

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 23 AUGUST 1960**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy



# Queensland Parliamentary Debates

## Legislative Assembly

### FIRST SESSION OF THE THIRTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

#### Appointed to meet

AT BRISBANE ON THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF AUGUST, IN THE NINTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HER MAJESTY QUEEN ELIZABETH II., IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1960.

**TUESDAY, 23 AUGUST, 1960**

#### OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

Pursuant to the proclamation by the Deputy Governor, dated 21 July, 1960, appointing Parliament to meet this day for the dispatch of business, the House met at 12 o'clock noon in the Legislative Assembly Chamber.

The Clerk of Parliament read the proclamation.

#### COMMISSION TO OPEN PARLIAMENT

The Clerk acquainted the House that His Excellency the Governor, not being able conveniently to be present in person this day, had been pleased to cause a Commission to be issued under the public seal of the State, appointing the Hon. George Francis Reuben Nicklin, the Hon. Kenneth James Morris, and the Hon. Jack Charles Allan Pizey, Commissioners in order to the opening and holding of the present session of Parliament.

The Commissioners so appointed being seated on the dais, and the Clerk having read the Commission—

**THE SENIOR COMMISSIONER** (Hon. G. F. R. Nicklin—Landsborough) said: Honourable Members, we have it in command from His Excellency the Governor to let you know that as soon as the Members of the Legislative Assembly have been sworn, the causes of this Parliament being called together will be declared to you; And it being necessary that a Speaker be first chosen, it is His Excellency's pleasure that you proceed to the election of one of your number to be your Speaker, and that you present such person so chosen to His Excellency the Governor, at such time and place as His Excellency shall appoint.

The Premier thereupon produced a Commission under the public seal of the State empowering him, the Hon. George Francis

Reuben Nicklin, the Hon. Kenneth James Morris, and the Hon. Jack Charles Allan Pizey, or any of them, to administer to all or any members or member of the House the oath or affirmation of allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen, which Commission was then read to the House by the Clerk.

#### RETURN OF WRITS

The Clerk informed the House that the writs for the various electoral districts had been returned to him severally endorsed as follows:—

Albert—Cecil Charles Carey.  
Ashgrove—Seymour Douglas Tooth.  
Aspley—Frederick Alexander Campbell.  
Aubigny—Leslie Frank Diplock.  
Balonne—Edwin James Beardmore.  
Barambah—Johannes Bjelke-Petersen.  
Barcoo—Edward William Davis.  
Baroona—Patrick Joseph Hanlon.  
Belmont—Harold Francis Newton.  
Bowen—Peter Roylance Delamothe.  
Brisbane—John Henry Mann.  
Bulimba—John William Houston.  
Bundaberg—Edward Joseph Walsh.  
Burdekin—Arthur Coburn.  
Burke—Alexander James Inch.  
Burnett—Claude Alfred Wharton.  
Cairns—George Walter Gordon Wallace.  
Callide—Vincent Edward Jones.  
Carnarvon—Paul Jerome Remigius Hilton.  
Chatsworth—Thomas Alfred Hiley.  
Clayfield—Harold Bourne Taylor.  
Condamine—Victor Bruce Sullivan.  
Cook—Herbert Arthur Adair.  
Cooroora—David Alan Low.  
Cunningham—Alan Roy Fletcher.  
Fassifern—Adolf Gustave Müller.  
Flinders—William Horace Lonergan.

Greenslopes—Keith William Hooper.  
 Gregory—Wallace Alexander Ramsay  
 Rae.  
 Gympie—Allen Maxwell Hodges.  
 Hawthorne—William Edward Baxter.  
 Hinchinbrook—John Alfred Row.  
 Ipswich East—James Donald.  
 Ipswich West—Ivor Marsden.  
 Isis—Jack Charles Allan Pizzey.  
 Ithaca—Robert Levi Windsor.  
 Kedron—Eric Gayford Lloyd.  
 Kurilpa—Clive Melwyn Hughes.  
 Landsborough—George Francis Reuben  
 Nicklin.  
 Lockyer—Gordon William Wesley  
 Chalk.  
 Logan—Robert Leslie Harrison.  
 Mackay—Frederick Dickson Graham.  
 Mackenzie—Neville Thomas Eric  
 Hewitt.  
 Maryborough—Horace Jason Davies.  
 Merthyr—Samuel Raymond Ramsden.  
 Mirani—Ernest Evans.  
 Mount Coot-tha—Kenneth James Morris.  
 Mount Gravatt—Graham Lloyd Hart.  
 Mourilyan—Peter Byrne.  
 Murrumba—David Eric Nicholson.  
 Norman—Fred Phillip Bromley.  
 Nudgee—John Melloy.  
 Nundah—William Edward Knox.  
 Port Curtis—James Burrows.  
 Redcliffe—James Edward Hiram  
 Houghton.  
 Rockhampton North—Mervyn Herbert  
 Thackeray.  
 Rockhampton South—Reginald Byron  
 Jarvis Pilbeam.  
 Roma—William Manson Ewan.  
 Salisbury—Douglas John Sherrington.  
 Sandgate—Harold Dean.  
 Sherwood—John Desmond Herbert.  
 Somerset—Harold Richter.  
 South Brisbane—Colin James Bennett.  
 South Coast—Eric John Gaven.  
 Tablelands—Thomas Vernon Gilmore.  
 Toowong—Alan Whiteside Munro.  
 Toowoomba East—Mervyn John  
 Reginald Anderson.  
 Toowoomba West—John Edmund  
 Duggan.  
 Townsville North—Percy John Robert  
 Tucker.  
 Townsville South—Thomas Aikens.  
 Warrego—John Joseph Dufficy.  
 Warwick—Otto Ottosen Madsen.  
 Wavell—Alexander Tattenhall Dewar.  
 Whitsunday—Lloyd Henry Scurfield  
 Roberts.  
 Windsor—Percy Raymund Smith.  
 Wynnum—William Morrison Gunn.  
 Yeronga—Henry Winston Noble.

## ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF MULGRAVE

## ISSUE OF NEW WRIT; RETURN OF WRIT

The Clerk informed the House that owing to the death of one of the candidates the writ for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Mulgrave was vacated and a new writ was issued on 19 April, and that the writ had been returned with certificate endorsed thereon of the election on 23 July, 1960, of Roy Alexander Armstrong.

## MEMBERS SWORN

The Commissioners, who with other members of the Ministry, had been sworn in before His Excellency the Governor on 11 August, 1960, and 22 August, 1960, and subscribed the roll, then administered the oath or affirmation of allegiance to the following other members, who thereupon also subscribed the roll—

Adair, Herbert Arthur, Esquire.  
 Aikens, Thomas, Esquire.  
 Anderson, Mervyn John Reginald,  
 Esquire.  
 Armstrong, Roy Alexander, Esquire.  
 Baxter, William Edward, Esquire.  
 Beardmore, Edwin James, Esquire.  
 Bennett, Colin James, Esquire.  
 Bjelke-Petersen, Johannes, Esquire.  
 Bromley, Fred Phillip, Esquire.  
 Byrne, Peter, Esquire.  
 Campbell, Frederick Alexander, Esquire.  
 Carey, Cecil Charles, Esquire.  
 Coburn, Arthur, Esquire.  
 Davies, Horace Jason, Esquire.  
 Davis, Edward William, Esquire.  
 Dean, Harold, Esquire.  
 Delamothe, Peter Roynance, Esquire.  
 Dewar, Alexander Tattenhall, Esquire.  
 Diplock, Leslie Frank, Esquire.  
 Donald, James, Esquire.  
 Dufficy, John Joseph, Esquire.  
 Duggan, John Edmund, Esquire.  
 Ewan, William Manson, Esquire.  
 Gaven, Eric John, Esquire.  
 Gilmore, Thomas Vernon, Esquire.  
 Graham, Frederick Dickson, Esquire.  
 Gunn, William Morrison, Esquire.  
 Hanlon, Patrick Joseph, Esquire.  
 Harrison, Robert Leslie, Esquire.  
 Hart, Graham Lloyd, Esquire.  
 Herbert, John Desmond, Esquire.  
 Hewitt, Neville Thomas Eric, Esquire.  
 Hilton, The Honourable Paul Jerome  
 Remigius  
 Hodges, Allen Maxwell, Esquire.  
 Hooper, Keith William, Esquire.  
 Houghton, James Edward Hiram,  
 Esquire.  
 Houston, John William, Esquire.  
 Hughes, Clive Melwyn, Esquire.  
 Inch, Alexander James, Esquire.  
 Jones, Vincent Edward, Esquire.  
 Knox, William Edward, Esquire.  
 Lloyd, Eric Gayford, Esquire  
 Lonergan, William Horace, Esquire.  
 Low, David Alan, Esquire.  
 Mann, John Henry, Esquire.

Marsden, Ivor, Esquire.  
 Melloy, John, Esquire.  
 Müller, Adolf Gustave, Esquire.  
 Newton, Harold Francis, Esquire.  
 Nicholson, David Eric, Esquire.  
 Pilbeam, Reginald Byron Jarvis, Esquire.  
 Rae, Wallace Alexander Ramsay,  
 Esquire.  
 Ramsden, Samuel Raymond, Esquire.  
 Richter, Harold, Esquire.  
 Row, John Alfred, Esquire.  
 Sherrington, Douglas John, Esquire.  
 Smith, Percy Raymond, Esquire.  
 Sullivan, Victor Bruce, Esquire.  
 Taylor, Harold Bourne, Esquire.  
 Thackeray, Mervyn Herbert, Esquire.  
 Tooth, Seymour Douglas, Esquire.  
 Tucker, Percy John Robert, Esquire.  
 Wallace, George Walter Gordon,  
 Esquire.  
 Walsh, Edward Joseph, Esquire.  
 Wharton, Claude Alfred, Esquire.  
 Windsor, Robert Levi, Esquire.

### ELECTION OF SPEAKER

**Hon. J. C. A. PIZZEY** (Isis—Minister for Education and Migration) (12.25 p.m.): Now that all hon. members have signed the roll the House has the important duty of electing a Speaker. It is a great privilege and pleasure for me to nominate Mr. David Eric Nicholson to take the chair of the House as Speaker. I move—

“That Mr. David Eric Nicholson do take the chair of the House as Speaker.”

Since I have been in the House, that is, since 1950, we have been fortunate in our selection of Speakers. I served as a private member under the Speakership of the late Mr. Sam Brassington, who was followed by Mr. John Mann, and, in the recent Parliament, by Mr. Alan Fletcher. I think all hon. members will agree that those three Speakers upheld in every way the high traditions of their important office. We may not all have agreed with them on every occasion, but I believe they did what they thought was right in carrying out their duties. We were particularly fortunate in the last Parliament in having a very capable and able Speaker in Alan Fletcher. I am quite confident that my nominee today, David Nicholson, will continue to uphold the prestige of this office and will maintain the decorum and dignity of the House. He has had considerable experience as Chairman of Committees. Those who have seen him in action in that position know that he has all the attributes necessary to qualify him for the office of Speaker.

**Mr. Walsh:** When was he Chairman of Committees?

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Temporary Chairman of Committees. He has acted as Chairman of Committees, and on those occasions I think hon. members were very impressed with the capable way in which he controlled the

debates. He does not come to this important position without a considerable amount of experience.

He is a man of irreproachable character, quick decision, and steady nerve. Any of you who knew him in his younger days would agree with that. He is also tolerant and has a good sense of humour. Above all, I believe that he has what Australians always look for: a high degree of the sense of fair play and impartiality in dealing with all hon. members.

Tradition and custom have conferred on Mr. Speaker a position of great importance, great dignity, and great authority.

I do not intend today to go into any historical details of the development of this position, but we do know that he is the guardian of the rights of Parliament, not only against encroachment by the Crown, which today does not occur, but against encroachment by the Executive.

In this House we are all members, equal in status in the eyes of the Speaker. His main function, of course, is to preside over the House in full assembly, but that is not his only responsibility; he has to maintain order, and I have no doubt that every member who has just been sworn in will realise his responsibilities fully and give the Speaker every support in maintaining order and maintaining the high prestige and dignity of this House of ours. He has to protect the rights of minorities.

**Mr. Aikens:** That will be a novelty.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** Well, minorities have had their rights. They have been very well protected.

**Mr. Aikens:** I haven't had any rights.

**Mr. PIZZEY:** I do not think that any hon. member can claim that he has not had more than a fair go from the various Speakers over the last 10 years. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that most Speakers have stretched a point to give extra concessions to those who are not representative of any major political party. Anyway, Speakers in the past have looked after—as no doubt David Nicholson, the Speaker-elect, will do—the interests of members of a minority party or independents in this House.

The Speaker also has to control the affairs of Parliament itself. During the last few weeks, however, there has been a hiatus in the office of Speaker due to the appointment of Mr. Fletcher to Cabinet rank. During that time I think that not only members on this side of the House, but all members who know of his control of Parliament, will acknowledge that the choosing of David Nicholson as Speaker was a wise move indeed, and I am sure we will give him all our support. I have much pleasure in nominating him to take the chair as Speaker.

**Mr. SMITH (Windsor)** (12.33 p.m.): I have very much pleasure in seconding the nomination by the Minister for Education and Migration of David Nicholson as Speaker of this House. The hon. gentleman said that to a large extent Mr. Nicholson was untried, which is correct, but, to a degree, it is also incorrect in that we have seen, throughout the life of the last Parliament, Mr. Nicholson acting as Temporary Chairman of Committees. Since the beginning of this new Parliament he has been acting as Speaker and he has discharged the duties with skill and attention. Quite apart from the domestic chores that the Speakership entails, which I have no doubt hon. members will acknowledge have been performed so effectively by Mr. Nicholson, I am sure he will perform his duties in this House with ability equal to that which he has already displayed over the past weeks.

It was remarked by way of interjection from the hon. member who formerly represented the seat of Mundingburra—

**Mr. Aikens:** Don't stick your neck out or I will cut your head right off.

**Mr. SMITH:** I remind the House of some of the historical features of this high office.

**Mr. Aikens:** I at least come along to the House to attend to my business. You will not find me up at the Supreme Court when I should be here.

**Mr. SMITH:** In a democracy today it is interesting, in passing to recall how, in times past, the position of Speaker was not highly regarded and the life of the nominee was usually in jeopardy.

We had an instance of that in the reign of King Charles at the time of the Long Parliament. In 1640, at the commencement of that Parliament, King Charles appointed William Lenthall to the office of Speaker. He had an almost uninterrupted reign until 1662. On 4 January, 1642, two (2) years after the appointment of Lenthall as Speaker, the King came to Parliament to seize five members whose speeches had displeased him. The hon. member for Townsville South, who has just interjected, can be thankful indeed that times have changed, because I am sure many of his speeches would have roused the Crown to ire long before 1960, and if times had not changed his head would have fallen and rolled in the gutter a long time ago. Although Lenthall, the Speaker at that time, was a nominee of the King, he refused to name the five hon. members I have referred to. He showed the courage that is required of the occupant of this high position.

A Speaker has to cope with unruly hon. members as well as deal with all other problems, and in this Parliament we are not without unruly hon. members.

I have no hesitation in endorsing the nomination, but I am moved to comment on the events of the last few months. If the

office of Speaker is vacant, as it has been in the past few months, in my opinion Parliament should be convened without delay in order that a nomination can be submitted. The affairs of the House would then be controlled by the person who is entitled to the post by right as well as by any other way. I sincerely hope that in similar circumstances in future we shall not have to wait for weeks after the elections before we assemble to choose a Speaker.

I endorse the sentiments that have been expressed and trust that all hon. members will elect the hon. member for Murrumba to the high post of Speaker without demur.

**Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South)** (12.33 p.m.): I have some remarks to direct in very serious vein to the Speaker-elect and hon. members.

This Assembly has inherited from the House of Commons many good practices and customs. It has also inherited many practices and customs that are a travesty of democracy. For instance, it is a travesty of true democracy that this is the only time I can make the remarks I am about to make, that is, before we have a Speaker in the chair. If I were to make them after the Speaker had been elected to the chair, he would, in accordance with the customs, privileges and precedents of this Parliament, rule me out of order. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that one of the customs that we inherited from the House of Commons was to preserve the so-called sanctity of the judiciary. No hon. member of this Parliament, either in or out of it, can criticise the judiciary or express any dissatisfaction at all with their actions or with the sentences they inflict. If he does so during the course of a debate, the Speaker will rule him out of order on the ground that his remarks constitute a reflection on the judiciary, and he will tell the hon. member, as I have been told frequently by the hon. member for Brisbane, the hon. member for Cunningham and the late Mr. Brassington when they occupied the office of Speaker, that the only way in which hon. members can discuss the actions of a member of the judiciary is to move a substantive motion. But if an hon. member does move a substantive motion, as I did last year, it will be placed by the Premier at the bottom of the business sheet and will never be debated or even noted upon. In saying that I am not making a political attack on the present Premier, because any Premier would do the same thing. The motion would never be dealt with, and would be automatically wiped out at the end of the session.

One thing that is agitating the minds of the people of Queensland more than anything else today is the dreadful toll of the road and the death and destruction caused by drunken drivers.

I want to assure hon. members that I have no intention of taking undue advantage of the position in which I find myself by

launching a personal attack on any member of the judiciary. If I did so in the present circumstances, I should be both cowardly and churlish, and I am too old to become either.

**Mr. Walsh:** Nevertheless you are doing it.

**Mr. AIKENS:** No, I am not going to launch an attack on any member of the judiciary. I am going to address my remarks particularly to the Press and the people of Queensland to show just where this Parliament fails in its very essence in claiming that it is a democratic institution.

Recently, in Northern Queensland, two drunken drivers in separate towns, one in Townsville and one in Cairns, ran down and killed—while they were hopelessly drunk—innocent people. A man named John Matthew Watson of Cairns ran down and killed a little boy while he, Watson, was hopelessly drunk. He ran him down and killed him on a straight road in broad daylight in shocking circumstances; so much so, that the jury in Cairns had no hesitation in finding him guilty of manslaughter. Mr. Justice Jeffriess, I think, erred a little on the side of leniency when he sentenced Watson to five years' imprisonment.

Prior to Watson's case, a man named Eberle, in Townsville, howling drunk, driving on a straight road, brilliantly lit, on a bright moonlight night, came up at terrific speed behind two youths, pedalling home from A.T.C., with bright tail-lights on their cycles, and ran them down and killed them both. He dragged the bicycle of one young boy 600 feet under the bumper bar of his car, and probably would not have stopped but for the noise and the sparks that were occasioned by the bicycle being under the bumper bar. He, too, was found guilty of manslaughter by a Townsville jury; he, too, was sentenced to five years' imprisonment by Mr. Justice Jeffriess. He did not appeal within the legal time limit. Watson, however, did appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal, which was constituted by Mr. Justice Wanstall, Mr. Justice Mack and Mr. Justice Stable. In their judgment delivered on 12 April this year, they found that the sentence, despite the shocking circumstances, despite the fact that the killer was drunk, despite the fact that he was driving dangerously—to use their words—was "manifestly excessive," and it was reduced from five years to 18 months. Mr. Justice Wanstall, attempting to be either facetious or ponderously sarcastic, said that a strict enforcement of the law was a more effective deterrent to road negligence than heavy court sentences in the rare cases of convictions for manslaughter. To put it in plain words, so that the people of Queensland will understand, the Court of Criminal Appeal, through these three judges, said two things: firstly, that innocent human life in Queensland is cheap today, as long as the instrument of death is a car driven by a drunk, and secondly, that they believe that

only by a strict enforcement of the law by everyone, except the judges of the Court of Criminal Appeal.

I really think, Mr. Nicholson, and I address my remarks to you, as you are the Speaker-elect—

**Mr. Walsh:** Mr. Dunlop, you mean. Mr. Nicholson is not the Speaker yet.

**Mr. AIKENS:** He will be. The Government have had their Caucus meeting just as the hon. member's party had its. I want you, Mr. Nicholson, to ponder on what I have to say to you. You will be the Speaker of this House for three years, and I think one of your first duties should be to see to it that hon. members are given an opportunity—once a year will be enough—to tell the members of the judiciary just what the people of Queensland think of their actions, and particularly of their sentences for drunken driving.

**Mr. Walsh:** The Speaker cannot lay that down.

**Mr. AIKENS:** Just listen to me! The hon. member for Bundaberg, who managed to get into Parliament just by the skin of his nose, interjects that Mr. Speaker cannot lay that down. I will tell him what Mr. Speaker can do and I will tell him what Mr. Speaker can, and will, I hope, make one of his first jobs—namely, the convening of a conference representative of all parties in this House to devise some means of altering the Standing Orders to give hon. members of this Assembly the opportunity—one day a year will be sufficient—to tell the members of the judiciary, in restrained and decent debate, just what the people of Queensland are thinking about their actions and the sentences they inflict.

**Mr. Coburn:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. AIKENS:** I am glad to have a remark of commendation at any rate from one of the free members of this Assembly, the hon. member for Burdekin. I think it is about time that we, as the elected representatives of the people of Queensland, told the judges what the people think. I have no doubt about the sincerity of the judges; I am not attacking that. I believe Mr. Justice Wanstall was mistakenly sincere when he made that outrageously either sarcastic or hypocritical statement. I believe he thought he was saying and doing the right thing. I believe that Mr. Justice Mack and Mr. Justice Stable thought they were doing the right thing in letting a drunken murderer off with an 18-month sentence. Eberle's sentence was also later reduced. So much so that in Queensland today, no matter how drunk a man gets, no matter how fast he drives, and in no matter what terrible circumstances he kills an innocent pedestrian, or an innocent cyclist, or an innocent motorist, he can be sentenced to only 18 months' gaol.

**Mr. Bennett:** That is rot.

**Mr. AIKENS:** It is not rot. It is a ruling by the Court of Criminal Appeal. The other day in a drunken brawl in Townsville one man bit a small piece out of the ear of another man and he was sent to gaol for two years for it. I have no quarrel with the verdict and I have no quarrel with the sentence, but, if the assailant had taken his victim out into the middle of Flinders Street and run him down with a car and killed him, in accordance with the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeal he could have been sentenced only to a maximum of 18 months' gaol.

**Mr. Bennett:** Rubbish!

**Mr. AIKENS:** I will debate the issue with the legal know-all from South Brisbane in plenty of time. If he wants to lock horns with me he is as welcome as the flowers in May. I am talking on a very serious subject. I am talking of the innocent pedestrian who while crossing the road is run down and killed by a drunken or speeding motorist. I am talking of little boys who are going home from school or from A.T.C. training or practice or from anywhere else, riding their bicycles, and are run down from behind and killed by drunken, speeding motorists, and I am talking of judges who mouth the belief that everyone else except themselves should enforce the law. I want the opportunity, at any rate, as the representative of a very important section of the people of Queensland, to tell the judges what the people of Queensland are thinking and saying about the flippant attitude that is being adopted by far too many of them towards the ghastly carnage that is occurring on our roads today. I hope Mr. Nicholson can convene a conference representative of all the parties in the House, and evolve or devise some means by which we can debate the issue once a year in the Chamber without going through the flim-flam and flummery of a substantive motion that will never be debated and never be voted upon. Later I intend to ask a question. You cannot even ask a question about the judges, but in a couple of days' time I shall ask a question based on these two shocking cases, and, in accordance with the Standing Orders and the customs and traditions of Parliament, Mr. Speaker will of necessity be compelled to rule most, if not all, of my question out of order and delete it from the business sheet. So are we hamstrung in our attempt to tell the judges what the people are thinking about their flippant attitude towards the toll of the road! If Mr. Nicholson can convene the conference and if he can give us, as the elected representatives of the people, the opportunity to tell the judges what the people are thinking, then he will go down in history as one of the great Speakers of this Assembly.

**Mr. WALSH** (Bundaberg) (12.50 p.m.): Mr. Dunlop, this is an unusual situation where, as the hon. member for Townsville South has said, hon. members are allowed very wide freedom in discussing not only the election of

Speaker, but also any other matter that may, as he has indicated, be brought before hon. members prior to the election of the Speaker.

**Mr. Aikens:** And that cannot be debated at any other time after the Speaker is elected.

**Mr. WALSH:** We realise that. And the hon. member, I would say quite calmly, has dealt with one of his pet subjects—his references to the judiciary. He has not even gone as far as he might have done, compared with previous criticism in the House when he actually attacked certain judges.

Far be it from me to attack a judge in his position as judge; but once he goes outside that position, or before he is appointed to it, I think I can claim the right to make remarks about him. The previous Speaker did in fact rule out portion of a notice of motion that was given here by the former Leader of the Queensland Labour Party, the then hon. member for South Brisbane, who I think will be missed in this House and whose defeat was, I think, poor recompense for the service he gave to democracy and to Parliament. The Speaker may have been under the impression that he was entitled to give such a ruling, but if Mr. Nicholson, Mr. Gaven, Mr. Taylor, or even Mr. Aikens becomes Speaker here—

**Mr. Aikens:** I would be better than Johnno Mann. I would make up the Standing Orders as I went along.

**Mr. WALSH:** If the hon. member wants to make the headlines, I might even nominate the hon. member for Brisbane.

The previous Speaker may have felt that he was justified in ruling in that way, but I hope that future Speakers will have strict regard for the Standing Orders of this House as well as the rulings that have been laid down in Erskine May over the years during which that journal of Parliamentary procedure has been compiled. If the Speaker at that time had only looked at the authorities set out in May, he would have seen that it has been laid down by the Speaker of the House of Commons that it is competent to criticise any member of that House in any capacity and in any position other than as a member of the House. I remember the hon. member for Mirani taking exception here to my referring to his position as chairman of directors of Farleigh mill. If a person was secretary of a trade union and also a member of this House, it would be absurd if you could not refer to his activities as an official of a trade union. Before Lord Beaverbrook became a member of the House of Lords, he was a member of the House of Commons and was also editor of a paper. He was being criticised by another member in the House of Commons, and the question was raised as to the right of that member to so criticise him. The Speaker of the House of Commons ruled that it was quite proper for the member to criticise Lord Beaverbrook in his capacity as editor of a paper.

My desire at the time was to criticise the appointment of Mr. C. G. Wanstall, whose appointment was obviously political. I was hostile to it because in my view no member of the judiciary is competent to act where he shows either political or religious prejudice against any section of the community.

**Mr. Ramsden:** What about Dr. Evatt?

**Mr. WALSH:** Dr. Evatt has sworn allegiance to the Queen and is now a member of the judiciary. He will occupy the position with distinction, as he did every other judicial position that he held. What he did in politics is another matter.

**Mr. Chalk:** You are trying to wriggle out of it.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am not wriggling out of it. The views I am now expressing are no different from those that I have always expressed. I never at any stage identified myself with the charge that Dr. Evatt was a Communist, and if Australia can produce more men of his legal capacity to give service similar to that given by him in the international sphere, it will be better for Australia and for the world.

Let us be fair in these things.

**Mr. Hiley:** On your line of argument you would have opposed the appointment of Mr. Justice Brennan.

**Mr. WALSH:** At the moment I am making the speech; the hon. gentleman can make his later. I have the right to discuss the position of a judge when he identifies himself with controversial political matters as a witness in a court.

**Mr. Aikens** interjected.

**Mr. WALSH:** We heard the hon. member in silence.

**Mr. Aikens:** Will you admit that you could not say these things once Mr. Speaker occupies the chair?

**Mr. WALSH:** I have already admitted that. There are many other things that I intend to say later on.

**Mr. Aikens:** Are you going to support me for a day of open debate on the judiciary?

**Mr. WALSH:** I know that the hon. member for Townsville South—I have to remember the new name for his electorate—will at least pay me the tribute that I know something about the procedure here. We would not be looking to Mr. Speaker or to the Premier to rule the subject matter out of order; it goes much further than that. The judges are protected in other ways outside the Chamber altogether, and rightly so, so do not let us be humbugging on that matter either.

I am taking advantage now of the situation which would have arisen by disagreeing with Mr. Speaker's ruling. Naturally I would have to give the reasons. In that case it will

be remembered that a barrister, having identified himself in the way he did with the Foley case, broke all the ethics of his profession by travelling to dig out the evidence to be levelled against this man. Why would I subscribe to that when it was so deeply political? If no-one else wanted to express his opinion on the appointment I considered that I had to because I do not think anybody should carry his religious or political prejudices into public administration, more particularly the judiciary.

If I am asked to qualify my attitude towards Mr. C. G. Wanstall—and I am not obliged to—I can remember what happened when we were sitting on the other side of the Chamber. And there will be a day when those who subscribe to the Queensland Labour Party principles will be sitting there.

Perhaps I might make a suggestion at this stage. I know that the Premier has an appointment at 7.15 p.m., and no doubt others will have the same appointment. But I want to exercise my rights and if it is going to inconvenience the House the Premier might suggest that the House adjourn until the normal resumption time at 2.15 p.m.

**Mr. Aikens:** He can't.

**Mr. WALSH:** Let us be fair about this. If the Premier wants to go on until we all finish—

**Mr. Aikens:** No Rafferty rules while I am here.

**Mr. Nicklin:** Carry on.

**Mr. WALSH:** I should like everybody to understand that if I sit down now this is not my last say by any means. I have a lot to say. In case anyone is under any misapprehension on the rights of my colleagues, Messrs. Hilton, Diplock and Adair, I suggest that they study Standing Orders and the Rules of Practice.

**Mr. Mann:** We know all about that.

**Mr. WALSH:** That is all right, as long as the hon. member knows it, but there are a lot of new members who do not.

My attitude towards Mr. Wanstall when he was a member of this House, despite all the criticism levelled at him from hon. members who sat on the same side of the Chamber as I, was that I never under-estimated his ability and his capacity as a legal man.

I would say during my time in Parliament he had one of the keenest analytical minds in this House and he caused the Government of the day, of which I was a member, more anxiety because of his capacity to analyse the controversial aspects of a measure more effectively than any other member in the House. So let us be fair about it; I admire his capacity, but I should hate to think that any member of the judiciary could be appointed merely because of his political or other affiliations.

**Mr. Ramsden:** You would not have his affiliations prevent his being appointed, would you?

**Mr. WALSH:** Not as long as he did not exhibit his prejudices. Just as the Speaker of the House of Commons does, he dissociates himself entirely from any organisations, clubs, and similar bodies that can be taken as being identified with controversial political or similar matters. If Mr. Nicholson is to be the Speaker—and there is no guarantee of that yet—and if he is a member of the Queensland Club, I hope he will resign from it.

**A Government Member:** What is wrong with the Queensland Club?

**Mr. WALSH:** It is a den of iniquity. More political plots are hatched there than in any other place in Brisbane.

**Mr. Hiley:** All you are sore about is that he was instrumental in having corruption found against your colleague.

**Mr. WALSH:** The Treasurer has given me the opening but I will not come at it yet. However, do not be worried. I have it here.

**Mr. Aikens:** If you won't read it, give it to me and I will.

**Mr. WALSH:** It is here in my own handwriting. I remind the Treasurer, having regard to the pertinency of the interjections, that Mr. Justice Townley did find that Mr. Foley did not benefit materially or financially.

**Mr. Hiley:** Did you read the rest of the findings?

**Mr. WALSH:** I have read them as carefully as, and probably more carefully than, the Treasurer. There are members of this House, including the spies who gave the information to Mr. Wanstal, as he was when he was appearing before the Royal Commission, who knew my attitude long before that Royal Commission was appointed. I investigated the matters that were raised and, on the judge's findings, convinced myself that Mr. Foley had not benefited financially or materially. So why should I or any other member of this House "pick him"?

Who did benefit? That is the point. And if he had corrupted his office, there are simple deeds done that likewise could be interpreted as being corrupt. I have never accepted the argument, on the legal definition of the word "corrupt," that others have not corrupted their offices just as much.

**Mr. Hooper:** Why did you kick him out?

**Mr. WALSH:** We did not kick him out.

**Mr. Hooper:** You took him back only when the split occurred.

**Mr. WALSH:** It would appear that unity tickets circulate not only in the trade-union movement but also here in the election of

the Speaker. We have the display of the Minister for Education and Migration moving the election of a senior member of the Country Party as Speaker, and a member of the Liberal Party seconding the motion.

I should have thought that these people, and many others in the House who are such sticklers for procedure, and have respect for and recognition of authority, customs and practices, would have respected the position of the hon. member for Clayfield. Apparently we have got away from that matter.

**Mr. Aikens:** Are you going to nominate him?

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member will know if he waits a moment. The question that arises is who should be the Speaker. The matter is dealt with on page 5 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly as printed in 1951 and subsequently amended. Standing Order No. 9 deals with the procedure to be followed in the event of a vacancy in the office, No. 10 covers the appointment of a deputy in the unavoidable absence of the Speaker, and No. 11 covers the procedure to be followed during the temporary absence of the Speaker during a session. Those circumstances have arisen in my experience from time to time. On the death or resignation of a Speaker a vacancy occurs in the office, and in accordance with Standing Order No. 9 the Clerk has to report the same to the House and has then to conduct the business of the House as he is conducting it today.

Standing Order No. 10 sets out the procedure to be followed in the unavoidable absence of the Speaker. I notice that the Chairman of Committees is recognised as the person who should take the chair in that event. The temporary absence of the Speaker during a sitting is covered by Standing Order No. 11, and again the Chairman of Committees is authorised to take the chair. Not only is the right of the Chairman of Committees protected in the Standing Orders but it is also protected in the Constitution Act, which clearly recognises that the Chairman of Committees is the likely successor to the Speaker in the event of the death of the Speaker or his unavoidable or temporary absence.

If it is usual to depend on custom and precedent, the obvious nominee on this occasion would be the hon. member for Clayfield. I have some suggestions to make to the Premier on matters pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Speaker, and I hope that my suggestions will be treated seriously. The duties of the Speaker cover not only control of the proceedings of the House and things that occur within the precincts of the House, but also extend to what might be described as the administrative functions of the House. The position was envisaged by the hon. member for Windsor, if that is his electorate.

**Mr. Aikens:** He does not know what he is.

**Mr. WALSH:** I know he is a Liberal, and I do not like his politics.

**Mr. Dewar:** You do not like yourself.

**Mr. WALSH:** That may be true, but there are over 5,000 people in Bundaberg who apparently like me.

The suggestions I am going to make merit serious consideration. The period between the dissolution and reassembly of Parliament is a lengthy one, and I cannot find anywhere in the Standing Orders a rule that gives a Speaker-elect authority to administer the functions of the House.

I cannot find that. I know we have accepted it as a custom over the years. I am not complaining about that. If I have any complaint at all—

**Mr. Aikens:** You have been just as lax.

**Mr. WALSH:** Well, if the Governments of the past have been just as lax, what does that matter? The hon. member from South Townsville does not expect me to admit it, does he? I think consideration could be given, in circumstances such as exist in this particular instance, to the appointment of an authority—call it what you like—to administer the functions of the House in the event of there being no Speaker, or no accepted Speaker-elect. If it will help I make this suggestion without prejudice, I should say that the Premier of the day would be one of the authorities, the Leader of the Opposition might be another, and the Clerk of the Parliament might be the other.

**Mr. Aikens:** What if they are both defeated at the poll?

**Mr. WALSH:** We can overcome that. If the hon. member consults the Standing Orders, he will find that there are certain committees that function from session to session. Their positions do not become vacant until the next session, and the Premier then gives notice of the appointment of a new committee. So far as I can see from the Standing Orders—I have not consulted the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt on this—

**Mr. Aikens:** You will be worse off if you do that.

**Mr. Hiley:** The committees of Parliament go out on the dissolution of Parliament.

**Mr. WALSH:** If the Treasurer has any information to that effect, I shall be glad to hear it. I know specific committees are dealt with in the Standing Orders. I do not know that they are affected by the dissolution of Parliament in the same way as a member of Parliament. It may be that they are. It is something that may be given consideration.

Before I proceed to argue on the election of Speakers, there are a few things I think we should look at that should be of concern

not only to members of this House, but to everybody who subscribes to the democratic way of life. If I have to say a little bit about myself, it will be very brief. I can say I am here in spite of a full-scale blast to oust me. I know that politics is a hard game, and a tough game, and there are times when you have to play it hard. I have had a feeling over the past three years, having regard to the assault on me by the A.L.P. and the Liberal Party, that I have been a little too friendly.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why don't you be like me and turn the other cheek?

**Mr. WALSH:** To bring about my defeat—and not without some underground association with the Opposition—they selected as the A.L.P. candidate a man who, to my knowledge, had never been in the A.L.P. prior to last September.

**Mr. Lloyd:** Are you squealing?

**Mr. WALSH:** If the hon. member for Kedron has ever known me to squeal in this House—

**Mr. Davies:** If that is true, what would have been the result if he had been in there longer?

**Mr. WALSH:** On my left is the hon. member for Maryborough, who knows the truth of the statement I am making. This man's application for membership to the A.L.P. was submitted last August.

**Mr. Davies:** I did not say the A.L.P.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am saying it. The hon. member cannot deny it, though I would not expect him to admit it. Nominations closed on 28 November and, owing to the arrangement that was made, no other person qualified under the rules of the A.L.P. would be nominated and the Q.C.E. would endorse this man.

I go further and look at my genial friend sitting on the Government front bench, the hon. member for Isis. He knows that the same man was a member of his party; in fact, he joined the party after I became the hon. member for Bundaberg.

**Mr. Aikens:** Joined the Country Party?

**Mr. WALSH:** Joined the Country Party and was in fact a financial member.

**Mr. Aikens:** What a motley crew they have become.

**Mr. WALSH:** So wouldn't I have some gratification for having succeeded in repelling this blast, the biggest one that has ever been put on me in my political history? Even Johnno went up there in 1957 and did his best to defeat me, but he realised what a hopeless task it was.

I have not finished my story yet. I am not damning this man as a citizen—not at all. And I know that he was approached

by the other side to stand for them, but there are men sitting on the Government front bench—

**Mr. Aikens:** You could say all this in the Address-in-Reply debate, you know.

**Mr. WALSH:** Oh, yes, but I will have a lot of other things to say in that debate and my speech in it will be limited to 40 minutes. No doubt later the Premier will complain about me, and other hon. members opposite may join in the complaint. But I am merely exercising my right as a member of Parliament; I am not even abusing it. I have made the statement. There it is. The man was never a member of the Australian Labour Party. He was a member of the Country Party. In his time he had been a member of the Union that the hon. member for Ipswich elected led so successfully for many years, and I know he is still a strong supporter of it—the Queensland Colliery Employees' Union. In that case he worked, of course, and paid his union affiliation fees, just as Liberals, Communists, members of the Country Party and people of all other political beliefs have to pay their affiliation fees. That is in accordance with rules properly determined and it is no good complaining about it. But, in addition to that, they peddled that great monster, sectarianism. Not once to me did they raise it in the House, but I have become sick and tired of those people who, underground, go round damning the Q.L.P. as a Catholic party. I could just as easily damn the A.L.P. as a Catholic party, but where would that get us? And why should it be done in politics? If anybody wants to take me on that one let him do so. In every Q.L.P. electorate in the last fortnight of the election campaign this thing was heavily "vetted" underground.

**Mr. Aikens:** You don't know what a filthy campaign is! Come up and hear the A.L.P. on me in my area and then you will have something to talk about. They get right down in the cesspit.

**Mr. Mann:** We will start on you next time.

**Mr. Aikens:** You have been saying that for many, many years. I will be here when you are dead, and you will die unwept, unhonoured, and unsung. Not even the boys from Spring Hill will go to your funeral.

**Mr. WALSH:** I should like the Minister for Justice to look into another matter. I do not know what he can do about it, but if I make the statements here, at least the onus is on him to do something.

I know that many low things can be done in politics—I only know of them: I have never been identified with them—but when it comes to the stage that canvassers for a political party have to invalidate the votes of aged and sick people, I do not think anything could be lower. I asked the scrutineer who acted on my behalf to take the names on at least three postal votes of old people that

were put in. One or two of them have since died of old age, and the name of one of them had been on the roll, I think, since 1895. Worse still, the person concerned in association with another party had accepted appointment as a justice of the peace.

**Mr. Aikens:** What person, and what party? Come on, don't be vague about it. If you want to tip the tin, tip it.

**Mr. WALSH:** I have never allowed the hon. member for Townsville South to make my speech for me. I am saying it in my own way. I am not going to name the party and I do not want at this stage to identify the person who is a justice of the peace.

**Mr. Aikens:** I would tag him if he did it to me.

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member may not have as much decency in him as I have.

**Mr. Aikens:** You are completely unscrupulous in the political game. You could give me 10 yards in 100 and beat me.

**Mr. WALSH:** In this case, where the letters "J.P." had been inserted on the outside of the envelope and the elderly, sick people said they had voted for Mr. Walsh, they did not proceed with the rest of the signature.

**Mr. Bennett:** You want to ask Brian Mullins what he did.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am not concerned with what the hon. member did. He had better keep his bib out of this for the time being.

**Mr. Bennett:** People living in glass houses should not throw stones.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am not living in a glass house. The hon. member can have his say for three years, and perhaps we might be pushing up the daisies by then. We have little say in how much time we spend on this earth.

I got my scrutineer to compare the writing on the envelope to which I have referred with that on envelopes containing other absentee votes, and there was no doubt in his mind who the party was. I have since had it confirmed by a friend of the wife of one of the men who collected the ballot papers. Apart from what I have said about other matters, it will be realised that they have left no stone unturned to unseat Walsh, the hon. member for Bundaberg. The last candidate they stood against me was a man named Green. That was his name, but not his colour! I do not know where he is now; he is probably a member of the Country Party. There may be others, even in this House at the present time. But there is one thing I can do: if anyone likes to challenge me I can bring in my first union ticket which was issued in 1911 when I was well under 21 years of age, and my first W.P.O. ticket, again issued when I was well under 21 years of age, at a time when there was no Labour Government and no conscript unionism.

Because of my remarks I suppose I shall be branded as a supporter of Santamaria, Catholic Action, or something else, but I make no apologies to anybody for my fight against Communists and Communism in this State over the years that I have been in Parliament, as well as on the public platform. If there is any doubt in the minds of the latecomers into the fight against Communism about my attitude I ask them to look at my contributions to the debates in this House in 1944 and 1945 when Russia was still an ally fighting with Great Britain. I made it clear then that, as I saw the future, as the great claw of the Russian bear was thrust out, more and more territory would be claimed and Russia would become the greatest imperialist nation in history. I still subscribe to the attitude I adopted in those years although I was not supported by some members of my own party.

**Mr. Aikens:** Which ones?

**Mr. WALSH:** I had better not bring the hon. member into it. He will remember when he was on the Communist ticket at the Townsville City Council elections.

**Mr. Aikens:** That is about as silly as all the rest of the things you are saying. The Communist ticket is the A.L.P. ticket in Townsville.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am talking about some years ago.

**Mr. Aikens:** Oh, the blacks were bad!

**Mr. WALSH:** Because of the infiltration of Communists, not only into the A.L.P. but also into many other phases of community life, the whole parliamentary system of the State and country is threatened.

**Mr. Mann:** What nonsense!

**Mr. WALSH:** If I can get the hon. member for Brisbane, the Leader of the Opposition, and other members of the A.L.P. en bloc to denounce Communism publicly in the House and give their pledge to the Queensland people that they are prepared to take the platform to engage actively in the fight against Communism then I shall—

**Mr. Wallace:** We did it many years before you came into it.

**Mr. WALSH:** Mr. Dunlop has heard me. Far be it from me to say that I was the first. I can remember the time when they had the hon. member for Cairns tabbed, not that I ever tabbed him. One of the things I had to resist was that element in the Labour Party that wanted to brand every militant unionist as a Communist. I always objected to that just as I have objected to any political party organising the trade-union movement on a political basis.

Those are not new remarks. They have been made at Labour conventions and they have been made in this House. I am not introducing something that is new, and, if the hon. member for Cairns wants to cross

my path on this question, I point out that he was probably a member of the 1956 Mackay Convention. A number of members here were delegates to that convention and as such refused admittance to one Frank Waters, even as a visitor. But today what do we find? It was not only the Walshes or the Gairs, or the other supporters of the Queensland Labour Party who took up that attitude. They did it after questions were raised by the late Mr. Joe Bukowski and statements were made by the President of the Convention, the late Mr. Harry Boland. No better Labour man ever walked than Harry Boland.

Today, like many others, you find the same Mr. Waters as a member of the Queensland Central Executive. Is there not reason for anybody who subscribes to the principles of the Labour movement to have fears for its future?

**An A.L.P. Member:** Rubbish!

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member can say it is rubbish. If he treats it as lightly as that, I treat it seriously, and always have.

**Mr. Mann:** What is your view on the Petrov Commission?

**Mr. WALSH:** There are many views about the Petrov Commission. The hon. member can read my remarks in this House on the matter, given when others did not have the "guts" to speak. I labelled the Petrov Commission as a political stunt. Why did not the Leader of the House do that at the time? Why leave it to a junior like I was to do? I was attacked in an editorial in a paper that circulates in my own area because of the attitude I adopted in this House on the Petrov Commission.

**Mr. Lloyd:** What do you think about the National Civic Council?

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member for Kedron has asked me my attitude towards the National Civic Council. Again in my own time I will tell him what I think about it. It is here. What I want to get at now, in the sequence of my notes, are unity tickets and A.C.T.U. policy.

All my life I have been identified with organisations associated with the Labour movement and I think I have attended more conferences, both Federal and State, than any other member of this House and have taken an active part, even though not a voting part in discussions, so I think I am qualified to make these remarks. I have always been taught to believe that the Communists were directly opposed to the Labour Party.

**Mr. Aikens:** Will you answer one question?

**Mr. WALSH:** I am not answering any questions.

**Mr. Aikens:** I will ask you just the same. In view of the fact that you can say all these things after we elect the Speaker, will you tell us why you are saying them now?

**Mr. WALSH:** Because I want more time, although this is not necessarily my last reference to the subject.

**Mr. Dewar** interjected.

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member knows that on occasions I have spoken for three hours. If some hon. members walk out of the Chamber and the Clerk puts the vote—

**Mr. Aikens:** I will be Speaker.

**Mr. WALSH:** I will nominate the hon. member for South Coast.

Unity tickets are not being dealt with seriously by those who control what is described today as the Australian Labour Party, and, worse still, the A.C.T.U. has decided to levy all members of affiliated unions in order to cover the expenses of union officials from Communist countries when they visit Australia in the capacity of spies, or come here to learn something of the good conditions enjoyed by Australian workers. These matters taken in conjunction lay the foundation for a Communist onslaught on this country. Anyone who has followed the trend during the past few years must agree that it is similar to that of 1947, 1948 and 1949. I remind some of those who conveniently want to forget it that we have reached a stage similar to that when a great Labour man like Ben Chifley was forced to put troops into coal mines to win coal so that industry could continue in spite of the Communist threat, and it must not be forgotten that the present Federal leader of the Australian Labour Party and other Labour men decided to go to the coalfields and fight this threat or challenge from the Communist Party.

As the once great A.L.P. is now sitting down and doing nothing about this threat, I and others are justified in the attitude we adopt.

To satisfy the hon. member for Kedron—

**Mr. Aikens:** Did you say "To scarify him"?

**Mr. WALSH:** No. I would not do that to him.

If the activities of the National Civic Council are directed against Communists within the trade-union movement, it, and any other body having a similar policy, will receive my full support. But if the National Civic Council, or any similar body, enters the field of politics, I shall at once dissociate myself from its activities. In giving that answer to the hon. member for Kedron, I give my personal opinion.

**Mr. Lloyd** interjected

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member for Kedron is a novice in these things. I have said over and over again that I object to any political party organising the trade-union movement on a political basis. I have never subscribed to the view that every other political party should be allowed

to organise on a political basis, but that the Labour Party should not. It is my complaint today that the Labour Party has prevented Labour members from organising as part of the A.L.P.

**Mr. Smith:** Is it safe to go for lunch?

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member can go for lunch, but I am going on talking.

For the enlightenment of the hon. member for Kedron, I say that I believe it is the responsibility not only of the National Civic Council to undertake these duties but also of every other organisation and every individual in this State who subscribes to our way of life to band together and fight this threat and menace of Communism. It is no good saying it is a bogey. Look at the map today; take it and put it on the wall and see what has happened since 1945.

I make a plea at this stage to the returned soldiers' organisations to enter the field on a wider scale than they have in the past and carry their activities into the workshops and into every phase of industry.

**Mr. Bennett:** They are not political.

**Mr. WALSH:** They are not asked to be political; they are asked to combat Communism, and, in fact they are anti-Communist. The hon. member for South Brisbane should know it. He should know that it is part of the constitution of the R.S.S.A.I.L.A.

**Mr. Bennett:** I have a badge.

**Mr. WALSH:** As the hon. member has a badge, he should know the League's rules; they do not admit Communists. Why don't they admit them? If that is the League's policy, what is the hon. member doing about it? He is doing nothing about it. I can remember back in 1948—

**Mr. Aikens:** I can remember in 1948 when you turned the "coppers" on the strikers. Don't talk about 1948. I can remember the big railway strike, and what you did, and what I did. If you want to bring up 1948, let us have it.

**Mr. WALSH:** I will put the hon. member for Townsville South right again. I did not know I exercised a great influence over the Government, because I was not a member of this Parliament then.

**Mr. Aikens:** You were an organiser for the A.L.P. You were the power behind the throne.

**Mr. WALSH:** At least, the A.L.P. was doing something about it. It was the Government who were going to bring in the "coppers". At least I can say they were doing something about it.

In Bundaberg, the local branch of the Returned Soldiers' League sponsored an anti-Communist party. They endeavoured to do everything possible, in publicity campaigns, meetings, and propaganda. Surely no member of this House is going to object to any

section of society taking a stand in this State against Communism and the threat that obviously exists because of Communist activities.

If I might condescend, in my humble way I make a plea again at this stage to the anti-Communist unions to link themselves against the threat of Communists in industry generally. No Labour supporter can be satisfied with the future of the A.L.P. until that party publicly declares, its opposition to Communism in a way that will convince the public. In other words, there has to be more activity on the part of members of the organisation itself before it can expect to convince the people. Nor will any Labour supporter be satisfied until such time as there is a clear and unqualified statement of policy that all parties in this House subscribe to the principle of opposition to outside influences directing hon. members of the Parliament.

While on that, let me refer to a cable that appeared in "The Courier-Mail" of 29 July under a London dateline of July 28. It said—

"British Labour Members of Parliament are not bound by the decision of the annual delegate conference of the movement as a whole.

Labour leaders have intervened in a current Socialist squabble to rule this.

The Leaders—Labour's national executive committee—approved a statement prepared by the party secretary (Mr. Morgan Phillips).

This said that under the Labour constitution, the Parliamentary Party was bound only by the manifesto drawn up on the eve of a general election."

Very interesting! That is only one side of the issue, of course, that arose in 1956-1957.

I note that the hon. member for Fassifern is in the Chamber. But the Minister for Labour and Industry and the hon. member for Tablelands are not; I cannot help that. I want the hon. member for Fassifern to understand that at this stage I am not making any personal attack on him. I am speaking now in the light of what has been said in past years when the Premier and his Ministers sat on this side of the Chamber, and of the charges they made against the then Government about administration. I can sympathise with the Premier on this matter. Let me pay him the tribute at least that not merely throughout Queensland but throughout the length and breadth of Australia he would be accepted as a very honourable and honest administrator. I know these things can occur and that they can embarrass the leaders. I want to know who did the pushing to get Mr. Muller out of office and what were the reasons. The bare statements that have been made are not sufficient. The reasons are important to this Parliament. If I were to accept what has been published in the Labour paper I could

draw only one inference, but I am not going into that. I am dealing with the point that these things arise, and the characters of members of Parliament are involved. Even if the suggestion is that the hon. member for Fassifern had to vacate his office because of some taxation report, knowing him as I do I say that it could have been an honest mistake on his part. I suppose if a lot of other taxation reports were investigated properly they would reveal things, too. But I have no doubt that the hon. member for Fassifern has courage enough, and is man enough, to justify whatever action and whatever stand he has taken. I want to know whether the Liberal influence has been at work here, wanting to hound a Country Party Minister.

**Mr. Mann:** They wanted to direct him.

**Mr. WALSH:** That may be, and they have directed him. They have got him out.

The other suggestion is that the big squatters were not too pleased with his administration. The hon. member was elected to this House at about the same time as I was, and for many years he was a member of the Opposition. I say about him, as I said about Mr. Wanstall when he was a member of the Opposition in this House, that he was a most vigorous and persistent campaigner. Even if a Minister was telling the truth, the hon. member would not believe him and would go on with the fight. I hope that the Premier has not allowed himself to be pushed about by any section of the Liberal Party. They are taking a job from a man who has given service over a very long period.

The Premier knows that during the election campaign the matter of certain lands on the Tableland was brought to my notice. As I heard it, it seemed to me to be unjust and that there was something questionable about the transaction. Through the Premier's secretary, Mr. Colin Curtis, I arranged for the farmer concerned, who had six or seven children and who looked as if he was going to be badly dealt with by the Department of Irrigation and Water Supply, to see the Premier. I do not know what the outcome of that interview was, but I thought it proper to bring the matter to the Premier's notice. I raise it now because I have the correspondence and plans, and so on, in my pocket. I have heard indirectly that the Premier saw that the matter was adjusted to the satisfaction of the landholder, but there were things about it that certainly did not please me. As time goes on we shall probably be debating them.

A great deal has been said in the Press about the "Touring Minister," and I notice that the Minister has been given credit for having visited Cooktown two or three times in an aeroplane. If he has the time, I think that is very creditable.

**Mr. Aikens:** I didn't bring you a pie in a bag. Will I get you one?

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not have a midday meal. My wife saw to it that I got a good breakfast this morning.

**Mr. Aikens:** It is no trouble.

**Mr. WALSH:** As the hon. member can see, I am always properly fit.

I do not wish to question the Minister's right in this matter. He has as much right to buy land for himself in Cooktown as anybody else. However, I would question the wisdom of taking aeroplane trips up there if they are associated with the development of any property with which he may be directly or indirectly concerned.

**Mr. Morris:** You do try to be nasty, don't you!

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not. I could never be as nasty as the Minister was when he was sitting in Opposition. I am not saying to me, but to my colleagues.

**Mr. Morris:** You are so filled with venom yourself that it is poisoning you.

**Mr. WALSH:** Do not expect me to sit in this House dumb and then go round the State and listen to everybody including the Minister, kicking me apart.

**Mr. Morris:** You are making a goat of yourself.

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not care. I am only exercising my rights. If this is the first occasion I have made a goat of myself it must be remembered that the Minister has made a goat of himself so frequently that it is becoming commonplace. If the Treasurer wants to raise the matter concerning the findings of Mr. Justice Townley, I raise the matter of the propriety of the Minister's accepting gratis travel trips from travel agencies. After all, they come under his jurisdiction.

**Mr. Morris:** We shall debate that one at the proper time.

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. gentleman has openly and publicly stated that they were paying his expenses, so he is not hiding anything from the public. All I am doing is questioning the propriety of such actions.

**Mr. Morris:** We shall debate that at the proper time.

**Mr. WALSH:** The Minister should not forget that he has to make the contracts and the transactions between these agencies in some way. Everybody knows what has happened to Ministers and Cabinets in the House of Commons in the Parliament of Great Britain. The hon. gentleman would not give me any credit if I went around street corners talking about it.

**Mr. Morris:** There will be every opportunity to debate it.

**Mr. WALSH:** I think the Premier should consider the appointment of an appropriate

authority to administer the affairs of the House during that interval between the dissolution and the reassembly of Parliament. I think it is a matter worth looking into because I am not at all in agreement with what has happened in the present instance, and I say that here publicly.

Another suggestion I have to make is in keeping with the authority and the rights of Parliament. I am not blaming the Government on this occasion because I cannot. Factual evidence could be produced in rebuttal of any charge I might make. As hon. members know, it has been the custom over a long period for members of the Executive Council to be sworn in as members of Parliament in the Executive Building. From memory that practice goes back over 40 years.

**Mr. Nicklin:** The end of the 80's.

**Mr. WALSH:** If the Premier has looked it up I will not dispute it but my recollection is that it was started in the term of the Ryan Government. In the limited time available to me for research my inquiries reveal that this is the only Parliament in Australia where such a practice exists. I suggest that the practice in the House of Commons and in other Australian Parliaments should be followed and that hon. members should be sworn as members of Parliament in this House. We must protect the authority of this institution rather than bit by bit have this one and that one sworn in here and there. It has always been accepted that the right place to be sworn in is in Parliament itself.

**Mr. Nicklin:** May I interrupt you for a moment, please? I should just like to inform you that if you have not read the business sheet the House has an appointment at 2.30 p.m. with His Excellency the Governor to present the new Speaker.

I think in courtesy to His Excellency it is our function to advise him whether we will keep that appointment. Can you tell me whether you will be finished speaking in time or shall we postpone the appointment?

**Mr. WALSH:** I think you should let him know, because we have not elected the Speaker.

**Mr. Nicklin:** I wanted to know because it is a custom that has come down over the years, and if we are unable to meet His Excellency I shall inform him that we will attend on him later.

**Mr. WALSH:** Thank you, Mr. Premier; that again emphasises what I said earlier, that Parliament is the Parliament and we do not surrender our rights as a Parliament to anybody. That is not being discourteous to His Excellency because I think he knows well enough that not only myself but thousands of others in this State respect him as much as, if not more than they respected others who in the past have occupied the high position of Governor.

I shall give hon. members a hint now. I intend to nominate the hon. member for Clayfield, but, before I do, I want to say a few things about the position of Speaker. It is a pity I cannot say something on many other matters.

I can truthfully and sincerely say—not that I have to do it to ease my own conscience—that there is no arrangement between the hon. member for Clayfield and me that I should nominate him.

**Mr. Taylor:** Thank you.

**Mr. WALSH:** Nor is there any arrangement between me and any other hon. member that I might subsequently nominate him.

**Mr. Smith:** Are you going to have 76 other tries?

**Mr. WALSH:** It has been stated by the hon. member for Windsor that the Speaker of the House is supposed to be the guardian of its rights and those of its members, and he went on to say, of course, that he is there also to protect the rights of minorities. Now, the name in itself indicates that even if he is not, he should be spokesman for this House and not merely for the Government. He was so in Britain in the days when there was considerable conflict between the parliamentary institution and the ruling monarch, and quite frequently the Speaker had to watch his moves because he might earn the displeasure of the ruling monarch. If I am to accept the actions of the Government over the past three years as an indication of what might happen in the future, the Speaker, whoever he might be, also runs the risk of incurring the displeasure of the present Government unless he submits to their dictates.

**Mr. Dewar:** You do not think that, do you?

**Mr. WALSH:** I will give the hon. member a bit of evidence later.

**Mr. Dewar:** Someone is pulling your leg.

**Mr. WALSH:** I should only be emphasising the obvious if I said that the traditions of the office of Speaker are high and the position is a great one. Not only is he ceremonial head, but he is No. 1 member of this Parliament, and, as such, he should resist any attempts to whittle away hon. members' rights and privileges. In that regard I remind hon. members of the notice of motion given by me on the day the House adjourned in March last. I sought permission to move the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance. I complied with Standing Orders by giving the Speaker the requisite notice before 10 o'clock that morning. I produced to the Speaker the letter setting out the grounds on which I sought to move the adjournment. I think the Government were very unhappy because the Speaker exercised his right under

the Standing Orders to give the House an opportunity of discussing the matter, because, when the House adjourned late in the afternoon, even the usual valedictory speeches were overlooked. Certain hon. members had given notice of their intention not to contest the election, which in effect meant that they would retire at the end of the session. They included a Cabinet Minister, Hon. J. A. Heading, who had given long and honourable service in both Government and Opposition while representing Murgon and other electorates that had been renamed from time to time, Hon. Arthur Jones, a member of the Queensland Labour Party who had served in Labour Cabinets over a lengthy period, and two other members of the Australian Labour Party. Not a word was said about their services to this House and Parliament. There is now no record of the work of those hon. members as Ministers and private members and of their service to the community. If the Government were responsible—and I should hate to think the Premier would be a party to it—they were guilty of a small, miserable, mean attitude.

I know that some person blamed me because I had seen fit to exercise my right to move the adjournment in order to discuss a matter of public importance. No doubt I shall have something further to say about it later.

In considering the election of Speaker, there are a few matters that must be taken into account. In the first place, what qualifications are required? The mover of the motion spoke of his experience in this House over the past 10 years. I could refer to Speakers over the past 25 years, and the best Speaker under whom I have served was George Pollock. I do not think any other Speaker has been his equal in any respect. In some ways I may not have liked him, but as Speaker he has not been equalled in my experience, and I should say it will be a long time before we have a Speaker with similar ability. He had the required qualifications. A Speaker must have some understanding of the Standing Orders, rules, practices and customs of the House. All too frequently, despite the fact that they have been associated with the House over a long period, some hon. members display little or no knowledge of Standing Orders. That applies to the Temporary Chairmen of Committees, too. After all, it is not good enough to be resting on the shoulders of the Clerk, or his assistants, all the time. There are many documents and publications in the Library and in this Chamber that will be very helpful to hon. members if they peruse them. Hon. members can glean from them many interesting phases on procedure in Parliament. There is much to learn, and although I have learned a few things, I have still much to learn.

Anybody who occupies the position of Speaker should have the capacity to make decisions and stick to them! The Speaker

should not allow himself to be pushed around and bullied into a position where he may be browbeaten by the Government, or other influences, including the Press.

**Mr. Smith:** You do not suggest he should stick to decisions that are pointed out to him as wrong, do you?

**Mr. WALSH:** I say that if the Speaker has made a decision on proper grounds in the first place, there is no need for anybody to point out to him that he is wrong. If, where the contingency is not provided for in the Standing Orders, he is going to be guided by the decisions in the House of Commons, let him give those decisions based on the rulings in the House of Commons, and not something that immediately fits the position as it suits the Government. Speakers come and go, and we cannot have these eternal rulings. If a Speaker is called upon to give a ruling on a specific matter that has not previously arisen in the House, he should give it serious consideration before committing it to writing. I say he should not be browbeaten by the Government and the Press.

Although I am going to nominate the hon. member for Clayfield, I can point to one instance where my remarks may be directed to his failure to comply strictly with his position as Chairman of Committees. I can remember the Press reporting—I think it was on Melbourne Cup day—that the former Leader of the Queensland Labour Party, the then hon. member for South Brisbane, who will again find his way into one of the parliamentary institutions of Australia—

**Mr. Bennett:** But not through South Brisbane.

**Mr. WALSH:** South Brisbane is only a small part of Queensland. The statement I make is that Vince Gair will be back as part of this institution one day, and not with the assistance of the A.L.P. or the Liberals.

**Mr. Bennett:** The only way he ever got in was through the A.L.P.

**Mr. WALSH:** It may be that that source will eventually put the hon. member out.

**Mr. Bennett:** They nearly put you out this time.

**Mr. WALSH:** Yes, but I am here. I was going to say that the Press mentioned that the then hon. member for South Brisbane had in his possession in the Chamber a small radio set. If the Chairman of Committees or the Speaker could not act on the day on which the incident occurred, neither the Speaker nor the Chairman of Committees had any right to base his decision or any ruling on what appeared in the Press the day after.

**Mr. Hooper:** Do you think he was right to bring a radio into the House?

**Mr. WALSH:** I am not asked to answer that. If I am asked to answer it, I do not

think it is important. If I had been looking for headlines, I could have made the headlines by getting up on the dais to make my speech today, and somebody would look a bit silly, Mr. Premier, if I nominated somebody to occupy the Speaker's room in the interim when there was no Speaker.

My predecessor in Bundaberg pointed out some of the weaknesses in the law regarding these matters.

**Mr. Hiley:** You are wearing his mantle in every way.

**Mr. WALSH:** Frank Barnes at least knew how to play his cards. He did much good for many humble people. If the Treasurer can make the same claim and can show that he has helped as many people as Frank Barnes did, that will be to his credit, too.

There is a need for the Speaker, whoever he may be, to have some understanding of the difference between relevancy and irrelevancy.

**Mr. Hiley:** I wish you would demonstrate some.

**Mr. WALSH:** I give the Treasurer credit for being capable of being relevant when he wants to be relevant, but this is a situation that allows of irrelevancy.

**Mr. Hiley:** It doesn't call for it.

**Mr. WALSH:** That is the hon. gentleman's point of view. That is only because he is sitting on the other side as a member of the Government. Naturally he would object to all the things hon. members on this side of the House might want to do. I hope the Government will not use this as the occasion to strangle these rights in the future. There is a danger in that.

I say there is a necessity for some understanding of the difference between relevancy and irrelevancy but I point out that there have been some good Chairmen in this Assembly, too. The Premier knows that. I think he is the Father of the House now—the longest here—since 1932. He will agree that there have been some good Chairmen. I can name two very capable Chairmen in my time—Vince Gair and Paul Hilton. While I was out of Parliament I had the opportunity to look up some of Mr. Hilton's rulings and some of his handling of the debates while he was Temporary Chairman of Committees.

I am sure the Treasurer will not disagree with me when I say that, on this subject of an understanding of the difference between relevancy and irrelevancy, very often the occupant of the chair, either the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees, is embarrassed by the lead given by a Minister on the floor. If the Minister wants to wander into a field that is quite irrelevant to the matter being debated, it is very difficult for the Government's own nominee to pull him up. So I would very emphatically advise whoever may

be the occupant of the position not to allow himself to be led off the track, even by Ministers.

Last but not least, the Chairman should be a strictly impartial servant of the House. And in this respect I want to raise the question of what is known as the roster. Over a period of years a practice has grown up in this House whereby an arrangement is made between the Whips of the various parties on which hon. member shall speak next. I have never subscribed to that, even while I was a member of the Government, and I do not intend to subscribe to it in the future. If I want to exercise my right to speak on a matter, I expect the Speaker or the Chairman to catch my eye. If he does not do so on the first occasion, he will have to take notice of me when I persist in rising to indicate that I want to speak, and the same goes for any other hon. member. That is important. I know that the arrangement made between the Whips is supposed to be for the more orderly conduct of the House. The Premier, with his long experience here, knows that sometimes an hon. member who had not intended to speak feels obliged to do so in the face of statements that have been made during the debate. It could happen that an hon. member of this House, whether a member of the A.L.P., Q.L.P., Country Party, or Liberal Party, was away in his electorate, and he could come back and find that all the time had been taken up.

**Mr. Hanlon:** He should not expect to walk in and claim precedence over people who have been in the House all the time waiting to speak.

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member may have something there. However, I shall not go into that because I am fairly regular in my attendance here. Anyhow, I am not going to abuse anybody for not being here unless he starts abusing me.

There may be another qualification too, though not necessarily my own. The "Coms" want to follow the banner of Peter Lalor, and it would be interesting to hear what he said should be the qualifications for Speaker. Incidentally he was a Speaker for eight years, from 1880 to 1888. He said—

"The first duty of a Speaker is to be a tyrant."

**Mr. Aikens:** A tyrant?

**Mr. WALSH:** Yes.

**Mr. Aikens:** Johnno Mann must have read that.

**Mr. WALSH:** He continued—

"Remove him if you like, but while he is in the Chair, obey him. The Speaker is the embodiment of the corporate honour of the House. He is above party."

I think we would agree with the last three sentences; the other one might be questionable; but those were the ideas of Peter Lalor. Those who parade his name, particularly the

Communists, might consider what the same Peter Lalor said in the Ballarat "Star" in those days when he was being attacked for voting for an amendment of the electoral law to provide for voting on a property qualification. This great revolutionary hero, who is cited so extensively by the Communists and others, did not approve of the adult franchise. He had this to say in replying to his critics—

"I would ask these gentlemen what they mean by the term 'democracy.' Do they mean Chartism or Communism or Republicanism? If so, I never was, I am not now, nor do I ever intend to be, a democrat."

**Mr. Aikens:** Who said that?

**Mr. WALSH:** Peter Lalor.

**Mr. Aikens:** The bloke from the Eureka Stockade?

**Mr. WALSH:** He went on—

"But if a democrat means opposition to tyrannical press, a tyrannical people, or a tyrannical government, then I have ever been, I am still, and will ever remain, a democrat."

**Mr. Aikens:** When are you going to draw the £5 prizes? I have had my dinner.

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member for Townsville South thinks that he himself might be proposed and elected as Speaker.

**Mr. Aikens:** I want to be surgical registrar or auditor at Townsville. That will do me.

**Mr. WALSH:** The Speaker of the House of Commons dissociates himself entirely from the political parties in the House of Commons, and from all clubs and all organisations—

**Mr. Bennett:** You said all this before.

**Mr. WALSH:** I am saying it again, and the hon. member for South Brisbane will find that he will be one of the parties who will be pulled up here by the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees for tedious repetition.

**Mr. Bennett:** You are lucky you have not a Speaker here now.

**Mr. WALSH:** We have not got one; that is it.

He resigns from clubs and organisations that are in any way tainted with controversial political matters. The hon. member for Townsville South has just indicated that he has been out dining.

**Mr. Aikens:** And what a lovely luncheon it was! What is more, I paid for it!

**Mr. WALSH:** I take it that the hon. member feels that he is inclined towards one of the traditions of the House of Commons, that is that the Speaker of the House of Commons even dines alone.

**Mr. Aikens:** Why? Has he got bad table manners?

**Mr. WALSH:** Even if he has he would not be as bad as the hon. member for Townsville South.

So then I come to the point where I nominate the hon. member for Clayfield.

**Mr. Aikens:** You had better do it by name.

**Mr. WALSH:** Mr. Taylor.

**Mr. Aikens:** His full name.

**Mr. WALSH:** The Clerk is running this affair and if the hon. member is trying to tell me what are the Standing Orders covering this matter let me tell him that I could nominate myself.

**Mr. Smith** interjected.

**Mr. WALSH:** If I were nominated I should decline because it would mean I should have to be quiet then. I nominate the hon. member for Clayfield even though I do not like his politics.

**Mr. Dewar:** He does not like yours, either.

**Mr. WALSH:** That might be so. Outside of any Communist who may or may not be in the House I put the Liberals' name next on the list of those whom I do not like.

In all my experience of Parliament the person who has acted as Chairman of Committees has succeeded to the office of Speaker when a vacancy has occurred. There have been two instances in my period in the House of Chairmen of Committees subsequently becoming Cabinet Ministers. The Chairman of Committees is recognised, not only in Standing Orders but also under the Constitution Act, as being the logical occupant of the Speaker's chair in the absence of the Speaker or when a vacancy occurs because of death or resignation.

During the period he has been Chairman of Committees Mr. Taylor has carried out his duties in a very dignified manner. I do not know whether it amounts to a unity ticket or not, or whether, if he fails on this first round, he will be given the second plum of Chairman of Committees. During his term of office he has shown himself to be very tolerant. If any complaint could be made against him perhaps it would be that he was over-tolerant in some instances.

**Mr. Aikens:** What about when Johnno Mann was Chairman of Committees and you were trying to put Hilton in the Speaker's chair over his head?

**Mr. WALSH:** I do not remember that. If I did not remember it and it actually happened, I would admit that I did remember it, but as it never occurred I will say nothing. As I say, the hon. member for Clayfield carried out his duties as Chairman of Committees with satisfaction to this House. As a matter of fact, I know the Premier himself has publicly stated that Mr. Taylor gave great service in his capacity as Chairman of Committees.

I would not be taking up this attitude, Mr. Premier, had it not been for the fact that following the election, when you had your various party meetings, the Country Party nominated the previous Speaker, Mr. Fletcher, as their nominee for the position of Speaker in this Parliament. That was fair enough; that was following the procedure of all parties over a long period of years, but, a vacancy having occurred in the Cabinet due to the resignation of the hon. member for Fassifern, it became necessary for the Country Party to have another meeting. If that custom or precedent was on any other basis, the member for Clayfield had a right to this position; that is when I say his right became operative.

I do not say that the Premier is obliged to do these things, but I do not like to see this high office dragged around like a stinking carcass, as it were, by one who, after the election in 1957, actually brought into this House a so-called Bill of Rights. Why would not the custom of the past be followed after Mr. Fletcher's appointment to Cabinet? If the Country Party and the Liberal Party want to fight over these things in that way it shows that they have no respect for the authority of the position. The hon. member for Clayfield, having proved himself as possessing all the qualifications and the necessary bearing for this position, probably as a result of his war service—Mr. Nicholson might have war service; I do not know—

**Mr. Aikens:** He was not in the Sudan campaign with Mr. Taylor.

**Mr. WALSH:** If he was not and Mr. Taylor was, I ask what the Government are doing about preference to returned soldiers. In any case, I content myself with nominating Mr. Taylor, the hon. member for Clayfield, for the office of Speaker of this Parliament.

I move—

“That Mr. Harold Bourne Taylor do take the chair of the House as Speaker.”

**Mr. ADAIR (Cook) (2.33 p.m.):** I second the nomination by the hon. member for Bundaberg of Harold Bourne Taylor as Speaker of this House. In so doing, I believe Mr. Taylor has done an excellent job as a member of working committees and as Chairman of Committees. He was fair in all decisions that he had to make, and I am confident that, as Speaker of this House, he will carry out the functions with the necessary dignity.

**Mr. TAYLOR (Clayfield) (2.34 p.m.):** The obligation is now upon me to say whether or not I decline the nomination. I have heard a great deal of the situation that prevails in the House at this time when there is no Speaker or Chairman. Any member can rise and say what he likes and can continue for as long as he likes, and jump up again for

a second or a third time. I listened attentively to the mover. He did not say very much about me other than to praise me, for which I thank him.

I should like the hon. member for Murrumba, the Government nominee, to take note of the fact that the hon. member for Bundaberg admitted that I had made no approach to him and that there was no arrangement between us that he would nominate me.

I have not asked any hon. member to nominate me and I have not sought a vote from any hon. member, but I have sought advice as I believe that points of view other than those held personally by a person should be considered. I asked for the advice of a man who has close association with the Labour movement. I told him of the situation in which I found myself as I saw it. There was not much I could say, but I said to him, "I want to see the other point of view. Suppose a Labour member was similarly situated and a member of the Liberal Party nominated him against the Government nominee, what would they say of him in the Labour Party?" Without hesitation this person said, "A rat."

**Mr. Walsh:** Theodore must have been a rat, because he nominated one.

**Mr. Aikens:** Theodore was many things other than a rat. That was only one of the things he was.

**Mr. Walsh:** He was not a rat.

**Mr. TAYLOR:** My parliamentary career is gradually coming to an end, and when I retire I do not want to have a torturous mind because of things I may not have done. I may retire at the end of this Parliament. That will depend first of all on my health and the result of consultation with my party. But on that point I should like to tell those who are about to move into Bonney Avenue, Clayfield, that when I last saw my doctor he told me I was disgustingly healthy.

When I retire I should like to think that I carried out my duties to the satisfaction of the House and that I had had the courage to say what I thought. I am reminded of the words of a great man who once told a young soldier that courage was a soldier's greatest asset and that, if he believed he was right, he should have the courage to fight until he either won or lost.

On this occasion the joint Government parties in a secret ballot have decided that the hon. member for Murrumba should be the Government's nominee. I fought until I lost, and I should rather lose with dignity than win by means that would enable anybody to describe me as a nasty rodent. I therefore decline the nomination.

**Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (2.39 p.m.):** The hon. member for Clayfield has declined to

accept nomination and in doing so has exercised his right under the Standing Orders. In the course of his speech he said that he had consulted someone in the Labour ranks.

**Mr. Taylor:** I did not say "in the Labour ranks."

**Mr. WALSH:** Well, a Labour man.

**Mr. Taylor:** A man with Labour experience.

**Mr. WALSH:** He then said that this person described the nominator of a second Government member as a rat.

**Mr. Taylor:** Not the nominator. I would be the rat if I accepted nomination in such circumstances.

**Mr. WALSH:** I misunderstood the hon. member.

It is on record that in 1912, H. F. Hardacre, a Labour member, nominated Mr. Forsyth, a Government member, and Mr. Forsyth having declined, E. G. Theodore, a young member who had entered Parliament only three years earlier, nominated another Government member, J. W. White, who also declined. Then Mr. Bill Hamilton—I think it was—who did time in the 1891 strike and occupied the seat now held by Mr. Wally Rae, nominated Mr. Hardacre for the position. A record of the only time in the history of this Parliament when there has been a contested election for the Speaker is to be found in the volumes of Hansard of 1912. A secret ballot was conducted by the Clerk and the voting was 41 to 24. It is nothing unusual for a Labour man to nominate a member of the Government Party for this office. I should like to make it quite clear that I would have no regard for the hon. member's politics, because I feel he would have carried out the duties of his office in an impartial way. I hope I shall be able to say that about the hon. member for Murrumba, if he is elected to this position.

I now nominate the member for Southport, Mr. Gaven. After all, Mr. Gaven was the runner-up in the vote in the Country Party for selection as Speaker when Mr. Fletcher won it, subsequent to the election. He was beaten by only one vote. Mr. Taylor having declined, Mr. Gaven is the obvious one to fill the position in the fight for this plum in Parliament.

I move—

"That Mr. Eric John Gaven do take the chair of the House as Speaker."

**Mr. NICHOLSON:** Hon. members, I am deeply conscious of the honour proposed to be conferred on me. I humbly submit myself to the pleasure of the House.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

There being no further nomination, Mr. Nicholson, on being called, was conducted by

the mover and seconder to the chair. Speaking from the dais, he said: I thank you for the privilege of electing me to this very high office.

**Honourable Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier) (2.43 p.m.): It is with great pleasure that I offer you my congratulations on behalf of the Government and myself on your election to the high office of Speaker. There is no doubt that you will discharge the very onerous duties associated with the Speakership with credit to yourself and justice to all members, and to the satisfaction of all members during the session of this House. I have been in this House for quite a number of years and I have seen a number of Speakers elected. I have never been more pleased, in all my life, to see a Speaker elected, notwithstanding the rather tortuous proceedings to get you into the chair today.

I appreciate, as was said by your nominator, that you have the capabilities and the qualifications to be a Speaker fit to follow in the very high traditions set in this House by the successive Speakers occupying that high office over the years. You have a great responsibility. It is your responsibility to maintain the dignity of this Parliament and see that the name of this Parliament is held highly by the people of the State. It is our responsibility as members of this Chamber to ensure that we assist you in your endeavours to maintain dignity and decorum in the Chamber.

We realise that Parliamentary government is being challenged today and the best way to undermine the prestige of Parliament and parliamentary government is to fail to conduct ourselves in a manner in keeping with the high traditions of a British Parliament. I am sure that, with your lead, all hon. members will do their best to maintain the traditions of Parliament and to see that when this Parliament comes to its end, as it will do under the Constitution of the State, it will go down as one that has done nothing to undermine the high traditions of parliamentary government in Queensland.

This is not a time to make long speeches, but, on behalf of the Government and on my own behalf, I heartily congratulate you on your election. I know I speak for all hon. members when I say I am certain that everyone will do his best to assist you in the onerous duties you will be called upon to perform.

**Mr. DUGGAN** (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (2.47 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, I suppose you would regard 2.45 p.m. on 23 August, 1960, as being the culminating time of the tensest and most frustrating and nervous periods of your political career, because until that time you did not know whether or not you would be Speaker of this Assembly. The

question was resolved at that hour by the action of a gentleman in declining to accept nomination for the office.

I have been in this Assembly for more than 20 years and I do not recall a situation similar to that which confronted us today, inasmuch as, preceding the convening of this meeting in the Chamber this afternoon, the Press was full of reports that there had been a grave disruption in the Government parties because of their inability to resolve many problems, in particular that of selecting a nominee for the Speakership. Considerable credence was given to that Press speculation by reason of the fact that not one, not two, not three, but at least half a dozen people from both sections of the Government parties saw fit to contact hon. members on this side of the House as to their reactions if certain alternative action were taken for the nominee as Speaker.

I could well understand the Premier's relief when he rose to offer his congratulations to you and his saying that for him a period of anxiety had ended and that in his long association with Parliament he could not recall any previous announcement of the election of a Speaker that he could receive with more relief than today. Knowing the background, I can appreciate his anxiety and his disquiet.

And I want to compliment the hon. member for Clayfield on the manner in which he declined nomination. He made no bones about it that he had fought a losing fight. He said that he had fought this fight to the point of a secret ballot in the Caucuses of the Government parties.

Remember, too, that the present Premier, at one stage in the life of the previous Parliament, sought to introduce a Bill of Rights and, when this and other allied internal problems of the Government parties came up and they were asked to exercise a secret vote in the Caucus, he refused to exercise the privilege in his capacity of President of that Caucus.

So this has been an extremely complex occasion. Very many complex problems have been resolved here today. It is the first time in my personal experience as a parliamentarian that there has not been unanimity in the choice of a prospective Speaker. We have heard a lot of discussion—and academic discussion—on the great obligations of Speaker that you are now called upon to assume. We have had from the hon. member for Windsor an historical survey of the great traditions of the office and mention has been made of the reluctance of hon. members to come forward and assume the obligations of Speakership, and when one thinks of all this academic claptrap and associates it with the manoeuvrings that have gone on behind the scenes, one must express a great disappointment that we cannot say that you came here, like so many of your predecessors, on the unanimous vote and with the good will of everybody.

I shall have something to say on the personal level later on, if you will not take exception to it. I am dealing now with not merely the person of Nicholson but the nominee for the office of Speaker. I want to go further on this occasion and say that I have long been a strong defender of the privileges of Parliament and the privileges of Parliamentarians. I have in the past risen in this Assembly to defend members of the then Opposition because in one or two instances questions of their own personal Parliamentary privilege were involved. Wherever I have been, I have always been a strong defender of the rights of people to express themselves in a proper constitutional way. There is no doubt that strong pressure was exercised on this occasion, and I go so far as to say that the pressure was so strong that Mr. Taylor was told that if he chose to fight the decision his endorsement for appointment as Chairman of Committees would be withdrawn. I say quite definitely and emphatically that that threat was made to Mr. Taylor. Something was said about power politics. I know of no occasion where they have been used more ruthlessly or more scientifically than they have on this occasion by members of the Government parties.

**Mr. Dewar:** Pure rot!

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member is a good judge of that sort of thing.

Then we had the extraordinary spectacle presented by the hon. member for Townsville South. To us, of course, it was not unusual for him to seek this opportunity of using the right, which is his as a member of this Assembly on an occasion such as this, to unburden himself of some views on subjects in which he is closely interested. Considering his propensity for speaking on every possible occasion and his interest in this matter, I think that today he exercised more restraint than is customary for him, and I think we can say in all fairness, perhaps, that he did not have an opportunity of dealing with this matter under other appropriate headings of the Standing Orders. I have no quarrel with the hon. member for Townsville South. He was brief, logical, and succinct; he made his point and sat down.

**Mr. Aikens:** I had to say it then or I could not say it during the rest of the life of this Parliament.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** I acknowledged that.

Then we had the extraordinary spectacle of the hon. member for Bundaberg engaging in a marathon speech extending over almost two hours. Again I say that I have no quarrel with the hon. member for Bundaberg exercising his right to address us on this occasion, but his subjects embraced everything from the fact that he did not like the politics of the hon. member for Clayfield to the fact that he did not even like him as Chairman because on one occasion he rebuked a former member of this House for transgressing the

rules relating to procedure. Notwithstanding that, he then nominated him for the office of Chairman of Committees, which to me seemed to be a rather unusual way—

**Mr. Walsh:** Don't misconstrue what I said.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** The hon. member said he did not like his politics, and then he said politics did not matter very much. I have some difficulty in understanding those arguments. He said he was not concerned about politics, yet he then nominated the hon. member for Southport.

**Mr. Walsh** interjected.

**Mr. DUGGAN:** If the hon. member was half as wise as I am, he would not have made the silly damn speech he made today. For my part, it is all right if he makes more of them. A majority of 17 is very slender, and with speeches of that type there would be no need for us to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Brisbane about going to Bundaberg in great force, because those speeches will do more to undermine that majority than anything that will be said from this side of the House.

In my own personal experience—in a private capacity, in a military capacity, and in a parliamentary capacity—I have been in a position to enjoy sometimes minor, sometimes major, privileges. I hope I have used those privileges intelligently and fairly. On every occasion that I have seen the withdrawal of a privilege it has been invariably because of its abuse. In New South Wales there was a time when members of Parliament were permitted to attend theatres upon presentation of their gold passes. I do not know whether that practice has ever existed in Queensland. I spoke to the manager of the Theatrical Guild in New South Wales and he told me that the privilege had been withdrawn because some members of Parliament had tried to make themselves popular with their constituents by inviting people to attend six or seven theatres in Sydney on the one evening. In every case I know of where a democratic practice operates any withdrawal of privilege is because there has been an abuse of it. The hon. member for Bundaberg knows better than anyone else that executive or administrative actions taken by the previous Government were used on many occasions to impose probably harsh penalties on people who had not committed any breach at all merely because some person had abused some privilege.

The hon. member spoke about the menace of Communism. On behalf of myself, and on behalf of everybody behind me, I point out that we take second place to no-one in our loyalty to the Crown and the Queen, and in our repugnance to Communism. We are aware of the menace of Communism in Australia. Half of the people who talk about this menace are doing the very thing that they accuse others of doing. If they were sincere Labour people they could do more to defeat

Communism by remaining loyal to the A.L.P. than by trying to create disunity and bring about division in the ranks of people outside. That is the device the Fascists and Communists have used. They divide gradually. Naturally if you are a divided force it makes it much easier for those who are opposed to you. While I am Leader of the Australian Labour Party we shall have nothing to be ashamed of in our stand against Communism. We are opposed to it—utterly opposed to it.

I say here and now, when it is proper that you, Mr. Speaker, as custodian of our rights and privileges, should be told that in this Opposition you will find an Opposition loyal to you and your office as Queen's representative, and we shall do all we can to defend this democratic system of Government.

If I were Premier I should be tempted to curb the abuses that were obvious this morning. With the possible exception of the reference to Mr. Justice Wanstall, every subject matter could have been covered in the Budget debate or the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. People who talk about the need to retain these democratic privileges should remember that it is hard to retain them when they are abused, and I think they were abused today. I have no personal quarrel with the hon. member for Bundaberg. We were colleagues for a period and in many ways I regret the severance of personal relations. But I have been the subject of campaigns that have been stronger and more violent than those complained of by other victims and I do not forget and forgive the things done to me personally. But when we hear such references to the withdrawal of a man from this Assembly, a man who made a contribution to the Government of the State, and who had a reputation for having a keen analytical mind, I am not able to understand it.

Let me get back to remarks of a more personal nature. Now that the conflict between your own parties has been resolved, we offer you, Mr. Speaker, our best wishes for a happy and successful period of office. We heard a great deal about the rights of hon. members. Your nominator said that the most junior member has the same rights as the most senior member. I hope it will be your desire as far as reasonably possible to see that that procedure and policy are followed on all occasions. You have an exacting task. Certainly, you do not bring to the office of Speaker long years of experience in the chair, but you are a person who is, I think, a quick thinker. You are a person who has been in more than your fair share of affray and political battle in your own party before you got to this controversial post of Speaker.

I think you know that all sorts of problems will arise but I feel sure that, although you have not had any experience in the chair, you have had enough experience in Caucus

to realise that you must exercise some temperate feelings and that when you exercise your powers of authority in due course you will do so not only with that experience behind you but with the knowledge that you are upholding the high traditions and dignity of this office.

I think the office of Speaker should be long preserved in this country. I hope all democratic institutions will be long preserved and that all of us who are honoured to remain members of this Assembly will be conscious of our obligations to the people and to the nation. If we concentrate on those obligations, we can always revere and respect the office of Speaker in Parliament.

**Hon. K. J. MORRIS** (Mt. Coot-tha—Minister for Labour and Industry) (3.2 p.m.): I take the opportunity as Leader of the Liberal Party and as a partner—a happy partner—in the coalition Government to congratulate you, Mr. Nicholson, on your elevation to the high office of Speaker. I hope you will have a very happy occupancy of the office. I know it is never an easy one but I feel sure you will carry out your task with your usual ability.

I do deplore one or two aspects of this debate. I refer first of all to a statement by the Leader of the Opposition when he chose—I hope innocently—to misrepresent a comment that was made by the Premier. No doubt, the Premier did say that this was an election he was pleased to have concluded. The purpose of it, of course, was that it is not often that we have been so unhappily situated as to listen to so much irrelevant nonsense from a senior member so far as years of service are concerned.

I think all of us are pleased to see that the normal procedures of Parliament, under which advantage cannot be taken of unusual circumstances, have been resumed and that from this time onward debates will be controlled in the normal manner. That was the reason for the Premier's pleasure, and I can assure him that all hon. members on this side of the House join with him in his pleasure that that unpleasant incident has been concluded.

If the Leader of the Opposition can see something sinister in the fact that, when there is an opportunity for promotion, several people are interested in the possibility of promotion, it seems to be quite ridiculous. He has served in a Government for many years, and no doubt he has participated on many occasions in scuffles for office and good luck to him; I do not blame him in the least for that. No doubt he knows, as well as we all do, that when there is opportunity for promotion, especially acceptable promotion, it is natural that more than one person should be interested. If a man has any ambition at all, it comes to the surface with this type of promotion. It can be seen in this sphere, in the army and

everywhere else. It is something that human nature is heir to, and I think it is a good thing that it is.

I compliment the hon. member for Clayfield on his very excellent comments when telling us quite freely and frankly where he stood.

The hon. member for Bundaberg in his long diatribe—mostly uninteresting—chose to make some personal reference to several hon. members on this side, to me among others. I shall answer those statements at a more appropriate time and I look forward to the opportunity of doing so. When I give the facts, perhaps the hon. member for Bundaberg will be gracious enough to apologise. I hope he is man enough to do so.

The other matter is a much more serious one. He chose to say some things that were completely untrue, completely unfair, and completely out of character for most hon. members of Parliament. He made insinuations against a judge of the Supreme Court of Queensland. I think he said that this member of the judiciary had corrupted his office. I may be speaking quietly, but I am speaking with a great deal of sincerity. I know the gentleman to whom the hon. member for Bundaberg has referred. There is no finer or more upright gentleman in Queensland than the judge whose character has been attacked by a person who is infinitely his junior in capacity and all the decencies of life. I resent the hon. member's remarks. I do not intend to prolong the debate, but I must register my very deep resentment.

On behalf of the hon. members of my party, I sincerely congratulate you, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to serving many years under you in this Chamber.

**Hon. P. J. R. HILTON** (Carnarvon) (3.6 p.m.): On behalf of the Queensland Labour Party I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, very sincere congratulations on election to your high office. I am confident that you will acquit yourself in a very creditable manner.

It cannot be denied that a great deal of party manoeuvring took place on the election of Speaker on this occasion. In this and other Parliaments of Australia the Speakership is aligned with the Party system, and so we can always expect manoeuvring both within the Government Party or coalition of parties. It will always be so unless the Parliaments of Australia adopt the system that is recognised and, I think, highly cherished by all political parties in England where the Speaker is entirely apart from the party-political sphere, and is not opposed in election to office. Unless that system is adopted, we can always expect party fights and party manoeuvrings. If the parties in this House ever decide to adopt the sound policy of the Mother of Parliaments, the tussle for the job will be much greater than on this occasion.

As the Speaker is the symbol of Parliament, some thought should be given to adopting the practice in the Mother of Parliaments. I think it would be of advantage. It would ensure to a greater degree the strict impartiality that we expect from a person holding the exalted office of Speaker.

Although I think we should adopt that practice, I realise that it will not come about in my time. I will not be a starter for the position of Speaker. Nevertheless it should be considered and I think it could be adopted with advantage.

The manoeuvrings that have occurred throw light on the rights and privileges and, shall I say, the peculiarities of the Parliamentary system. Each has a purpose. We cherish those things, although at time some hon. members may be irked by Parliamentary procedures that may be followed, perhaps not frequently but in the unusual circumstances as they exist today. Every member is entitled to exercise his personal rights. I think it is a good thing in some respects. At least it relieves the monotony that is sometimes associated with rigid party politics. For that reason I like to see a member exhibit a little individuality and pursue his rights when the occasion presents itself. However, as the Premier mentioned, it is not the time for long speeches.

Matters of a topical nature have been mentioned in this debate. I do not propose to touch on them on this occasion, but I certainly propose to have something to say, objectively, when the proper time arises. I congratulate you again, Mr. Speaker, and I wish you very sincerely a happy term in your exalted office.

**Mr. AIKENS** (Townsville South) (3.12 p.m.): As leader of the only "dinkum" and undivided Labour Party in Queensland and as a member of this House who received more votes than any other member, with the possible exception of Mr. Donald, who now occupies one of the Ipswich seats, I should like to say something about your well-merited elevation to the Speakership. I heard quite a lot from the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Bundaberg about manoeuvrings, back-scratching, and coat-tail-pulling prior to your selection. I see nothing wrong with it. If you belong to a party, as the hon. member for Carnarvon so truthfully pointed out, every member of that party has a right to aspire to office, and each party has its own method of selection of those who are going to be political leaders. It happens in the Labour Party. Anyone listening to the Leader of the Opposition would think this never happened in the Labour Party. When there was a vacancy in the Labour Party, there was always intrigue. There was much intrigue in the Labour Party after the last election for the humble office of Whip, when the hon. member for Maryborough was successful in putting the skids under Billy Baxter. I have nothing to say about that, because that is

the party system. We know there is much manoeuvring and touching one another on the shoulder and saying, "Are you going to vote for me, or aren't you?"

I interjected when the hon. member for Bundaberg was speaking and said that in the past the Chairman of Committees has automatically gone up into the Speakership. I will repeat my interjection in case the "Hansard" writers did not get it. I can well remember that when the hon. member for Brisbane was Chairman of Committees—after the 1947 elections, I think—there was a determined move by the Walsh faction—he was not even in the party; he had been defeated for Mirani—to supplant the hon. member for Brisbane as Chairman of Committees with the late George Devries, and the hon. member for Brisbane just made the grade by 18 votes to 17.

Later on, when the hon. member for Brisbane was still Chairman of Committees and the hon. member for Bundaberg had returned to this Assembly, the hon. member for Bundaberg was the mainspring in a conspiracy in the event of the death of the then ailing Speaker, the late Mr. Brassington, to put the hon. member for Carnarvon right over the head of the hon. member for Brisbane, straight into the Speaker's chair, leaving the hon. member for Brisbane as the Chairman of Committees.

I have mentioned those cases merely to show that this manoeuvring goes on in all political parties. Hon. members are all tarred with the one brush so far as I can see, and no hon. member has the right to cry "Stinking fish" at another.

We heard the hon. member for Windsor, one of our legal luminaries in the Chamber—probably the dimmest—speak about the Speaker of this Parliament protecting the rights of the political minority. I can speak with a lot of feeling on that subject because when I came into this Assembly in 1944 no rights were given to me.

**Mr. Mann:** I looked after you.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The hon. member for Brisbane was not even in the hunt. He was only the Chairman of Committees. Believe it or not, I was even refused the main traditional privilege of all country members; I was refused accommodation at the Parliamentary Lodge. I was told that the Lodge was fully occupied. The Labour Speaker told me it was full up—full up of Tories representing country electorates, full up of Labour men representing country electorates, but there was no room for me. Consequently, I had to go and seek accommodation at Marr's Guest House, where I have stayed in the 16 years that I have been a member of this House.

In all fairness to the then Premier, the late Frank Cooper, about six weeks later he heard of what had happened to me and came and told me that, while I was a member of this Assembly, I would have made available to me all the privileges and concessions that

are applicable to every other hon. member and that there would be a room at the Lodge for me if I wanted it. I told the late Mr. Cooper that, as I had already told the Speaker that he could put the room at the Lodge where the workhouse foreman was told to put the Christmas pudding, I would remain at Marr's, and I have been there ever since.

When you hear talk of the protection of political minorities in the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that, when I came into Parliament in 1944, it was to see the last six years of the shocking persecution of the late Frank Barnes, and I myself suffered, in this Chamber and out of it, much of that persecution. And if I enjoy any privileges in this Chamber, and if I am now treated on an equal basis with every other hon. member, as I am entitled to be, then it is because I refused to be browbeaten and persecuted by Speakers in the past.

**Mr. Chalk:** Who gave you a broom cupboard?

**Mr. AIKENS:** There was an instance! The hon. member for Brisbane, when he was Speaker, put me out of a room that I occupied downstairs and, in my absence and without my authority or consent, shifted all my belongings into a room down at the bottom end of the George Street corridor. The first thing I had to remove from that room was a box of sawdust and the next was a sign, "Please adjust your dress before leaving." That is the sort of treatment I got.

I will say this for the former Speaker, Mr. Fletcher—that he decided to shift me, the hon. member for Burdekin and another hon. member into another room that was previously occupied by Mr. Richter and Mr. Ewan, but before he removed any belongings he wired me for my permission to do so. He sent me a prepaid telegram, probably knowing that if he had not I would have sent the reply collect. I gave him my gracious permission to shift my belongings from the broom cupboard to the new room and I suggested that he also shift the electricity point, the radiator, and the fan, which he did.

**Mr. Mann:** I gave you all those.

**Mr. AIKENS:** The hon. member did not give us all those at all. He gave us nothing. In fact, he gave us the other room and, as I said at the time, he gave the messenger certain instructions. If necessary we can bring the messenger to the Bar of the House to tell us about those instructions. They were to put Aikens and Coburn in the room at the end of the corridor, and the messenger, in all good faith and decency, put us in the room at the end of the George Street corridor, whereas what the hon. member for Brisbane meant was to give us the room at the end of the Alice Street corridor. That is where he tried to put us.

You have been in the House for 10 years, Mr. Speaker, and you have seen how I have

had to fight to retain for myself even the meagre rights and privileges that were grudgingly granted to me by a succession of Speakers, and by others, and I will continue to fight. I do not think I will have to fight very hard against you any more than I had to against Mr. Fletcher, because you have an innate sense of decency and honesty and fairness. But I want to remind you that, if you care to try to do what some of the previous Speakers have done—if you think that you can persecute and intimidate me—you are welcome to have a go.

All I want from this House are the same rights and the same privileges as every other hon. member who has been elected to serve in this Assembly. I shall be honest. The hon. member for Brisbane used to give me a fair deal from the Chair once in a while. That was until the then bosses of the A.L.P., led by the hon. member for Bundaberg, and others, made him put the screw on me. It is all very well for him to pose as a knight in shining armour. Like hell he is! The moment "Big Ted," as he called him, used to put the screw on him and say, "Clamp down on Aikens," he had to do it. I will let the dead past bury its dead. As far as I am concerned, I will seek no more than any other member gets. That is all I ask—no more, but no less.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that you and I are going to get along all right, but as I said in my first speech in the House—a good thing will bear repetition—"I came here to fight anybody and everybody. My hand is against every man. Every man's hand is against me. I ask no quarter and I will give none. I am prepared to fight you under Marquis of Queensbury rules, but if you like to fight under Rafferty's rules, you can have it any way you like."

**Mr. WALSH** (Bundaberg) (3.23 p.m.): I probably should have allowed the opportunity to pass by saying that I endorsed the remarks of the hon. member for Carnarvon in his congratulations to you on your election to the high office of Speaker but for the fact that I object to people distorting what I say. It seems that we still have some freedom and democracy since the election of a Speaker, because the discussion has been fairly wide since then. I wish to say to the Leader of the Opposition that I did not take exception to the hon. member for Clayfield acting in his position as Chairman of Committees in connection with a matter raised by the hon. member for South Brisbane. I objected to his having acted on a Press report instead of acting on the day the incident occurred. I think my statement on that matter will be accepted by every sensible hon. member. If a Speaker or a Chairman of Committees can act immediately and spontaneously to deal with a matter, there is no reason why it should be raised 24 hours hence or 12 months hence.

**Mr. Windsor:** He did not hear it that day.

**Mr. WALSH:** It does not matter. There is procedure to be followed. If the Chairman did not hear it, he should resist an attempt by any hon. member to influence him.

**Mr. Windsor:** How could he stop it if he did not hear it?

**Mr. WALSH:** The hon. member does not know much about it. The Speaker or the Chairman of Committees must hear the hon. member before he can take action against him. In this case the Chairman of Committees admitted that he had knowledge of it and that he acted 24 hours later.

The statement was made by the Minister for Labour and Industry that I had charged a judge with corrupting his office. I made no such statement.

**Mr. Morris:** Yes, you did.

**Mr. WALSH:** The Minister can have it his way. I said that the judge broke all the ethics of his profession prior to his appointment to the bench by travelling to Boonah in the way in which he did. The hon. gentleman has the capacity for distorting, but he is not going to get away with that statement. I have risen in my place because I have the opportunity to combat it now.

Now that you have been appointed, Mr. Speaker, you have all the obligations of administering the functions of this House. Let us get back to where they used to be, particularly the strict supervision over the property of this House. I can remember when the dining-room had in it some of the finest cedar tables in this House. I could not tell you where they are now, nor do I know whether anybody else can. There are many other instances where property has been removed from the House. I know it is a bit late to be talking about it now because it probably did not occur in this Government's time, but I am pointing out the need for stricter supervision.

Do not let the architects ruin this building. Whoever concocted the plan to install the lift in its present position? I do not know how any Government or any Speaker could allow the Department of Public Works to get away with it. Parliament House, together with the Treasury and Executive Buildings, is one of the architectural monuments of the State.

Apparently it was thought desirable to spend a few thousand pounds on a lift in Parliament House—for whom, I do not know. I realise that the staff on the upper floor need a lift, but why employ a full-time lift attendant who does almost nothing all day?

**Mr. Aikens:** Where would you have put the lift?

**Mr. WALSH:** At the end of the ground level where the ministerial cars pull up. I realise that the expenditure on the roof had to be considered, but Parliament House is a building to be architecturally preserved. While so much money is being spent in the interior of the building somebody should have a look to

see what is required for the protection of its exterior. It looks to me as if the Liberal influence became evident in the choice of the blue carpet on the dais and the dull-looking carpet on the floor of the Chamber. It was dull enough before; it is much duller now. By the extreme red colour selected for the old Legislative Council Chamber it looks as if they are getting ready for the takeover. It seems strange to me that a carpet that was good enough to be used when entertaining royalty—Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh in 1954 and the Queen Mother later—should have to be replaced now at considerable expense. All this money is being spent on Parliament House when people outside are begging for finance to build schools, houses, police stations, etc. Surely the Government could have suffered the previous interior colours a little longer. At the same time I agree that it is desirable that some money should be spent on Parliament House.

While on this subject, I express the hope that the Building Committee, as appointed by this Parliament, will not have its functions taken entirely out of its hands. Very strict action on your part is necessary if you are to make yourself felt about the place and to ensure that the traditions and privileges of Parliament are maintained as they should be.

I have no desire to go into the other matters raised by the Leader of the Opposition. I exercised my right to speak about Communism. All I asked him to do, as I have asked everybody else to do, was to give some definite evidence of a real fight against Communism. It is no good saying what somebody else is doing, or talking about the damage caused by anti-Communism. I know many people who have never identified themselves with an attack on Communism. I do not want the Leader of the Opposition to say that there is a sincere drive against Communism within the Labour movement when we have such evidence as Frank Waters getting back on the Q.C.E. and the decision made at the Federal conference that prevents members of the A.L.P. from organising as a group of Labour men in the fight against Communism within trade unions. That is my complaint. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to take a lead in this matter apart from his political affiliations, I am quite happy to associate with him or anybody else. I remember in the days when I was organising the Groups here on a different basis from the other States people objected because a trade unionist, as a member of the Protestant Labour Party, had identified himself with a group in a fight against Communism. I told them I was not concerned about his religion or his politics. All I was concerned about was that he was, firstly, anti-Communist, and secondly, a bona fide trade unionist. We cannot fight Communism on a sectional basis. That is why I make the plea to you, Mr. Speaker. I know that you, in your position which has the authority of Parliament as a

whole, will be the first to back any movement that has for its object the defeat of this menace to our democracy.

I extend my congratulations to you in your new position. I hope you have a successful term. If there are occasions when we have to object to your rulings, I personally shall exercise my right at all times to object to any ruling that I think is not in accordance with the Standing Orders or practices and procedure of the Mother of Parliaments, or in any attempt by the Government to bulldoze you into going their way. I shall take every opportunity to resist that, too.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I thank hon. members for the kindly words and expressions that they have used in congratulating me on my elevation to this very high and honourable position. I have taken due note of the suggestions put forward, both prior to and since my election.

During the course of this discussion or debate, as it may be termed, history has been delved into somewhat and I think it is worthy of note that the election of Speaker in 1912 was the only other previous occasion, I am led to believe, when a similar situation arose. It centred on Mr. Forsyth, who was then the hon. member for Murrumba. That is worthy of note, gentlemen.

I am deeply conscious of the duties entailed in this high office and of those illustrious men who have held it. Two of them are still hon. members of this Parliament. I will, no doubt, feel that I have the critical eye of both of those gentlemen on me while I am carrying out my duties, but I do pray that I shall be given the wisdom and strength to carry out the duties of this office according to the established customs of democratic Parliament.

I am not unmindful of the fact that to err is human. If I err and am not correct in my judgment I shall be the first to recognise my fault; I shall not try to bluster or bluff my way through, simply because I occupy an office of authority. It has been proved in the past that authority can be abused. The hon. member for Townsville South has thrown the gauntlet into the ring, so I say this: If he is prepared to abide by the Rules and the Standing Orders of this Parliament he has nothing to fear from the Chair.

**Mr. Aikens:** I am right.

**Mr. SPEAKER:** I shall carry out my duties to the utmost of my ability and I shall endeavour to discharge them with strict impartiality. Being conscious of my imperfections, I look forward to the co-operation of hon. members in carrying out our Parliamentary duties, yours and mine. With your assistance and my endeavours I am sure that Parliament and the high and honourable position that I now occupy will lose none of their former lustre. I thank you all.

## PRESENTATION OF MR. SPEAKER

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): I desire to inform hon. members that His Excellency the Governor will receive the House for the purpose of presenting Mr. Speaker to His Excellency at Government House this afternoon at 4 o'clock. Such hon. members as care to do so are invited to accompany Mr. Speaker to Government House.

## SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN** (Landsborough—Premier): I move—

“That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 11.57 a.m. tomorrow.”

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.38 p.m.

---