursula's College	Toowoomba	19,484
Star of the Sea High School	Southport	25,600
Villanova College	Brisbane	13,398
Brisbane Grammar School	Brisbane	32,800
Church of England Grammar School	Brisbane	33,500

School		Expenditure $
Christian Brothers' College	Mackay	2,000
Christian Brothers' College	Rockhampton	13,212
Convent High	Rockhampton	12,000
De La Salle College	Scarborough	9,668
Ipswich Boys' Grammar	Ipswich	2,256
Ipswich Girls' Grammar	Ipswich	7,600
Lourdes Hill Convent	Hawthorne, Brisbane	10,892
Marist Brothers' College	Ashgrove, Brisbane	19,818
Marist Brothers' Good Counsel	Innisfail	17,222
Mt. Alvernia Girls Secondary College	Kedron, Brisbane	12,930
Rockhampton Grammar School	Rockhampton	4,000
St. Francis Xavier's Convent	Ayr	570
St. Joseph's College	Nudgee, Brisbane	15,668
St. Mary's Secondary	Kingaroy	5,922
St. Patrick's	Nanango	6,242
Townsville Grammar	Townsville	2,460
	Total	1,545,600

The expenditure on equipment for individual State Secondary Schools is not available. Equipment was purchased in bulk each year and distributed to schools."

INCINERATORS FOR DISPOSAL OF SHIPS' GARBAGE

(*a*) **Mr. Davies** for **Mr. Tucker**, pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) Did he receive a telegram from the Townsville Harbour Board on or about November 15 regarding the installation of incinerators?

(2) If so, what is the present position in regard to the provision of the incinerators and what further action, if any, does his Department propose to take?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "Tenders for the supply of incinerators at 13 Queensland ports were invited on June 29, 1968, and closed on August 15, 1968. They were referred to the Commonwealth Department of Health on September 3, 1968, with views and recommendations. On November 19, 1968, the Commonwealth Department of Health informed the Department of Harbours and Marine of its views on the tenders and officers of both Departments will confer on the matter in Canberra tomorrow. In the meantime the Department of Harbours and Marine has proceeded with design of the buildings and foundations for the incinerators and tenders for these will be invited early in December. The Honourable Member will appreciate that this design could not proceed until the tenders for the plant were known. The Commonwealth Department of Health has advised that the Commonwealth is prepared to meet the cost of establishment of approved proposals for incinerators for the disposal of overseas ships' garbage at ports in Queensland. The Commonwealth Government has not accepted responsibility for replacement costs of incinerators and facilities associated therewith and I propose to further discuss this aspect with the Commonwealth. However, this will not hold up progress in the provision of the incinerators and I am taking action to see that the need for early decision on the matter of tenders is impressed on Commonwealth officers."

(*b*) **Mr. Hanson,** pursuant to notice, asked The Treasurer,—

(1) With regard to the Commonwealth offer of financial assistance to each State for the provision of facilities for the disposal of overseas ships' garbage, has any finality been reached by him with the Commonwealth authorities in the matter?

(2) If any construction is being undertaken for the erection of the disposal units at any Queensland port, what is the present position at the respective ports?

(3) As the States have a responsibility under the proposed scheme to maintain and operate the units and to transport ships' garbage, has this been a deterrent to the expeditious implementation of the scheme?

(4) As grazier organisations and the people generally are anxious to see the scheme functioning as early as possible, have any measures recently been taken by him to see that all ports have this valuable amenity?

Answers:—

(1) "I would refer the Honourable Member to my Answer in reply to a Question by the Honourable Member for Townsville North covering this matter."

(2) "Construction has not yet commenced."

(3) "No. The scheme is being implemented with all possible speed."

(4) "See Answer to (1). The State Government is anxious to see that these facilities are provided at the earliest opportunity and I trust that the Commonwealth will show suitable speed in consideration of tenders. It seems to me that Commonwealth views on tenders have been too long delayed. Indeed, I regret to have to state that, throughout this project, the State has experienced the utmost difficulty in ascertaining the standards of Commonwealth quarantine requirements and of means acceptable to the Commonwealth in achieving these requirements. I would also remind the House that there is still the problem of control of dumping of ships' garbage by overseas ships at sea but in such close proximity to the Queensland coastline as to wash up on the shore."

Appointment of Permanent Stock Inspector at Georgetown

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

In view of the importance of the cattle industry to North Queensland and the large numbers of cattle in the districts surrounding Georgetown, will he appoint a permanent stock inspector at Georgetown?

Answer:—

"The importance of the livestock industry in North Queensland is fully realised. A stock inspector is currently stationed at Georgetown throughout the greater part of the year. This officer is occupied largely on special work in relation to the eradication of bovine contagious pleuropneumonia (commonly known as 'pleuro'), as this is the most important service that he can render to the industry at this stage. He is available however to advise stock owners on other problems as time permits. Owing to the improvement of roads and other communications in the area much more assistance is now available from staff stationed at Cairns and Mareeba. It is envisaged that an Inspector will be required at Georgetown in connection with 'pleuro' eradication work for the next two years and when this work is concluded, the appointment of a permanent inspector will be considered in the light of the circumstances prevailing at the time."

New Court-house, Georgetown

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

(1) When is it intended to commence building the new court-house at Georgetown and when is it anticipated that the work will be completed?

(2) Will the work be carried out by contract or by day labour?

(3) What is the estimated cost of the building?

Answers:—

(1) "Plans for the erection of a new court-house at Georgetown are being prepared. Subject to the Executive Council approving of the expenditure involved it is expected that work will be commenced in the first quarter of 1969."

(2) "It is proposed to employ Departmental labour on the work."

(3) "The cost of the building has not yet been estimated."

Provision of Warning Signs on Unfenced Roads

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

In view of the long distances between signs signifying that a roadway is unfenced and that straying stock may present a hazard, will he consider a distinct sign to eliminate the excessive wording and have the signs placed at more frequent intervals?

Answer:—

"I shall have the matter investigated."

Medical Diagnostic Facilities in Country Hospitals

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the claim made by a Townsville doctor and published in *The Sunday Mail* of November 24, that country diagnostic facilities in Queensland are little better than those in developing nations overseas?

(2) Has the patient in the bush been overlooked and are suitable diagnostic facilities provided only in the capital city?

(3) Are there dangerous delays in diagnosing serious illnesses in the State?

(4) Are the diagnostic facilities used in the country of nineteenth-century standards?

(5) Does the Queensland hospital system practise "mail-order" pathology?

(6) How many mental hospitals for men are there north of Rockhampton?

(7) What is the period of delay on the waiting list for the Townsville psychiatrist?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "No. The Director-General of Health and Medical Services advises that it is not necessary to provide full diagnostic facilities in every country hospital, and indeed, it is not possible in any but the larger base hospitals. Base hospitals are provided with adequate diagnostic facilities. They provide all the specialities available in that area by means of visiting staff to enable better diagnosis and treatment to be

carried out without having to transfer patients to a larger base hospital. Specialist staff of various categories are employed at Cairns, Townsville, Mt. Isa, Mackay, Rockhampton, Gladstone, Gympie, Maryborough, Bundaberg, Nambour, Southport, Ipswich, Toowoomba, Warwick, Charleville and Longreach Hospitals. For special facilities such as for heart surgery and neurosurgery, patients may be transferred to a Brisbane hospital at public expense, subject to a means test. In Western Queensland, the Flying Surgeon brings a consultant surgical service to the people of very many towns far removed from other specialists. In this State, 'the patient in the bush' has never been overlooked. He is not overlooked today."

(3) "I am informed by the Director-General that he has no knowledge of dangerous delays."

(4) "No."

(5) "It is considered not to be a practical proposition to establish and staff pathology laboratories in small country towns. Doctors desiring tests arrange to forward these to a diagnostic laboratory. This is a well established procedure and gives satisfactory results. Results are reported promptly—in urgent cases by telephone or telegram."

(6) "There is one special hospital for men—this is at Charters Towers. A psychiatric unit is established at Townsville Base Hospital."

(7) "At the Psychiatry Unit, Townsville Hospital, urgent cases are seen without delay, but patients with non-urgent conditions may have to wait until March, 1969, for a consultation with the visiting psychiatrist. As a general comment, it should be understood that specialists are not usually available except in major centres of population."

COMMONWEALTH SAVINGS BANK FINANCE FOR HOUSING

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a claim made by a spokesman for the Queensland Housing Industry Association that the arrangement between the Queensland Government and the Commonwealth Savings Bank is not fully or effectively using the available funds?

(2) Have all available funds been used to date for housing development in Queensland?

(3) What is the Australian average per capita that the Commonwealth allocation allows?

(4) What is the Queensland average per capita under the same allocation?

(5) What profit did the Queensland Housing Commission make for the financial year 1967-68?

(6) Is it intended that the Queensland Housing Commission should operate to make large profits or build homes for the needy?

(7) What is the Government doing to increase the housing allocation per capita?

Answers:—

(1) "Yes."

(2) "There has been some lag in the use of funds available under the Commonwealth Savings Bank Agreement. This has received the attention of the Government and the Housing Commission is examining a proposal suggested by the Treasury. This would overcome the lag and it is believed that it would be acceptable to the Bank."

(3 and 4) "I am not sure to what funds the Honourable Member is referring. The Housing Industry Association Report, which was the basis of the Press article, refers only to allocations under the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement. It ignores allocations from all other sources, e.g., from State Loan Fund, from Debenture allocations, from the Savings Bank Agreement and so on. However, to allay any doubts held by the Honourable Member, I would advise him that the number of new houses and flats completed in Queensland in 1967-68 was 11·3 per cent. above the number completed in 1965-66. Over the same period, the average Australian increase was 6·6 per cent. only."

(5 and 6) "I refer the Honourable Member to the last Annual Report of the Queensland Housing Commission tabled in the House. In the Queensland Housing Commission Fund, with an income of $2,478,661 in 1967-68, there was a loss of $26,639. In the Commonwealth/State Housing Fund, with an income of $9,512,074, there was a profit of $318,327. These figures do not disclose any large profit considering that the total assets of both Funds at June 30 last were $184 million. Moreover, I would remind the Honourable Member that the profits of the Commission are ploughed back into the business and are used for the construction of more homes as they become available on purchasers and borrowers completing payments under their contracts which may extend up to 45 years."

(7) "The rate of increase in completions in Queensland is already showing up favourably in comparison with the Australian average. I believe that, if the Honourable Member cares to study the record, he will find that the overall position in respect of all funds available for housing shows a satisfactory picture compared with the Australian average."

Investigation of Gold Coast City Administration

Mr. Davies for **Mr. Bennett,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Local Government,—

In spite of his persistent refusals to have an investigation into the affairs of the Gold Coast City Council, what does he propose to do now that the Gold Coast City Council has unanimously sought such an investigation?

Answer:—

"If and when a submission is made to me by the council, a decision will be made."

Shortage of Medical Staff in Public Hospitals

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

What public hospitals throughout Queensland are not fully staffed by either full-time or part-time doctors and what is the shortage in each hospital?

Answer:—

"The information sought by the Honourable Member is being collated and will be supplied to him when available."

Cost of Treatment in Public Hospitals

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

What was the average cost per patient per day at (*a*) Royal Brisbane Hospital, (*b*) Princess Alexandra Hospital, and (*c*) all public hospitals as at June 30, 1966, 1967, 1968, and at the latest date for which information is available?

Answer:—

——	Year ended June 30, 1966	Year ended June 30, 1967	Year ended June 30, 1968
	$	$	$
Royal Brisbane Hospital—			
Including Interest and Redemption	13.01	14.32	15.19
Excluding Interest and Redemption	12.09	13.31	14.23
Princess Alexandra Hospital—			
Including Interest and Redemption	12.23	13.91	14.59
Excluding Interest and Redemption	10.13	11.63	12.30
All State Public Hospitals—			
Including Interest and Redemption	10.75	11.67	12.54
Excluding Interest and Redemption	9.41	10.20	10.92

These statistics are complied on an annual basis and the latest figures available are for the year ended June 30, 1968.

Tourists to Cooktown

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

For the calendar years 1965, 1966 and 1967 and to the last known date in 1968, how many tourists have visited Cooktown?

Answer:—

"Definite statistics are not presently available to show the number of tourists who visit Queensland, or any particular part of the State. However, as has already been announced, research is to be undertaken during the next two years, by arrangement with the Department of Economics of the Queensland University, to assess the value of the Tourist Industry to Queensland. The only information available at the moment, concerning visitors to Cooktown, was supplied on February 13, 1967, by Mr. Hans Looser, of Cooktown, which revealed that the number of persons who had signed the Visitor's Book at the Cooktown Historical Museum was as follows:— Calendar year 1965, 2,694; calendar year 1966, 4,505. It will be recalled that I led a safari to Cooktown in July, 1966, and there is reason to believe that the increase in the number of tourists to Cooktown for that year partly resulted from the publicity which Cooktown received from that visit. Endeavours have been made to obtain from Cooktown similar figures for 1967 and for 1968 to date, but unfortunately the telephone line to Cooktown is out of order, because of a bush-fire in that area."

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRAWNING INDUSTRY FACILITIES AT CAIRNS

Mr. R. Jones, pursuant to notice, asked The Premier,—

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a report in *The Cairns Post* of November 26, headed, "Large Quantities of King Prawns found by Survey"?

(2) If so, following confirmation of the reported extent of the prawning grounds, off Hope Reef near Cairns, will he urgently consider an application to the Commonwealth Government for a special grant or grants for immediate commencement of extensions to Cairns port facilities, berths, amenities, etc. in order to retain the prawn trawling fleet as a local industry, with Cairns as the base port?

Answer:—

(1 and 2) "I have not seen the report to which the Honourable Member refers. However, I have asked officers of the Fisheries Branch of the Department of Harbours and Marine to make enquiries into the matter including the points raised by the Honourable Member."

DISMISSAL AND RE-EMPLOYMENT OF MARRIED WOMEN TEACHERS

Mrs. Jordan for **Mr. P. Wood,** pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Education,—

(1) How many married women teachers were notified at the end of the last school year that their services were no longer required?

(2) How many married women teachers have been re-employed during the present year?

(3) Approximately how many married women teachers will be advised that their services will not be required after the end of this school year?

Answers:—

(1) "50."

(2) "1,005 were admitted or readmitted during the present year. (678 primary, 327 secondary)."

(3) "20 Primary teachers."

ESTABLISHMENT OF PORT AT HAY POINT

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

With regard to the proposal that has been accepted by the Government to establish a new seaport at Hay Point—

(1) Was the decision to establish the seaport the decision of the Government or was it the decision of the company that is being given the privilege of developing the Goonyella coalfield?

(2) If and when the seaport is established at Hay Point, what body will be the controlling authority?

Answers:—

(1) "The decision is one made by the companies."

(2) "Appropriate provision is made in the Agreement for a Harbour Board for the new harbour and details will be available when the relevant Bill is brought before the House."

ROAD FATALITIES

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

For each calendar year since 1960 and to date in 1968—

(1) How many persons have been killed in road accidents?

(2) What was the total number of road accidents and the number involving fatalities?

(3) How many of the road accidents and deaths occurred in the metropolitan area?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "I suggest that the Honourable Member study the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Police for the period in Question."

(3) "Separate statistics are not available from Police Department records for the metropolitan area but I shall ascertain what information I can from the Bureau of Census and Statistics and then advise the Honourable Member."

MIGRANTS TO QUEENSLAND

Mr. Dean, pursuant to notice, asked The Minister for Industrial Development,—

(1) How many persons migrated to Queensland during each of the calendar years 1964 to 1967 and to October 31, 1968?

(2) How many more are expected by December 31, 1968?

Answers:—

(1) "The information sought by the Honourable Member is not available from the records of the State Immigration Office. In this connection I would mention Queensland receives many categories of migrants including full fare paying passengers, British assisted passage migrants under both Commonwealth and State Government processing, and European migrants under Commonwealth Government nomination. However, the following figures appear in

the quarterly statistical summary of Australian Immigration published by the Commonwealth Department of Immigration in June 1968.

Settler Arrivals by State or Territory of Intended Residence	
Year	Queensland
1963-64	8,355
1964-65	9,747
1965-66	9,268
1966-67	9,088
1967-68	9,202"

(2) "It is not possible to furnish an accurate assessment of the anticipated migrant intake for the period July 1, 1968 to December 31, 1968. However, the intake of British Assisted Passage Migrants through the State Immigration Office for the period July 1, 1968, to October 31, 1968, has increased by 40 per cent. over the corresponding period for the preceding year. There is every indication this rate will be maintained."

Industrial Safety Committees

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

(1) What progress has been made to date with regard to the setting up of industrial safety committees on each of the major construction sites in the metropolitan area?

(2) What co-operation is the Government receiving from the firms concerned?

(3) Will he consider setting up a permanent Safety in Industry Committee with the Government, employers and unions concerned?

Answers:—

(1 and 2) "The Honourable Member is referred to the Press statement on page 3 of yesterday's *Courier-Mail,* wherein, among other things, it is reported that, and I quote—'The Queensland Master Builders' Association told a Conference with Building Union representatives the Association favoured the appointment of a Job Safety Committee on all major building projects.' As the Honourable Member is well aware, the question of the composition of such Safety Committees was the subject of a Compulsory Conference before Industrial Commissioner Pont yesterday, when certain suggestions were made by him, with a view to resolving this problem, and advice of the attitude of both the Unions and the Queensland Master Builders' Association to his suggestions is still awaited."

(3) "I am surprised that the Honourable Member, who always endeavours to create the impression he is an authority on every public issue, is unaware that an active tri-partite Health, Welfare and Safety Board has been in operation in Queensland since 1960, when is was established by this Government. The employee representatives on this Board are Messrs. Edgar Williams, Branch Secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, and Harry Peebles, Secretary of the Federated Ironworkers' Association. The employer representatives are Messrs. A. S. Gehrmann, President, Queensland Chamber of Manufactures, and B. T. Tunley, Past President. The other members are Mr. H. O. Muhl, Under Secretary, who is Chairman; Mr. A. J. Hilless, Chief Safety Engineer and Chief Inspector of Machinery, Scaffolding and Weights and Measures; Mr. T. P. Egan, Chief Industrial Inspector, Chief Inspector of Factories and Shops and of Workers' Accommodation; Dr. E. M. Rathus, Director of Industrial Medicine; and Mr. R. J. Humphries, Secretary, Division of Occupational Safety. This Board has met regularly, and has been responsible for many Rules and Regulations issued in the interests of Occupational Safety and the Physical Working Conditions of Workers, and has examined and discussed numerous matters related to those fields. Examples of these are the Welding Rule, the Construction Rule covering the wearing of Safety Helmets, and the Portable and Semi-Portable Electrical Equipment Rule, for all of which there is evidence to show that they have resulted in a considerable reduction in the number of fatalities and serious injuries. The functions and responsibilities of this very successful Tri-partite Board, all of whose recommendations and decisions have been the result of unanimous thinking are set out in Parts V and VI of "*The Factories and Shops Acts,* 1960 *to* 1964."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the Forestry Acts, 1959 to 1964.

Regulations under the Public Service Acts, 1922 to 1965.

MEDICAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Initiation in Committee

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

Hon. S. D. TOOTH (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (11.43 a.m.): I move—

"That a Bill be introduced to amend the Medical Acts 1939 to 1966 in a certain particular."

The purpose of this short amending Bill is to enable medical practitioners who hold satisfactory qualifications gained in the Republic of Ireland to become eligible for registration as medical practitioners in Queensland.

Until 1955, medical graduates from the Republic of Ireland were entitled to register as medical practitioners in Queensland provided they held a medical qualification entitling them to registration under the Medical Acts of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Medical Act Amendment Act of 1955 amended section 19, which is the section concerned with qualifications for registration in Queensland, by restricting the number of countries whose medical graduates were entitled to registration in Queensland without further examination. This recognised the degree, diploma or certificate (obtained after due examination) in medicine or surgery of any university, college or other body in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, New Zealand or States of the Commonwealth of Australia. Medical practitioners who obtained their qualifications in the Republic of Ireland were not included. The reason for the 1955 amendment was that the Medical Practitioners' and Pharmacists' Act of 1947 passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland permitted the registration of certain medical practitioners whose qualifications were obtained in countries where the standards of training were not acceptable to the Medical Board of Queensland.

The Medical Acts were further amended in 1963 to provide for only the primary degree, diploma or certificate (obtained after due examination) of any university, college or other body in Great Britain, Northern Ireland, New Zealand or States of the Commonwealth to be recognised for registration in Queensland.

That amendment also provided for recognition of primary degrees, diplomas or certificates (obtained after due examination) in medicine or surgery of any university, college or other body in the Republic of South Africa, subject to such qualification having been firstly recognised in Queensland by the Governor in Council.

Medical graduates trained and registered in the Republic of Ireland are registerable in other Australian States, and various anomalous situations became apparent in Queensland in recent times because of the absence of such recognition in this State. The first of these was drawn to my attention by the hon. member for Windsor when he told me that the medical officer in charge of a very large Commonwealth establishment in Queensland, who is a very highly qualified medical practitioner, was not eligible for registration. This man has on occasions been called to accidents in the vicinity of the Commonwealth area, in which his lack of registration by the State Medical Board does not prevent his practising, and in there giving medical aid he has been technically in breach of the law in practising medicine outside the confines of the Commonwealth area.

The Federal Minister for Civil Aviation (Mr. Swartz) has also drawn my attention to an anomalous situation in his area. In that case, a medical practitioner has been registered because he was granted his primary degree in Great Britain, but his wife, whose degree was obtained in the Republic of Ireland, has not been registered. Of that couple, one can practise medicine and one cannot.

Mr. Thackeray: You are referring to Dr. O'Leary?

Mr. TOOTH: No, I am not referring to Dr. O'Leary.

I was recently honoured by an approach from the Ambassador of the Republic of Ireland in relation to this matter. He made representations that medical graduates trained and registered in the Republic of Ireland be eligible for registration in Queensland.

There appears to be no valid reason why such Irish medical graduates should not be registered in Queensland, provided—

(a) They have passed through a course of medical study of not less than five years and have received, after examination, a degree, diploma or certificate which is equal to or higher than the degree in medicine issued by the University of Queensland;

(b) Their applications have been approved by the Medical Board; and

(c) The primary medical qualifications held by them have been recognised by the Governor in Council by Order in Council.

In other words, the procedure adopted for registration of South African medical graduates will be followed for registration of medical practitioners from the Republic of Ireland.

I wish to emphasise that a primary medical qualification obtained (after due examination) from any university, college or other body in the Republic of Ireland will not be recommended for recognition by the Governor in Council until the course of training leading to that qualification has been examined by the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Queensland and a statement has been issued by it that such medical course is equal to, or higher than, the course of medical training available at the University of Queensland.

The First Secretary to the Embassy of Ireland in Canberra has informed the Director-General of Health and Medical Services that medical graduates of the University of Queensland could be registered in the Republic of Ireland. To enable this to be done, the Irish Medical Registration Board would need to certify that the standard of medical training in Queensland is not lower than that required for registration in Ireland. On receipt of this

certificate, an order would be made entitling Queensland medical graduates to register in Ireland.

I commend the Bill to the Committee.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (11.50 a.m.): The Opposition certainly will not protest against the Bill that the Minister suggested should be introduced if it contains only the provisions that he has outlined. I can well understand how an anomalous situation has arisen. Doctors coming to this country from the Republic of Ireland and being recognised by other States and by the Commonwealth would find themselves in a very peculiar position indeed if they were sent to a Commonwealth institution in the State of Queensland and their qualifications were not recognised here. If the other States and the Commonwealth have seen fit, in their wisdom, to recognise these graduates and doctors from the Republic of Ireland, I believe that Queensland would do well to follow in their footsteps.

Generally speaking, as I have seen and heard, the standard of medical training throughout Australia is very high, and hon. members know that it certainly is high in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Queensland. I was very pleased to hear the Minister say that there will be reciprocity in the Republic of Ireland for those who have graduated from the Faculty of Medicine in this State, and I think that is only fair and reasonable.

It could be said that Queensland generally is still suffering from a shortage of doctors. In Townsville, there is a very good doctor working in the field of child guidance. I think that he came from Northern Ireland —I am not really certain of that, but I do not think he could have come from the Republic of Ireland—and he is practising in Townsville and is very well thought of in the area. In view of the shortage of doctors to which I referred, anything that can be done to lessen its effect, while at the same time maintaining a high standard, will be welcome.

On Saturday, 23 November, 1968, a report appeared in the Townsville "Daily Bulletin", and I should like to place it on record because, as I see it, it bolsters my argument that there is a shortage of doctors over a large area of the State. Of course, it has particular relation to the Townsville General Hospital, which is in my electorate. The report, which contained a statement by the Acting Medical Superintendent, Dr. A. D. Campbell, was headed "Inadequate staff troubles hospital", and reads—

> "Inadequate medical and nursing staff at the Townsville General Hospital was discussed at length at the Townsville Hospital Board's monthly meeting last night.
>
> "The Acting Medical Superintendent, Dr. A. D. Campbell, said in his report to the board that staffing arrangements were barely adequate.
>
> "He told the meeting that at least one member of the medical staff, at present numbering 15, was on leave at all times, and this was having a serious effect on hospital services, especially in the Out-patients' Department.
>
> "Dr. Campbell said that an approach to the Department of Health for more medical staff had met with the reply that in-patient numbers at the Townsville hospital were declining and out-patient numbers were increasing, and the department felt that the present staff was adequate to deal with the load.
>
> "Dr. Campbell said that the in-patients being treated were more seriously ill and suffering from more obscure illnesses than those being treated 10 years ago.
>
> "For this reason they required more care and time from the doctor. The medical staff was unable to devote the necessary time to the in-patients without cutting the time available for each out-patient treatment.
>
> "He said this was having the effect that out-patients were receiving stop-gap treatment, and often had to return, placing a heavier load on the over-taxed staff. If the doctor had time to more thoroughly examine the patient in the first instance, the return would be unnecessary."

That is one of the points I am making and one of the things that is causing the Opposition a great deal of worry in every town or city in which there is a hospital.

I think there are two pertinent points made by the doctor. The fact is that apparently because of a shortage of staff the Acting Medical Superintendent at the Townsville Hospital feels that out-patients attending the hospital have not been thoroughly examined, and this sometimes means a return visit to the hospital. This, I believe, must be very worrying. If a person such as Dr. Campbell makes the statement that, because of a shortage of staff, doctors are not able to give the time that he thinks is required to examine patients thoroughly, it could some day happen that, because of a rush or a shortage of staff, something that should have been seen might be overlooked and this could mean very serious trouble for the patient.

I thought it proper to raise this matter today. I know that my colleagues, by way of questions, have been raising it with the Minister for some time, but, being a little parochial this morning, I raise it again on behalf of the Townsville Hospital. Frankly, I am worried by the fact that a leading medical authority such as Dr. Campbell was prepared to claim at a board meeting, that in his opinion the staff was completely inadequate.

A similar position obtains in many far-flung areas of the State. I know it is very hard to obtain adequate medical staff at some places in western areas and probably some of the far north-western areas as well. If this Bill enables us to attract more medical people from overseas, maintaining the same

high standards we have in Queensland with degrees equal to those issued by the Queensland University to its medical graduates, then the Opposition welcomes the move.

We have no argument with the other matters raised by the Minister. He adverted to various Legislation that has been introduced into this Chamber. In short, he gave us a history of what had happened previously in the State, pointing out that some people had been restricted because the medical graduates from certain countries were not recognised in Queensland as being up to the standard set in this State. Again I have no argument in that regard if the standards obtaining were not acceptable to the Queensland Medical Board. We must at all times maintain our high standards. As a layman I would not be in a position to argue this, but I have read that there are people who think that the period of six years spent at the Queensland University on a medical course is too long. Only the first year's course can be done at the university college at Townsville, after which students from all over Queensland must attend St. Lucia university to complete the next five years of the course.

It has been advocated by some that this course should be looked at and that there could be some dead wood cut out of it. Perhaps the day will come when it will be reviewed. I do not for a moment ask that the standard be lowered, but, as I say, there are experts who have claimed that the six-year course should be looked at and certain things which they feel are not warranted cut out. Generally, perhaps the course could be upgraded to a certain degree and become more realistic on the medical side. However, that is a case to be put forward at another time.

Generally speaking, the Opposition has no argument with the provisions of the Bill, so it will allow it to pass the first-reading stage.

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (12 noon): I do not wish to delay the passage of the Bill. I am indebted to the Minister for mentioning that I am interested in it. I am quite sure that the hon. member for South Brisbane cannot draw in on this measure as he does on many other measures for which I have been responsible.

Mr. Bennett: I am interested in the law; I am a good lawyer.

Mr. SMITH: I am interested in the well-being of the people, too. The proposed measure will assist many people whose qualifications entitle them to practise medicine in Great Britain to do so in this State. There are a number of serving officers in our armed forces who have been recruited in Great Britain, and on coming to Australia are surprised to find that they cannot obtain registration immediately in the States to which they are posted.

Mr. Bennett: Your Government will not allow New South Wales lawyers to practise here.

Mr. SMITH: I do not remember the Government to which the hon. member for South Brisbane professes to owe allegiance readily allowing them to, either.

Mr. Bennett: Well, it did.

Mr. SMITH: At one stage it did, but at an earlier stage it did not. It is no use my learned friend coming into this Chamber and making these ridiculous assertions. His own party stands charged far more than we can be.

One of the consequences of having people who are skilled in medicine debarred from practising civilly is that some inhibition is placed on them if, in the course of their duty or vocation, they see an injured person on a road. Under our law they are not qualified to practise in this State. It would be a bad thing indeed if these people, whose qualifications and skills are of a sufficiently high order to warrant registration by the Full General Medical Council of Great Britain, are not able legitimately to attend to an injured person on the road or in someone's home.

Mr. Tucker: I cannot see that that is so. Ambulancemen can render first aid, so surely the people you mention should not be stopped from rendering first aid.

Mr. SMITH: Maybe not, but perhaps an injection of some pain-killing drug is part of the practice of medicine. To my mind, it is quite absurd to have a person who is recognised by the General Medical Council——

Mr. Tucker: I have no argument about that.

Mr. SMITH: Then surely the hon. member will go along with making such a man free to apply his skills without any fear of repercussions.

I mention an occasion when I went to a dentist for dental attention, and the use of cocaine that had gone bad caused me a considerable amount of physical discomfort and distress. It was more poisonous than it should have been. Suppose a man or a woman—and medical practitioners embrace both sexes—who was qualified did something in all good faith but, in the course of attending to a person, caused some injury. He would lay himself open certainly to a claim for compensation. It would be interesting to see whether or not he would be criminally liable because he was performing a task that he was well equipped to perform but was not qualified in this State as a medical practitioner.

From my own personal knowledge—and the Minister referred to this—I know that peace of mind is of very great importance to those few people who I know will be affected by this measure. I congratulate the Minister on his presentation of the Bill.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (12.4 p.m.): I should hate to think that the submissions put forward by the hon. member for Windsor would be generally accepted by the Committee. There are certain countries that do not have reciprocity with Australia, and in particular with Queensland. There are very good reasons for that. There are many people from European countries who, in their own country, may be regarded very highly in certain spheres of medicine but may lack some training that is required here before a person can be registered to engage in the practice of medicine.

Some few years ago representations were made to me by a friendly society or organisation about bringing a doctor out from Ireland. But there was no way in the world that he could be admitted to practise here until he landed in the country and submitted himself to certain examinations set by the Medical Board. I agree with that to a certain extent.

If other States seek to amend their laws relating to the admission of persons entitled to practise medicine in this State, that is no reason why we should follow them blindly. I think a very high standard has been set in Queensland for training persons who wish to engage in the practice of medicine, and I should hate to see it broken down in any way whatsoever simply because of an agitation from a certain country, or a certain group on behalf of people who want to enter this country. I have read in the past of migrant doctors from overseas—Hungary, Poland, or elsewhere—who have come to this country but have not been allowed to practise. They have been engaged in field work or other outdoor work because they were not eligible to practise medicine here.

I hope the Minister will not take serious cognisance of the hon. member for Windsor or be influenced because the Commonwealth may employ someone within its structure, perhaps at Greenslopes. I do not believe that because the Commonwealth decides to bring a person from overseas and appoint him in its activities in Queensland, Queensland should follow suit unless the person can measure up to the required standards for practising medicine in Queensland.

I recall that a Premier of this State made a visit overseas a few years ago. When he visited Scotland a young chap who attended the medical school at our university, and who thought he would go to Edinburgh to extend his knowledge of surgery and medicine, sought him out after a certain function that they both attended. He was quite open about his thoughts concerning the standard of training in Queensland. He said, "Mr. Premier, don't let anybody tell you that there is a higher standard over here than in Queensland."

I think we are too prone to believe that because someone goes to Edinburgh, Dublin, or somewhere in England, his qualifications should be regarded as being on a higher plane than those obtainable here. It is all very well for a doctor to obtain the letters, and no doubt doctors who go overseas gain more extensive experience because of the larger institutions and the great variety in the types of cases dealt with there. I thought it was a great honour when a young man from Queensland whose father was associated with university activities in his profession made it quite clear that, compared with medical standards overseas, we in Queensland had nothing to be ashamed of.

There may be some reasons why doctors from the Republic of Ireland were excluded from practising in Queensland. We know of the prejudices that exist between the north and the south of Ireland, and that could have an effect somewhere along the line.

Mr. Smith: I said that full membership of the British General Medical Council should entitle them. Full membership is not what you are talking about.

Mr. WALSH: I heard what the hon. member said, but he conveyed the impression that simply because somebody else was recognised in some other country——

Mr. Smith: I did not say that at all.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member gave me that impression. I am sorry that he was unable to express himself sufficiently clearly to enable me to understand him. However, I can quite understand that.

We have in this country—and the early history of medicine in this State shows this—many outstanding medical practitioners who came from Ireland. My friend the hon. member for Bowen (Dr. Delamothe) would know many of them who proved to be good surgeons and physicians. I know quite a few who are in practice. In Bundaberg, Dr. Michael Donelly and his wife are highly respected in this sphere. No doubt somewhere along the line they were up against this barrier and would have had to submit to certain tests. Their qualifications were recognised in their own country. They proved that when they came to this country.

It is all to the good if we can attract people from other countries as long as they measure up to the standard laid down in Queensland. I do not go along with the idea—and I emphasise this—that simply because some other State amends its laws for convenience or because of pressure we should follow suit. We have continued to maintain a high standard. Generally speaking, irrespective of any political aspect, most people in Queensland are proud of that high standard. I hope that the Minister will not be influenced by any remarks made in this Chamber which suggest that the gate should be thrown wide open.

The remarks of the hon. member for Windsor about a man giving an injection on the roadside are typical of the legal mind. I suppose, if I were in the bush and somebody was bitten by a snake, he would say that I should not take the necessary precautions to

see that an incision was made and that the poison was got out and so on, because technically I would be committing a breach of the Medical Act. But do not let us be carried away with the idea that because somebody gives an injection on the roadside, that is another reason for opening the door. I think the Minister's explanation shows that he is not in any way attempting to break down any of the high standards of the Queensland medical profession.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (12.13 p.m.): The Deputy Leader of the Opposition said that for obvious reasons, the Opposition will not oppose the introduction of this Bill. However, I cannot help observing how inconsistent the Government is. It will not allow free competition in the legal field, in that it will not allow barristers from any other State to practise in Queensland. It will not let a New South Welshman practise in Queensland. The Labour Government did, but because certain Liberal Party supporters and Liberal Party practitioners fear competition from New South Wales and Victorian barristers, those barristers can no longer practise in Queensland. Anyone who desires their services can no longer obtain them unless those barristers were admitted when the Labour Party was in power.

Mr. Smith: Labour only started it in 1954, anyway.

Mr. BENNETT: At least it did start it, and this Government repealed it because of fear of competition. Liberal Party members cannot stand up to competition in any field, although this is supposed to be a free-enterprise Government. Their activities show that they are afraid of competition.

The reason given by the Minister for this Bill is no doubt not the real reason, although it is good in principle to allow skilled practitioners if they are suitably qualified, to come to Queensland and practise. The real reason why this is necessary is that, because of the restrictive quota system applied over the years at the University of Queensland, there are not sufficient Queensland graduates to meet the demand in Queensland, and the Government is busily seeking the services of other medicos because it was not prepared to make the necessary arrangements and to pay the necessary moneys to train Queensland doctors.

As the hon. member for Bundaberg said, we have nothing to be ashamed of in our standards. Unfortunately, however, we do not train a sufficient number of doctors to cope with or cater for the demand in this State, and the Minister has to rush around seeking ways and means of making it possible for other practitioners to come to Queensland, without dropping our barriers.

Certainly we could not allow medical practitioners from every overseas country to practise here, no matter how skilled or qualified they may be. For example, although European or Asian doctors may be men of outstanding ability in their own countries, they could not successfully practise here if they were not familiar with our language, customs, practices and climate. Without a knowledge of these things, they could not even make correct diagnoses.

Mr. Smith: A vet. can treat an animal although he cannot talk to it.

Mr. BENNETT: I should hope that the standard set down for the treatment of animals would not be applied to the treatment of human beings. I sometimes attend athletics meetings, and if I broke a leg there I would certainly hope that I would not be shot, as veterinarians shoot horses injured at race meetings. I think we should have a higher standard for human beings and not allow veterinarians to treat them. I am rather surprised that the hon. member for Windsor should make such an outlandish suggestion. He will be telling me next that those who have a skilled knowledge of the baccarat school at West End should be allowed to appear in court for people charged with gaming offences because they have a specialised knowledge of the gaming laws—or how to evade them.

The principle behind the Bill is a good one. Let us hope that it galvanises the Government into increasing university facilities so that an adequate number of doctors can be trained within our own country to fill the ranks of the medical profession. Let there be an end to the artificial quota system which has been strictly and harshly applied at the university and at other institutions of education in this State.

Hon. S. D. TOOTH (Ashgrove—Minister for Health) (12.18 p.m.), in reply: I am glad that the Opposition is prepared to support the Bill. It removes a very obvious anomaly in the registration system that is long overdue for correction. I do not propose to deal with the injustices that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition suggests exist in Townsville. We are at present busy dealing with one injustice at the moment. However, I am grateful for his support in this respect.

The hon. member for Windsor, who initiated this measure by drawing my attention to the problems with which it deals, is also supporting the Bill. Although his comments were interesting, there are one or two things that need correction, particularly as he has been challenged. First of all, there is, of course, a difference between rendering first aid and giving medical treatment. The rendering of first aid is a social duty that devolves upon all who have sufficient knowledge to be able to assist injured persons without causing further harm to them. A medical practitioner who finds himself brought into contact with a person who is badly hurt or very ill is not likely, whatever the legal technicalities may be, to keep within the limits of first aid if more advanced treatment is required. Therefore

the point made by the hon. member for Windsor is a valid one. There have been a number of cases in which people who are qualified but unregistered in Queensland have been in technical breach of the law, and that situation should be corrected.

Mr. Tucker: This will not remove all people from the possibility of being in that position, but only those who come from Ireland. There will still be others unregistered in the community, will there not?

Mr. Smith: They are not practising as doctors; the other people are. What I said is perfectly valid and quite sensible.

Mr. TOOTH: That is what I said.

Mr. Smith: The hon. member for Bundaberg has just returned to the Chamber. He was absent before and did not hear what you said.

Mr. TOOTH: Perhaps he will not be so pleased as I proceed.

I now wish to refer to what the hon. member for Bundaberg said, and to assure him in advance that there is absolutely no intention whatever of reducing our standards. The Bill that excluded graduates from the Republic of Ireland was brought down in 1955, when the hon. member was a member of the then Government.

There were very good reasons for bringing down that Bill, and this is the point on which I wish to disagree with the hon. member for Windsor. The hon. member said that anybody who has the recognition of the General Medical Council of Great Britain——

Mr. Smith: Full membership.

Mr. TOOTH: Well, the General Medical Council of Great Britain is a small, select body and it grants recognition. The problem arose because in 1947, after World War 2, legislation was introduced in Great Britain under which the General Medical Council granted approval to doctors from various parts of the Commonwealth, including Pakistan, India, and similar places, to practise medicine in Great Britain. It was very difficult to resist taking that action because of the fact that during the war, at a time when there was great difficulty in providing all the medical services that were needed, those people had been practising either in the armed forces or in civil situations. Apparently the then Government of Great Britain felt that it was under an obligation to grant them that type of registration.

Because the approval of the General Medical Council of Great Britain carried with it at that time automatic certification in Queensland, a former Labour Government of this State thought that some steps should be taken to correct that position, and that is why the Bill was brought down in 1955. It was designed to amend the Act to ensure that the qualifications of the universities and the certifying bodies such as the Royal College of Surgeons in Great Britain were accepted automatically in Queensland, and it excluded various other parts of the Commonwealth, including some Asian countries in which the standard perhaps was not quite as high as it was in the qualifying bodies and universities in Great Britain. That was the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. Walsh: It was a perfectly good reason, as you said.

Mr. TOOTH: It was a reasonable precaution. It does not mean that we do not accept graduates from India, Pakistan, or the University of Cairo. Indeed, as recently as last week I submitted to the Executive Council for recognition the name of a medical graduate of the University of Cairo, first of all as a person who is eligible to practice in Egypt. That is the first step towards his coming before the Medical Board of Queensland and being examined. The board will not examine anybody until such time as there is formal recognition of his eligibility to practise in the country in which his degree was obtained. Quite a complicated process has to be gone through before these people are granted registration in Queensland. As the hon. member for Bundaberg said, they must have a knowledge of the language.

Mr. Walsh: I do not think that American doctors are recognised here.

Mr. TOOTH: American doctors are not recognised automatically.

These provisions are not, I assure the hon. member, ever likely to be watered down. But in 1963, when the Government looked at this situation in relation to graduates from South Africa, the Act was so amended that the automatic registration granted to graduates of British universities was not automatically extended to graduates of South African universities. The Bill provided that the universities of South Africa would first be examined by the appropriate authorities in Queensland and their standards reviewed. If those standards were accepted by the authorities in this State as being equal to or higher than Queensland standards, the graduates of those universities could apply to the Medical Board of Queensland for registration. They would still have to apply and be considered individually.

It is precisely this procedure that we now propose in respect of graduates from the Republic of Ireland. There are two universities in Ireland that, in the general academic sense, are recognised as being equal to the British universities. The medical standards of these graduates will be examined by the appropriate authorities here. We will get the advice of our own faculty of medicine and faculty of surgery, and examinations of the standards of their training will be conducted. They will then be in precisely the same position as graduates

of the University of South Africa. They will be able to apply to the Medical Board of Queensland for registration, and I have no doubt that in the great majority of cases, provided there is no personal bar, they will receive registration.

Motion (Mr. Tooth) agreed to.

Resolution reported.

FIRST READING

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

LAW REFORM COMMISSION BILL

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

Debate resumed from 13 November (see p. 1446) on Dr. Delamothe's motion—

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

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE

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

Clauses 1 to 9, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—Functions and Duties of Commission—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.30 p.m.): There are many ways of implementing the very desirable principle of law reform. The Minister indicated this at the introductory stage when he outlined the approaches adopted to the implementation of law reform in Great Britain, New Zealand and the other States. In some of the places that he mentioned Parliament involves itself directly with law reform, whereas in others, as is proposed by the Minister, it allocates this responsibilty to a commission that is distinct from Parliament, and it does not have any representation on that commission.

We do not take issue with the Minister in his decision to allocate this task to a commission, but we do take issue with his approach to the recommendations and reports made by the Law Reform Commission and to the receipt of them.

I think it is true to say that the Minister has recognised the fact that law reform is a matter of the broadest public concern. He has made the functions of the commission so wide that access to the commission is available to every person in the community whether he is a member of the legal profession, a professor or lecturer in law at the universty, a member of Parliament, or an ordinary citizen.

Under clause 10, as it is presently framed, the function of the commission shall be to receive and consider any proposal to reform the law that may be made or referred to it. Quite desirably, the Minister has not restricted the qualifications of any person who seeks to place a proposal before the commission. He has recognised that matters that may be dealt with by the commission are of public concern. To a great extent, matters that are dealt with by the commission will, I suppose, be referred to it by the Minister or by some other person or body who is intimately connected with the law. However, the Minister does not restrict the commission to receiving proposals only from that kind of person but allows it to receive a proposal from the ordinary citizen on something that he considers to be relevant to the responsibilities of the commission, whether it be on a matter relating to an anomaly, which will probably be the main type of submission made by the ordinary layman, or on a technical matter of codification of the law or similar matters.

We believe that the Minister has adopted something of a paternalistic approach in deciding that the commission should make its recommendation as proposed in clause 10.

Clause 10 reads—

"Any recommendations formulated by the Commission and approved by the Governor in Council shall be laid before Parliament."

We believe that it should not be necessary to obtain the approval of the Governor in Council before recommendations are laid before Parliament. As these are matters of public concern, we believe that they are therefore of parliamentary concern. However, we do not suggest that because they are laid before Parliament they should be implemented. At the introductory stage the Minister pointed out that the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Attorney-General, may decide that some recommendation that is made by the Law Reform Commission cannot be implemented when it is made or in the form in which it is presented to him. But we believe that Parliament and, in turn, the public are entitled to know the recommendations that have been rejected by the Minister as well as those that have been accepted by him. Parliament and the general public should be made aware of the reasons for the Minister's rejection of certain recommendations.

Unfortunately, in many places in which the parliamentary system of democracy operates a great number of young people are under a disillusionment about that system. They consider that Parliament is a place that is becoming remote from matters that concern the ordinary person. If we are to indicate that Parliament is a form of participatory democracy, we have to show that it is a reforming body that is interested in matters of reform, and that citizens will not be placed in the situation of people who are waiting at a bus stop, in which sometimes the bus arrives to pick them up and sometimes it does not.

We must show that Parliament itself is interested and anxious to get on with matters of law reform. The amendment that I intend

to submit is in the interests of Parliamentary democracy and in the interests of the ordinary citizens of Queensland. The decisions of the Law Reform Commission should not be vetted or censored by the Attorney-General or the Governor in Council prior to their being laid before Parliament. For that reason, I move the following amendment—

"On page 4, lines 16 and 17, omit the words—

'and approved by the Governor in Council'."

Clause 10 (3) would then read—

"(3) Any recommendations formulated by the Commission shall be laid before Parliament."

We believe it would be a desirable sequence of events, although this is not incorporated in our submissions, in that Parliament itself would adopt what we believe to be a desirable practice, which is very rarely availed of in this Parliament, namely, that when important matters and reports of this nature are laid before Parliament, Parliament should direct a special committee of the Parliament to examine the recommendations and inform Parliament, so that Parliament may have the benefit of a study of the reports. I am not in any way down-grading the examination that would be made of them by the Attorney-General or the Governor in Council, but I think that if we adopt this procedure we will protect the Government of the day, irrespective of its political colour, from the suggestion that reforms recommended by the Law Reform Commission were set aside in secrecy because they cut across some traditional policy of the Government of the day or had some effect on some pressure group or vested interest that supports the Government. I am not speaking politically on this occasion, but we know that all Governments, irrespective of their political colour, have supporters, and that all Governments pay regard not only to the interests and submissions of those who support them, but also those of others who exercise their right to present their views. We believe that in such situations it is not desirable that the reasons for the Government's not approving the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission should not be made known to the Parliament or the people, and that only those which the Minister is prepared to accept are made known to Parliament.

I do not think I need to take up the time of the Committee by going much further into this matter, but I foreshadow another amendment to a later clause concerning the actual report of the Commission on its work. It is not a consequential amendment, although it might be regarded somewhat as a corollary. These are two distinct amendments. On this occasion we are dealing with specific recommendations of the Commission and, later I will move an amendment to a clause that deals with the presentation to Parliament of the report of the Commission on its work each year.

Mr. PORTER (Toowong) (12.39 p.m.): I listened with a great deal of interest and sympathy to the hon. member for Baroona. I feel that the attitude that Parliament must have every opportunity to scrutinise matters that are of concern to it contains a principle with which no-one would disagree. However, I do not view this amendment in this particular light because, as I see it, the amendment would not, in fact, help the Parliamentary process, and may well tend to hinder it. We must remember that the role of the commission in the larger sense, will be to remove archaic laws, to recommend consolidations and improvements in wording, and so on. It will not be a policy-making body.

If every recommendation that the commission arrived at had to come to Parliament—if we consider this in cold, hard, pragmatic terms—that procedure in itself would have a very inhibiting effect on the commission. I am quite sure that if every recommendation it made was to be subjected to Parliament's scrutiny, the net result would be a reduction in the amount of work the commission would be prepared to do. In addition it would certainly impose a considerable burden on a Parliament.

After all, in all essential respects, this commission is a body which will be responsible to the Government of the day. If the amendment is accepted, the Government will be put in the rather peculiar position of having to defend every decision that it makes on every recommendation of the Law Reform Commission. In practical terms, this would severely reduce the effectiveness of such a body.

Mr. Walsh: I think you are talking with your tongue in your cheek.

Mr. PORTER: No I am not. I remind the hon. member for Bundaberg that every recommendation that the Law Reform Commission arrives at and the Government adopts must come before this House anyhow because the effect would be that there would be an amendment to some piece of legislation. What I do say is that all the machinery matters—the recommendations which are not adopted and do not become effective in law—should not come before Parliament. Surely this is a responsibility of the Government of the day.

Mr. Hanlon: There are thousands of detailed matters of departmental "pifflepoffle" that come before this Parliament in annual reports and you do not say that they should not.

Mr. PORTER: I think that the hon. member for Baroona is anticipating his next amendment. At this stage I am dealing with his amendment that any recommendation formulated by the commission must be laid before Parliament. I believe that in the long run, and in terms of practical consideration, this would vastly reduce the scope and the effectiveness of the commission

and would not help it. Therefore, reluctantly because I accept the general premise of the hon. member's amendment, I must oppose it.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (12.42 p.m.): I support the amendment. I am surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Toowong whom we have heard on several occasions say that there is a tendency to get away from parliamentary control and to have more and more executive control. All that is requested in the amendment is that the report be tabled in Parliament.

If the Government, and the Minister in particular, desired to bypass Parliament in this respect, the Minister or the Government should have appointed a special committee to undertake this work. In that way the necessity for tabling the report would not exist. Let me remind the Minister and the hon. member for Toowong that there have been numerous commission reports on important matters tabled in this Parliament from time to time. Two that come readily to mind are the reports of the Wool Advisory Committee in 1932 or 1933 and the Royal Commission on Sugar Peaks and Cognate Matters in 1939. The tabling of these reports gives to hon. members the information that they are entitled to scrutinise.

If the Minister wanted all this machinery he could have gone about this in another way instead of taking up the time of Parliament. I do not know how many hours we have spent on this Bill up to this moment.

Mr. Smith: Not very long.

Mr. WALSH: My recollection is that this Bill has been before the Committee on three or four occasions and the second reading has just been passed today. I spoke to this Bill some considerable time ago and it has been the subject of a good deal of debate. No doubt it took a good deal of preparation.

All that is asked is that the report be tabled in Parliament. Surely that is not asking too much in a matter of such importance.

Mr. Smith: There have been six speakers on it.

Mr. WALSH: Those speakers have taken a long time. Six speeches account for 150 minutes. The amendment, as I read it, is to insert the words, "and a copy of the report shall be laid before Parliament."

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is dealing with the second amendment to be moved by the hon. member for Baroona.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (12.45 p.m.): I am at a loss to follow the argument of the hon. member for Toowong. I think he is trying to find a distinction without a difference in this matter. He queries why it should be necessary for recommendations formulated by the commission to be laid before Parliament. The Minister recognises the desirability of placing before Parliament those recommendations approved by the Governor in Council, which we all know means those approved by the Government. The clause establishes the principle of the Minister's putting before Parliament only the recommendations of which he approves. If it is a valid argument that the ones of which he approves should be laid before Parliament, why is it not also a valid argument that the ones of which he does not approve should also be laid before Parliament? The matter is as simple as that.

The hon. member for Toowong suggested that he would have more sympathy with the proposed amendment of clause 15 to provide for the laying before Parliament of a copy of the commission's annual report. I believe that two quite distinct things are involved. One is a specific recommendation, and the other is a report on the work of the commission during the year which presumably will deal with a wide range of subjects which do not involve specific recommendations. We have no argument with the proposition that the Minister should determine the priorities of the commission. If that were not done, they could be working on a whole range of things of little importance.

Mr. RAMSDEN (Merthyr) (12.47 p.m.): My feelings are similar to those of the hon. member for Toowong. The hon. member for Baroona asks why there should be a difference between recommendations approved by the Governor in Council and those not so approved. In the first place, I think that by the retention of the clause as it reads the Government would retain the initiative in the introduction of legislation. Acceptance of the hon. member's amendment would mean that the Government was surrendering its right to determine what was to be initiated in this State.

Mr. Hanlon: It is not initiated till it is placed before Parliament.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I am more likely to agree with the hon. member's second amendment concerning the annual reports of the commission. I feel that in that matter he has a valid argument. On the matter of placing before Parliament any recommendations formulated by the commission, it is not as though the commission will sit for a week and then go into recess. As I understand it, it will be a continuing commission which will constantly keep the laws of the State under review. The Bill provides that the functions of the commission shall be—

"(a) the codification of such law;

(b) the elimination of anomalies;

(c) the repeal of obsolete and unnecessary enactments;

(d) the reduction of the number of separate enactments; and

(e) generally the simplification and modernisation of the law."

Accepting the amendment therefore becomes completely impracticable. If this is to be a continuing commission, I take it that it will not merely sit around for some period of time and then send in all its recommendations from its deliberations over the last three or six months. I assume that its recommendations will go forward from time to time as they are made.

Mr. Hanlon: If the commission, as a matter of urgency, made a recommendation to the Minister that an extreme injustice suffered by somebody be corrected, that matter would not come before Parliament unless the Minister agreed to take action on it. If the Minister did not agree to bring it before Parliament, the person concerned would get no redress.

Mr. RAMSDEN: The power of the Government is not being surrendered to the commission.

Mr. Hanlon: Should not the Minister have to justify a refusal to act on the recommendation?

Mr. RAMSDEN: I do not think so. I have known the Minister to do many things that he has not had to justify.

Mr. Hanlon: He should have justified them.

Mr. RAMSDEN: I cannot agree with the hon. member's suggested amendment.

Mr. Walsh: Dozens of reports are tabled in this Chamber and are never debated.

Mr. RAMSDEN: That is quite true, but it does not alter the situation. Even if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona has some merit in it, which I doubt in the present circumstances, I do not think it is practicable. What is the use of tabling a report if someone is not going to be able to debate it?

Mr. LICKISS (Mr. Coot-tha) (12.51 p.m.): I oppose the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona. I believe that it is a basis of government that all aspects of the legislative programme should be the prerogative of the Government of the day. It is true that private members' Bills may be introduced, but this is the way in which Parliament functions. To suggest that a report or a recommendation made by a commission should go direct to Parliament, in terms of the amendment moved by the hon. member, means a virtual bypassing of the Government.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. LICKISS: The hon. member is arguing on a different issue. The proposal, if adopted, would tend to bypass the Government, and it would also, I suggest, restrict the commission, because that body would be very reluctant to make certain recommendations that may be on the borderline of effecting law reform relative to certain Government policies. In my opinion, the Government of the day should be responsible for the initiation of legislation.

Mr. Porter: It is a reform body, not a policy-making body.

Mr. LICKISS: It is very true, as the hon. member for Toowong reminds the Committee, that it is a reform body, not a policy-making body.

Although I can see certain merit in the recommendations of the hon. member for Baroona, I believe that, on balance, the way in which the provision is presently recorded in the Bill is the way in which it should be adopted by the Committee.

Mr. TUCKER (Townsville North) (12.53 p.m.): In my opinion, the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Baroona has a great deal of merit. After all, the Bill before the Committee asks us, as a Parliament, to set up a Law Reform Commission. That is a good idea. A commission is being set up because hon. members think that there are certain anomalies in the law and that certain parts of the law have become redundant, as has been proved on a number of occasions. Collectively, hon. members believe that there is a need to do something about the situation, and they are agreeing to set up a commission to inquire into the matter. There is no argument about that. The Opposition believes in it; the Government believes in it.

As hon. members on both sides of the Chamber are in agreement on that point, why should not we, as a Parliament, have a right to know what the commission is doing? In other words, the hon. member for Baroona has said, "This Parliament, having agreed collectively to set up such a commission, now wants to know what the commission has found out and recommended —not only certain parts of its recommendations but the whole of them." I cannot see any argument against that, and I certainly cannot follow the arguments of hon. members opposite who have been on their feet in the last few minutes. If hon. members collectively decide to set up a commission, surely it is only right that the Parliament should know what that commission is doing and what it recommends. That is all that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona seeks to provide.

This Parliament should at all times be aware of what the commission has decided. We do not accept that we should know only what the Minister and those who are advising him accept, but what the commission that we, as a Parliament, have set up, recommends. I cannot see any argument at all against the proposition that each and every one of us, Opposition as well as Government, should know what the commission is doing and what it recommends.

Mr. Porter: Such an attitude is quite understandable. The Opposition would like to see

what recommendations are made in order to find something with which to clout the Government over the head.

Mr. TUCKER: We do not necessarily subscribe to what the hon. member says. In this matter we should not be looked upon as an Opposition; rather should each individual member be regarded as a part of the Parliament of Queensland which has set up a commission, and we consider that we collectively have a right to know what that commission is doing and recommending, not only its suggestions that the Government feels it should accept. That is all the hon. member for Baroona seeks to do. When the commission makes certain decisions, this Parliament, which has set it up, wants to know about them. I believe that the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Baroona is a very valid one.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (12.57 p.m.): I cannot accept the amendment. I listened very carefully to the mover and his colleagues, and they are under a complete misapprehension and misconception of what the Law Reform Commission is to do. I think the mover of the amendment mentioned that it will examine proposals from all and sundry—that there will be no limit to the field from which proposals may come.

The very name "Law Reform Commission" refers to law. In other words, this commission will set out what is the legal side of any particular proposition. It will have nothing whatever to do with policy-making. When the Minister comes before this Parliament with a motion embodying Government policy and claims that the Law Reform Commission is behind it, he will then table the commission's report. In ordinary circumstances, only those things that, on advice, the Government accepts, should obtain. After all, all day long and every day, on the other side of the Chamber as well as on this side, we are taking advice from all sorts of people in all sorts of fields.

Mr. Hanlon: The commission is armed with the powers and authority of a commission of inquiry, and any person can be summoned to appear before it and give evidence.

Dr. DELAMOTHE: I do not come here and say any more than the Leader of the Opposition does when he says, "I have advice from union circles to do this". I am afraid that I cannot accept the amendment. The Bill must remain as it is.

[*Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2.15 p.m.*]

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (2.15 p.m.): I feel that I am obliged to rise again on the amendment, although I do not want to pursue an endless argument with the Minister and Government members on it. We have put it forward in all sincerity because we think it recognises the right of Parliament to be fully informed in these matters.

The Minister and Government members seem to suggest that the recommendations made by the Law Reform Commission will be made, in a cosy atmosphere, to the Government of the day and not to the community generally or to Parliament. The Minister has said that nobody is obliged to go before the commission and make submissions to it. It is true that nobody is obliged to submit a matter for its consideration, but from clause 11 it will be seen that the commission is armed with the powers and authorities conferred by the Commissions of Inquiry Act and consequently it will be able to summon anybody to appear before it and produce papers and documents. In other words, it will have the full powers of inquiry under that Act. Of course, in order to carry out its functions it should rightly have that power, and I do not quarrel with that authorisation being delegated to it. However, as Parliament will be giving these powers to the commission, it is entitled to know the results of the commission's deliberations and its recommendations.

I interjected when the hon. member for Merthyr was speaking that in a later amendment we will be submitting that the commission furnish an annual report to Parliament. We want to know the commission's recommendations, which will be formulated only when the commission has come to a firm conclusion on a particular matter that has been put before it. We, as a Parliament, want to know when the recommendation is made and what it is, because there may be pressing reasons for implementing it and there may be reasons why Parliament should pursue the point with the Governor in Council and with the Attorney-General if he has decided not to endorse or implement the commission's recommendations.

We do not suggest that putting the matter before Parliament will compel the Government or Parliament to accept the recommendation. We simply say that Parliament should be told what the recommendation is at the time it is made. We do not want to see matters left until the publication of an annual report, which is a different thing altogether.

The hon. member for Toowong has always spoken as if he were a champion of this Parliament, so I was surprised to hear him express reservations about, and even opposition to, the amendment because he thought the Opposition might play politics with the recommendations put forward by the Law Reform Commission. That very attitude that the Government of the day should protect itself from the Opposition has been the graveyard of parliamentary reform in this Parliament under the previous Government and under this Government.

Since the Isis by-election Government members may have realised, as perhaps Labour could have when it was in office, that the Government of the day is the Opposition of tomorrow, and vice versa. We are looking at this matter from the point of view of Parliament and not simply in order to play politics. It is inevitable that a very fine line exists between the two when politics enter into these matters, but if we are interested in extending Parliamentary democracy and making Parliament work as it should, we should be prepared to take the risk of allowing even an Opposition to fall down on parliamentary democracy if it chooses to misuse vehicles that come before Parliament by way of reports from public accounts committees, law reform commissions, or any other bodies.

I do feel that the arguments advanced by the Minister have not destroyed the worth of the Opposition's amendment. Whilst I recognise his integrity in putting his conclusions forward, I do not feel that in his reply he has answered or destroyed our amendment.

Mr. SMITH (Windsor) (2.20 p.m.): If the mover of the amendment had looked into what has been done by the English Law Commission he would have found that the practice contemplated here is not far out of line with what is done in England.

Mr. Bennett: Why have we, in this Parliament, to slavishly follow everybody else?

Mr. SMITH: It is always wise to look at what has been done in a particular field before hacking out something fresh for ourselves.

It is quite safe to say that the English Law Commission and the English Parliament have had a little more experience in this field than we have, and I, for one, am always prepared to benefit from other people's lessons. Sometimes those lessons are very unfortunate, but here we have these brash young men wanting to dive off without knowing where they are going or what they are going to do. I prefer to take a much more cautious path. I cannot excuse hon. members opposite, because they could have gone to our own journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth, "The Parliamentarian", for advice. Lord Lloyd of Hamstead sets out in it some of the workings of the English Law Commission in its first three years. He shows the duties of that commission as being to report to the Minister, and to undertake, pursuant to the Minister's instructions, certain investigations.

One other matter which the Law Commission in England can concern itself with is the providing of advice and information at the instance of the Government, to Government departments and other authorities or bodies concerned, with proposals for the reform or amendment of any branch of law. That particular power could, I suppose, be read into clause 10, which it is proposed to amend. This relates to the elimination of anomalies, the repeal of obsolete or unnecessary enactments (or the reduction of separate enactments) and, generally, the simplification and modernisation of the law.

I think it is quite competent to address the Committee this afternoon on the power of providing advice and information to Government departments under the cover of clause 10 (1) (e), whether that clause is amended or not. I commend to the Minister's consideration the matter of discussions with the commission when it is formed as to its mode of operation. We all have various ideas about what should be done, but we have not the same number of lawyers in Queensland as there are in England; we have not the same wealth of learning to draw on in Queensland as in England, therefore we cannot expect to get quite the same volume of research done as is done in England. But possibly it may be advantageous for the Law Reform Commission to advise Parliament.

That in itself may be the answer to what the Opposition is seeking. If the Opposition wants to be given certain information, it may well be that the Minister, after discussion with the commission, could feel that there is nothing wrong in letting the information out to the Opposition, or to any department that seeks it. I can well see that a department would be advised to consult the Law Reform Commission before starting to formulate proposals in respect of which it wants legislative recognition. It would be well advised to see whether or not something ought to be done, and much time could be saved by first seeking the commission's advice.

I commend to the Minister consideration of Lord Lloyd's article in "The Parliamentarian", particularly the reference to the power to provide advice and information to Government departments and other authorities or bodies concerned. No doubt the Minister will need to have discussions with the commission when it is formed. He will have to seek its concurrence and it, too, will have to seek his approval of certain steps that it proposes to take. I think that, along with what I suggest here, we might well consider a discussion between the Minister and the commission about making its recommendations available, if not to Parliament, at least for perusal. After all, there will be a shocking consumption of time in sorting out what has to be done under (a) and (b) of clause 10 (1). I have no hesitation in suggesting that the Steam Rollers Regulation Act of 1892 would be one matter for consideration.

Mr. Bennett: While this Government is in power we need that Act because it steamrolls over everything.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member would be a very good thing on which to use a steam-roller.

The time taken by the commission in doing something constructive would be far better spent in that way than in preparing reports to be tabled in Parliament and probably never read. The Law Reform Commission in New South Wales does contemplate tabling its reports, and in fact two of them have been tabled. But very little interest outside the professional world is shown in these reports. They are not good reading or the fictional type of reading that appeals to many people; they are mundane and considerably heavier than one would like them to be, and a person must be interested in the subject matter to plough through them. Let us not waste the commission's time in having it prepare reports that will not be read or recommendations for submission to Parliament. Let it get on with the job of codifying the law, removing anomalies and bringing the law up to date, and let us write the law in language that everyone can understand. Then there will not be half the opposition to the law that there is today.

Mr. BENNETT (South Brisbane) (2.27 p.m.): I am rather amazed that my friend and colleague the hon. member for Windsor adopted the attitude that he did to the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Baroona, who seemed to have a better appreciation of the functions, duties and purposes of Parliament than the only lawyer in the Government. The argument of the hon. member for Windsor is that parliamentarians are so lethargic, dull, comatose and weary that they will not read reports.

Mr. Tucker: He was referring to the Liberal Party members.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly. He must be referring to the Country-Liberal members—or just the Liberal members.

Members of the Opposition do read the reports that are tabled in Parliament. Not only are they entitled to do that, but it is their obligation to make themselves aware of what is going on. After all, Parliament is the representative of the people and the taxpayers, who will pay for this Law Reform Commission. If Parliament is informed, the people who are paying for the Law Reform Commission are informed. I am quite disappointed that the Minister is not prepared to have the report tabled.

It does not matter if many Government members do not want to read the report. Many of them will not be here after next April, anyway. Let us legislate for the active, energetic Parliament that will be here next year with good Labour Government members who will read the report. We have seen so little legislation—I am speaking in comparative terms—that this would be the laziest parliamentary session ever. There is a lot of triviality in the legislation. What has been introduced has denuded the rights of the ordinary man compared with what he erstwhile enjoyed in the application of liberty and justice.

I refer, for instance, to the behind-closed-doors proposal on Public Service promotions and school-teacher promotions. Now we have a behind-closed-doors Law Reform Commission. It will sit in secrecy and will stealthily steal into the Minister's office and tell him of its proposals. He will take them to Cabinet and Cabinet will say, "Politically they are not worth a bumper at the next election. Take them and throw them into the rubbish basket. We do not want to consider them because we must conserve our funds to introduce measures that might be of political advantage to us." That is the sort of behind-closed-doors tactics encouraged by this Government.

The people of Isis would not put up with these tactics. They want to be properly informed and to know what evidence, if any, is being considered by this Parliament. Many of the mistakes in the International Sugar Agreement negotiations would not have been made if Parliament had been better and further informed by the people who are prepared to read reports, unlike the hon. member for Windsor who said that parliamentarians will not read them.

I am shocked and amazed that the hon. member made that candid admission on behalf of Government members. The New South Wales Parliament is more enlightened than this Parliament, so, if we wish to follow slavishly what others do, we could well follow the example of the New South Wales Parliament and have reports of the Law Reform Commission tabled. If we have nothing to hide, and if we are a courageous Parliament prepared to consider and determine what we will accept and what we will reject, we will not be embarrassed by having the commission's recommendations submitted to us.

On the other hand, if the Minister is proposing to have merely a sham show, as happens so often with the organisations, bodies and committees that the Government sets up from time to time, then do not allow the recommendations to see the light of day because the public may want some of them implemented. If there is no genuine intention to reform the essential portions of our law, let us go ahead and have the recommendations concealed. But surely parliamentarians, if they are to do their duty when discussing Estimates, Bills and other matters that come before them from time to time, should be armed with all the recommendations made by the Law Reform Commission. Is this commission going to be like so many other government-formed committees who pretend to have authority and standing but who in fact have neither?

If the arguments of the hon. member for Windsor are sound, no reports would be submitted to parliamentarians. His argument is that because the law is drab and mundane, the recommendations would not be read. I do not accept his statement that law is drab and mundane. I think it can be made very interesting and, if the Law Reform Commission is composed of men like men, I can assure hon. members that its reports would be very interesting and every parliamentarian, whether he be lazy or not, would want to read them.

Mr. Smith: The lecturers at the university make it very interesting.

Mr. BENNETT: As the hon. member for Windsor says, lecturers at the university make it very interesting. Certainly they must have been skilled to sustain interest in him during his years at the university, otherwise he would have slept through lectures just as he now sleeps in Parliament. The lecturers in his day must have made the law interesting and put it for him in plain, humble, ordinary language.

Mr. Smith: I should like to put all our laws in the same language, too.

Mr. BENNETT: If the law is to be put into simple language and the commission's recommendations are to be made in similar style, surely there will be nothing abstruse about them that parliamentarians cannot understand. I think the hon. member for Windsor adopts a sectional, snobbish attitude when he suggests that parliamentarians would not be capable of reading reports of the Law Reform Commission.

Mr. SMITH: I rise to a point of order. It is quite clear to me that some members of the Opposition do not follow what is said in this Chamber. I never said that they could not be read. I said that they would not be read. I am pointing out to the present speaker that he is misquoting my speech, and I ask him to correct what he is saying.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey): The hon. member for Windsor raises objection to being misquoted by the hon. member for South Brisbane. I ask the hon. member to note the objection.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, Mr. Carey, I note the objection. I also noted an interjection by the hon. member for Burnett. It may be appropriate to say that he would no doubt do well to submit his position to the Law Reform Commission so that he could be properly informed on his rights as a parliamentarian, particularly in view of the fact that at one stage a Minister threatened to assault him and drag him out of the window when he was sitting in Parliament. I am sure that he would very much like to know what his rights are in that situation. I am prepared to advise him and take action on his behalf, but, of course, bearing in mind his party membership, he probably got other advice.

Mr. Hanlon: The best advice would be to close the window.

Mr. BENNETT: As a matter of fact, as the hon. member for Baroona said in plain, humble language, it would have been good advice, if the hon. member had any common sense, to at least put the window down and protect himself.

This is an important Bill, and it is sad that we are beginning on the wrong foot in relation to a commendable proposal. Few, if any, parliamentarians would not be happy about the proposal to constitute a Law Reform Commission, and I believe that an enthusiastic, energetic and ambitious commission would wish to report to Parliament so that it could not be frustrated by an individual Minister. I am not attacking the present incumbent of the Justice portfolio when I say that, but hon. members are making legislation for the future. I believe that there could be, and have been, Ministers in the Country-Liberal Government who would conceal the truth from this Parliament and not be prepared to submit proper reports. If Ministers such as that are given the right to censor and vet the reports of the Law Reform Commission, Parliament will be in a completely unsatisfactory position.

It is true that the force and effect of some of the reports that are made from time to time are reduced by the lateness of their arrival in this Chamber. I do not know whether it is by design or accident, or whether it is just coincidental, but sometimes hon. members do not receive reports until the day before or the day of the discussion of certain departmental estimates. The effect of a report is certainly stultified under those circumstances. A properly prepared report on law reform would be of tremendous advantage in a discussion of not only the Estimates of the Department of Justice but also the Estimates of other ministerial portfolios.

It has been argued by my learned friend and colleague the hon. member for Windsor that many hon. members would not be interested in such a report, that one cannot discuss a subject that is not one's specialty. On that point, I think that I was able to put some very satisfactory submissions to Country Party members on a matter that should concern them—the cattle tick—and I hope that some members of Cabinet will make further inquiries into my submissions relative to that aspect of land matters.

I really cannot see that there has been any logical, sensible or fruitful opposition to the proposed amendment. In my opinion, the opposition emanates purely from a paltry political attitude that anything that the Opposition says cannot be adopted or accepted. Quite frankly, I believe that the

present Government plays its politics unfairly and too frequently when the interests and welfare of Queenslanders are at stake. Hon. members even saw the degrading spectacle of the hon. member for Mulgrave attacking a new member of this Assembly after he had made his maiden speech, which was a wonderful contribution to the debate and would have done justice to many a veteran member. Because of the cheap political attitude adopted by the Government and its members, the hon. member for Isis was attacked on the day on which he took his seat.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Carey): Order! I hope that the hon. member will get back to the matter before the Committee.

Mr. BENNETT: I was only drawing an analogy, Mr. Carey.

I am satisfied that the Minister for Justice is not able to advance one logical argument against the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Baroona.

Mr. Sherrington: Even though he trains on "Bundy" rum.

Mr. BENNETT: Yes, even though he trains on "Bundy" rum and wears a singlet to advertise it. I understand, too, that the hon. gentleman gets 10 per cent. when he is on the track.

Dealing with the reports that are furnished from time to time, I suggest that if hon. members receive a full and correct departmental report, they will then know whether the information coming from the lips of certain Ministers is true or otherwise.

We had the extraordinary spectacle recently of the Premier being misled by a departmental report, causing him to apologise to the Parliament for the incorrect and false information given to him from the Police Department. No doubt this false information was given to him because some superior officer along the line was able to censor and yet the original report which should have been obtained and should have been accurate.

Likewise, if the report of the Law Reform Commission is to be censored and vetted, the Minister could unconsciously give incorrect information to Parliament and could be placed in the embarrassing and undignified position, as the Premier was on his return from overseas, of having to apologise for the falsity of information given by his departmental heads.

I feel that the Minister should give further and serious consideration to the amendment of the hon. member for Baroona. I know that deep down in his heart the hon. member for Windsor supports the proposals because any genuine lawyer would say that it is a natural corollary of the proposition to constitute a Law Reform Commission. In normal circumstances I think the hon. member for Windsor would have been the first after me, to wholeheartedly support the amendment, except that the elections are so near and the whip has been pulled out relative to legal reform. Breathalysers have to be discussed today and the hon. member for Windsor is afraid that his election prospects might be lessened unless he gets on side with the Minister.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (2.42 p.m.): The Minister has failed to give any reasons why the clause should be retained as presented to the Committee. Normally we look to him for a very intelligent and cogent explanation as to why an amendment should not be accepted. In this case he simply stood up and said, "I cannot accept the amendment".

I think we have to look at the whole of subclause 2 to justify the amendment moved by the hon. member for Baroona. We might gain the impression that the commission will have a free hand but apparently this is not going to be so. It can only work and function according to the desire of the Minister. So that I will not be misunderstood, I shall quote subclause 2. It reads—

> "For the purposes of carrying out its function, the commission shall—
>
> (a) Receive and consider any proposal for the reform of the law which may be made or referred to it;"

I take it that the Bar Association, the Graziers' Association or the Playboy Club would all be authorised in their own way, say, to refer any proposal to the commission for consideration and amendment of the existing law. The clause then goes on—

> "(b) Prepare and submit to the Minister from time to time, or at the request of the Minister, a programme for the examination, in order of priority, of different branches of the law for the purposes of reform, consolidation or statute law revision;"

I draw attention to (c) particularly. It says—

> "(c) Undertake pursuant to approval by the Minister of such programme, and in accordance with the approved order of priority, the examination of particular branches of the law, and the formulation of recommendations for reform, consolidation or statute law revision."

So it may be that the Law Reform Commission could submit certain proposals which it thought should be examined and dealt with, while on the other hand the Minister might take the attitude that these things should not come within the ambit of discussion by the commission. So some restraint is imposed upon the functions of the commission.

I do not know why the Minister should take the attitude that he has taken, because generally any report of any committee or any commission of inquiry contains a number of recommendations, and, very often, numerous recommendations. In a later

clause, which may be debated, all that is involved is the submission of the report to Parliament. If recommendations are to be embodied in the report what difference would it make if they are in the terms submitted? The Minister may argue that he does not see fit to accept this amendment, but if he agrees to a later amendment that will be moved the result will be that a recommendation made by the commission will be submitted in its report.

The hon. member for Baroona is trying to ensure that all recommendations that have been made by the commission whether accepted or rejected by Cabinet will be put before Parliament. The principle that is involved is an important one. Perhaps there will not be a very important recommendation involved, or perhaps only one recommendation out of 20, 50, or 100 will be important, but at least the principle should be there. It is desirable that Parliament should be informed of the recommendations that are accepted by Cabinet as well as those that are rejected by it; therefore, I think that the proposal submitted by the hon. member for Baroona is a sound one.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from Clause 10 (Mr. Hanlon's amendment) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 28

Armstrong	Pilbeam
Beardmore	Porter
Campbell	Ramsden
Chalk	Richter
Chinchen	Row
Delamothe	Smith
Hewitt, W. D.	Sullivan
Hinze	Tooth
Hodges	Wharton
Knox	Wood. E. G. W.
Lee	
Lickiss	
Lonergan	*Tellers:*
McKechnie	
Miller	Kaus
Murray	Ahern

NOES, 23

Bennett	Melloy
Bromley	Newton
Byrne	O'Donnell
Dean	Sherrington
Donald	Thackeray
Duffey	Tucker
Graham	Wallis-Smith
Hanlon	Walsh
Hanson	
Harris	*Tellers:*
Houston	
Inch	Blake
Jones, R.	Jordan

PAIRS

Rae	Davies
Bjelke-Petersen	Duggan
Camm	Mann
Newbery	Lloyd
Cory	Wood, P.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 14, both inclusive, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—Reports—

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (3.10 p.m.): I do not intend to delay the Committee long in justifying the proposed amendment to clause 15. This matter was pretty well canvassed in the discussion on the previous amendment. I am heartened by the at least tentative support indicated by some sections of the Government to believe that the Minister might even accept the amendment, or that those members might give me the support necessary to carry it. The last amendment was narrowly defeated and it is obvious that very little support is required by defectors from the Government to carry this amendment.

I move the following amendment:—

"On page 5, line 29, after the word 'date' insert the words—

'and a copy of the report shall be laid before Parliament'."

We are not calling for the report furnished to the Minister at his request and on his own initiative, which we regard as a ministerial matter; we are calling merely for the annual report of the Law Reform Commission to be tabled in Parliament.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted in clause 15 (Mr. Hanlon's amendment) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 23

Blake	Melloy
Bromley	Newton
Byrne	O'Donnell
Dean	Sherrington
Donald	Thackeray
Duffey	Tucker
Graham	Wallis-Smith
Hanlon	Walsh
Harris	
Houston	*Tellers:*
Inch	
Jones, R.	Bennett
Jordan	Hanson

NOES, 29

Ahern	Muller
Armstrong	Murray
Beardmore	Pilbeam
Campbell	Ramsden
Chalk	Richter
Chinchen	Row
Delamothe	Smith
Hewitt, W. D.	Sullivan
Hinze	Tooth
Hodges	Wharton
Kaus	Wood. E. G. W.
Knox	
Lee	*Tellers:*
Lickiss	
Lonergan	McKechnie
Miller	Porter

PAIRS

Davies	Rae
Duggan	Bjelke-Petersen
Mann	Camm
Lloyd	Newbery
Wood, P.	Cory

Resolved in the negative.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Hon. P. R. DELAMOTHE (Bowen—Minister for Justice) (3.4 p.m.): Before I move that the Bill be reported, I should like to say that the suggestion of consulting with the commission is a good one.

Bill reported, without amendment.

The House adjourned at 3.5 p.m.