

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 9 AUGUST 1956

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

in the following irrigation areas, respectively, viz.—(a) Clare; (b) Millaroo; (c) Dalbeg; (d) Dawson Valley; (e) St. George; and (f) Mareeba?

“2. Are restrictions on the use of water imposed in any of the abovementioned areas and, if so, in which of such areas?”

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) replied—

“1. The fixing of charges for the supply of water in irrigation areas during 1956-1957 is now receiving consideration. Legislation requires that charges be authorised by Order in Council, copies of which will be tabled in this House when issued.

“2. No restrictions are imposed on the use of water in the operating irrigation areas at the present time and would only apply when the condition of storages required such action. Water is supplied to irrigators in accordance with their requirements on a roster basis, and in Theodore, Millaroo, and Dalbeg on a 24-hour day basis.”

THURSDAY, 9 AUGUST, 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. J. H. Mann, Brisbane) took the chair at 11 a.m.

QUESTIONS.

SCHOOL CLASSES, METROPOLITAN AREA.

Mr. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“Will he please advise how many school classes in the metropolitan area, and under the control of one teacher, there were at the end of June, 1956, consisting of the following total pupils:—(a) 50, but under 60; (b) 60, but under 70; (c) 70, but under 80; (d) 80, but under 90; (e) 90, or over?”

Hon. L. F. DIPLOCK (Condamine) replied—

“Under 40, 311; 40 to 49, 685; 50 to 59, 402; 60 to 69, 63; 70 to 79, 1; 80 to 89, nil; 90 and over, nil. The hon. member will note, by comparison with information supplied on this subject during the last session of Parliament, the marked improvement in the staffing of schools due to the vigorous policy pursued by the Government in the recruitment of teachers.”

WOOL-LADEN RAILWAY TRUCKS.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Minister for Transport—

“Will he kindly advise the House the estimated number of wool-laden railway trucks which are held up at various railway stations and sidings throughout the State and are thus not in effective use?”

Hon. J. E. DUGGAN (Toowoomba) replied—

“Approximately the equivalent of 260 four-wheeled wagons.”

WATER CHARGES, IRRIGATION AREAS.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) asked the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation—

“1. What are the charges (if any) for water payable during 1956-1957 by settlers

SEPTIC SYSTEM, OAKLEIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“Further to my question to his predecessor on 24 August last year in relation to installation of septic systems in schools in the Mt. Coot-tha electorate, and subsequent personal representations in relation to the Oakleigh State School in particular, will he please advise whether it is the intention to instal such facility at this school during this financial year?”

Hon. L. F. DIPLOCK (Condamine) replied—

“The present policy of the Government provides for the installation of septic systems at State schools where the water supply is adequate and suitable drainage can be arranged and consistent with this policy, the claims of the schools in the Mt. Coot-tha electorate, including that of Oakleigh school will receive consideration in due course, and in conjunction with the claims of other schools in various parts of the State.”

PLANS TO COMBAT TICK MENACE, LOCKYER AND DARLING DOWNS.

Mr. CHALK (Lockyer) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“In view of the spread of cattle ticks into certain clean areas in the Lockyer district and also on to the Darling Downs, and the fact that public meetings have been held and the views of such meetings conveyed to the Minister’s Department by way of deputation and written resolutions, will he make a public statement covering the present plans proposed by his Department in an endeavour to combat the spread of ticks both immediately below and above the Dividing Range, and whether such plans

include the charging at the Government's expense of rucide dips at certain points, and, if so, where are these dips situated?"

Hon. H. H. COLLINS (Tablelands) replied—

"The Lockyer district and certain sections of the Darling Downs are now more heavily infested with cattle tick than usual. Following a public meeting of stock-owners in Toowoomba called by the Darling Downs Local Authorities Development Association a deputation appointed by the meeting requested that action be taken by the Department of Agriculture and Stock to deal with these infestations. Plans for cleansing the areas concerned have been evolved by the Department and conveyed in writing to the secretary of the Darling Downs Local Authorities Development Association. To achieve this objective the dips charged with rucide by the Government at Nanango, East Nanango, Yarraman (Rocky Creek), Cooyar, Anduramba, Ravensbourne, Murphy's Creek (McCormacks), Helidon, West Haldon, The Falls and Mt. Edwards will be used and in addition dips at Flagstone Creek and Bum Bum Creek are about to be charged."

Mining for Beach Sands, South Coast District.

Mr. GAVEN (Southport) asked the Secretary for Mines—

"In respect of the South Coast areas, will he kindly furnish the following information for each of the years, 1953-1954, 1954-1955, and 1955-1956, relating only to the group of minerals commonly found in beach sands:—(a) Total area of (i) Crown land and (ii) private land, covered by mining tenures; (b) Total area of (i) Crown land and (ii) private land, actually worked in pursuance of such mining tenures; (c) Total annual revenue to the Crown from rental of such mining tenures; (d) Total annual revenue to the Crown from royalty on minerals won from such mining tenures; (e) Total value of minerals won from such mining tenures?"

Hon. G. H. DEVRIES (Gregory) replied—

"It is not possible to furnish the information in the form sought, that is, for each of three financial years, as mining leases are being regularly applied for, withdrawn rejected or approved throughout a year. At this date, however, the information sought under the various headings is as follows:—(a) Areas applied for under mining leases—(i) Crown land, applications approved, 9,014 acres 1 rood 23 perches; applied for but not yet approved, 4,239 acres 2 roods 27 perches. (ii) Private land, applications approved, 359 acres 3 roods 4 perches; applied for but not yet approved, 5,782 acres 3 roods 8 perches; total, 19,396 acres 2 roods 22 perches. (b) The information is not available. (c) £9,561. (d)

Royalty is payable as from 1 January, 1956, but as royalty returns for the half-year ended 30 June, 1956, are not due until 30 September next, it is not possible at this stage to ascertain total royalty for that half year. (e) 1953, £969,983; 1954, £890,836; 1955, £1,154,157; 1956 (March quarter only), £339,624."

REVENUE FROM LAND TAX AND SUCCESSION AND PROBATE AND GIFT DUTIES.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Darlington) asked the Treasurer—

"What amount of revenue was received under the following headings during the year 1955-1956:—(a) Land Tax; (b) Succession and Probate Duties; (c) Gift Duty?"

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg) replied—

"(a) £1,386,451; (b) £2,947,743; (c) £183,739."

FEDERAL AID ROADS GRANTS.

Mr. HEADING (Marodian) asked the Minister for Transport—

"With reference to his reply on 7 August last in which he indicated that £5,009,361 had been received from the Commonwealth Government by way of Federal Aid Roads Grants during 1955-1956, and that during this period the amount allocated for Local Authorities was £1,028,125, will he kindly advise in what manner the balance of the moneys received, namely £3,981,236, was expended?"

Hon. J. E. DUGGAN (Toowoomba) replied—

"These moneys were spent on the construction and maintenance of roads declared under the Main Roads Acts, having been paid into the Main Roads Fund, from which the total expenditure was £10,307,345."

SATELLITE TOWNSHIP AT CLUDEN.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) asked the Secretary for Public Works, Housing and Immigration—

"In view of the pressing need for many more Housing Commission homes in Townsville, and the claims of the Government that no suitable building sites are available, will he inform the House why the Housing Commission picked the eyes out of the 300 acres of land available at Cluden and resumed only 43 acres for home building sites instead of resuming the whole area, and building a satellite township there in Townsville as was done in Brisbane at Inala?"

Hon. C. G. McCATHIE (Haughton) replied—

"The area of approximately 43 acres was resumed because it was most suitable for the erection of houses and because the

owner would not agree to sell that area. When resumption action was under consideration, the Townsville City Council advised that it was of the opinion that a scheme in this locality should not proceed. Now as further industry is to be established at Stuart, the council is in favour of large-scale housing development in the area. A subdivisional plan making provision for 158 allotments with shopping sites and an area retained for future developmental projects, has been approved. Action has now been taken, following my personal inspection of the area with the Townsville City Council recently, to re-examine a further piece of land of approximately 40 to 50 acres of the balance of the 300 acres referred to. As the area concerned is in my electorate, I can assure the hon. member for Mundiburra that I am quite capable of looking after the housing needs in my area, and, for that matter, in the City of Townsville.''

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Report of the Queensland Coal Board for the year 1955-1956.

Order in Council under the Labour and Industry Acts, 1946 to 1952.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE—THIRD ALLOTTED DAY.

Debate resumed from 8 August (see p. 180) on Mr. Moores's motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, on which Mr. Nicklin had moved the following amendment—

“Add to the question the following words—

‘We desire to inform Your Excellency, however, that, in the opinion of this Legislature, your present advisers are not fit and proper persons to form your Executive Council, in that—

(a) A Royal Commission, appointed by Your Excellency's Command to inquire into and report on allegations of corruption relating to dealings with certain Crown leaseholds in this State, has, by report dated the eighth day of June, 1956, proved corruption within a Government Department, namely the Department of Public Lands, which corruption involves and implicates one of the members of Her Majesty's Government, and also the political party to which your present advisers owe allegiance and from which such advisers are drawn; and

(b) Your present advisers have failed to maintain law and order in the western regions of this State to such degree that offences against the statute law involving bodily harm to the person are of alarmingly frequent occurrence; that law-abiding citizens

go continually in fear of bodily harm to their persons; and that persons committing offences of such nature are not being brought to justice; and

(c) Your present advisers have mismanaged and are mismanaging the business undertakings of Her Majesty's Government by failing to take all steps necessary to ensure the prompt and satisfactory transport of all wool lawfully consigned to and accepted by the Railway Department, thereby seriously and detrimentally affecting the basic economy of this State and causing huge and unwarranted losses in the trading accounts of the Railway Department; and

(d) Your present advisers have wholly failed to uphold and maintain the industrial laws of this State'.''

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg—Treasurer) (11.12 a.m.): At the outset I state that I am speaking to the amendment. I should like you, Mr. Speaker, to give an intimation whether that will deprive me of the right to speak subsequently to the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly not. My ruling is that any hon. member who has spoken to the amendment will have an opportunity of speaking again to the Address in Reply, except the mover and seconder of the motion, together with the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader.

Mr. WALSH: I was more or less protecting my rights, knowing that I might desire to say something later on.

The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition is clear. It comes under four headings, (a), (b), (c), and (d).

I should say it would be generally agreed that Opposition members who have spoken to the amendment have devoted the bulk of their time to paragraph (a).

Mr. Aikens: I wondered why they moved the other three, paragraphs (b), (c) and (d).

Mr. WALSH: Surely to goodness none of us would deny that the matters in the subsequent headings are of some importance to this State and to the orderly economy of the State, but how many Opposition members who have spoken in support of the amendment have dealt with those particular subjects?

Mr. Power: None.

Mr. WALSH: The Leader of the Opposition knows now if he did not know before that he has surrendered his right to speak again, having spoken to the motion and moved his amendment.

I wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition is seriously concerned about the things mentioned under the other heads of

this amendment? It is all very well for the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha to laugh and giggle about it.

I take it that all the points mentioned in the amendment are serious matters.

Mr. Morris: That is why they are there.

Mr. WALSH: Consequently I felt that it would be only fair to hon. members generally that Mr. Speaker should rule as to the rights of hon. members to speak. I asked for that ruling in case I should want to speak subsequently on other matters.

Mr. Morris: You should have known.

Mr. WALSH: The amendment could be classed as the finale of a bitter personal, political and sectarian campaign, under each of its headings. I intend to deal with that as I go along. Since the Press have backed the Opposition, and have lashed out on the Government, I will not depart from my usual tactics of expressing my opinion of the conduct of hon. members opposite in respect of these things. I do not care who the persons are who might subsequently be the subject of my comment because, after all, if I were involved, there would be no sympathy for me—none whatever.

Mr. Nicholson interjected.

Mr. WALSH: It is quite true, as the hon. member for Murrumba says, I do not look for sympathy. It is clear that, prior to the campaign's getting under way earlier this year, there was a clear-cut plan by the Opposition to engage in this sort of propaganda, and the only thing that disappointed them was that it broke too early. They would have been more pleased if Senator Wood had held his tongue until a little later, because there is evidence in my possession which clearly indicates—and I shall refer to it later—that prominent people who backed the Country Party knew of these things, and it was their intention to drop the matter just before the election. The unfortunate thing is that they were able to find within the structure of the Labour movement a receptive ear and thereby associated themselves with a campaign that sought to destroy the Labour Government in this State.

I have made interjections from this side of the House about contributions to Opposition funds and the Opposition have as much right to make similar observations in respect of Labour Party funds, so long as they are true. Why be frightened of the truth. I shall deal with that, too, as I go along.

The next phase was that it was very evident that they had invoked the aid of the more irresponsible section of those who class themselves as leaders of Christian thought, and it must have been a sorry day for the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman for Mt. Coot-tha that the Presbyterian Assembly of this State decided it would have no association with such a campaign.

Mr. Morris: It is their business.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. gentleman shows more than an ordinary interest in it.

Mr. Morris: That is not true.

Mr. WALSH: We shall see about that later on. All I say at this stage is, although I am not so intimately associated with the reverend gentleman who took the lead in that respect, in the terms of the judicial reference, at least he showed consistency of conduct. In 1938, when stationed at Mackay, he made it very evident to those who were crusading the length and breadth of the State that there was no place in Mackay for such a mission. At least we concede to him that he stands up to the principles of his Christian religion as do the great bulk of those who belong to his religion.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke about party funds and took up the story told by the Press, which is fanned by people within the Labour movement who put themselves forward as real Labour men. They are supplying the traditional opponents of the Labour Party with material in an effort to destroy the Labour Government of this State.

Everybody knows that every party leader, whether it be Menzies, Fadden, or anyone else, has a party fund. Everybody should know that in 1949 the banks contributed thousands of pounds to defeat the Chifley Labour Government. Although they are crying out today for a financial policy like Chifley's, in those days they regarded it as a real challenge to them. I am not blaming the banks for contributing to the funds of the Opposition party if they think—and I am sure they do—that Labour's opponents are the only political party that would give them protection to exploit the people of this country. They are quite justified in contributing to the funds of our opponents. Again, because of the substantial funds that were at the disposal of the Opposition during the recent State elections, there is no doubt in my mind that the oil companies contributed to them.

Mr. Morris: You are drawing on your imagination.

Mr. WALSH: Not on my imagination. I refer particularly to one oil company, which paid particular attention to the fight against the Labour Government in this State because of the stand the Minister in charge of prices took against its agitation for an increase in the price of petrol.

Mr. Lloyd Roberts: Your Government gave the oil companies a surcharge of 5d. a gallon in Mackay.

Mr. WALSH: Is that so? The hon. member for Whitsunday will have an opportunity of explaining that statement later on. If it is as irresponsible as his usual statements are, and as he is one of those who engage in sectarian issues—

Mr. Lloyd Roberts: You would not know—

Mr. WALSH: I ask the hon. member not to provoke me into giving instances.

The oil companies have concentrated on the fight against the Labour Government in this State for the reason I have already pointed out. In passing, when we look for those who are peddling the wares of the oil companies as intermediaries between the Government and the oil companies, no doubt the Premier or somebody else will have something to say in this House one day about a gentleman named Smedley.

Mr. Morris: Who is he?

Mr. WALSH: Lest the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha think I am drawing on my imagination I will quote an extract from a communication that I am sure the Leader of the Opposition must know something about.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. I do not want to stop the Treasurer from saying what he proposes to say, but in order to have it straight in the record, why did you stop me the other day from saying the things that the Treasurer is now about to say? Why is there one rule for me and another for him?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition in moving his amendment spoke about an alleged bribe of £1,000 or asking for party funds and the Treasurer is replying to that. At any time that I stopped the hon. member for Mundingburra he was out of order.

Mr. Aikens: One rule for me and another rule for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. Aikens: Everyone knows it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That is a reflection on the Chair and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. Aikens: Very well, I withdraw it, but everyone knows—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WALSH: I quote this extract from a communication that the Leader of the Opposition must know something about.

Mr. Nicklin: Why must he?

Mr. WALSH: I will show the hon. gentleman. It reads—

“During the State Campaign, our Mr. Hopkins called on Banks and other Organisations, and many expressed surprise and even concern when advised that this Organisation had not received a share of the contributions.”

“For the State Elections, the Banks said that they would make a contribution only to your Body, but would ask that a proportion be earmarked for this Organisation. Certain letters on this subject have been received and we hold them here as they are confidential.

“When I attended the Meetings of the Central Council, I did not desire to raise these issues as they would have caused comment and probably had a very far-reaching effect on subscribers who, naturally, do not want the fact that they contribute to our funds discussed. Our case, naturally, is at a disadvantage, but would like your Management Committee to consider the following suggestions.”

Now does the hon. gentleman know where the communication came from?

Mr. Nicklin: No, I do not.

Mr. WALSH: Apparently the hon. gentleman has not followed these discussions as he should. There would be no doubt about the heading on that.

An Opposition Member: We cannot see it from here.

Mr. WALSH: I will read it—“Northern Country Party Organisation”.

Mr. Nicklin: What is the date on it?

Mr. WALSH: That is immaterial. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WALSH: Surely the hon. gentleman does not think he can floor me with that one. The date is 13 August, 1947.

Mr. Aikens: That was the same year as Bell said Foley asked him for £1,000.

Mr. WALSH: Two years later. In any case, the Opposition would be very foolish to deny that the banks and oil companies contribute to their funds.

Mr. Hiley: Are you presenting this as an argument in justification of the £1,000 attempt?

Mr. WALSH: No. I will come to that. I am merely replying to the points that were discussed by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nicklin: Pretty widely, too.

Mr. WALSH: Not wide at all. The hon. gentleman attacked the Premier's Party political fund. Mr. Speaker has ruled that I have the right to speak on it and of course I have. Let the hon. gentleman not worry about my not dealing with the other phases.

The hon. member for Coorparoo adopted a somewhat different attitude from other hon. members opposite. I do not say that with any idea of currying favour with him, nor does my statement let him out of what I may have to say later. But I think it will be agreed that at least he paid some attention to the speeches from the Government side. He analysed the speeches of the hon. member for Belyando, the Premier, and so on. Of course I do not agree with everything he said, but I agree with some of the things he said just as he agreed with some of the things that the Government have done in this matter.

After a lot of deliberation I would say with all due respect that the outlook of the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha and the other hon. member who is not now present—the hon. member for Yeronga—was largely clouded by sectarianism.

Mr. NICKLIN: I rise to a point of order. Is the Minister in order in imputing wrong motives to myself when he says that my motives in approaching this thing were connected with sectarianism? I absolutely deny that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the Treasurer to accept the denial of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WALSH: I accept the hon. gentleman's denial in accordance with the practices and customs of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the Treasurer accept the denial of the Leader of the Opposition without qualification?

Mr. Nicklin: I ask the hon. gentleman to accept the denial without any further qualification.

Mr. WALSH: It is true that it is customary to withdraw these things unreservedly. Although it may be necessary for me to make amends under the Standing Orders for what I might say in the House, it does not deprive me of my thoughts outside the House.

Mr. Nicklin: Nobody cares what the Treasurer thinks outside.

Mr. WALSH: My statements on many of these matters are largely based on the actions of speakers in the House from time to time and their different approaches. If his outlook is clouded by issues that should be foreign to the political structure of the country, how can any hon. member from either side of the House think objectively on the major issue confronting us? If he is looking for paltry little things like what has happened within our own structure to-day, how can he concentrate on the things that are important to the State's economy?

Most of my remarks will be in reply to what has been said. For example, the hon. member for Coorparoo said that if a judge reported in favour of the Government, that is all right, but if a judge reported in the reverse way then it is a different question. I hope I am not misinterpreting his remarks. All hon. members will have a clear recollection of his making that observation.

Mr. HILEY: I rise to a point of order. It is true that I used that by way of illustration. I said that if any judge appointed to a royal commission found that when he said something that pleased the Government he was lauded and when he said something that displeased the Government he would be slandered and brow-beaten for it,

that that would be a terrible and monstrous thing. That was the theme I presented and I ask the Treasurer to accept it.

Mr. WALSH: There is no need to ask me to accept it if that was the hon. member's expression and the explanation he wished to convey. Unfortunately, that is not the way the Press or the radio may convey it to the multitude of people who are reading and listening. If I sat in my home last night and heard on the radio that observation attributed to the hon. member for Coorparoo do you blame me for my approach today?

Mr. Hiley: Make your attack on the radio and the Press.

Mr. WALSH: Very good. We have the explanation. I said that I hoped I was not misinterpreting the hon. member's observation.

Mr. Morris: But you knew you were.

Mr. WALSH: There is no question about it; when I want to I will. I am sure I am not misinterpreting the remarks of the hon. member for Yeronga when he made his reference to the late Mr. Justice E. A. Douglas when he was appointed to report on a matter which implicated an hon. member on this side of the House, something within the political structure. There was the suggestion that this judge, because he had done what, in his opinion, was his duty, was victimised by a Labour Government.

Dr. Noble: That is what the people of Queensland believe.

Mr. WALSH: The people of Queensland would not know anything about him. If there is anybody who embarked upon a more deliberate, misleading, treacherous sectarian campaign, it is the hon. member for Yeronga.

Dr. Noble: I object to the statement that I embarked upon a misleading, treacherous sectarian campaign. I am not at all bigoted. Some members on the other side are.

Mr. SPEAKER: The honourable the Treasurer.

Mr. WALSH: At least, although I say it, I do not think anybody will trace my tongue anywhere in public or private life regarding those matters. Too frequently the tongue of people within the structure of politics has been traced regarding this phase of our life. You might just as well argue, if you get onto that phase, that two members of the judiciary at the present time, the Chief Justice, Mr. Alan Mansfield, and Mr. Justice Ross Philp were appointed to their positions because they were counsel for Theodore in the Mungana case. What humbug! Let us be decent about it.

Mr. Aikens: Let us admit that it is a popular belief.

Mr. WALSH: Well, I do not know. Probably the observation I could make in regard to the hon. member for Mundingburra and one that would fit the hon. member for Yeronga too would not be Parliamentary.

Mr. Aikens: Don't you take me on.

Mr. WALSH: Do not throw out any unnecessary challenges. Would anybody here say that either the Chief Justice of this State or Mr. Justice Philp were Labour supporters? They are entitled to their politics. They were appointed to the bench by a Labour Government. But you would still get the mind that would say because they appeared for a prominent figure in the Labour Party that they had had bestowed on them some right or concession. Then you get even within our own structure outside this House Labour supporters who thought why did he go to Mr. McGill when the man I referred to previously was implicated in a political matter in 1938 and sought the services of Mr. A. D. McGill, President of the Queensland People's Party?

Mr. H. B. Taylor: The Queensland People's Party did not exist then.

Mr. WALSH: I was thinking of the M.C.O. and the Nationalists—they are all the same party. Hon. members opposite will not deny that Mr. McGill was the President of the Opposition Party in this State. What I am trying to convey is that Mr. McGill stood out in the legal world, and any man, irrespective of his politics or religion, would seek his assistance when looking for counsel for the defence. Let us do away with all this silly childish approach to these matters. If we cannot trust these men in their jobs, well, it is just too bad.

I now come to what I think is a very important part of this discussion, and I feel that in order to deal with the matter logically you have to go through it from the beginning. We have to satisfy ourselves as to the reasons for the appointment of the Royal Commission in the first place. Some hon. members in this House claimed that so-and-so was responsible and others claimed something else. If we were looking for the modern parallel of certain of those claiming the credit in this matter, where would we look?

What exactly did this person do? He said he found that he disagreed with the policy being pursued by his superiors. In respect of that policy he decided they were wrong and that he was right. In this situation he determined to go and did in fact go to the enemy in the sense of those he knew were opposed to his superiors, and gave them all the information in his possession, information that came to him only by virtue of the position of trust he held.

Mr. Morris: One of the Opposition speakers was prevented yesterday from discussing that very thing.

Mr. WALSH: I am not going to discuss it. Who are the modern parallels in a similar set of circumstances, men who were employed in positions of trust, obtained information by virtue of those positions, disagreed with the policy they were asked to carry out, went over to the enemy and disclosed all the information in their possession, information which in their case also had been obtained only by virtue of the positions of trust that they held? The people I have in mind are Pontecorvo, Dr. Klaus Fuchs, Nunn May, Burgess and McLean, men who would I hope be condemned without hesitation by the whole of this country, the western world and everybody in this Parliament as traitors to their country of the worst possible kind. I say that by way of introduction to my statements as to the reasons for setting up the Commission, a subject that has been debated at length.

Since they have been explained during the course of the proceedings of the Commission, there is no reason for me to take up a lot of time giving the reasons. Whether Senator Wood, Creighton, the Australian Workers' Union or "The Worker" was responsible does not matter. The Commissioner himself said that he was appointed to inquire into certain things arising out of Senator Wood's speech in the Senate.

So that I can make myself perfectly clear in respect of this matter I mention that I followed the proceedings before the Commission day after day. There was barely a night of a day of the sittings that I did not read the whole of the transcript. My observations as to the proceedings, the evidence given before the Commission and the conduct of counsel are made with some knowledge at least, as I read the transcript of proceedings.

Mr. Aikens: Did the hon. gentleman reach the same conclusion as Mr. Justice Townley?

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member is not going to get any speeches out of me in reply to interjections.

There should be general agreement that there could be no complaint as far as the Commissioner is concerned about the way proceedings were conducted.

Mr. Hiley: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. WALSH: There is no reason why it could be held otherwise.

Mr. Hiley: That was said from the Government side.

Mr. WALSH: No. That was a different matter altogether. The hon. member for Belyando under the circumstances was quite entitled to make his own observations on the findings, and if I had been in his position I probably would have said all that he said and a lot more.

There could be no complaint about the conduct of proceedings as far as the Commissioner is concerned. As a matter of fact

I formed the opinion from day to day that he was particularly tolerant, and more so in respect of the submissions that were made by counsel for Mr. Creighton and in the first place by counsel for Senator Wood, not that the Commissioner did not eventually put the particular counsel in his place. There is evidence that he intended to and did allow the fullest latitude in submissions and presentation of any evidence from any source so that the subject could be fully investigated.

As the Premier did, I agree with the Commissioner's report and the findings to the extent that he has at least based those findings on the evidence submitted to him, and if he did that there can be no complaint from anybody in this House. He was only asked to make his decisions on the evidence before him. There is much that may be said about the proceedings of the Commission and their effect on honest men, and it is a matter about which I am sure the Premier will have something to say later on. At all times the Commissioner was strictly judicial in the conduct of the Commission. I go further and say that if for any reason I was to appear before the same Commissioner as a judge in a court I would have the feeling that I was getting a fair go. I do not think I would place him in the category of some judges who have sat on the bench in this State, where there was the impression left, anyhow, that the judge sat as a judge, prosecutor and jury all in one. That sometimes gives one food for thought particularly when you see judges acting in that way. There is something that I will say regarding such matters. The Commissioner's task was made more difficult because of the intrusion of party politics, not that they were brought into the proceedings by the Commissioner himself or the counsel assisting the Commission or counsel appearing for the Department of Public Lands or other counsel. I am not going to remove from my mind that politics did play a part in the leading up to this question and during the hearing. "The Courier-Mail" played its part, true to form, of course. Why would it not? It was in the battle and in the gang-up of monopoly interests in this State against the Government, and anything it featured in respect of this case which could underwrite the Government and give a lift to the Opposition it did to the fullest advantage. That is no credit to that paper, although I said the other day that it gave a reasonable resume of the report of proceedings. Since the proceedings, at every turn, in its editorials and otherwise it has sought to use the findings of the Commission against the Government, without justification at all.

Attacks on counsel, Mr. McCawley and Mr. Casey, were engaged in, from this side of the House—not by a member of my party—and by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Barambah. What was the particular object of attacking Mr. Casey in this House? How

could anybody unless he followed the transcript of proceedings and had read the report carefully be in a position to adjudicate on the attitude of counsel before the Commission? So far as Mr. Casey is concerned my observations show that at all times he endeavoured to assist the Commissioner in keeping the proceedings on the proper level. There are quite a few parts of the transcript to which I could refer, but I refer particularly to page 1595, the last paragraph—

"Mr. CASEY: I would submit that undoubtedly Your Honour could. The question is whether Your Honour should. There would undoubtedly be uppermost in Your Honour's mind consideration of whether or not proceeding with the consideration of this matter would not tend to bring the administration of justice somewhat into disrespect."

That is a clear indication that at that stage counsel assisting the Commission could see that politics were being drawn into it, and he regarded it as his duty to draw attention to it.

I come now to the right of a person who holds a commission from the Queen to withhold information. Are we to take it from the attitude of the Opposition that any person who holds a commission from the Queen, irrespective of his status in life, is entitled to hold unto himself information of a criminal nature? In this case it was information of a criminal nature to the extent that the Commissioner found so in respect of Bell's allegations, although it was not proved in a court of law. Will hon. members opposite extend that right to Ministers of the Crown who are in a similar position? Will they concede it to other people who hold commissions from the Queen, such as the Chairman of the Land Administration Board? I am not now referring to the man himself—everybody knows he is due to go out today, depending on the decision of the Executive Council—but is the holder of the office of Chairman of the Land Administration Board entitled to hold unto himself information related to corrupt or criminal practices in public administration? If hon. members opposite concede that right to judges and others, they must concede it to Ministers of the Crown.

Mr. Morris: The hon. member for Carnarvon knew there was a suggestion of bribery.

Mr. WALSH: That interjection shows that the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha does not intend to approach this matter in an intelligent way. At least the hon. member for Carnarvon—and the hon. member for Charters Towers—revealed to the Premier information that was in their possession. That information was related only to "Lundavra," in respect of which the Commissioner subsequently found there was not a scintilla of evidence to suggest corrupt practices. Were not the Premier and Cabinet entitled to come to a decision, on the information before them,

that there was no justification for proceeding any further with the allegations about "Lundavra?" Hon. members opposite cannot say that any Minister has breached his office by withholding information.

Mr. Aikens: If the Commission had not been held, Cameron would probably have got what he was after.

Mr. WALSH: I do not want to listen to the hon. member's silly nonsense. If he wants to talk in a provocative strain, let him do so outside the House.

Somebody will say that I had certain evidence in my possession. That has not been denied. The evidence given before the Commission—and it was quoted here the other day—shows that I was a party to certain discussions. That was admitted by the hon. member for Belyando. I am absolved from any charge of withholding information, although at that stage I did not hold a commission from the Queen.

When I start to study these things, I ask myself where it starts and where it finishes. What right is whose right? We are entitled to voice our opinions as to where it should start and finish. If I took notice of all the rumours that I hear, I would waste my time trying to follow them up. For example, how far would I go if I listened to bar-room gossip implying that a prominent member of the legal profession held 1,000 shares in a drive-in theatre, which he got because of his help in getting the licence? If on a subsequent check I find that the gentleman does hold 1,000 shares, it might well add to my suspicions. But it still would not provide me with evidence that he acquired those shares in an irregular way.

Mr. Hiley: Except that as the custodian of State revenues you would probably have a particular duty to tell the Commissioner of Taxes to investigate it.

Mr. WALSH: I would assume he had conducted his business on legitimate lines.

Mr. Hiley: In that case, where is the background to all the innuendo?

Mr. WALSH: It is not innuendo. I say the statement is made as part of the same bar-room gossip as that about "Lundavra" and all the other matters raised by hon. members on both sides. That is not denied.

(Time, on motion of Mr. R. J. Gardner, extended.)

Mr. WALSH: I thank hon. members for their indulgence. Whether it be bar-room gossip or anything else, I do not ask hon. members to accept my word for this, as I have not seen the publication, but I have been told that evidence was put in the hands of members of the Opposition, not necessarily named, of certain happenings that would disqualify members of the House from holding their seat. The matter was published in the "Downs Star." "The Courier-Mail" made no reference to

it. I understand the paper said the information was put into the hands of the Opposition. If hon. members opposite are so keen on clean administration let them say what they have done about it.

Mr. Hiley: We have not seen it.

Mr. WALSH: It is in a publication. I have not been able to trace it and I do not know whether the parliamentary library takes in that publication.

Mr. Nicholson: Produce the evidence.

Mr. WALSH: Make no mistake about it, I am making the statements on good grounds. Let the hon. member not worry about challenges. He can stake his life on it, I will dig it up.

Mr. Nicholson: Why haven't you got it now?

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member will not be any better pleased when I produce it.

Mr. Nicholson: It won't worry me.

Mr. WALSH: It may not. I do not know whether it will or not. It has been said that judges are entitled to protection in carrying out their duties. It has long been accepted, and I hope it will continue to be, that the House should not be used to air personal objections to individual judges. But it is not all one-way traffic. There have been instances where at least one judge, now deceased, from his place on the bench made reflections on every hon. member of the House. Because he makes such a statement from the bench, are hon. members to be denied the right to reply?

An Opposition Member: Who was that?

Mr. WALSH: I am not going to talk about dead men. Let the hon. member search through "Hansard." I protested in the House at the time. He said from the Bench that members of Parliament were in Parliament for what they could get out of it. That is a nasty slur. I did not see any hon. member of the Opposition rising in his place to object to such a statement.

Mr. Hiley: Roughly when was it?

Mr. WALSH: It was some years back. Hon. members can take my word that I mentioned it in the House and it is in the journals of this Parliament. Again I was the subject of what I consider a very malicious attack against a Minister and another person holding a Queen's commission, the President of the Land Court. I adequately dealt with it in the House at the time. We have to exercise our right at some stage. There is a proper procedure laid down and if there were no other way of dealing with a matter of that nature I would not hesitate to consult the Leader of the Government and ask that this procedure should be followed. I do not think I have to do that. Whilst it is agreed that there is and should continue to be protection against

unjustifiable criticism of judges, they also have their responsibilities and obligations. It will be agreed that at all times judges should be judicial in the carrying out of their duties. The protection of judges against criticism can be justified only if they carry out their duties in accordance with the accepted standards of practice and the ethics of their office. I have the name of the judge in my notes to whom I have been referring but I will not mention it. The man has been dead for some years.

As to the right of persons holding a Queen's commission to withhold information of an important nature, it would appear from evidence that Messrs. McLean and Lucy did in fact convey certain information, although not necessarily to the right source. At least they did convey it and did not withhold it. There was no evidence that the witness Philp had at any time attempted to convey to the proper authority such alarming information. Hon. members will agree that that is serious. If I were in possession of the same knowledge and withheld it for over six years there would be nothing too damning that could be said from the other side of the House. Hon. members would be entitled to attack and condemn me if I withheld information for six years which suggested that a Minister of the Crown had corrupted his office.

Mr. Morris: Even though it was only hearsay you maintain it was his duty to do that? I completely disagree.

Mr. WALSH: I am not taking any hearsay evidence whatever. I am talking about the evidence of witness Philp himself that, on 14 December, at this place at the corner, he became possessed of that knowledge in 1949.

Mr. Morris: At that stage it was his.

Mr. WALSH: At that stage it was his! If I were in the same position you could say at that stage it was mine, and I would have to keep it to myself and say nothing about it? If it was information of the nature that might involve one of my colleagues in the Cabinet you would not have justified my action if I kept it to myself.

Mr. HILEY: I rise to a point of order. I listened to the hon. gentleman develop his case in order to determine the implications that must flow from it. After listening carefully I submit the argument being presented is of a character which, in accordance with our Standing Orders, and Rules and Practice, can only be presented to the House under cover of a substantive motion. This is being presented in a manner that is only consistent with criticism of a member of the judiciary.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member invites my ruling. I give the same ruling today that I gave the other day. Mr. Justice Philp was a witness at the Royal Commission and as such the Treasurer is dealing with him—on the basis of the evidence he gave.

Mr. HILEY: I rise to a further point of order. Had it been presented in that manner the position would have been different. I invite your recollection of the particular argument presented by the Treasurer in which he made it clear that he was not criticising him as an ordinary person but as a holder of a Queen's commission. The only commission—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I appreciate the fact that Mr. Justice Philp has a commission from Her Majesty the Queen, but as such the judge placed himself in the position of a witness before the Commission. I judge that the Treasurer is dealing with His Honour as a witness at the Commission. I feel sure that the Treasurer will not reflect on the judge as a judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. WALSH: You can accept my assurance, Mr. Speaker, on that. There is no reason why I should. Personally I have the greatest respect for them.

Mr. Fletcher interjected.

Mr. WALSH: I do not know what the line of the hon. member for Cunningham is going to be. I do not want to listen to a lot of humbug from him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WALSH: Where do we get in this line of differentiation, between positions held by members of the Executive Council, the Governor, or judges? I am not going to develop any criticism of a judge as a judge. As far as that approach is concerned I have made my position clear.

Mr. Hiley: You make your argument on the plea of being a holder of a Queen's commission.

Mr. WALSH: Is there anything wrong with that? In the first place, if the Chairman of the Land Administration Board as chairman has a Queen's commission, has he the right to withhold information? As the holder of a Queen's commission has any other person the right to withhold information. It is a remarkable thing that over at the Queensland Club with all its members the one person who could be picked out was witness Philp. Don't tell me that no other member of the club knew about it.

Mr. Morris: You are only justified in doing this if you do it under a substantive motion; and you know it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Morris: The Speaker knows it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman must not reflect on the Chair. If the hon. gentleman disagrees with my interpretation of the Standing Orders he has his rights, but in reflecting on the Chair he is doing something that is not in keeping with

the Standing Orders. If the hon. gentleman does not conform to the Standing Orders I shall take steps to deal with him.

Mr. Morris: You can.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw any reflection he has made on the Chair. If the hon. gentleman does not do so I shall take steps to deal with him.

Mr. Morris: I have made no reflection on the chair, but I disagree with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member disagrees with my ruling?

Mr. Morris: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has his remedy. He may move a motion of dissent to the ruling, or withdraw the remark.

Mr. Morris: I give notice that I shall move a motion of dissent to Mr. Speaker's ruling.

Mr. WALSH: I am entitled to draw attention to this matter, and is it not reasonable to assume, having in mind the membership of that club, that persons other than the witness who called knew about it? I am not going to divulge confidences, but I know in my own heart that other members of that club knew about it, unless they want to brand themselves as liars.

Mr. Pizzey: The hon. gentleman should have given that information to the Royal Commission.

Mr. WALSH: That has nothing to do with it. If I had had in my possession anything of probative value that would have assisted the Commission, I certainly would have been one of the witnesses.

Having made the point that it is remarkable that one member and one member only of that club was called, may I refer further to this place across the road. What useful purpose it serves, I do not know, but I suggest that it is the centre of bitter political and sectarian propaganda, and I am not making those statements also without some justification. Can any hon. member in this Chamber tell me why the late Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Macrossan was refused membership of the Queensland Club? Is there any hon. member in the House prepared to get up and give reasons for that?

Mr. Hiley: I shall tell the hon. gentleman later.

A Government Member: He did not get enough votes.

Mr. Jesson: They had something against him.

Mr. WALSH: If the explanation of the hon. member for Coorparoo is the same as the story I have heard, I would rather he not tell it, because subsequently another member of the judiciary was admitted as a member and his path was not too easy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WALSH: In saying what I have said about the Queensland Club, I concede that it does not apply to all its members. Mr. Gunn was a member of that club, and, as I have said, I have some written evidence in my possession that he knew about it before the election—well before.

Now I come to Bell's part in the matter.

Mr. Hiley: Before the hon. gentleman leaves that aspect, is he suggesting that this other knowledge emanated from Mr. Justice Philp?

Mr. WALSH: I trust the hon. member for Coorparoo has read the transcript. The transcript suggests that one Francis Marsh Bell was called—and in most unusual circumstances, too—and that there was no evidence, apart from that given by Bell, of the conversation between Bell and the hon. member for Belyando.

Mr. Aikens: What about Mr. McGill's notes?

Mr. WALSH: The evidence of witness Philp was received not to prove the conversation between Mr. Bell and Mr. Foley but to prove consistency of conduct.

Mr. Hiley: That is not right.

Mr. WALSH: The Commissioner said that in his report.

Mr. Hiley: What about the registered letter? What about the telephone call? What about Mr. McGill's handwriting? Those things were all accepted by the Commissioner.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member for Coorparoo knows as well as I do that the evidence of Mr. Justice Philp was accepted in accordance with the practice in judicial circles in this State, other States, and other countries.

Mr. Aikens: Only in criminal jurisdiction.

Mr. WALSH: With all due respect, Mr. Justice Philp is a very capable and competent legal man and he would know before he went into the witness box that his evidence was of no legal value so far as the determination of the charge made against the hon. member for Belyando was concerned.

I shall now get away from that point.

Mr. Morris: The hon. gentleman ought to get away from it.

Mr. WALSH: I have decided that myself.

I now come to my next point that Bell had a political interest. In saying that, I have a recollection that at one time he had ideas of being a member of this House.

Mr. Muller: Never!

Mr. WALSH: Wait a minute. That is only the hon. member's word.

Mr. Muller: Can you produce the slightest evidence. I know it to be a fact.

Mr. WALSH: When the vacancy occurred in the electorate of Stanley I am sure that Mr. Bell, who is accepted generally as a truthful man, will not deny that he had an interview with the late Mr. W. Forgan Smith and left it to that gentleman to determine the matter. Everyone knows that I was pretty close to the late Leader of this Party. Mr. Bell sought his advice—if he stood for the Stanley electorate and became a member of Parliament, could he continue to hold his position on the Queensland Meat Industry Board.

Mr. Muller: That is not true.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member does not know.

Mr. Aikens: A man can have a political interest and still tell the truth.

Mr. WALSH: I am not saying otherwise. I am proceeding to show that at that stage he was keen enough on politics to enter this House but still wanted to retain his position on the Queensland Meat Industry Board. The late Mr. Forgan Smith told him that he had to make up his own mind, that he could not be a member of Parliament and a member of the Board at the same time. He made his choice. I am giving my story to prove his political interest. At that time, when he was desirous of entering this House, he continued to hold his position on the Board right up until he was about to retire, and having removed himself entirely from the atmosphere of politics, he allowed himself to be made the tool or the medium to assist the Opposition in a political campaign. As I have already said, Mr. Gunn knew all about this. This subject will be an occasion for a debate later when I will no doubt make a few observations.

I come to the point now, Mr. Speaker, when I naturally ask myself, should the hon. member for Belyando resign. I have asked myself that question, and I am convinced in my own mind that there is no justification which calls upon him to resign from this House.

Mr. Hiley: Do you accept the Commissioner's findings?

Mr. WALSH: Yes.

Mr. Muller: Wholly accept it in full?

Mr. WALSH: To give my justification for that, I again must turn to the transcript of the evidence. Hon. members will find that during the conduct of the proceedings there was quite an interesting discussion on what constituted corrupt conduct. As the Commissioner pointed out in his report, he did not define it but, I should say, his findings properly, judicially and legally interpreted, could certainly have a very far-reaching effect on the public administration of this State, and for that matter, in any other State if the same interpretation was accepted. I doubt if any Minister in any particular office where he was entrusted with

administering certain laws, has not, in some way, corrupted his office, not intentionally. I do not put this proposition up now to be taken individually or personally. Take for instance, breaches of the traffic law—simple breaches of the traffic law, such as parking cars and speeding—that one would not be a simple one—and all the necessary actions taken by police officers. A police officer does his duty and makes a report containing evidence for a prosecution. However, no action is taken, probably because somebody knows somebody else and makes certain representations. No-one will deny that those things can happen, but on a strict interpretation of the law the man responsible for preventing the taking of any action has corrupted his office.

And so let us get down to a simple definition of the term "corrupt conduct" so that we can understand just how far-reaching its effects can be on a public administrator or a Minister who might be the subject of an inquiry.

Mr. Aikens: Are you suggesting that the Government would hold a royal commission into trivial charges such as that?

Mr. WALSH: It is not a matter of a royal commission, but of the definition of "corrupt conduct." I do not want to waste time answering silly questions by the hon. member for Mundingburra, but I have discussed this matter with prominent legal men, who have assured me that the illustration I have just given is quite pertinent.

An Opposition Member: It is far-fetched.

Mr. WALSH: It is not far-fetched. The same thing applies, for example, to bowling clubs or golf clubs who have been the subject of police attention for breaches of the Liquor Act.

On this matter of corrupt conduct, I quote the following from page 324 of the transcript of proceedings before the Royal Commission:—

"Mr. Casey: May it please Your Honour, there is a matter that has been agitating my mind and I think I should address it to Your Honour now. It is this: Royal Commissions can run riot despite the noblest efforts on the part of the Commission or anyone else to keep them within very definite channels. Considering the Terms of Reference here, I submit it would be reasonable on the part of Your Honour as Commissioner to require of any particular witness, such as the witness now in the box, or his counsel, a statement that he entertains an honest and reasonable belief that any particular matter that he is pursuing will most probably lead to evidence of corrupt conduct. We are not here to inquire into the question of any dispute that might have arisen between the Hon. the Minister and Mr. Creighton as Chairman of the Land Administration Board. However interesting it may be, it

is not at all relevant to this Commission to find that Mr. Foley and Mr. Creighton were at times in conflict, so I submit that, before we embark on an investigation of Lundavra or any other file (and I assume that there are thousands of them, perhaps, in the Lands Department)—before this Commission takes on the aspect of an inquiry, departmental or otherwise, into lands administration, the basis should be set by either the witness or his counsel that that bona fide relief to which I have referred exists.”

Was that not an honest approach to the matter?

The transcript continues—

“The Commissioner: It is a matter that has been exercising my mind, too, and what I proposed to do was to wait until Mr. Wanstall had finished dealing with Lundavra and Bullamon Plains and then ask him if the rest of the evidence in relation to these specific properties that have been mentioned was going to be of the same calibre and, if so, what relevance has the evidence to charges of corrupt conduct.”

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. ENGLISH (Mulgrave): I move—

“That the Treasurer be granted a further extension of time to complete his speech.”

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is no provision under the Standing Orders for a further extension of time. However, on 3 September, 1946, the then Premier was given a further extension of time by special permission of the House. I propose to put the question to the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the Treasurer be granted a further extension of time to enable him to complete his speech?

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) (12.25 p.m.): The question now before the House is, of course, of particular importance. You may remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the closing stages of the debate on the Appropriation Bill last session the Treasurer was granted an extension of time. I recall that in speaking for almost half an hour before the tea adjournment he wasted the time of the House and did not refer to the matters under discussion. Then when he found that he could not complete his argument on the Financial Statement he asked for the unusual procedure of being granted a further extension of time. The practice is open to abuse and it is just a question whether the Treasurer is now abusing the privileges of the House and seeking to take advantage of our good nature. So I want to record a protest against the practice becoming common. In the circumstances, I do not wish to curtail the Treasurer’s speech in any way, so I am prepared to agree to the extension on this occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already drawn the attention of the House to the fact that there is no provision in the Standing Orders for the further extension but in September, 1946, the Premier of the day was given special leave by the House.

Mr. NICKLIN: And we gave it last session.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to point out to hon. members that it is a concession. As there is no provision for it in Standing Orders, it can be done only by the pleasure of the House.

Mr. MORRIS: I rise to a point of order. I do not object to the granting of the extension of time but no period for the extension has been stated and I think a time should be stated.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should say the same as before, thirty minutes, no longer. Is it the pleasure of the House that the Treasurer be granted a further extension of time?

Mr. NICKLIN: For thirty minutes?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Motion (Mr. English) agreed to.

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg—Treasurer) (12.29 p.m.): Again I thank the House for its indulgence. I hope from now on to place before hon. members something that will be informative to them if they will study it as I have done. I do not ask them to accept my interpretation, because it can be read in the transcript.

I have already referred to the Commissioner’s comment intimating that he would draw attention to certain evidence. The transcript continues—

“Mr. Casey: That is so.

“The COMMISSIONER: That is why I had not intervened up to the present.”

Later in the same discussion, at page 347, the Commissioner said—

“I am directed to inquire into the allegation of corruption relating to dealings with certain Crown leases made by Senator Wood in a speech delivered by him in the Senate on a particular date. To interpret the direction, I look at the speech. The speech alleges first of all that racketeering in land rents and leases has been going on in Queensland.”

and so on.

On page 348 the Commissioner said—

“When I read that and ask myself what the terms of my commission mean, is it not abundantly clear that what I am directed to inquire into is corrupt payments made or received in respect of extensions or renewals of Crown leaseholds and dealings in Crown leaseholds, and that is all, and, of course, any subjects, matters or things which appertain to those matters aforesaid, or any of them which seem to me to be

meet and proper to inquire into in the public interest; but I am still confined to charges or allegations of corruption or corrupt conduct in relation to dealings with certain Crown leaseholds."

The Commissioner made further observations. As the transcript will show, Mr. Wanstall, counsel for Mr. Creighton, said that together with his learned junior he had given consideration to the very problem to which His Honour had drawn attention. Mr. Wanstall made a reference to the report under discussion and said—

"This report, in our allegation, is nothing but a smoke-screen to cloak the manner in which the concession was to go to Cameron."

The Commissioner said—

"Assuming that that is so, does that amount to corrupt conduct within the meaning of the terms of my Commission? Assuming you could not prove payment or have any reasonable evidence from which I could find that any payment passed to anybody—?"

At that stage Mr. Wanstall came in and said—

"Assuming there is no evidence of the receipt of money by the Minister for Lands? He is the person who is concerned."

The Commissioner said—

"Yes, or giving him as an example."

The transcript continues—

"Mr. WANSTALL: I would submit to Your Honour that if Your Honour accepted the evidence that the Minister for Lands did embark upon this scheme by which to give a concession, that would amount to corrupt conduct, and I submit that the evidence is relevant in that way.

"The COMMISSIONER: Do you say it would be corrupt conduct, say, if he did it because he was motivated by friendship for the lessee?

"Mr. WANSTALL: Yes, it would be corrupt because it involves the setting-up and the carrying out of a scheme by which to circumvent the land laws and by which there would result a breach of faith between the department and the other lessees who had entered into contracts with the Government to surrender their lands on the faith of fair treatment in accordance with Part II."

He went on to deal with it extensively. Later on there is an interesting discussion between Mr. Casey, Mr. Wanstall, and Mr. Bennett, with the Commissioner having some remarks to make here and there. He made this observation—

"Well, money—sums of money from £2,000 to £10,000, those sums, I take it, being mentioned in a general sense."

1956—H

The transcript continues—

"Mr. CASEY: Yes, that it what Your Honour, I submit, is charged with inquiring into. For my friend, Mr. Wanstall, with his undoubted knowledge of the law, to stand and say that evidence of the type that is being produced from this witness could conceivably measure up to what is required in PEACOCK and THE KING on circumstantial evidence is just something that is too farcical for any lawyer to listen to. It would be utterly absurd to ask Your Honour on this type of evidence to find that you must draw an inference to the exclusion of all other hypotheses that some person was guilty of receiving money, something in the nature of dishonesty. That is the state of affairs that would have to be reached before Your Honour could find corrupt conduct; and for anybody to suggest that this type of evidence that is coming out here—take in relation to Lundavra. The Lundavra leases, we are told, are not going to expire until somewhere between 1964 and 1966, varying periods, and there is a lot of fuss being told to Your Honour here about the suspicions of Mr. Creighton in relation to what might happen at some time between now and periods variously stated between 1964 and 1966. How Your Honour could find on that any question of corrupt conduct in relation to the extension of a lease there, or the promise of an extension of a lease, when the machinery of the law has to be gone through, properly set in motion before it can be done, I fail to see. It is a matter of fact. It is only that this is of such public interest; if we were discussing this matter as lawyers in court, the thing would be dismissed as utterly farcical."

Later Mr. Casey said—

"Mr. Wanstall, responsible counsel, is still submitting this type of evidence from which Your Honour will be forced, as a matter of law and in accordance with your duty, to find corrupt conduct. He wants to investigate a whole series of leases in respect of which Mr. Creighton is to be taken as the criterion for everything correct."

The discussion that followed was very interesting. There are a few more points that I think I should put on record. I quote—

"Mr. McCRAWLEY: Might I define the attitude of the Minister and the department? It is not desirable, from the point of view of the Minister or the department that at the close of this inquiry that anybody should say his counsel had endeavoured in any way to restrict the inquiry into any feasible suggestion of corruption."

That is important also. I continue—

"The COMMISSIONER: If there was evidence produced—and when I refer to evidence I mean evidence which would be admissible in a court of law—of corrupt

conduct which amounted to an offence against the Criminal Code, I doubt whether I should proceed with the inquiry."

It is important to note that point. Immediately there was evidence tendered that suggested there was an offence under the Criminal Code the hearing was adjourned and a prosecution took place in another court. At no other stage of the hearing was there any evidence of a nature to suggest an offence under the Criminal Code. There was only one criminal offence—only one brought out during the whole hearing before the Commission. That was dealt with and the person charged was acquitted.

I want to get on with the point I made about the friendship. Mr. Bennett, counsel for Bukowski, had some submissions to make on this. The Commissioner put this question to him—

"If a person in an official position confers a favour upon, say, a friend—I do not say that is the case here—under particular circumstances where in a number of other cases of similar circumstances that favour has not been applied, would that be corrupt conduct by that official?"

"Mr. BENNETT: In my submission, definitely."

That fits my illustration about the breaches of the traffic law, the liquor law, and other similar laws that could be mentioned.

The Commissioner continued—

"Even though he was empowered to take both courses of action?"

"Mr. BENNETT: He has abused his discretion in order to confer a favour upon a friend, apparently for the consideration of a friendship. That is in direct violation of duty I submit. I am not suggesting that occurred here.

"The COMMISSIONER: I am not suggesting it occurred here. Merely putting it as an example in a certain case to see whether there has not to be some money or other valuable consideration passing having regard to the speech of Senator Wood.

"Mr. BENNETT: I submit such conduct would be corrupt if it brings about a result not on grounds consistent with duty, whether money passes or not."

I ask every hon. member to give careful consideration to this discussion before the Commission. Clear your minds of political prejudice and see if you form the same conclusion that I have of just how far-reaching the findings of the Commissioner can be if they are applied to public administration generally.

I now wish to draw the attention of hon. members to other parts that convinced me beyond any doubt whatever that the hon. member for Belyando should not resign.

On page 8 of the typed report—not the printed report—one finds this observation by the Commissioner—

"This brings me to the standard of proof which should be attained before a

finding that any person is guilty of corruption or corrupt conduct—if the terms are not synonymous—is made. Although corrupt conduct may not involve criminality, nevertheless I think I should not make such a finding unless I am satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that it has been established; that all reasonable hypotheses consistent with innocence have been excluded. In this connection it appears to me that an onus which requires for its discharge such a high standard of proof should not be satisfied by hearsay alone. Hearsay, however, where there is other evidence, may play a part and an important one. Although findings which I make are not binding on any person and can found no judgment of any kind, nevertheless I must, in my opinion, be mindful of the fact that a finding of corrupt conduct may result in grave consequences and, for that reason, I think I should adopt the standard of proof above indicated."

I ask hon. members to pay attention to that.

Hon. members will find also in the report an observation made by the Commissioner that there was no financial gain or material gain by the hon. member for Belyando in connection with the handling of these Crown leases, so it boils down to the simple explanation that he has been found guilty of corrupt conduct in regard to Crown leaseholds, other than the Bell case, because of doing something which has been interpreted as a concession to a friend. Would that justify action being taken by this Parliament, even if it had the power, to remove the hon. member for Belyando from office? How could it be suggested on that finding that there would be justification for his removal from all his affiliations or associations? The Premier has dealt with the charge heard in the Police Court that the hon. member for Belyando approached Mr. Bell for a contribution to party funds. If he had been found guilty of that charge, an offence against the Criminal Code, the action to be taken by Mr. Foley would have been quite obvious. There would not have been any need for action by this Parliament or anybody. There is no doubt that the hon. member for Belyando would have acted of his own volition.

I am somewhat disturbed that there is this feeling that the judiciary or the magistracy are subject to political intervention. It can be said truthfully by the Premier as Leader of the Queensland Government that the selection of the Commissioner was left in the hands of the Chief Justice of this State, as it was when the Prime Minister got in touch with the Premier and requested the services of a Queensland judge. The recommendation of the Chief Justice was not accepted by Mr. Menzies. It was on the recommendation of the Chief Justice that Mr. Justice Townley was appointed Royal Commissioner.

Having in mind his responsible position, I should have expected the Leader of the Opposition to refrain from making any insinuations against the magistrate who heard the charge against the hon. member for Belyando, because after all a magistrate, while not acting in a judicial capacity equal to or superior to that of a judge, is nevertheless acting in a judicial capacity. I do not think any of us would feel happy if there was a suggestion that magistrates could be persuaded to deal with matters in the way desired by hon. members on either side of the Chamber.

If I am misquoting the Leader of the Opposition he can correct me. I am relying on the report that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 8 August. He is reported as having said—

"The evidence of Mr. Justice Philp as to the conversation with Bell immediately after Bell's interview with the Minister was precluded"—

He used the word "precluded" and I do not know whether somebody put that into his head or not. However, he went on to say—

"Mr. Nicklin said he was loth to criticise a member of the magistracy, for which he had the greatest respect.

'But I do say that the decision of the magistrate in this case cannot be supported,' Mr. Nicklin continued. 'I am not suggesting for one moment that the outcome of a trial before a judge and jury would have had any different result than that in the lower court, but the circumstances of this case most certainly did warrant such a trial.'"

If the Leader of the Opposition is in possession of some knowledge of some circumstances, he has not revealed that knowledge to this House. It would have been better if he had outlined the circumstances to justify the making of that statement that the magistrate did not give any reason for precluding evidence of this conversation. The Commissioner dealt with that in his report when he said that evidence was not admitted. He did not castigate the magistrate for not accepting the evidence. Legal men all knew it was not admissible and why did the magistrate have to proceed to give reasons? The witness himself would know before he went into the witness box that it could not be accepted in a court of law.

Mr. Pizzey: Didn't he say not admitted and not admissible?

Mr. WALSH: Yes—"Before me there was evidence which was not admitted by the magistrate and not admissible before him" That would be in accordance with the advice given by the late Mr. McGill that there was no evidence to justify a conviction of the hon. member

for Belyando. I think everybody, irrespective of politics, accepted that position. It is a pity that there should be such odium cast on the magistracy in these matters because, as has been said, such statements made in this House can have a far-reaching effect on public opinion in respect of the conduct and administration of justice. The Government have never at any time since my association with it in 1935 endeavoured in any way to influence any member of the judiciary in respect of matters to be placed before members of it and decided by them. There should be no suggestion of political taint. In the evidence I have read there should be sufficient to justify hon. members in making the same decision that I have made, namely, that there is no justification whatever for the demand by the hon. member for Coorparoo that Mr. Foley should resign his position from this House. If there was evidence to the contrary I would not be here on my feet justifying his retention of membership of this House. Whilst the hon. member for Coorparoo laid it down that he would have strong objection to Parliament legislating to provide for the expulsion of members from this House, I might have a different view because I think there might be occasions when the House would be fully justified in doing so. However, anything written into the legislation would have to be carefully written in. The hon. member for Coorparoo was quite prepared to pass on the matter to the Premier and members of the Parliamentary Labour Party—that they take it upon themselves to tell Mr. Foley to get out. To get out for what? It is quite possible that some day a member of Parliament may be involved in some of the simple things that I have outlined today and, to be consistent in their conduct, hon. members opposite will then have to adopt the same attitude as they are adopting now.

I have had a good deal to say in putting my thoughts before the House. I am not asking hon. members to agree with them. However, as the members of the public have not had a fair presentation of this matter, particularly since the findings of the Royal Commission were published, as far as I am concerned they are quite entitled to have it through "Hansard," which is published by this House. I think it is in the Premier's mind to have an increased number of "Hansards" printed for that purpose.

Mr. FLETCHER (Cunningham) (12.52 p.m.): On this occasion I deplore, more than I generally do, the fact that I have a simple, unsophisticated, country background, and that I am unversed in the nimble methods and devious reasonings that we have heard here for so many days. I have admired and have even been entertained—as I always am—by the undoubted capacity of the Treasurer to conjure up from his imagination bogies that he attributes to us on this side of the House, bogies that he brought forward under the

heading of a personal, political and sectarian campaign, with which he charges us. I have admired also the gusto with which he knocked down some of those bogies, but although I listened very attentively to him, I must confess that he did not help me to reduce the matter to its simple essentials; indeed, he has increased my confusion in certain respects. For example, he criticised the fact that Mr. Justice Philp kept to himself for several years knowledge regarding the misconduct of a certain Cabinet Minister that was imparted to him at the Queensland Club. The Treasurer thought that that was not consistent with the judge's moral responsibility. He went on to say that he was not criticising the judge as a judge, but as a witness. It seems to me, however, that it is a matter of moral responsibility that must be carried forward into that gentleman's life as a judge, that you cannot divide his moral responsibility into different compartments of his life. It is quite possible, of course, that I am not correct.

The Treasurer also went to some trouble to draw the moral that Mr. Foley was not convicted of any criminal charge, that he had not been convicted of corrupt conduct. He said that since the reason for such corruption on Mr. Foley's part could, at the most, have been only some concession, valuable though it may have been to someone else, it was not consistent on our part to urge that he should be asked to vacate his seat in Parliament. That seemed to me to be merely splitting straws. The question of reward seems to me to be of less importance than the actual corruption.

Mr. Walsh: Let a bowling club or golf club get into trouble over the liquor laws and then you will find out.

Mr. FLETCHER: Quite possibly. I have had great difficulty in following many of the arguments advanced by hon. members opposite. Perhaps I am partly to blame. But even to my mind unskilled in legal matters it has been apparent through the debate for the last two days that they have insisted that the findings of the Commissioner are accepted and not in question. That is somewhat different from the impression we gained the previous day. Speaker after speaker on the Government side did none other than question the Commissioner's report. They told us we should read the transcript. Selected parts of the evidence were put before us and we were asked to draw a conclusion without doubt at variance with the findings of the Commissioner. It seemed to me that the whole tenor of the debate was that they did not agree with the findings.

I have felt all along that the issue could be reduced to simple terms. On the one hand if the Commissioner's report is not accepted something should be done about it. If the judiciary is not accepted as having acted properly something should be done about the judiciary. On the other hand, the findings of the Commissioner may be accepted. In

that case, to be consistent, something should be done about the man found guilty by the Commissioner.

Mr. Walsh: Action has been taken. The Commissioner found that the Minister had corrupted his office as a Minister and the hon. member for Belyando no longer occupies that office.

Mr. FLETCHER: True, but it seems to me that his position as a Minister is dependent upon his being a member of the House. The difference between his responsibilities as a Minister and his responsibilities as a member of Parliament is one of degree, not of principle.

Much uncomplimentary language has been used in the debate. Hon. members on this side, especially the Leader of the Opposition, have been called uncomplimentary names. I made a note of some of them at the time. The hon. gentleman was charged with having told untruths, with being unfair, malicious, with having made a bitter attack, having uttered drivelling nonsense and with making unscrupulous political speeches. There has been a lot of the pot calling the kettle black. The Treasurer's charge of a bitter political and sectarian campaign is hardly in accordance with the facts. I assure the Treasurer that there is nothing sectarian in either my background or my viewpoint.

Before the luncheon adjournment I was referring to the intemperate language used in the House. This applied particularly to the Minister who just resumed his seat. I was in conversation with one of my colleagues during the recess and I was most amused at what I thought was a particularly apt description of the Treasurer's attitude. My colleague said he was like a small boy who puts on a cowboy outfit and then goes through the house, shoots a couple of redskins in the lounge, a couple of very bad eggs in the kitchen, cleans up a particularly bad nest of corruption by an alien band of other cowboys out on the back verandah, and then warns his mother, "You must not go in there, Mother, the place is just reeking with corpses."

The Attorney-General was responsible for some of the intemperate language. He claimed most vociferously yesterday that his colleague and friend had been condemned without a right of appeal. The thought occurred to me at the time that I would have thought more of the Attorney-General if he had displayed the same feelings towards Mr. Creighton.

The Premier made a lot of charges against us. Amongst other things he said that we wanted to sack Mr. Foley. This is not exactly true. He said we could not do it because there were no findings against the conduct of the hon. member for Belyando as an hon. member of the House; the only finding against him was as a Minister. That is on all-fours with the Treasurer's suggestion. He holds his position as a Minister

because he is an honourable member and his responsibilities for the two positions are the same in principle. The only difference is degree. We make a great play in the Chamber of insisting that we are honourable members on all occasions. If anything is said which could be considered to reflect upon the integrity or standing of an honourable member the remark must be withdrawn on the grounds that it would be a reflection on an honourable member. That puts us in a particularly responsible category. There can be no differentiation in principle between responsibilities of an honourable member and responsibilities of a Minister.

I lay claim to as much compassion, decency, and goodwill as are possessed by any honourable member. It would be with feelings of regret, even sadness, that I would see the hon. member for Belyando leave the House. The association I have had with him has been friendly; he has helped me in things I have taken to him. Even though I would have feelings of regret and sadness that does not mean that I do not think he should leave the House. The honour, standing and dignity of the House, especially in the eyes of the community, must be upheld and I think the hon. member should leave the Chamber. The orderly processes of our judicial machinery have brought about a finding of corruption and I think that he should get out for the good of himself, his Party and the State. Thinking of it in the terms of the respect the general public should have for this institution, if any injustice is done—we are all human and injustices have been done and will be done while human justice has to be dealt with—then that is the lesser evil. As I see it and as the tradition throughout the British Empire sees it, it is better for the person to suffer than the institution of Parliament which we as members are bound to uphold. The completely fatuous suggestion has been put forward that we should disregard the findings of the Commissioner and instead dissect the evidence for ourselves, that we should concentrate on specially selected pieces of evidence taken out of their context, disregarding the spirit and continuity, and on small portions of the evidence decide on our own judgment what we ought to do about things. We have been invited to read the transcript of the whole matter which, I claim, is physically impossible. I say that advisedly, that it would be impossible for everyone even if some people could. We are invited to make our own judgment and disregard the calm dispassionate expert opinion of a man who has a high reputation for his ability and his honesty. We are invited to agree with the interested opinion produced by a special pleading argument on the Government side, instead of the specially selected opinion of a highly skilled man. In those circumstances we have reached a very serious position—one that gives us great concern and justifies this vote of no confidence even if there were not any other serious reasons for it. I think, with the

Treasurer, that this matter of the Commission has had a preponderance of attention for too long. I had my say the other night, and I take the opportunity now to say that nothing I have heard since has caused me to change my opinion.

The amendment deals with other matters, some of which, as the Treasurer has said, are very serious. The amendment adds certain matters to the Address in Reply that are much in the minds of persons interested in the welfare of this State. I know that the recent Royal Commission was most important, but it has had a great deal of attention. I think perhaps the next in importance would be that relating to the failure of the railways to run their affairs in such a manner as to obviate the serious losses that have occurred because of their failure to carry wool. That is one of the very serious things that face us at the moment. The industrial lawlessness relating to bodily harm is just as important. I leave that matter with the remark that there is a regrettable feeling that the Government should have done more to obviate this sort of thing. The Government should leave no stone unturned to correct any impression held by the public that they are not doing all they can to protect men on either side from bodily injury.

The failure of the Railway Department to carry wool and the general position of that department are most important and symptomatic of an acute and serious condition that has been developing for some time. The most serious aspect is that the impression abroad is that the Government are not prepared to do very much to correct the alarming drift that has taken place in the railway deficit and the alleged incompetence of the railway organisation.

I know it is fairly common to hear criticism of that department, and I have always gone on record as saying that one has to keep in mind that this is not an ordinary business institution. I have already conceded that there are many phases of the work of that department that deserve special consideration. It has been and is a vehicle for the opening up and development of this State, which even in this day is a new one as far as development is concerned. For years to come we will have to look to the Railway Department for certain concessions and for special consideration to many people and many classes of people. I know it is common to hear criticism of the department by people who virtually in the same breath are prepared to ask for special consideration from that department. We have to face the fact that many concessions are necessary in certain circumstances. There is justification for concession fares to ill and old people and low rates in respect of certain low-value commodities. Concessions must be given to certain primary producers. But, having conceded all this, the Railway Department is not absolved from the responsibility or carrying on as an efficient business. That it has been run as an efficient business is open to grave doubt.

There are many others in the community, including men in the Railway Department, who doubt whether the Railway Department has been run as efficiently as it could have been run. It is, after all, a business, and it must be run efficiently. It has been evident to everyone that the department has not effected the expansion necessary to cope with the expansion in our economy and the demands made on its services. Queensland's needs are growing and those in charge of the department should have been able to provide expanded services to meet those requirements.

Mr. Graham: Have they not done that?

Mr. FLETCHER: No, and nothing like it.

Mr. Graham: Tell us how or why?

Mr. FLETCHER: I cannot state exactly how or why. I am mentioning what has happened. I am mentioning the fact. It must be admitted that the department has not been able to cope with the demands made on its services or anything like it. The position is gradually getting worse. Other services, such as road services, are taking advantage of the situation. Road services have certain natural advantages, but their biggest advantage is the inability of the Railway Department to cope with the situation, the inability of that department to provide trucks and tarpaulins and to give a service that will satisfy the demands of those who use the railway.

Rather than do something about it, the Government are prepared to let the position get worse. They more or less automatically resent criticism. They refuse to be honest and say, "Yes, perhaps we could be more efficient if we knew how to cope with the problem, but we are doing our best to be efficient." They have tried to justify a position which cannot really be justified at all. So far as I know, no real earnest effort has ever been applied to the railways, and the general impression that I have got, and as a matter of fact that held by the general public, is that the Government are not likely to do anything because they are scared of the railway unions who are inclined to resent such an effort. The huge losses this year, up to £2,500,000, are particularly severe, considering that no provision has been made for interest charges. Considering the interjections by the hon. member for Mackay, the only effort that I can see that has been made was made last year when an amendment was brought down to the Railway Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I draw the hon. member's attention to paragraph (c) of the amendment which specifically refers to the carriage of wool. Hon. members cannot indulge in a general discussion on the Railway Department under this amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER: I was dealing with the losses referred to in the amendment and particularly to the £600,000 lost in the carriage of wool and the fact that certain wool

had been declared black by certain elements within the Railway Department. The general refusal to cart wool represented a loss to the Railway Department of £600,000 which, in anybody's terms, is a good deal of money. Out of all this arises what I have referred to as the serious position throughout our community over some years, which indicates that we have a Government who cannot or will not govern. The Railway Department is a business run by this Government; they have control over it, but they are not prepared really to control it in the face of objections by certain elements within their own business. This is a sovereign State that believes in arbitration. The Government come here and proclaim that they believe in arbitration, that they take a pride in it, but they tolerate an open defiance of an order of their own Industrial Court. The whole matter started when the shearing industry award was varied to the detriment of the shearers. The price for shearing came down and elements within the Australian Workers' Union decided to defy the award of the court. That same union respected the award when the court rose rates but defied the court when the shearing rate was lowered, despite the fact that it had been mentioned that the rate was a prosperity rate and would have to come down with the lowering of the price of wool. The Government have done nothing about the action of this element. They have been allowing their own Railway Department to be used as an instrument to uphold an illegal strike, and to break their own laws and they have helped an element within the community to break their proudly proclaimed industrial law. They have helped the efforts of this malicious element within the community who are hoping to break down the industrial law and lower our respect for the law. In effect, the captain of our ship of State, the Premier, cannot do anything about it because certain members of the crew have decided that they are not prepared to accept his order. If the Premier's first mate, the Minister for Transport, sees rocks ahead and wants to correct his course, the deck hands are having afternoon tea and cannot possibly be interrupted. And so the ship of State goes on its course. Before very long, it must run on the rocks.

Perhaps the worst thing that has happened, politically in connection with the shearers' strike, has been the Premier's attitude towards it. It amounts to an encouragement to those who break his own laws when he goes out of his way to prove to us that the shearers' strike is not a strike at all, that it is only the shearers exercising their God-given right not to work if they do not want to.

Mr. Gair: You do not dispute that, do you?

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not dispute it as a general proposition, but in this particular instance it is absolutely against all the facts.

Mr. Gair: Mr. Gunn, of the United Graziers' Association, agrees with me.

Mr. FLETCHER: I do not care who says anything.

Mr. Gair: You are one of those arrogant fools—

Mr. NICKLIN: I rise to a point of order. Is the Premier in order in referring to any member of this Chamber as an arrogant fool?

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear him say it, but if he did I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Gair: I said it. I do not deny anything I say. The hon. member is engaging in a lot of arrogant foolery.

An Opposition Member: You said he was an arrogant fool.

Mr. Gair: I did, and if it is unparliamentary I withdraw it.

Mr. FLETCHER: I will overlook that, Mr. Speaker. I can afford to.

If the shearers' strike is not a strike, why was it necessary to declare wool black in support of the God-given right of a man not to work if he does not want to? All the facts indicate to anyone who will not be misled that it is a strike.

In this State we live to a great extent on the production of wool, perhaps to a greater extent than on any other single avenue of effort. Therefore, this is a very serious matter. We live by the export of wool and we can produce in Australia only at the level of Australian costs. The amount of £600,000, which has been wilfully lost for political purposes, will be added to the producers' costs. Somebody will have to pay it. If we want to sell overseas, our costs must bear such a relationship to those of other countries that we can compete with them. To the extent that the Government are encouraging a type of action that is increasing our costs, we are here to condemn them. All industrial trouble within the State must obviously increase our costs. The shearing dispute must indirectly affect the solvency of the State.

The striking shearers have been defended not only by the Premier, but by the unions. For example, the railway unions are behind them. The Government are walking hand-in-hand with those elements within our community who have decided to break down our standards of industrial arbitration and our general standards. Those elements are making use of the Premier and others who are on his side. Only yesterday an article appeared in the Press comparing conditions in New Zealand with those in Australia. The comparison favoured New Zealand largely because their industrial situation had been coped with better than ours. Everybody in the community knows that industrial disruption and interruptions

increase costs and lower the standard of living; that is, everybody except the Government, apparently. Perhaps they realise it and regret it as much as I do. Perhaps they have not the courage to do anything about it. Some Government member will probably interject and ask, "What can we do?" Hon. members opposite said yesterday or the day before that if the Government had intervened it would have brought about a state of chaos. I think they should at least have tried. Some day somebody has to try. The trend is too serious to be ignored. It is not good enough to sit on the sidelines weakly and say, "We could not do anything about it." The Government deny that they take orders from outside. Surely they are intelligent enough to realise that they must insist upon respect for their laws. The law must be obeyed. Anything that encourages any person or any element of the community to disregard a law is against the interests of the State and inconsistent with the responsibility of Government. I say that the Government are dodging their responsibility with a good deal of nimbleness.

Mr. Walsh: I did not realise until just now that you meant this to be an attack on the Menzies-Fadden Government.

Mr. FLETCHER: I suggest that the hon. gentleman is living up to the standard that he set this morning.

Mr. Walsh: You are overlooking all their faults, of course.

Mr. FLETCHER: In response to an interjection this morning the Treasurer claimed that he had not misinterpreted or twisted observations from this side of the House but he added, "When I want to, I will." I suggest that he is now indulging in a little of the standard he laid bare to us then.

Part of the outcome of the wool dispute has been the recent very serious increase in rail freight charges. Only last March the Minister for Transport was reported in the Press as saying that the Government then had no intention of increasing freight charges. In his explanation he said, "We have been caught up in the spiral of costs and wages." It seems to me that, with wool a vital factor in rail freight, he should then have been able to foresee this difficulty. I sympathise with him, of course, in having an extra £600,000 suddenly dumped into his lap.

The unreality of the unions in dictating their viewpoint to the Government is fantastic. The best exposition of the completely detached unreality of their viewpoint is in the fact that in New South Wales when freights were increased a large meeting of union organisations decided, either by a great majority or unanimously, that they would organise to oppose the increase in fares. They claimed it was an

attack upon the living standards of the workers. How unrealistic can you be! You cannot have it both ways: you cannot put up prices and still have the old standard of living on the same amount of money.

I support my Leader's protest at the serious position that has arisen through the refusal of the Railway Department to carry wool. Their refusal to cart wool and their inability to cart all the other things they have been unable to cart lately has had a most catastrophic effect on roads. I have a personal knowledge of what has happened and road transport has been brought willy-nilly into operation with resultant severe damage to roads. The nation's money is going down the drain. That the Railways are allowed to get away with it is only because of the supine Government's sitting back and saying, "We can't do anything about it because if we try to do something, worse will happen." It is an attack on the arbitration system of the State.

(Time expired.)

Dr. DITTMER (Mt. Gravatt) (2.47 p.m.): An amendment to the Address in Reply can only be by way of addendum but when one looks at the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and seconded by his Deputy it is found that it incorporates four items. So far six hon. members of the Opposition have spoken but there has been little more than 35 minutes devoted to the last three sections of the amendment. The Leader of the Opposition dealt with three of the sections only in passing and practically the whole of his time to the first section. The Deputy Leader spent no time at all on the other three sections. The hon. member for Barambah would not have spoken for half of his time on the last three sections. The hon. member for Yeronga used a small portion of his time in speaking about them. That coldly dispassionate and most logical speaker on the Opposition benches, the hon. member for Coorparoo, spent no time on three sections of the amendment. What was the purpose of including them? Hon. members of the Opposition have spoken about the Premier's fund, but were those three sections merely included to pander to some of their bosses, the graziers, who contribute substantially to their funds, along with the liquor interests and other commercial enterprises of the State? Hon. members on both sides of the House are in a quandary as to why these other three sections were included. The first clause of the amendment has been thrashed willy-nilly, far and wide, words have been twisted and turned inside out and upside down and every other way, so I do not propose to deal with it at all.

I shall deal with the remarks of hon. members opposite on the other three clauses. The hon. member for Cunningham in his introductory remarks accused the Treasurer of using devious means to castigate hon. members opposite. If he will analyse his speech he will find he was not so far behind

in using words to reflect on the Treasurer. He said the Government should have done more about the assaults. In what way is it suggested that the Government should have done more? Mention was made of what happened at Cunnamulla. There may have been provocation for what happened but that would not concern the Opposition. Further, the hon. member said that the railways should be run on an efficient basis and in a businesslike way. That was said after stating that they pandered to the needs of private enterprise by providing lower freights. The two statements are not consistent. The hon. member said, "Why not bring in an overseas expert?" He should realise that railways all over the world are experiencing financial difficulty. Why did the Labour Government in England take over the railways that were serving nearly 50,000,000 people? Because they were in financial trouble and they could not carry on. What was the trouble with the American railways that operate in a very well endowed country serving nearly 200,000,000 people. In Queensland we have 6,000 miles of railway which serve fewer than 2,000,000 people. How could you apply business principles to the railways in their entirety?

Opposition Members interjected.

Dr. DITTMER: The hon. member for Cunningham said that there was a strike on. He said, "Let us not delude ourselves; these men have refused to work, and that constitutes a strike." I point out that Mr. Gunn, the President of the United Graziers' Association said that the men had the right to sell their services on the best market. That view is shared by the hon. member for Barambah and the hon. member for Yeronga. How can we accept the statement by the hon. member for Cunningham when two other hon. members on his side differ from his view? He also referred to a "black" ban. We all know that there is an industrial dispute, but I shall show that defiance of an award of the Court does not apply only to the Australian Workers' Union but to every grazier who is not paying the old award rates of pay. It is abundantly clear that the shearers and the A.W.U. are not the only opponents of the award. The hon. member for Cunningham read an article that appeared in the Press recently regarding the position in New Zealand and Australia. Let us throw our minds back a few years. It did not need any devious twist of mind on the part of the Treasurer to bring in the Menzies-Fadden Government. I had already thought of them. If the Country Party accept New Zealand as a standard they must be ashamed, because they opposed the devaluation of the £ in relation to the British £ to such an extent that Charles Russell resigned from the Party over the matter. New Zealand previously devalued it and the commercial interests in Sydney and Melbourne had proposed the devaluation of the £ but the Country Party almost entirely with all their partisan supporters—

the primary producers—with the exception of Charles Russell opposed it. Hon. members opposite should not talk in terms of New Zealand unless they are prepared to argue in terms of devaluation in relation to purchasing power between 10 December, 1949 and the present day. They should realise that a £ today is worth only 7s. compared with 1949. That is due to the actions of the Menzies-Fadden Government and not contributed to by the Queensland Government. I think I have dealt effectively with the remarks of the hon. member for Cunningham.

The speech by the hon. member for Barambah was another snide attack on unionism. I appreciate the sincerity always exhibited by the hon. member for Barambah, but he is one of the ultra-conservative class of people who were common at the beginning of the century and since. We are now living in the twentieth century and have to display reality in our approach to the problems of this century. The practice of days gone by of battering workers with rifle and batons will not be tolerated today in any civilised part of the world. That type of behaviour breeds communism and fosters industrial unrest. There is no doubt about that. Let us examine the remarks of the hon. member for Barambah when speaking of Mr. Gunn, the President of the United Graziers' Association. He said that Mr. Gunn stood for law and order and was defying the unions because they were disobeying the rulings of the Industrial Court. The hon. member for Barambah said it was a pity that there were not more men of Mr. Gunn's type. He added that credit must be given also to shearers who are shearing at what is known as the award rate.

Take the statement that Mr. Gunn stands for law and order. How can that be reconciled with the fact that over 5,000,000 sheep have been shorn at the old rate, that 1,400 graziers have agreed to shear at the old rate and that 1,200 of that 1,400 have signed industrial agreements now lodged in the Industrial Court. That number includes two graziers who own more sheep than any other graziers in Queensland. They have the greatest aggregations within my knowledge of the industry, and, although my knowledge is limited, I claim it is greater than some hon. members opposite who pose as experts in this industry. One of those graziers is Mr. Russell, at one time a Conservative member in the Queensland Parliament and later the Federal Parliament. His sheep are second in number only to those of Mr. Roubin who owns 200,000 sheep against 100,000 sheep owned by Mr. Russell. All of Mr. Roubin's sheep have been shorn at the old rate. Only recently Mr. Russell discovered that his managers were having his sheep shorn at the new rate. The damage to his sheep was so great that he ordered all the sheep to be shorn at the old rate, and shearers have now commenced to shear at the old rate on all his properties including Clover Downs.

So much for the statement that Mr. Gunn stands for law and order and the rulings of the Industrial Court is in accord with the wishes of the graziers.

In reality not one sheep is being shorn at the new rate, because, in addition to that rate, allowances, fares, food and many other things are being paid and provided by the graziers. For example, under the old rate learners were paid the amount they could earn. They are now being paid a minimum of £18 a week plus fares, an allowance for combs and cutters and other allowances. In those circumstances, how can hon. members opposite castigate the A.W.U. for not obeying the ruling of the Industrial Court?

Mr. Pizzey: Would you say graziers are breaking the award by paying more than the minimum?

Dr. DITTMER: No more or less than a shearer who says, "I will not work for less than I think is justified." Further, graziers are breaking regulations by threatening and stopping A.W.U. officials from entering properties. The graziers who are supposed to be the friends of hon. members opposite are said to be upholding law and order, but what do they think of the treatment by graziers of men who have lived and worked for 20, 30 and 40 years in the outback, men who have reared their families and built their homes in the West? These competent men are being denied what they are entitled to and outsiders are being brought in to take their jobs and in total being paid more than efficient shearers who have lived their whole life in the industry. There are those graziers who are prepared to fly into this State all kinds of incompetent people to take the place of competent men who have lived for years in the West and devoted their whole lives to the shearing of sheep. Does not the hon. member think that that is a measure of defiance? The hon. member for Isis should know the industrial mind of workers, cane-cutters in particular. If the challenge was to be thrown out to them they would accept it. That is what is happening in the West. No industrial dispute is ever settled by flaunting defiance in the face of workers whose livelihood is being taken from them unfairly.

A wool broking firm has claimed that only 40 per cent. of the graziers in the State belong to the United Graziers' Association, but the executive of that association is determining the action to be taken by every grazier throughout the length and breadth of the State. The manager of that firm has claimed that he does not know one grazier who would refuse to pay the old rate for shearing, which now should be £7 16s. 3d. a hundred. Recently when on the South Coast I met a couple of graziers who said that they would be willing to pay the old rate for shearing. They said Mr. Gunn should be thrown into the river. In the office of the Australian Workers' Union there

are numerous letters where graziers have even offered fares to their properties plus the old rate for shearing provided the shearers did not let it be known in the district.

Mr. Pizzey: Who determines the new rate? The graziers or the shearers?

Dr. Noble interjected.

Dr. DITTMER: I did not hear what the hon. member for Isis said. I will deal with the statement made in relation to trade unions. When dealing with the determination by the Industrial Court it can be said with all truth that that court can make mistakes. When we speak particularly of trade unions due regard must be had to the long history of the Australian Workers' Union in industrial matters. It must not be forgotten that through the years hon. members on this side of the House and many sensible hon. members opposite have paid tribute to the A.W.U. for its moderate approach to problems associated with industrial expansion. When due regard was paid to the change in the price of wool no regard was paid to the increase in the number of sheep in the country and the capacity of industry to pay. It is a recognised principle in arbitration that the capacity of industry to pay must be taken into consideration.

Mr. Pizzey: You say the court paid no regard to those things in making its determination?

Dr. DITTMER: It would suggest that no regard was had to the capacity to pay nor was cognisance given to the increased number of sheep. The shearer on the one hand can only increase his income by increasing the number of sheep he shears but on the other hand the grazier can increase his income by increasing the number of sheep on his property. The hon. member, with his mathematical mind, will realise what that means to the grazier compared with the shearer. If the shearer's rate a hundred went down his income went down because he cannot shear any more than he has been shearing. Although there may be a decreased price for wool, it is more than counter-balanced by the increased number of sheep on a property for the grazier.

I take exception to the remarks made by the hon. member for Yeronga in regard to the Australian Workers' Union. It has been said repeatedly that this is a moderate union and its history shows that it has continually been fighting communism and has done more than hon. members opposite to combat its spread. Why should the A.W.U. suddenly change? Hon. members opposite cannot say that Joe Bukowski is solely responsible for the actions of the A.W.U. He is backed unanimously by every official of that union and by the members of the union. Hon. members opposite should ascertain the attitude of the striking shearers and see how bitter they are. If the A.W.U. are adopting a certain attitude, would it not occur to hon.

members in the light of the history of the A.W.U. that on this occasion the court could be wrong and the A.W.U. is not a union to accept economic injustice.

Never let it be said, as was said by the hon. member for Yeronga, that the late Hon. W. Forgan Smith controlled the A.W.U.

Dr. Noble: I did not say that.

Dr. DITTMER: I took the trouble to read the hon. member's speech in "Hansard." He said, "When the late Forgan Smith controlled the A.W.U. in the times of Clarrie Fallon." I may be wrong, but I leave it to those who were present when the hon. member spoke to decide whether those were his words.

The A.W.U. knows how to run its own affairs, and no Premier would interfere with it. It ill becomes a member of this Assembly to say that any Labour Premier controlled the A.W.U.

Dr. Noble: Why have you changed from the Right Wing to the Left Wing?

Dr. DITTMER: In answer to that interjection, which is a complete distortion, I always only stand for what is right.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the amendment before the House.

Dr. DITTMER: It must be more than a coincidence that the Leader of the Opposition has moved the amendment. It is very unusual for an amendment to be moved to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. However, after listening to the speeches of hon. members opposite, I wanted to correct some of their statements, particularly those about the shearing dispute. I want to have recorded in "Hansard" how unscrupulous and hypocritical the Opposition can be, particularly when they speak of the Premier's fund. The Opposition have put forward an amendment in three sections simply to pander to a sectional interest that has contributed so much to their funds, and contributions which that section, along with other commercial interests, must have regretted giving because for so long the Opposition have met with humiliating and thoroughly deserved defeat at the hands of the electors.

Mr. MULLER (Fassifern) (3.10 p.m.): I very much regret some of the methods used by Government members in the debate, particularly when referring to the Leader of the Opposition. Members of Her Majesty's Opposition have a duty to do and if they suspect irregular practices in any Government department they are entitled to probe them. This morning I heard from the Treasurer perhaps the worst form of argument I have ever heard in the Chamber. Last week the Premier said that sectarian bitterness was the worst form of bigotry. This morning the Treasurer said that the late Mr. Justice Macrossan was denied admission to the Queensland Club because of the faith he

professed. I will not dwell on it but I regard that as hitting below the belt. Such an idea has never entered the mind of any member of the Opposition. I am a Protestant. My only son is a Roman Catholic. I am not saying whether I am ashamed of him or proud of him but I should certainly be ashamed of him if he indulged in the type of argument the Treasurer used this morning, and I do not intend to stoop to that level.

The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt complained bitterly that members of the Opposition devoted most of their time to discussing Clause (a) of the amendment. He spent most of his time on Clauses (b) and (c). Remember that the Treasurer this morning spoke for 100 minutes; I timed him—two forties and then twenty.

Mr. Power: A very good speech, too.

Mr. MULLER: In the Attorney-General's opinion, perhaps. Ninety-five of those 100 minutes were devoted to Section (a). Surely there can be no quibble as to the part of the amendment he chose to emphasise.

There has been a remarkable trend in this debate. Last week hon. members discussed the report of the Royal Commission under another heading, the dismissal of a Crown employee, and the Commissioner's report was used by way of argument. Without exception Government speakers then based their argument on the transcript of evidence and ignored the findings of the Royal Commission. Yesterday a change occurred. In reply to an interjection the Premier said that he accepted the finding of the Royal Commission, and I think I heard the Attorney-General say, too, that he accepted it.

Mr. Power: You heard that quite correctly. I did say it.

Mr. MULLER: The Attorney-General did not do so last week.

Mr. Power: I said I accepted it.

Mr. MULLER: Every part of his argument was founded on the transcript and he and other members of the Government side-stepped the Royal Commissioner's report.

Mr. Power: Let me clear the matter up. Did you say I did not accept the Commissioner's report?

Mr. MULLER: The Attorney-General accepted it yesterday.

Mr. Power: I accepted it quite a lot of times.

Mr. MULLER: The hon. gentleman did not accept it before. Let him read "Hansard." I am speaking of what I heard as I listened to the debate.

Mr. Power: I challenge you to prove I did not accept it.

Mr. MULLER: I did not miss a speech and "Hansard" will prove whether my statement is correct or not.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member said that yesterday I had stated I accepted the findings of the Royal Commission. That is true. He went further and said that on a previous occasion when I was speaking I did not accept it. That statement is untrue. I accepted the report of the Royal Commission at all times.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Fassifern to accept the denial of the Attorney-General.

Mr. MULLER: I accept the denial. The Attorney-General has now said he accepted the findings of the Royal Commission. I am going to read the findings of the Royal Commission and then ask the Attorney-General whether he is going to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission. I would not have quoted this but the Treasurer has questioned my statement. The report states—

"A. I find:

(i.) That from the month of October, 1950, until the month of March, 1951, Thomas Andrew Foley, then Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation, in the purported exercise of such Office did use the question of burr infestation on Dutton River Holding as a pretext for delaying and did delay approval of the transfer of the said Holding from Ruthven Ltd. (in Liquidation) to Robert Stanley White now deceased;

(ii.) That in fact burr infestation constituted no ground for so delaying approval of the said transfer and was not in fact the reason for such delay;

(iii.) That in fact the reason for such delay, as the said Thomas Andrew Foley knew and intended, was to benefit financially the said Robert Stanley White;

(iv.) That the said Robert Stanley White did in fact financially benefit by such delay in that the said Ruthven Ltd. (in Liquidation) was (as it was required to do under the contract of sale between it as vendor and the said Robert Stanley White as purchaser and the said Thomas Andrew Foley well knew) obliged to bear and pay and did by reason of such delay bear and pay for a period of approximately twenty (20) weeks the sum of approximately £300 per week being working expenses of the said leasehold and the stock depasturing thereon which it had contracted to sell and deliver to the said Robert Stanley White, which working expenses, had it not been for such delay, the said Robert Stanley White would have had to bear and pay;

(v.) That the above-described conduct of the said Thomas Andrew Foley constituted corrupt conduct in relation to a dealing with a Crown leasehold, namely the said Dutton River Holding.

“B. I find:

(i.) That on 16th May, 1951, the said Thomas Andrew Foley, in the purported exercise of his said Office, approved of the exemption of the said Robert Stanley White from conditions lawfully attached to the lease of the said Dutton River Holding, which conditions provided that the lessee thereof should maintain a marsupial-proof fence erected upon and around portion of the said Holding and should depasture sheep upon the said portion so enclosed;

(ii.) That the said Thomas Andrew Foley made no inquiry or investigation before approving of the said exemption;

(iii.) That the said exemption was to the financial benefit of the said Robert Stanley White;

(iv.) That the said Thomas Andrew Foley knew and intended that the said Robert Stanley White would so benefit by the said approval and granted such approval with such intention and for the purpose only of such benefit;

(v.) That the above-described conduct of the said Thomas Andrew Foley constituted corrupt conduct in relation to a dealing with a Crown leasehold, namely Dutton River Holding.

“C. I make no finding as to the guilt or innocence of the said Robert Stanley White of corrupt conduct in relation to any dealing with any Crown leasehold.

“D. I find:

(i.) That on 14th December, 1949, the said Thomas Andrew Foley whilst Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation did solicit from one Francis Marsh Bell a donation to Labour Party Funds of £1,000 in return for which donation the said Thomas Andrew Foley stated to the said Francis Marsh Bell that he, the said Francis Marsh Bell, would receive the grant of, or favourable consideration of the grant of, a stud lease in respect of the Crown leasehold known as Camboon Holding;

(ii.) That the above-described conduct of the said Thomas Andrew Foley constituted corrupt conduct in relation to a dealing with a Crown leasehold, namely the said Camboon Holding.

“E. I find that, other than as hereinbefore set out, there was no corrupt conduct on the part of any person in relation to any dealing with any Crown leasehold coming within the scope of Your Excellency's Commission.”

I read that finding for a purpose. In this morning's paper we saw the headlines, “Foley: I will Not Resign.” I can understand Mr. Foley's making that statement. If the Government accept that finding that I have just read which definitely implies that in the opinion of the Commissioner Mr. Foley solicited this money from Bell for the purpose of aiding party funds they should resign.

In my opinion Mr. Foley is in honour bound to resign but there is no real reason why he should resign one day before his Government. The point about that is this: if Mr. Foley did resign the Government know full well they would have no chance of holding his seat. The essence of this report should be judged by the people. The arguments by the Government last week and this week have been that the people have already passed judgment and have returned the Government to office with a substantial majority. I submit that if the people had had this report before the elections that would not have happened. I feel in fairness to the people and to members of this Parliament, that this question should be submitted to the people for their judgment. Up to the present that has not been done. The Royal Commissioner, Mr. Justice Townley, agreed that the money was not for Mr. Foley's personal gain, but for party funds. If it was for party funds, then the Government are in honour bound to hand in their resignation.

There are a few notable features about this inquiry. The other day the Premier endeavoured to explain that the reason for setting up this commission was because of the remarks of Senator Wood in the Senate. Senator Wood based his statement on rumours that had been circulated throughout the country. That is nothing extraordinary. We heard statements in this House again and again—hearsay statements. If Senator Wood had any idea that corrupt practices were being carried on in the affairs of the Queensland Government, he was entitled to make reference to them—some duty rested on his shoulders. I submit that the Premier was not much concerned with what Senator Wood said in the Senate; he thought it was a good opportunity to trap Senator Wood. He thereupon set the trap with the object of silencing Senator Wood but instead of catching Senator Wood he caught Mr. Foley. That is a remarkable feature about it. As the inquiry proceeded certain developments took place. Those developments led to the intervention by Mr. Bell. After the Commission had proceeded for some time the position began to look serious not only for Mr. Foley but also for the Government, and in order to whitewash the matter and get it over as quickly as possible the inquiry was transferred from the Commissioner's hands and made the subject of an investigation by a stipendiary magistrate. I have no wish to reflect on the magistrate who handled the case or anyone else, but, without even accepting the evidence that was available, the magistrate acquitted Mr. Foley and closed the case. That was a notable feature. These are things said by people outside and the conclusions drawn by them. Another notable feature of the inquiry was the opinion that the Government sought from Mr. Casey. Mr. Casey is a very capable barrister, but people outside doubt very much the sincerity of the Government in referring this question to him for advice.

It has been argued by the hon. member for Belyando and other Government members that after all, the findings of the Commission do not amount to a conviction. I agree. Mr. Foley was not convicted by the Royal Commissioner; he made certain findings and, if Government members are sure that this case can stand the test of Supreme Court proceedings, I ask them to clear Mr. Foley by submitting the case for trial in the Supreme Court. If Government members are sure that the findings of the Royal Commissioner mean nothing, clear Mr. Foley and the Government by having the matter tried in the Supreme Court.

I now come to Mr. Bell's intervention in the Royal Commission proceedings. I believe that if he had not intervened the Commission would not have reached a serious stage. It is my opinion, and I think the opinion is general, that the Commissioner's report is a masterpiece. His examination and analysis of the evidence and the findings he delivered were really wonderful. I pay a tribute to the work of the members of our judiciary. They are trained to examine evidence; members of this Parliament are not. The public generally were not in a position to attend the sittings of the Commission or read the transcript. Consequently they are not in a position to judge the issues.

It was said in the course of this debate that Mr. Bell was not a man of moral standing. I will not allow such a statement to pass. If one duty devolves on me, it is the duty of wiping out that smear. Mr. Bell lives in my district. I have known him and his family all their lives. I know he would rather cut off his right hand than take an oath and commit perjury, and the same thing applies to every member of his family. I do not know of one black mark against any member of his family. Whenever opportunity offers to help people in less favourable circumstances, a neighbour or anyone else, they are always to the fore in giving it. If there is one person entitled to that credit, it is Mr. F. M. Bell, the person who volunteered this evidence. It was said that he had political ambitions. The Treasurer said this morning that he knew that at one time Mr. Bell had approached the late Hon. William Forgan Smith with the idea of contesting the then Stanley seat. I interjected when the Treasurer was speaking to say that it was not true. I still cannot believe it. His late brother, Mr. Ernest Bell, at one time represented the Fassifern seat that I now hold. At the time of his death people in the district approached Mr. F. M. Bell and asked him to contest the seat, but he refrained from doing so. He told me again and again that he never wished to be a parliamentarian because of the life his brother was obliged to live and the duties he had to carry out. Mr. F. M. Bell never at any time in his life had political ambitions. It is true that he is a member of the Country Party. I say that he has never taken an active part in an election campaign since I represented the

electorate of Fassifern. He has not taken part in any election campaign either in Fassifern or elsewhere.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MULLER: Therefore, it is quite wrong to suggest that Mr. F. M. Bell was imbued with political motives. You, Mr. Speaker, know perfectly well how Mr. Bell came into the matter. He was in the South when this Commission was being conducted; he read the evidence and he recalled an experience he had had. His coming into the picture was the result of his honour and integrity. He felt a duty had then fallen upon him. He had to decide whether to be a man and live up to the ideals people expected of him or slip out of the picture and do nothing about the matter. He was compelled because of his conscience to come into this inquiry. He then endeavoured to look up a few records which he thought might still be filed with his solicitors, Darvall & Darvall of Boonah. The late Mr. C. B. Darvall was his legal adviser at that time and his character was beyond reproach. He was noted for the good life he led. I could quote instances of where he turned clients away from his office who came to him with improper motives. These records were not held in cold storage for a particular purpose, they were simply filed. Since Mr. Darvall Senr. passed away the sons have carried on the business and, of course, held the records. They found that there was a record of an experience Mr. Bell had had some years before. On looking at the record he was reminded of what actually took place. As you know, Mr. Speaker, much discussion has taken place as to Mr. Bell's intervention in this inquiry. His experience was like this: he was called in to see Mr. Foley. At this stage I want to make the point that I give Mr. Justice Townley extremely great credit for his report. He had to decide whether he was going to believe Mr. F. M. Bell or Mr. Foley. The question has been raised and it was suggested here yesterday that there is no reason why Mr. Bell should not have reported the matter to the police. I think it was the Attorney-General who said that if Mr. Bell's case was sound it was his duty to report the matter to the police. In fact, that hon. gentleman went so far as to say that Mr. Justice Philp should have disclosed his information to the police. Mr. Bell could not report the matter to the police because of the very thing under examination by the Royal Commission. It was Mr. Foley's word against Mr. Bell's. Mr. Bell consulted the late Mr. Darvall, who told him that it would be unwise to take the matter any further. He also consulted the late Mr. A. D. McGill, a prominent legal man, and he too advised him that he had no case. Then he consulted Mr. Justice Philp, who confirmed the previous advice that it would be unwise to take the matter any further. However, when the Royal Commission began its proceedings, Mr. Bell felt it his duty to disclose what had happened. That action of his must be

admired, and I have heard it said repeatedly that it is worthy of public recognition. Mr. Bell had no axe to grind—he had no wish to incriminate Mr. Foley or anyone else—but he felt he had a duty to perform.

The Commissioner was faced with the tremendous task of ascertaining whether Mr. Foley or Mr. Bell was telling the truth. First of all, he had to satisfy himself that Mr. Foley called Mr. Bell to his office for this confidential talk. Mr. Foley did not deny that. In fact, there were certain features about his invitation to Mr. Bell that he admitted. He said that he had rung Mr. Bell about 8 o'clock one morning before the office opened. Mr. Bell came into the office not knowing what the subject matter of the discussion would be.

It is not necessary for me to repeat what Mr. Foley put to Mr. Bell, but the Commissioner had to ascertain if there was anything in the suggestion of improper motives, and why Mr. Foley brought Mr. Bell to his office. Members of the Government have been very eager to quote parts of the transcript of evidence before the Commission, but I should like them to read that part of Mr. Foley's evidence where he was cross-examined on why he invited Mr. Bell to his office. He told the Commission that he wanted to discuss with Mr. Bell the tenure of the Camboon holding, which was held by Mr. Bell and his sister-in-law, because he was very concerned over the action of the Commonwealth Government in defreezing portion of Camboon, which it had been intended to cut up for closer settlement.

The Commissioner had to examine that evidence to see who was telling the truth, and the conclusion he arrived at was that Mr. Foley hedged whilst under cross-examination. Mr. Foley said that he wanted to see Mr. Chifley about it, and when Mr. Wanstall reminded him that Mr. Chifley had been defeated at the elections four days previously, he said he wanted to see Mr. Menzies. The result of it all was that the Commissioner said that he did not believe Mr. Foley.

Then there was the evidence about the registered letter. Mr. Bell said he held a receipt for it, but Mr. Foley denied getting it. The Commissioner did not believe Mr. Foley's evidence, and found in favour of Mr. Bell.

Mr. Bell's position is beyond reproach. It is quite wrong for anyone to say that he came before the Commission for political motives or to do anybody an injury. Neither Mr. Bell nor any member of his family would do anybody an injury. The Premier and the Treasurer said that Mr. Bell would be the last man that the ex-Minister would approach. I can only say that for 18 years Mr. Bell was a member of the Meat Industry Board and it may have appeared from that that he was a prospect. However, he has a record that any hon. member could well be proud of. Any reflection on his actions must also be a reflection on his advisers, and who would attempt to reflect on the soundness of the advice of the late Mr. Alex McGill? I am

sure, too, that no-one would reflect on Bell's solicitor, the late Mr. C. B. Darvall. It is clear that everything Bell did was above board and it is just too bad for the Government that they were exposed by the findings. Government affairs are in a very sorry state indeed if resort must be had to such means for boosting Party funds.

Remember that the report has been accepted by the Government as correct, and that is doubly proved.

Mr. Burrows: We do not accept your interpretation of the findings.

Mr. MULLER: I do not ask anybody to accept my interpretation. I admit that, like the hon. member for Port Curtis, I have not had any training that fits me to exercise judgment in a case of this kind. I have been to the Supreme Court and have learned to admire the ability of some of our judges. They have special training for the work. Think of the great pains Mr. Justice Townley went to before arriving at his finding! His was a tremendous task. First of all he had to study the demeanour of the two men to determine where the truth lay. That important part of a judge's work is apparent to all who attend the court.

Mr. Devries: The Treasurer paid Mr. Justice Townley a great compliment this morning.

Mr. MULLER: Yes, and I think he should. Judges are obliged to listen to witnesses who have sworn to tell the truth but they do not all tell the truth, and that is putting it very mildly. So it is the duty of the judge to determine who is telling the truth. That seems to be the basis of this matter and I think it is a pity that any aspersions should be cast on Mr. Bell, whose record is beyond reproach.

Mr. Burrows: The judge cast a reflection on him when he said he was not what might be called a "good" witness.

Mr. MULLER: The Commissioner said he was asked to judge of the credibility of the two men. He said that he felt he should rely on Mr. Bell. If we accept the Royal Commissioner's report then we accept what he has actually said. We cannot question the finding seeing that it is accepted by the Government and proved beyond all doubt that Mr. Bell's evidence was with foundation.

Mr. Bell could have kept out of it! There was no need for him to go to all this trouble. He is not a young man and he does not like this sort of thing, but his soul demanded that he do his duty, and he did it.

Mr. Burrows: Why didn't it come out seven years ago?

Mr. MULLER: If the hon. member had been in the Chamber when I was speaking he would have heard earlier why it did not come out. Had Bell made this statement at the time he would have been charged with

defamation. The evidence available to him was not sufficient even to take to the police. He told Mr. Justice Townley what he knew. He did not condemn Mr. Foley. He stood up to the strain of cross-examination.

The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt said that hon. members of the Opposition failed to deal with Sections (b) and (c) of the amendment. It is remarkable that he should make that statement seeing that he, himself, did not speak at any great length about these clauses. He dealt with Mr. Russell and the devaluation of the £ and other things which were quite irrelevant.

In my opinion never was the time more opportune for an amendment of this kind. The Government's record, particularly over the last few years, has been one of bungle, bungle, bungle. I will prove that in the course of my remarks. The Government's defence to that would be that their record was approved by the people at the elections in May last—in other words, that the people approved of all this bungling.

Let me examine this approval and see what it means. The figures were used by the Leader of the Opposition when he moved his amendment. Was the Government's action approved by the people of Queensland? The Government received 50.8 per cent. of the votes and 66 per cent. of the seats—49 seats out of a Parliament of 75. On the number of hon. members in the House it appears that they received the approval of the people but on the number of votes cast in their favour there has not been any great approval.

(Time, on motion of Mr. Lloyd Roberts, extended.)

Mr. MULLER: I thank the hon. member for Whitsunday and the House for the courtesy extended to me. In view of the present state of the electoral boundaries it would take nothing less than an earthquake to move the Government. It is true there were whispers before the election regarding what the findings of the Royal Commission might be, but if this document had been available to the people at that time I doubt whether the Government would have been returned. I think I am justified in challenging the Government to test the feelings of the people by having Mr. Foley resign; then we would know whether they retain the confidence of the people of Queensland. The reason why Mr. Foley has not resigned is that they are afraid of the result. As I said earlier it would be better if the Government, who are so sure that they have the confidence of the people, resigned and allowed the people to express their views. That is the only way to see whether the Government have retained the confidence of the people.

The economic position of our transport system, as referred to in the amendment, has reached breaking point. It is almost impossible for the Railway Department to carry wool or any other lines. The condition of some of our passenger vehicles is terrible.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to the carrying of wool.

Mr. MULLER: You have not given me any latitude, Mr. Speaker. You could not have been listening to the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt when he was dealing with the de-valuation of the £1. He was not pulled up at all. I am going to abide by your ruling. I am not stuck for an argument, if you keep me strictly to the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I would remind the hon. member on the question of railways I kept all other hon. members to the carrying of wool as set out in the amendment.

Mr. MULLER: You could not have been listening very attentively to the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. I was amazed that he survived for five minutes. There is much to be said about the amendment. I am glad that the hon. member for Gregory is sitting on the Ministerial benches because he knows I was at Longreach and saw what happened the day that the Minister for Transport and the Commissioner for Railways, Mr. Moriarty, issued instructions to railway employees to move the wool that was standing in railway trucks in the railway yard at that centre. What happened? The wool was not moved. Why was it not moved? Mr. Bikowski dominates the policy of this Government. That was clearly demonstrated at the Mackay Convention when he took control out of the hands of the Government, and he has held it ever since. He decided that if they could not beat the woolgrowers they would bring the Transport Union into the picture and the wool would not be moved. This did not happen only at Longreach, but in other places in the West, where I saw wool in trucks at railway sidings. Inquiries by me revealed that some of the wool had been at those sidings for weeks. The railway employees at Longreach were ordered to move that wool, but they defied the direction of the executive head of the department.

Mr. Devries: They did not defy him. They accepted the advice of their union. The union forbade the handling of it.

Mr. MULLER: I do not care what advice they accepted. The fact is the wool was not moved, and that is the only thing that matters. Have we reached the stage when an employee of the Railway Department or any other department can defy the directions of the head of his department? If we have, then democratic government has nearly reached its end. When the Premier was speaking the other day, the hon. member for Mundingburra interjected, "If you forced these men to do their job, the whole of our industrial system would be paralysed." The Premier and the hon. member for Mundingburra agreed on that point. The behaviour of some of our wharf labourers was mentioned during the debate. I am not arguing in support of the wharves any more than

I am arguing in support of the railway employees or the shearers, but we must have some form of law and order.

I am glad to see that the Attorney-General is in his place.

Mr. Power: I am always in my place, and will finish up putting the hon. member in his place.

Mr. MULLER: I intend to draw an analogy, but first of all let me state that in the conduct of affairs of the State we must have civil laws and industrial laws and we must enforce them. What is the use of having civil laws if they are not enforced.

Mr. Power: If the hon. member had his way, we would have industrial war.

Mr. MULLER: Industrial laws must be enforced. The Attorney-General besides being the attorney—he is not a general—is the ministerial head of the department that controls prices. Prices are fixed just as wages are fixed. Wages are fixed by the Industrial Court, and it is the duty of anyone seeking employment to work at those rates.

Mr. Power: It is not.

Mr. Skinner: That is only the minimum wage.

Mr. MULLER: The person seeking employment has a moral right to refuse, but not a legal right. The Attorney-General fixes prices.

Mr. Power: I do nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULLER: If a butcher refuses to sell meat at the fixed price, what is the outcome?

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. I do not fix the price of anything. That is the prerogative of the Prices Commissioner, under the Profiteering Prevention Act. It is his sole right and he is not subject to my direction.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Clark): I ask the hon. member to accept the Minister's denial.

Mr. MULLER: I accept his denial. I am just trying to emphasise what happens. There is an obligation upon the purchaser of that meat to pay that price and an obligation on the part of the butcher to sell it at that price. Furthermore, the Attorney-General said that if the butcher does not issue a docket, he will be prosecuted.

Mr. Power: That is so. I will never let up.

Mr. MULLER: He has been known to fine a butcher as much as £25 for refusing to issue a docket. That illustrates the one-sidedness of his argument. Imagine what would happen if one went up the street to a baker and asked for a loaf of bread and

the baker refused to supply the loaf at the fixed price. He leaves himself open to a prosecution.

Mr. Power: He need not sell the bread at all.

Mr. MULLER: The price of bread is fixed and he has to sell his bread at a fixed price and the Attorney-General sees that he does. We have been told in regard to the sale of butter—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid the hon. member is getting away from the amendment.

Mr. MULLER: To complete the analogy let me say that if one refuses to sell butter at the fixed price he is liable to prosecution. I think it would be a very sorry state of affairs if you compelled a man to work against his will. In the West a number of these shearers refused to accept the award rate and got employment elsewhere. I do not blame them. It is only human nature. Mr. Bukowski, who directs the Government, told the people not to accept work and hon. members opposite are complaining here today—

Mr. Power: It is you who are squealing.

Mr. MULLER: I am giving the Attorney-General a few home truths. What is going to happen if we do not stand up to arbitration? Are we not going to do the shearers and the workers generally a disservice by telling them not to accept the award rate? Have not the Government induced or aided or abetted them to defy the Industrial Court? Only one thing can happen—the end of our industrial system and the fixation of wages.

Mr. Power: In this case the men did not sign on and would not sign on under the new rate. They signed no contract and they are not on strike. I do not think they are entitled to less in Queensland than they are getting in the other States for the same kind of work.

Mr. MULLER: That is beside the point. The time will come when Government members will be only too glad to recommend these same people to accept arbitration. Hon. members opposite talk about reflections upon the judiciary, but are they not reflecting on the judges of the Industrial Court? They are doing that when they who framed this legislation and are supposed to control and defend the Court are going to tell the people not to accept the Court's findings. Mr. Bukowski has laid it down to these people that he will tell them what wages they will take. Whether the Gair Government like it or not they are obliged to do what he has told them. It is not a question of what conditions in industry generally are.

Mr. Speaker has ruled that I cannot discuss other affairs of the Government. I had quite a lot to say in regard to other departments but I say now that we have reached a pretty

sorry plight when the Railway Department is losing upwards of £3,000,000 a year. One can travel over the main road to Ipswich any day of the week and see trucks hauling wool to Brisbane with consequent loss to the Railways. Dry rot has set in in that department. Why? The Minister for Transport for some reason or other has not found it convenient to be in the House whilst this debate has been in progress. He was not here yesterday or today. If he is not ashamed of his department he should be. Those of us who participate in the affairs of Parliament are perturbed and wonder what will happen. If our transport system breaks down everything will break down. We have reached the stage when members of this Government are telling railway employees that they can handle what goods they like. What is going to happen if they do not handle the goods? They will be carried over the roads.

Mr. Power: What would you do with the strikers?

Mr. MULLER: We have reached the stage where something must be done.

Mr. Power: You would shoot them down as they did in 1891.

Mr. MULLER: I have never heard a Minister of the Crown behave in the manner of the Attorney-General today. He has been bowled out in all his arguments, and he is now playing the part of a dingo by trying to howl me down. That may be all right at street meetings, but this is Parliament House. I do not expect it to be conducted like a Sunday School, but I do expect a man who holds the important office of Attorney-General to display at least some degree of dignity. We are entitled to put our case, and in my opinion I have made a sound one.

Mr. JESSON (Hinchinbrook) (4.6 p.m.): I did not intend to enter this debate, and I rise now merely to correct an error in today's issue of "The Telegraph." Whilst the Treasurer was speaking this morning there was some cross-firing between him and the hon. member for Coorparoo and at one stage I interjected. My remark was misreported. I am not blaming the Press reporter because there was a good deal of noise in the Chamber at the time. However, I should like my correction to be recorded in "Hansard" because the version that appears in "The Telegraph" might put me in a very poor light.

This is the report as it appears in "The Telegraph"—

"Why was the late Chief Justice (Mr. Justice Macrossan) refused membership to the club?"

"Mr. Hiley: I can tell you about that later.

"The Government Whip (Mr. Jesson): They had something against him."

I did not say that at all. What I said was, "Did they have something against him?" That changes the whole complexion of the report.

Mr. HEADING (Marodian) (4.7 p.m.): I regret that it is necessary for me to speak during this debate. I do not get any pleasure from the fact that we are in our present position because of the finding of the Royal Commissioner, and I feel quite sure that the Commissioner derived no pleasure in finding as he did, that he did it out of a sheer sense of duty. However, men in public offices, such as we are, must protest against certain things that have occurred.

I regret also the attack on Mr. Justice Townley, who conducted the Royal Commission. It is quite unfair. We are indebted to men of his calibre who take on these very unpleasant jobs. Mr. Justice Townley has spent a lifetime in practising law; he is trained for such a job as a Royal Commissioner. I do not think anybody better could be got for the job. The Treasurer said the other day, however, that Mr. Justice Townley was only a man and could be wrong. Apparently, at that stage the Government had decided that they would try to protect Mr. Foley and argue against the Commissioner. They did all they could to break down the Commissioner's decision. Whenever members of the Opposition have spoken about the judiciary they have been pounced on and told not to criticise judges. How wrong then were the Government speakers the other day! Mr. Justice Townley is a man trained to hold the scales of justice in balance and I do not think hon. members have a right to criticise him, particularly those who appointed him as Commissioner. At least they should be satisfied that they appointed the right man.

Mr. Devries: Wouldn't the Chief Justice nominate the Commissioner?

Mr. HEADING: Of course, but the Government would decide the man for the job. It seemed to me that the speakers on the Government side questioned the Commissioner's decision in an attempt to protect the hon. member for Belyando, whether right or wrong.

Mr. Devries: Surely each individual hon. member has a right to express his opinion on the report! That is all we have done and that is what you are doing now.

Mr. HEADING: Of course, but until yesterday, as far as I could see, Government members were arguing that the decision was wrong. Then there was a noticeable change when the Premier said he accepted the report.

Mr. Devries: So did the Treasurer this morning.

Mr. HEADING: Of course he did. However, I took notes when Government members were speaking and I am sure I formed a sound impression of their attitude.

Mr. Devries: Of course, you do a lot of provoking from your side, too.

Mr. HEADING: I think I have been very quiet. I have spoken only when it was really necessary.

Mr. Devries: I was not referring to you personally.

Mr. HEADING: The Government were quite happy to give the Commissioner the opportunity of investigating the allegations but when he was unable to clear the hon. member for Belyando of corrupt conduct they felt he had given a wrong verdict and they did all they could to get round it.

The ex-Minister's criticism of the Commissioner may be likened to the criticism of a judge by a man caught in the act of breaking into a house, tried and found guilty. I can understand his being critical of the judge. He had no say in his appointment and he might well be vicious about his punishment. I would not expect him to approve of the policeman who caught him in the act nor would I expect him to eulogise the people who tried him or gave evidence against him. There we speak of a man who has committed a crime, one subjected to legal action and confinement. Here the Government set up the Commission themselves. The man who broke into the house did not have any say like that. The Government set up the Commission and then feel hurt about the result. They are squealing, there is no doubt about it. I wonder why they are fighting so desperately for the hon. member for Belyando in condemning the findings of the Commission. If the decision of the Commission is accepted the Government must accept the fact that Mr. Foley did ask Mr. Bell for £1,000 for Party funds. Mr. Bell is one of the outstanding citizens of the State and that was proved during the many years that he was on the Meat Board at the abattoirs. Immediately the Government change their attitude and decide to accept the Commission's decision they accept the fact that Mr. Foley asked Mr. Bell for £1,000 for Party funds and once that is accepted many other hon. members of the Government Party are brought in. If he asked Bell for £1,000 is it not conceivable that he asked many other people for money? Of course it is. He asked Mr. Bell many years ago and the Secretary for Public Lands—

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HEADING: Hon. members opposite are going to get it. The Secretary for Public Lands was in the job many years after that happened. What happened during those years? If an hon. member of the Opposition were caught out as the hon. member for Belyando was I can imagine what the Government would be saying about us. Immediately hon. members on the Government side accept the fact that Mr. Foley asked Mr. Bell to put £1,000 into Party funds it means that many hon. members on that side of the House knew all about it.

Mr. RASEY: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has suggested that hon. members on this side of the House knew all about it at the time. That is offensive to me and I ask him to withdraw it. He is indicating that hon. members on this side of the House had knowledge of it before the Commission started. That is offensive to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I feel sure that the hon. member for Marodian does not wish to cast any reflection on any hon. member of the Assembly, particularly on the Government side, and I ask him to withdraw any offensive remark he may have made.

Mr. HEADING: I have no objection to withdrawing anything offensive. I am sure he did not hear what I said. I said "some members." I do not blame them all. I am sure some did not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member is reflecting on any hon. member I ask him not to continue on those lines.

Mr. HEADING: If you accept the report you must accept the statement of the hon. member for Belyando that they were all doing it. So it must have been pretty widespread. If you have a political fund and if you accept the fact that he had been asking for money and that money was paid into that fund, surely it would not only be the man who asked for the money who knew about it. Somebody else must know if the party got £1,000 or £1,500. Would not somebody say, "Tom, where are you getting it from?"

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the hon. member that the Premier has indicated already that no member of the party had any authority from him to solicit funds corruptly in any way on behalf of the party. I ask the hon. member to accept that.

Mr. HEADING: Did I understand you to say that there was no fund?

Mr. SPEAKER: He said that no-one had any authority to solicit any funds corruptly on behalf of the party either in the political or industrial wings.

Mr. HEADING: If I insulted the hon. member I withdraw. We have accepted the fact that the then Secretary for Public Lands was accepting money for these leases, and if the leases were of any value the money paid for them is the property of the State and should not go to party funds or to any private member. If a lease that is due to expire is worth anything then the Government whose job it is to look after the finances of the State should see that the money goes to the credit of the department or to Consolidated Revenue. It should be all above board. If it is worth anything the money should be paid to the State.

Mr. Jesson: You mean that if a man has plenty of money he can buy concessions and the small bloke cannot buy anything.

Mr. HEADING: That is what you have been doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEADING: That is not what I am suggesting. If I took up a 30-years' lease, at the end of that time it would revert to closer settlement, but if, at that time the department was not ready to throw it open for selection—there is a shortage of surveyors; the Main Roads Department told me that today—I might be told that it would be leased for another 10 years and that such lease was worth £1,000 or £1,500. Such money should go into the coffers of the State. I do not think there can be any argument against that. I stand for the small man every time. I am one of those who struggled from the bottom up and if I can put in a word for the small man I am going to do it. I ask hon. members to consider the bad effect that this will have on land settlement in this State. I read recently that there were 200 or 240 applicants for one block of sheep country. Another block was mentioned in the paper yesterday. It was reported that there were 330 applicants for 10 blocks. That emphasises the land hunger of the young men of the State. If the lease of an area of land is due to expire, why should not that land be thrown open so that the little men will have a chance of getting some land? How has the returned soldiers' land settlement scheme been affected by the land policy of this Government?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That has nothing to do with the amendment.

Mr. HEADING: We find that the leases of areas in good rainfall belts have been extended. That will affect the economy of the State. The land should be made available to young settlers.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting right away from the amendment in dealing with land matters generally. I ask him to deal with the amendment.

Mr. HEADING: That land is not being thrown open for selection. I wonder whether there is any sinister reason.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jesson interjected.

Mr. HEADING: I do not appreciate that accusation that I am disloyal. I am one of the most loyal persons in the State. I ask that that remark be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the remark. If the hon. member made that remark, I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. Jesson: I withdraw it.

Mr. HEADING: I have very strong feelings on the matter and I think I have demonstrated where I stand.

I come now to the strike in the shearing industry. It is a subject that calls for lengthy discussion, perhaps more than I will be able to give to it this afternoon.

The strike is one of the most serious in this State. The Attorney-General by way of interjection said that the shearers were not on strike. If that is true, why have railway employees declared the wool black?

Mr. Power: They are only on strike once they sign a contract.

Mr. HEADING: I am pleased to hear that they are not on strike, but they are not doing the shearing.

Mr. Power: A lot of them are shearing at the old rate.

Mr. HEADING: I do not think a man should be compelled to work if he does not want to, but he must find a job. The State should not have to feed him. If he does not want to work for the award rate, he must not expect to be fed by the Government and the Government should not allow him to stand in the road of someone else who is prepared to work. The economy of this State is being shattered because of the action of these people who refuse to work. The men who are shearing under the new award are not doing any harm. They are keeping faith with the Industrial Court. This Government have said they stand for arbitration. Why are they not supporting the Industrial Court.

Mr. Power: The decision must be made by the Court. The matter must be settled by arbitration.

Mr. HEADING: The matter must be settled by arbitration. The Government are supposed to be the leaders of the Labour Party. Why do they not tell these people that what they are doing will mean that many others will be out of work? There are many sheep that will not be shorn. A lot have died from blow flies just because they could not be shorn. Unfortunately for the sheep owner in the West this strike came during one of the wettest seasons the West has ever known. I discussed this question with a man who had been bulldozing out in the West, not the hon. member for Barambah, and he told me that the area in which he was working which normally has an annual rainfall of 19 inches had over 54 inches. The sheep that had been blown by fly got away and died in the long grass and could not be found. Thousands of pounds have been going "west" which should have been boosting the economy of the State and going into the pockets of the workers. That is what is taking place because we have on our hands a silly strike. The Attorney-General said yesterday and again today that people should not be expected to work for less than similar workers were receiving in the southern States. I am glad he made that statement because I often wondered what he thought about these matters. If the Industrial Court awarded the same rate in Queensland as that awarded in the other States I should be happy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEADING: The Attorney-General said that they should not be asked to work for less here than in the South. I want to

know why it is that the producers of lard in Queensland have to sell it for 1s. 1d. a lb.—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEADING: Whereas they are getting 2s. 7d. a lb. in the South.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has been allowed certain latitude, but he is now taking more advantage of it than ever. I ask him to deal with the carrying of wool over the railways.

Mr. HEADING: I can easily talk about that because I am concerned with it. I am concerned also with the workings of the Railway Department and the fact that we have lost £600,000 in that department because the wool was not carted. When coming to Brisbane the other day I was amazed to see a number of big trucks of wool coming in from the West by road which should have been carried over the railways. These trucks were tearing up the roads and taking revenue away from the Railway Department. It is not the fault of the man carting the wool, it is the fault of the Government because they are not doing anything about it. Are the Government going to sit by and simply say that if we do anything we will have a terrible mess on our hands and that people all over the place will be on strike? If that is their attitude they will ride us to death.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEADING: When I had a strike on my hands I said, "Either you work or get out."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEADING: Getting back to the question of wool, when I saw truckloads coming down by road, I said, "Look at the revenue the railways are losing." The sum was £600,000 a month ago and it is going up day by day.

Mr. Nicklin: And everybody else has to pay higher freights.

Mr. HEADING: Yes, I and other people living in the bush have to pay higher freights because the Government are losing all this money. They will lose more. The economy of the State and the wool industry rests on the fact that we want freights as low as possible. If the Government let the workers do as they like, how can they reduce freights? How can we compete with other countries on the overseas markets? If any of these men had people working for them they would not allow them to dictate the terms of their employment. In the railways, however, it is left to the employees to decide what they will do, irrespective of the fact that the wool-grower is trying to get his wool to Brisbane for the sales

The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt had a good deal to say about awards. He stressed the fact that the Industrial Court did not take certain things into consideration in its judgments. I have here many judgments of the court, and in all of them that I have

examined the President has referred to most things connected with the wool industry, such as the number of sheep in the State and the prosperity of the industry.

The 1937 judgment reads—

"When the present shearing rates were fixed in March, 1936, the Court observed that wool prices were satisfactory and pastures assured for a flock which approximated closely to the average for the State over 20 years.

"Since then the flock has substantially increased; so, too, wool prices. Moreover, splendid rains have continued to fall, and the outlook for the wool industry is particularly good. In these circumstances an increase in the shearing rates must be conceded."

In 1951, the Court increased the then shearing rates by 33½ per cent.

For the information of hon. members, I quote the average prices of wool and the shearing rates since 1948-49—

Year.	Average Price.	Highest shearing rate per 100.	
		s.	d.
1948-49 ..	51.29 ..	75	0
1949-50 ..	68.49 ..	96	10½
1950-51 ..	142.31 ..	149	9
1951-52 ..	84.04 ..	160	0
1952-53 ..	88.86 ..	147	9
1953-54 ..	86.45 ..	149	6
1954-55 ..	72.85 ..	153	9

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must connect his remarks with the failure of the railways to transport wool.

Mr. HEADING: I was replying to a remark by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt. He said certain things were not allowed. I know that the Government have not very much legal power to stop a strike but they could talk to the people and tell them the harm they are doing to the community. Railway men are not dunces and I am sure that if the Premier made a public statement about losses and costs it would soon seep into their minds. I do not believe men should work for nothing. I believe in fair conditions of work just as I believe in a fair day's work. I think those involved in the strike, which is really a strike against carting wool, should be told where to get off so that the State might return to an even keel as early as possible.

Debate, on motion of Mr. Turner, adjourned.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Hon. J. E. DUGGAN (Toowoomba—Deputy Premier): I move—

"That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, 21 August, 1956."

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.45 p.m.