

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 12 JUNE 1957

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 12 JUNE, 1957.

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

QUESTION.

LEGAL EXPENSES, COLLINSVILLE ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. JESSON (Hinchinbrook) asked the Premier—

“With reference to payments to barristers in connection with the Royal Commission which inquired into certain matters relating to the State Coal Mine at Collinsville,—

1. What amounts for legal expenses were paid (a) to Mr. D. Casey, (b) to Mr. D. McCawley, and (c) for any other legal expenses?

2. What was the total cost of the Commission?”

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane) replied—

“1. (a) £4,499 5s.; (b) £4,630 10s.; (c) £5,170 4s.

“2. £31,989 18s.”

DEATH OF MR. W. BERTRAM.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE.

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Premier) (11.2 a.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this State by the late William Bertram, Esquire, a former Member and Speaker of the Parliament of Queensland.

“2. That Mr. Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland, in the loss they have sustained.”

Hon. members will learn with regret of the death yesterday of the former Speaker of this Parliament, Mr. William Bertram.

Mr. Bertram was elected at the general election of 27 April, 1912, to the 19th Parliament as member for the electoral district of Maree, and served through the 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd and 24th Parliaments.

He was Chairman of Committees from 12 October, 1916, to 9 January, 1920, and Speaker from 9 January, 1920, to his defeat at the general election of 11 May, 1929.

I understand that Mr. Bertram was on his way to catch a bus to attend yesterday's proceedings of the House when he collapsed and died. He had visited Parliament House on Monday to reserve a seat for the opening of the Session.

The late William Bertram was born at Hamilton, Scotland, on 11 January, 1875, and was eight years old when he came to Australia. He was educated at the East Warwick State School, and was employed in the grocery trade before entering politics.

Billy Bertram, as he was familiarly and affectionately known, is remembered as a tall, lithe, good-looking man, extremely amiable and friendly with everybody. Not only his own Party but members of the Opposition always found him courteous and friendly.

As an athlete, he distinguished himself as a boxer, and he won the amateur middle-weight boxing championship of Queensland in 1890 and 1900.

We very sincerely convey our heartfelt sympathy to the relatives and friends of the departed member of this Assembly.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) (11.5 a.m.): I second the motion and support the remarks of the Premier. We extend to the relatives of the late William Bertram our deep and sincere sympathy in the loss they have sustained. The late gentleman was well known to many of us. I have known him for a number of years although I was not a member of this Parliament at the time he occupied the position of Speaker. Since I have become a member, I have met Mr. Bertram on a number of occasions and had discussions with him regarding Parliamentary procedure. He had a long and useful life and an excellent record as a Parliamentarian. He held the offices of Chairman of Committees and Speaker of the House for many years and in the latter position he enjoyed the respect of all members. I have heard him spoken of very often by those who were in the House at the time he was Speaker. He was eminently fair in his decisions and carried out his duties as Speaker with credit to himself and the House.

As the Premier said, he was an athlete in his youth and one can well imagine that on seeing him in his later years. During his Parliamentary activities he took a very keen and prominent interest in union affairs and in later life as you, Mr. Speaker, no doubt

know, was a very enthusiastic member of the Caledonian Society. I knew him particularly when he was stationed in my electorate as an officer of the Forestry Department. He displayed keen interest in his work and played no small part in the development of the North Coast. He has passed on after a useful life of service and we will always remember with pride the contributions he made to the State. We have lost an excellent citizen.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba) (11.7 a.m.): I only knew when the Premier rose to speak of the unfortunate death of Mr. Bertram and I join with him and the Leader of the Opposition in extending to the relatives of the late gentleman our sincere sympathy for the loss they have sustained. There are only perhaps one or two members of this Parliament who were here when the late Mr. Bertram was a member of it. My association with him was mainly confined to meetings with him when I attended Scottish functions. I know of the great contribution he made when a member of this Parliament and I understand from those who knew him well that he was a widely respected man, possessed of definite principles and was able to keep his mental faculties to the very end. I and members of my Party regret his passing. He was one of the grand old men of the Labour Movement and at 82 years of age he still evinced keen interest in the political affairs of the State. We regret the passing of such a motion but hope that it will be some consolation to his relatives to know that he was held in high esteem by Parliament.

Motion (Mr. Gair) agreed to, hon. members standing in silence.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—VOTE OF CREDIT.

(The Chairman of Committees, Mr. Clark, Fitzroy, in the chair).

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Premier) (11.11 a.m.): It is generally understood, I think, that this extraordinary session of Parliament has been made necessary because of disaffection in the Government Party; because members of the Labour Party who formerly supported the Government saw fit to answer to the dictates of an authority that is not answerable to Parliament or the people, on a matter that had been debated on innumerable occasions by the Parliamentary Labour Party, which had decided that the legislation sought by those in charge of the industrial wing could not be introduced by the Government because of financial difficulties.

Ordinarily the session would not have begun until approximately 15 August, but because certain members of the Government Party saw fit to withdraw their support, it was necessary for us to bring Parliament together to deal with the circumstances that exist at

present. The reason why it has been necessary for the Treasurer to submit the Bill to provide for Supply beyond 31 August must be apparent to every thinking member of Parliament. To avoid any embarrassment to whoever may be the Government following an election, it is necessary to ensure that there is ample Supply to meet the wage and salary bills of Crown employees. That is why the Bill has been brought down at this stage.

In the course of the debate yesterday the hon. member for Toowoomba made extraordinary statements, one of the most amazing of which was that any self-respecting Premier would have sought the dissolution of Parliament of his own volition. That statement disclosed a lamentable lack of knowledge by the hon. member on the necessities associated with a dissolution of Parliament. Who dissolves Parliament? It is not the Premier. Indeed, it is not the Parliament itself. It is necessary for the Premier in charge of the Government to seek a dissolution from the Governor of the State or the person acting in his stead. Governors do not grant dissolutions simply on application. They must satisfy themselves that the Government have lost the confidence of the Parliament itself and they must look for some concrete evidence or expression from Parliament that such is the case before a dissolution can take place. Yet the hon. member for Toowoomba said that any self-respecting Premier would have sought a dissolution of his own volition. If only he took time to study the position, he would know that what I am saying is correct.

Dr. Noble: You could have called Parliament together earlier.

Mr. GAIR: There was no need to call it together any earlier.

Dr. Noble: The majority of people on this side of the Chamber wanted it called together earlier.

Mr. GAIR: Oh, did they? They even presumed to advise the Administrator—a most irregular practice and most improper conduct on the part of the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy.

Mr. Walsh: They embarrassed the Administrator.

Mr. GAIR: Most embarrassing to the Administrator, to say the least of it.

Mr. Walsh: Never known in history.

Mr. GAIR: Never known in history, as the Treasurer has said. However, that is the position. When Parliament determines the question of Supply, we shall be in a better position to report to the Governor and to advise him on what course should be pursued. Everybody knows that the only people qualified to advise the Governor are his Ministers.

Hon. members opposite said, too, that an election can take place at any old time and that there is no legitimate reason why there should be any delay in conducting it.

Mr. Aikens: If you wanted it to take place at any time, it would take place.

Mr. GAIR: Anyone with a grain of commonsense knows that the first indispensable requirement of a properly-conducted election is a properly-compiled roll of those qualified to vote at that election. Some weeks ago, the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha rushed into error. He said, "The rolls have been printed and there is no reason why the election should not go on forthwith." He overlooked the fact that, as this is not an election year, only a limited number of rolls have been printed for each electorate—about 100 to 120—all that are necessary in a normal non-election year.

Mr. Morris: You are not suggesting that it would take a long while to print the extra rolls, are you?

Mr. GAIR: After the first batch of rolls was printed, all the type was taken down and stacked away. All that type has to be set up again to print the rolls necessary for the conduct of an election. Moreover, it must be patent to all that for this election, more so than for any previous election, because of the three major parties that will contest it, more rolls than usual will be required. All the forms associated with elections have to be printed.

What is more important and what is generally overlooked by those who say with the dramatic touch, "To the people!"—

Mr. Lloyd: They are doing work for the Q.L.P.

Mr. GAIR: The Government Printing Office, as a printery, is entitled to work for anyone who will give them business and are prepared to pay for it.

Mr. Walsh: It does not interfere with the printing of the rolls.

Mr. GAIR: Then there is the matter of the distribution of rolls and all the material associated with elections. It is true that you can put rolls and other printed material aboard aeroplanes and send them to Mt. Isa. When it is received in Mt. Isa it has to be distributed to the more remote parts of the State by road. That takes time. According to the reports I have received from the Government Printing Office through the Treasurer, the Minister in charge of the printery, it will be some weeks before the annual rolls up to December, 1956, are completed and then following the police canvass at present in train supplementary rolls will have to be printed.

Mr. Morris: Would you please tell us the date of that advice?

Mr. GAIR: We are getting them every week. Here is the first report dated 29 May—

“The original order from the Justice Department for the limited number of rolls is now complete in respect of the whole 75 electorates.

“The despatch of the rolls required by the police (including those for the police canvass), clerks of petty sessions, and other officers will be finalised today.

“The printing of the additional annual rolls required to meet the needs of the election is now in hand and 14 of these have been completed to the binding stage. This number includes 11 which were worked off with the original print.

“Eight hours’ overtime was worked by six printing machinists and one folding machinist on Saturday, 25th instant, which gave the job a good boost forward.

“SUPPLEMENTARY ROLLS.

“To date 16,400 registrations for inclusion in these rolls have been received by this Office for 36 electorates. These names are now in the process of being set and read. It is important that the work on the supplementary rolls be kept as far up to date as possible.

“This office has despatched to electoral registrars over 110,000 claim cards since the first of this month, consequently it is anticipated that the new registrations will be heavy.

“BALLOT PAPERS.

“An order from the Justice Department was received on 21st instant for the following ballot papers—

| | |
|------------------------|-----------|
| Form 2a Section 35a .. | 60,000 |
| Form 27 Section 69 .. | 175,000 |
| Form 28 Section 70 .. | 25,000 |
| Form 32 Section 71 .. | 50,000 |
| Form 11 Ordinary .. | 1,175,000 |

“As the Section 70 and 71 ballot papers are required to be in the hands of the 139 electoral registrars by the day on which the writs are issued, they are therefore being given preference and are now on the machines. After the machining is completed, the ballot papers have to be gummied and then numbered.

“The proofs of the other ballot papers have been passed and their printing will following the completion of the Section 70 and 71 papers.”

The next report states—

“ANNUAL ELECTORAL ROLLS.

Number of Electorates for which the additional rolls have been printed is now 29

At this time last week it was .. 14

So that the number printed this week was 15

“Many of the 15 rolls printed this week were, however, small as they were those of far distant electorates. In these circumstances the number of pages contained in the rolls printed and unprinted gives a better picture of the position. Here it is expressed in pages:

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total number of pages in a complete set of the 75 State rolls is | 19,040 |
| Number of pages in the 14 rolls printed at 28/5/57 .. | 3,717 |
| Number of pages in the 15 rolls printed from 29/5/57 to 4/6/57 | 3,170 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 6,887 |
| Number of pages still to be printed | <hr/> |
| | 12,153 |

Then there are the supplementary rolls. All these things are in train. Overtime is being worked to print the rolls and all the other necessary material associated with an election.

There is no guarantee that these rolls and other matter associated with the election will be completed in time to hold an election before the school holidays which commence on 12 August and continue until 26 August. Hon. members know without my telling them how important a part the school teachers play in the conduct of elections, not only in the metropolis but outside. Is it suggested that they should forgo their vacation so as to discharge their duties as presiding and returning officers in an election? What is going to be the position if the Government Printing Office cannot turn out its work in time for an election on or before 3 August? We cannot have an election while the schools are on vacation. Then we reach the end of August when our Supply is cut out. Yet we have the Opposition—all sections of it—refusing to grant the Government Supply as a precautionary requirement against any emergency that may happen. I can assure you, Mr. Clark, I am just as anxious to get to the people as any section of the Opposition.

Government Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. GAIR: But I want to see an election properly conducted. Properly conducted means clean rolls compiled and used in the conduct of the election. Someone has suggested that we should use the Federal rolls. The Federal Government have not printed a roll for years. Every member in the metropolitan area knows—and I am sure that country members know too—that there is an overlap of sub-divisions that would render it impossible for the conduct of a State election under the Federal rolls under existing conditions.

Mr. Aikens: It would be impracticable.

Mr. GAIR: It would be impracticable. They would not have the rolls any more than we would have sufficient rolls in 1956 to conduct an election today. If the Opposition want to accept the responsibility for refusing Supply—the responsibility for placing the Government in the position of not being able to pay their employees, well, that is their business; it is a matter for their decision. I am glad it is their decision and not mine. Everything humanly possible is being done for the preparation of the materials necessary for the conduct of a proper election.

Mr. Hiley: Have you committed yourself to the House as to the date by which it should be possible?

Mr. GAIR: No.

Mr. Hiley: Don't you think you should?

Mr. GAIR: No. I still want reports from the Government Printing Office as to the progress made. Next Monday is a holiday and that means an interruption to the work at the Printing Office.

Mr. Pizzey: What would happen if the Government were defeated on the floor of the House? Would we have to wait four months for an election?

Mr. GAIR: We would have to wait for the rolls. If it was an election year an ample supply of rolls would be printed in the first couple of months, but in a non-election year only a limited number is printed to meet normal requirements. Who wants rolls outside police officers and members of Parliament, a library or two, and a few people interested in election matters?

Mr. Rasey: Are not the ballot papers important too?

Mr. GAIR: Of course. I have taken the opportunity of discussing this matter in great detail with the Leader of the Opposition, and I think he appreciates some of the difficulties associated with the preparation of the material necessary for the election.

Mr. Hiley: He does not believe that they are insuperable.

Mr. GAIR: If he does not believe that they are insuperable, he has not made any constructive suggestion as to how the difficulties can be overcome. Some suggestion has been made that the ballot papers should be printed outside the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Pizzey: Not the ballot papers.

Mr. GAIR: For reasons of security, the ballot papers should be printed in the Government Printery under close supervision. We know that people have got away with coupon paper and so on from the Government Printing Office and produced coupons that they have retailed at some monetary advantage to themselves.

Mr. Pizzey: You could put out a supplementary.

Mr. GAIR: We know that if we handed out the printing of the ballot papers to a private printery we could not expect to exercise the same serenity and supervision as is being exercised at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Dewar: Who suggested that the ballot papers be printed outside?

Mr. GAIR: Many people have suggested it. It has been suggested in the Press.

Mr. Dewar: No.

Mr. GAIR: It does not suit you to admit it now that you have been told the value of having the ballot papers printed in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Dewar: No-one here has ever said that.

Mr. GAIR: I regret that the Opposition have seen fit to take this narrow view. You can be sure that if the schools were not on vacation from Friday, 9 August, until Monday 26 August, there would be no necessity for this Bill, because I am sure that we should be in a position to conduct an election not later than that period. However, because of that interruption, it might be necessary for us to defer the election until the school teachers resume duty and have at least a week to attend to electoral matters, in the cases where they are returning officers, and see to it that their arrangements and organisation for the conduct of an election are complete. As the Attorney-General reminds me, postal votes must also have the attention of the returning officers, many of whom are school teachers. I want hon. members to be fair enough to appreciate the difficulties that are facing the Government. All we have asked for is two months' Supply in case the Government are unable to go to the people before the end of August.

We must also have regard to the fact that the incoming Government, whatever their political colour, will not be able to meet Parliament to get Supply until the return of the writs, if there is a close election and the result is not very decisive. The incoming Government would be greatly embarrassed by that lack of Supply.

Taking into consideration all the facts, the responsible and common-sense thing to do is to guard against any of these emergencies. If the Opposition want to accept the responsibility and gamble on it, that is their business, not mine. Whatever hon. members might think about the necessity for having an election, I say to them, guard against any embarrassment that might be caused to the Government of the State and their employees by the lack of authority to appropriate and pay the salaries of the workers. I am amused by the airy way people without responsibility can dispose of these difficulties. I should like the gentlemen who can airily dispose of these difficulties to have a talk with the Govern-

ment Printer, a very practical man, and one who knows his business. He would tell them what is involved. It is not as easy as a lot of people believe. I think each and every member should be responsible enough to recognise that the first essential in the proper conduct of an election in a democracy is that every man and woman qualified to vote should be on the roll in the electorate in which he or she resides.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MORRIS (Mount Coot-tha) (11.36 a.m.): We are facing a fantastic situation. First of all the Treasurer asked for Supply for a further two months after the end of August and then equally fantastic or perhaps more fantastic was the Premier's rising in his place and giving all sorts of reasons why we cannot have an election within three months, knowing that an election was necessary and without giving the Chamber any assurance whatever that if he is granted Supply he will resign, and without giving any undertaking that he will go to the people and resolve the sorry mess that exists in Queensland without delay. Of course, the Opposition cannot under those circumstances give him Supply. I go further and say that all the specious arguments advanced by the Premier today are empty, hollow and without foundation. Of course they cannot do it. They are the Government that over the last ten or eleven years have not been able to arrest the drift in railway finances; they have not been able to overcome our housing problems. They are a Government that have failed in almost every way in their administration to look after the interests of Queensland. Of course they cannot do it because they are old in office and have not got the will to do the job. Let us look at a few facts. The Premier and his Cabinet knew on 24 April they would not be able to carry on because that surely must have been evident to any member of the Chamber. From 24 April to 20 July is a matter of 12 weeks and to 27 July a matter of 13 weeks and to 3 August a matter of 14 weeks. All of those dates are possible election dates. Will anybody tell me that any Government of this country can advance sound reasons why they cannot have an election within 14 weeks of knowing that an election was required? I remind the Committee that only a few years ago when it suited the book of the Government they were able to put on an election within two months of the close of the year.

Mr. Walsh: An election year and an entirely different situation.

Mr. MORRIS: It does not alter the fact that the rolls did not close until the end of the year and the Government were able to stage an election. Of course the Government cannot do it now because they are too inefficient to do it. Let me use the reasons the Premier gave to show how empty are his arguments.

The Premier quoted from a report by the Government Printer. Presumably it was the first report that the Premier had received from the Government Printer, and I remind the Committee that it was dated 29 May, notwithstanding that the Premier knew on 24 April that an election would have to be held. If the Premier had had an earlier report he could have produced it, but apparently he did not ask for a report for four weeks after he knew that he would have to go to the people. During that period, however, either the Government Printer or a spokesman for the Government Printing Office said that no problem would present itself in the printing of the rolls. And then the Premier says that the necessity to have the electoral rolls up to date is the main reason for delaying an election. I suggest there are other reasons.

The last report quoted by the Premier was dated 4 June. This is 12 June. If the Premier has to give us information, why can it not be factual information as of yesterday or today?

Mr. Walsh: That is here.

Mr. MORRIS: Why did the Premier not give it?

Mr. Walsh: He has quoted it.

Mr. MORRIS: He has not.

Mr. Walsh: Of course he has.

Mr. MORRIS: The Premier gave the date of the last report as 4 June.

Mr. Gair: There is no report dated 4 June. The reports are dated 5 June and 11 June.

Mr. MORRIS: Why did the Premier not quote the later report? Why have we not heard the report bearing yesterday's date?

Mr. Walsh: You will hear it.

Mr. MORRIS: Only because it has now been revealed that the Premier is trying to keep back that information. He is not treating the Committee with the confidence that he should. Such an attitude is ridiculous in the extreme. He says he is doing everything humanly possible to hold an election. I do not believe that is so. In certain departments since 24 April there has been a deliberate policy, dictated by the Government, of going slow on some of this work and doing other work instead.

Mr. Power: That is ridiculous. All the officers of the Justice Department have been working overtime for months.

Mr. MORRIS: Since 24 April?

Mr. Power: Yes. They have been working overtime, and the records show it.

Mr. MORRIS: If they have been working overtime since 24 April, why did not the Premier quote from a report dated prior to 29 May? These excuses are completely fallacious, and hon. members opposite know it.

Mr. Gair: You are one of those who rushed in and said the rolls had been printed.

Mr. MORRIS: I know that many of the rolls have been printed. Some hon. members received their full supplies of rolls for an election year many days ago. The argument from the other side is completely empty and fallacious.

The Premier said that the Leader of the Opposition and I acted irregularly in writing to the Administrator.

Mr. Gair: Presuming to advise him.

Mr. MORRIS: I suggest that the Premier read the letter that we sent to the Administrator; he has had plenty of opportunity.

Mr. Gair: I have read it.

Mr. MORRIS: In it we said, "We desire to inform Your Excellency" of certain facts. "Inform" him, not "advise" him.

Mr. Walsh: Where was your right to inform him? It is the Ministers who inform His Excellency.

Mr. MORRIS: Does the Treasurer suggest that there is no such constitutional right for the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition officially to inform the Governor or Administrator?

Mr. Walsh: No, none whatever.

Mr. MORRIS: What rubbish!

Mr. Walsh: Quote it. Quote your authority.

Mr. MORRIS: The office of Leader of the Opposition is created by the Crown and recognised by the Crown.

Mr. Walsh: You quote the authority.

Mr. MORRIS: If hon. members opposite have not up to this stage had the opportunity to learn about the office of the Leader of the Opposition, may I say that possibly one or two of them will have that opportunity in a couple of months' time, but many of them will not, because they might not even be here.

Mr. Walsh: You will still be over there.

Mr. MORRIS: Make no mistake. I doubt very much whether many of the hon. gentleman's followers or the followers of the hon. member for Toowoomba will be here. If they are, they will be on this side of the Chamber and not on the Government benches. Why, the very Treasurer who presumes to rise in this Chamber and pose as the defender of democracy—this man who has known of the irregularities that have been going on in the Government for some years, illustrated by former members of his own party until recently—

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order, just to put it on record. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that I am aware of irregularities in connection with Government administration in Queensland. It is offensive to me and I ask for its withdrawal and for an apology from him.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement.

Mr. MORRIS: Yes, in deference to you, I will, but, in doing so—

Mr. Nicklin: Do not withdraw the statements he made yesterday, though.

Mr. MORRIS: In doing so, I shall quote some of the statements that he made yesterday and then let him eat his words.

Rather than lose too much of my time, I shall go on with the letter to the Administrator, in which we said:

"We do therefore respectfully submit and request that Your Excellency shall ensure that the Parliament of the Legislature of Queensland shall assemble not later than 11 June, 1957."

Is that giving advice?

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. Gair: Yes.

Mr. MORRIS: I suggest that in their spare time the hon. gentlemen study the dictionary.

I and my 23 colleagues have consistently opposed Labour because we believe its members are bad administrators and have a bad policy. Heaven knows, if I had had any doubt about it, I should have had it amply proved to me yesterday by statements, from Government members and from those who were until recently Government members, that all that I thought about them has been right over the years and that in the interests of Queensland the time for them to go is very much overdue. I am satisfied, too, that anybody who was in the gallery yesterday or last night, anybody who reads the newspapers, and anybody who reads "Hansard", will be equally confirmed in the belief that we have had much too much of allegedly Labour Government in Queensland. Why, only yesterday they proved shocking mismanagement in one of their own departments. The Treasurer was the very one who rose and spoke about £25,000,000 having been lost by the railways over the past 10 years. Is not that mismanagement? The Premier accused the hon. member for Toowoomba of perverting the administration within his Department. He has evidently known of that for some considerable time. He went to the extent of saying that he would not even say that the officers of the Main Roads Department had worked, but had merely been employed—another case of perverting the administration. These things were said, not by their traditional enemies, ourselves—because we are their traditional political enemies—but by their erstwhile friends, people who have been working with them. We heard much said yesterday by hon. members who call themselves members of the Labour Party, that there has been gross political victimisation by the Government. We also heard charges that there has been gross political patronage. These are things that they admit

they knew were present within the Government for years. It is only since they have had their quarrel that they tell the people of Queensland that these things have been going on and that they have permitted them to go on. We have heard of standover tactics. The Secretary for Labour and Industry accused the hon. member for Toowoomba of being the worst to stand over the Commissioner of Police. Have they just found this out since they broke with each other on 24 April? Of course not.

The hon. member for Toowoomba said that he would go to any length to preserve the Labour Party. Mark those words, "He would go to any length." He did not say that he would go to any length to preserve the good of Queensland but he would go to any length to preserve the Labour Party. It is the duty of every hon. member in the Chamber to go to any length to preserve the good of Queensland but not to preserve the good of any political party. I was shocked at other statements by the hon. member for Toowoomba. He accused members of the Government, his colleagues until recently, of Gestapo tactics. He also said one of the most fantastic things that has ever been said in any Parliament in the British Empire when he said, "When I was a member of the Ministry and we did these things"—he was referring to travelling around Queensland at the taxpayers' expense—"we at least clothed it with an air of respectability by doing some official business." Of all the things I have ever heard I do not think anything has been such vicious nonsense and such an abuse of Parliamentary privilege. These are the people who formerly were friends.

Yesterday I voted with the Government to give them an opportunity to tell us why Supply was needed. Yesterday we heard no reason and today, even though the Premier has spoken, we still have no concrete reason why an election should be delayed. I do not think that there is any sound foundation in his argument. I have my own belief why they are doing it, but I have heard no reason why they should. I repeat what I said earlier: it is completely ridiculous that the Treasurer should now assume the mantle of defender of democracy. I will also repeat something else because I think it must be repeated: he and his colleagues and some of his friends intimated yesterday that there had been political patronage and victimisation for years—not since 24 April—yet they tried to present a united face to the people only 12 months ago.

They admitted there had been mismanagement of departments—again for years. Hon. members opposite presented a hypocritical front to the people and allowed Queensland to suffer. I am reminded of something I said 12 months ago in my policy speech. This is what I said—

"A vote for Labour is a vote to make Queensland a pawn in this faction fight. Government of the State of Queensland

is the prize and Labour's present internal fight for its control will be a bitter page in the history of this State."

What a bitter page was written into the electoral history of the State when we heard the shocking allegations and statements which would not have been permitted to be heard in any other Parliament in the whole of the British Empire. I believe the whole fight within the Labour Party is a matter of personal hatred. I believe that if certain elements within the Right Wing or the Left Wing were removed to-day, tomorrow both wings would be prepared to accept the same old thing over and over again. I think it is high time this was cleaned up once and for all. We must remember two basic facts: first, that the Premier cannot govern now and will not be able to govern after the election. Secondly, the Duggan group cannot and must not govern.

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg—Treasurer) (11.58 a.m.): I propose to deal with certain remarks by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in connection with the printing of rolls, and the hon. member's suggestion that there was laxity on the part of the Government or the department in connection with their preparation. It is a pity that a body of men who are elected on the basis that they are above average intelligence should not make a more responsible approach to a matter like this. For example, the hon. member for Isis holds a Diploma of Education. I can understand the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha's getting into these difficulties, but one expects more from a man who holds a Diploma of Education when he tries to make out that the Government could conduct an election within a couple of months.

Mr. Pizzey: You should be ready every year for an election.

Mr. WALSH: Let us see what is involved in preparing for an election every year. I know that the hon. member for Coorparoo would not agree with that statement. It is obvious that in a non-election year, irrespective of the Government in power, the Government Printing Office follows the practice of printing the number of rolls required to meet the demand for official and public purposes. That has been done over the years. The rolls printed would not be sufficient to conduct an election within two months, three months, or four months.

Mr. Hiley: He would have to set the type up to print even a few.

Mr. Pizzey: That is a point.

Mr. WALSH: We are not disputing that. I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition is unmindful of the difficulties; he understands the situation.

Mr. Hiley: He thinks they could be overcome.

Mr. WALSH: That is a difference of opinion in regard to certain phases of the machinery. The rolls printed this year would have been completed in February or March. The type is taken out and put away on a rack. In most electorates there would be 120 rolls and they would be printed for the whole of the State. When I examined the position, I found that certain members, as was their right, had gone to the Electoral Office and taken their two dozen rolls, or whatever number they are allotted out of the total number of rolls printed. In addition to the rolls taken by those members, other rolls required for official purposes had been distributed to C.P.S. offices, Electoral Registrars, and so on, throughout the State. For the Electorate of Condamine, for example, there were only four rolls left out of the total number printed.

Mr. Hiley: But the type was set up.

Mr. WALSH: Just a minute. I am not going to evade anything. There were other electorates for which 23 and 29 rolls were left. Hon. members know that in some electorates there are as many as 69 polling places, all of which have to be provided with from one to five rolls. Take the electorates of Mirani and Port Curtis, for example. Each of those electorates has between 60 and 70 polling places, and every one of those polling places has to be provided with a roll. To say that we could just take the type down from the racks, put it in, and start the machines going is just so much rot.

The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha made the point that the Premier should have known on 24 April that we could no longer carry on as a Government. Did he? Let us see if that is so. Were there any published reports which indicated that certain members of the Opposition were prepared to back the Government? Was that not a fact? Specific statements were published, and it was suggested that there was some evidence of an agreement on the part of the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha. After his visit to Sydney, he came back with different ideas. The whip had cracked somewhere.

Mr. Morris: Why don't you read what I said on the night of 24 April?

Mr. WALSH: I do not think that any hon. member in this Chamber or anybody outside it would dispute that Mr. Tucker, the Government Printer, is a man of the highest integrity and honesty. At the time the statements appeared in the Press in regard to the printing of the rolls, Mr. Tucker was away on holidays. I did not even know that he was on holidays, but he felt that the reports appearing in the newspapers were so misleading that he came back to Brisbane and conferred with the Under Secretary of the Treasury Department. He felt a little bit uneasy about the statements that had been made in the Press, because they misrepresented the actual position.

When I returned to my office, the Under Secretary, whom I had called into my office, told me that Mr. Tucker was there. He said, "Would you like to speak to him?" I said, "Yes, I would." I immediately went through this problem of the preparation of the rolls with him. He was able to tell me things that I had never imagined would be happening in the mechanics of an election. The biggest problem in all the mechanics of the election is in the Government Printing Office.

When he came back from holidays, I discussed the matter with him further and told him that we should have an election as early as possible because Supply had been granted up to 31 August or thereabouts. I asked him how long he thought it would take to print the rolls, and how long he thought it would take to make the other preparations. I told him that it would be necessary for him to get in touch with the Printing Industry Employees Union—and don't let us overlook this fact—to see if he could arrange the working of overtime. The Government Printer cannot compel his men to work overtime. He undertook to make representations to the union to see whether the men would work overtime. They have been working overtime since that date according to the arrangements made. The Premier read to the Committee the various reports regarding output week by week. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha was so interested in the last report. There is no reason to withhold the information, but rather than bore the Committee with reading every detail, I shall give the relevant parts.

Mr. Morris: What is the date?

Mr. WALSH: 11 June. On my instructions, to make sure that there is no laxity in the Government Printing Office, I instructed the Government Printer to submit a report to me at the end of each week. Those reports will indicate to hon. members that I am trying to get on top to see that the machinery is in proper working order. The number of electorates for which the additional rolls have been printed is now 42, and at the time he made his report on 4 June, 1957, it was 29, leaving the number printed since 4 June at 13. Expressed in pages, the position is:—

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total number of pages in a completed set of 75 rolls | 19,040 |
| Number of pages printed to 4 June, 1957 .. | 6,887 |
| Number of pages printed from 4 June to 10 June | 2,945 |
| Total printed to 10 June, 1957 | 9,832 |
| Number of pages still to be printed | 9,208 |

There are seven printing machines and one folding machine which worked 8 hours each last Saturday. A total of 880 pages were printed on that day as the result of the overtime arrangement with the union. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha wants to make out that we are making no effort. We can say that almost 20 per cent. of the total pages printed per week were printed by overtime on Saturday. Coming to the registration of the supplementary rolls, the total registration to 10 June, 1957, was 35,092, which are all new registrations since the old type was set up. This is work of which the Leader of the Opposition or somebody else might say, "Why don't you farm it out?" The Government Printer says that as he goes along he handles that part of the supplementary rolls, and that it is not a great difficulty to him. Between the date of the issue of the writ and the date of nominations the Government Printer has to see to it that the work is done because the date of the issue of the writ is the last day on which any alteration can be made to the rolls. When I pressed the Government Printer for the earliest date possible he could give us, one of his pleas to me was, "Be sure you give us enough time between the date of the issue of the writ and the election so as to provide for the printing of the supplementary rolls."

Mr. Morris: You have that problem every election.

Mr. WALSH: I am not denying it. The hon. members fails to see that this is an occasion when an election was not anticipated and all the machinery has to be geared. As has been pointed out by the hon. members for Isis, Mt. Coot-tha and Mundingburra, in 1953 we went to election within a period of a little over two months. Why was that?

Mr. Morris: Because it was to your advantage.

Mr. WALSH: So-called intelligent men are unable to understand that in October of the year prior to an expected election year, the Government Printing Office and other departments involved in the preparation of the machinery for an election start to prepare their work, so that by the end of January or the beginning of February in the election year, all the rolls are virtually completed. That, of course, does not apply in the present case. As I say, in October or November of the year preceding what is expected to be an election year, the Government Printer has the type taken from the racks and placed in position. In other words, he is preparing for the printing of the rolls for five or six months. During that time other departments, particularly the Justice Department, have to make arrangements for the numerous forms that are necessary. It is not merely a matter of what the Justice Department might say; the information has to be got from every returning officer throughout the State. Every returning officer in the 75 electorates has to advise the

Justice Department of his requirements in the conduct of an election.

Mr. Dewar: Having worked it all out, what do you regard as the earliest possible date for an election?

Mr. WALSH: As the Premier said, there would be no difficulty in holding an election in August.

Mr. Morris interjected.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha will distort things. The Premier made it quite clear that the school holidays will extend from 12 to 26 August, and Exhibition Week falls during that period. Of course, if anybody wants us to fix the election date during that period, we may do it.

Mr. Morris: You would be silly enough to do it.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha says we would be silly enough to do it. If the machinery is ready, and if he is so anxious for an early election, why would he object to its being held in the middle of August?

Mr. Morris: Because it could be held earlier.

Mr. WALSH: It could not be held in the middle of August for the reason that the Premier has put forward, that is, that school teachers throughout the State form a vital part of the mechanics of an election. It is all right for the hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha to sit in his little borough in the metropolitan area, together with the small number of Liberals who represent metropolitan constituencies, but what about the man out in the back country? Is he not entitled to a vote? Metropolitan constituencies are served with trams, buses, and all the other conveniences that could service the community in half an hour, but the navvies, road workers and others out in the back country are just as entitled as city dwellers to vote at an election. I remind the hon. member that there are voters in such places as Burketown, Julia Creek, Croydon, Stonehenge, and Boulia. That is the attitude of the Liberal Party towards the country dweller—wipe him off!

Various hon. members have said they have got their rolls. Of course they have. I have got mine, too. I have got my two dozen, or whatever the allotment is that is made to hon. members without charge. All hon. members are entitled to them and, if they have not collected them, that is their fault. The fact remains that, whereas on the average 120 rolls have been printed for each electorate as for a non-election year, anything from 270 to 400-odd rolls will be required in each.

The "Courier-Mail" printed bally-hoo about using the Federal rolls and about how up-to-date they are. Let them seek

the opinion of the Government Printer. I do not think anybody is more qualified than he to advise the Government or the members of the community in these matters. They will find that no Federal rolls have been printed for the last two years. Even if we had to use the Federal rolls to conduct the election, where would we get them? It will be obvious to hon. members that it would be too silly for words to put the Federal rolls into the hands of presiding officers and ask them to determine which streets come within the boundaries of, say, the Buranda or the South Brisbane electorate.

Very definitely the obligation rests on Parliament to see that the essential Supply is granted to enable the Government to meet not only the wages and salaries of Government servants and others in Government employ but also other Government commitments. Hon. members opposite will appreciate that. If Supply is not granted, I can assure hon. members that there will be financial confusion whichever Party is returned to power.

Mr. Hewitt: It won't be your Party.

Mr. WALSH: I feel sure it will. It certainly will not be those on my right, because very few of them will be returned.

Whichever Party is returned, there will be great confusion in the State's financial policy if this Supply is not granted as requested.

Mr. HILEY (Coorparoo) (12.19 p.m.): I am sure every hon. member has listened to the debate with mixed feelings. Mixed feelings, of course, have been described as what you experience as you watch your mother-in-law drive over a precipice in your brand-new Cadillac.

The Bill asks Parliament to grant a Supply of £27,000,000. Quantitatively, the amount excites no comment. It has not yet, and it should not. The timing, however, is extremely unusual and the request has been presented to Parliament in a manner completely unprecedented. On the timing, the only positive statement made to hon. members in support of a Supply Bill at this unusual time is that there is an election pending.

There has been no clear, unequivocal undertaking by the Government to resign. There has been no announcement of an election date. In the absence of these two essential qualifications, to come into the Chamber and ask for Supply is to ask for a completely blank cheque. As a matter of fact, the whole tactics yesterday and today remind me irresistibly of a bankrupt debtor whining, twisting, weaving and supplicating and doing all in his power to stave off the bailiffs by a week or two. The Government are politically bankrupt. They have lost their support. They have not got the moral courage to come to Parliament and say, "We are through.

1957—D

We will resign on a certain date and we will go to the people on a certain date." Those are the clear moral obligations of a government who know their days are ended. Instead, they have come into Parliament without offering any undertakings whatever, and said, "Give us, without any qualification at all, £27,000,000." In any British Parliament such a request is completely unprecedented and can receive only an unequivocal denial. That is the only possible answer to so absurd a request.

Mr. Aikens: They could stave off the election until some time in September.

Mr. HILEY: October if they liked, and then come back with the same story again.

Mr. Walsh: How could we come here with the same story?

Mr. HILEY: The Treasurer has done it this time. No undertaking has been given.

Mr. Walsh: Parliament was prorogued until 11 June.

Mr. HILEY: Parliament is together now.

Mr. Walsh: Tell us how we could do it next time?

Mr. Chalk: Do not tell him, he might do it.

Mr. HILEY: I have sat in this Parliament for 13 years—

Mr. Gair: The resignation of the Government does not dissolve Parliament.

Mr. HILEY: I know it does not but the Government have not indicated positively to the Chamber any intention to resign.

Mr. Gair: We do not have to.

Mr. HILEY: The Government do not get Supply until they do.

Mr. Gair: We don't?

Mr. HILEY: All right, they don't. If the Government will not face up to realities and indicate their retirement from an untenable position it is the duty of hon. members generally to tear them shrieking and unwilling from the seats they do not want to leave.

Mr. Smith: How will you do that?

Mr. HILEY: By refusing Supply.

Mr. Smith: You have not got the numbers. You have only 24 and we have 25.

Mr. HILEY: We will see what happens when the vote is taken. I am certain of what the result will be because I see doom written on the faces of everyone who is looking at me.

For 13 years I have sat on this side of the Chamber and it has been my particular responsibility to understudy the Treasurer and to pay particular and specialist attention to matters he brought before the Chamber. During that period I have seen many Supply Bills brought forward by the late Mr. Hanlon, Mr. Larcombe, Mr. Gair

when he was Treasurer, and by Mr. Walsh during the period he has occupied the office. Until this occasion I have never heard of a Supply Bill being presented to the Chamber for Parliament to exercise its power of appropriation without some regard being paid to some of the vital interests of the State, without reference to some of the important problems and without some evidence of a sense of responsibility by those entrusted with the reins of office. What did we hear on this occasion? We heard a long tirade of irrelevancies and abuse, and this morning dismal excuse. We heard about matters touching police transfers, Communism, union ballots, Mr. Bukowski, oil and even home laundries. While on the subject of home laundries let me say that the company with which I happen to be connected has distributed approximately 50,000 home laundries.

They have been used in various parts of Australia. If by some miracle they could marshal the lot of them in simultaneous operation they could not cope with the dirty linen which the Treasurer presented to the Chamber yesterday. During all this tirade of abuse and excuse there was not one word about Queensland; not one word about her problems or development; not one word of encouragement regarding the bankrupt position of housing which has collapsed under this Government; not one word concerning the problem of drought which is exercising the anxieties of primary producers, and not one word concerning the basic financial outlook of the State. Instead of that the Chamber was given an example of the big pots calling the little kettles black. There is only one issue: who is to rule?

Mr. Walsh: I said that yesterday.

Mr. HILEY: Exactly, that is what the hon. gentleman said; and it is the only thing that is worthwhile replying to. It is obvious that the Government cannot govern and it is obvious that no other party can. In that situation anyone who has the faintest idea of responsibility or regard for democratic things is only concerned with one thing, and there is only one possible answer—an election as early as it can properly be conducted.

Mr. Gair: That can only follow a dissolution of Parliament.

Mr. HILEY: You have to be defeated in order that Parliament will be dissolved. That is the only way a dissolution will take place. It is well to remind ourselves that Parliament, in days when the administration keeps taking more and more powers, has been wise enough to retain the power of appropriation. Only Parliament holds the power of appropriating moneys. If it were not for that power it would be months before these people who have lost the confidence of the people would be brought to face up to their masters. I hope that everyone will keep indelibly in their

memories the important part that the power of appropriation plays in preserving the authority of Parliament over any administration. If this had occurred in January instead of April the Government would have sat there for three extra months and they would have still given the excuse that the rolls were not ready. In the course of the statements made to the Committee by the Treasurer it seemed to me that he succeeded in convicting himself. Take what the hon. gentleman said about the Communists. He singled out the hon. member for Mackay and proceeded to show that in his judgment he was influenced by Communist association as long ago as 1941. If the Treasurer honestly believed that was so, if that were his conviction from 1941 to 1946, he still accepted him and politically co-habitated with him. I will go so far as to say that if there is an aristocracy of Communists and fellow travellers the Treasurer on his own admission will be known as the prince of fellow travellers.

Take what the hon. gentleman had to say about trade union ballots. Again he stands self condemned. He says that this trouble has been going on for years. For years they have had knowledge of it and done nothing about it. He taunted us with never doing anything about it. In New Zealand a party of our political colour cleaned up some of the trouble, and in the Federal sphere there are thankful men in trade union circles to-day who still pay tribute to what members of our party did to improve the system of Court ballots and access to them.

What have hon. members opposite done in this State to deal with this evil thing that they say has existed for so many years? We have no law of treason in this country, but there is an offence associated with it that is known as aiding and abetting the King's enemies. When the Treasurer comes into the House and says he knows that these things have been going on and has done nothing about them, all he is doing is purging his own shame.

Mr. Walsh: What did you do about the forged tickets that you knew so much about in the Bulimba by-election?

Mr. HILEY: We took action on the floor of the House.

Mr. Walsh: I challenged you in this House.

Mr. HILEY: We ripped the mask off the man who for years and years, by immoral means, had secured the return of you and your colleagues, so that you were forced three times to indict him before the court. That is what happened. If I had not made the speech that I did on that occasion, that man would still be there, sheltering and aiding and abetting you as he did all through the years.

Mr. Moore: You tried him here before he went to the court.

Mr. Power interjected.

Mr. HILEY: You were forced, as a result of what was said here, to take him before the court, and the hon. gentlemen were the two men who openly defended him in this House, leaving in my mind for ever the conviction that they knew far more about what was going on than they admitted.

Mr. Power interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is far too much noise in the Chamber.

Mr. Walsh: I am talking about the speech you made in the Bulimba by-election in which you accused a member of this House of being associated with forged ration tickets. What did you do about that?

Mr. HILEY: On that particular subject your knowledge is far closer and wider than mine. It is up to us all to do something about that.

Mr. Walsh: You are quite right.

Mr. HILEY: Our pledge is this: we will waste no more time—indeed, we have not yet wasted any of our time—pursuing personal hatreds and engaging in stupid grasping for personal power. That is the issue that has divided the Labour Party. Our pledge to you is that we shall get on with the job by giving positive government to this State.

Mr. Power: The abolition of the 40-hour week, the abolition of free hospitals—that is what you will do.

Mr. HILEY: I venture to predict that—

Mr. Power: By their deeds shall ye know them.

Mr. HILEY: We shall do everything we can to develop this State. This Government have forfeited their right to govern; they have in fact ceased to govern; and the lamentable whining of the Premier and the Treasurer this morning about their inability to organise the printing of rolls from type that has already had the first print taken from it shows how incompetent they are to remain in office for one day longer.

Mr. Walsh: That is a reflection on the Government Printer.

Mr. HILEY: You are the Minister in charge.

Mr. Walsh: That is a reflection on the Government Printer and his employees.

Mr. HILEY: A print of every roll was made. It is true that not sufficient copies were made, but the type is set up. Are the only printing presses from which further prints can be made with type that has been set up the presses in the Government Printing Office? I know it will mean carting some tons of metal to different points in the city.

Mr. Walsh: 130 tons!

Mr. HILEY: You would not cart all of it away. You would cart 10 tons here and there, and if that is the Treasurer's only trouble I will see that semi-trailers are available this afternoon to take it to whatever printers he nominates. As to the work of envelopes, tally sheets, postal vote applications, absent vote applications, and the general run of incidental election printing, it could be farmed out to 50 printers in this State without the slightest complication.

Mr. Aikens: Almost everything excepting the ballot papers.

Mr. HILEY: Yes, and the primary roll set-up. I venture to say that the Government showed that they are bankrupt of ideas about how to get the work done and it is their duty to tell the Administrator so that he can discover whether there are any other parties in this Chamber who would tackle the job of getting the election machinery set up and functioning in proper time. All the arguments put forward remind me of my commercial experience in dealing with bankrupt debtors. When you get a person who cannot pay you find that he shuffles about and puts forward all excuses and adopts any tactics whatever to give him another week or month. The days for excuses are past. Every reason or excuse presented here merely underwrites the political bankruptcy of the Government. It underwrites their incompetency and their unsuitability to remain one day longer in office, and with my colleagues I propose to vote against the motion for another penny for them.

Mr. DONALD (Bremer) (12.38 p.m.): I can wholeheartedly support the sentiments expressed by the Leader of the Opposition at the commencement of his speech yesterday afternoon when he claimed that the Government are a minority Government. We have a minority government in the British House of Commons and in our Commonwealth Parliament at the present time; there are other minority governments. They are a minority government because they do not represent the majority of the people who have a vote, and because they only hold one-third of the membership of this assembly. They are a minority government because they have forsaken the policy on which they were elected by the electors of Queensland. Hon. members will agree that there is only one way out of the present political impasse and that is for an appeal to the electors. An early appeal to the electors of the State will allow them to pass judgment and return a verdict in a democratic spirit. I cannot support the motion moved by the Treasurer for the granting of £27,000,000 Supply until the end of October. In his two hours' speech in this Chamber yesterday he did not advance one argument or reason to cause anybody to agree with his motion. His speech was simply a hymn of hate against the Labour Movement generally, and in particular against Jack Duggan and Joe Bukowski. No-one can question Mr. Jack Duggan's loyalty to the Labour movement

and his loyalty to his ex-leader and no-one can question the loyalty that he displayed to the Premier not only on the floor of this Chamber but outside, in Caucus and at meetings of the Q.C.E. The accusations that Mr. Duggan was disloyal to his leader and sought to promote his own personal interests are not in accordance with facts and no not reflect credit on those who made them.

The Treasurer devoted much of his two-hour speech to trying to tell the people of Queensland, through "Hansard," that Jack Duggan was anything but a gentleman.

None of us can forget what close friends Mr. Bukowski and the Treasurer were when for some years they were running the Industrial Group Movement in this State. Is the present hostility being shown by the Treasurer and members of his Party due to the fact that he, Mr. Bukowski, is still a loyal member of the A.L.P. while they are outside the A.L.P. and the Labour Movement. At that time I was one of the members of the Australian Labour Party who said that the introduction of Industrial Groups could result only in splitting the Labour Party in Australia from top to bottom. And that is just what has happened. That was the real cause of the present split in the Australian Labour Party, not only in this State but throughout the Commonwealth.

Members of the Queensland Labour Party have accused Mr. Duggan of being disloyal. What did the Premier say of the leader of the Australian Labour Party in the Federal sphere, Dr. Evatt? He accused him of being a wrecker of the Labour movement. I remind hon. members that on every occasion when Dr. Evatt, as leader of the Australian Labour Party, has appealed to the electors of Australia, whether in a referendum or a political contest, the majority of them have supported his policy and confirmed his leadership. Again and again Dr. Evatt has proved himself to be not only a real leader of the Australian Labour Party, but a statesman of world renown. His reputation in the United Nations proves that, and there is no need for me to elaborate on it.

Mr. Bukowski was paid a glowing tribute by the Attorney-General on 17 November, 1953. This is what he said on page 1315 of Vol. 207 of "Hansard"—

"Let me say about Joe Bukowski that at least he is a loyal Labour man. He has never ratted on the Labour Party and was never expelled from it."

His present traducers cannot say the same of themselves.

Mr. Evans: Who said that?

Mr. DONALD: The Attorney-General.

Mr. Duggan has had many triumphs in this Assembly; he has made many brilliant speeches and has scored triumphantly over his opponents. But he scored his greatest triumph yesterday, when he vindicated his actions, and those of other members of the

Australian Labour Party, to the large audience in the gallery. He left his opponents not only uncomfortable, but feeling very sorry for themselves. No-one can deny that it was Mr. Duggan's day yesterday. He scored his greatest triumph then.

A Government Member: We felt sorry for him.

Mr. DONALD: No-one need feel sorry for Mr. Duggan. On the contrary, many people feel sorry that they have lost his services, which have been retained for the Australian Labour Party.

The Treasurer has said that he and his party are on the crest of a wave. I agree. They are on the crest of a wave of resentment that extends from one end of Queensland to the other, a wave that will eventually engulf them and carry them to destruction. If they think otherwise, let them not quibble about holding an early election. Let the people go to the ballot box and make their decision.

Hon. members will agree that we would not have been meeting today had it not been for the trouble in the Australian Labour Party. They will also agree, in spite of the protestations of the Premier and the Treasurer, that there is plenty of time between now and August for the holding of an election so that Parliament can re-assemble in August.

The Premier and the Treasurer say we must grant Supply of £27,000,000 to enable the work of the community to be carried on and so that there will be no interruption in the payment of Public Service wages and salaries. Not one hon. member would contend that there is any danger that any public servant or anybody else in the employ of the Government will go without his wages because Supply is not given. What would have been the position if all the members of the Labour Party had been true to their pledge and true to the Party platform? Parliament would not have met until August.

Again the Treasurer displayed the snide tactics for which he is noted. He read at great length from the rule book, Rule 89, but he did not read this—and this is what they have all been guilty of—

"All endorsed Australian Labor Party Members or Candidates shall be bound by the decisions of the latest Convention and the latest Platform, and shall sign such Platform when called upon by the Queensland Central Executive to do so."

I feel that hon. members may put only as much reliance on what the Treasurer said in the two hours of his speech yesterday and his 25 minutes this morning as they can on his action in quoting only Rule 89.

Mr. Walsh: Very good. But I signed the platform.

Mr. DONALD: He did. That is the exception I take and the exception that every member of the Australian Labour Party

takes. The Treasurer dishonoured his signature and dishonoured his standing in the Party. He walked out.

Let us be truthful about the whole position. I will quote from the rule book. I do not want to bring party squabbles into the Chamber and I would not have done so had the Treasurer not introduced them. This is what the rule book says about the power of the Q.C.E.—

“To interpret the planks of the Platform or any of these Rules or any resolution or decision of Convention, which may at any time be in dispute, and to expel from membership of the Party any member who refuses to abide by such interpretation and/or decision.”

That covers everything. How many have been expelled from the Party by the Q.C.E.? The only man who has been expelled from the Party is Mr. Gair. Admittedly, Mr. Foley was expelled for quite another reason prior to that.

Let me read again from “Hansard,” this time from page 51 of Thursday, 19 August, 1954. This is Mr. Walsh talking.

Mr. Walsh: Yes, and I say it again here today.

Mr. DONALD: Let me read it now so as to place it on record, to use one of his pet phrases. The Treasurer said—

“Everybody realises that there has to be a certain amount of discipline in any political party, and it would be a bad thing for the country if discipline was not exercised. If any complaint is to be made it is that sometimes discipline is not exercised as extensively in the public interest as it should be.”

Continuing, he said—

“The Labour Party has never made any excuse about disciplining its members. That is why we have continued to remain a formidable force in the Government of this State. It would be a sorry day for the State of Queensland if we lost control over the Party as a whole.

“Let me remind the Leader of the Opposition too, that there is no more democratic political organisation in this State than the Labour Convention. A delegate is elected from each of the 75 branches.”

Honourable Members interjecting—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is too much interruption and I am not going to allow it.

Mr. DONALD: Further on the Treasurer says—

“There is a delegate from each of the 75 electorates. Representation is based on a formula laid down by delegates themselves, by delegates from industrial unions affiliated with the Australian Labour Party—not by the executive of the Labour Party. Consequently I do not know of any

more democratic body as far as the laying down of political policy is concerned. It is not this party; it is not this Government, who lay down the political policy and platform of the Australian Labour Party. As a matter of fact, the number of Parliamentary representatives at a convention is very small compared with the total number of delegates. At the last convention the total was 120. The hon. member may think he has made an attack on the Government, but his attack was really on the farmers, the coalminers, the railway workers, the business men and others who make up the representation at an Australian Labour Party Convention.”

That describes the Treasurer’s contribution towards letting the Chamber know how we were going to tackle the many problems confronting the State. He chose to make an attack, not on the Q.C.E., not on the Labour Party, but on the coalminers, railwaymen and business men of the State.

Let us see what the Premier had to say, and I refer to the leading article in the “Courier-Mail” of 19 February, 1953—

“On his own admission his Government, if it is returned to office, will have to take its instructions from the Labour-in-Politics convention after the election. This is what he said on 5 February, when he announced that he and other members of his Cabinet had agreed to recommend to the Convention a plan for zonal referendums on the question of legalising off-course betting:

‘In matters of major policy a Labour Government, like any other political party, is bound by the party’s constitution or, if the constitution does not provide for the matter, by the decision of the party’s supreme governing body.’

“For the Queensland Parliamentary Labour Party that supreme governing body is the Labour-in-Politics convention.”

After having been to convention time after time, after sitting on the Q.C.E. year after year, the Premier is trying to tell the people of Queensland—

A Government Member: Before the Communist invasion.

Mr. DONALD: He now says that these bodies have been invaded by the Communist Party.

Mr. Power: You walked out of the House.

Mr. DONALD: I walked out of the House. I was exercising my rights as a free citizen in a free country. I walked out of the House with a clear conscience and my conscience is still clear. The men who walked out of the great Australian Labour Party have not got a clear conscience. My action in walking out of the House has been approved by my union, every industrial union in the Bremer electorate, every branch of the Australian Labour Party in the

Bremer electorate, and after all by the electors of Bremer who gave me the biggest Labour majority—

Government Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to allow the hon. member for Bremer to make his speech without interruption.

Mr. DONALD: I am only telling the truth. The Labour Party does not have to go down to the gutter to succeed. Our policy and our objectives can be achieved by truth. We have no need to stoop to the dirty tactics of our opponents or indulge in personalities. We do not need to indulge in character assassination. We go forward with our policy and objective. People come to the Labour party and people go from it. There have been breakaway groups over the years; it is a nine days wonder, and then they fade away. But the old Labour Party goes on because it is a party of idealists who are working for the benefit of humanity. It goes from strength to strength and victory to victory. The Treasurer went to the last Convention and the Premier sat on the Q.C.E. until he was expelled, and neither of them objected to any of the Trades Unions becoming affiliated with the A.L.P. nor to the acceptance of the delegate sent by the Trades Unions to represent them on the Q.C.E. or at Convention.

Mr. Gair: They suggested you were a communist when you came to the Q.C.E.

Mr. DONALD: It may have been raised, but this is the fact: I am still a member of the Q.C.E. and have been for the past 15 or 16 years. I am still a member of the Australian Labour Party; I have not been expelled as the Premier has.

I am a man who will honour his word. I will fight for what I think is right, and I am prepared to accept the verdict of the people.

An Opposition Member: Do you believe in Socialism?

Mr. DONALD: I believe in Socialism because it is the Objective of the Australian Labour Party. There is no member in this Chamber who can say that at any time have I been afraid to expound the socialisation objective of our party. I am not ashamed of it. We are the force that we are because of our Socialist objective. When we break away from our Socialist objective we cease to be a working-class party. We would be no better than the people who occupy the Treasury benches if we neglected to advocate and adhere to our Socialist objective. I believe that there is every need for the electors to be given the opportunity to say what they think at the earliest possible moment. The present Government cannot govern and they should do the decent thing and make it possible for the electors to say whether they want the Government to continue with the businessmen and everybody else they can pull in, or

whether they want the Australian Labour Party or whether they want the Country-Liberal Party. (Government interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DONALD: I shall say it no matter how much they howl. I am a democrat. I want everyone to have an equal opportunity to express his opinion. I shall not shout "Moo, moo, moo" when any hon. member on the other side speaks. I shall not disgrace my position as a member. I shall not indulge in tactics that would cause the people to lose respect for Parliament. Such conduct causes people to believe that parliamentarians are not what they should be. These are the things that led to the rise of Mussolini and Hitler. I think we should conduct our debates calmly and without vindictiveness. If we are democrats we can do that. Some people do not like the truth.

A Government Member: You do not like the truth.

Mr. DONALD: I am not afraid of the truth.

A great deal has been said about Communism. The surest safeguard against Communism is a strong and united Labour Party and a strong Labour Government.

I wish to deal now with the question of union ballots. The Treasurer was very caustic in his remarks about union ballots, and he referred particularly to ballots conducted by the Australian Workers' Union. I have been connected with two big industrial unions, the Furniture Trades Union and the Miners' Union, and I have been returning officer for both those organisations. I want to assure hon. members and the public generally that there is nothing wrong with their ballots. The Miners' Union conducts its ballots on the same lines as ballots are conducted for Parliament. The ballot is secret, with a returning officer and scrutineers at each pit throughout Queensland. Ballot papers are returned to the general returning officer, and two scrutineers are elected by the rank and file of the union, just as the scrutineers at the pits are elected by the rank and file of the union. Each ballot paper is initialled and is above suspicion. The percentage of voters in miners' union ballots is as great as the percentage of voters in the State elections, or perhaps a little higher. So anxious are we that every man shall be given a chance of recording his vote that the returning officer goes to the general hospitals with the ballot papers and the ballot box.

Mr. Gair: We made no reference to the miners' ballots.

Mr. DONALD: The hon. the Treasurer referred to union ballots.

Mr. Gair: One ballot.

Mr. DONALD: I have a perfect right to defend union ballots in this Chamber, and I have better credentials than the hon. the

Treasurer, who condemned union ballots. I am a member of a union and an official of a union, and I have been an official for many, many years. The ballots conducted by the Miners' Union are conducted in such a way as to be above suspicion. They give a true expression of the opinions of the members. They are a true expression of the opinion of the members.

Mention has been made of court controlled ballots. I say that any union that surrenders its right to conduct its own ballots is admitting its own incompetency. (Time expired.)

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon—Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation) (2.18 p.m.): I shall make an objective approach to the Vote at present before the Committee. We know very well from the statements made by those opposed to the real Labour Party in Queensland that Supply will not be granted, and we on this side of the Chamber are fighting to the last ditch to uphold constitutional government in this Parliament.

It is true that this very vital question of constitutional government was fully discussed at the last Labour-in-Politics Convention, which was held in Mackay last year. Much has been said about the breaking of party pledges; much has been said about the power of the Q.C.E., and what convention has declared and what convention should do and the powers of convention. So that the people of Queensland may get the matter into its correct perspective, I propose reading from the official record of the Labour-in-Politics Convention compiled by Mr. Schmella—no doubt with the approval of Mr. Bukowski—as to what actually happened there on this vital question of constitutional government.

I propose to quote extracts from some of the speeches made by the Leader of the alleged Queensland Branch of the Australian Labour Party sitting opposite to show what his attitude was then, and I shall quote other extracts to show the attitude of prominent members of the Q.C.E. so that these facts taken from official records can be placed in the hands of those not present to hear my remarks so that they can judge the position for themselves. These extracts will give the background of some of those on the Q.C.E. who mouth about loyalty to the Australian Labour Party and the upholding of democracy and so on. Page 83 of this record shows that Mr. Egerton, one of the most loud-mouthed members of the Q.C.E., had to say. I will be quoting briefly from his speech, not taking anything out of its context. When the Premier opposed the motion of direction from the Q.C.E. Mr. Egerton said—

“I think there is much logic in what the Premier has said, but the time for logic has disappeared.”

Later on he said—

“The Premier said this afternoon that Convention should not presume to direct the Government; and then the Premier sheltered behind the Constitution of Parliament. The Premier can have his Constitution and the Premier can have his Premiership . . .”

Those remarks give an idea of the outlook, the mentality and the attitude of Mr. Egerton so far as constitutional government is concerned. There was a lot of prattle about the democratic aspect of the Convention and I now place in the witness box one John Duggan and I quote from a very good speech he made which is recorded on page 87 of this record—

“An opportunity may be taken to examine the workings of the Arbitration Court generally, but you cannot, on the one hand, lay down an arbitration system as the authority to determine these things, if there is going to be . . .”

And mark these words

“ . . . progressive infiltration by the trade union movement by means of domination in the Q.C.E. or domination of Convention, to get, by that power and authority, the things they cannot get from arbitration.”

Continuing, he said—

“I want to make it perfectly clear that I have no quarrel with those powers being used for the purpose of achieving major social reforms in industry, and it may be argued that the three weeks' annual leave question may come into that category—I am not prepared to say; but, I do not think Mr. Bukowski, who is a representative of a powerful industrial union, nor Mr. Devereux, who is the leader of a strong craft union, nor Mr. Egerton, who is secretary of a very vital union in industrial life in this community, will agree that they should use the power of this Convention or of the Q.C.E. for the purpose of getting all those award conditions which are refused by the Court.”

Continuing further, Mr. Duggan said—

“I am not saying that it is not technically competent for this Convention to give a direction on this matter, and whilst I think the Premier gave you compelling reasons on the constitutional aspect . . .”

Note these words—

“ . . . I am not going to labour the point because I realise that the great mass of the people are not concerned with the constitutional aspect of this. I say that, not because I disagree with the Premier. All I am saying is that the interpretation which he places on that is right and correct, but a similar interpretation may not be placed on it by people outside who are concerned more with some positive action or some negative action one way or the other.”

What does Mr. Duggan mean by "technically competent"? All I can say is that whilst under the constitution of the Australian Labour Party he thought they could give a direction, Mr. Duggan was not prepared at that stage to admit that such a direction would be sound constitutionally, legally, morally, or in any other way. He described it as a technical direction.

Mr. Duggan went on to say—

"I ask delegates calmly and dispassionately not to embarrass the Government. I know where the weight of numbers is here but I am not going to be pessimistic at all. I think that possibly 100 votes may be mustered to carry a resolution of this kind, but I ask you, before you become part of that 100, to think about it and consider the political repercussions which could result and be a great danger to the Labour Government in this State."

I give those quotations from Mr. Duggan's speech to illustrate the views that he held very strongly then and that he expressed so convincingly. I ask hon. members to reconcile those views with his present attitude.

The Premier, in his usual consistent and sound manner, subsequently made the position very clear to Convention. It is appropriate to read now what he said. This is what he had to say—

"If I may intrude at this stage, before you proceed with the next agenda item, to report the result of the meeting of Cabinet held last evening following on the resolution that was carried by Convention directing the Government to include in its policy speech a promise for the three weeks' annual leave, and directing the Government to implement that industrial reform in the first session of Parliament, I desire to inform Convention that Cabinet considered the matter very carefully and unanimously decided that, having regard to all factors and circumstances, it did not accept the directions contained in that resolution. In the opinion of Cabinet, the resolution is contrary to the rule of constitutional government and a negation of the principle of responsible, democratic government—namely, that the Government is responsible to the electors and only to the electors."

That was a sound statement for the Premier to make. But what happened after he made it? What did Big Boss Bukowski do? Why did he not accept the challenge then and expel the whole of Cabinet, which had agreed unanimously?

Mr. Graham: That is the mistake they made.

Mr. HILTON: The hon. member is saying that now.

After the Premier had made his statement, Mr. Bukowski said—

"After hearing the statement by the Premier, I desire to move—'That seven members of this Convention meet the Premier and the Deputy Premier.'

"The Committee is to comprise Messrs. Pont, Egerton, Whiteside, Devereux, Chalmers, Maxwell and Bukowski."

That committee was to report back to Convention. It did not. Why? The Communist collaborators that they brought into the Convention could not be controlled. They did not want to accept the challenge of Government at that time and, as Mr. Duggan has already confirmed, both he and the Premier came back and reported to the rest of Cabinet that, as long as the three weeks' leave legislation was introduced when economic circumstances permitted, the Q.C.E. would not press the matter, or words to that effect. Nobody can deny that, yet we hear all this prattle about the breaking of pledges. Obviously, on one occasion if not on more, the whole party unanimously agreed to the non-introduction of the three weeks' leave. According to Mr. Devereux, every member of the party should therefore have been expelled. Why should one man who repeated a statement made by a majority of members of Caucus and made by Cabinet unanimously be shamefully and shockingly expelled, ripping the Labour movement in Queensland asunder? Do those people who claim to be Labour men think we should stand by, submissive and arrant cowards, bowing the knee to dictation on a matter that was fully ventilated at convention and on which Bukowski and his fellow delegates of the committee did not have the courage to report back to convention or to force the issue on that occasion?

To indicate that the Premier and Cabinet triumphed in all that happened, let me read the final words of the convention, Mr. Bukowski was again the spokesman. He said:

"Mr. Gair, I desire to give you a vote of complete confidence in your position of Premier and Leader of the Queensland Political Labor Party, and extend to you and the Queensland Government all the assistance that is possible from our organisation and financial support of the forthcoming elections."

That was carried unanimously—by every member of the now so-called Australian Labour Party sitting on the cross-benches opposite. Can they reconcile their present hypocritical attitude with their honest expression of opinion in unanimously supporting the motion?

Let me place on record in "Hansard" another very interesting extract from this official report compiled by Mr. Schmella. This appears at page 184—

"The Queensland Parliamentary Labor Party has added three more years to its remarkable and unique record of continuous Labor Government. Labor has now been in control of the Treasury benches for a continuous period of 24 years and, as a matter of fact, Labor has been in power now for 38 out of the last 41 years. With Labor's

excellent record during the last term there can be no doubt that Labor is assured of office for many years to come."

Despite that glowing praise in the official Labour record, we find the political rabble opposed to use now—Mr. Wood, Mr. Duggan and others—saying Mr. Gair really left the Labour Party at the Hobart Convention. This took place subsequent to the Hobart convention. What hypocrites they are if they say that now when they did not have the courage to stand up and oppose the vote of confidence in the Premier and oppose the adoption of the report containing glowing tributes to the Premier for his leadership of the Labour Party! Those matters speak for themselves and cannot be denied.

It is true that Mr. Duggan and Mr. Wood, even in Stanthorpe, and elsewhere, have been saying that certain things happened at Hobart. Time does not permit me to go into all the details of the Hobart Conference, but it is true that since then there has been a very strong influence operating in the Labour Party. In a book "The Light Glows Brighter" by Dr. John Burton, which has the blessing of Mr. Chamberlain, the Federal President, and the blessing of Dr. Evatt, who has recommended it to all Labour members to read, among the many sugar-coated pills let me read two extraordinary statements.

Mr. Graham: Is it out of the "News Weekly?"

Mr. HILTON: No. This is by a man at whose feet the hon. member would grovel—

"The fantastic exaggeration of 'Communism' in the country, the misrepresentation of Communist policies, and the coloured propaganda about Communist aggression which fills our newspapers every day, are not an honest attack against a real enemy, but an attempt to make people fear Socialism."

And then we find—

"Co-Existence a First Step Towards Co-operation.

"In this changing situation, Labor should welcome any common ground which can honestly be found between communists and socialists, and which can make co-existence practical, and co-operation possible. Any other attitude assumes, it seems to me, an inevitable war against Communism."

That clearly indicates the philosophy that these alleged Labour men are trying to ram down the necks of those who stand here as the genuine Labour Party today. Now let me read some outstanding chapters from the "Communist Review" of April, 1957—

"The Hobart Conference decisions of the Australian Labor Party regarding foreign policy was a historic turning point in A.L.P. affairs and allow for tremendous unity with our party.

"To our brothers in the A.L.P. we say, a united working class, under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Socialist Party, will prove invincible.

"I feel that the strengthening of the Party can take place side by side with the isolation of the rightists in the A.L.P. who reject unity."

What I have read clearly demonstrates who are the Communist collaborators. Those of us who have stood firmly behind the Premier will fight to the last ditch. We will fight successfully and put the great Australian Labour Party back on a sound basis in Queensland again.

I regret that I have not sufficient time to deal with the many relevant aspects of the situation this afternoon. However, before I resume my seat I want to throw back the dirty insinuation the hon. member for Toowoomba made against me yesterday afternoon. I made a note of his words at the time. He said, "You spend all your time defending some of the things you should occupy your mind with. I will challenge you, make no bones about that. I am not going to seek the protection of the Chamber to say it, either." I know that during this crisis friendships have been broken, great disappointments have occurred, people whom we regarded as friends and men of sterling character have proved otherwise. But I think it ill becomes the hon. member for Toowoomba to make his dirty accusation against me yesterday afternoon. I throw the challenge back in his face now. Even if these are the last words I ever utter, I say that never in my career in Parliament have I in the slightest way violated my oath to Cabinet as a Minister. Never have I violated in the slightest degree my oath both with regard to secrecy and the obligations imposed upon me as a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Hiley: Is it consistent with your oath as a Cabinet Minister to accept into your company a man against whom corruption has been found? Is that consistent with your oath?

Mr. HILTON: To whom are you referring?

Mr. Hiley: The hon. member for Belyando.

Mr. HILTON: Let the hon. member read the oath that a Cabinet Minister takes. The hon. member will not get me off the track. I shall deal with that again, as I have already done, on the platform. I cannot get an extension of time to deal with the matter now. I repeat that I challenge the hon. member for Toowoomba to make any accusation in this Chamber or elsewhere against me. While I am a frail mortal I keep before me that striking lesson of the Pharisee and the Publican. I leave it to my electors and to those who know me to judge whether I have ever been guilty, publicly or privately, of anything that would

justify the dirty slur that the hon. member for Toowoomba sought to place on me yesterday afternoon.

An Opposition Member: To what was he referring?

Mr. HILTON: I do not know. I leave that to him. That dirty insinuation is there in "Hansard." It was obviously said for the benefit of the Communists who, in the main, compose the new A.L.P. in my area. I say without fear of contradiction that the member for Toowoomba and the member for Ithaca were recently in Stanthorpe forming a new branch and nobody can deny that some members of that branch are known Communists.

Mr. Hanlon: Your brother attended the meeting.

Mr. HILTON: He did not. When the time came they closed the doors.

Mr. Wood: Your brother-in-law organised the meeting.

Mr. HILTON: No. They went along to hear what they had to say. I repeat that some of the members who were enrolled there as members of the new A.L.P. are avowed Communists.

An A.L.P. Member: Name them.

Mr. HILTON: In due course. The man who was the chairman was a man who left the A.L.P. in the '40's after the origin of a scurrilous anonymous letter against myself was revealed at an A.L.P. meeting. I shall have more to say about that during the campaign.

(Time expired.)

Dr. DITTMER (Mt. Gravatt) (2.43 p.m.): I listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Carnarvon. The hon. member's vehemence was amazing when he sought to protect his character, but he does not hesitate either in this House or on the public platform—nor do his associates—to assail the characters of the men who constitute the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labour Party. They brand them with the worst names they can think of, and brand them as Communists and fellow-travellers, terms that are anathema to every member of the Australian Labour Party. That is what the hon. member does, but when a challenge is thrown out to him he rises in his wrath. The hon. member read from a book which was published 12 to 18 months ago and which he had not previously condemned. Hon. members opposite seek to gain a political advantage irrespective of any other consideration.

In certain statements made yesterday, either in speeches or by way of interjection, it was suggested that I was associated with sectarianism. Even hon. members who constitute the official Opposition are decent enough to admit that I would not be associated with

it, and I know that many men on that side of the Chamber would not level that charge at me. But if through the machinations of hon. members opposite, one of my children is hurt, I shall deal with them very quickly, make no error about that. I shall not take that from anyone.

The Premier saw fit to make an announcement to this Chamber that I had a drink with Arch Fletcher, a very decent man, the Secretary of the Leader of the Opposition, at half past 2 when a meeting had finished. Who was in there before me? The hon. member for Rockhampton and the Under-Secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department. I am not denying them that right. But why should the Premier impute improper motives to me? If I want to have a drink with Arch Fletcher, I shall have it, because he is a decent type of man. Neither the Premier nor anybody else will stop me, make no error about that, either.

History tells of the Holy Alliance. Yesterday we witnessed an unholy alliance in the close co-operation between the official Opposition and the Government. We saw it when the Leader of the Opposition unjustifiably retained his office by means of that co-operation. The official Opposition knew that the Government were not asking for this further Supply in order to hold an election in September. There is no doubt that the Government want to hold the election as quickly as they can, because they believe that the tide of sympathy is rapidly running out and that the people, are learning the facts. When that happens the return of the Queensland Labour Party as the Government is inevitable.

I believe that many members of the Opposition, decent as they are, did not realise that that motion would be utilised for the purpose of making the most outstanding volcanic belching of venom and hate that this House has ever heard. The standard of the debate today has been much higher. The Premier, in his own capable way, delivered quite a good speech; so did the Treasurer. We know that the Treasurer is an able man, in some respects, and his contribution this morning was in much better taste. I congratulate him on his speech and sympathise with him. But I do not agree with what he said about the hon. member for Toowoomba, because I do not think anyone made a more outstanding contribution to the debate yesterday than the hon. member for Toowoomba. It was appreciated by the people in the gallery, and it is regrettable that there are fewer people in the gallery today. The hon. member for Toowoomba is quite capable of looking after himself. He did it to good effect last night; if necessary, he will do it on the public platform.

It is amazing how rapidly the mantle of the former anti-Labour protagonists has fallen on the present Queensland Labour Party and how we are now charged with being Communists. One could be excused for thinking that it was the Right Hon. R. G. Menzies or the

Right Hon. Sir Arthur Fadden who was speaking. Of course, they would do it in a decent way. They would pay their money and have the big advertisements inserted in the paper saying that we are Communists.

One name is being spread far and wide, from east to west, from north to south, over the length and breadth of this State. Everyone knows that name, but for the information of the people in the gallery I shall name the man whose name hon. members opposite are using in trying to win the election—Joe Bukowski. We have a letter here—a typed copy of a so-called letter—and, peculiarly enough, two men concerned in it are dead. They are Jack Beasley and Clarrie Fallon. Clarrie Fallon was the senior officer of the Australian Workers' Union, and one of the other officers of that union was Joe Bukowski, a man born in Mt. Morgan of a decent family. His sister was Tottie Bukowski, who married the late Dr. Uren. He rose within the union ranks, and what do hon. members think happened to this so-called Communist during the war while Fallon was still the senior officer of the A.W.U. He was co-opted by the Government of which Jack Beasley had the honour to be Minister for the Minerals Production Committee. When the war was over the late John Curtin wrote to Bukowski and congratulated him on the part he played. He would never have permitted Bukowski to be co-opted to that committee if he was a Communist or suspected of being one. Bukowski has been a member of the inner executive of the Q.C.E. for 14 years. I want to do justice to the Treasurer and say that he has been a member longer but for at least that length of time the Treasurer has sat in close collaboration and co-operation with none other than this so-called Communist Joe Bukowski. Hon. members saw how he tried to take away this man's reputation by words with malevolent intent. Hon. members opposite want to take his character away, not to hurt Joe Bukowski so much as to damage the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labour Party in Queensland. Incidentally, might I say that the Premier has sat on the inner executive for many years with Joe Bukowski but we never heard anything from the Premier concerning him until recent months. I am trying to defend a man who has been unjustifiably criticised. He is a capable man and will no doubt defend himself, but I take this opportunity on behalf of Joe Bukowski to try to disabuse the minds of people against the misrepresentations that have emanated from hon. members opposite concerning him, a misrepresentation which must hurt Mr. Bukowski and his family.

It has been said that hon. members of the Opposition have their golden chance of getting hold of the Treasury benches of Queensland and I believe that they are awake to their prospects, but the question in the minds of the people is from where will they get their leaders and Cabinet members? I am not now speaking of the Parliamentary members of

the Country Party but members of the Country Party in the West and the South have stated that this is the greatest opportunity that the Country Party and the Liberal Party have ever had. However, under no illusion, they have said, "From where will they get their Cabinet?" and it has been said, "That is how we will lose the election."

Returning to Mr. Joe Bukowski, it has been suggested in recent months that the cleavage in the Labour Party came about because of the personal vendetta ruthlessly waged by Bukowski against the Premier. What for? Because he had not been appointed to the Industrial Court! It is said that he experienced a sense of personal frustration. On many occasions at meetings of the inner executive of the Q.C.E. Bukowski spoke to the Premier and said, "You know, Vince, I not only never sought a position on the Industrial Court but I have repeatedly said I would not accept one."

Mr. Gair: I deny that.

Dr. DITTMER: I want to be fair to the Premier and pay him a tribute—

Mr. Gair: That will be strange.

Dr. DITTMER: According to "The Courier-Mail" report the Premier in a recent television interview said of Mr. Joe Bukowski—and this is what I would expect the Premier to do—that he, Bukowski, never sought anything for his own personal advantage. Why did not the Premier contradict the statement at the Q.C.E. when there were others present if he now denies that Bukowski never sought a position? There would be witnesses to his statement now. The Premier cannot deny that there has never been a suggestion from any quarter that a position should be given to Bukowski on the Industrial Court Bench.

Mr. Gair: It was not important.

Dr. DITTMER: I will show the Premier that it is important, not only in the role played by Mr. Bukowski but also in that played by the A.W.U.

It has been suggested that the allegations in the "Worker" of irregularities in the Lands Administration of this State were made in an effort to bring down the Cabinet and the Government. That is completely false. We must accept the findings of the Commissioner. Indeed, I have evidence from none other than the Premier and the present Deputy Premier in their statements in this House to support the findings of Mr. Justice Townley, who is recognised as probably the most eminent brain on the Supreme Court bench, and whose integrity is undoubted and unassailable. Was the A.W.U. in the wrong on that occasion? It may be suggested by our opponents on the left—many people seem to be keen on the words "on the left"—that the A.W.U. should not have ventilated its suspicions through the Press, but that it should have

tried to correct any irregularities within the confines of the party. However, I remind hon. members that the executive of the A.W.U. saw the Premier and requested an investigation into what they believed were irregularities in the administration of the Department of Public Lands. They made no mention of corrupt conduct. All they wanted was to be assured that the department would be run efficiently and fairly. A man who was a member of the Cabinet five or six years ago was particularly interested in the matter. He brought it up in caucus six years ago, and if enough evidence had been available then the Department of Public Lands would have been investigated and then administered efficiently and honestly.

Now in relation to a statement by the Treasurer last night, it is amazing how hon. members opposite will bring in these trivial incidents to confuse the people on the eve of an election. For example, last night it was said that the hon. member for Coorparoo, who wanted to do someone a good turn, made arrangements for a washing machine to be delivered to Joe Bukowski and debited to his own account. In his inimitable way, the hon. member for Coorparoo put the case as he saw it and the balloon collapsed. Incidentally it was a member of the Cabinet who had approached him on behalf of Joe Bukowski. Incidentally, also, Mr. Bukowski was not getting the washing machine for himself, but for another official of the union. Did the Minister concerned rise last night and say, "It was I who made representations to Mr. Hiley?"

Mr. Evans: Who was it?

Dr. DITTMER: I will not get down into the gutter. I prefer to keep up on the concrete road.

Mr. Brosnan: Are you sure it was a Minister?

Dr. DITTMER: I am certain, but I do not propose to divulge his name. I have pointed out that the hon. member for Coorparoo, in his inimitable, efficient and superior way, explained the honesty of the dealings with Mr. Bukowski about the washing machine, how it was delivered to him and how a Minister had made the request.

Mr. Hiley: I did not say it was a Minister.

Dr. DITTMER: I know the hon. member did not. I say we pay due regard to him. There was nothing wrong in that transaction. Many people render similar services to others and there is nothing irregular in the practice. The attack was simply an attempt to discredit the Party and to besmirch Bukowski, and, to achieve that, no means are too low for some people.

We have sought an early election. If the Opposition had been completely honest, they would have supported us in the motion and not afforded the present Government an

opportunity to vilify us and to destroy men's characters. Many of them have sufficient decency that, if they had known the depths to which some would go, they would not have permitted it but would have refused Supply and the Suspension of Standing Orders. The whole matter could then have been dealt with before dinner yesterday.

We are prepared to go to the electors at any time, whoever our opponents may be, and however big they may be in physique. After all, intellect plays no small part in politics and victory. When we are returned, we will carry on all the social services, the health services, and so on, consistent with Labour policy as laid down by successive Conventions. We will improve industrial conditions too. Government members have claimed credit for the introduction of long-service-leave legislation. That was introduced after repeated requests from the unions. I admit that the Secretary for Labour and Industry realised there were anomalies in it and he saw fit to correct them in the interests of the people of Queensland. The people are grateful to him for that.

I read in the paper recently where the Secretary for Public Instruction mentioned high schools on the periphery of Brisbane. He claimed it was a new idea and a good one. But the idea is not novel. It came from the mind of Dr. Lew Edwards. The Ministers who from time to time have been in control of the various Departments need not assume the mantle of cold superiority lifting them above their fellows. They achieved what they did not because of their own vision but because they carried out the policy of the Labour Party. That is the only credit to which any of them are entitled. Now that the Ministers in charge of the various departments are on their own I hope they will not claim any credit for what has been achieved as a result of that policy. It embodies Labour ideas and ideals.

So with free hospitalisation. Incidentally the idea of free hospitalisation was not born in Queensland; it was born in the minds of Ben Chifley and his Cabinet. In 1946 the Federal Government agreed to subsidise every public bed in Australia as long as it was free. That was how the first subsidy of 6s. came in in 1946. The amount was subsequently increased in 1948. It is all too familiar to hon. members. Now that there has been a debate it will reveal to the people of Queensland, whether they are against us or in favour of us politically, whether they are prepared to work and vote for us, that we are prepared to keep the campaign on a high level. It will show that we are not anxious to assail the characters of anybody. We are not anxious to capitalise or seek political victory at the expense of the character of anyone and the suffering of their loved ones.

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr—Secretary for Health and Home Affairs) (3.6 p.m.): After listening to the debate following the

Treasurer's motion to provide the necessary supply to carry on the requirements of government, I am reminded of a statement made many years ago by the late T. J. Ryan at a meeting in the City Hall. Amongst many other things, when speaking of the Opposition of the day, he said to the multitude assembled, "They under-estimate your intelligence, ladies and gentlemen, and they believe that the memories of people are very short." No truer words could have been uttered then or now. Because of the position they now find themselves in, hon. members on my right are apologising or attempting to make excuses for the mess they are in. They are merely foolishly trying to extricate themselves so we need not worry much about their utterances at this stage.

When all the viciousness was poured on the head of the Premier and when we of Cabinet and a section of the then Parliamentary Labour Party decided to stand by our Premier, it was very evident that there would be an election. It was also known to people following the political matters of the day that Parliament would assemble. Let us see what the Leader of the Opposition had to say as reported in the "Courier-Mail" of 27 April, 1957. He said that the Country Party was prepared to support the Gair-led Government in certain circumstances. He was asked, "Is it likely that in some circumstances over some particular Bill you would vote against Mr. Gair and support the anti-Gair faction?" The answer of the Leader of the Opposition was, "That is very remote." The Leader of the Opposition and his party could very easily support the Government in the Bill before the Chamber to provide Supply, and thus allow the Government machinery to function so that the electors in Queensland would be given the right under the electoral machinery to conveniently and thoroughly cast their vote at an election which we all know will be held very shortly.

I want to remind the Chamber that we all know of the attitude of the splinter Labour Party. Its leader, even in the Q.C.E. meeting at the time of the expulsion of the Premier, admitted he would come into the House and if necessary move a vote of no confidence against the Government. The hon. member then did a bit of a moan and sang a sort of swan song when he referred to the odium that would attach to him if the Labour Party in Queensland was defeated and an anti-Labour Government occupied the Treasury benches. Most people, including myself, thought at the time that that would be a certainty. But since we decided to take a stand in the interests of democracy and constitutional government and in the interests of the protection of the electors of this State, and formed a Queensland Labour Party, the wave of enthusiasm in our support has been so great from one end of Queensland to the other that I am satisfied we will extricate the hon. member

for Toowoomba from the position that he foreshadowed he might be in, because after election day the Queensland Labour Party will be the Government of Queensland. (Opposition interjections.)

An Opposition Member: You are getting white on top.

Mr. MOORE: I may be white on top but I am not yellow underneath. The "Courier-Mail," stimulated by the political atmosphere and the interest of the people in the political atmosphere, had this to say on 25 April, the day following the expulsion of the hon. the Premier:

"Mr. Gair owes it to electors who voted for his leadership and policy to keep faith with them so long as he can carry on the Government of the State with a sufficient Parliamentary majority."

The Premier is doing what the "Courier-Mail" said he should do and is attempting to pay that debt to the people of the State by bringing down a Bill to give sufficient Supply for Government requirements so that the Government can carry on an election conducted in an orderly manner. We have been berated by the Liberal Party which is going to bring along men and trucks to carry election material around the town. We are not a Queen Street Government; we are interested in the whole of the people of the State. A vote from a man or woman outside Boulia or Birdsville or at Thursday Island, is as important to them and to us as a vote cast by an elector in Merthyr, South Brisbane, Yeronga, or Mt. Coot-tha. It is no use members of the official Opposition trying to make out that we are prevaricating in this matter. We have some responsibilities. People have often said to me, "Why do not the Government do so-and-so? Why does not someone get up in the House and say anything, as certain Independent members do?" The people of Queensland have put their trust in Labour Governments for many years. The people of Queensland have given a mandate on two occasions to Mr. Gair and his followers to govern them, and they gave that mandate in no uncertain fashion. They gave us a mandate to carry out all the work of government, irrespective of what the circumstances might be. The principle we are fighting about is this great treasure of the electors of Queensland—the right to elect constitutionally their Parliamentary representatives, with the obligation that the representatives elected by the people shall go into Parliament and govern and not govern at the dictates of outside bodies. We are the only group in this Parliament who have the intestinal fortitude to take a stand in the interests of the people of Queensland, and we shun direction. According to newspaper reports, the Leader of the Liberal Party went to Sydney for discussions with certain of the Australian heads of his Party on some matters. That is his business; I am not criticising him for doing it.

Mr. Dewar: He was down at Cribb Island last Saturday.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member will find that the interest in this question is wider than the interest in the mud crabs at Cribb Island.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition conferred with his Party executives, and Mr. Richter took a prominent part in those consultations.

The followers of Bukowski put the gun at our head and said, "You do so-and-so, and you do it now." That is why we are here today in our small numbers, and that is why certain members are in opposition to us today. The question we are going to put to the people of Queensland is this: who is going to govern you? Hon. members opposite can bring in all the red herrings that they wish. We shall talk to the people of our achievements as a government. We shall not forget to do that. The most important question—the 64 dollar question, as it were—is: who is going to govern the people in the Parliament through the constitutional electoral machinery? A properly constituted government, or some other party?

Dr. Noble: I will tell you—the Liberal-Country Party.

Mr. MOORE: You are not a very good political judge.

Everyone who follows politics closely knows that this was the dog that the anti-Labour forces, the left wing forces, threw into the ring to see if it could eat the other dog. They demanded legislation.

There was another way in which this question could have been dealt with. It was well known to the unions. There was nothing to prevent unions taking this matter to the Industrial Court and putting before the Industrial Court, as they do on all other industrial questions, their case for extra leave. All the other unions would have had to go into Court with them and state their cases, and the Government representatives would have had to put the case for the Government. They did not want to do that, because they could not have lied to the Court as they have lied about the Treasurer's statements in regard to the finances of this State and his refusing to better the conditions of the workers. The Government have never refused better conditions to the workers while the finances enabled them to grant those better conditions.

At all times we have been accused of not wanting to conciliate but at all times we have said that if the finances of the State warranted it better conditions would be granted for the working people. Let me cite the betterment of conditions in regard to workers' compensation. The amount rose from £300 on the death of a worker to £2,800 today. When finances permitted legislation has been passed in the interests of the worker, not at the direction of the

Q.C.E. For the last month I have been addressing meetings on behalf of the Queensland Labour Party and the enthusiasm has been great. No other State in Australia has a statutory entitlement to three weeks' annual leave. The question is in the hands of Industrial Courts. The Queensland Government have not lagged behind on the leave question.

The Deputy Leader of the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labour Party, the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt made a speech with his usual contradictions. He said that the A.W.U. at all times wanted to do certain things. In his defence of Mr. Bukowski he said that the A.W.U. wanted to do things to correct the position, and mention was made of maladministration in the Department of Public Lands. The Premier has been expelled and one of the charges against him was that he deliberately brought forward the Commission in order to embarrass that particular union. That is the type of contradictory statements that have been made by A.L.P. members in their advertisements and over the wireless. Mention was also made about the constitution of the Q.C.E., but who are on the Q.C.E. today? Men like George Whiteside who sat with the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt in planning the execution of our Premier. I am reminded that Mr. Whiteside said of the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt that he was not even a Labour man and was one of the worst employers of labour. That has been borne out by the Department of Native Affairs because the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt gave that Department considerable trouble in regard to wages to a native labourer. He is one of those who planned and finally expelled the Premier because they knew that he would not bow to Communists. They wail about Communism but here is a testimony given by Comrade McCalman:

"Our ultimate aim is to form a United Workers' Party on the basis of the defeat of the right wing and its class collaboration policy, and the adoption of Marxist Scientific Socialist principles.

"If we do not seek to destroy the A.L.P. the other way is the ultimate joining of the A.L.P. and C.P.A. in one great party of the working class. Any other ideas appear unthinkable today. Such a united party would attract large sections, decisive sections, of workers, farmers, and progressives to its side."

It is significant that the membership of the Communist Party in New South Wales has reached its lowest point since 1933. Southern political commentator Frank Brown estimates that no fewer than 3,000 have been dropped off the party books, leaving membership for New South Wales at roughly the same figure. There is, says this well-informed commentator, no mystery about where they have gone.

The missing 3,000 are now in the A.L.P., in which many of them hold office in the newly constituted branches. Their influence has resulted in an agenda for the June A.L.P. Conference, opening in Sydney this week-end. In my opinion, the official Opposition should not have objected to the Bill; on the contrary, they should have supported it. I assure hon. members that when all the difficulties associated with the holding of an election have been overcome there will be an immediate election. However, we refuse to be stampeded by this smoke-screen barrage by our opponents who are trying to delude the people into believing that there is some sinister reason behind the Premier's failure to announce the election date. The Premier is not a fool; he is not prepared to announce the election date until he can choose one on which every person in Queensland can conveniently, and in accordance with the law of the land, go to the polling-booths unmolested and untroubled, and vote for Parliamentary representatives who will govern as they should. We as a Government stand firm on the principle of free and untrammelled Parliaments and of giving the people every opportunity to exercise the franchise. If that is the last thing we do as a Government we shall be commended for it by the people of this State.

Mr. WOOD (North Toowoomba) (3.28 p.m.): In my relatively few years in this Assembly I have never heard a more unconvincing case on why the people of Queensland should be denied their inalienable right to decide this issue at an election than that advanced by the Premier and the Treasurer. We have heard a good deal about the necessary delay in preparing rolls, ballot papers, forms and all the other material necessary for an election. I have every confidence in the Government Printer and his staff. The Government Printing Office is a very fluid organisation; it is, by its very nature, one that has to be geared for any crisis. There is hardly a time in the life of the work of the Government Printing Office when it has not rush work to do. It has the men to do it, and it has the efficiency to do it.

Mr. Kehoe: You would not want an election, would you?

Mr. WOOD: I shall welcome an election much more than will the hon. member for Nash. Between him and me is the vital difference that after the next election I shall be on that side of the Chamber while he will not be here at all.

Mr. Kehoe interjected.

Mr. WOOD: That is a very pious hope by the hon. member.

I will not accept the theory that the Government Printing Office cannot prepare the rolls and the other election material in time for an early election. Certain information has been given to us—reports from the Government

Printer and remarks about certain conversations—but we have no assurance that the Treasurer has given us all the information at his disposal.

I take the Treasurer back to the Federal House for a moment. He has spoken of the difference between Federal rolls and State rolls. Incidentally, I believe—and I have always said—that the State electoral system is much better than the Federal system. I point out, however, that on 10 December, 1949, the Menzies-Fadden Government were returned. The election would not normally be due till late 1952.

Mr. Walsh: How do you work that out? The election was held in 1946; there must be another in 1949.

Mr. WOOD: I said that. They were returned in 1949. After that, the next election would normally have been at the end of 1952.

Mr. Walsh: No, 1951.

Mr. WOOD: But normally.

Mr. Gair: It would have been.

Mr. WOOD: That is my point. There was no more warning in the Federal sphere on that occasion than there would be a double dissolution than there was on this occasion that Parliament would be dissolved.

Mr. Walsh: They did not produce a new roll.

Mr. WOOD: But the election was held, and conducted efficiently five weeks after the date of dissolution, without any complaints from any contending party. It is physically possible for the Queensland election to be conducted within a couple of months, and it is morally right that it should be.

I will now give hon. members information I have received from a very reliable source, namely, an ex-employee of the Government Printing Office. Firstly, at the moment the normal complement of rolls that would be printed in a non-election year has been completed for the 75 electorates.

Mr. Gair: That is true. I told you that this morning.

Mr. WOOD: Right.

Mr. Walsh: They are nearly all gone.

Mr. WOOD: Secondly, an order has been given for an extra 200 rolls to be printed for each electorate.

Mr. Walsh: No, some 300.

Mr. WOOD: All right, 200 to 300. Thirdly, the rolls for 42 electorates—and these are the figures the Treasurer quoted—have already been completed on that basis, leaving those for 33 electorates to be done.

Mr. Walsh: That is right.

Mr. WOOD: Normally, when an election is pending, it is the practice in the Government Printing Office for the staff to work a 10-hour day. If that practice were adopted, the rolls would be ready a fortnight from now.

Mr. Walsh: Don't be silly. They are working overtime.

Mr. WOOD: How much overtime?

Mr. Walsh: They are working two hours' overtime each day and eight hours on Saturday. That shows how much you know.

Mr. WOOD: I will give hon. members some information on overtime, and I challenge the Treasurer to produce figures to show that the ex-employee who has given it to me is wrong.

Mr. Walsh: That might be the cleaner.

Mr. WOOD: No, it is not. It is a very loyal unionist who is not revealing any scandal or any information about the movements of public men, but something in the public interest that should be given to hon. members. We were told this morning that overtime has been worked for several months in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Walsh: No.

Mr. WOOD: Oh yes, by interjection.

Mr. Walsh: Not by me.

Mr. WOOD: By interjection, the Attorney-General gave that information.

Mr. Walsh: His department—entirely different.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is quite incorrect in saying that I said that overtime had been worked for months in the Government Printing Office. I made no such statement. I made the statement as it affected my own department, the Justice Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to accept the Attorney-General's denial.

Mr. WOOD: I accept his statement, if I misunderstood him. On this subject of overtime, I ask the Treasurer, if the figures given me are wrong, to tell hon. members definitely what overtime has been worked.

Mr. Walsh: I can only tell you what the Government Printer tells me.

Mr. WOOD: One of the unionists has told me that up until last week on the binding floor the overtime worked was nil.

Mr. Walsh: It may not be necessary.

Mr. WOOD: On the composing floor the overtime worked was nil.

Mr. Walsh: It may not be necessary.

Mr. WOOD: In the machine room the overtime worked was 16 man hours. For those associated with the printing of rolls the total overtime worked has been 16 man hours

up until last week. If that information is wrong and the Treasurer can produce to the Chamber an exact statement of the number of man hours overtime that have been worked up until last week on the compilation of rolls I will accept his statement and admit that the information given to me by a very worthy unionist has been incorrect.

Mr. Walsh: Sixteen man hours, did you say?

Mr. WOOD: Up until last week—16 man hours in the machine room. If that is incorrect will the Treasurer tell the Chamber exactly how many man hours have been worked in overtime since the dispute in the Labour Party developed up until last week? As he admits, they were not taking any unusual precautions to prepare rolls, and the first report was not until 29 May.

Mr. Walsh: That is not right. There could be no overtime other than by agreement with the union. That is number one.

Mr. WOOD: The usual thing is that when rolls are being printed the employees engaged on the compilation of rolls work 10 hours daily until they are complete. My information, again let me say I believe it to be authentic, is that the compilation of the supplementary rolls is proceeding as normally as it does at any other time. It is always a rush. The last date for enrolments is the date of the issue of the writ and it is always a rush on the part of returning officers and the printing staff of the Government Printing Office to get the supplementary rolls out in time.

I believe that while there is a rush it is no greater than the normal rush associated with any ordinary election. I await with interest the exact information to which I believe the Chamber is entitled.

Mr. Walsh: I will make a fool of you for sure.

Mr. WOOD: That is all right.

Mr. Walsh: I have already said this morning that there were eight hours worked last Saturday.

Mr. WOOD: I said up until last week.

Mr. Walsh: Saturday, yes, up to the end of last week.

Mr. WOOD: The Treasurer can include that and give us the exact time up to the end of last week.

This Government, elected as a Labour Government, must give the people that early right for a determination of their Government to which they are entitled.

Mr. Gair: We will.

Mr. WOOD: Every hon. member opposite will admit that the Government were elected as a Labour Government. They no longer enjoy a majority as a Labour Government.

Mr. Gair: Ten Ministers out of eleven. There was only one rat in the Cabinet.

Mr. WOOD: In reply to that, if you put the rest of the Cabinet into a hat, you would not get half a Duggan among the lot of them. I make no apology for that.

Mr. Gair: Ten out of eleven Cabinet Ministers!

Mr. Duggan: A lot of them are sorry I am not leading them now.

Mr. WOOD: They have lost approximately half of their strength with which they were returned to power. We will not argue about the measure of support they have lost but indeed they have lost some measure of support of the people who elected them. No longer can they claim to represent the people who voted for them on 19 May, 1956. In fairness to Parliament, in fairness to the people who returned them last election and in fairness to those who did not vote for them, they must at the earliest possible opportunity give their masters, the electors, the right to say whether they should be returned, and if they are not to be returned the right to say who should replace them. The speech delivered last night by the hon. the Treasurer was the type of speech that defeated Chifley in 1949, with outpourings of hatred.

Mr. Walsh: By Comms. like yourselves.

Mr. WOOD: I take exception to that statement—“by the Communists like yourself.” I ask for a withdrawal.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Turner): I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Walsh: What I said was, the outpourings of the Communists like those over there. If the hon. member is so sensitive about it, in accordance with the Standing Orders I withdraw.

Mr. WOOD: It is not a case of being sensitive. I do not take second place to the Treasurer in my locality to the Throne or to the country. I have proved that. (Government interjections.) I know of no more dirty way in which one member can attack another member than by trying to hang the label of a Communist on him. When he does that he is striking at something that goes to the very roots of our beliefs. The speech the hon. gentleman delivered was typical of the speeches delivered by Fadden and Menzies which defeated Chifley. As I said yesterday, one could imagine it was prepared by Mr. Wentworth, M.H.R., or Mr. Jim Killen, M.H.R., with this exception—they would have put it over in better taste. As has been said by the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, we have had the sorry spectacle of leading members of the Government adopting the catch-cries used by the Opposition at the last election. The hon. member for Mt. Coot-tha called us the Evatt-Bukowski-Gair Party at the last election. I ask the hon. member if that is not correct.

Mr. Morris: I shall look it up.

Mr. WOOD: This time members of the Government are out-Torying the Tories; they are stealing their catch-cries. (Govt. interjections). Members opposite are putting them over in a very vicious manner. (Government interjections.) There is much I should like to say in the little time at my disposal. I should like to say something about Communism. The Treasurer and those sitting with him are making the same charges which they quite rightly resisted so strenuously over the years when they were levelled at members of the Labour Party by Menzies, Fadden, Hiley and Nicklin. The Treasurer is now using the same methods to discredit us as was used by the Tories over the years. The hon. member for Carnarvon had something to say about this. It is my belief that no-one should make any charge in this House affecting the character of any person unless he is prepared to stand up to it outside. He stated that the hon. member for Ithaca and I went to Stanthorpe to reform the A.L.P., and that there were known Communists at that meeting.

Mr. Hilton: That is true.

Mr. WOOD: That is true, according to the hon. gentleman. I did not know more than two people in that audience. They were very enthusiastic. I offer the hon. gentleman the opportunity of naming them. If he does not, he smears with the brand of Communism every person who enrolled as a member of the Stanthorpe A.L.P.

Mr. Hilton: Most of them are.

Mr. WOOD: Before it was “some of them”; now it is “most of them”. He has smeared with the taint of Communism every member who signed that pledge. I hope that he will name from the public platform those people who he knows are Communists.

Mr. Hilton: Leave that to me.

Mr. WOOD: On this question of Communism, the honourable the Premier said at page 295 of “Hansard,” Volume 212, less than two years ago, speaking of the Opposition Leaders—

“Those people must be feeling very frustrated at this stage at the lack of support from their Federal leader”

That was at a time when the Rt. Hon. R. G. Menzies had stated at Lennons that the Labour Party was no more Communist than he was.

He went on—

“in their attempt to beguile the people of Queensland into believing a mistruth, that Labour is associated with Communists. We find greater sympathy for Communists among Opposition members than on this side of the House.”

Again, in the same speech the Premier said—

“Labour fought Communists while the Nicklins and Hileys used it to try to destroy the Labour Movement.”

An Opposition Member: Who said that?

Mr. WOOD: The Premier. Last year he was charging Mr. Nicklin and Mr. Hiley with destroying the Labour movement. Today he is out-Torying those Tories in his attempt to use the same weapon to destroy the Labour movement.

In October, 1954, the Treasurer said—

“It is fitting that the leaders of parties opposed to the Labour Party are prepared to surrender to and work side by side with Communists.”

Three years ago he was accusing the Opposition of surrendering to and working side by side with Communists.

I wish to deal now with this Hobart Conference. The Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation denied in this House yesterday that he had voted in favour of recognising the foreign policy of the Labour Party as set out at the Hobart Conference.

Mr. Hilton: I said I protested against it.

Mr. WOOD: Oh no you did not.

Mr. HILTON: I rise to a point of order. As a member of Caucus, the hon. member should know, Mr. Chairman, that I stood up and made reference to the Hobart Conference and the foreign policy before a vote was taken in Caucus. The hon. member cannot deny it. (Uproar.)

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: Order! When I call “Order!”, I expect hon. members to obey my call.

Mr. WOOD: I shall read extracts from the minutes of 30 March, 1955. I moved this motion, which was very ably seconded by the hon. member for Keppel—

“That this meeting of the Parliamentary Labour Party recommends to our representative on the Q.C.E. that he supports the instruction of the Federal Conference in regard to A.L.P. Industrial Groups.”

Cabinet held a meeting during the adjournment for lunch. On our return, on behalf of Cabinet the Deputy Premier, Mr. Duggan, moved a motion which was seconded by Mr. Donald and carried unanimously. The hon. member for Carnarvon did not speak to it.

Mr. Hilton: That is untrue, I did.

Mr. WOOD: I took the opportunity of checking and his name is not included. This is the motion—

“As this Party is of the opinion that all decisions of the Federal Conference including the one recently concluded are binding on all branches, no specific direction from members of the Parliamentary Labour Party are necessary to our delegate on the Q.C.E.”

The Parliamentary Labour Party unanimously confirmed all the decisions of the Hobart Conference, including their foreign policy.

Mr. Hilton: Do you deny that I stood on my feet and protested against the motion?

Mr. WOOD: Yes.

Mr. Hilton: You cannot deny it.

Mr. WOOD: In concluding, let me say that the Premier has stated that if re-elected as Leader of the Government the Government will introduce legislation in connection with court-controlled ballots, and he has said also that he would have done it earlier if there had not been so many Jack Duggans in the Party. Never in Caucus meetings that I have attended have I ever heard the Premier or any member of Cabinet make any suggestion recommending the institution of court-controlled ballots.

Mr. Walsh: You know that the Convention failed to carry a resolution.

Mr. WOOD: Instead of having too many Jack Duggans in the Party, my only regret is that we have not more.

(Time expired.)

Mr. H. R. GARDNER (Rockhampton) (3.53 p.m.): As one of the newly-elected members of the Government and with the experience I have had in the last few days, I wonder at the attitude that can be adopted when a motion for Supply is submitted to carry on the government until an election can be held in a democratic manner. The suggestions put forward by the Premier and the Treasurer this morning should be heeded by members of the Opposition parties including Messrs. Nicklin, Morris and Duggan. They should avail themselves of an interview with Mr. Tucker, the Government Printer, to ascertain the true picture as outlined by the Treasurer. It is all very well to say that this and that can be done without having authentic information on whether it can or not. The head of a Government department is the only person to approach to ascertain whether rolls can be printed in time for an election in accordance with the Elections Act. We, as representatives of the people, must guard their interests. Bill Jones, who lives at Camooweal, Hughenden or Dajarra, is just as much entitled to a vote as people who live in Brisbane and the other large cities.

I have had a varied experience in the Labour movement. After a lifetime of work in the movement and less than 12 active months in Parliament, I have been discarded by those on the other side of the Chamber because I had the temerity to tell a body of unionists in Rockhampton the true story on three weeks' leave. I pulled no punches in expressing an honest opinion about what went on. I did not know that I had been expelled from the Labour Party until 11 April last. When I applied for the renewal of my membership ticket, I was notified that a ticket could not be issued to me. That was my first knowledge that I had been discarded by the party, despite the fact that I had appeared twice before the Inner Executive, when Mr. Duggan and Mr. Gair were present, and also at a Moscow trial before Bukowski, Dittmer,

Schmella and Whiteside. At that time, I was told by Jack Egerton that I would not be allowed back into the party unless I was prepared to sign a special pledge. Because I refused to bow to the standover tactics of a Moscow trial, I was not wanted in the Labour movement. However, I was not notified of my expulsion by a letter from the Q.C.E., nor was the Rockhampton Executive notified by letter. Incidentally, I have had two votes of confidence from the Rockhampton Executive, the last being as recently as 5 March, 1957. Over a period of five months, the Q.C.E. failed to notify the Rockhampton Executive that I was not wanted in the Labour movement.

After all that, men on the other side of the Chamber are castigating those who have the courage to stand up for what they regard as right and just, and who choose to act constitutionally and democratically in accordance with the oath of allegiance that we take when we enter Parliament to do what we regard as right and proper in the interests of the people. Many of my friends on the other side of the Chamber have revealed how weak they are since 24 April, 1957. At a caucus meeting in December last, on a motion to lift my suspension, 19 of them walked across the floor and voted against it. That was the result of sheer intimidation by the boys of Dunstan House. Not one of the men who voted against that motion can get up here and say why Gardner should be put out of the Labour movement. What wrong did I do? I have been in the movement since 1920, and I have been a member of a union since 1918. I was not wanted in the Labour movement, and the reason has been ventilated in this Chamber during the last 24 hours. The men who were responsible for my expulsion from the movement are trying to justify their actions before the people by saying that we on this side of the Chamber are doing something that is wrong. However, they are not prepared to stand up to the constitutional aspect of Communist infiltration in the Labour movement.

I am not basing my speech on any Communist phobia. I carried Labour's banner in 1949, in 1951, and the one after that for Dr. Evatt in Capricornia, and I was opposed by a Communist candidate on each occasion. Never in my life in a public place have I advocated keeping down the Communists and forcing them underground. I have never disagreed with that unionist who said to me, "We believe that Communist leadership in Australia produces the best fighters who get the best results." I have never disputed the right of unionists to elect their own officials. Today in Queensland the major organisations are definitely Communist-controlled. It is no good saying what we did in 1935 in the Q.C.E. Today we have organisations affiliated with the Q.C.E. that have been fighting Australian Labour Party representatives, in the case of the A.R.U., since 1931. Never have I read in the "Railway Advocate" an admis-

sion that the Labour Party has done any good; rather does it advocate the principles of Communism.

I say these things because I believe that in my 25 minutes I have to make my position very clear. I have to explain to the people of Rockhampton who elected me on 19 May, 1956, why I was expelled from the Australian Labour Party and why 19 Party members could not see fit to vote for one simple resolution. As mates, in a spirit of comradeship, they could have said, "We will support the resolution and let it go back to the Q.C.E." They did not have the courage to do that and so I gradually slipped out of the picture. Nobody worried about me, just as nobody worried about Tom Foley. But when the Q.C.E. put the axe to Vince Gair's head, 26 members of his Party were strong enough and courageous enough to stand up to their responsibilities as members of Parliament and as members of the Labour movement. I am proud that I am still able to say that I have not deviated from my plans and from my convictions. Those who expelled me will regret the step they have taken. They have brought about a cleavage in the Party and in the Parliament of Queensland, and the people know it.

The Leader of the Opposition deplored the washing of dirty linen in this Chamber. I disagree with him. I do not want to wash any either, but I know that even he will admit that the people of Queensland are entitled to know why 26 members of the Government elected on 19 May, 1956, nine of them Cabinet Ministers, have seen fit to stand by their Premier and to fight for his constitutional right to administer the Government. Above all else, let us have the credit for showing some sense of loyalty to our leader.

I entered Parliament a little over 12 months ago and sat for the first time in the Caucus room. Now I hear all these statements made in Parliament by those who have been members for many years bolstering up Jack Duggan and criticising Vince Gair, lauding the attributes of one and condemning those of the other. In the Caucus room those men were elected leader and deputy leader. I leave it to hon. members to imagine my view of what has happened in those 12 months.

The Trades and Labour Council of Queensland, controlled mainly by Communist officials, will acknowledge their stand. I have here a small leaflet written by A. H. Field of the A.M.I.E.U. He does not deny his Communist sympathies. Bukowski was present on this date and he supported a vote of condemnation of the Government. Let us see who is on this wonderful Executive of the Trades and Labour Council that co-operated so well in trying to link up with the administration of the Q.C.E. The president is Gerry Dawson, the vice-president is Jack Egerton. I cannot say much against Jack because he is weak and easily led. Macdonald is the treasurer and then there is Hanson of the

Painters' Union, Millar from the Miners' Union, Frank Waters from the Postal Workers, and Nicol from the B.W.I.U.

All these people are sitting with Joe Bukowski who never sat there before. The A.W.U. never sat there before in its history until Bukowski had his back to the wall during the wool strike. When I first entered the Chamber hon. members opposite were criticising the Government. Joe Bukowski was fighting the wool issue. He had his back to the wall, the graziers were getting on top because the wool was being shorn. That was the first time in history that Bukowski ran for these boys on the top of the hill. That is when he sold the Labour Party out. It is no use anybody saying that the Communists have not got control.

Mr. Evans: You tried to get back.

Mr. H. R. GARDNER: I tried to get back in accordance with the constitution. I would have had the guts to say what I am saying now if I had got back. I have said it from the public platform. When Bukowski got there and the Premier had his back to the wall we all know what was happening with hon. members over on that side today who claim to be the great A.L.P. We know what they were trying to do when we tried to get conferences to introduce a little common sense and get them into the Industrial Court to have things settled. The hon. members over there do not want to stand up to the responsibility of trying to attack the Communists. Yesterday the hon. member for Ithaca said that the Communists are not a political party.

Mr. HANLON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member may have misunderstood my interjection yesterday. I said that the Communist Party is just as anti-Labour as the Liberal-Country Party. I did not attempt to say that the Communist Party was not a political party. I merely said it was just as anti-Labour as the Liberal-Country Party.

Mr. H. R. GARDNER: I heard the hon. member for North Toowoomba say today that the Menzies-Fadden Government brought about the defeat of the Chifley Government. Let us see what Mr. Sharkey has to say in "The Communist Review" under the heading of "History Repeats Itself"—

"The two main factors that the Communist Party used in that year to defeat the Chifley Government were:—

"1. The coal strike which paralysed the whole nation for months just prior to the Federal elections."

The Treasurer made reference to that when he said that the military had to be put into the mines in New South Wales and the employees' funds had to be frozen. Continuing with what Mr. Sharkey had to say—

"2. The standing of a record number of Communist candidates to split the Labour Party vote."

He went on further to say that that is a method of exploitation they want to adopt.

In 1937, at the annual conference of the Australian Labour Party, the following resolution was carried—

"In no circumstances must any branch or member of the party be associated with members of the Communist party or a subsidiary thereof in the holding of joint meetings in the advocacy of any matters, and further that any branch of the A.L.P. which contravenes this instruction must be declared bogus and any member of the A.L.P. similarly offending will automatically expel himself or herself from the movement."

I say to members of the A.L.P.: what about Bukowski and Egerton going throughout Queensland during the wool strike with Hanson and Gerry Dawson, and associating with Macdonald, and blaming the Labour Party. They then come back and sit in judgment on the Government. I understand why our old friend Bukowski wants to deny this statement issued by Comrade Dixon, the National President of the Communist Party. At an executive committee conference in March, 1957, Comrade Dixon said:

"Comrade Aaron in his report on the August conference in 1952, rightly stressed that,

"It is the task of the Communists to assist and lead the left wing in the A.L.P. towards the amalgamation of the Communist Party and the A.L.P. on the basis of Marx-Leninism."

That has been borne out by the infiltration of those fellows in recent years, some of whom made up the 25 delegates who voted for the expulsion of the Premier. I give credit to Mr. Goding and Mr. Williams and our friend Bill Edmonds. They had the strength and the courage to say, "We want to have a conference with the A.W.U. State Executive; we do not want to break up the Labour movement." What did Bukowski say? He said, "I am the Almighty in the A.W.U.; I am the person to decide when a conference will be held." No conference was held and a resolution was carried by 35 to 30 expelling a man who led the party to victory at two elections with the greatest return of members. Because men on this side had the courage and the confidence to stand behind him it was suggested that we did not know what was going on. We are fighting to clean this movement. We will clean it. We will finish ahead of the Official Labour Party even if we do not finish on top. Let us analyse what the Communists told the people. Comrade Dixon had the following to say:—

"Now we have to deal with the second part of this complicated situation in Queensland which is confusing so many of our comrades. I do agree entirely that Walsh is more dangerous than Gair himself, but the suggestion that we should

use our influence in the Q.C.E. in exposing Walsh is wrong. We have to realise that we are executing our influence in the Q.C.E. through our trade unions. People who represent our unions in the Q.C.E. are not members of our party—and you know well, that they must not be. They are the people who sympathise with our ideas or who consider our ideas opportune for their own personal careers. We, of course, do not agree with these Left Wingers, but still we have to use them in our struggle against the Right Wing in the A.L.P., and consequently, we consider carefully their wishes, and often adjust our tactics to their opportunism, not in order to be victims of their opportunism, but in order to use their opportunism to our ends.”

These people are interested in the downfall of Gair, and in the re-shuffle of the Queensland Labour Government for their personal advantage and aspirations.

At the moment they are concerned with the fall of Gair, without splitting the A.L.P. in Queensland. It is true that the fall of Gair will not rid the A.L.P. in Queensland of all the reactionary Right Wing elements, but it is also true that the fall of Gair will bring consternation into their ranks.”

I believe that Parliament is a democratic institution, giving us rights and conditions for which we have fought over a great number of years. Members on this side of the Chamber stand for the preservation of democracy and democratic principles. If there is any man, irrespective of his political affiliations, who links himself with the Communist Party in this country to overthrow our democratic institutions, I have no desire to associate with him. I am sure that members on this side of the Chamber who are prepared to take this stand will be able to say to the people of Queensland, “We have taken a stand on a definite issue. We believe that the infiltration of the Communist Party in Queensland has been so marked in the last two years that we are prepared to fight this issue, and we either stand or fall by the principles to which we adhere.” My colleagues and I believe that the sooner we can go to the country and tell our story, and tell it well, the sooner we shall be able to convince the people of Queensland that the stand we have taken is in the interests of democracy and for the preservation of our conditions and democratic institutions.

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg—Treasurer) (4.17 p.m.): In the course of his remarks, the hon. member for North Toowoomba made a statement that was obviously incorrect in the light of reports tendered to me by Mr. Tucker, the Government Printer. I asked the hon. member for North Toowoomba to repeat his statement. He said that 16 man-hours were worked in overtime on the compilation and preparation

of the rolls. Mr. Tucker advises me that the machinists and assistants worked 328 man-hours in the machine room on rolls.

Mr. Wood: Overtime?

Mr. WALSH: Yes.

Mr. Wood: Over what period?

Mr. WALSH: Over the period up till last Saturday.

Mr. Wood: From when?

Mr. WALSH: Never mind when. The hon. member wants to shift his ground. The fact remains that he made the specific statement that only 16-man hours had been worked on the compilation of rolls up till last week-end. The hon. member made the statement; I did not. He said that only 16 man-hours had been worked. What time did he mean?

Mr. Wood: What were the times since 24 April, for instance?

Mr. WALSH: That is what has been done since 24 April. I made it clear this morning that, on my instructions, Mr. Tucker approached the representatives of the union. We have not yet reached that stage of dictatorship where we tell men that they have to work overtime. By arrangement with the union it was decided to work overtime, and from the time the union agreed with the Government Printer 328 hours overtime worked on the compilation of rolls has been done. Is that clear enough.

Mr. Lloyd interjected.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member is so confused and will be more confused when he engages in his election campaign at Kedron and has to meet the campaign of Dr. Uhr.

The hon. member for North Toowoomba again made the specific statement that there had been no overtime worked in the binding room. Is that correct? I am not distorting what he said? My information from the Government Printer is that in the binding room there were 72 hours overtime worked on ballot papers in addition to the 328 hours. Everybody knows that a ballot paper must be prepared before a name is put on it.

Mr. Wood: There is no printing on it.

Mr. WALSH: I hope the hon. member has not got his name in ahead of the issue of writs.

Mr. Wood: Can you bind before they are printed?

Mr. WALSH: I am not the Government Printer. It is open to any hon. member who questions the explanation I have given to get in touch with the Government Printer. That is a fair enough proposition. It is no good asking me whether you bind and fold in the one room because I would not know anything about the technique of the printing office. I am guided by the advice given me by the

person charged with the administration of the office. The hon. member for North Toowoomba could not tell me whether binding is done in the same room. Obviously ballot papers are handled in the binding room. The hon. member went on to say that there was no overtime worked in connection with folding, and for his information I have to tell him that on the advice of Mr. Tucker that folding is part of the work carried out in the machine room which is included in the 328 hours. If the hon. member wants to go round listening to pimps and spies of questionable standing or mental perverts I cannot help it.

Mr. HANLON (Ithaca) (4.24 p.m.): I oppose the motion introduced by the Treasurer seeking further Supply for the Government, if one can call the 25 members on the opposite side, in a House of 75, the Government. The Treasurer referred to me as a novice, a description I do not deny, but I understand it is the practice in this Chamber for a new member or a novice to be allowed to make his maiden speech without interruption. I do not seek your protection, Mr. Clark, because I can hit to the boundary any of the innocuous lollypops bowled up to me by Government members.

This is the first occasion I have had of addressing the Committee since my election at the by-election last December, and I take the opportunity of placing on record my personal appreciation and that of the electors of Ithaca for the sincere Labour representation given them in this Chamber by the late Mr. Leonard Eastment, a gentleman who was sincere in every phase of his life, whether it was in carrying out his Parliamentary duties, in attending to the activities of the many public bodies with which he was associated, or in his unswerving allegiance to the Australian Labour Party. I remind hon. members opposite that if the late Mr. Eastment was still the Labour member for Ithaca in this Assembly, he would have adopted the same attitude as I in the present unfortunate crisis in the Labour Party.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says it is regrettable that in introducing the Bill, the Treasurer should have engaged for 119 minutes in a vicious attack on the Australian Labour Party. Of course, I would extend more respect to the complaint of the Leader of the Opposition if I had not sat in the Chamber during the previous session of Parliament and heard almost every member of the Opposition bring Bukowski, the Q.C.E., Communism, and all those issues into the discussion on virtually every Bill that was introduced. But I say with the Leader of the Opposition that the Treasurer was not justified in going into intimate Party dealings as he did when introducing the Bill. As an attack has been made on members of the Australian Labour Party, however, we must pay some attention to it and make a reply.

As a member of this Committee who has only recently taken the oath of allegiance to the Crown, I register very strong objection—and I join with my leader, the hon. member for Toowoomba, in this—to the innuendoes, the implications and the straight-out accusations made by the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation, and other hon. members opposite, that I or any other member of the A.L.P. would be the tool of the Communists, or any other body of people who might be trying to pull down democracy. Let us examine those who are trying to smear us as Communists. It is significant that every hon. member on the other side of the Chamber who has spoken on the Bill has quoted from some Communist publication or another. One is almost led to believe that the entire personnel of the Queensland Labour Party is on the mailing lists of those who print Communist publications, because they all seem to be able to pull out a Communist publication and quote from it. Last night, for example, the Treasurer produced, I think, "The Communist Review," and said that it told the people they should support the Australian Labour Party. The Treasurer said it was the April issue of that publication. I have never read it, but if it is like most monthly papers it is published early in the month, so that it would have been referring to the Australian Labour Party as it was before the Premier and the Treasurer, and their supporters, left it. It was probably published after the Motor Spirits Distribution Bill had been introduced into the Chamber, and when the Communists were running round and saying, "Hurrah for Vince Gair!"

Mr. Gair: You supported that Bill.

Mr. HANLON: It was supported not only by members of the Parliamentary Labour Party, but by the Communists. However, we cannot infer from that that the Premier automatically becomes the No. 1 Communist of Queensland. That would be too ridiculous for words. Because the Communist Party is anti-Labour, it knows that it can do the Labour Party the greatest harm by attaching itself to our coat-tails. That is the only reason for its support on this issue. But we cannot say that everything the Communist Party supports is no good.

I propose to examine what has happened in the Australian Labour Party. In the same way as the hon. member for Toowoomba, I am very sad at what has occurred. The so-called Queensland Labour Party occupying the Government benches, which in my opinion could better be described as Tory Party No. 3, was formed not after the Premier was expelled from the Australian Labour Party but the day before, when the Premier got the members of his Cabinet, with the exception of our Leader, John Duggan, to sign a declaration.

Mr. Gair: Not with the exception of Duggan. He signed it.

Mr. HANLON: If the Premier will let me finish, he will grasp my intention.

Mr. Gair: He signed it all right.

Mr. HANLON: The photostat produced by the Treasurer last night showed that, on the day before the Premier was expelled from the Party, on 23 April at a Cabinet meeting, he got the Cabinet—or they agreed, whichever way you like to put it—to sign that they would withdraw from the A.L.P. if he were expelled the next day. They all signed, but John Duggan refused to agree to withdraw from the Party, because he was interested in trying to preserve its unity. He agreed to show his confidence in his Leader but he was not prepared to desert the Party any more than the rest of us were. Hon. members may have overlooked the fact that the Premier had such respect for the word of honour of his Cabinet Ministers that he would not take their word of honour. He wanted them to put it in writing, that they would follow him, so that they could not get out of it. That is why they are over there with him today.

Mr. Walsh: Why did the hon. member for Toowoomba put his name on the paper?

Mr. HANLON: As I think I pointed out, the hon. member for Toowoomba merely signified, in the interests of the unity of the Labour Party, that he was prepared to support the Premier, not that the Premier deserved his support. However, he was not prepared to signify that he would desert the A.L.P. The Premier's lack of respect for his colleagues' word of honour may have been engendered by his own knowledge of what happened with the Leave Committee at Mackay. They took his word that he would introduce the three weeks' leave legislation and he woke up to the fact that people's word of honour is not worth much. He had given his word in Mackay and got away with not carrying it out and he thought that members of his Cabinet might do the same.

Mr. Gair: You have been contaminated early.

Mr. HANLON: I will not be contaminated any longer by those hon. members on the Government benches.

Mr. Gair: No, not very long now.

Mr. HANLON: The matter was then taken to Caucus and the Premier sought to put over the same confidence trick. In other words, he told Caucus, "Say you are going to support me. Say you will walk out of the Party, and the Q.C.E. won't have the courage to throw me out." In his television interview in Sydney he said, "The Q.C.E. won't expel me; of course they won't." That is how he convinced his colleagues. They thought, "Oh, nothing will come of this. We will just agree to it and nothing will happen."

Mr. Gair: Why didn't they expel Duggan? He opposed the three weeks' leave.

Mr. HANLON: Duggan did not give his personal pledge at Mackay as the Premier did.

Mr. Gair: Yes, he did. He did more than I did.

Mr. HANLON: As a matter of fact, a photostat is being taken of a declaration by every person who attended that Leave Committee meeting with the Premier and the Deputy Premier. Of the nine people then present, eight are prepared to swear on oath that the Premier promised to introduce the three weeks' leave.

Mr. Gair: They told a different story at the Q.C.E. meeting.

Mr. Walsh interjected.

Mr. HANLON: I would appreciate it if the Treasurer would direct any remark he has to make to the Chair and not across the Chamber. Much has been said about democracy and how members of Parliament are responsible to the people. We all realise that there are many faults in the party system. We do not pretend it is perfect but it is no use the Premier or any of his followers picking out odd points in the system and blaming the Australian Labour Party. Every hon. member knows that the only reason the Premier remained Premier for five years and the only reason that his Government have carried on is that every member of the Parliamentary Labour Party honoured the pledge that the Premier has now broken. Whether they think it wise or unwise, right or wrong, if the majority of the Parliamentary Labour Party decide on something they vote for it. Is not that what happened when the Petrol Bill was before the Chamber? The hon. member for Toowoomba was opposed to certain principles in the Bill. The Premier told him that because he was outnumbered in Cabinet he had to vote for it in Caucus and in Parliament. If he had not done so the Premier would have been the first one to go to the Q.C.E. to complain that Duggan had broken Parliamentary rules by voting against him in the House and therefore should be expelled. Apparently it is all right for the authority of the party to be exercised against Duggan or Dittmer or Hanlon or Lloyd or anybody else, but when it is exercised against the Premier it is a different matter.

I remind the hon. member for Rockhampton that when he was suspended from the Labour Party and the hon. member for Belyando was expelled we did not find the Premier organising any breakaway parties for them. Then they talk about democracy. It is just a lot of "holier than thou" stuff. The Liberal and Country Parties are very worried because they have always claimed to be the protectors of democracy and the Premier is trying to take over this role, together with a great number of their supporters. I understand one of them has been nominated as a candidate for the Queensland Labour Party against the hon. member for Kedron. They are also very

worried about the money being subscribed to the Queensland Labour Party from sources that would normally be regarded as belonging to the Liberal-Country Party.

I draw the attention of hon. members to the application form for this new so-called Queensland Labour Party. As a prospective member of the Australian Labour Party you have to certify that you are not a member of the Communist Party, Fascist Party, or any other party opposed to the Australian Labour Party, and so on. I have seen the application form for membership of the Queensland Labour Party. They were handed out at a meeting at Nundah. They have no such certification.

Mr. Gair: How did Elson Green get into the Ithaca Branch of the A.L.P.?

Mr. HANLON: He certified he was not a Communist. If the Premier wishes to say any person is a Communist let him have the guts to say it outside the Chamber.

The Treasurer was very active last night telling us about secret conferences and allegedly security reports which are supposed to be confidential but which he was bandying about. I may be able to tell hon. members something about the activities of the Treasurer immediately following the expulsion of the Premier from the Labour Party. I had accepted an invitation from the Treasurer some weeks before—and I appreciate the courtesy extended to me—to accompany him to Gladstone where he had an official duty to perform on the Saturday after the Premier was expelled. When I found the Premier had been expelled I considered it my duty to report to my executive what had happened and find out what they thought about the matter. On Anzac Day I rang the Treasurer and told him I would not be accompanying him. Actually I did not think the Treasurer would be leaving on the Thursday night because I had read that the Premier had called a meeting of his supporters in the Executive Building on the Friday morning. As the Treasurer was not due to perform his official ceremony in Gladstone until Saturday morning I thought that if he were a supporter of the Premier he would attend the meeting and not leave for Gladstone until Friday night.

Mr. Gair: You do not think that there was any doubt?

Mr. HANLON: I will tell the Premier how much it was in doubt. The Treasurer asked me whether we were going to have any meetings. I replied, "That is not for me to say. Possibly it will be up to the acting leader, Mr. Duggan. If he calls one, I shall attend, but I imagine, judging from his actions and his desire to avoid a split, that he will not rush into any hasty action." The Treasurer then told me that he had been in touch with people in Melbourne.

Mr. Walsh: That is true.

Mr. HANLON: With people on the Federal Executive.

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. HANLON: Mr. Chamberlain and those people—

Mr. Walsh: Yes.

Mr. HANLON:—whom the hon. gentleman now says are Communists. The hon. member was in secret contact with them endeavouring to try and get them to patch up the thing. (Government interjections.) I could only gather that possibly the Treasurer was prepared to ditch the Premier as long as the situation could be solved.

Mr. Walsh: I had approaches from Tom Dougherty the other night. (Government and Opposition interjections.)

Mr. HANLON: The Treasurer told me that on no account must there be a conference, because he was going to try and solve the thing. I said, "What about the meeting that Mr. Gair has called for tomorrow?" The Treasurer was going away. Why did the hon. gentleman leave on the Thursday night instead of on the Friday night, which would have enabled him to get to Gladstone in ample time to carry out his official duty? The hon. gentleman did so because he did not want to be photographed with the Premier till he found out whether he was going to "dump" him or not. The hon. gentleman referred to the practice in ministerial office and he referred to what was done by Menzies and Fadden. I repeat that when the hon. member for Toowoomba was a member of the Cabinet they had the support of the majority of the House, but they have not got it now. If the Treasurer maintains they have still got that support and if hon. members opposite still claim they are the Labour Party, I remind them that there is a gentleman up at Goodna who thinks he is President Eisenhower. (Opposition laughter.) If the Treasurer still thinks that they are the Labour Party and that they have the support of the House, I suggest that he contact the authorities at Goodna and arrange for his admission. (Government interjections.) The Treasurer told us about the little dictators. Members of the Parliamentary Labour Party who spoke on the 4BK Political Forum were compelled to submit the script to the Premier's Department for censorship. The Premier talks of Communism, but does that not savour of State censorship as operates in Soviet Russia? I have no complaint against the Public Service which, I think, compares favourably with any other Public Service in the world. (Government interjections.) Members who spoke on 4BK had to submit their script for censorship, which savours more of Communism than anything else. I agree with the hon. member for Coorparoo that Parliament, in its wisdom, has kept the matter of Appropriation within its power. Therefore it is

for the House to decide whether there is to be an election. If the Premier attempts to ignore the authority of this Parliament, the responsibility for any inconvenience to the Public Service rests with the Government. Hon. members opposite were very vociferous yesterday that the House should be master of its own destiny and that Parliament was supreme. If it is supreme, we claim that it is possible to have an election before Supply is exhausted, and that the Government should get on with the job of doing it and not go on with political hickery-dickery any more. We know quite well that the Treasurer said yesterday that the Queensland Labour Party is on a great wave. If they are on a great wave, then I say to them that they are very shortly going to be washed up.

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg—Treasurer) (4.46 p.m.): I shall not deal with everything that the hon. member for Ithaca said. He made the mistake of saying that I interjected during his first speech in this House. Any reference that I made to him on that occasion was in reply to an interjection from him, not during the course of his speech. I did not look for any protection from interjections when I came into this House.

Mr. Jesson: You could smell the gum leaves on you.

Mr. WALSH: I should hate to say what I could smell on the hon. member.

In his endeavours to make it appear that I might not be on side with the Premier, the hon. member for Ithaca went on to tell the House about my approaches to certain people in Melbourne. I wish to thank him for bringing to the notice of the public something that I should not have thought of bringing out.

Because of my loyalty to the Labour movement as I knew it in years gone by, when I saw the destruction that was to be brought about, the obvious thing for me, or anybody else who is interested in the preservation of the Labour movement in this House, to do was to make approaches to those people who we thought might be able to rectify the position. I make no apology for that, because I think there are many people who are violently opposed to the Labour Party in this State and in the Federal Parliament and other State Parliaments who do not wish to see the destruction of the Labour movement in Australia. They know its value in the economy of the country, and they know that, up till the present, it has been the only movement that had any chance of stemming the growth of Communism. It is for that reason that hon. members on this side of the Chamber have had to take charge of the Labour movement here. We must see that that fight is continued.

It is quite true that I did get in touch with certain people in Melbourne. It is quite true, also, that I was advised by a particular

person to get in touch with the Federal President of the A.L.P. in Australia, Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Hanlon: I thought he was a Communist.

Mr. WALSH: Never mind about his being a Communist. I accepted the advice of the person in Melbourne, and, after all, I have not called Chamberlain a Communist. If the hon. member accepts him in that way, that is another matter. When I have evidence to justify my calling Chamberlain a Communist, there will be no doubt about my doing it—none whatever. However, he is the recognised head of the Federal organisation in Australia. I undertook that task on behalf of the Labour Party in Queensland, and I did it for the great body of Labour supporters in Queensland. The next day I received several telephone calls from persons actually advising me that at that stage two members of the Federal Executive were coming to Queensland to take control. That was followed not by any further telephone calls but a communication that I received at Bundaberg after having left here. The hon. member for Ithaca questioned my right to leave on the Thursday night. I had my commitments to my own electorate and I went there before going to Gladstone. I never left the Premier; I am here now and that is what counts. That evening I got a ring from Melbourne to advise me of the position, saying that the balloon was up and the three men who exploded the balloon were Dr. Evatt, Clive Cameron and Tom Dougherty. Having completed my part to bring somebody here to deal with these rat-bags—

Mr. Hanlon: Did you tell the Premier about it?

Mr. WALSH: Of course I told the Premier.

Mr. Hanlon: The Premier said he did not want the Federal Executive on it.

Mr. WALSH: I told the Premier that on the eve of the meeting of the House I had three rings from the South, one from Dougherty and two from Melbourne sources.

Dr. Noble: If these men had come up and your negotiations had been successful would you have re-associated with these people?

Mr. WALSH: I am telling the hon. member that these people had sufficient interest in my standing in the Labour Movement to ring me on the night prior to the House meeting. I told them that so far as I was concerned there was no way in the world that I or the Premier would have anything to do with Bukowski, and if there was any approach to be made regarding a resumption of negotiations that move would have to come from the leader of the A.L.P. Party opposite. Don't tell me about my part to save the wreckage. Where is Egerton today, one of the leading lights in the dispute? On the pay-roll of

employers, running round on the racecourse with big bundles of notes. He is on the payroll of the employers to prevent industrial disturbances within their organisation. A member of his union communicated that to me; the Premier is a witness and there is another responsible member in this Chamber who would say the same thing. He disappeared and got away with part of the oil companies' roll. He accompanied the leader of the A.L.P. Party down to this House immediately after the expulsion of the Premier. The two that came down were Duggan and Egerton.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. WALSH: It is nothing compared with what your Party got from the oil companies. The hon. member for Ithaca is parrot-like in repeating stories and statements made by various people associated with the splinter movement.

I have some notes taken, not by myself, but one of the members of the Parliamentary Labour Party who turned up to hear the Q.C.E. case regarding three weeks' leave. It was a special leave conference and the Premier and Mr. Duggan attended with Messrs. Maxwell, Chalmers, Bukowski, Devereux, Whiteside. Many members on both sides sat that night to hear each individual member make his contribution. When it came to speeches, and whether the economic position was mentioned, Maxwell, the meat-worker from Rockhampton, said, "No," Chalmers said, "No," Bukowski said, "Yes," Devereux said, "Yes," and Whiteside was not sure. He said, "The Premier said it would go into the policy speech." Bukowski said, "The Premier said it would not go into the policy speech, but subject to the financial position it would be introduced in the first session." These are the men who were so unanimous!

Mr. Graham: Whose notes are you reading from?

Mr. WALSH: I am reading from notes made by the hon. member for Kurilpa. He took them in his own handwriting.

An A.L.P. Member: A lot of reliance you can place on that.

Mr. WALSH: I can place more reliance on it than I can on the hon. member.

Strangely enough, the hon. member for Toowoomba agreed with the statements made by everybody; he agreed with the Premier, with the people who said "Yes," and with the people who said "No." He said they were all right. If anybody can work out that jigsaw puzzle, I cannot. I know the comments that were made that night by hon. members opposite when they left Dunstan House, and how disappointed they were with the stand that had been taken by the then Deputy Premier, the member for Toowoomba.

So much for the points raised by the hon. member for Ithaca. He introduced them, and I wanted to deal with them. He spoke

about approaches that I made to people in Melbourne, and I have replied. He also raised the point about what occurred when all members of the Party were available, including the hon. member for Bremer and me.

Mr. Donald: You have to rely on the hon. member for Kurilpa to take your notes for you.

Mr. WALSH: He took the notes. I have never stamped the hon. member for Bremer as a Communist, but he has all the signs of one in that he takes notes of everything as he goes around.

Mr. Donald: I have not a little book in my pocket or any bombshells.

Mr. WALSH: And I have no books in my pocket.

Mr. Hiley: No cloak, and no dagger?

Mr. WALSH: No.

The hon. member for Bremer has reminded me of a little notebook that was handed to me through another source. It had many interesting notings in it. I mentioned it during the previous session of Parliament. It was not by a member of the Committee, but by Mr. Bukowski. He is the man who goes around with dossiers and books.

Now that the subject has been raised, I will tell hon. members why I have never trusted Mr. Bukowski. In 1946, when I was playing my part as Deputy Premier and Minister for Transport in trying to settle the meat strike, there were certain people associated with the Trades Hall who, although they may disagree with my actions in the present crisis, are still friendly enough towards me to convey certain information to me. On the occasion to which I refer, the representative of a trade union who was fighting the Communists—and Bukowski was supposed to be fighting them with him—rang me and wanted to tell me of certain happenings. I said, "I will not see you in my office; I will see you at Parliament House after 5 o'clock." He came down here. I asked him, "Have you got a car?" He replied, "No." I said to him, "I will drive you home." As we pulled out of Alice street in my car—and I could bring my driver to swear to this—another car pulled out following me and it trailed down Elizabeth street in the direction of the address of my passenger. I immediately came to the conclusion that the car was trailing me and I said to the driver, "Slow down and let this car pass us. Don't pull up at the passenger's home but drive round the block." I took the number of that car and the next morning I instructed my secretary to check with the Main Roads Department for the name of the owner. He was a man who was, and still is, prominently associated with Mr. Bukowski—spying on his own mate who was fighting the Communists. That is the atmosphere I have

lived in all these years. Why would not I distrust him at all times? However, that is all I have to say at this stage.

Rt. Hon. F. M. FORDE (Flinders) (5.2 p.m.): At the outset I extend my heartiest congratulations to the hon. member for Ithaca on his brilliant speech. It was one of the finest maiden speeches we have ever heard in either the State or Federal Parliaments. It showed that he has many of those qualities that enabled his late father to rise to the highest position in public life in Queensland.

I speak as one who has had considerable experience in public life in Australia in both State and Federal Parliaments. Everyone who has the best interests of the Labour movement at heart regrets the present crisis, but it has occurred and anyone with a knowledge of the constitution and platform of the Australian Labour Party, the rules and powers of the Labour-in-Politics Convention and the powers of the Queensland Central Executive must recognise his plain duty, which is to stand with the official Labour Party. In the words of Henry Lawson, one of Australia's grand old writers and one of the sterling democrats of earlier days, "I am too old to rat." He was not prepared to rat on the official Labour Party that has its roots in the industrial unions of Australia. That is where I stand today and that is where every true Labour man should stand. The official Labour Party was created by the industrial unions of Australia; it grew out of them, just as the great British labour movement grew out of the trade unions of the United Kingdom. Hugh Gaitskell recently said that he took great pride in the knowledge that, as the leader of the British Labour Party, he had the backing of 6,500,000 affiliated unionists of the United Kingdom. We cannot have a Labour Party without the affiliation of the great mass of working men and women, the hundreds of thousands of industrial unionists in Queensland and, throughout Australia, the 2,500,000 workers who are in one union or another and are affiliated not with a break-away Labour Party like the Gair Party but with the Official Labour Party.

The great British Labour leader, Keir Hardie, once truly said, "Policies are sounder and last longer than personalities." I am not going to indulge in any personalities individually. I shall try to deal with this question factually and from the point of view of one who has made a close study of the Labour Party's machinery, its platform and its policy. I have had previous experience of splits in the Labour Party. My mind goes back to the days when Billy Hughes in 1916 said, "Those who believe in me follow me," and he walked out of the Parliamentary Labour Party and took with him almost half the members of the Party. Of course, he said he was not going to join the reactionary Conservative Party. He said

he was going to form a new party. It was not long before Billy Hughes was leader of all the reactionary Conservative forces in Australia. We had Bill Holman in New South Wales about 1916 and another example in Queensland was Bill Kidston in 1906. He was a newsagent and bookseller. The Labour movement paid his debts and enabled him to get into Parliament. He was in the Labour Party for some time, but at a time before the industrial unions had grown to anything like their present strength in Queensland. He decided to leave the Labour Party and formed what was known as the Kidston Party. In other words he was filled with egotism, and set out to "buck" the Labour organisation that lifted him from obscurity. In the Federal sphere when I was a Minister in the Scullin Government Joe Lyons came to me and said, "Frank, I am going to form a new party, a United Australia Party. I would like you to join me." I said, "What! That would mean leaving the Official Labour Party to join a party that I believe will in no time be swallowed up by the Liberal Party in Australia." He said, "Oh, no, it is going to be something separate and independent altogether." But it was not long before the outside Liberal Executive contacted John Latham, then Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament, and asked him to resign as the parliamentary leader in the Federal sphere to make way for Joe Lyons, who became the leader of the combined forces under the banner of the United Australia Party the old Tory Party under a new name. Lyons took with him Jim Fenton, Charlie McGrath, Jack Price and others. These men unfortunately went back on the Labour Movement. It made it possible for them to rise from positions of comparative obscurity to positions of great prominence in the public life of Australia.

They sold out to the traditional enemies of Labour. History has a habit of repeating itself.

Candidates for membership of a branch of the Australian Labour Party must sign a pledge. If the pledges mean anything they call upon those who sign them to honour what they have signed. The pledges are signed every year by every hon. member who comes in here as a Labour man. They are signed when they renew their membership in the A.L.P. The pledge is in the following form—

"I hereby pledge myself to the Principles of the Australian Labor Party's State, Federal and Local Government Platforms and to any alteration thereto made by a duly constituted Labor Convention. I also pledge myself to do everything in my power to further the Objects of the Party as set forth in its Constitution and General Rules."

Mark those words—"I also pledge myself to do everything in my power to further the Objects of the Party as set forth in its Constitution and General Rules." Is it

furthering the interests of the Labour Party to run candidates against the official Labour candidates at the forthcoming election in Queensland? Furthermore, every candidate for admission to a branch of the Labour Party must sign the following pledge—

“I hereby declare that I am not a member of a Communist or Fascist organisation or party, or of any political party having objects and methods in any way opposed to the Australian Labour Party.”

In other words official Labour declares that it is opposed to Communism and Toryism.

That is a clear and definite pledge which is signed by every candidate appealing to the people under the banner of the Labour Party. The following pledge is signed before a person is selected as a Labour candidate—

“I agree, if elected, to advocate and support the principles contained in the Australian Labour Party's Federal, State, and local government platforms, and on all questions affecting the platform to vote as a majority of the Parliamentary or Municipal Labour Party may decide at a duly constituted Caucus meeting. In the event of the question of the interpretation of any plank in the platform being in dispute, it shall be referred to the Queensland Central Executive for decision, and that decision shall be final. I also pledge myself to do everything in my power to further the objects of the Party as set forth in its Constitution and General Rules.”

Hon. members opposite who are running under the banner of a splinter Labour Party signed this pledge and they cannot lightly cast it aside. Surely they are expected to honour what they signed, in many cases, a little more than a year ago.

Mr. HILTON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has said that I, as a member of a splinter party, dishonoured a pledge. That is offensive to me. I point out to the hon. member—as he knows—that Dr. Evatt broke his pledge in 1927 when he stood against an endorsed Labour candidate. (A.L.P. interjections.)

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Flinders.

Mr. FORDE: It is obvious there is no point of order. I listened on many occasions to very fine speeches by the hon. the Premier. On more than one occasion during the last five years the Premier has said that there were only two parties, the Labour Party and the anti-Labour party, and that if you wanted to vote for Labour you voted for the official Labour candidate. That was true then and it is true today. The official Labour Party is the party that has its roots in the industrial unions in this country; it is the party that has its policy drawn up at the triennial Labour conferences which are

attended by 134 delegates, 75 of whom represent the 75 electorates. These delegates represent a fair cross section of the community; the remaining 59 represent the Industrial Unions on a pro rata basis according to membership. These triennial conferences were eloquently described by the Treasurer in 1955 when he said that nothing could be more democratic than the Labour-in-Politics conventions held triennially by the Labour Party. Any candidate who is not an official Labour candidate is an anti-Labour candidate who will no doubt be competing for the votes of the Liberals, and trying to snatch votes from the official Labour candidate. The Secretary for Public Instruction, Mr. Diplock, Labour, let the cat out of the bag in his speech at Maryborough when he indicated that there had been some collusion and negotiation with the Opposition parties to get support for the Government, probably on the basis of a composite ministry.

Mr. Duggan: The great gamble that failed.

Mr. FORDE: The great gamble that failed, as I am reminded by my worthy leader.

The Secretary for Public Instruction, speaking at Maryborough on 5 June, 1957, said—

“The Opposition had said, ‘Fight this thing constitutionally and we will stand behind you,’ but what it had not said was what it thought, and that was, ‘when we get you at a disadvantage, we’ll stab you in the back.’”

He let the cat out of the bag. Evidently there had been some negotiations with persons who had indicated that they would give them support under certain conditions. The Secretary for Health and Home Affairs made some sarcastic reference in his speech to the broken promises by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Nicklin. It is evident that members of the splinter Labour Party held some hope that they would get support from the Opposition to carry on a composite Ministry.

Mr. Morris: Rubbish!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FORDE: I admit that the Premier, when speaking at the Labour-in-Politics Convention at this time, in 1956, said amongst other things—

“I admit that the Government could not be a Government without the assistance of the real worthwhile trade unions.”

That is a fact. No Labour Party can function, no Labour Party can develop, no Labour Party can achieve victory at the polls, if it has not the affiliation and support of the industrial unions of this country. The official Labour Party is affiliated with those unions and the Q.C.E. gets an

annual revenue from them in the form of capitation dues at the rate of 1s. 6d. per head per annum. While the official Labour Party has been given a temporary set-back, I am satisfied that it will win through under the able leadership of John Duggan.

The Premier can find no good in the Queensland Central Executive today, but as late as 15 April, 1957, he said—

“I have faith in the Queensland Central Executive, and I think they have a sense of justice, and the consciousness of the benefits of a Labour Government in Queensland.”

Hon. members opposite now set out to tell the Chamber that there is no good whatever in the Queensland Central Executive, that it is riddled with Communists, and so on. I am satisfied that there is not a scintilla of truth in the statement that there are Communists on the Queensland Central Executive. When the Premier and others who support him were challenged to name one Communist, they were unable to give the name of any man on the Queensland Central Executive who was a Communist.

The Trades and Labour Council is a different body altogether. The Trades and Labour Council is composed of representatives of nearly all the trade unions of Queensland, but it is not affiliated with the Queensland Central Executive. There are persons such as Gerry Dawson and MacDonald who no doubt are members of the Communist Party. But they are not on the Queensland Central Executive, and they could not become members of any branch of the Australian Labour Party.

I am reminded that in 1947 MacDonald was nominated as a Communist candidate in South Brisbane; but on representations being made to him, he withdrew from the contest so he would not take any votes from the Premier. A great deal of nonsense and gross misrepresentation has been indulged in. There has been a great deal of misrepresentation by both anti-Labour sides of the Committee. Robert Menzies, Sir Arthur Fadden and no doubt Mr. Frank Nicklin and Ken Morris would drop dead politically if they thought Communists were to be driven out of this country permanently. Their election “bogy” would be gone. The chief stock-in-trade of the new party opposite is that the country is riddled with Communism. Communism and party-ism is being indulged in today to an extent that is almost nauseating to the true democrat of Australia.

There has been a lot of nonsense talked about disciplinary control of men in the Labour movement as if it were the only party that exercised disciplinary powers through its governing executive, the Q.C.E. I have with me books of rules of the Liberal Party, the Country Party and the Labour Party.

Clause 6 of the Australian Country Party, Queensland Constitution, 1944, amended in 1955, reads—

“The council shall, in all matters including disqualification or expulsion of members, exercise full control and its decisions on all matters shall be final and binding on all persons and sections of the party concerned.”

Clause 98 reads—

“The council may expel or suspend from membership any member by resolution.”

Within the constitution of the Liberal Party there are also rules for disqualification and expulsion. We all know what happened in the Federal sphere. I was Deputy Leader of the Federal Opposition under Federal Leader John Curtin, when Billy Hughes, Walter Marks, George Coles and Alex Wilson, three Liberal members and a Country Party member voted for a motion of no confidence that wonderful leader John Curtin moved in the Menzies-Fadden Government. Billy Hughes said that he placed the welfare of Australia first. He realised that there was no all-in war effort organised for Australia. Was he given any freedom? He was expelled from the Liberal Party and Walter Marks was expelled from the Liberal Party and George Coles and Alex Wilson were expelled. We all know what happened to Sir Lyttleton Groom, that distinguished Speaker in the House of Representatives for many years when he did not come on side with his party and adopted an independent attitude in a crisis in the Federal Parliament. He was expelled; some time later he unfortunately passed away. The Country Party member, Charles Russell, was also expelled. I have given the names of men who had the courage to stand up to their convictions. Billy Hughes being an adroit and skilful politician, attended a Liberal Party conference and delivered an eloquent address and a resolution was carried re-admitting him to the Liberal Party. Later on Billy Hughes and Percy Spender were members of the War Council, a body set up to keep members of the Opposition in the picture in connection with Australia's war effort and to give them an idea of the war effort being made, the difficulties being encountered, and the prospects of success. Menzies and Fadden decided to withdraw from the War Council so that they could play the game of politics but Billy Hughes and Percy Spender remained on it. What happened to them? They were again expelled from the Liberal Party, although both got back into it before the following election. They accepted the decision of the Executive and got back later. If Gair had the true interests of Labour at heart, he would have done that instead of splitting Labour from top to bottom.

The statement has been made by Mr. Walsh that there is some evidence in the form of a letter from Beasley that Mr. Joe Bukowski was a Communist at some time or another.

I do not believe that there is a scintilla of truth in such a suggestion. As a matter of fact, in those days Jack Beasley had nothing to do in Cabinet with Security Service. The two Ministers who dealt with it were Dr. Evatt and me, as Minister for the Army. No report of an adverse nature about Mr. Joe Bukowski ever came before us. Furthermore Bukowski has been noted for his fearless fight against Communism in Queensland for over 20 years and this has been recorded in special articles in the Brisbane "Telegraph" by Ken Hardy and A. N. Robinson.

(Time expired.)

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General) (5.26 p.m.): The question before the Committee is whether the Government should be granted Supply to enable them to carry on for a brief period, and reasons have been given by the Premier, the Treasurer, and other speakers why an election cannot be held immediately. The Treasurer has given the Committee some information about the work of the Government Printing Office and also about the printing of rolls. However, there is a good deal more to the holding of an election than the mere printing of the rolls. First of all, it is essential that a very close police check be made over the whole of the State to ensure that the name of every person entitled to a vote is on the roll. After the last election, complaints were made to me that a number of people in the Toowong electorate had been refused a vote because their names were not on the roll. In some cases the complaint was justified as it was discovered that some names had been incorrectly removed from the roll. In other cases, applications for enrolment were received at the Electoral Office one day too late.

At present, working in collaboration with the Minister in charge of the Police Force, a canvass is being made of the whole of the State; attention is being paid to the outback parts as well as to the metropolitan area. That canvass was started immediately there was a possibility of an election this year, and every day the police are sending to the 75 Electoral Registrars throughout Queensland information that is necessary to bring the electoral rolls up to date. Certain work has to be done in the Electoral Office, and then the names are forwarded to the Government Printer for insertion in the rolls.

Nobody is more anxious than I to put before the public the case of the Queensland Labour Party. I am not concerned about the result of the election; I feel quite satisfied that once again I shall be returned as the member for Baroona and that my majority will not be reduced. On Sunday last I convened a political meeting at my home, and over 200 people attended it. Allegations have been made about subscriptions to Labour Party campaign funds, but I am proud to say that at that meeting

over £460 was subscribed to my campaign fund. That money was subscribed by the workers present when the Baroona branch of the Queensland Labour Party was formed. Every member of the executive of that branch is a trade unionist. Before the Baroona branch of the Australian Labour Party broke away from us we had about £800 and a building worth £10,000. Those assets were built up mainly through organisation and hard work not only by me but also by an excellent body of workers who have been with me since I entered public life in 1931. All that was taken away. I made no attempt to retain any of it. I let them take it because I was satisfied that I would get sufficient finance to fight the election, and I am always prepared to spend some of my own money.

It is ridiculous for the hon. member for Ithaca to suggest by innuendo that any oil company paid me £800. If he cares to make the statement outside Parliament, I will give him the opportunity to prove it. I warn him that a man who walked the streets of Ithaca and who worked in Ithaca for him will be his Labour opponent at the next election. If he wants to become personal that is all right with me.

The hon. member for Bremer said that I told him in 1952 that Joe Bukowski was a good trade unionist. I have never said that he was not. I have no reason to say now that he is not a good trade unionist. I remind the hon. member for Bremer that when he first went to the polls seeking election to the State House and found himself in difficulties, the late Dave Gledson, who then held the portfolio I now hold, sent an S.O.S. for me to go up to Ipswich and speak on his behalf. There was a great deal of talk about his Communist affiliations and associations and they were afraid that he would not get the votes of a number of people in the area. He did not declare himself until I put it right onto him. I told him it had been put to me that he was a Communist. I had replied, "I would not be here if I thought Mr. Donald was, but I expect him to declare himself tonight from this public platform." And he did, only the night before the night of the election, when I forced him into it. Now he talks about loyalty to the Labour movement and standing behind the decision of the Party. Why, when the time for decision came, he walked outside the House so that he would not be called on to vote and left his colleague from Ipswich like a shag on a rock. He had to carry the baby. There was clear evidence that he was not prepared to abide by the decisions of the Parliamentary Labour Party. It is all very well for such people to take up a certain attitude when it suits them. I have a fairly long memory on Mr. Donald's attitude.

It has also been said that no action was taken when Mick Gardner was suspended. Why was Mick Gardner suspended? He was

suspended because he had the temerity to make a statement in Rockhampton on a certain matter. He was charged with having made a statement he should not have made. I invite hon. members' attention to Rule 6 on page 95 of the Constitution and General Rules of the Australian Labour Party. It reads—

“The Right of Public Assembly and Free Speech to be made Statutory.”

Because he had the temerity to express his opinion the hon. member for Rockhampton was suspended by the Labour Party. It has been said that nobody made any attempt to defend him. The Premier was unable to attend the Q.C.E. meeting, but I attended on his behalf. The hon. member for Rockhampton tendered an abject apology to the Q.C.E. It was on my advice that he tendered that apology. I asked the Q.C.E. not to deal severely with him because he had had the temerity to criticise the Q.C.E., but what happened? He was wiped out so that they could get the remainder of those who were there to accept the direction.

When the matter of three weeks' annual leave was raised in Cabinet, the hon. member for Toowoomba was one of its bitterest opponents. He supported Cabinet's attitude in the Caucus room. What are the rules of the A.L.P.? I will tell hon. members what the direction of convention meant, if it meant anything. Again on page 95 of the Constitution and General Rules, we find Rule 16. This is what it says and this is what it means—

“The State Parliamentary Labour Party to introduce during the next term of Parliament succeeding Conventions, all legislation covering decisions of Convention.”

What is a term of Parliament? Is it not three years?

Mr. Lloyd: You get us pay for three years!

Mr. POWER: The hon. member for Kedron would not know anything about A.L.P. rules.

Mr. Lloyd: What?

Mr. POWER: The hon. member sat on the fence and then fell over because it was suggested there might be some refusal of endorsement.

Mr. Lloyd: I will have something to say about that in a minute.

Mr. POWER: There is the rule for everybody to see. I am not going to allow any member of the Q.C.E. to alter that to suit himself.

What happened when a vacancy arose and the Treasurer should have been the next delegate to the Q.C.E.? He was passed over and a member of the Q.C.E. said to me, “All

right, we have got the numbers. You can do anything when you have got the numbers.”

Mr. Nicklin: I have heard somebody else say, “We have got the numbers.”

Mr. POWER: Yes, I have said it here and we had the numbers because of the electors' votes.

I have many friends within the trade union movement. I was on the Trades and Labour Council when some of these people were unheard of. I was one of those who formed the Federated Clerks' Union when it was very unpopular to be a member of a trades union. Out of a total of 65 delegates 30 voted against the expulsion of the Premier. I am not going to say that the Central Executive is composed of Communists but I do say that delegates are sent there with a direction from their Communist-controlled Executives as to what they shall do. I said to one delegate, “How are you going to vote on this?” He said, “Bill. I would like to be with you but my Executive has directed me.” The rule laid down by the late Mr. Fallon and the late Mr. Boland was that no delegate was bound to accept a direction. Despite that these delegates felt bound to vote as they were directed, and the Premier was expelled. I was a member of the Q.C.E., and I was defeated at Mackay. I made no complaints about that; I accepted my defeat. There are many unions now affiliated with the Q.C.E. who were refused affiliation at one time because of their Communist associations and affiliations. Everybody knows that Gerry Dawson is a Communist. Everybody knows that Jack Hanson—a very excellent union secretary and a decent fellow to deal with—is a prominent Communist. Everybody knows that Alex Macdonald, who is now fraternising with others in Red China, is a Communist. Everybody knows that when the country was at war they advocated a second front for Russia. When our boys were fighting and dying in Malaya for the preservation of democracy the Communists were only concerned with the second front for Russia. We have the same story in regard to Korea. It has been advocated that no soldier should fight beyond the shores of Australia, but is it not better to fight outside the shores of Australia and protect this country from the horrors of warfare? There are people who would hand this country over to people with a foreign ideology and allow the people of Moscow to control this country along lines that are diametrically opposed to the beliefs of the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Let us examine the position in regard to Communism in general. Everybody knows that the only candidates Communists have opposed are those who represent industrial areas. I have been opposed on every occasion by a member of the Communist Party. I am prepared to bet a guinea to a gooseberry that there will not be one Communist candidate opposing a member of

One would have expected a reasonable man to seize on any means of conciliation that might have left the Party united to carry on its great work for the people of Queensland. In the face of a threat of punitive action against the Premier for failing to carry out his party's wishes, any degree of compromise was obviously desirable. In my opinion, there was no spirit of compromise or conciliation on the part of the Premier.

At previous conferences when the Premier had been asked whether it would be possible to introduce the three weeks' annual leave at some later stage, he had said no. and unequivocally refused to compromise or conciliate. His actions throughout have been provocative. Whatever led to the dispute on the question of three weeks' annual leave, the real argument was one of interpretation of the rules and the platform of the Australian Labour Party and the pledge signed by every candidate for pre-election endorsement. Every Labour member owes his primary allegiance to the Australian Labour Party just as any other member of Parliament owes his allegiance to the political party that endorsed him and supported him in his election campaign. I am sure that applies to members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party. No Cabinet Minister would have been elevated to his position if he had not received the endorsement and support of the Australian Labour Party.

Statements and insinuations have been made that I was sitting on the fence, leaning first to one side and then the other, and that in the end I fell on one side. Apparently stories are being broadcast throughout my electorate, throughout Brisbane, and indeed around the Chamber that I was in grave danger of not being endorsed. If I had been frightened that I would not be endorsed by the A.L.P. what would have been my position? At least I had sufficient courage to risk the danger of non-endorsement by remaining loyal to the pledge I signed before being elected in 1956 as the Labour member for Kedron. I stayed loyal to the pledge and loyal to the rules I signed in conjunction with the pledge. If I had been really frightened it would have been quite a simple matter to have moved over to the Queensland Labour Party and thus write my own endorsement as other members of that Party have done.

Let us take a look at some of the people who have been endorsed. Other than some of the hon. members opposite very few of the men endorsed for this campaign have any loyalties to the real working men, the real Labour men of the State. Instead we find businessmen with any amount of money, film magnates and even doctors. That reminds me that I have a doctor representing the Queensland Labour Party opposing me. He was their selected candidate, but who were

the other nominees? They were men who had some background of loyalty to the industrial movement.

Mr. MOORE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Kedron is referring to and insinuating that Dr. Uhr is a Liberal. I have known Dr. Uhr for 30 years. He is a personal friend of mine and he has always supported the Labour Party and voted Labour.

Mr. LLOYD: I have not mentioned Dr. Uhr yet. Now that the hon. gentleman has brought his name out I will have something further to say about him. In 1949 during the Federal election campaign Dr. Clive Uhr was invited to address a lunch-hour meeting of the Newman Society at the Queensland University. At the time the hon. member for Ithaca was studying Commerce at the University. During his lunch-hour address Dr. Uhr viciously attacked the late Ben Chifley who has been so eulogised by the Treasurer. If hon. members want confirmation I refer them to the hon. member for Ithaca. Not only did he viciously attack the late Ben Chifley, but he called him a Communist, just as hon. members on that side of the Chamber are calling some hon. members over here Communists or travellers with Communists. The people of Queensland at least are sufficiently educated to know that whatever they say is merely an attempt to create a pattern of mass hysteria, engendering hatred and bitterness in the hearts of the people in an effort to beguile decent respectable people into believing the worst of good people.

Mr. Gair interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: The Premier is interjecting. He interjected while the Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation was speaking. He interjected quietly on the side and said that the hon. member for Toowoomba had attacked women. He did not attack any woman. He mentioned Mrs. Gair and said that she was a very fine person. Let us see who is attacking women. I have a letter here in relation to the late Garnett Townsend, a foreman employed by the Main Roads Commission. The late Garnett Townsend was sent from Brisbane to Tara by the Main Roads Commission to carry out special duties on behalf of the Commission in April. Unfortunately, while at Tara on duty, he collapsed with a heart attack and died. His body had to be brought back to Brisbane for a family funeral. Is not that the natural thing to do? The widow has no money and this Government in this letter rejected my submission that they pay the cost of bringing the body back from Tara to Brisbane. The only reason the application to which I have referred was rejected is because I submitted it. Who is attacking women? (Government interjections.) The hon. member for Toowoomba is a decent honest man who has carried out his principles

and pledges. Alderman Tom Doyle could say a few words about attacking women. At a quarter to 12 one night there were three 'phone calls in quick succession at Alderman Doyle's home. It was said over the 'phone that someone had kept Mrs. Doyle and Tom Doyle in bread and butter for 25 years. Alderman Doyle is a most decent person who used his truck and his petrol to assist in election campaigns on behalf of the Premier. These statements were made over the 'phone and after Mrs. Doyle hung up the receiver she fell over a chair and broke her arm. Nuisance calls were put in during the next two days and Alderman Doyle had to ring up the P.M.G.'s. Department to have his 'phone monitored. (Government interjections.) Alderman Doyle would never be opposing the hon. gentleman were it not for the fact that the hon. gentleman disregarded the friendship that Alderman Doyle had for him and for every other man. It has always been this way.

There has been much talk about Parliamentary democracy for years. When we attempted to bring up some subject in Caucus that we considered important we were disregarded; we were steam-rolled. Matters were brought up in relation to legislation at Caucus meetings. Legislation has been rejected and then recommitted. (Government interjections.) What about the Salaries Bill? At that time the Treasurer was on the inner executive of the Q.C.E.. We wanted £1,750 and the Treasurer took it to the inner executive and sent back a direction to the Parliamentary Party in regard to that legislation. What is more, we accepted that direction; we accepted a compromise arranged between the hon. member for Toowoomba and the inner executive and the trades unions. That direction came from the Queensland Central Executive. (Government interjections.) While the Treasurer was a member of that inner executive the hon. gentleman sent a direction from the Q.C.E. to the Brisbane City Council which resulted in the resignation of Mr. Frank Roberts. Subsequent to that statements were made in this House by the Treasurer that discipline is necessary and it is essential that in any political party there should be discipline. I have a statement here that was made by the Treasurer in regard to that matter.

Mr. Walsh: Why quote it? I will quote it myself.

Mr. LLOYD: "It would be a bad thing for the country if discipline was not exercised in any particular party."

(Time expired.)

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon—Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation) (7.31 p.m.): I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to have your advice on this matter, and I raise it because I wish to be quite honest and fair.

During my speech this afternoon, I did make the statement that certain Communists, or some Communists, were admitted to the Stanthorpe Branch of the A.L.P. In the Brisbane "Telegraph" of this afternoon, I am reported as having said that people endorsed by the A.L.P. were avowed Communists. As the Labour selections have not yet been made, it would obviously be ridiculous for me to say that any candidate endorsed by the A.L.P. was an avowed Communist.

My point of privilege is this: in fairness to men who may be endorsed as A.L.P. candidates, is there any action that can be taken, either through yourself or through the Speaker, to rectify the shocking mistake or misrepresentation that has taken place in the reporting by the Brisbane "Telegraph"?

The CHAIRMAN: It is a matter for Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROSNAN (Fortitude Valley) (7.32 p.m.): I had no intention of participating in this debate. However, several things have been said today that I think should be answered.

Before dealing with those items, I should like to say that I do not agree with the hon. member for Kedron that all action taken by the Premier was provocative, and I think very few members of the old Australian Labour Party, if I may refer to it in that way, would agree with him. That statement is uncalled for, unnecessary, and untrue. I suggest that the Premier, as Leader of the Australian Labour Party in the Parliament of Queensland, has carried out his job with a great deal of leniency.

The hon. member for Kedron also said that it was a question of interpretation of rules and adherence to pledges. We did not hear anything about rules and pledges until after the Premier was expelled. Hon. members opposite have been quoting rules of the party. What about the rule of the party that says that Caucus decisions are binding? We have not heard of that one. It is there, and I suppose I might as well throw it into the ring with all the others. The farther we go, the worse the confusion becomes, and I believe it is necessary to try to clear up some of these questions. When personalities conflict, it is only natural that we should reach the stage of "dog eat dog." That is human nature. It is a matter for regret, and it is a pity that these things have taken place in this Chamber in the last two days. But as they have been said, and as my character has probably been assailed in the process, I believe that I should take this opportunity of replying, because if I am to believe my erstwhile friends on my right I shall not have an opportunity in the future; however, if I take any notice of my friend the hon. member for Mundingburra, I am a certainty—

Mr. Aikens: A certainty for what?

Mr. BROSNAN: A certainty to be sitting here alongside him after the election.

Mr. Chalk: He is a leg puller.

Mr. BROSAN: Yes, and very frequently it is your leg. The hon. member for Bremer made a statement this morning. He said that the trouble in the Labour Party started with and was brought about by Industrial Groups.

Mr. Donald: Correct.

Mr. Power: He walked out of the Party vote like a dingo.

Mr. BROSAN: I only want to deal with the statement by the hon. member for Bremer. I do not want to be personal, but I remind him that he made the statement. I also remind him and any hon. member opposite lauding adherence to principles and pledges and decisions as the right approach and method of participating in this dispute, that the Industrial Groups were formed as the result of a Convention decision. They were initiated by the Q.C.E. under the chairmanship of the late Clarrie Fallon and confirmed at both Rockhampton and Toowoomba and were dissolved by the Q.C.E. and therefore are as much a part of the Labour Party as any other integral unit. If they were the cause and reason for the Labour Party's being split today, it is difficult to reconcile that statement. They were dissolved by a decision of the Federal Party.

Mr. Donald: To which you agreed.

Mr. BROSAN: To which I subscribed. I make no apology for my part in the Industrial Group Movement. I was selected by the Q.C.E. to be one of the committee. I made a speech in this Chamber on 19 October, 1954, which was so appreciated at that time by Mr. Bukowski that he had printed and distributed 1,000 extra copies of "The Worker" in which the speech appeared. I always subscribed to the Party's policy and Platform. I could only do what the Labour Party asked me to do. However, when it comes to a matter of conscience and determination as to whether one subscribed rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, to an instruction, and when such adherence to the instruction would completely cut across one's conscience I could not do it. I was prepared to do anything the Labour Party asked me to do, provided it was consistent with my appreciation of good faith. I do not use the word "faith" in a religious sense. It is true, I have been attacked on that basis, but I make no apologies for my religion. I have never done so, nor do I ask anybody else to do so.

I have said in this Chamber that regardless of what the political party is, it should not be a prerequisite to joining or a condition of membership that one should be of any particular religion. It is a travesty of justice for grown men to bring it into the realm of Industrial Groups. I emphasise the fact that anybody who says there are not Communists rampant in Australia today or that the manifestations of Communism are negligible should think of the parents of

the children in Hungary. The mothers and fathers of children in Hungary could not see any danger in Communism, but how the children are suffering for it! I see in the Communist spread in Australia today no great danger to myself, for I have almost lived my span of life, but I have a son, and there are many other people similarly placed—with children—listening to me now and it is for them and their children that a stand has to be taken. The Communists are infiltrating into every walk of life in Australia today. Their position in things that affect the lives of the people of Australia has never been as sound and secure as it is now. They are doing their job to greater effect than ever they hoped for.

When the Communist Party first started in Australia, it did not meet with much success. However, the depression that lasted from 1929 to 1935 gave the Communists a flipp, and from then on, in pursuance of their ideology and their methods of attack, they tried to infiltrate into the trade unions and in that way get control of the masses of the people and ingratiate themselves with the Labour movement, to which they say they belong. I have always said that the Communists are anti-Labour, that they are anti-everything that is free. There can be no place in a democracy for a Communist, or for anyone who subscribes to the Communist ideology. The Communists almost succeeded in gaining control of the masses of people of this nation by infiltrating the industrial unions. Say what you like, none can deny that it was the industrial groups that stemmed the tide.

Mr. Graham: And they destroyed the A.L.P. in the process.

Mr. BROSAN: That statement is completely opposed to what the hon. member for Mackay said in a broadcast a few days ago. He said on that occasion that the Australian Labour Party was now bigger, better and stronger than ever. Tonight he says that the Australian Labour Party has been destroyed. If he will make up his mind I will debate the matter with him, but while he is at sixes and sevens I cannot.

As I say, the industrial groups stemmed the tide of Communism in the trade unions. I am prepared to withstand any challenge on my integrity, my standing, and my association with the Australian Labour Party and the industrial groups. I have never breached a rule of the Australian Labour Party or done other than what was in its best interests. Everything I did relating to the industrial groups was well known to the committee—both Mr. Bukowski and Mr. Rasey. I have gone to Sydney to attend meetings of the interstate committee; I have been met by Tom Dougherty and driven by him to the Great Southern Hotel, where the meetings were held.

Mr. Graham: Was Santamaria there too?

Mr. BROSAN: Santamaria was not there. He comes from Melbourne. I have met Mr. Santamaria. He lives in the same suburb of Melbourne as my sister, and his children and my sister's children attend the same school. He attends the same church as my sister, and when I have been to Melbourne I have attended that church and have met him there. I know Santamaria as a gentleman, a father, a citizen, and an upright man. I am not ashamed to say that I know him.

The man who I believe is to oppose me at the coming election as the official Labour candidate challenged me in the Trades Hall, just as I have been challenged here by the hon. member for Mackay. The same question was asked at an A.L.P. affiliated Unions Committee at which meeting two unions were represented by delegates who are Communists. Is it any wonder, therefore, that I could not see how the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labour Party could continue to carry on when it admitted to a committee representative of A.L.P.-affiliated unions a delegate from the Butcher's Union who is a self-confessed Communist?

Mr. Graham: Who was he?

Mr. BROSAN: You know him as well as I do.

Mr. Wallace: Name him.

Mr. BROSAN: All right. I am not afraid to name him—Mr. Laurie.

Mr. Graham: Good, we know him now.

Mr. BROSAN: Oh, the hon member knows him well! When I was challenged by Mr. Egerton, I told him what I have told hon. members tonight. Of course, you know, don't you that his nickname in the Trades Hall is Cowboy Jack—because he separates the Santa Gertrudis from the Santamarias. Hon. members opposite say that because a man knows a Communist or because a Communist speaks over the Labour radio station it does not make them Communists. Does it make me a Santamaria-ite because I know Santamaria? I throw the same logic back at them.

As the Communist Party members were not completely successful in infiltrating into the Labour Movement through the trade unions and that avenue was closed to them by the work of the Industrial Groups, it was only natural that they should turn to the political wing. Their success in that field to date has been astounding and has caused grave concern to those in the Labour Movement who have watched them at work, who have fought them and attempted to destroy them and keep them out of our way of life. We have a duty to pass on to our children the same splendid heritage that our forebears passed on to us, and sooner or later, we must face up to that responsibility. That is why I take my stand alongside the Premier today.

I was present at Convention and I was at the Q.C.E. meeting the night we were all summoned and at no time at either place did the Premier pledge that he would introduce three weeks' leave in this session of Parliament. On the contrary, before the last State election, the Premier addressed trade unionists in Room 30 at the Trades Hall. I was then President of the Electrical Trades Union and I had just led them in a successful strike for an increase of 27s. 6d. a week. Unfortunately some other unions have not got that yet. I hope they will get it. I do not like to see one union get it and another miss out. However, the Premier told that gathering in Room 30 that he would introduce three weeks' leave when it was economically possible and sound to do so.

Mr. Gair: That was on the eve of the election.

Mr. Walsh: That was on the Thursday before the election.

Mr. BROSAN: There has followed an attempt to expel the Premier only, not those of us who supported him, the majority of Caucus. If Caucus decisions are binding on one occasion, they are binding on another.

I did my duty and fulfilled my obligations as I saw them and in accordance with my conscience. I shall with pleasure leave it to the electors of Fortitude Valley to judge whether I have carried out my task in a manner befitting a member of Parliament. If they think my decision was correct, they will return me on polling day. If they do not, I shall accept their decision in accordance with the principles of democracy.

Mr. DUFFICY (Warrego) (7.50 p.m.): Like the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, I have no intention of engaging in the argument that has taken place because I am not going to get down into the sewer to attack hon. members on my left. I hope that any contribution I make will at least be factual and free from personalities and abuse. If any abuse is introduced in the course of my remarks I am prepared to answer it. I am not asking for any mercy. The debate should be conducted on a reasonably high plane and I will do my part to keep it that way. During the last two days we have listened to arguments as to the rights and wrongs of the present situation. We have heard much about the splinter group on my left and the Australian Labour Party of which I am still proud to be a member.

All hon. members sitting on this side of the Chamber behind the hon. member for Toowoomba have signed a pledge that they will remain loyal to the Australian Labour Party. All the hon. members sitting on my left have also signed a pledge to remain loyal to the principles and platform of the Australian Labour Party. At this moment let us decide who has remained loyal. Is it not a fact that we who are sitting behind the hon. member for Toowoomba, as the Leader of the

Australian Labour Party, are still members of the Australian Labour Party, while hon. members sitting on my left are now members of the Queensland Labour Party and not in accordance with the pledge they signed? Is it not quite obvious who have remained faithful to their pledge and who have broken it?

On the left we find the Premier. Do not think for one moment that I am going to attack him personally. I have known him since he first came into Parliament in 1932. He may remember that he attended a victory social I organised in Maryborough. We were celebrating the victory of the late James Stopford over John Blackley for the seat of Maryborough in 1932. Mr. Gair had just been elected as a member of the Queensland Parliament. When I met him he had not even taken his seat in the Chamber. At that time I had been an official of the Australian Workers' Union for five or six years. Mr. Gair was able to take his seat in the Chamber in 1932 because he had been endorsed by the Queensland Central Executive and he was a member of the Australian Labour Party.

After each election since 1932 the hon. member for South Brisbane was able to take his seat in this Chamber because he had been endorsed and supported by the Q.C.E. Without being personal at all, let me say that it is a far cry from a comparatively dingy railway office in which the hon. member for South Brisbane was pushing a pen before the Labour movement lifted him from that obscurity, to the Coronation ceremony at Westminster Abbey. Every step the hon. gentleman took was made possible by the Labour Movement and the Australian Labour Party. The hon. gentleman was able to travel to attend the Coronation at little or no personal inconvenience or expense. It ill becomes hon. members opposite to condemn the organisation that made it possible for them to rise to the heights to which they have risen. They rose to those heights, not because of any outstanding ability but because the wheel of fate and the Labour movement picked them up and put them where they are. It is also a far cry from a sugar mill stokehold to a seat in this Chamber. That journey was made possible for me because of the Labour movement—not because of Jack Duffey. I was able to make that journey without any expense or inconvenience because of the Labour movement and the Australian Labour Party. I was picked up by the wheel of fate and I am now privileged to speak on this motion. Hon. members on my left owe their positions to the Labour movement and it ill becomes them to condemn the Australian Labour Party or the Queensland Central Executive. The hon. the Premier and other hon. members opposite were first endorsed by the Queensland Central Executive. When they were endorsed before the last election they did not say that the Queensland Central Executive was wrong nor did they accuse hon. members who are sitting on this side of being Communists. Speaking of Communism,

there is not a member in this Chamber who has done more in the fight against it than I have. I say that deliberately and honestly. I was an official of the Labour movement for more than 20 years before I had the privilege of contesting an election as the endorsed Labour candidate for Warrego. I spent 22 years as an officer of the Australian Workers' Union. I am not concerned about industrial groups or about the Treasurer or the Premier and what they may have done against Communism. I do point out that I was fighting Communists in this country when the hon. the Premier was pushing a pen in a railway office. I was fighting Communists when the hon. the Treasurer was farming in Mirani. The only time that Communists ever amounted to anything in this State was during the depression years and shortly afterwards, and they were mostly economic Communists then, anyhow. I was in Maryborough in 1932 when a Communist candidate named McElligott polled 1,500 votes against one of the best Labour candidates that the Party has ever produced, the late Jim Stopford. Have a look at what the Communist candidates in this State and other States of the Commonwealth poll at the present time. I venture to say that not one of them since the days of Fred Paterson has saved his deposit.

When I first stood for the Warrego seat, I was opposed by a Communist candidate and a Country Party candidate. The Communist candidate did not poll as many votes as the informal votes that were cast in that election. That is true, and I refer hon. members to the official records of that election. Apparently Communists were so important in the Warrego electorate at that time that the Industrial Groups thought it necessary to send a man named Poulgrain—I suggest that hon. members on my left will know the name—600 miles west of Brisbane to Cunnamulla to form an Industrial Group to fight Communists where they did not exist, according to the official figures for the election at which I was elected. That was two years after my election.

This Communist bogey is just too silly, too foolish for words. I am speaking as a man who has had a long association with the industrial and political life of this State.

In company with my old friend and colleague, the hon. member for Barcoo, I commenced organising for the A.W.U. in 1928. From that time up till the present I have fought Communism in Queensland, and I claim without fear of contradiction that the union with which I have been associated for virtually the whole of my adult life has done more to defeat Communism than any Industrial Group or any wild statements that have been made in this Chamber.

I resent the statements by hon. gentlemen on my left who have tried to brand members on this side of the Chamber as Communists. I say—and I defy truthful contradiction on

this—that personally I have done more to fight Communists in this State than any one of them, I do not care who he is.

The name of the late Clarrie Fallon was mentioned. It grieves me to mention the name of Clarrie Fallon in the same breath as the names of hon. members on my left, because I know what he would have thought of them had he been alive today. I know that because I was associated with Clarrie Fallon longer than any of those on my left.

Mr. Walsh: How long would that be?

Mr. DUFFICY: Thirty years.

Mr. Walsh: I think I could beat you.

Mr. DUFFICY: I do not think you could, because I knew Clarrie Fallon when he was at Bundaberg before he started organising, and I do not think you knew him then.

Mr. Walsh: That is more than 30 years ago.

Mr. DUFFICY: It might be. I knew him before he started organising and the Treasurer did not know him then. He started organising in Childers in 1921-1922, and I followed him when he left. Do not let the Treasurer tell me, because I know. I was sent to the Burdekin in 1935 by the late Mr. Clarrie Fallon and there were some Communists in this country at that time. Today Communism is a fallacy. Forget about it. I speak from experience and say that you get Communists in any country when people lack food, clothing and shelter. Mostly they are economic Communists. That is what happened in the depression and a few years after. Take the Greater Brisbane Council elections when quite a competent man in the person of Mr. Max Julius stood in the interests of the Communist Party. He was capable of making quite a good statement and in expressing himself but how many votes did he get in the Greater Brisbane area? Can anybody tell me of any Communist over the last ten years who has contested any constituency or any position where a secret public ballot was required who has not lost his deposit? I do not know of any. Surely if there are a great number of Communists in our midst they will vote for a Communist in a secret ballot. That should be obvious. Forget this Communist bogey. I have heard the Treasurer and the Premier state on a number of occasions that the secret of Bob Menzies's success politically was that he worked this Communist bogey so effectively. Hon. members opposite are endeavouring to adopt the Menzies technique in this campaign by branding us on this side as Communists when they know perfectly well that they are wrong.

Coming back to Mr. Bukowski, the great big, bad wolf in this business, I say that I am not concerned about Bukowski; I am certainly not concerned about the Premier or the Treasurer in this campaign. I have been long enough in the Labour movement to

realise that individuals do not count. Hon. members opposite have quoted the late Mr. Fallon as a striking example of a good Labour man. I agree with them completely. I quote his words to me when I was a young organiser. He said, "Always remember that in the Labour movement individuals just do not matter; it is the movement that matters. Individuals can be of no concern." Do not think I am worrying about Bukowski because he is just an individual in the scheme of things. I am not worrying about the Treasurer or the Premier because they are individuals, with this difference that they are not in the movement now and therefore they matter even less.

They point to Mr. Bukowski as the big, bad wolf but I wonder if the people whom they are trying to convince have paused to realise that the split occurred before Mr. Bukowski was the President of the Q.C.E. and before he was branch secretary of the A.W.U.

I defy truthful contradiction from hon. members on my left when I say that the splinter group led by the Premier and the Treasurer had its beginnings in Hobart. Is it not true that six delegates were sent by the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labour Party to attend a Federal conference of the Australian Labour Party in Hobart? That cannot be denied. Nor can it be denied that only one of those six delegates attended the Federal conference.

Mr. Walsh: And what did you do to him in the A.W.U. ballots?

Mr. DUFFICY: Do not squeal. The only delegate who attended the Federal conference was the late Harry Boland, who at that time was Branch Secretary of the Queensland Branch of the Australian Workers' Union and also President of the Q.C.E. Joe Bukowski had nothing to do with it. Anyone who says that the breach in the Australian Labour Party in this State did not start at the Hobart conference is not being factual. The Treasurer knows as well as I that when those delegates returned from Hobart there was resentment in the Party because they had refused to shoulder their responsibilities.

Mr. Walsh: What did the Q.C.E. do?

Mr. DUFFICY: I shall come to that. I am glad the Treasurer reminded me of it. What did he and the Premier do? It is in the minute book of the Party that they endorsed every decision of the conference that they had boycotted. I ask them to deny that.

What I imagine the Treasurer is going to say is quite true. A vote of censure on the delegates was moved at the Q.C.E., but it was defeated by the Q.C.E. as then constituted. Those hon. gentlemen were prepared at all times to accept the decisions of the Q.C.E. as long as they suited them. If the decisions were contrary to their wishes, they

rejected them. What did they do to Frank Roberts, who was the Lord Mayor of this city?

Mr. Walsh: I have that down, too.

Mr. DUFFICY: What did they do to him when he refused to carry out an instruction of the Q.C.E.? He did not wait to be expelled. He had the decency to resign. However, the hon. gentlemen on my left were not satisfied for him to resign. They followed him and expelled him because he refused to carry out a decision of the Q.C.E. I do not think the Treasurer will deny that he stood up in the Party meeting and told me that if I, or anybody else, thought we were not subject to the decisions of the Q.C.E., we were just fooling ourselves.

(Time expired.)

Mr. SKINNER (Somerset) (8.15 p.m.): I rise to support the motion. It was refreshing to hear the hon. member for Warrego say that the decent thing to do is to resign when you find yourself in conflict with something that cuts across the democratic rights of the people and the constitutional powers of Parliament. He is at variance with his Leader, the hon. member for Toowoomba, and the hon. member for Bremer and the hon. member for Ipswich. They accompanied their leader to a meeting held recently at the Ipswich railway workshops and to another at the Ipswich Town Hall, reported in the columns of "The Courier-Mail," when I was charged with being a deserter. Their Leader said I should be ashamed of myself for having deserted the Party.

Mr. Graham: So you should be.

Mr. SKINNER: I do not think so. My conscience is clear and I can sleep at night. I do not think many hon. members on my right sleep very well. I should not be able to sleep well either if ever I felt that I should face the electors of Somerset and say, "I have failed in my responsibility to you. I have failed to vote in your interests in the Legislative Assembly and to work in your interests in accordance with the principles of democratic and constitutional government." I have not reached that stage, so I have no regrets and my conscience is quite clear. When I go before my people, I am congratulated on every hand for my stand in supporting the principles of democracy and constitutional government.

The Leader of the break-away Labour Party—and that is what it is in the eyes of those in the Labour Movement and in the eyes of every honest and decent Christian who supports Labour's principles—the Leader challenged me and said I should feel ashamed of myself for having deserted the Australian Labour Party, Queensland Branch. This is what he is reported as saying about me—

"Mr. Skinner had worked in the workshops over the years, and had built up a fine industrial record, based

on a fine industrial background. He has gone the other way and should be ashamed of himself for turning his back on the men who helped him into Parliament and for backing Gair and those who are now more violently opposed to Labour than Messrs. Nicklin and Morris."

I do not know how long some of those sitting on my right have been affiliated with the Australian Labour Party, or how long they were financial members of an industrial union before they hopped onto the band wagon of the Australian Labour Party for election to this Assembly. I have been a member of an industrial union from the day my parents signed my apprenticeship papers for an industrial trade, even though it was not compulsory for me to be a member of an industrial union. Soon after I commenced my apprenticeship the control of apprentices was taken away from the Industrial Court and the Apprenticeship Committee was established instead. It was not compulsory for an apprentice in any trade to hold a union ticket. My principles were such that I felt it was my responsibility to contribute something if I was to share in the benefits that were being gained by my senior members in the union. Even during the depression years I never once relinquished my membership or failed to keep myself financial. I could point to many men who are tagging along with the industrial world today, professing to be the champions of the industrial movement, who grasped the opportunity in the 1929-1932 period to relinquish membership of industrial unions simply because the Industrial Court had been ring-barked by the then Tory Government in control of Queensland. Do not let the hon. member for Toowoomba or any one else point the finger of scorn at me or suggest that I should feel ashamed of my background affiliation and association with the industrial movement.

I have broken no principle or rule of the industrial union I belong to. I am still a financial member and hope to remain so for many years. At least I had sufficient intestinal fortitude to go before the trade union long before this crisis came to a head. I was prepared to go before the union in Ipswich and discuss it with them and give them my story about the introduction of the legislation that has precipitated the crisis.

Mr. Donald interjected.

Mr. SKINNER: I did something you did not have the guts to do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SKINNER: I went before the district committee of my union. I went before the combined shop stewards' meeting in Ipswich. The shop stewards and the district committee are the only people I am responsible to. On every occasion that I asked them for opportunities to speak or they invited me to speak I honoured my obligation. Not once was I condemned by the

rank and file of my union. Let us look at it from the A.L.P. side. Only a few weeks before the expulsion of the Premier and before I was called on by my own A.L.P. branch at Brassall to declare myself within five days as to whether I would stand behind the Q.C.E. and sign an unconditional pledge that I would relinquish all the principles of democracy and constitutional government, I attended the annual meeting of the electoral executive committee of the Australian Labour Party in the Somerset electorate. By 13 votes to 2 my actions were endorsed on everything I had done through the history of the three weeks' leave dispute.

Mr. Donald interjected.

Mr. SKINNER: You cannot deny it.

Mr. Donald: I can deny it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SKINNER: I challenge the hon. member for Bremer—

Mr. Donald: Outside.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SKINNER: I have a copy of the minutes of that meeting in my possession. Unless someone has interfered with the minute book my copy is accurate because I took my copy from the minute book. It was sent to me by the secretary of the E.E.C. whilst she was an inmate of the Brisbane General Hospital so that I could type out the minutes and send them to every branch in my electorate. It is all right for the hon. member for Bremer to challenge me but I know he is wrong.

Mr. Donald: I am right.

Mr. SKINNER: I have a copy of the minutes. My actions were endorsed by a vote taken at that combined branches' executive meeting held only about a month before the crisis came to its head. The motion was—

“That we express full and complete confidence in Mr. A. J. Skinner M.L.A. as member for Somerset in the past and in the future.”

What could be more decisive than the complete confidence of the rank and file in that area? There is not one branch of the A.L.P. in existence in the Somerset electorate once you get beyond Brassall.

Mr. Donald: There is so.

Mr. SKINNER: There is not one. (Government interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SKINNER: I think I have said sufficient to convince people who are not prejudiced. The Press printed the statement by the hon. member for Toowoomba and I feel sure that they will accept my statement

in answer to it. Another reason why I support the motion is this: As a good industrialist, the first principle I learned was that a good unionist endeavoured to ensure that whatever he did would be in the interests of full employment for the members of the union in the industry for which it catered. When the matter of three weeks' leave was being debated at the Parliamentary Labour Caucus, Cabinet and Q.C.E. meetings, attention was drawn to the fact that there was unemployment throughout the State. The A.W.U. organisers from North Queensland confirmed the statement that over 400 men in the timber industry were unemployed in that area. I represent an area in which there are hundreds of good unionists employed by the Main Roads Department, the Forestry Department and the sawmills; and being in constant personal contact with the people in my area, I was aware of the full extent of unemployment. In view of the unemployment that existed, how could I stand by the principles of unionism and at the same time advocate the introduction of legislation that would give an additional benefit to the people who were employed? The Premier has given ample reasons why this motion should be carried. He has clearly indicated that it is not for the purpose of gaining a political advantage, but purely for the purpose of guaranteeing that a position cannot arise through any emergency as a result of which public servants and other employees of the Crown may suffer inconvenience and hardship. After all, that is all the worker has—his pay envelope. For that reason, if for no other, I appeal to members of this Assembly to think seriously and carefully before casting their votes in the negative on this motion, if they are the good unionists that they profess to be. Many hon. members of the Liberal-Country Party who are employers also acknowledge that the unions play an important part in the life of the State, and that the men who are members of the unions are, in the main, good honest men and workers. I submit that no worker should be forced into the position where he or his family or his dependants are penalised because Supply is not granted in accordance with this motion.

The reasons given were ample, I submit. The rolls have to be prepared, and I believe that the only thing that has held up the announcement of the actual date of the election—and I am quite sincere when I make this statement—is a clear, decisive indication from the Government Printer as to when he expects the rolls and other matters connected with the election to be completed. We are not afraid to go to the people. We have taken this stand on a principle that is dear to the heart of every citizen of this State. Why should we be afraid to go before the people? We have made our position quite clear.

If any further proof is required, let me refer hon. members to the statement that

I gave to the Press on the occasion on which I tendered my resignation from the A.L.P. I said—

“I believe that right and justice must prevail, and am quite content to leave the issue in its rightful place for determination; that is with the people of the electorate of Somerset and Queensland to determine. After all, the people elect their representatives to Parliament and it is for the people to determine the issue on the principles that I have stated. That is I believe in the democratic right of the people, and I shall be prepared to accept their decision.”

What is wrong with that? Is there any reason here why hon. members opposite should charge members of the Queensland Labour Party with being afraid to shoulder their responsibilities or with being afraid to go to the people?

An hon. member spoke here yesterday afternoon and gave a wonderful display of rhetoric and oratory. This afternoon we heard the hon. member for Bremer lauding him. He said he had lived in his greatest hour of oratorical triumph. If the occasion ever arises when I have to stoop to insulting or vilifying in any way a glorious and honourable woman in this State, the wife of the Premier, and a mother, who chooses to defend—

Mr. DONALD: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Toowoomba did not insult a woman. He spoke of Mrs. Gair as being a wonderful woman, a wonderful mother, and a wonderful wife. He certainly did not insult her.

Mr. SKINNER: He was implying that this woman, the woman to whom I have referred as a glorious, honourable woman, and a mother, was pushed onto a political platform against her will purely to save the hide of the Premier and to justify his stand. That is entirely incorrect. The lady in question was a visitor here last night, and I thought she was going to fall over the balcony with shock and surprise when she heard the statements by the hon. member for Toowoomba. If I have to sink to that level to claim oratorical triumph then I do not want any of it. I would rather be an ordinary person on the political platform getting the knocks and bumps as they come.

The hon. member for Toowoomba also said that he would go to any lengths to preserve the Australian Labour Party. We on this side are prepared to go to any lengths to preserve the democratic rights of the people of Queensland and the principles of democratic government by the elected representatives of the people. I think that is more in conformity with the requirements and standards of democracy as we know it. Many good trade unionists in the State are somewhat confused over this issue.

They are being hindered on a question of loyalty. They are unable to make up their minds where their loyalty lies. I say to every trade unionist not to have any fear or doubt as to where his loyalty lies. The policy being pursued by hon. members opposite cuts across the rights of democracy and can only end in the complete destruction of the organisation to which they belong and the things that they hold dear. The question of loyalty need not deter any good unionist. If further evidence is required that hon. members opposite are pursuing a policy that will destroy trade unionism in this State let me quote from a document that has been pedalled round the Somerset electorate by people who declare themselves to be members of the Labour Party. On the back of it there is a Communist publication. This document is being pedalled around by members of the Australian Labour Party who hold themselves up as the champions of democracy but it is an attempt to denounce me in the eyes of the people of that portion of the State.

Mr. Walsh: Where was it printed?

Mr. SKINNER: Authorised by E. A. Bacon and printed at the Coronation Printery. I heard an hon. member speaking about his glorious efforts to destroy Communism within the industrial movement. Does he think for one moment that he is the only person who has ever fought Communism in this State? This is what the document says—

“In this election we will support the return of an Australian Labour Party Government. We believe that this Government can do much to meet the needs of the people provided it bases its formula on the united workers—”

Here is the reference to the unity ticket.

“and submits itself to Democratic control and pursues a clear-cut progressive policy in line with the real requirements of the Trade Unions and other democratic organisations. We will work to help expose and defeat the Gair group.”

What more do hon. members want? Do they want further proof that loyalty does not exist today so far as trade unionists are concerned? There are thousands of decent trade unionists all over Queensland who are deserting the A.L.P. and joining the true democratic party whose platform is based on true democratic principles—the Queensland Labour Party. That is why A.L.P. supporters are becoming so concerned. If they had a good case to submit to the people, there would be no need for them to try to besmirch the characters of others. If you have a good case, there is no need to bolster it with lies and filthy propaganda. I ask supporters of the Australian Labour Party whether they believe in constitutional government by the elected representatives of the people. They must answer that question in the negative, because they have accepted the

principle of direction, coercion and compulsion from the big-time bosses who are wielding the big stick.

(Time expired.)

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (8.41 p.m.): I came down from my beloved North Queensland on Monday to be present in this Chamber and to stand dry-eyed at the graveside to witness the burial of the Government. In all my experience of funerals—and I am now speaking both literally and metaphorically—I have never seen those at the graveside so charged with venom or a corpse so reluctant to lie still in the coffin while the lid was screwed on.

Mr. Walsh: This is only the wake.

Mr. AIKENS: Perhaps a wake would be appropriate for the passing of the Government.

Being rather naive, I thought that the burial of the Government would be accomplished with some semblance of solemnity and dignity. My only regret is that a talking film of the proceedings in Parliament both yesterday and today could not have been taken and shown in every city, town, village and hamlet of Queensland so that the people of this State would be as shocked as I have been so frequently during the conduct of the debate.

Abuse, personalities, slander and scandal have always been abhorrent and repugnant to me. We have seen in the Chamber during the last couple of days so much of all those things that at times I actually shuddered. Many hon. members have complained of the scandal and slander that has been heaped upon them, but I give them one consolation. If, during my long and colourful political and unionistic experience, slander, innuendo and inference could have stripped me of my good name and reputation, and all the other things I hold dear, I would have been wandering round naked years ago. That sort of thing runs off me like water off the proverbial duck's back.

I have only five minutes in which to speak, so I must be brief. If any hon. member on either side of the Committee really thinks that the people of this State believe that the split in the Labour Party resulted from the argument over the implementation of three weeks' annual leave, he is gullible enough and credulous enough to believe that babies are brought by the stork or found under cabbages.

I listened very attentively to the Premier today when he gave his reasons for the necessity to pass the Bill now before the Committee. Frankly, I was not impressed by the arguments he advanced. If he could have given us some assurance that he would resign or if he could have given us some definite date, or even a reasonably approximate date, on which he would go to the people and let them decide the issue, we could have judged him on that. But he sedulously refrained

from giving us any such assurance. Consequently, he has to be sent to the country by an adverse vote in the Chamber and I will be one of those who will cast it. As I said last night, the sooner the issue is sent to the people, the sooner our sovereign masters are given the opportunity to decide on the contentious and chaotic political position that now exists in Queensland, the better it will be for all concerned.

(Time expired.)

Mr. JESSON (Hinchinbrook) (8.46 p.m.): Until this afternoon I had no intention at all of entering the debate. I rise on two matters—first of all to refute the suggestion that I have had anything to do with the Communist Party at any time and, secondly, to answer the slanderous attack of an hon. member opposite and to defend a friend of mine who, too, fought for four or five years to clean the Communists out of an organisation.

I very much resent any suggestion that I have ever flirted with the Communists or had anything to do with them or that I have refrained from fighting them throughout my political life. I have had women Communists and men Communists oppose me at election time. With the hon. member for Warrego I recall that 20 years ago, just after the depression, Communists could get as many as 1,200 votes in my area. They could not do that now. Thanks to the work of the various unions, particularly the A.W.U., to my own activities, and to the better times we are enjoying, Communism is at a minimum in Hinchinbrook.

I remind hon. members that as a young lad I served in World War I. My son served in the Air Force in World War II and was shot down while in New Guinea fighting for democracy and was lost for months. I am a family man with a wife and six children and seven grandchildren and I strongly resent any suggestion linking me with Communism. I have as much cause to fight Communism as any hon. members on the Government benches. Some of them have one or two children and others none at all, but it is remarkable how readily they attack us. On behalf of the Australian Labour Party and the various industrial unions, I very strongly resent the insinuations coming from Government members, with the assistance they are getting from various people in the community to spread this red bogey about the place.

I know the Treasurer is preparing to speak; he is writing down a few notes about Forgan Smith. He has already spoken for hours and hours and hours—till he ran out of ammunition. Yesterday he mentioned the late Hon. W. Forgan Smith and a certain happening when I missed a division. He will probably claim that he saved me from non-endorsement, in 1938 I think it was.

Mr. Walsh: No I won't. I won't say anything about it.

Mr. JESSON: I am just getting in first in case he does. Everybody knows how I missed that division.

Mr. Walsh: I was not thinking about it till you reminded me.

Mr. JESSON: I am going to tell it anyway, and I am going to tell hon. members what Forgan Smith told me about the Treasurer. The Protestant Labour Party was in vogue at the time. Some sectarian issue had been started off in "Smith's Weekly" and something published in that paper was attributed to me. The endorsement was to be made on the Monday. The Q.C.E. had the same set-up then as it has now. Recommendations were made by Mr. Forgan Smith and one or two others to the full executive. I do not know whether Mr. Walsh was there or not.

Mr. Walsh: You cannot even remember the name of the paper.

Mr. JESSON: "Smith's Weekly."

Mr. Walsh: No.

Mr. JESSON: It was "Smith's Weekly" because I have a copy at home now. I have still got a copy of the "Truth" when Mr. Walsh was outside the Party and he ran along to the newspapers condemning the Government and members of it. He tackled me and said that I seconded a motion regarding place betting. I did not second it at all, so the informer that gave him "the drum" up at the Lands Office Hotel gave him the "wrong oil."

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. JESSON: I came down to Brisbane because of a wire or a letter or a phone message from Vince Gair, whom I was very friendly with at that time. (Government members interjected.) I am not going through a list of reasons why we do not like each other now. He knows in his own conscience. I am not going to bring women into it. I will leave that to Mr. Gair's conscience. I can remember when a certain young lady said, "Mr. Gair, I leave your future with God." I do not want to produce letters that I wrote to Vince Gair on this lady's behalf, or speak about the dirty, filthy insinuations he made. If necessary, I will. If he likes to make the same statement out in the street that he made about her and me I will take him to court and expose him for the dirty low coward he is.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. JESSON: I am talking about out-side, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that remark.

Mr. JESSON: Very well. I came down on the Stinson plane to Archerfield. It was raining heavily. Walsh and Gair met me and took me to Forgan Smith's home at Yeerongpilly.

Mr. Walsh: You are still wrong.

Mr. JESSON: One of them took me, anyway.

Mr. Walsh: Yeronga.

Mr. JESSON: Yeronga. One of them took me there. I explained my position to Mr. Smith and he accepted my explanation. On the Monday I was endorsed. It was not because Mr. Walsh and Mr. Gair loved George Jesson that they went to all this trouble, but they knew that if I did not get endorsement Larry Kelly, a relation of Mr. Hanlon's, would have been endorsed, and Mr. Hanlon would have had another supporter and they would have lost one. See how they work! That was the hidden secret behind it. I have never done a thing against Walsh or Gair in my life, but I know plenty about both of them. I have knocked around with them. They were driven around in my old Ford years ago.

Mr. Walsh: Not me.

Mr. JESSON: Many a time I have taken you to the home on the range, brother!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. JESSON: I do not want to get personal. I want to tell the facts. Now I am going to tell a story of what Mr. Forgan Smith said to me. I was walking down Pitt Street, Sydney, and I met him. He invited me for a drink of coffee at the Wentworth Hotel. I went up to the lounge. We had a chat about politics and we went over the old days. A lot of things had happened since then. He was then on the Cane Prices Board. Mr. Walsh's name was mentioned and he said to me—and I told the Premier about this a few years ago—that Ted Walsh was the worst pick he ever made of any man to put into any position, that he would wreck the Labour Party. He said, "Ted Walsh will wreck the Labour Party," and that he was a Frankenstein, and that he regretted the day he went out to his farm and spent two or three days persuading him to nominate against Artie Fadden. That was when Fadden had run away from me down to Mirani, and was beaten by the present Treasurer. That is the position, ladies and gentlemen. The hon. member for Bundaberg has fulfilled Forgan Smith's prophecy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to address his remarks to the chair.

Mr. JESSON: On 5 February, 1957, I received a letter from the Department of Public Works and Housing in reply to representations I made on behalf of my son and my grandson and his wife for a rental home at the Housing Commission. I have made representations to the Housing Commission on behalf of hundreds of people without much success. The lack of houses in the Ingham district has been mentioned to me. It is a disgrace to the Government. I could not say

much about it. I would get kicked out if I opened my mouth. The letter to which I have referred reads as follows—

“Dear Mr. Jesson,

“I have thoroughly examined the case of your son who is desirous of being allocated a Rental Home from the Housing Commission.

“In the light of refusals for similar requests in the past and to the fact that the policy of the Commission is very definite on such matters, I regret to state that rental accommodation cannot be provided as requested.

“It will be necessary for Mr.———, the landlord, to take the necessary steps through the Court to secure his home.”

This gentleman had a spastic kiddy and he took a flat near the spastic home, but when the child showed no improvement he decided to return to his own home, and he asked my son to vacate it. My son, like his father, would sooner cut his throat than remain in a home that was wanted by a man who had a spastic kiddy. A dirty insinuation has been made against me because I sleep at Parliament House. I have three families living in my home because they cannot get a house.

Mr. Hilton: There are priorities; you know that.

Mr. JESSON: I know that there are no priorities for public servants who belong to you fellows. The groupers get houses.

Mr. Hilton: No, they do not.

Mr. JESSON: I know of a man who came down and walked straight into a home and I know a schoolteacher from Townsville who walked into a home.

Mr. Hilton: A schoolteacher's residence.

Mr. JESSON: No, a Housing Commission house. There are no residences in the city. I was victimised because I would not obey your wishes. Because I voted for the three weeks' annual leave you were told to do no more for Jesson than you could help.

Mr. Hilton: That is an untruth.

Mr. JESSON: Of course it would be!

Mr. Hilton: Of course it is.

Mr. JESSON: There is the proof—this letter.

It would be very interesting to know how many Housing Commission homes there are in Carnarvon. Will you answer that?

Mr. Hilton: Yes, certainly.

Mr. JESSON: How many?

Mr. Hilton: I shall have to look it up, but about the same number as there are in Warrego.

Mr. Dufficy: I thought you were a christian gentleman.

Mr. Hilton: I never thought you were.

Mr. Dufficy: And the same number as in Barcoo?

Mr. JESSON: This letter was written to me on 18 February by Mr. W. Elson Green, and the address on it is “Inns of Court, 21 Adelaide street, Brisbane.” Mr. Green the barrister and I have been fighting side by side for years to defeat Communism in the Australian Legion of Ex-Servicemen, and we have succeeded in defeating it. The people who defeated it in the South, Matt Harrison and Morrie Kelly, the Federal President and the Federal Secretary, both received the O.B.E. from the Queen for their services to a returned servicemen's organisation. They did not have half the battle that Mr. Green and I had. What have we got from the present Government, the splinter Party? Nothing but kicks and abuse.

This is what the Premier said in 1932, Vol. 161 of “Hansard,” page 923—

“Men went to war to get out of their obligations.”

How can we expect decent treatment for returned soldiers from a person who made a public statement like that?

Mr. J. R. Taylor: Who said that?

Mr. JESSON: The hon. the Premier. He was a private member then.

Mr. Kehoe: You did not read the rest of it.

Mr. JESSON: There is nothing else to read. I should like to say something very unparliamentary to the hon. gentleman.

In this letter, Mr. Green said—

“I feel I must write to you because of certain vicious propaganda now being circulated against me by certain interested persons. So that you will know the true facts I wish to state that at no time whilst I have been a member of the Australian Labour Party have I worked or stood as a candidate in opposition to an endorsed Labour candidate (See Rule 106, A.L.P. rules).

“Anyone knowing these facts who states to the contrary is a despicable liar.

“Now that I have, after some years of striving, cleared my name of the filthy, smear of Communism and disloyalty unjustly and recklessly made by certain groupers and other bigots in the political arena of this State, I find that I am now being politically ‘investigated’ by these self same character destroying pigmies and gossips.

“They have gone back twenty-six years to 1932—the year when the Moore Government was thrown out of office—for the purpose of finding some material on which to attack me. In that year I turned 21 years old, but a little too late to be enrolled as a voter for that election and

hence I did not have a vote. However, about this time I became interested in a group of independents who were opposed to party politics. They formed a political group known for want of a more suitable name 'The Queensland Party.' All members were free to have their own political beliefs. At that time I lived in Nundah where the candidate was a Mr. McDonald who was a Socialist. In South Brisbane the candidate (Mr. Clancy) was more of an extreme right wing Labour candidate like Mr. Gair who also stood for his first contest. I point this out to show that the members of this organisation were banded together to fight for freedom of political thought for their candidates and not on any stated political policy. All candidates except one lost their deposits and the party was wound up in the following year. At no time before or during the existence of the 'Queensland Party' was I a member of the A.L.P.

"I first became a member of the A.L.P. when I joined the Coorparoo Branch about 1938-1939. At a State Election held about 1947 I phoned Mr. Gair (whom I thought was a friend) and offered myself as a Labour candidate to contest the almost impossible seat of Toowong.

"Mr. Gair said that the party was getting behind an independent named O'Shea. (This should be borne in mind when considering what happened in Southport in 1950.

"After my discharge from the Army I transferred to the Nundah Branch and remained a member until 1948 when I allowed my membership to lapse.

"This followed a vicious lie of the typical grouper type, viz., that I was a Communist, told to the then Q.C.E. secretary, the late Mr. Fallon, which resulted in the Q.C.E. refusing my endorsement as a candidate to contest the plebiscite for the Senate.

"It then appeared to me that leading members of the party had gone so far to the right that they branded anyone who conscientiously followed Labour principles to be a Communist as an excuse for their own defection. In 1950 a State election was held. At this time I was not a member of any political party. However, I believed that an independent candidate could win the Southport seat from the Tories and that a Labour candidate could not, as had been proved time and again. It did not appear at all likely that a Labour candidate would take the field. I made certain inquiries in this direction and this was generally believed in Labour circles to be the position. I then announced my candidature as an independent. Still no sign of an A.L.P. candidate. It then appeared that two Tory candidates would take the field, viz., Mr. Charles Porter, who had been selected as a Liberal, and Mr. E. Gaven as a Country Party nominee.

I intensified my campaign believing that in the circumstances I had an excellent chance of winning. However, Mr. Porter suddenly withdrew and at the last minute Mr. E. Hill was elected as an A.L.P. candidate. By this time there was no turning back. The result is well known."

He then goes on to say that he blames a certain Labour Minister for being very close to the Country Party candidate for Southport and helped him to get in. He further said—

"I rejoined the Rosalie Branch of the A.L.P. in January, 1956, on the nomination of the late Mr. Len Eastment, M.L.A., who made full inquiries into my political background. I was recently elected vice-president of that branch and a representative on the Federal and State Electorate Committees.

"To conclude, I would say that I owe no apology to those of my critics who, though legally members of the Labour Party, have traitorous hearts which are with Labour's political enemies and have been so for quite a long time.

"I am writing you because I feel I have a duty to you who have been a friend, and I do not believe that you should be embarrassed by not knowing the facts.

"Kind regards,

"Yours sincerely,

"(Signed) W. Elson Green."

I have in my hand a copy of the "Tribune" of Wednesday, 27 February, 1957, where it states "Gair shows up oil companies' blatant grabs." The Communists are backing Mr. Gair. It further says, "Urges national inquiry" and has a photograph of Queensland Premier Gair. The Petrol Distribution Bill was so mutilated after Caucus had a go at it that you would not know it for the Bill presented.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. I think in fairness to the general public I should state that the statement made by the hon. member that the Bill was mutilated after Caucus is incorrect. There was no variation of it and the hon. member knows that.

Mr. JESSON: I know what I am talking about. A thing that has worried me is that the hon. gentleman moved to provide that before appointments were made they should be brought down to Caucus.

Mr. Power: I did not move it.

Mr. JESSON: If the hon. gentleman did not move it then somebody else did. It will be on record. I am sure it was the hon. gentleman but I will find out from the minute book.

Mr. Power: What I said was that appointments should be reported to Caucus before they were made public. However, when I became a member of the Cabinet I learned that once the Government passed a minute it became public property.

Mr. JESSON: Was it not the same thing with the appointment of Mick Lyons to the Films Commission? I know all about the row that the Premier had with the former Public Service Commissioner, the late Mr. McCracken, when he brought down a minute to the effect that there was to be no appeal against certain appointments. In spite of that, the Premier had the cheek to include provisions for the right of appeal in the University of Queensland Acts Amendment Bill.

(Time expired.)

Mr. BROSANAN (Fortitude Valley) (9.11 p.m.): I do not intend to waste the time of the Committee by engaging in levity. In my previous speech I emphasised the grave importance of realising the menace confronting the nation today. I rise again because I was followed by the hon. member for Warrego, who told the Committee at least seven times during his speech that he, more than any other person, was competent to talk about the fight against Communism. He said he took second place to nobody, here or outside, in that fight. Let us accept that as a fact. The hon. member went on to say that he had been fighting Communism for 28 years, and then he said that to suggest that there was any Communist influence in the nation today was too silly for words. He said subsequently that to suggest that Communism here was rampant or strong was fallacious. That is the type of thinking that unfortunately is confusing the issue today. Here is a self-confessed champion of the fight against Communism. In one breath he tells us that he has been fighting Communism for 28 years, and in the next he says that to suggest that there is any Communist influence in the nation today is completely fallacious. One statement or the other must be untrue or has he been fighting nothing for 25 years. It is indisputable that the Communists try to cause confusion; they get men's minds muddled. If you examine their actions, you will always find a motive for destruction. Once you find that, you will recognise their approach and attack and consequently be able to counteract it. Let nobody say that the Communists are not a force in Australia today. They can afford the most expensive advertising space for their book depot in the Valley on page 2 of "The Courier-Mail" every Saturday. They never fail to get out their propaganda. You can buy reams of literature about Red China and every other country they have taken over. Men who say in one breath that they are champions of the cause against Communism and in the next that talk about Communism in Australia is fallacious can be likened to the parents of the children of Hungary. What happened in Hungary can happen here if we are not careful and watchful.

A.L.P. Members: Ah!

Mr. BROSANAN: I do not mind how much hon. members on my right "Ah!" and

"Oh!" As a responsible citizen and as a member of the Legislative Assembly—

Mr. Davis: A man holding two jobs!

Mr. BROSANAN: Yes, and doing them both efficiently and well. If the hon. member for Barecoo finds it difficult to do the one he has, I have no difficulty in doing the two I have, any more than his Deputy Leader has in doing his two jobs.

Let this thought sink deeply into the minds of those who have a care for the future of Queensland. It is not a fallacy to say that there is a Communist influence in Australia today; it is not too silly for words. The Communist Party in Australia is stronger today than it has ever been. The Communist Party is stronger in Australia today than ever before in its history and it is up to all those who believe in democratic principles to stand up for them. That is what hon. members on this side have done and I am proud to be associated with them.

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg—Treasurer) (9.15 p.m.) Before replying to hon. members, having learned of the illness of Mrs. Nicklin, the wife of the Leader of the Opposition, I am sure I speak for all hon. members when I express the hope that her illness is not a serious one and that she will make a speedy recovery.

Honourable Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nicklin: Thank you.

Mr. WALSH: Now I have a very wide field to cover. Subject on this occasion to the indulgence of hon. members, I will exercise my right to unlimited time. It is very necessary that I should reply to some of the statements that have been made. I hope that hon. members on my extreme right will advise some of their number who have spoken tonight that their place is in the Chamber in the concluding stages of the debate, as I have no desire to say anything about them in their absence. Immediately the two gentlemen to whom I particularly refer made their contributions, they left the Chamber and we have not seen them since. I know this is typical of many others.

I shall reply first to the hon. member for Hinchinbrook. Over the years we have come to know him as one of the clowns of this Assembly. On occasions he has put on a really good show to entertain his members.

Mr. Jesson: You have not been able to use the whip on me as ring master.

Mr. WALSH: I do not think the hon. member has ever earned his pay as Whip, and I hardly think the taxpayers should be called upon even to pay his parliamentary salary. No doubt the electors of Hinchinbrook will have some say in that when the opportunity arises.

The hon. member had much to say about the time he got into great difficulty because of flaunting his association with different

interests that were opposed to the Labour Party and were seeking, through sectarian propaganda, to disrupt the Labour Party in Queensland. He referred to "Smith's Weekly," but, if I may correct him, it was "The Clarion."

Mr. Jesson: It was not "The Clarion" at all.

Mr. WALSH: And the man who wrote the article, and whom the hon. member for Brisbane took down to the station to interview him the night before he left, was Mr. Mackay, who used to write for "Smith's Weekly." Now he is getting his facts right.

I will not waste any time on what the hon. member for Hinchinbrook said that the late Hon. W. Forgan Smith may have said about me. I think I can leave it to the members of that gentleman's family to say whether any of the things that he said about him tonight would be correct. I do not have to go beyond that, because I know the hon. member so well. He is troubled about the time I made some reference to him and the hon. member for Brisbane about a proposal that was put up in Caucus. I was not a member of the Caucus.

Mr. Jesson: You had the wrong oil.

Mr. WALSH: I had the right oil when I was told there were certain interests that frequented a particular club in the city that had £250 to pay on the spot if certain amendments to the Racing Act could be prevented. Then I saw a little paragraph in the "Courier-Mail" next morning saying that Messrs. Mann and Jesson had raised this matter in Caucus. I immediately accepted that as a message to the people outside who were dealing with this that these two men had done their job in Caucus.

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order. The Treasurer's statement is absolutely wrong. It is offensive to me. I was not even mentioned in the paper and I did not second the motion. I only spoke on it. His informant arrived back at the Caucus meeting late, as he always did, and at that time Mr. Roberts had seconded the motion and I was just talking on the matter. It is no use denying that. I could talk about the money given to Mr. Walsh to go to Bundaberg by a hotel-keeper as a present from his admirers.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Jesson: What about the send-off they gave him in the Lands Office Hotel?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member has no need to raise that. It is already in "Hansard."

Mr. Jesson: I am just reminding people like you are trying to remind them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: It is in "Hansard." I quite frankly admit that many of my admirers, not only at that centre but in many others, were prepared to contribute to my return to Parliament. I have not let them down either.

Let me get on with this story about the amendment to the Racing Act.

Mr. Jesson interjected.

Mr. WALSH: You are no longer the official Whip of Parliament. You are sacked.

Mr. Jesson: I sacked myself and thank God I am where I am.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: I did not say that the hon. member for Hinchinbrook seconded any motion in Caucus. I said that a report appeared in the "Courier-Mail" which stated that Messrs. Mann and Jesson had raised the matter of the amendment of the Racing Act in Caucus. I know the representations that had been made. This was not given to me by a man in politics but a man who comes from the country and frequents Tattersalls Club. He was able to tell me that this particular offer of money was being made to Messrs. Jesson and Mann.

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order. I strongly object to that and ask for it to be withdrawn. It is untrue. I could say that it was a foul untruth. It is the only thing you could expect from the Treasurer. He knows very well that it is wrong. I challenge him here and now to name the man.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: I have not said that the hon. member accepted £250.

Mr. Jesson: You did. What did you say then?

Mr. WALSH: I said that I was informed that £250 was to be made available. What happened?

Mr. Jesson: Name your informant.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: I wanted to get this statement into the Press. What happened? I made the statement to the Press that I protested against the Parliamentary Labour Caucus being used as a means for peddling this particular type of propaganda. I thought it was damaging to the Labour Party. Everybody knows I made the statement.

Mr. Jesson: Yes, to build up the race clubs and Dr. Uhr. I am a wake-up to you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: I am talking about something that happened approximately eight years ago. I do not know that Dr. Uhr was even prominently associated with racing

at that time. The hon. member should not introduce these red herrings. What happened? It was discussed in Caucus. I was on my way to the North on an organising campaign and I picked up a "Courier-Mail" in Townsville only to see two very good photographs on the front page. One picture was of the hon. member for Brisbane and one of myself. That was splashed on the front page of the "Courier-Mail" and it said what they were going to do with me and how they were going to deal with me at the Q.C.E. Immediately I reached Cairns I sat down in the A.W.U. office and dictated a letter which I addressed to the Parliamentary Labour Party Secretary, Mr. Donald. I did not forward it to the Party. I enclosed it in an envelope addressed to Mr. S. J. Bryan, Secretary of the Q.C.E. I explained, as a member of the Inner Executive, although I took up the matter with the Parliamentary Labour Caucus, I thought I should bring it before their notice. In that letter I made certain charges which were subsequently dealt with by the Q.C.E. It was quite in order.

Mr. MANN: I rise to a point of order. I have been informed that during my absence the Treasurer made certain allegations that I was a party to bringing a matter up in Caucus, and there was a certain suggestion of £250 offered to myself or Mr. Jesson if that matter was brought up in Caucus. I give that an emphatic denial. Were I not Speaker of this House I would use much stronger terms in expressing my condemnation of the filthy insinuation made by the Treasurer. I could say strong things if I were on the floor of the House and not the custodian of its rights and privileges. The statement is not correct; it is untrue. The matter the Treasurer is speaking about was the matter of the abolition of place betting at the races at Albion Park and Eagle Farm. I had a strong objection to the abolition of place betting. Everybody knows that I am an inveterate gambler. The suggestion there was any representation made by me is incorrect. The statement that the hon. member for Hinchinbrook had anything to do with it is a filthy insinuation. I moved the resolution and Mr. Roberts, the ex-Lord Mayor, seconded it. I was at the following Caucus meeting—

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MANN: I have a point of order. I don't want to get a direction from you.

Mr. WALSH: I am not taking it from you.

Mr. MANN: I will not take it from you.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MANN: I apologise to the Chair. I am not going to allow this lout to tell me what to do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MANN: I withdraw it.

Mr. Walsh: You are a bludger.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the Treasurer to withdraw that remark.

Mr. WALSH: I withdraw it.

Mr. MANN: At a subsequent Caucus meeting the matter was brought up before the late Mr. Hanlon and he suggested the matter be dropped and he would handle it at the Q.C.E. I had the mat almost worn out at the Q.C.E. facing charges but never was I charged before it in relation to the matter which the Treasurer talks about. I ask him to accept that denial.

Mr. WALSH: I accept his denial. The hon. member is overheated. He was not here when I made my remarks. He can thank the hon. member for Hinchinbrook and not me for introducing the subject.

Mr. Jesson: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. Mann: Filthy cur!

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Mann: In deference to you, Mr. Clark, I withdraw it.

Mr. WALSH: Everybody here heard the hon. member for Hinchinbrook raise the question.

Mr. Jesson: Of course I did. I raised it all right, to show what a hypocrite you are. I will raise a lot more, too, before you sit down.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member having raised it, I immediately proceeded to outline my attitude, no more than that. I did nothing more than I had done before, not a thing.

Mr. Jesson interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: I did raise those matters. I am not denying them. I did put charges in to the Q.C.E. that were subsequently dealt with and determined.

Mr. Mann: Why don't you tell the truth? It was not on that matter at all—nothing to do with place betting.

Mr. WALSH: Can you remember what the charges were that I put in?

Mr. Jesson: No, he was not advised of them.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member for Brisbane was.

Mr. Jesson: He was not.

Mr. WALSH: I am not resurrecting the matter, but I will go on with it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Mann: Go on with it.

Mr. WALSH: I am not bringing the matter up.

Mr. Jesson: I could have told them something about the milk vendors; I could have told them about the drive-in theatres.

Mr. WALSH: I have a few cheque butts in my possession, too.

Mr. Jesson: That is more of your dirty mongrel stuff.

Mr. WALSH: If you want to know who gave them to me—Laurie Kelly gave them to me.

Mr. Jesson: Why haven't you raised them before? You have carried them around for years.

Mr. WALSH: I do not know why the hon. member for Brisbane should get so heated about it.

Mr. Mann: I have just been informed of it.

Mr. WALSH: You were informed about it. You know that I have never run away from an argument with you. Thank your colleague for bringing the matter up.

Mr. Mann: I do not mind what you say about me as long as you tell the truth.

Mr. WALSH: That is all right; I never do otherwise.

Dr. Noble: We are finding out a few things about both sides.

Mr. WALSH: You did not have to find out these things. They were all published and splashed in the Press.

Dr. Noble: It has been a pretty dirty party in the past.

Mr. WALSH: It has been published and splashed in the Press. We had some very regular correspondents.

Mr. Jesson: You mentioned those cheques.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. WALSH: Now I come to Mr. Elson Green.

Mr. Jesson: An honourable gentleman.

Mr. WALSH: I did not raise anything here about Mr. Elson Green.

Mr. Jesson: The hon. the Attorney-General did.

Mr. Power: I said he opposed a Labour candidate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I shall have to name somebody here.

Mr. Moore: Name him. Why don't you shut him up and let the Committee proceed?

Mr. WALSH: Other members have raised Mr. Elson Green's name, and I just want to tell the Committee the position as I see it.

The Mayor of Bundaberg is my authority in this instance, and I think every hon. member who knows Mr. Buss will accept him as a very respectable and honourable citizen.

Mr. Sparkes: A very fine chap.

Mr. WALSH: A very respectable and honourable citizen. On one of my recent visits to Bundaberg, the Mayor of Bundaberg said to me, "How is Elson Green getting on?" I said, "I do not see much of him." He said, "Ask him if he remembers the days when he was in the Young Liberals Debating Club with me." I have named my authority.

Mr. Duggan: He is one of your principal supporters in Bundaberg.

Mr. WALSH: If Mr. Buss is one of my principal supporters, that is to my credit.

Mr. Hiley: That is obviously untrue, because there were no Young Liberals when they were young men.

Mr. WALSH: I would not take the responsibility of mentioning the name of Mr. Buss if he did not make that statement. Let the hon. member for Coorparoo fight it out with the Mayor of Bundaberg.

Mr. Hiley: You want to bring forward a statement that sounds credible before you make a stupid statement like that.

Mr. WALSH: I have given you my authority.

Mr. Hiley: Why repeat the rot?

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member does not mean to tell me that there is any difference between the old Nationalist Party or the Conservative Party and the old Liberal Party.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to allow the Treasurer to make his speech in his own way.

Mr. WALSH: What does it matter if they were the Liberals or the Nationalists? Mr. Green was still a member of the debating club.

Mr. Jesson: Why didn't you say that in the first place?

Mr. WALSH: It does not matter. I will probably get evidence later on that somewhere in the distant past if a member of the Communist Debating Party—

Mr. Hiley: You are now suggesting that Mr. Buss was at one time a Communist?

Mr. WALSH: No. I think the hon. member for Coorparoo has a lot to learn. It is true and cannot be denied that Mr. Elson Green did stand against the endorsed Labour candidate on the South Coast.

Mr. Jesson: He stood against him. (Laughter.)

Mr. WALSH: I give the hon. member for Hinchinbrook marks for that. He opposed the Labour candidate. After all

these years and after his being the secretary of the Queensland Party which ran candidates opposing the Labour Party in 1932 when he was quite a young man, at this late stage when Communists are beginning to infiltrate into the A.L.P. Mr. Green has found his way into the A.L.P.

Mr. Jesson: You condemn the Australian Legion of Ex-Servicemen?

Mr. WALSH: It is a filthy lie.

Mr. JESSON: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

Mr. Jesson: He called me a filthy liar in other words.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the Treasurer to withdraw the statement.

Mr. Jesson: I want to keep Parliament's prestige high. (Laughter.)

Mr. WALSH: Nobody believes that, knowing the hon. member for Hinchinbrook.

He got on to other matters about appointments made by the Governor-in-Council where there was no appeal. I do not know of any Government at any stage with a policy other than that of appointing administrative heads and departmental heads by way of executive minute, with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, with no appeal.

Mr. Jesson: What about Mick Lyons?

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Lyons is not a member of any department of the Public Service. The hon. member has been here for 22 years and apparently he does not know the machinery of administration.

The hon. member for Warrego made reference to the Coms. at Cunnamulla and talked about a man called Poulgrain going out to Cunnamulla. The only person I know who had any association with sending Mr. Poulgrain out there is Mr. Bukowski. We find the hon. member for Warrego defending Mr. Bukowski. He should work out with Mr. Bukowski what the relationship was at that time. Of course, I do not think Mr. Poulgrain would want to be associated in any way with Mr. Bukowski. Nevertheless, if we accept the statement of the hon. member for Warrego, and as Mr. Bukowski was very actively associated with the Industrial Groups at that time, he must take some responsibility for that.

The hon. member went on to dismiss the Communist influence in this country as negligible. As the hon. member for Fortitude Valley has pointed out, the hon. member for Warrego said he had been fighting the Communists for 28 years, and then he went on to say that it was fallacious to talk about a Communist influence in Australia. On his own admission he has been engaged in activities against the Communists for 28 years, and then he admits, in effect, that his

activities were of no real value and could not be justified. If the hon. member knew the history of the pastoral industry in this State as he should, he would know that in 1931 the P.W.I.U. formed a very strong organisation, backed by "Trucker" Brown and a few more, and aided and abetted by people who want to parade themselves today as good A.W.U. members. He would know also that there was a very serious challenge to the A.W.U. on that occasion. He would know, too, that an alliance between the United Graziers' Association and the Australian Workers' Union effectively defeated the Communist thrust into the pastoral industry in those years. The hon. member for Barcoo knows all about these things. If he was truthful, he would not deny the truth of what I am saying.

The hon. member said he was in the Burdekin area. Some hon. members will remember that in 1935 Communists Henry and Neville, and others, engaged in a very strong Communist attack on the sugar industry. On that occasion an alliance between the organisations representing the growing and milling sides of the sugar industry and the Australian Workers' Union defeated the Communist threat in Tully and other northern sugar centres.

I warn hon. members not to brush aside lightly the threat of Communism. The Communists are on their way again. As I proceed, I will show that they are infiltrating the Labour Party. Once again I have to cite "The Communist Review" of April 1957, at page 132. This is what it says—

"Approaches with the A.W.U. developed at the time of the shearers' strike, and we hope to reach closer relations with that organisation."

Those are not my words. They are the words of the official journal of the Communist Party appearing in an article by no less a person than Edgar Ross, whom everybody knows to be a Communist. The article is headed: "Crisis in the Coal Industry. Report to the Central Committee, March, 1957." The Communists have admitted that they have again made approaches to the Australian Workers' Union and that they hope to have closer relations with it in the future. I turn now to the statement by the hon. member for Warrego that the division in the Labour Party in Queensland had its origin in the Hobart conference. He referred to what was known as the Hobart splinter group. In the course of his remarks, when he had so much to say about the late Mr. Harry Boland, to whom I referred last night as a very honourable Labour man and a good unionist, I asked what Mr. Bukowski had done with him in the A.W.U. ballot. I repeat it now. He came 21st in the ballot in the Southern District, where 19 delegates were required. In other words, he was not voted in as a delegate by Mr. Bukowski's district at all.

I think even the hon. member for Warrego will concede that any difference of opinion I have had has always been expressed within the Parliamentary Labour Party, the Q.C.E. or the Cabinet itself. I have never engaged in outside argument on the domestic policy of the Labour Party. As I am no longer a member of the party that is now being needled along by the Communist Party, I am no longer bound by that loyalty to refrain from expressing my opinion on these matters.

I cast my mind back to the unanimous decision of the Inner Executive of the Q.C.E., when, much against my wish, I was selected as the representative to go down on the first stage of the inquiry into the charges that had been made against certain members of the Federal Parliamentary Labour Party. Having attended that Executive meeting, and remembering that Dr. Evatt had said he was going to make charges against those people, I expected that charges would be made. All twelve members of the Executive—two from each State—decided that in the eight pages of the submissions made by Dr. Evatt, the Leader of the Federal Labour Party, no charges were made and he was given until 10 o'clock next morning to make them. When I went along to see him during the dinner adjournment, I pointed out that he had made no charges and told he had been given till 10 o'clock next morning. "What do you want me to do, Ted?" he asked, and I said, "It is up to you, Bert. You have publicly stated your intention of making charges against these men and you have made none." Consequently, I could not be blamed at that stage if I submitted to him that he had no right to hang the Labour Party's dirty linen out on the public highways; there was a proper place to deal with it and he had no right to use the radio or the Press to broadcast or publish statements about his intention to make charges. I told him quite frankly that if I were to give an honest, just and sincere decision in accordance with the rules, it would be that the charges made against him had been upheld.

However, I pass to the conference. The Victorian Labour Party having elected six delegates from a properly constituted conference under their own rules as determined by the State Conference in exactly the same way as we do at the State Convention here, the Communists got in and obtained a hold and saw to it that, with the use of the Federal Executive, a special conference was summoned to dislodge those six delegates. Mr. Schmella of Queensland and Mr. Chamberlain, now Federal President, were appointed the Credential Committee to determine the bona fides of the delegates to the conference.

Two Victorian delegates were nominated which neither Mr. Schmella nor Mr. Chamberlain would certify as bona fide Labour men, because of their Communist associations. That did not stop them getting into the Labour conference and it did not stop these Communist representatives so determined by Messrs. Chamberlain and Schmella from hav-

ing a say in the selection of the six delegates who were accepted by the conference in Hobart. It is quite true that the decisions that were made in Hobart have been accepted by the Parliamentary Labour Caucus here. It is also quite true that all the other decisions by Convention here have been accepted irrespective of whether members have agreed or disagreed with them. But at no stage has it been accepted by the Parliamentary Labour Caucus that the Q.C.E. or any other body should take unto itself the right to direct the Government as to the week and month when legislation should be introduced into this Chamber. That is partly the cause of the split, plus the fact that the Communist organisation today is seeking to get a firmer and firmer grip on the Labour Party in Queensland.

Despite what the hon. members for Bremer and Warrego might say, these matters were dealt with by the Q.C.E. When the Premier, myself and other delegates to the Hobart Conference returned, the Q.C.E. refused to accept the motion of censure moved by Mr. Bukowski. By a majority decision the Q.C.E. turned it down. Hon. members of the splinter group of the A.L.P. do not desire to accept that position, but on the other hand they think that the Premier should allow himself and other members of this Party to be pushed along by a Communist-controlled Q.C.E. at their bidding and direction.

When the hon. member for Toowoomba was short of something to talk about last night he mentioned that I frequented a particular hotel. Everybody knows that. I do not dine here. Everybody knows that. I get sick of some politicians—I see enough of them. I like to get around and meet some of the useful people in the community. Consequently I frequent the same place as the hon. members for Barcoo, Warrego, Ipswich, Kedron, North Toowoomba and others in the Chamber. I am not getting in a plug for the Lands Office Hotel, although let me tell you there is very good service there. I do not know whether it surprises the hon. member for Toowoomba to learn that I have been going there for 22 years and I do not look any the worse for it. It is true that I have many business friends who go to the same place.

I feel honoured with their acquaintance and association. They may differ from me in politics but I regard them as friends in the community. They are not conspiring or intriguing against their mates the same as you find down here, which fact urges one to get away from it. Since I came back in 1950 I have never had one meal at Parliament House. I do not frequent the places which the hon. member for Toowoomba may frequent—clubs and various other places. I would not be dined and entertained with the flash wines and all the other things.

Mr. Duggan: You have had your share of them.

Mr. WALSH: I never have mixed in the same atmosphere and I have no desire to do so. If the hon. member wants to attend at the American Club in Sydney with oil company representatives that is his business.

Mr. Duggan: Secret police.

Mr. WALSH: No, not at all. Innocent people who go about their work, and who happened to be on holidays.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member talks about the Gestapo. I told him frankly how quite innocently in this House a visitor from Sydney—not the Gestapo and not an informant of the police—was able to mention the time and place when the hon. member was at Lennons Hotel that day.

Mr. Duggan: Would there be anything dishonourable in that?

Mr. WALSH: No, not at all.

Mr. Duggan: Why mention it?

Mr. WALSH: When the hon. member became so agitated about "The Courier-Mail" report of his dash back to the city I said, out of the blue, "I can tell you you were at Lennons at a quarter to 11 yesterday morning." I can assure the hon. member I have no desire to pimp or spy on him. The hon. member has been in the public eye and everybody notices him. There are many people whom I do not know but who recognises me as the very successful Treasurer of this Government.

Mr. Hiley: Your deficits will be unforgetable.

Mr. WALSH: How many have there been since I have been Treasurer?

Mr. Hiley: You emptied the Treasury; two years ago there were millions there.

Mr. WALSH: I told the hon. member last night how it was emptied by the gentleman whom he boomed up as the great administrator of the railways. That hon. member was responsible for the money going down year by year. Everybody knows how I have tried to keep my fingers on it. I am not blaming the administration. As I said at the conference of officers called by the Premier last July, when they were told they would have to engage in an economy campaign, that any administration must have some guidance from the Minister in control, and if it does not get that guidance things may go wrong.

Mr. Hanlon: The Premier told the hon. member for Toowoomba that he did not have a Minister capable of taking the Transport Department portfolio.

Mr. WALSH: I do not know; that is the hon. member's word. The hon. member for Kedron—he is away again—made some reference to Dr. Uhr.

Mr. Jesson interjected.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member will be getting some liquorice before this is over.

Mr. Jesson: I can give it back; do not worry about that.

Mr. WALSH: I shall leave the hon. member for Hinchinbrook to the people's court.

Mr. Jesson: That is right.

Mr. WALSH: I shall leave the hon. member to the people's court as we understand it in a democratic State, and not a Moscow court trial such as the Premier got. I should think that every man who is acquainted with Dr. Uhr knows that he has been a very good citizen of Queensland, a man who underwent considerable hardship as a prisoner-of-war of the Japanese in Changi and other camps.

Mr. Jesson: You had two opportunities to go—the first war, and the second war.

Mr. WALSH: I have said in this House before that all I could do was offer myself. If I was rejected, that was not my fault.

Mr. Jesson: What did you have—flat feet, or a weak heart?

Mr. WALSH: At least I did not have a bone head.

Mr. Jesson: It is a funny thing; I was shot in the bone head, and the bone knee, too.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member for Hinchinbrook to refrain from interjecting.

Mr. Jesson: I am sorry.

Mr. WALSH: Dr. Uhr is accepted by everybody in the community, particularly those who know him well, as a man who has given outstanding service in many ways. There are few men that I know of in this State who have done as much as Dr. Uhr has in the interests of charitable institutions in the City of Brisbane. When he is returned to this House as a member of the Queensland Labour Party for the Kedron seat, hon. members will find that he is one of the finest debaters ever to come into this Chamber. I look forward to seeing him sitting side by side with the Premier and his colleagues on this side as a member of the new Government under the guidance of the Queensland Labour Party.

The hon. member for Kedron said a number of things about what goes on here and what goes on there. I am sorry he did not tell us about his reception at Tattersall's Club amongst his friends. He knows, and his friends who accompanied him know, what sort of a reception he received there. When those men found out that he had run out on democratic government, they no longer wanted to know him.

Again, he can be left to the people's court—the electors of Kedron.

Mr. Duggan: When are you going to tell us why Supply should be extended until 30 October?

Mr. WALSH: If the hon. member had been in here instead of running out and answering the phone for the oil company representatives, he would have heard the reasons.

Mr. DUGGAN: I rise to a point of order. I think every one will agree that some attempt should be made to bring more dignity into this debate. The hon. the Treasurer should set an example. He has made a nasty innuendo that I went out to answer the phone for the oil companies. When I have been absent from the Chamber today, I have been absent on official business or dealing with matters in the interests of my constituency. The statement he has made is offensive to me and I ask that he withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw.

Mr. WALSH: I accept his denial. Under the Standing Orders, I am obliged to do so.

Mr. Duggan: That is another insinuation.

Mr. WALSH: The insinuation by the hon. member for Toowoomba was that I had given no reasons to this House.

Mr. Duggan: Neither you have.

Mr. WALSH: I have. If he was not in his place and he does not know those reasons, that is no reason why he should ask me to repeat them. The Premier gave very sound and compelling reasons why the Committee should grant Supply.

Mr. Duggan: All you have done is make personal attacks on various members of Parliament.

Mr. WALSH: I gave the reasons this morning. I accept the hon. member's word that he had other business to discuss outside the Chamber, because I know that happens to many members. On the other hand, if the hon. member wishes to insinuate that I did not give the reasons, that is equally offensive to me.

Following the statement that I made last night, Mr. Bukowski wanted to make some challenge. After all, he has got no fewer than seven or eight writs on his hands now. I would not discuss the merits or demerits of them.

Mr. Jesson: A few more will do no harm.

Mr. WALSH: Some of them are two years old. If you could get him into the witness box—

Mr. Jesson: Appoint a few more judges.

Mr. WALSH: It is nothing to do with judges. If he likes to make application for a case to be heard no doubt the case would come before the court, if any one of them will come before the court. Some day this Parliament will have to look at the position because in other States there is a law dealing with this particular circumstance. I do not think that in a community such as ours people should be allowed to issue writs out of the Supreme Court for the purpose of stifling public discussion and that only. Any person issuing a writ should be able to satisfy a judge that he has a compelling reason for the issue of a writ and the judge would determine whether there is justification for the issue of it.

Mr. Jesson: Alter the law and we will support it.

Mr. WALSH: He went on to speak about my association at a Fascist meeting and published this in "The Worker." The hon. member for Toowoomba might complain about some of my references tonight, but does he object to my replying to statements published in "The Worker?" That is what I am doing. It is true that round about 1948 or 1949 I met three very respectable citizens and I did so at the request of Mr. Bukowski. If it was a Fascist gathering, he was the person who invited me to go to it. I asked him the nature of the meeting, and he was not clear as to what it was, but he thought it was something to do with anti-Communism. I went to the particular home and met three respectable persons concerned in the handling of this particular plan. It was a plan to meet a possible attack by Communists in the State where the Communists might seek to take control of powerhouses and such-like installations. This particular so-called Fascist gang had a plan based on the A.R.P. which operated during the war for civil defence. I commended them on their plan, but I said I was afraid the Labour Party could not associate itself with it. If the same plan arose tomorrow to meet the same set of circumstances I would not run away and not commend any citizen who sought to implement a plan to resist and restrain Communists from taking control of power installations in this State. I heard their story. At the invitation of Mr. Bukowski, I say publicly I met them and commended them for their plan to meet the Communist threat. They were doing no more than the late Ben Chifley, a Labour Prime Minister, did in New South Wales. Why then condemn them?

Mr. Hanlon: Did they tell you whether they had arms or ammunition stored up?

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member might inquire from the Communists at the Trades Hall whether they have arms and ammunition stored up.

The hon. member for Toowoomba seems to have a police bogey at the moment. I thought he would have let that subject die last night. His real bitterness is not so

much against the transfer of Inspector Currey as it is against the transfer of Inspector Burns from Longreach to Toowoomba.

Mr. Duggan: I do not understand the implication behind that statement.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member knows what the implication is.

Mr. Duggan: I do not.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member's memory is not as short as that. Inspector Burns was in Toowoomba previously as a sub-inspector.

Mr. Devries: He is a very fine officer.

Mr. WALSH: I do not know the man. I think the hon. member for Toowoomba had better leave references to the police alone.

I now come to the Australian Workers' Union and industrial groups. Of course the Australian Workers' Union was actively associated with industrial groups. It derived considerable finance for its propaganda from that association. The Southern District Secretary of the A.W.U. used his car and petrol that, I take it, was paid for mainly from funds contributed by the members of his union. I am not condemning him for that. He was giving useful service against Communist activity in this State. But now he wants to condemn all those who were associated with him at that time. He was deeper in it than anybody else, yet he wants to condemn all the others. Why? It all emanates from a petition that Frank Roberts drew up and had signed by more than 1,000 members of the A.W.U., seeking court-controlled ballots for official positions in the A.W.U. It was to be presented to the Federal Arbitration Court. Mr. Bukowski cannot deny that. It was the Communists and their sympathisers at the Trades Hall who rescued him. They got Frank Roberts to hand the petition over to them, and it has not seen the light of day since then. It was then that the bargaining between Bukowski and the Communists at the Trades Hall started.

Mr. Jesson: I do not think you are telling the truth on that, either.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member can make his own inquiries.

Mr. Jesson: I have made a few.

Mr. WALSH: I call as my witness no less a person than John Schmella.

Mr. Jesson: He is in England, and the other men whom you were talking about last night are in their graves.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member will be in his political grave after the next election.

Everybody knows my attitude towards industrial groups and to the suggestion that they should be accepted constitutionally as part of the Labour Party. I resisted the

suggestion at Toowoomba, I resisted it at Rockhampton, and I resisted it at Adelaide. There are men at the Trades Hall who know that if it had not been for me, industrial groups would have been written into the Federal Constitution of the Labour Party at Adelaide. No less a person than one Thomas Dougherty, the General Secretary of the Australian Workers' Union, recommended that that should be done. I was appointed chairman of a committee on which was appointed a representative of each State to report on the motion that Dougherty was prepared to move. Fred Riley was there. He is a grand old Labour stalwart, who served a term of imprisonment during World War I, because of his agitation in Victoria against conscription. He is still with them fighting the Communists although he is now over 70 years of age. He seconded the motion in the Committee. After I had offered my resistance, they came round to a resolution that was accepted by the Conference of the day and there was no further trouble. Hon. members may test that in any corner they choose. I am sure it will be accepted anywhere. The reason for my action was not that at any time I opposed the activities of groups in their fight against Communism but that, as I said in Toowoomba, there was no room for bodies within bodies. It was right and proper that the Labour Party as such and the trade union movement as such should give all the moral support they could to the activities of industrial groups against Communism in Australia. I will continue in that attitude despite all the sneers from the break-away party.

The hon. member for North Toowoomba raised the question of man-hours worked and I replied to him. I listened to the National News and I must say there was a very fair presentation of that item. They reported what he had said and what I had replied. That is fair reporting. We do not always get that from the Press. The hon. member for North Toowoomba can see how he was led astray.

Mr. Wood: No, he was not. You know that the Government Printer could print the ballot papers in five days.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member made the specific statement that no more than 16 man-hours had been worked in overtime.

Mr. Wood: Up till last week.

Mr. WALSH: Up till last week.

Mr. Wood: And you still have not given the exact periods covering those hours.

Mr. WALSH: I gave the information quite clearly to the hon. member as from the date the Government Printer entered into the agreement with the union to work overtime.

Mr. Wood: What date was that?

Mr. WALSH: Up till last Saturday 328 hours had been worked on the compilation of the Rolls and 72 hours on the binding of the Rolls.

Mr. Wood: How many of those hours were worked last week?

Mr. WALSH: I cannot answer that. The hon. member is not going to subject me to cross examination to get the Government Printer down here to check on those figures tonight. I will not keep hon. members here as long as all that; they would not put up with it.

I know that in all these establishments there are people who may be suspect. Even during the war, people were able to get from the Government Printing Office the specially-marked paper that was handed out for the printing of ration coupons, which were then circulated throughout the State at 30s. a sheet. Certain employees of the Government Printing Office were charged under National Security Regulations in 1943 and I have not the slightest doubt that somewhere in the structure of the Government Printing Office there could be a cell. It could include someone who in his youth was accustomed to distributing Communist literature and reading Communist pamphlets. Such people could still be about the place, you know, as they could be in many other places.

Mr. Jesson: Do you know there is a cell sitting at the table that you have your lunch at every day at the Lands Office Hotel that passes information back to me on what you say about us?

Mr. WALSH: I am sorry that the hon. member has not revealed that before tonight.

Mr. Jesson: I told you months ago in the bar.

Mr. WALSH: He did not tell me anything for the reason that he always steered very clear of me. One of the reasons he has never come under my fire is that he has never seen fit to misrepresent my position.

Earlier in the day I made reference to Mr. Egerton. Everybody will agree that his name has appeared very prominently in the papers over a lengthy period. At one stage when they sought to quieten him they had an industrial union spokesman—still identifiable, of course—but now you cannot see Mr. Egerton's footprints anywhere at all in the split in the Labour Party. He has completely disappeared. Why?

I am curious to know where he is. I was wondering whether he has got a job from the oil companies. At one time it was suggested he might go to Bundaberg to contest the seat against me. I told some of the trade unionists then to do all in their power to encourage him to be my opponent. I would love to have had him there.

Mr. Jesson: You are not so popular up there.

Mr. WALSH: I am more popular there than the hon. member will be in Hinchinbrook.

Mr. Jesson: That is a funny one!

Mr. WALSH: Yesterday I quoted from a very important judgment of the House of Lords. In my concluding remarks it would be very pertinent to put on record an extract from the same judgment.

Mr. Wood: Did you not say yesterday that you would not follow British tradition?

Mr. WALSH: I never said that at all.

Mr. Wood: You voted that way.

Mr. WALSH: I am amazed at the hon. member for North Toowoomba for wanting to follow British tradition. I made it quite clear yesterday that the Speaker had informed the House of his obligations if he were to accept the 1937 English Act in relation to the Leader of the Opposition. If he accepted that obligation it would not be this House that was deciding the point at all. He was obliged under that Act to certify in writing, but the Speaker did not do any such thing. He wanted to use only part of the Act to justify his argument. The arguments advanced yesterday were accepted by this Parliament, that is that Parliament had complete control over its own business. That is still in accordance with British tradition.

Mr. Hanlon: We have control of Supply too and you are not getting any more.

Mr. WALSH: I was very youthful once. He will live and learn.

Mr. Duggan: He has started off better than you finished.

Mr. WALSH: Before this is all over there might be a few other things that we can teach the hon. members for Ithaca and Toowoomba. I know that the hon. member for Toowoomba has applied himself to reading books in the Parliamentary library. I have read material dealing with the administration of government and the procedure in this Chamber, constitutional procedure, and before we finish we might still be able to tell the hon. member something.

I will conclude with these remarks of Lord Shaw—

“Parliament is summoned by the Sovereign to advise His Majesty freely. By the nature of the case it is implied that coercion, constraint, or a money payment, which is the price of voting at the bidding of others, destroys or imperils that function of freedom of advice which is fundamental in the very constitution of Parliament. Inter alia, the Labour Party pledge is such a price, with its accompaniments of unconstitutional and illegal constraint or temptation.

“Further, the pledge is an unconstitutional and unwarrantable interference with the rights of the constituencies of the United Kingdom.”

“The Corrupt Practises Acts, and the proceedings of Parliament before such Acts were passed, were but machinery to make effective the fundamental rule that the electors in the exercise of their franchise, are to be free from coercion, constraint, or corrupt influence; and it is they, acting through their majority, and not any outside body having money power, that are charged with the election of a representative, and with the judgment on the question of his continuance as such.

“Still further, in regard to the member of Parliament himself he too is to be free; he is not to be the paid mandatory of any man, or organization of men, nor is he entitled to bind himself to subordinate his opinions on public questions to others, for wages, or at the peril of pecuniary loss; and any contract of this character would not be recognized by a Court of law, either for its enforcement or in respect of its breach. Accordingly, as it is put in the words of Fletcher Moulton L.J., ‘Any other view of the fundamental principles of our law in this respect would, to my mind, leave it open to any body of men of sufficient wealth or influence to acquire contractually the power to exercise that authority to govern the nation which the law compels individuals to surrender only to representatives, that is, to men who accept the obligations and the responsibility of the trust towards the public implied by that position.’ ”

I think those words are very fitting for this occasion. I ask hon. members to pay some attention to them. I am sure those are the principles which will be uppermost in the minds of the electors when they are asked to decide who is to be the future government of this State. The government have done their duty in introducing this measure for the additional Supply till the end of October in order to guard against emergencies that may arise. The Premier has clearly indicated the disorganisation that could occur in the middle of August. There is no doubt the government will have the additional money before the Supply to the end of August runs out. I wish to place this warning on record. The responsibility will be on the shoulders of hon. members opposite—the traditional enemies of Labour, the Liberal-Country Party and splinter group on my right, if in the months of October and November they find themselves in a very confused state financially. No hon. member can sav what is going to be the outcome of the election. When we remember that up to three weeks has to elapse before all the writs can be returned and no member can take his seat until the writs are returned one can imagine the confused state that may result,

especially if the issue is close. If there is anything over five electorates outstanding no Parliament can meet. I emphasise that if hon. members opposite find themselves in the position that in the middle of October there is no finance to meet the commitments of the Government for salaries or otherwise, the responsibility will be on their shoulders.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Walsh) be agreed to—put; and the Committee divided—

AYES, 25.

| | |
|------------------|-------------|
| Mr. Brosnan | Mr. Kehoe |
| “ Collins | “ McCarthie |
| “ Cooper | “ Moore |
| “ Devries | “ Moores |
| “ Diplock | “ Power |
| “ Dohring | “ Robinson |
| “ English | “ Skinner |
| “ Foley | “ Smith |
| “ Gair | “ Walsh |
| “ Gardner, H. R. | |
| “ Gardner, R. J. | |
| “ Hadley | Tellers : |
| “ Hilton | Mr. Rasey |
| “ Jones, A. | “ Adair |

NOES, 45.

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Aikens | Mr. Keyatta |
| “ Baxter | “ Lloyd |
| “ Bjelke-Petersen | “ Low |
| “ Brown | “ Madsen |
| “ Byrne | “ Marsden |
| “ Chalk | “ Morris |
| “ Davies | “ Müller |
| “ Davis | “ Munro |
| “ Dewar | “ Nicholson |
| Dr. Dittmer | “ Nicklin |
| Mr. Donald | “ Noble |
| “ Dufficy | “ Pizzey |
| “ Duggan | “ Roberts |
| “ Evans | “ Sparkes |
| “ Fletcher | “ Taylor, H. B. |
| “ Forde | “ Taylor, J. R. |
| “ Gaven | “ Turner |
| “ Graham | “ Wallace |
| “ Gunn | “ Wood |
| “ Heading | |
| “ Hewitt | |
| “ Hiley | Tellers : |
| “ Jesson | Mr. Herbert |
| “ Jones, V. E. | “ Hanlon |

Resolved in the negative.

The House resumed.

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Premier) (10.38 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, in view of the adverse vote just taken in Committee of Supply I now wish to state that I propose calling on His Excellency the Administrator of the Government as early as possible to inform him that Supply was asked for by my Government and it has been refused by this House.

MOTOR SPIRITS DISTRIBUTION BILL.

PROPOSED DISALLOWANCE OF PROCLAMATIONS.

Mr. HILEY (Coorparoo) (10.39 p.m.), by leave, without notice: I move—

“That this House resolves that the Proclamations published in the ‘Government Gazette’ on 11 May, 1957, whereby it was proclaimed—

1. That Section 24 of ‘The Motor Spirits Distribution Act of 1957’ should come into force on and from 1 August, 1957, and

2. That Section 23 of the said Act should come into force on and from 1 August, 1957, in the following Local Authority Areas, namely, the Area of the City of Brisbane, and the Areas of the City of Ipswich, the towns of Redcliffe and South Coast, and the Shires of Albert, Pine, and Redland,

which said Proclamations were laid upon the table of this House on 11 June, 1957, shall be disallowed in whole pursuant to the provisions of Section 36 of the said Act and shall thereupon cease to have effect."

In support of that motion I point out that the Motor Spirits Distribution Act provides for certain administrative steps to be taken by proclamation. In accordance with the usual practice the proclamations had to be laid on the table of the House, which was then afforded the opportunity of either confirming them inferentially by passing no comment on them, or putting forward a substantive motion to disallow them and thus make them void.

Because of the extraordinary circumstances under which this session has been held, it was necessary for me to seek the indulgence of the House so that I could move this motion without the customary notice. I acknowledge the courtesy of the House in permitting me to do so.

I shall now proceed to give my reasons for moving the motion. It should not be the administrative act of a Government who have already forfeited their right to govern to introduce proclamations that are to take effect from 1 August next. The proclamations were the first of a series of administrative acts and should have been left entirely to a new Government who will be elected by a new Parliament.

It is obvious from the character of the motion that no attempt is being made to repeal the Act or to inhibit in any way a free consideration of it by the succeeding Government. I repeat, a Government who were under sentence of death had no right to seek to exercise their administrative powers in extension of the period during which they knew they could retain the mandate of the people.

We say that the proclamations should be disallowed and that it should be left entirely to the incoming Parliament and the Government who emerge from it to decide what they will do in the future administration of the Act.

Mr. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Leader of the Opposition) (10.42 p.m.): In seconding the motion, I agree entirely with the reasons submitted by the hon. member for Coorparoo. Let us remember that the proclamations that we are seeking to have disallowed concern possibly one of the most controversial pieces of legislation ever introduced into this House. One feature of the legislation that was objected to violently by

the Opposition was that it is made operative largely by proclamations and/or regulations. It is very improper for a Government who have, to say the least, a very precarious political hold, to table proclamations tending to implement a very important section of this controversial legislation. They are doing it in the face of tremendous public opposition.

It was apparent to all yesterday that this Parliament would die in the near future—in fact, it has been proved tonight—so that we should not approve of any proclamations that implement any part of what I have referred to as controversial legislation. Rather should we leave it to the new Parliament that will be elected by the people. They will be given an opportunity at the polls to voice their opinion not only on this legislation, but on other legislation and administrative acts of the Government. We of the official Opposition opposed the legislation at all stages and it is only right that we should now oppose the implementation of any section of it by proclamation. I support the motion.

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Premier) (10.47 p.m.): I cannot support the motion any more than I can accept the argument as to why proclamations affecting the Motor Spirits Distribution Act should not be accepted by this Parliament. The main argument advanced is that since the introduction of the legislation, and indeed since it was agreed to by the Parliament, there has been a change in the numerical strength of the Government. The fact remains that the legislation was dealt with by this Parliament and this Parliament decided to accept it as submitted. Indeed the third reading was carried by 42 votes to 23, indicating very clearly and decisively that the Parliament was in accord with the legislation. The proclamation of it is merely a routine matter giving effect to the voice of this Parliament and enabling and authorising those charged with its administration, the authority in power, to draw up the regulations and all the necessary machinery for its implementation to give effect to the intention of the Legislature. Where is there room for argument? If it had been simply a regulation or an Order in Council or something else that Parliament had not had the opportunity of considering or deciding, I might have been ready to concede that there was some merit in the motion. We cannot overlook the very important fact that Parliament considered the legislation at length. It was considered in detail in Committee and even on the third reading it received the express approval of Parliament.

Mr. Hiley: And Parliament reserved to itself the right to disallow any Proclamation as part of that legislation.

Mr. GAIR: Even conceding that it is going to be very difficult for people who voted for the legislation to disapprove of the Proclamation which merely gives effect to the

principles of the Act and gives those charged with its administration the power to administer it, and implement its provisions.

Mr. Nicklin: You must admit that at least we are consistent.

Mr. GAIR: I will concede that. Hon. members opposite were opposed to it.

(Time expired.)

Mr. MUNRO (Toowong) (10.52 p.m.): The point was very well made by the Premier that Parliament approved of the legislation. If Parliament is still of the opinion that it is good legislation and should be proclaimed to come into effect as from 1 August, 1957, then I have no doubt that Parliament will reject the motion submitted by the hon. member for Coorparoo. But there is a very sound reason why Parliament should not reject the motion. The reasons for the submission of the motion at this particular time and under these particular circumstances have been very soundly and clearly stated by the hon. member for Coorparoo and the Leader of the Opposition. Their arguments have not been effectively replied to by the Premier.

Within the few minutes available to me I wish to give additional reasons and point out why the disallowance of the Proclamations is completely consistent with the attitude of hon. members of the Opposition at the time the legislation was introduced. The Act does not state any date of commencement. It was quite rightly referred to at the time as a club in the cupboard. It gives the government of the day power to bring in its provisions by Proclamation. It gives the Minister in charge of the Department extreme powers. Under Section 16 of the Act—

“The Minister may, to the extent he deems fit, subject any retailer’s license to conditions”—

and it goes on to cover the conditions some of which are objectionable, including paragraph (c) which states—

“Requiring any specified description of motor spirits, or any specified grade of any specified description of motor spirits, to be sold under the authority of the license.”

Under sub-section (2) the Minister has power, as he deems fit, to amend or revoke any of the conditions. There is further extreme power in sub-section (3) to the effect that conditions imposable by the Minister under this section may be imposed by him at his absolute discretion, and differently in respect of different retailer’s licenses. I ask the members of this House, after hearing the debate this afternoon and this evening, is it right that this Government and the Minister of this Government should be given these powers? On the answer to that question I ask members to make their decision.

Mr. AIKENS (Mundingburra) (10.56 p.m.): There can be no doubt as to the constitutional right of this Parliament to disallow this Proclamation. Consequently, if we are exercising our rights in accordance with the Constitution and the law, there can be no cavil about it. I propose to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Coorparoo for the simple reason that I opposed this obnoxious provision in the Bill when it was before the House. As I said then, the Petrol Bill does not attack the oil companies; it simply adds one more robber to the gang. If it did take on the oil companies as they should be taken on, if it represented a genuine attempt to curb the predatory actions of oil companies I would be 100 per cent. behind it. All that the Proclamation and the provisions of the Bill will do is to allow the Minister to direct any garage or service station in the areas mentioned in the Proclamation to make provision for a bowser to be erected by the Chop Suey or the Dim Sim people. To my mind that is unfair and unjust. I shall not delay the House by recapitulation of what I said during the passage of the Bill. I assure the House that since the Bill was passed I have, in accordance with the practice and policy of my party and myself gone back to my electors and told them about the Bill and what I said about it and how I voted; and they have confirmed my actions in every regard. So, in opposing these Proclamations under the Act, and the obnoxious clause in the Bill, I am acting in accordance with the views of my party and my conception of democracy and freedom.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba) (10.58 p.m.): We propose to support this resolution. It is fitting that we should find ourselves in the position today of reaffirming a principle which we attempted to establish yesterday. When the Premier addressed himself to the House a few minutes ago, his main point was that this Bill had been approved by a majority of 42 to 23, and therefore we had no right to interfere with the Proclamation of administration matters that follow from the acceptance of certain principles contained in the Bill. Yesterday when we sought to establish a case for the acceptance of my position as official Leader of the Opposition these gentlemen who now want to say we have no right to interfere, said it was in the power of Parliament to control its own destiny. I am sure these gentlemen are very sorry that as late as 24 hours ago they wished to deny us certain things and now they plead that we do not exercise our constitutional right to withhold consent to these Proclamations. The reason we withhold our consent is not that we disagree with the necessity of controlling monopolies. I say now, and I have told this to the Premier and members of his Cabinet—that I will take the stump anywhere in Australia to introduce appropriate legislation for the effective control of monopolies, oil, steel or any other kind, within the constitutional powers of this State.

Because I was bound by the decisions of the Cabinet and the Caucus so to do, that is why. I kept my pledge in this matter, something that you have repudiated.

I made it abundantly clear in Cabinet that this Bill contained some provisions that all decent, self-respecting people should repudiate. When we have the opportunity of examining this Bill with all the facilities available to a Government, we shall see whether or not this Act should be proclaimed. We have no desire to frustrate Parliament's giving effect to the clearly expressed will of Parliament, but we all know the suspicious circumstances associated with some of these provisions. Some of the principals of this organisation that this legislation seeks to protect will be very sorry indeed that they placed themselves in the hands of people who have compelled them to invest large sums of money on very uncertain foundations. They are the people who will be regretful, perhaps they may even be spiteful, because certain promises given to them cannot be honoured.

On behalf of the Australian Labour Party, I say that we are prepared to oppose monopolies and cartels and propose to introduce legislation to deal with them. But we shall be happy to preserve all the provisions of this Bill that are not obnoxious and not in contravention of British justice and fair play.

For those reasons, I say that we should support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Coorparoo.

Hon. W. M. MOORE (Merthyr—Secretary for Health and Home Affairs) (11.3 p.m.): One would have thought that the Opposition, after 25 years in Opposition, and after being rejected by the people of the State on eight occasions, would have learnt something about tactics. Here you have them, one minute in power, one minute in authority, and they begin the vicious interfering with the rights of the people of Queensland. (Opposition laughter.)

One would have imagined that in their election campaign they would have selected the matters that they would attend to if returned. In one drunken minute of political power they could not withstand a temptation to start to tear up all that Labour Governments have laid down, and the Duggan and Bukowski political hypocrites of this State—

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. gentleman will withdraw that remark.

MR. MOORE: I withdraw it. I shall go on to say that the gentlemen on my right led by the Speaker himself, said in Caucus that this was the type of legislation that the Labour Party should have been bringing into Parliament more often. That was said by the hon. the Speaker himself, and the Bill was passed unanimously in Caucus. That shows the hypocrisy of the gentlemen on my right. It also shows what the people of

Queensland can expect if we have as a Government a coalition of the official Opposition and the Duggan-Bukowski party. I want to warn the people of Queensland that this will be No. 1. Free hospitals will be No. 2, the 40-hour week will be No. 3, and long service leave will be No. 4.

I am delighted that they have moved this resolution tonight because they have now proved to the people of Queensland what they will do if by some chance they sit on these Treasury benches.

Hon. W. POWER (Baroona—Attorney-General) (11.5 p.m.): There is no doubt that the motion will be carried. Its carriage provides sufficient proof of what we have been telling the people of Queensland, namely, that members of the Queensland Branch of the Australian Labour Party will carry out the directions and dictates of the Q.C.E. At our Party meetings the Bill was approved unanimously. In Cabinet the hon. member for Toowoomba, the champion of the oil companies, was opposed to the Bill as he was opposed to legislation dealing with price control.

Mr. Duggan: You made a shocking mess of price control.

MR. POWER: I will make a mess of the hon. member when I go to Toowoomba. He has been the champion of the oil companies and on one occasion he threw his hands into the air and said, "Why have a quarrel with the oil companies over a penny?" That is his attitude. You, Mr. Speaker, and every member of the A.L.P. part of the Opposition were advocating and supporting this legislation. I have been fighting the oil companies all my life. As a result of rule by a Labour Government the price of petrol is cheaper in Queensland than in any other State of Australia. We warn the people that that Party opposite will accept direction.

Dr. DITTMER (Mt. Gravatt) (11.8 p.m.): I wish to make my position clear in relation to the motion before the House. I sat on a Committee that discussed this Bill and I opposed it.

I quarrelled with the extraordinary power given to the Minister or his departmental officers. The Bill we discussed was intimidatory in its approach in the way it gave certain powers to inspectors. I did not quarrel so much with those powers but I did quarrel with the penalties imposed. There was no discretion vested in the magistrate and the penalty was nothing less than £200 and that penalty had to be applied. It was pointed out that under the Magistrates Court Act the magistrate would have the right to exercise a discretion.

MR. POWER: Why did you not raise this in Caucus?

Dr. DITTMER: I did not raise it in Caucus because I was unavoidably absent. I want to make it clear that I said to the Minister in charge of the Bill that I thought

it was bad as it was giving one man too much authority. The Bill was vesting supreme authority in one Government official. It was not founded on a sound basic principle. These gentlemen who are speaking of Christian principles and seeking to enlist those who believe in the application of Christian principles are the very people who are running round the country making all sorts of unworthy insinuations about our stand on this matter. It is because of the suspicious circumstances associated with the reasons for introducing this Bill that we, if returned as a Government, will use all our resources to find out all the things that were responsible for its being introduced in this particular and peculiar way.

A Government Member: Why did you vote for it?

Dr. DITTMER: Because I followed the practice of all political parties in that once the majority had determined a matter I accepted the decision.

Hon. E. J. WALSH (Bundaberg—Treasurer) (11.10 p.m.): The Premier did not suggest that Parliament had not the power to disallow the proclamations. What he said was that only a few weeks ago—on 3 April—by 43 votes to 23, Parliament approved of the principle in the legislation that authorised the Government to bring down these proclamations. Included in the 43 votes to which I have referred were those of the splinter party now sitting opposite me.

Mr. Sparkes: And Dr. Evatt congratulated you.

Mr. WALSH: I will come to that.

I am not disputing the right of Parliament to disallow the proclamations, but I draw attention to some unusual features of the attitude of the splinter group. As the hon. member for Aubigny just interjected, no less a personality than Dr. Evatt, the Leader of the Federal Parliamentary Labour Party, congratulated the Premier and the Queensland Government on the introduction of the Bill. We also received many letters of congratulations from throughout the State.

I remember the significant remarks of the hon. member for Toowoomba when this matter was finally decided by Cabinet. In one of his violent moments of hostility towards the introduction of the measure he said, "You will be sorry for this later on." How true! In the concluding stages of the debate in this Chamber, I said it would not surprise me if the oil companies made inroads into the Labour Party in this State with a view to bringing about the destruction of the Labour Government. What clearer evidence would anyone want of the confirmation of my statement? On my right the hon. member for Toowoomba, who represented the oil interests very effectively in Cabinet, is leading a splinter group consisting of another 23 members. They are now lining up with the traditional enemies of Labour to help in the

destruction of a Labour Government that has been in power for 25 years. They are also lining up with the traditional enemies of Labour to destroy the only piece of legislation that has been introduced into a Parliament in Australia challenging the oil monopolies. I have to concede to the official Opposition, led by the hon. member for Landsborough, that at least they consistently opposed the legislation. But what explanation will the 24 members of the splinter group be able to give the vast body of Labour supporters outside? They voted with the Government a few weeks ago in the passage of the legislation and supported it unanimously in Caucus. At that time you, Mr. Speaker, said that this was the type of legislation that the Labour Government should have introduced years ago. You are not in a position to cast a vote tonight, but the splinter group—the wreckers of the Labour Government—are associating themselves with the official Opposition, on behalf of the oil monopolies of Australia, to prevent the implementation of legislation that represents the only challenge ever made in Australia to those monopolies.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon—Secretary for Public Lands and Irrigation) (11.15 p.m.): I rise to oppose the motion. Although I know full well that the Opposition, with the aid of the breakaway Labour rats, will carry it, I oppose it because, under the laws of the State having regard to the Constitution, the Act was the only effective legislation that could have been brought down to deal with oil combines in Queensland.

The hon. member for Toowoomba said that he had to vote as Cabinet decided. He knows full well that if his conscience pricked him on the matter and he could not conscientiously support the measure, he could have resigned from Cabinet and fought the matter on the floor of Caucus. He did not do so. Let me remind him of an occasion, which I now make public, when I was called upon by him, in the absence of the Premier from the State, to take a certain line of action that was in conflict with my conscience and in conflict with a decision previously arrived at by Cabinet. I did not do it and I told him that I could not in all conscience. I offered my resignation from Cabinet in preference to doing it. I want to expose his hypocrisy in saying he had to vote for the measure because of majority decision. Why did he not resign from Cabinet and fight it on the floor of Caucus?

I oppose the motion with all my heart and soul.

Mr. H. R. GARDNER (Rockhampton) (11.18 p.m.): The Opposition have adopted a rather surprising attitude at such a late hour in the life of the Government. I am not very critical of the members of the official Opposition for they have opposed the measure ever since it was first mooted in Parliament. I think we all believe that the

Liberal-Country Party are the direct representatives of monopolies in the State just as Menzies and Fadden are in the Federal sphere. We do not pledge ourselves to monopolies and monopoly control and we are not financed by them. Those hon. members opposite who voted in the House for the legislation should analyse their actions over the last few weeks. Bukowski has pulled the strings and cracked the whip.

I have in my possession an article that appeared in the morning "Bulletin" of 3 April 1957, which has this to say about Joe Bukowski at the Australian Workers' Union conference in Sydney—

"But Mr. Bukowski agreed that the Premier (Mr. Gair) was following the correct line in demanding a full inquiry into the ramifications of the oil companies in Queensland and Australia generally.

"Mr. Bukowski said that oil companies, more or less, had held the State to ransom.

"But if Mr. Gair has instructed the Prices Commissioner to consider the submissions of the oil companies, then he has somersaulted on his original statements," said Mr. Bukowski.

"He said that one matter which should be dealt with by the Queensland Government was that of compelling oil companies to sell more than one brand of petrol.

"Oil companies, in common with all other forms of business, should be open to competition."

What a change of front! Every hon. member on the other side who was part of the Australian Labour Party machine voted for that legislation. I made an appeal this afternoon when I spoke on the action of the Inner Executive of the Q.C.E. It reminds me of the day when Vince Gair went to the Inner Executive meeting with Jack Duggan while the Bill was being discussed in Parliament. What happened at the second reading? You will recall that the Q.C.E. somersaulted on Joe Bukowski's own advocacy. Duggan voted with the Inner Executive of the Q.C.E. and left the Premier on his own. A modification of the Bill was asked for. Is there any hon. member on my right who can honestly tell the workers of the State that they defend the interests of Labour to fight monopolies. They are claiming that they are the official Australian Labour Party representatives. How are they going to explain their position to the rank and file of the Labour movement when they go outside? When I was in trouble with the Inner Executive of the Q.C.E. I was prepared to accept disciplinary measures, but were these people prepared to carry a simple resolution to ask the Inner Executive to relieve me of my suspension? No, they voted against that simple resolution to help one of their mates. I had placed my faith in mankind. I had believed that at least they would be sincere. We have seen their actions here today. How can they explain

them to the people of Queensland? We on this side of the House will be quite prepared to explain our actions. We will not be afraid to tell the people of Queensland our attitude. There is no excuse for people to vote unanimously in Caucus, to support the Bill in Parliament and vote for it on every division only to say now that they are on the side of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.22 p.m.): I listened very attentively to the hon. member for Rockhampton. I was rather amazed to think that in the dying stages of the session he should suggest that on controversial legislation we should vote with him. Hon. members on the other side do not know very much about responsible government. While there is no Government we should at least give the people an opportunity to say what they think by way of election on controversial legislation. With a new Government coming into power let the people decide whether the legislation is correct. The Government have not the confidence of the electors. To have responsible government we must have a statement from the electors themselves.

Hon. A. JONES (Charters Towers—Secretary for Labour and Industry) (11.24 p.m.): I was astounded at the attitude adopted by some hon. members on the other side. They sat in Caucus and discussed this legislation, they sat in Committee when it was discussed, and "Hansard" shows that they voted consistently in favour of the Bill. I can understand the hon. members for Coorparoo and the Leader of the Opposition. At least they are consistent. They have opposed the legislation right through and we know exactly where they stand but the attitude of some of the other hon. members over there really amazes me. It is a most inconsistent thing. They say that they are the official Labour Party. As members of the official Labour Party two or three months ago they assisted to put this Bill through, but today they say that they will vote against it. I wonder what the position will be if this crowd are elected by some fluke. They passed this legislation a short time ago and now they want to repeal it. (Opposition interjections.) They are prepared to vote against it. That indicates to me that there is something wrong. I cannot imagine a body of men adopting that attitude. As the hon. member for Rockhampton said, this is a matter that was considered by the different Labour organisations over the years. At the meetings I addressed recently I read a resolution that was carried by the Trades and Labour Council a year or two ago asking the Government to take action in connection with oil monopolies. Mr. Bukowski made a similar statement when he suggested that the Government should do something in connection with this matter.

Mr. Jesson: You are a bit worried about being deregistered.

Mr. A. JONES: I was at a place recently and I was told that one hon. member said he knew nothing about the petrol legislation, that it was not explained to them. Hon. members know the composition of the Labour Party. We have our committees and the gentleman who made that statement was on the industrial committee.

Mr. Jesson: I was the chairman of it and I had to get the Parliamentary draftsman to explain it to me. (Government interjections.)

Mr. A. JONES: In reply to the hon. member I point out that he made a report and he moved its adoption. We know the hon. member's attitude in connection with the matter. The day that Cabinet discussed this legislation the hon. member for Toowoomba was not present but he was there when the matter was discussed for some time in Caucus. Everybody knows the resolution was carried unanimously by Caucus. The whole thing satisfies me there has been some collusion between the Opposition and the A.L.P. in connection with this matter. (Opposition interjections.) If I talk for the next hour I know it would not make any difference. It is a sad thing to see that hon. members who took such a prominent stand in Caucus on this matter are now prepared to turn a complete somersault. It proves what the hon. members on this side have said—that hon. members on the other side are now taking instructions from Joe Bukowski at Dunstan House. Immediately the legislation was passed Bukowski was the first to criticise it.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Hiley) be agreed to—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 43.

| | |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Mr. Aikens | Mr. Keyatta |
| " Baxter | " Lloyd |
| " Bjelke-Petersen | " Low |
| " Brown | " Madsen |
| " Byrne | " Marsden |
| " Chalk | " Morris |
| " Clark | " Müller |
| " Davies | " Munro |
| " Dewar | " Nicholson |
| Dr. Dittmer | " Nicklin |
| Mr. Donald | Dr. Noble |
| " Duggan | Mr. Pizzey |
| " Evans | " Roberts |
| " Fletcher | " Sparkes |
| " Forde | " Taylor, H. E. |
| " Graham | " Turner |
| " Gunn | " Wallace |
| " Hanlon | " Wood |
| " Heading | |
| " Hewitt | <i>Tellers :</i> |
| " Hiley | Mr. Herbert |
| " Jesson | " Gaven |
| " Jones, V. E. | |

NOES, 24.

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Mr. Adair | Mr. Hilton |
| " Brosnan | " Jones, A. |
| " Collins | " Moore |
| " Cooper | " Moores |
| " Devries | " Power |
| " Diplock | " Robinson |
| " Dohring | " Skinner |
| " English | " Smith |
| " Foley | " Walsh |
| " Gair | |
| " Gardner, H. R. | <i>Tellers :</i> |
| " Gardner, R. J. | Mr. Rasey |
| " Hadley | " Kehoe |

Resolved in the affirmative.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

Hon. V. C. GAIR (South Brisbane—Premier): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. on Tuesday, 18 June, 1957.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

On Thursday, 13th June, 1957, the following Proclamation was issued by His Excellency the Administrator of the Government:—

A PROCLAMATION by His Excellency the Honourable ALAN JAMES MANSFIELD, Chief Justice of Queensland and Administrator of the Government of the said State and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

[L.S.]

ALAN J. MANSFIELD,
Administrator.

In pursuance of the power and authority vested in me as the Administrator of the Government of the State aforesaid, I, ALAN JAMES MANSFIELD, do, by this my Proclamation, Dissolve the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

Given under my Hand and Seal, at Government House, Brisbane, this thirteenth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and fifty-seven, and in the sixth year of Her Majesty's reign.

By Command,

V. C. GAIR.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!