

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 9 OCTOBER 1962

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 9 OCTOBER, 1962

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

QUESTIONS

EXPENDITURE ON HERMIT PARK INFANTS' SCHOOL AND WULGURU STATE SCHOOL

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

"(1) To the latest date for which figures are readily available, what amount of money, inclusive of cost of land and all other items, has been spent in the building of (a) the Hermit Park Infants' School and (b) the Wulguru State School?"

"(2) Is it proposed to spend any more money on either or both of these new schools in the present financial year, and, if so, how much?"

Hon. H. RICHTER (Somerset) replied—

"(1) (a) £38,148; (b) £44,503."

"(2) No."

COMPULSORY FITTING OF SAFETY BELTS IN MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Labour and Industry—

"In view of the recent Gallup poll result as published in 'The Courier-Mail' of September 26, wherein it was stated that six out of ten people would compel installation of safety belts in front seats of private cars and that this vote came from fifty-six per centum of drivers and six per centum of other people, will he re-examine my request to him and give consideration to making the fitting of such belts compulsory, especially in view of the reported statement of the Police Minister that such belts would be fitted in certain police and Government vehicles to minimise the personal injury rate in the event of accidents?"

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier), for Hon. K. J. MORRIS (Mt. Coot-tha), replied—

"The question of the compulsory fitting of seat belts in motor vehicles was recently considered on an Australian-wide basis by the Australian Transport Advisory Council and it was generally agreed that the use of seat belts should not be made a compulsory fitting. As with other safety aids which can be fitted to motor vehicles, the persons concerned must be prepared to use them.

If such fittings were made compulsory there is no guarantee that they will be regularly used; therefore it is not proposed

to make the fitting of safety belts compulsory, but to leave it as a matter for decision by individual motor vehicle owners. In this regard the Government has given a lead by deciding to fit safety belts to Government-owned vehicles. As the Honourable Member is no doubt aware, the trend in new vehicle manufacture is to provide anchor points for the fitting of safety belts if desired by the purchaser. I feel I must once again stress that safety belts whilst very desirable safety aids, are only incidental to the great problem of endeavouring to impress upon the irresponsible and careless section of motorists that not only are they endangering their own lives but the lives of other human beings."

DELAYS IN MAGISTRATES COURT HEARINGS

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Justice—

"In view of press reports that there are delays in justice due to insufficient magistrates—

(1) Have there been any people kept in gaol without trial during the years 1960, 1961, and 1962?

(2) If so, how many and for what periods of time?

(3) If the answer to (1) is in the affirmative, what are the reasons for this?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing), for Hon. A. W. MUNRO (Toowoong), replied—

"(1 to 3) The preamble to this question is incorrect in so far as it suggests that delays in justice are due to insufficient Magistrates. On a consideration of the basic principles of justice and long established legal procedures it is evident that some delays in the administration of justice are completely unavoidable. It is, however, not true to suggest either that there are insufficient Magistrates in Queensland or that such an insufficiency is a primary cause of any delay which may occur. It is not practicable to furnish figures asked for by the Honourable Member seeing that the prison records are not kept on the basis as detailed in his question. During the years 1960, 1961 and 1962 there were approximately 12,200 receptions into Queensland Prisons, this figure being inclusive of remand prisoners and convicted persons and doubtless including also a number of persons received into a prison on more than one occasion during the three-year period. Separate statistics are not kept in relation to the number of remand prisoners as distinct from convicted persons or as to the periods of time served by prisoners coming within particular categories. As a general indication of the position under our Queensland law it may be said that no person is kept in prison in this State unless that person has been

committed to prison following a conviction, is held on remand pending trial or appearance before the Court or is detained during Her Majesty's pleasure following on a trial. Cases before Magistrates are dealt with as promptly as possible having regard to the circumstances of each particular case. Any period during which a person is held on remand awaiting trial in the Supreme or District Court could not in any way be due to an insufficiency of Magistrates."

DISCHARGE OF MRS. LILLIAN WILSON FROM PRINCESS ALEXANDRA HOSPITAL

Mr. BROMLEY (Norman) asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"(1) Was a Mrs. Lillian Wilson, aged seventy-four years, of 19 Potts Street, East Brisbane, admitted as a patient to the Princess Alexandra Hospital during September?"

"(2) Was she suffering from a bad attack of shingles?"

"(3) Was she discharged approximately a week later against (a) her own wishes, (b) the desires of her son-in-law, Mr. Drewes, and (c) the advice of certain doctors and nursing sisters and that of her own private doctor?"

"(4) In view of the fact that medical advice was to the effect that she was not in a fit and proper condition to be discharged and because she was admitted to the Mater Public Hospital on a doctor's certificate, will he investigate the circumstances surrounding this case and submit the information to the House?"

"(5) How many patients in similar circumstances have been discharged in the years 1961 and 1962?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"(1) Yes."

"(2) Mrs. Wilson was suffering from shingles of moderate severity."

"(3) (a) She was discharged from hospital after two weeks. Before her discharge she was concerned with the difficulty of dressing the shingles after she went home. When it was explained that the hospital would arrange for the District Nurses to visit her daily to carry out the necessary dressings she was satisfied with this arrangement. (b) Mr. Drewes and the patient were interviewed by the Hospital Social Worker and the subject of dressings was discussed. (c) The senior physician attending her and the Medical Superintendent of Princess Alexandra Hospital were satisfied that Mrs. Wilson no longer required in-patient hospital care. The sister in charge of the ward stated that Mrs. Wilson was moving around the ward quite well but would need assistance with dressings because of the position of the shingles."

"(4) Mrs. Wilson was considered to be in a fit and proper condition to be discharged. She entered the Mater Public Hospital on September 24. The doctor recommending her admission stated in his letter that she had no one to look after her. The District Nurse in charge of the case expressed surprise that she re-entered hospital as she was improving."

"(5) It is not the policy of the hospital to retain patients who no longer require in-patient care."

CHECKS OF MOTOR VEHICLES FOR ROADWORTHINESS

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

"Will he investigate an alternative method of safety road checks of motor vehicles conveying persons to employment so as to eliminate the present situation wherein, because it takes approximately one half-hour to check these vehicles, persons so involved are being reprimanded by their employers and could incur loss of wages because of their late arrival?"

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier), for **Hon. K. J. MORRIS** (Mt. Cool-tha), replied—

"The system of checking vehicles for roadworthiness as at present being carried out is such that the inspection is undertaken by persons well experienced in their duties and usually takes only four or five minutes and does not cause any undue or lengthy delay to drivers of motor vehicles. Possible exceptions of course are cases where vehicles are found to have numerous defects or are found to be completely unroadworthy and are the subject of an order requiring their removal from service until placed in a roadworthy condition. No complaint has been received of a person or persons being delayed at a road check and being reprimanded by an employer for the delay or incurring the loss of wages because of late arrival at work. However, if the Honourable Member will give me particulars of the cases to which he refers, I will be happy to have the circumstances investigated."

PAYMENTS TO MEMBERS OF LITERATURE BOARD OF REVIEW

Mr. DEAN (Sandgate) asked the Minister for Justice—

"What monetary remuneration did each individual member of the Literature Board of Review receive for each meeting attended during the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962?"

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing), for **Hon. A. W. MUNRO** (Toowong), replied—

"Payment to members of the Literature Board of Review is made on the basis of an annual allowance and not on the basis of a fee per meeting. The Chairman of the Board received an allowance of £500 per annum. The Deputy Chairman receives £300 per annum and each of the three Board Members receives £200 per annum. The active work of the Board is not confined to meetings. Members of the Board spend considerable time between meetings reading and examining publications for consideration and discussion at Board meetings."

INCIDENTS AT WESTBROOK FARM HOME

Mr. DEWAR (Wavell), without notice, asked the Minister for Health and Home Affairs—

"Has the Minister's attention been drawn to the 'Sunday Truth' of October 7 wherein appears a heading—'New Outbreak of Violence, Riots, at Boys' Home.'"

"'Sunday Truth' quotes assertions of another major insurrection in which rioting boys smashed down a door and threatened warders with large pieces of timber. The statement goes on—'In the past few weeks an attempt has been made to stab a warder with a table knife. The warders are getting worried. The turnover in warders is terrific. After Monday night's show there will be a few more looking for jobs.'"

"Will the Minister advise the House the real 'truth' of the episodes referred to?"

Hon. H. W. NOBLE (Yeronga) replied—

"No rioting or collective disobedience by boys has occurred at Westbrook since those of May and June, 1961.

"The incidents referred to in the 'Sunday Truth' Press report are not in any way associated with each other and the Superintendent states that no boy has been 'seriously sexually attacked', or sexually attacked in any way.

"The incident of the smashing of a door which occurred on 1 October last involved one boy only. This lad is one of the most difficult boys at the Home and has been under constant psychiatric supervision for some months. After breaking a trestle of a ping-pong table, he used a piece of wood to smash a door but no injury was caused to any boy or any members of the staff. After being called by the blowing of the emergency siren, the Superintendent had no difficulty in taking the piece of wood away from the lad. This boy was examined next morning by a psychiatrist and later by the Government

Medical Officer, Toowoomba. As a result, he was removed to the Brisbane General Hospital for observation and later to the Brisbane Mental Hospital.

"On 22 August, one boy in the security unit did attempt to stab a warder but was prevented from doing so by the intervention of one of the other boys. In the face of the Press article, this is most notable. There is no mystery as to how the knife got into the security unit. Knives and forks are supplied for meals and, before boys leave the table, the utensils are handed back to the warders on duty to count them to ensure that all are received back. The incident occurred immediately after the check when one knife was found to be missing and the boy who had it then made his attempt. This boy was examined by a visiting psychiatrist and later transferred to the Brisbane General Hospital. He is now a patient at the Brisbane Mental Hospital.

Hon. members will appreciate that incidents such as the two mentioned can occur in any Home like Westbrook and I feel it is a tribute to the Superintendent and his staff that they can control such incidents without injury either to themselves or to the boys.

"The Westbrook staff situation is satisfactory, and no difficulty is being experienced in obtaining staff for the Home. In the last three months, there have been only three resignations; one passed the police entrance examination and joined the Police Force, another successfully passed the engine-drivers' examination and wanted to follow that calling, and the third resigned in order to avoid dismissal because he admitted he was carrying letters to and from the boys in the Home contrary to the regulations and without the knowledge of the Superintendent.

"The staff have not given any indication that they are worried. In fact, the Director, Mr. Clark, was at Westbrook on 2 October, the day following the incident of the smashing of the door, and no member of the staff approached him to express his concern, nor has the Superintendent had any approach from the staff in this regard.

"Segregation of boys does exist at Westbrook, but on the basis of behaviour. The more difficult boys are kept apart and the boys who are well-behaved live in the privilege unit. Surely 'Sunday Truth's' anonymous caller does not expect that boys who were involved in the 1961 incidents should forever be detained in the security unit and not given a chance for rehabilitation.

"The State Children Department, in collaboration with the Welfare and Guidance Service, is now exercising careful classification of all boys coming under the department's control. This classification, which

takes place at the Wilson Youth Hospital, enables the department to place boys in the most suitable conditions for their rehabilitation; that is, either back in their own homes on probation, in foster homes, in one of the denominational homes, or, for the most persistent offenders, Westbrook.

"Boys under 14 years of age are not now admitted to Westbrook. A classification within Westbrook itself is also made in collaboration with the Welfare and Guidance Service. The boys are placed in three groups—the privilege unit for the better-behaved boys, the general section, which is for new admissions and lads who have not earned places in the privilege unit, and the security unit, where the more difficult boys are held.

"There is now a very good scheme of classification, and it is working in the interests of all lads committed to the department's care. It has resulted in a considerable reduction in the number of boys at Westbrook. In April, 1961, an all-time high of 138 boys was held there. Today there are 59, and the daily average is maintained at around 60. This is essential not only for the management of the home but for the training of the lads. The position at Westbrook is considerably improved, and at least there is one correct statement made by 'Sunday Truth's' informer; that is, that the boys are not mistreated in any way.

"Work is still progressing at the Home. A new bathing and dressing block is under construction, and a commencement will soon be made on the manual-training unit. Further improvements are to be carried out in the near future.

"I can assure hon. members that the position at Westbrook is nothing like that contained in the newspaper report, and I do not feel that there are any grounds for concern."

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report of the Burdekin River Authority for the year 1961-1962.

Report of the Insurance Commissioner for the year 1961-1962.

Report of the Registrar of Co-operative Housing Societies for the year 1961-1962.

Report of the Government Gas Engineer for the year 1961-1962.

The following papers were laid on the table:—

Orders in Council under the State Housing Acts, 1945 to 1962 and the Local Bodies' Loans Guarantee Acts, 1923 to 1957.

Orders in Council under the Co-operative Housing Societies Acts, 1958 to 1961.

Orders in Council under the Harbours Acts, 1955 to 1962.

First Annual Report and Accounts of the Totalisator Administration Board of Queensland, covering the period March 1, 1962 to June 30, 1962.

Orders in Council under the State Electricity Commission Acts, 1937 to 1962.

Orders in Council under the Southern Electric Authority of Queensland Acts, 1952 to 1958.

Orders in Council under the Mines Regulation Acts 1910 to 1958.

LAND TAX ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Land Tax Acts, 1915 to 1962, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

LAND TAX (FURTHER ADJUSTMENT) BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill relating to land tax in and for the financial year begun on the first day of July, 1962."

Motion agreed to.

STAMP ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Stamp Acts, 1894 to 1961, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—
Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I
move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1961, in certain particulars."

Motion agreed to.

RACING AND BETTING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

INITIATION

Hon. T. A. HILEY (Chatsworth—
Treasurer and Minister for Housing): I
move—

"That the House will, at its present sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Racing and Betting Acts, 1954 to 1961, in certain circumstances."

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

COMMITTEE—FINANCIAL STATEMENT— RESUMPTION OF DEBATE

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

Debate resumed from 27 September (see
p. 644) on Mr. Hiley's motion—

"That there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1962-1963, a sum not exceeding £1,594 to defray the salary of Aide-de-Camp to His Excellency the Governor."

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.28 a.m.): Last year, in the discussion on the Treasurer's Financial Statement, the Leader of the Opposition claimed that it was a "booze and betting" Budget. It was obvious at that time that the Government was unable to fulfil many of the promises that the Liberal Party had made to a section of the community that, if it was the Government, it would never introduce legalised off-course betting in this State.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust hon. members will keep their conversations down so that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition may speak without interruption.

Mr. LLOYD: Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

However, hon. members opposite no doubt found, following discussions at meetings of the Loan Council and Premiers' Conferences, that they were unable to continue as a Government unless they obtained increased

revenue from the people. The easiest method by which they considered they could secure additional finance was by taxing the working population on the results of the sweat they had lost. In other words, they depended upon the fact that the working population of this State liked a glass of beer and a bet and, in their lack of wisdom, they decided to give them greater scope to spend their money in this way, thereby obtaining additional finance by way of taxation.

On this occasion, I think we could call the Budget presented by the Treasurer a ballot-box Budget, for two reasons. If the Treasurer will be patient for a moment I will give the two reasons. First, because of the ballot-box revolution by the people of Queensland in December last year it was possible for this State to secure additional finance from the Commonwealth Government to enable a greater expenditure during last financial year and this financial year. Second, it has become rather obvious that the State Treasurer has conserved a large portion of the £3,340,000 advanced by the Commonwealth Government last year for expenditure this year, which is an election year. At least, we hope it will be spent this year. We hope that the total amount of £3,690,000 advanced for the relief of unemployment this year will be spent by the Treasurer. For those two reasons I think we can call it a ballot-box Budget.

As a result of the ballot-box revolution in December, when the shock waves of the explosion of the Federal election swept round Australia, there was a fall-out of some millions of pounds. Previously it had been impossible for the Treasurer and the Premier of Queensland to convince the Federal Government that Queensland's case was sufficiently strong to warrant the infusion of additional money into this State. Several years ago it had been decided that in exceptional circumstances Queensland and South Australia should make application to the Commonwealth Government for additional financial assistance. Over the period of 12 months we have had an alarming increase in unemployment. Queensland's position in this regard has been worse than that of the other States. We do not know yet whether the Treasurer and the Premier have made individual approaches during that time for additional relief from the Commonwealth Government. In other words, we do not know whether they have made approaches for the unemployment relief which, because of the exceptional circumstances in Queensland at the time, could have been forthcoming from the Commonwealth Government. It was left until the explosion of the last Federal elections before the money was forthcoming.

In looking at the financial position of the State and the nation it is obvious that at the present time we are faced with an exceptional set of circumstances. I believe it is necessary for the Federal Government to budget this year for a deficit in excess

of £100,000,000. That is essential, even if only to bring Australia's economy back to the state it was in before the Federal Government introduced its harsh credit restrictions and other financial measures whereby it increased interest rates and reduced the taxation benefits of hire-purchase companies. Those measures all brought about a great deal of unemployment throughout Australia, causing a recession in development. The infusion of this additional money will not only remedy some of the damage that was done but it will also provide additional finance for development. It is on that point that I wish to dwell for the moment.

Irrespective of the protestations of many people in the community, at the present time Australia, and particularly Queensland, is faced with a rather difficult position. It is difficult for us to try to understand or to foresee what will happen to our primary industries and the future marketing of our primary products. The probability of Great Britain's entry into the European Common Market and the very fact that the armed power of nations to the north of Australia is ever-growing have brought about the realisation in this country that we shall have to live very closely with these people to our immediate north. If we are to maintain our trading capacity, both export and import, we shall have to alter many of our previous ideas on living and trade. The infusion of this money for development is directed mainly towards increasing our primary production. I do not argue against that because it is very necessary. It is essential to do everything possible to increase production so that when we are faced with difficulties in the future we can pay our way on the world markets. That can be done by two methods only: first, by increasing our export trade, and second, by increasing industrial productivity in Australia. Because of the generosity of the Federal Government, whether forced or not, the State Government has been able to infuse a certain amount of extra money into the local economy. However, there seems to be a complete lack of realisation on the part of commerce of the great necessity to increase production in secondary industries. If we are to survive, it is more than a question of increasing our primary productivity, or of increasing our exports. If our customers change overnight we have no guarantee that the world price for our commodities will be maintained, and if we have to change customers in the future they may not be able to continue to pay the prices that we have been receiving. That is only a possibility, but I advance it because we could be in a very difficult position in several years' time.

We should look at local production and encourage manufacturers in Australia, as far as possible, to increase their efficiency to enable them to compete with imported goods. We have a fine record in the production of iron and steel; indeed, the industry in this

country is one of the most efficient in the world. No doubt many mining companies have improved their efficiency to the extent that they can compete successfully on the world markets. However, many industries are badly managed and are completely incompetent and inefficient in their methods of production and cannot possibly compete with manufactured goods imported from overseas. If commerce is to play its part properly in the transitional period of Australia's development, it could, by increasing its efficiency and by improving methods of management, become competitive and expand production for internal consumption. In that way we could overcome any difficulty, or any recession in prosperity, in the next few years.

It has been said in the South that Great Britain's entry to the European Common Market may be of some benefit to Australia. It most certainly could be if secondary industry in Australia can be geared to produce goods economically for Australian consumers. But if secondary industry cannot compete with overseas manufacturers we will be in a parlous state.

It is very difficult to try to understand all the Tables and the Estimates presented by the Treasurer, who said that we could go to bed quietly, put a wet towel round our heads, and study them for some hours. That is necessary to try to understand them completely and analyse them thoroughly. I have said that last year the Treasurer conserved a considerable portion of the £3,340,000 which was contributed by the Commonwealth Government to Queensland for unemployment relief.

Mr. Hiley: Who gave you that idea?

Mr. LLOYD: I intend to submit a number of figures that substantiate that argument. I will be only too glad to do it. In doing so, I may repeat some of the arguments used by the Treasurer several years ago about the building up of trust accounts. I believe my reasons are substantial and, as I say, in some instances they will be a repetition of arguments used from time to time by the Treasurer.

Mr. Hiley: If they are justified they are very substantial, but make sure your facts are right.

Mr. LLOYD: I am sure they are.

Quite happily for himself, in February of this year the Treasurer was able to secure the sum of £3,340,000 from the Federal Government because of the explosion at the Federal Election. This amount represented a considerable infusion into the State's economy. No doubt whatever proportion of that money was used did a considerable amount of good, but I am speaking of the method of using it. If it was used for the purpose of building up the net loan expenditure on works in Queensland I have no argument about it. Apparently £2,814,000 was expended on subsidies to local authorities.

Of course, the amount of subsidy cannot be considered expenditure on State works. We have to compare the treatment by the Treasurer in this matter with the treatment of the £500,000 going for maintenance work on railways and for maintenance work on hospitals and other public buildings. The £2,814,000 paid in subsidies for local authorities increases to that extent the amount available in the Loan Fund Account for expenditure on works such as buildings, main roads, and irrigation and water supply.

When we compare the treatment of the moneys given to other States by way of Commonwealth benefit, we find, firstly, that the Tasmanian Premier had £1,168,000 allocated for expenditure during 1962-1963 on works that will create employment. He said that he feared this would provide only a temporary stimulus.

Mr. Hiley: You are speaking of 1962-1963.

Mr. LLOYD: Yes, next year.

Mr. Reece at that time took immediate steps to inject this amount of £1,168,000 into the Tasmanian economy through the agency of Government departments, semi-governmental bodies, and local authorities. That would be 1961-1962. That was his method. In other words, he gave the money to Government departments to spend on buildings and to employment agencies, local authorities, and semi-governmental bodies, which also would create employment.

In South Australia, as a result of the additional funds made available for housing and other employment-producing works, the Government took steps, according to Sir Thomas Playford, immediately to allocate the funds to departments and authorities.

In Victoria there was a different treatment of the money made available to that State. The Premier, Mr. Bolte, who is also the Treasurer, said—

“Because the form of the Commonwealth legislation made this special grant of £1,800,000 a general assistance grant, it became necessary to credit it in the first instance to Consolidated Revenue. An equivalent amount was then transferred from revenue into a trust account entitled ‘Special Works Trust Account—Commonwealth Grant’, and a validating appropriation for this transfer is included in the Supplementary Estimates.”

He went on to say—

“I would point out to the House that every penny of the grant was expended before 30 June last on the works and purposes which I outlined to the House in March.”

He added—

“... we spent the maximum of our available resources during last financial year in order to give the greatest possible stimulus to activity.”

No doubt the Victorian method of placing the money into a special trust account would enable us to discover from the trust account whether the money was expended in full.

The Treasurer here was fortunate because, following the last census, the State gained an additional £1,000,000 special assistance grant. No doubt that enabled him to recover from deficit budgeting and to create his surplus, which completely absorbed the £1,000,000. It would appear from a study of the Loan Fund Account that the total amount of £2,814,000 has not been expended.

Mr. Hiley: How much have our Loan Fund cash balances increased during the year? Have a look!

Mr. LLOYD: It was allocated from the Loan Fund Account most certainly, and apparently expended from that account. But the Treasurer knows as well as I do that a great number of Trust and Special Funds are financed from the Loan Fund Account, and it is necessary to examine the credit balances and the expenditure from those Trust and Special Funds to discover whether, in fact, the money has been fully expended.

Let us examine this position. If we compare the levels of Trust and Special Funds at the end of June, 1962, and the end of June, 1961, we get some idea of the improvement in the balances during a period of 12 months. In 1962 the level of investments held by the State Government amounted to £58,990,000. For the 12 months prior to that it was £54,733,000, showing an improvement this year of £4,257,000. The cash balance, plus short-term investments, increased from £4,835,000 in 1961 to £6,551,000, or an improvement of £1,716,000. The credit balances in the Trust and Special Funds have improved to the extent of some £6,000,000 during the period of 12 months.

We have also to consider that in the two years 1959 to 1961 the increased increment of Trust and Special Funds credit balances was less than the amount of the increase in the last 12 months, which indicates that it was a particularly prosperous year from the Government's point of view. These figures have been used before, and I know that the Treasurer himself has used them to indicate the prosperity of the Government at that time. He also endeavoured to attack the then Treasurer several years ago for putting away a considerable sum in Trust and Special Funds.

Let us now look at the position of the Loan Fund. The distribution was £2,814,000. No doubt much unemployment would have been averted if that amount of money had been diverted to such work as the building of public buildings and schools, which immediately creates employment. In some cases, that was not done.

The Treasurer points out in the Financial Statement that this year it is intended to eliminate the accumulated deficit of £673,000. His method of elimination is to take an equivalent amount from the Agricultural Bank Fund, the Harbour Dues Fund, and the Queensland Housing Commission Fund, and divert it to Consolidated Revenue this year and writing off £673,000. If we look at the balances of those three funds and their increases during the past 12 months, it becomes apparent that, had the Treasurer wished, he could have written off the accumulated deficit during the last financial year. He preferred to wait, however, because if he had written it off at that time he may have left himself open to an accusation of using Commonwealth money for that purpose.

Let us look first at the Queensland Housing Commission Fund. This fund benefited to the extent of £315,000, which was not appropriated. An amount of £315,000 more than was appropriated was transferred to the Queensland Housing Commission Fund and was spent in accordance with the provisions of the Loan Fund Account. If we examine the credit balances of the Queensland Housing Commission Fund, we find that at 30 June, 1961, the credit balance was £40,440, and at 30 June, 1962, the credit balance was £243,401. In other words, it had been under-spent by an amount of £200,000 during the 12 months, and at the same time £315,000 had been diverted to the fund, probably from the money provided by the Commonwealth for the relief of unemployment. If we go back further, we find that a few years ago £253,000 was paid from the Queensland Housing Commission Fund for the assets of the Workers' Homes Fund that were transferred to that fund. There is, of course, no doubt that the amount in the fund is increased or decreased from year to year; but this happened at a time when there was serious unemployment in the State and when it was necessary to stimulate the building industry as much as possible. As I said, the credit balance increased by over £200,000 in 12 months.

Let us now look at the Harbour Dues Fund. The appropriation for that fund was under-spent by about £500,000. I do not pretend to be completely accurate, but the amount appropriated was considerably under-spent. The credit balance in the fund increased by £300,000 in 12 months to an amount in excess of £800,000.

In the same period there was an increase of several hundred thousand pounds in the credit balance of the Agricultural Bank Fund, and during the 12 months the credit balances in the three funds that I have mentioned increased by over £673,000. Those are the three funds from which the Treasurer will be reducing his accumulated deficit.

To continue discussing the Trust Funds, we find—and here I do give the Treasurer credit—that an amount of just under £800,000

has been expended from the Loan Fund Account on public buildings, such as schools and technical colleges, over and above the appropriation for that fund last year. Obviously money received from the Commonwealth Government for the relief of unemployment was expended for that purpose. There was over-spending of £417,000 on irrigation and water supply, and I also give credit to the Treasurer there. Only £6,000 was added to the amount shown in the Trust and Special Funds, so we can take it that virtually the whole £417,000 was expended in 12 months.

Now let us look at the Main Roads Fund. A considerable sum was allocated from the Loan Fund Account to the Main Roads Fund, and an additional £259,000 was transferred from the Loan Fund Account to that fund. Here again we find a considerable under-spending and a very large increase in the credit balance in the Main Roads Fund.

All these instances have tended to increase our suspicion that moneys have been diverted. As I said, an amount of £315,000 was transferred to the Queensland Housing Commission Fund, which enabled the Government to show an increased credit balance of £200,000 in that fund, and £259,000 was transferred from the Loan Fund Account to the Main Roads Fund. Again there was some under-spending there, which meant an increase of £170,000-odd in the Main Roads Fund Account.

Another matter that requires explanation from the Treasurer is the Mount Isa Railway Project Fund. A study of appropriations reveals that last year an amount of £1,620,000 was appropriated for Loan Fund Trust Account. This year that figure has been increased to £2,020,000, an increase of £400,000.

I do not accuse the Treasurer of being deliberately misleading, but we could gain the wrong impression from those figures. The actual figures in the Loan Fund Account last year indicated that there was an appropriation in excess of £10,000,000, included in which was an appropriation for loans and subsidies to local bodies £510,000 greater than the figure shown in the Estimates as being appropriated on this occasion.

Mr. Hiley: What are you discussing now? Loans and subsidies, or Mount Isa?

Mr. LLOYD: Loans and subsidies. I am showing how this money was balanced out. An amount of £10,736,000 was appropriated last year. That is the Treasurer's own subdivision in the Estimates at that time. Included in that was an amount of £5,700,000 shown as appropriation for loans and subsidies to local bodies. This year that appropriation is shown as £5,190,000, or £510,000 less than the appropriation shown in the Estimates last year. Of that, £400,000 was added to the appropriation for the Mount Isa Railway Project Fund. In other words, to secure a balance, £400,000

of that £10,736,000 was added to the Mount Isa Railway Project Fund and £110,000 to the appropriation for new universities. I am not complaining about that, but although that brought that figure to an amount in excess of the actual Loan Fund expenditure on that item, the actual expenditure from the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works Trust Fund is shown as £88,000-odd on new universities less than the amount expended from the Loan Fund, and over the year an improved credit balance of £72,000 was available to the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works Construction Fund. The transfer of the sum of £510,000 was a method of manipulation to almost square up the appropriation for the Mount Isa Railway Project Fund Account.

In his Financial Statement last year the Treasurer said that an amount of £4½ million was the anticipated advance of loan moneys from the Commonwealth Government to the State to finance the Mount Isa Railway Project in that year. In actual fact, the State received only £3,750,000. No doubt, that was all that was needed by the State Government to finance the project in that 12-monthly period. Instead of £1,620,000 being spent from the Loan Fund Account, an amount of £2,020,000 was spent and the additional £400,000 was taken from the Commonwealth Government's advance for the relief of unemployment, transferred from works which could have immediately relieved unemployment to the Mount Isa Railway Project Fund Account. If the Treasurer's expectation had been reached, for the last financial year we would have received £4.3 million from the Commonwealth Government by way of advance to that fund, but instead we received only £3¾ million, or £600,000 less.

Turning now to the Railway Department, it will be noticed that there is another unexpected contribution to the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund in general expenditure in the Railway Vote. In the subdivision of the Railway Vote, expenditure on rolling stock was in excess of £420,000 above the appropriation. I have no doubt that this sum was also transferred to the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund for financing the purchase of rolling stock for that line. In other words, there was an apparent need on the part of the Treasurer to utilise some of his own loan funds this year on the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund, money that could have been used for other purposes, instead of claiming on the Commonwealth Government to the full extent of the £4½ million that he expected to receive at the beginning of last financial year. There is the indication that £400,000 of the money that should have been spent on the relief of unemployment in Queensland was not spent. If in fact the Treasurer had available to him £4.3 million and he was sincere in his approach to the problem of unemployment, he would have claimed on the Commonwealth Government to the full extent of that money. In the final analysis, Queensland

has spent much more than the Commonwealth Government in the few years that the fund has been in operation. Of the £10,000,000 which is the total amount of the expenditure on the railway line up to the present time, the Commonwealth Government has made a contribution of only £3,750,000. This year it is necessary for the State to allocate a further £980,000 from Loan Fund Account so that if, as we are told, the total cost of the work on the line is far below the original estimate of £29,000,000, Queensland will have contributed a total amount of more than £7,000,000 at the end of this year. In other words, in the next year or so while the work is in progress it will cost the State Government nothing and it will cost the Commonwealth Government the full expenditure of the fund. My criticism is not that we will have no contribution, or very little contribution, but that last year was a year of excessive unemployment in Queensland when it was essential that all Governments should do everything possible to provide immediate work to relieve the plight of the unemployed and give a stimulus to the economy of the State. If the Commonwealth Government was prepared to advance that £400,000, the money would have been better spent on public works, including many of the school buildings presently required in the State.

The overall picture shows an increase in most of the Trust and Special Funds, which are developmental and employment-creating in their intention. The Barron River Hydro-electric Extension Project Fund improved its balance from £35,925 to £265,578. I have already mentioned the Co-ordinator-General of Public Works Construction Fund, the credit balance of which improved to the extent of about £70,000. The Agricultural Bank Fund balance increased from £182,000 to £430,000. That was in a year when there was a good deal of unemployment. An additional number of people being settled on the land would at least have created some employment. The balance of the Harbour Dues Fund showed a huge increase from £576,015 to £856,979, while the Housing Commission Fund balance improved by £200,000. All those figures indicate the State's improved financial position.

In his Financial Statement the Treasurer has endeavoured as far as possible to write down the importance of the unemployment position and to concentrate on the great improvement that has come about in the last few months. Naturally we always expect a considerable improvement in the unemployment position during the few months when seasonal work is at its peak. That is normal. At the same time we cannot be happy, nor can the Treasurer, with the fact that at the end of August there were still some 12,000 people out of work. Because I have mentioned the increased expenditure from Loan Funds on school buildings, that does not mean that I intend to build up the Treasurer's programme.

However, if the credit funds are as indicated by the Tables, with an increase in the Agricultural Bank Fund, the Housing Commission Fund, and some other funds, I feel sure the Treasurer would have received an assurance from every member of Cabinet about the maximum expenditure from those funds. The very fact that the Queensland Housing Commission was able to increase its balance by £200,000 indicates that that amount of money was available for infusion into the building industry of this State. That would have created a great deal of employment, because many houses would have been built. Ancillary industries would have benefited and there would have been a snowballing effect on employment.

Members of the present Government have made a number of political boasts about their programme of work for schools and education. I do not know that there is a great deal about which they can boast. The overall plan for education was prepared by the Hanlon Government in 1946, when plans were made for the regionalisation of education in this State. The foundation for the present building programme, and for the general improvement in the educational standards, was laid because the changes in the world of technology and science were foreseen. In those days the Labour Government established a perimeter high school scheme and this Government continued with its implementation. In 1946 we realised that an ever-increasing sum would be required in the forthcoming years for expenditure on school buildings and education generally.

When I was secretary to the Hon. E. M. Hanlon I know that he caused a complete examination and analysis to be made of education in Queensland. He asked the Director-General at that time to establish the scheme of regionalisation, so that the State would be divided into regions and, so far as possible, there would be concentration on various forms of education in different parts of Queensland to suit local needs. If the north of Queensland was a primary producing area, then emphasis would be placed on agricultural education in that area. All those things were considered and, since 1957, this Government has simply implemented the overall plan. However, we say that expenditure on education at present is not quite sufficient. We must compare the expenditure in Queensland with that in other States. We find that the Premier of Victoria has estimated that it will be necessary for him to increase his expenditure on education for this year by 10 per cent. compared with last year, yet the Treasurer's statement shows only an 8 per cent. increase in expenditure for Queensland. In the other States of the Commonwealth the situation is the same. There has been an ever-increasing expenditure on school construction and education. The Premier of Victoria has forecast that his Government will spend on education 25 per cent. of its total expenditure.

The Victorian Government has been forced by circumstances to increase expenditure on education by 150 per cent. over the last seven years. Queensland, under a Country Party-Liberal Government, has increased its expenditure by only 75 per cent. in five years. Still the Government contends that it has improved educational services and that it is coping with demands. Its performance is not comparable with Victoria's. If the Government asserts that it is fulfilling all requirements in providing school buildings in Queensland, which I doubt, it indicates that the foundation laid by previous Labour Governments upon which it had to build was a solid one. The plan was an excellent one and one which enabled the State to cope with the problem.

Let us have a look at the expansion of education in Queensland before the present Government took office. In 1945, 7,845 children sat for the Scholarship examination and 5,305 passed. In 1955, 14,889 sat and 11,960 passed. In other words, the figures were doubled within 10 years. No doubt if we compared the figures for 1955 and 1962 we would find the same proportionate increase.

Turn to the Junior examination and bear in mind the rate of construction of high schools. In 1945, 4,790 children sat for the Junior examination and 3,819 passed. In 1955, 7,498 sat and 7,361 passed. So apparently there was a relationship between the numbers who sat for the Scholarship and passed and those who sat for the Junior and passed. If the increase had been 100 per cent. in the case of the Scholarship, it would have been the same with the high schools. The demand apparent in 1955 was being absorbed by the rate of construction of high schools in the State and the ability of the high schools to cope with the children requiring secondary education. No doubt the figures from 1957 to 1962 would show a similar result.

Complaints are still being received from many school committees that many of the primary schools are unable to cope with the numbers of children attending them. Last year the Government concentrated on the construction of high schools and in many cases State primary schools had to suffer, with insufficient buildings or insufficient classrooms, not merely in Brisbane but in many other parts of the State as well. There has been a little improvement this year but in some places the conditions persist. Such complaints indicate that the demand is not being met and that the rate of construction of schools and of additions to schools is not enough to keep everybody happy. The State school committees are not happy.

Mr. Hughes: I am on the Queensland Council of State School Committees and we have not heard that complaint.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Kurilpa may be sure that if they do not go to him it is probably because they cannot

find him. They come to me and to other Labour members. The education position is rather grave. I realise the impact it has had on the economy of the State and on its budgeting, and no doubt that will continue.

The Treasurer has said that the expenditure by way of grants to the Queensland University during the next 12 months will exceed £1,000,000. That figure is in excess of what was granted last year. I am speaking now of grant from the Loan Fund Account. I do not want to have the same misunderstanding as occurred last year when I was discussing the Loan Fund Account and the Treasurer indicated that I was discussing the overall expenditure on universities. Expenditure on universities is ever-increasing, and it shows the not very great desirability of matching grants made available from time to time by the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government has certain maximum limits in its allocations to the States for university buildings. It is necessary for a State Government to spend a certain amount of money before it can receive the maximum amount of matching grant, and I do not think that that is completely desirable. It was indicated last year that there would be a fallingshort of some £20,000 or £30,000 in the matching grant. It has been indicated in the present Financial Statement that, because of some savings in other departments or increases in fees at the University itself, an amount had been transferred to the grant for the University and it was possible to receive the whole of the matching grant from the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Hiley: We made a higher State grant.

Mr. LLOYD: I realise that we did get it. The point that I am endeavouring to make is that I am yet to be convinced that the system of matching grants from the Commonwealth Government is always desirable. For instance, it may not be possible for the State Government in one period of 12 months to make a sufficiently-large grant to the University for construction work to qualify for the receipt of the whole of the matching grant. The Government had its difficulties last year.

Mr. Hiley: The matching-grants system puts a weight on your back that could kill you.

Mr. LLOYD: Exactly. The same thing applies to a number of other Commonwealth contributions to the State Government. The provision of State schools is placing a great strain on State budgeting at present. This question is one of grave importance, and it is necessary that the difficulty be overcome before we turn to the University. Having budgeted for the maximum amount of money to each State, the Commonwealth Government could assist by making it available during such a difficult period as that through which the State Government is now passing. That would be the better system. After all, the money is provided in the budgeted

expenditure and, if it were made available when the State was concentrating on the provision of primary and secondary education, it would assist more than it does now.

There is no doubt in my mind that the abolition of the State Scholarship examination, as proposed by the State Government during the middle of the year, with the transition to a different form of primary and intermediate education, was intended at the time as a political gimmick. I have yet to be convinced that the State Government is in a position to cope with the transition period through which it will have to pass to enable it to increase the school-leaving age to 15.

Mr. Hughes: A special committee made that decision.

Mr. LLOYD: I realise there is value in the scheme. As a matter of fact, I would like to see introduced into this State the comprehensive system of education existing at present in the United Kingdom, where all schools are grouped together right through to the matriculation stage. There they have primary education, an intermediate period of three years during which vocational guidance is taken, and then secondary education at the age of 15. The students then go to matriculation by automatic progression, without any examinations. It is a very efficient system of education. What we have to remember here is that there will be many difficulties in the transition period when, overnight, we are going to abolish the Scholarship examination. That can be done quite easily, but perhaps the present system of education should have been continued, in a progression to secondary education, till, by means of building construction and perhaps the diverting of children from one school to another, the whole plan for primary and secondary education was complete. No doubt it would then have been possible to get through the period without any of the difficulties that will be encountered in the next two years.

The Government made only one announcement. The scheme is an excellent one that will operate to the advantage of the educational standards of the State, but I believe that the announcement was somewhat impetuous. If the Scholarship examination was to be abolished, certainly members of the public were entitled to know that; but the children between 12 and 15 years of age will be caught up in the transition.

Mr. Hiley: But that is why it was announced early—to enable us to get the buildings and the staff that we needed.

Mr. LLOYD: We see no signs of the buildings being ready next year.

Mr. Hiley: You can never leave Brisbane, if you cannot see evidence of it.

Mr. LLOYD: The population of Brisbane comprises one-third of the population of Queensland, so I suppose what is happening

in Brisbane is typical of what is happening in other parts of the State. If the secondary-school buildings are ready to accommodate all the children in the 12-to-15-years age group, that is all right, but I can see a number of difficulties. The children will have to be kept at their present primary schools until the high schools are provided, and I have not received any information from the Minister for Education and Migration about this matter. I am not the only one concerned about it. Many people interested in education in Queensland are asking what will happen, and parents are saying, "What is going to happen to my child the year after next?" They do not know whether the buildings will be ready or the teachers available. Let us have an assurance from the Government through the Minister for Education to clear the air. Up to date we have had only the bald statement that the Government is going to abolish the Scholarship examination, that primary education will cease at the age of 12 years, and that the leaving age will be lifted to 15 years.

Mr. Hiley: I will see that the Minister for Education gives you full details, but I can assure you that before the decision was made the Minister provided us with a supplementary schedule of the buildings that were required. The task was too big to be done in one year, and that is why 1964 was determined as the starting point. They will all be there.

Mr. Hanlon: You have not even provided all the accommodation that is needed now.

Mr. Hiley: We have done far more than Labour did.

Mr. LLOYD: No child was refused an education because of lack of accommodation or lack of teaching staff under Labour Governments. At least Labour Governments were able to take the State safely through a very difficult period immediately after the war when there was a very sudden and big influx of children into our schools. Queensland was the only State in which children were not refused an education because of a shortage of accommodation and teachers. That is a proud boast that we can make. But now, 16 years after the war and when the Government has been in office for five years, we still hear complaints about a lack of accommodation at primary schools.

Mr. Hiley: We have doubled the number of high schools in five years.

Mr. LLOYD: We realise that, but it was done on the basis of a plan prepared by a former Labour Government. In Victoria 25 per cent. of Government expenditure is on education, but the Queensland percentage is not nearly as high as that. In fact, the increase in Victoria this year is 10 per cent., whereas in Queensland it is only 8 per cent. The Government have very little to boast about in their endeavours to provide the schools required by children who are

endeavouring to acquire a higher standard of education. I do not know whether the Government is aware of this, but of the 12,000 people who are unemployed in Queensland, about 5,000 are children who left school at the end of last year and who have been unable to find work. That figure is going to increase. It might take up slightly when the school-leaving age is lifted to 15 years, but even then we must consider who is to bear the increased cost of such education. Many people in the community are at present finding it very difficult to meet the ever-increasing cost of education, particularly those with large families who have to meet increased cost of transportation and school books. That is one problem that has never been mentioned by the Government. At present parents must pay for the textbooks required by students at secondary schools but the burden can now be shelved by them when the student reaches 14 years of age. When the school-leaving age is increased to 15 years, is the State Government going to provide textbooks for the children, say, between 12 and 15 years of age or is it the intention to retain the present system under which parents purchase the necessary textbooks? That is one question that almost all parents will be asking but, as yet, there has been no announcement on it by the Government.

The Treasurer raised one rather interesting matter in a statement that he made referring to Sir Roland Wilson. I was expecting the Treasurer to mention this matter. I believe it is a serious one to both this State and to the Commonwealth. The statement to which I refer, as reported in "The Courier-Mail", is—

"Action was needed to break the hold that Sir Roland Wilson had on the sources of Australia's overseas loan borrowings, because the nation was missing out on millions of pounds a year as a result, the State Treasurer (Mr. Hiley) said last night."

Mr. Coburn: He has not retracted it.

Mr. LLOYD: He has not retracted it and, however viewed, it is an indication of what he believes. The statement itself is not particularly puzzling but it does pose one or two questions. The first is that in the 11 years since 1951 the Commonwealth Government contributed £800,000,000 from revenue sources to the States' loan borrowings for works and housing. That is a tremendous amount of money which is provided from direct and indirect taxation, placed in consolidation and investment reserve and transferred on loan back to the States at a rate of interest. It represents a considerable contribution made by the Commonwealth Government, but the puzzling point is that Sir Roland Wilson, who is Secretary of the Commonwealth Treasury, is a public servant. It is quite apparent that in recent years the practice has grown at Loan Council meetings for the Commonwealth Government, through its

control of the Commonwealth Bank and its voting strength on the Loan Council, to veto any decision by the States, thereby creating an artificial control of the amount of money that the State Governments and semi-governmental authorities will expend each year on capital development. That is obvious unless Sir Roland Wilson himself is controlling the Commonwealth Treasurer and the Commonwealth Government, and maintaining that artificial limit on State and Commonwealth expenditure on capital works. If he is not doing that, then I cannot see why he should be the subject of the Treasurer's attack. It would have been more apt for the Treasurer to attack the Commonwealth Government's financial policy. If this money is available from overseas it would obviously be a matter for the Commonwealth Government to decide whether there should be a splurge of additional spending and to grab some of this money for expenditure on works in the public sector of our economy, altering completely its overall financial policy. It is obvious that in recent years this limit of expenditure on capital works has been maintained in an endeavour to control inflation.

As part of its financial policy the Federal Government believed that if it limited the expenditure in the public sector it could in some way control the inflationary processes in our economy. I do not know whether the Treasurer wishes to comment on this matter at a later stage, but it seems strange that at the same time the Federal Treasurer made a comment in his Budget speech that because of the repayment to the International Monetary Fund of some £78,000,000 it had been possible for the whole of the moneys available from the International Monetary Fund to remain at a figure of £300,000 in addition to which our overseas reserves of gold and currency were in the vicinity of £500,000,000. In other words in overseas borrowings there was available to Australia immediately in the vicinity of £700,000,000 or £800,000,000. If this money of which the State Treasurer speaks was available, greater opportunity should have been taken by the Commonwealth Government to borrow from overseas and divert the money into State expenditure on capital works for the relief of unemployment and the creation of developmental works that would expand secondary industries in Queensland. However, with the Treasurer's silence on this matter it is rather difficult to get his real impressions.

Dealing with this artificial limitation of expenditure in the public sector, I do not see how any Commonwealth Government would allow a diversion into our economy of these millions of pounds of which the Treasurer speaks unless it had power in some way to control the economy. With the splurge of spending in the hire-purchase field until last year, with the buying and selling

of money—using money as a commodity—it was obvious that the investment of the private sector was the controlling factor in inflation. The expenditure was limited in the public sector but unlimited in the private sector. The Commonwealth Government postulated that it had no control over the activities of hire-purchase companies, yet under its taxing powers it was able to impose restrictions on them, which in effect was a control that limited their activities. The Commonwealth Government did in some way control the expenditure of the private sector of the economy. The control that the Commonwealth Government exercised last year was such that it immediately had the effect of lifting the savings of the people. The balance between savings and investment was completely altered. Whereas previously investment was high and savings were low, after the controls were imposed investment was reduced and savings built up. There was a retrenchment in spending by the community.

If what the State Treasurer says is right, that was the time when all the millions of pounds that were available overseas should have been taken advantage of. That money should have been infused into the economy. If expenditure in the private sector was low it was necessary for the expenditure in the public sector to take over and lift the economy back to the stage where the problem of unemployment was relieved and increased prosperity was evident in consumer purchasing.

There is one point associated with the Loan Council about which I have made statements from time to time. I refer particularly to semi-governmental and governmental expenditure on public utilities such as the provision of water and developmental irrigation projects, which in many cases, because of the attitude of the Loan Council, have been maintained at a very low level compared with the investment of the private sector of the economy. I instance the Brisbane City Council because I believe it provides a rather interesting comparison. It operates its own bus services. If those services were run by a private company they would be expanding continually; money would be ploughed back, limited only by the level of overdraft controlled by a trading bank. However, because the Brisbane City Council is a semi-governmental authority it cannot borrow the money required to expand this activity. The same may be said about electricity. If the electricity supply for Brisbane was controlled by a private company there would be no limit to its expansion programme except the overdraft limit imposed by a trading bank. However, because the Brisbane City Council controls this activity it is confronted with many difficulties in its expansion programme.

Mr. Hiley: You would agree that if there is money available in London, or New York, to sewer Brisbane, or water Brisbane, it should be taken?

Mr. LLOYD: I agree entirely. That is one of the difficulties that must be overcome. The Commonwealth Government's policy of lifting control on borrowing up to £100,000 is to be commended. I realise that the Treasurer is faced with a difficulty so far as the Brisbane City Council is concerned because the council is one corporate authority and must go to the Loan Council for approval for any money that has to be spent. The council must receive approval from the Loan Council, and we must remember that there is only one representative from Queensland, and each of the representatives from the other States has a say in it. I agree that if the money is available it should be used for the necessary development. I believe that the amount of £100,000 was arbitrarily established some years ago. It is quite possible that the Loan Council may give consideration to increasing the maximum amount over which detailed control is not exercised. The Wynnum-Manly sewerage scheme, with an allocation of £248,000 for this year, is a special case, and many other projects necessary for developmental purposes in the local-authority area of Brisbane could be taken as individual applications, up to the maximum amount of £100,000 for which the Brisbane City Council in turn should not have to make application for approval to the Commonwealth Government. The approval should come from the State Government. It is obvious that over the years there have been arguments about this matter. Some years ago the late Hon. W. Forgan Smith attacked the form of organisation of the Loan Council and demanded from the Commonwealth Government an amendment of the financial agreement to give greater power to the States in the borrowings of the States. The Treasurer is repeating indirectly some of the statements and attacks that have been made on the Loan Council over a number of years.

When the Treasurer attacked Sir Roland Wilson I thought that it would have been a more positive approach to the subject if he had attacked the organisation of the Loan Council, and the power of veto exercised by the Commonwealth Government which gives it full control over the economy of Australia at present. I think it would have been more apt for him to do that, rather than to accuse a public servant of having control of the financial policy of the country and, in fact, controlling the administration of the finance of the country by the Commonwealth Government.

To conclude my remarks on the Financial Statement, I have tried, so far as possible, to show that, through increases in the credit balances of the Queensland Housing Commission Fund, the Main Roads Fund, and

other trust funds, an amount of the Commonwealth Government's grant for the relief of unemployment has been diverted into those funds and remains unspent. Some of the £2,814,000 that was not transferred to the Loan Fund Account but was made available to the Loan Fund Account for expenditure was in fact not fully used.

I have endeavoured to show that the transfer of £400,000 from the Loan Fund Account to the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund was not necessary because that sum could have been claimed from the Commonwealth, if we are to accept the Treasurer's own statement on his introduction of the Financial Statement last year that the State had available to it 4½ million pounds from the Commonwealth Government and that it had during this period claimed only £3,750,000, leaving an amount of £650,000 unclaimed from the Commonwealth. To meet the position this Government transferred into the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund an additional £400,000 from its State Loan Fund resources. That money, I believe, could more properly have been used during that year for the relief of unemployment in Queensland in the construction of public buildings and schools and more homes.

The increase of £200,000 in the Queensland Housing Commission Fund, no doubt for the financing of workers' dwellings, will be used next year for only one purpose, namely, to offset the accumulated deficit in the Consolidated Revenue Fund. In other words, the £200,000 left this year to build up a credit balance in the Queensland Housing Commission Fund will be made up to £343,000 and transferred from the Queensland Housing Commission Fund to Consolidated Revenue this year. That money could have been used last year for employment-making purposes.

The Main Roads Fund provides another instance of this Government's policy. If the sum of £259,000 in that account had been fully spent, it would have created more employment. We believe that by planting these moneys in reserves during the year the Treasurer has endeavoured to build up sums for extra expenditure later, realising that there will be an election campaign in 1963. It will be very interesting to see how much of that money is spent at the end of this year.

The whole position with cash balances is that they have increased considerably despite the reduction in the Mt. Isa Railway Project Fund to some £900,000 during the 12 months, a reduction which, if the Government's normal expenditure and receipts had been maintained, would have been much more. I think I have shown that the money was available during the last 12 months at a time when there were many unemployed in this State. If it had been used in full in that time, the State would have provided a great deal of employment and overcome many of the difficulties confronting us at the present time.

Mr. COBURN (Burdekin) (12.44 p.m.): In discussing the Budget in this debate I do so with a sense of fear that, as a State Parliament, we have had taken from us the right to govern in the manner that we deem to be in the best interests of our people, or it might be more correct to say that we have voluntarily given that right away. We are no longer in a position to raise revenue that will be sufficient to provide all the services and to give all the assistance and encouragement that we should like to give to those who, if the assistance and encouragement were forthcoming, would play their part in the development of this great, richly-endowed State. This position has arisen because of the financial agreement entered into by the States and the Commonwealth Government under which the States have voluntarily transferred to the Commonwealth Government the sole right to raise income tax, thus giving the Commonwealth a monopoly in this lucrative field of taxation.

As compensation for the transfer of that right, the States receive annual taxation reimbursement grants under a formula accepted by them and by the Commonwealth Government. The amount received from this grant is inadequate for this State's requirements, especially in difficult times when, in many cases, because of factors over which we have no control, our industries are less productive of goods and, as a corollary, revenue, and the army of unemployed increases substantially.

A situation then arises with which the States, because of insufficient funds being made available and the absence of sources from which additional revenue can be derived, cannot deal effectively unless they receive generous grants from the Commonwealth Government. That happened during this year. The States then become entirely dependent upon the Commonwealth Government for revenue to enable them to alleviate the distressing economic conditions that exhibit themselves in many State industries and many avenues of our activities.

The decision as to whether these grants will or will not be made is exclusively for the Commonwealth Government, as no States-Commonwealth agreement binds the Commonwealth Government to make such grants. We claim in those circumstances that we have a moral right and, as to the effectiveness of our moral right, the decision must rest entirely with the Commonwealth Government. My objection to the position as it stands today is that we have no legal rights to overcome the situation that from time to time develops, a situation that needs urgent attention by the State Government. The undertaking of public works to relieve unemployment, and the expansion of public services for the convenience and benefit of the people is, in a large measure, dependent upon the amount of money that the Commonwealth Government is prepared to grant to the States in addition to the amount that

it is obliged to give because of commitments accepted in the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement.

Under these circumstances, it is obvious that the States have ceased to be fully autonomous. Because of the great expansion of the most laudable public services, particularly in the fields of health, education, transport, and agriculture, and the undertaking of land-development and irrigation projects, the State's financial commitments will increase to a marked degree in the future, thus accentuating the difficulties of the Treasury and making the State more and more dependent upon the Commonwealth for revenue to which the State is not entitled under the financial agreement.

After a basic amount has been agreed upon by the States and the Commonwealth, the factor in the formula that is paramount in determining the taxation reimbursement grant is population. Recently a "betterment factor" was included in the formula, and in 1960-1961 it was responsible for increasing the Queensland taxation reimbursement grant by a substantial sum, which the Treasurer made known to me a few weeks ago. But as this factor fluctuates only when there is an increase in the average Commonwealth wage, and as wages have now become more or less stabilised, as a reference to the quarterly figures issued show, I forecast that the "betterment factor" influence in increasing the Taxation Reimbursement Grant to the States will diminish substantially, leaving population as almost the sole influencing factor in determining the grant. In this formula, no consideration is given to the vast sums spent by the States that result in greatly increased revenue pouring into the coffers of the Commonwealth. The States provide the capital, as it were, to establish the business, and pay interest and redemption on the money invested, yet the Commonwealth receives almost the whole of the profits accruing from it. I think some consideration should be given at the expiration of the current Commonwealth-States Agreement to including in the formula for determining the States' Taxation Reimbursement Grant a factor that will reward the States for investment of funds in projects that result in greatly increased revenue being collected by the Commonwealth Government. My sole aim is to assure that our Taxation Reimbursement Grant will be sufficient to enable us to provide every requisite service from money that is ours, as a State, by right, instead of having to go periodically as mendicants to the Commonwealth, cap in hand, begging a handout. I am not unmindful that the Commonwealth Government has generally aided the States financially in many avenues and on many occasions.

Mr. Davies: In what way?

Mr. COBURN: I am thinking of the assistance that it made available for the improvements at the port of Gladstone and

of the assistance it is prepared to give in the development of the brisgalow country. Without devoting too much time to this matter, we all know that there are avenues in which the Commonwealth Government has recognised its moral obligation to assist the State, when the need arose, by granting extra money. My whole objection is that, under the present set-up, the money should be available to us as a legal right, not as a moral right, and that the decision is made by a Government other than the State Government.

Mr. Hanlon: You realise now that you should not have fallen for that 1959 formula, which you praised so much.

Mr. COBURN: That formula is still a better formula than the one that was operating formerly.

Mr. Hanlon: We had to get a special grant of £3,000,000, which you said that we did not need.

Mr. COBURN: We would still be far worse off under the old formula than we are now. The condition of the Consolidated Revenue Fund is not too bad, and the Trust and Special Funds give us little cause for worry; but before I conclude my speech I hope to show that there are several aspects of our financial position that are not as heartening as those that I have just mentioned.

I am concerned about whether the State's progress and expansion will be planned and financed by Queensland or whether we will be dependent upon the Commonwealth Government to determine it for us. My view is that at present its influence in determining our rate of progress is much greater than it should be. A striking illustration of what we know should be done, but are unable to do because of a lack of the necessary funds, is shown on pages 11 and 12 of the Financial Statement presented to the Parliament by the Treasurer on the afternoon of Thursday, 28 September, 1961.

On that occasion, the Treasurer said—

"Recommendations made by the Australian Universities Commission and adopted by the Commonwealth Government provide for increased assistance to universities for both capital and recurrent purposes for the triennium 1961-1963. Unfortunately, heavy increases in State expenditure are required to take full advantage of these increases.

To illustrate this, the maximum Commonwealth grant towards recurrent expenditure by the University of Queensland for the year 1961 was £929,000 . . ."

I do not know whether the Commonwealth Government had any legal right to give the Treasurer that money. It is a moral obligation that is being recognised by granting that money for university funds. The Treasurer has no agreement with them nor is there an Act that is binding on them.

Mr. Hiley: It is an administrative decision.

Mr. COBURN: In which the Commonwealth concurs.

There is another generous contribution by the Commonwealth Government under a moral obligation. I say it should not be a moral obligation but a binding one, either through an agreement or through some legal procedure.

The Treasurer continued—

" . . . an increase of 31 per cent. on the sum of £708,300 made available in the previous year as recurrent and emergency grant. However, for each additional £1 Commonwealth grant the sum of £1 17s. has to be found by the State or by way of student fees. The State grant has been substantially increased to £1,091,000 for the academic year 1961 but the Government was not in a position to provide the full amount required to attract the maximum Commonwealth grant. The amount of State grant and student fees is expected to be sufficient to attract a Commonwealth grant of £920,757, or £8,243 below the maximum grant available.

"University development faces a hazard in future years."

That is a fairly startling statement for a Treasurer to have to make when we realise the great value of the University and the part it plays in the life of the people. It is not because the Treasurer wishes it to be so; it is because the finance to enable development at a pace that the Treasurer would wish is not readily available for the purpose.

He continued—

"The past four years have seen a spectacular increase in State and Commonwealth contributions to a fast expanding University. Student numbers have multiplied, facilities extended, and Townsville commenced.

"But the capacity of the State to keep pace with this rapid growth is exhausted."

That is another startling comment.

The Treasurer went on to say—

"We have vast responsibilities to primary education; our secondary school task is expanding at a fantastic rate; and no State can afford to neglect that very important field of technical education. Failure in the fields of primary and secondary education would destroy the entire foundation of education, to which the University, as it were, provides the superstructure."

Indeed, I have heard it said that the department is prepared to put in the stumps, lay down the floor, build the wall, but not to finish the structure by providing it with a roof. University progress is being delayed for one reason and one reason only, namely that the necessary finance is not available to enable us to go at the pace that we think ought to be set.

Continuing with the Treasurer's statement, he said—

"Our inability to cover the full matching grant is a signal to the University to mark time. Unless additional revenue aid is forthcoming on a more favourable basis, the degree of that inability will grow with each passing year."

That statement contains some very startling pronouncements, the most startling being, "But the capacity of the State to keep pace with this rapid growth is exhausted." Money for education must be found. The only source from which it can come under the present circumstances is the Commonwealth Government. I know that the Commonwealth attitude has been that education is a State matter, and that the Constitution of the Commonwealth does not authorise the Commonwealth Government to interfere in the field of education within the States. Nevertheless, it has become necessary for the Commonwealth to make available considerable sums for university education. If it had not done so, the Commonwealth and the States would have suffered much more seriously than they have done through the lack of development of their best talents. When the time for the signing of a new Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement arrives, before committing themselves to another agreement the States should insist that payments to them by the Commonwealth shall be such as will be sufficient to provide all those services that are indispensable to the full development of a people in a modern world.

A remarkable contrast to the Australian attitude to university education is provided by the United States of America, which, in the field of education, has a constitution similar to that of our own Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. O'Donnell: Have you been reading the Teachers' Journal?

Mr. COBURN: Yes, naturally. Where else would the hon. member think I would get my educational knowledge? Surely he does not think it is a sin to read it.

Mr. O'Donnell: It is not a sin; I am just checking up on you.

Mr. COBURN: I have the honour, which I am sure my opponent on the other side of the Chamber has not, of being a life honorary member of the Queensland Teachers' Union because of the years of excellent service that I gave to it. What I am reading is an indication of the attitude of the Government of the United States of America towards the educational programme of that great country. When in the course of my research I come across information that is likely to be valuable in helping those who are charged with the responsibility of our State, I gladly make it available to them. That is what I am doing now.

As I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted by the hon. member for Barcoo, the United States of America, as far as education is concerned, has a constitution similar to that of our own Commonwealth of Australia. This means that education is the responsibility of the States, and the Commonwealth—that is, the United States Federal Government—has no authority to interfere in this field. It is very similar to our own Constitution. For a considerable time it was becoming evident in that country, as it is in this, that the best defence in present world conditions involves as a preliminary step the development of certain educational facilities, most specifically development in the fields of science and science teaching, and in the field of vocational guidance, to ensure that students enter the best course for their particular talents.

The United States is very concerned with the matter of defence. The result of this developing attitude was the passing of the National Defence Education Act of 1958, which defined the fields in which, and the conditions under which, Federal money would be made available for State education. Some of those provisions were rather wide in their scope. A glance at the fields in which the money was to be made available may prove enlightening to the Committee. Provision was made for loans to students in institutions of higher education; for financial assistance to strengthen science, mathematics, and modern foreign-language instruction; for national defence fellowships; for guidance, counselling and testing, and the identification and encouragement of able students; for language development; for research and development in the more effective use of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes; for vocational educational programmes, and for some other related matters.

It can be seen that that Act in the United States of America covers a very wide field. It is almost all-embracing. It is so comprehensive that the individual States of the United States can make a claim on their Federal Government for assistance in almost any sphere of education. The money is not merely passed over to the States by the Federal authority without any sort of direction or restriction, but two broad fields are provided. They are that some moneys are made available without restriction, except in the amount, and other sums are made available provided the State concerned can match the Federal sum with an equal sum. As the hon. member for Kedron has said, in many fields the States have to submit their programmes to the Commonwealth for approval before the money is made available but the whole scheme shows a nation-wide consciousness of the importance of education in today's world and circumstances. Why not then, instead of submitting to a curtailment of our great and valuable educational schemes, when the time comes for renewal of the

Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement, lay it down that a condition of the States entering into the agreement be that the Commonwealth give an assurance of enacting legislation similar to the National Defence Education Act of the United States of America?

Mr. Davies: Your parties have had 13 years to do it.

Mr. COBURN: The hon. member's party has had 50 years, and has done nothing. Similar assistance for guarantees of sufficient finance to conduct our public hospitals on the highest standard of efficiency could be a condition of our willingness to commit ourselves to a Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement. Service in the hospitals is very costly, but we have a fine hospital scheme operating throughout this State and we want to maintain the standard that we have attained.

Mr. Tucker: Who did that?

Mr. COBURN: I was one who helped to do it because I gave 17 years of service to the hospitals scheme before it was introduced by a Government. At the Ayr hospital we had a scheme of all-free treatment, including medicine, long before free treatment was enacted. We had that before there were any hospitals boards. I was one of those who introduced that scheme and I gave 17 years to the hospitals committee, as it was then called. There are people outside Parliament who have done much to build up the hospital system of Queensland and have never received any kudos for it.

Much more could be said about the Consolidated Revenue Fund, but as I desire to refer at length to the State's public debt—and my time is limited—I must leave further comment on it till another date.

A close scrutiny of the changing picture as it relates to the public debt again emphasizes the ever-increasing annual allocation that must be made to meet the staggering interest burden. It is mounting alarmingly. When I came into this Parliament in 1950, the Queensland Public Debt was £150,595,962 and the interest payable, at an average rate of £3 5s. per cent., was £4,900,850. Today, after 12 years, the State's Public Debt is £363,820,873 and the interest to be met on it is £14,301,886. That has to come out of Consolidated Revenue and is then not available for services that are our responsibility, such as health, schools, transport, and agriculture.

Mr. Davies: Are those this year's figures?

Mr. COBURN: They are up to 1961. In the 12 years I have been privileged to be a member of this Parliament I have seen the Public Debt increased by 141.5 per cent. and the interest on the Public Debt by 191.8 per cent. As our Public Debt has been increasing at the rate of approximately

£20,000,000 annually in recent years and our interest commitments by approximately £1,700,000, it is not difficult to visualise what a tremendous drag the servicing of the Public Debt will become in the next decade or two unless more satisfactory financial arrangements between the States and the Commonwealth can be achieved, or other sources of revenue outside the present taxation field can be found. There are high hopes that the unparalleled bauxite deposits, the enormous coal deposits, and the oil discoveries may provide these new sources of revenue. We hope they will.

The average annual increase in the Public Debt of Queensland during the 10 years from 1950-1951 to 1960-1961 was £17,619,341. If this annual rate of increase is maintained—and for the past three financial years it has exceeded this average increase by more than £2,000,000—then the Public Debt of 1970-1971 will be in excess of £518,492,526 and the interest payable on it, if the average rate of interest now prevailing is still applying, will be £21,747,063.

The servicing of the Public Debt will be considerably more than that. Of course, interest is not the only amount that is payable on a debt; there will be flotation and conversion charges, there will be debt management fees, and there will be exchange, in addition to that £21,000,000 that we have to take from Consolidated Revenue and deny to the services of the State because of the staggering Public Debt, which is increasing fairly rapidly.

Mr. Davies: What does the hon member suggest we should do?

Mr. COBURN: I will tell the hon. member all about it if he will be patient. As the interest, exchange, and commission payable in connection with the Public Debt are charges against Consolidated Revenue, they reduce substantially the amount that could be allocated from revenue to the various departments of State for the provision of services and the undertaking of developmental projects—and nobody knows that better than the Treasurer himself.

In addition to these commitments, it is necessary for the Treasurer to make annual contributions from Consolidated Revenue to the Sinking Fund, and the only amount of securities that we are able to buy in a year is round the £3,000,000 mark, which is not very much when we are dealing with hundreds of millions of pounds.

Exchange, debt management, and discount, flotation and conversion charges in 1960-1961 amounted to approximately £1,000,000, which was contributed from Consolidated Revenue, thus further reducing the amount available for allocation to the various departments. Last year, 1960-1961, the servicing of the Public Debt was equal to 32 per cent., or almost one-third, of the total amount

received by the State as Taxation Reimbursement Grant from the Commonwealth. Very few of the projects on which large sums of money from the Loan Fund have been expended have proved reproductive. If these projects on which we are spending our loan money so freely were able to return even interest on the debt it would be something, but they go nowhere near doing that. In some instances they add to the debt by having to be helped further from the Loan Fund, revenue from most of them being far short of the amount necessary to meet interest on the loan money involved. In many instances, such as railways, coal mines, and coke works, they have shown heavy losses over the years.

A perusal of the balance sheets relating to our major irrigation areas reveals that total construction costs as at 30 June, 1961, and results of operations for 1960-61 were as follows:—

	£
Dawson Valley—	
Construction Cost	1,509,456
Result of Operations, 1960-1961, Surplus of ..	7,836
Clare—	
Construction Cost	833,524
Result of Operations, 1960-1961, Loss of ..	1,655
Millaroo—	
Construction Cost	790,728
Result of Operations, 1960-1961, Loss of ..	1,590
Dalbeg—	
Construction Cost	499,585
Result of Operations, 1960-1961, Loss of ..	2,591
Mareeba-Dimbulah—	
Construction Cost	12,930,629
(Now considerably increased)	
Result of Operations, 1960-1961, Surplus of ..	9,854
St. George—	
Construction Cost	923,602
Result of Operations, 1960-1961, Loss of ..	937

None of these schemes had sufficient surplus to enable the interest on the capital expenditure to be met. In fact, they did not come within miles of the amount necessary to pay interest on the capital invested.

The story is repeated when we analyse the expenditure from the Loan Fund on mining undertakings and other State enterprises. Accumulated losses incurred, capital losses written off, and grants from Consolidated Revenue to 30 June, 1961, were £943,015 on account of the Collinsville coal mine and £397,278 on account of the Ogmore mine. Grants from Consolidated Revenue amounted to £952,025 on account of Collinsville and £373,604 on account of Ogmore.

The same picture is presented to us in connection with State expenditure from the Loan Fund on capital works in the Railway Department. Working losses in that

department for the past four years have been—

	£
1958-1959	1,257,919
1959-1960	2,627,537
1960-1961	2,036,682
1961-1962	2,078,423

When these are added to the interest charged on railway indebtedness, the net losses total—

	£
1958-1959	4,925,733
1959-1960	6,587,521
1960-1961	6,341,550
1961-1962	6,635,531

All these charges have to be met from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and the interest on the debt has to be found other than from the source in which the money has been invested. It might be easy for some people, but it is impossible for me, to see how we can ever wipe off our capital debt or how we can ever stop it from mounting if the undertakings in which we invest the money do not return interest and a little extra to enable us to begin redeeming the debt.

Mr. Graham: They say that the battle of Waterloo is not paid for yet, so what are you worrying about?

Mr. COBURN: There is no need for me to quote further evidence to prove that the expenditure from loan funds has been confined mainly to works that do not produce surpluses that will enable the payment of interest and contribute to a reduction of the debt. On the contrary, they have added further to the debt and the interest commitment by consistently showing deficits as a result of their operations. Expenditure of huge sums of money from loan funds on transport and developmental projects is imperative if our State is to progress and work is to be found to employ our people. However, from these sources, when every avenue of revenue is explored, the State does not receive enough to pay interest on the large sums expended year by year. The increased population directly due to the provision of costly irrigation projects, land-settlement schemes, and improved transport facilities, particularly railways, means an increase in the State's Taxation Reimbursement Grant, because a factor in the Taxation Reimbursement Formula is the ratio of the population for the year in which the grant is made to the population in the preceding year.

My friend the hon. member for Mackay is not concerned about the payment of our debts. He says that the battle of Waterloo has not been paid for yet. Although it has not been paid for, we cannot find enough money to provide the services that the State requires because too much money is being earmarked for the purpose of paying interest on the debt. Our debt is not being paid; the Commonwealth Government's debt is. In my opinion, the financial arrangements are so lopsided that I want to bring about a more equitable arrangement or agreement

with the Commonwealth Government to enable the States to handle this public debt. If something is not done about it, in the future it will be a millstone round the necks of those who are charged with the responsibility of running the State.

Mr. Hanlon: You should have voted for Mr. Calwell. He was going to do something about it.

Mr. COBURN: How does the hon. member know that I did not? He is telling me what I should do, but he does not know what I did.

Mr. Hanlon: It would be contrary to your form here.

Mr. COBURN: The hon. member does not know what I did.

This amount would be comparatively small. Some developmental schemes would result in increased returns from land tax, and there would also be moderate increases in receipts by the State from probate and succession duties, stamp duties, and certain licence and permit fees, but all of these fall far short of being commensurate with the tremendous expenditure of loan funds involved.

As I said once before in the House, it reminds me of the two persons who bought a cow in partnership. They shared it. Because one man had the front part, he had to feed it; because the other had the back part, he got all the milk. We own the front part of the financial cow and the Commonwealth owns the back part of it. I thought only one cow was involved but when I study the field of finance I find the whole dairy is involved. It is not only one cow, but a number of cows in a number of fields.

The Commonwealth Government, on the contrary, reap a rich harvest from the areas developed by the vast amount of money expended by the State for the amortisation of which and for the interest on which the State is responsible. The Commonwealth Government benefits considerably from increased income-tax collections, sales tax, pay-roll tax, and excise duties. Because of the great additional benefits that the schemes made possible by the expenditure by the States of substantial sums of loan moneys, confer upon the Commonwealth, to me it is logical and reasonable to ask that the Commonwealth accept greater responsibility in this vast expenditure. To me it does not make sense that the Queensland Government should spend £13,500,000 on the Mareeba-Dimbulah scheme—an excellent scheme which nobody would oppose—and receive in return an interest bill of £650,000 annually, and nothing else.

We put in £13,500,000 and all we get back for it is a small profit of about £8,000 from water supply charges and land rentals, and an interest bill of £650,000 every year, while the Commonwealth Government begins to rake in all the extra money that is provided in that field by the additional

industries that have been established. That principle can be applied throughout, wherever we have invested loan money. More responsibility should fall upon the Commonwealth Government, which derives so much additional revenue from that development.

I told this to the Federal Treasurer when he was on a visit to Ayr at one time and the chairman of the Ayr Shire Council and I were accompanying him to various places in the area. I told him how one-sided I thought the whole arrangement was. He said, "I think you have something there," but that is as far as he went; he has done nothing about it.

The States should at least receive interest-free the loan money used in developmental projects. I understand that in the United States of America the Federal Government makes available to the States, interest-free, loans for all developmental projects. Such loans are repayable without interest over a period of 40 years. $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the loan is repayable each year. It would be some contribution on the part of the Commonwealth Government if, when the time for signing another Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement arrives, we could force upon it the responsibility for at least some of the cost of developmental schemes from which it benefits so considerably. If this were done in Australia it would at least relieve the States of the burden of ever-increasing interest payments.

The Treasurer himself said in 1957—

"It is already clear that, in order to allow this State to develop at the pace which is desired, there must be a significant change in our financial policies. For some years past the policy has been to endeavour to meet the great basic needs such as re-equipment of the railways, housing, schools and other public buildings, loans and subsidies to Councils and other public bodies and, at the same time, carry out important public development works such as the Tully Falls Hydro-electric Project, the Mareeba-Dimbulah irrigation Project and the Burdekin River Irrigation Development Scheme.

"The result of trying to do all these things from limited funds has been that the pace towards completion of some of the developmental projects has been dreadfully slow, whilst the financial resources available for basic necessities such as homes and schools have never been nearly adequate for the need.

"Quite apart from the financial need to apply priorities, the time has come for private investment capital to play an infinitely expanded part in the development of the State.

"We do not regard public development schemes as a sole or even dominant means of development. Rather it is our view that the needs of the State can best be served by creating an atmosphere in which

private investment capital will discover an abundant opportunity to commence new industries and where the contribution of the State is confined to providing those services which clearly fall within the realm of public responsibility.

"As a Government dedicated to development, we cannot lightly accept severe financial limitations whilst there is any means open to us to overcome them. It has already been made clear that the Government does not accept the view that all this hastened development must come as an additional load on the public purse. On the contrary, I repeat our view that much of the important development that is so desirable, development which will lead to new production, which will provide new employment for new people—the greater part of that development must come from private investment capital."

I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the Treasurer on that occasion. Our investments of public money are increasing the Public Debt at an alarming rate.

The problem must be met or it will finally restrict and retard our progress. This is one way of meeting it. Private capital invested does not increase our public debt.

It does provide employment for increased numbers of people and the increased population gives us increased grants under taxation reimbursement assistance, each extra person domiciled in Queensland as a result of this new assistance being worth a little more than £25 a head to the State from taxation reimbursement. I think that the per-capita payment under the taxation reimbursement scheme is a little in excess of £25 at the present time.

Private-investment capital for the development of the unparalleled bauxite deposits at Weipa, the enormous coal deposits of Kianga and Moura, the doubling of the output at Mount Isa Mines Ltd. when the reconstruction of the railway line from Townsville to Mt. Isa is completed, and the establishment of the copper refinery at Townsville furnish classical examples of how the State's revenue can be increased substantially without an increase in the already too large Public Debt.

An examination of the increase in the public debts of the Australian States and of the Commonwealth indicates very forcibly that the States are not receiving their fair share of revenue derived from taxation. The total Public Debt of the six States of Australia in 1954 was £1,688,948,000, while the Commonwealth National Debt then stood at £1,917,855,000, the National Debt being £364,523,000 in excess of the total States' Public Debts. That was in 1954, when the Commonwealth had a debt of a little over £360,000,000 more than the combined States. Six years later, at 30 June, 1960, the total Public Debts of the States had increased to £2,544,904,000,

while the National Debt had decreased to £1,553,332,000. So that whereas at 30 June, 1954, the total Public Debt of the States was £364,523,000 less than the National Debt, at 30 June, 1960, it was £991,572,000 more than the National Debt. As the States had been able only to increase theirs, so the Commonwealth had been able to decrease theirs substantially. In the six years from 1954 to 1960 the total Public Debts of the States had increased by £855,956,000, while in the same period the National Debt had decreased by £364,523,000.

An examination of those figures discloses that the Commonwealth Government has so much money at its disposal that it can reduce progressively and substantially its Public Debt, whereas in most instances the States have no means whatever of meeting even the interest on their Public Debt, let alone wipe off any of it. Something seems screwy to me about an arrangement of that kind, and I would say that those who are responsible for an acceptance of the Commonwealth-States Financial Agreement sold the taxing powers of the States at much too low a price. We gave away something for something else that was not commensurate in value.

Mr. Hanlon: We contested it in the courts; we did not give it away.

Mr. COBURN: It is here now, and we cannot get away from the fact that if we are to have uniform taxation we must have an agreement that is much more equitable as between the States and the Commonwealth.

Another matter of concern in the Financial Statement is the pay-roll tax. After we entered into an agreement with the Commonwealth Government by which we were to get back a certain portion of the taxation collected in our State, the Commonwealth Government came forward with a pay-roll tax and took from us over £1,000,000 a year, I think. That goes on year after year. There was also an occasion a few years ago when the formula was evolved by which we were to have a portion of the taxation collected by the Commonwealth Government made available to us, but there was an increase in post and telephone charges which cost the State about another £300,000. That was tantamount to reducing the amount available to us under the formula. That may be good business from some people's point of view, but to my mind it is absolutely unfair and unjust. Under the present arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States, the States are receiving a very poor deal. I am amazed that in all the circumstances—some of them I will grant were fortuitous—the Treasurer was able to present the encouraging Budget that he put before Parliament last Thursday week. When we compare it with the New South Wales Budget we find that the New South Wales Public Debt is much more alarming than Queensland's. It is now

approaching the £900,000,000 mark. Even South Australia, which is much smaller than Queensland and has nowhere near our natural resources, has a Public Debt in excess of ours. The difficulties of those States are even greater than ours.

We must realise that before the Treasurer starts off from scratch he has to find about £18,000,000 to service the Public Debt, and also make provision for those enterprises that are showing losses each year. Yet he is able to present to us a Budget that will provide a surplus and also make a few concessions. Admittedly they are not large, but all concessions are acceptable and show a trend in the right direction. I would say that it is a very fine piece of financing on the part of the Treasurer under these very difficult circumstances. Anybody who takes the trouble to become cognisant with the financial set-up of the States and the Commonwealth will realise how difficult the position is and will appreciate that it is something on which he should be highly commended. He has difficulties ahead if he remains Treasurer of the State because these greatly increased services we are giving the people, particularly in the fields of education and health, will become more and more costly as the years advance. When we educate more children, costs rise; when we give expanded and more efficient hospital services, again costs rise. The money has to be found and the Treasurer is the man charged with the responsibility of finding it. His task is a very unenviable one. I was very pleased indeed to see at last a Budget presented to the Parliament which is much more encouraging than any other presented for some time. It shows that we are on the right track.

One of the things that might be of considerable help to the State is the discovery of oil. It has not yet been declared to be in commercial quantities but when companies start spending up to £7,000,000 on pipelines, they are not doing it merely for the sake of spending their money. The discovery of oil in Queensland, with prospects of other discoveries, might be one of the sources from which we can get much more revenue. Somebody said the other day that 1,000,000 tons of coal from Kianga-Moura would give the State £25,000 because we get 6d. a ton on it. But we have to go further than that. The development of our resources brings increased population and each extra person living in Queensland through developmental projects—and particularly these good developmental projects that cost the State nothing to establish—means a little over £25 to us. Every 1,000 people who get employment as a result of capital invested by a private concern means £25,000 to us. It would not be hard to visualise what will follow the establishment of the alumina plant and, we hope, the aluminium plant, although I am not sanguine about the prospects of establishing the latter because I cannot see where costs can be reduced; of

course, no-one knows what will happen in the future with the development that is taking place. Thousands of people will be given employment and those thousands of people will all mean extra money coming to us by way of tax reimbursement assistance grants. In accordance with that, I would say that the more money we can have invested by private concerns in the development of this country so that we do not have to expend loan money from which we get no return, the better it will be for the future of the State. I think the Government is moving in the right direction in trying to create an atmosphere to induce people who have money to invest to invest it in Queensland and develop our industries and give employment to our people.

Mr. O'DONNELL (Barcoo) (2.59 p.m.):

I do not think it can be said that any phrase has become more popular of late, particularly in the Press, owing to impending land legislation and the brigalow-development scheme, than that very brief but important phrase "security of tenure". Every land problem comes back to the brief question, "What is the security of tenure?" To my mind this expression is a very important one. I consider that there is no such thing as a perfect security of tenure, but I think that there is a maximum security of tenure. I believe that it must be applied not only to landholders but to all persons in Queensland, irrespective of whether they are landholders or employees. That is a very important concept that we must develop.

We have heard from time to time criticism of the Government's policy on unemployment. When it comes back to the simple question, "What does it mean?" it means that we are again discussing security of tenure, or the ability to hold a job. I think that this is a most important point to be raised now. This ideal in my electorate, of course, applies to people in a rural community that has, over the years, shown a tendency to decrease in population. Why has it decreased? It is simply because there has been a lack of security of tenure. The people who live in rural Queensland must be given every amenity to counter the drift to the cities, which we all know is very marked today. Every opportunity to establish an industry must be taken so that openings will exist for the youth of rural communities, and that means that there must be the maximum decentralisation of industry. For good government, particularly in this vast State of Queensland, that must be kept in mind.

I do not intend to refer at any great length to land matters, but I was amazed when I saw the reference in the Land Bill to the so-called living areas. I know that the definition of a living area is based on the carrying capacity of stock, but in this instance there is a reference to the carrying capacity of humans. It is provided that a living area must support a competent man,

his wife, and infant children. That is a rather limited capacity, and, if every living area in Queensland carried only that restricted number, I am afraid that our rural population would be very small today.

What I am most concerned about is that when we mention such things as living areas, we do not refer to the number of people that can be employed on them. We do not give a basis of development extending beyond a man, his wife, and infant children. I think it very important when considering the full development of any property to give some consideration to an assessment of the number of people actually required to achieve that full development. If we do it in those terms, we will have a broader view and we shall tend to encourage employees in our rural industries, as they will know that they have security of tenure and that their jobs will not be merely seasonal or due perhaps to rush periods on properties.

When speaking on these lines I am not including share-farmers. I am aware that the share-farmer has become a feature of our country life. He is working in an endeavour to establish himself as a property-owner in the future, perhaps, and I know that he can come and go to suit his own convenience. What I want to see in the development of rural industries is a guarantee of permanent employment. I want to see people there who are happy to stay in their employment because it is their life's interest. There are many problems associated with life in the country, and I cannot stress too strongly the need for security of employment. We must give the people working in the country that security and provide them with the amenities of the city. We must show them that they can rear their families there without disadvantage and enjoy life. If we can provide full-time, secure employment in rural industries the country will develop more speedily. Rural centres will be developed as business opportunities increase, and this, in turn, will provide employment for people in those towns. Although the centres may grow slowly, their growth will be sure, and they will assist in retaining population in rural areas.

Mr. Coburn: We need more rural industries.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I thank the hon. member for that interjection. We do need more rural industries. Our land is not being developed quickly, and it is not being developed quickly because not enough people are going into the country to work.

Mr. Rae: You said just two minutes ago that development was taking place in these rural areas.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I did not say that.

Honourable Members interjected.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I trust that hon. members will allow the Chair to hear something.

Mr. Rae: You were talking about living areas.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I was talking about the number of people working on the living areas. I want to see more people employed there.

Mr. Rae: I quite agree with that.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That is what I am after. I want the people retained in the country. The many people who wish to work in rural industries but have no desire to become landholders should be encouraged to stay in the country areas.

The subject of people with infant children is often raised. It is rather amusing to hear this, because those children eventually grow up. I know people who have had four children away at school receiving primary, secondary, or tertiary education. We want more people in the country areas, and, in order to secure more rapid rural and agricultural development, men must be given more security of employment. I stress that it must be security under award conditions. That is a very important factor. The countryside will then become a far better place than it is now. We will have land development, cultural-centre development, and population such as we have not had before. Why is not some consideration given to these matters when these conditions are laid down, so that our future development will be ensured? Of course, there seems to be a prevalent idea that primary industries, particularly agricultural and pastoral, do not lend themselves to increased employment and that if extra employment is required, a secondary industry or industries must be established. I know it is very difficult for primary industries to compete with secondary industries in the field of employment, but I think that we should encourage employment in primary industry.

Mr. Ewan: You will agree with me that you must have properties sufficiently large to enable the owners to do that.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That is the point I am making; some consideration should be given to employment, but it is not mentioned at all. That is what concerns me. We want people to be employed in the country and there should be some appreciation of the fact that employment is available in the conditions set out.

Mr. Aikens: In other words, you think they are confusing living area with existence area?

Mr. O'DONNELL: Yes, in determining that each living area has a carrying capacity of a limited number of humans. That is not desirable at all. I should like to mention one town that has shown very

rapid development owing to an influx of people onto the land—in this case mostly share-farmers—in addition to the people who took up the blocks in the Peak Downs area. I refer to the town of Emerald. Anybody who has been in and through Emerald over the last 10 or 15 years would no doubt have noticed not only the town's improvement in itself but also that there has been a considerable growth of population. I remind the hon. member for Gregory—and I am sure he agrees with me—that there are other towns farther west that are not doing so well.

Mr. Rae: They are all doing well in my area.

Mr. O'DONNELL: In some instances they are on the down-grade.

To rural communities, amenities are important—again I have agreement from the hon. member for Gregory—and whilst the climate may be at times unsuitable for mid-western dwellers, people certainly appreciate living in the West when their towns are able to provide all amenities. Some of these towns in the past had progressive local governments who long ago achieved the provision of amenities that are benefiting the people today, whilst in other centres the councils have failed to obtain—particularly in the field of sanitation—what is desirable for comfortable living. Those towns, I think, should receive very favourable consideration from the Treasurer, and this item in particular should be expedited. A contented population with all amenities is quite happy to stay in the country.

Mr. Aikens: You cannot do too much for them.

Mr. O'DONNELL: You cannot do too much for country people, I agree. As I mentioned previously, some centres are still suffering from a lack of amenities. The sooner they are provided the quicker those centres will have contented people who are prepared to remain there and develop the country—people who will be prepared to put their best into their work and become good Queenslanders.

I should like to deal now with the subject of education, which has recently become a contentious one in Longreach owing to the remarks of the hon. member for Gregory. I assure the hon. member that I am not going to attack him in any way.

Education today is the open sesame to life. Although I disagree with the observations of the hon. member for Gregory about public servants in the West being cast-offs, there is one point that I am concerned about. The West is suffering from a lack of experienced teachers. I am not blaming the Government in any way—I am not blaming anyone—but there is a dearth of experienced teachers. I commend the young people who are serving out there for their enthusiasm and industry, but they are suffering

from the disadvantage of youth and inexperience. Education today is highly competitive and it must be of great personal concern to them to know that they have to compete with far more experienced teachers in the cities. That is the position right through the Central West. In most of those schools the headmaster is naturally the most experienced person, but after that the experience falls away and you find these young people who are doing such a tremendous job. They are not cast-offs. They are there because their presence is required under the present system of education. They are facing a tremendous task, but they are doing it well. I must speak in appreciation of the job they are doing but I urge the Minister for Education to bring back the standard that every school staff should reach, namely, a blend of experience and inexperience. If there is an over-exaggeration on the side of inexperience the teachers feel it; they lose their confidence in themselves. Sometimes the parents are aware of it. In some cases perhaps even the children can sense that their teachers are not confident. We must try to alter that. We must bring about that blend of experience and inexperience. I know that some wonderful passes were secured in the country in last year's Junior examination, but many children just failed to make the grade when the scholarships were being handed out. Although the young teachers are doing a great job they may lack just that little extra ability of the experienced teachers in Brisbane, Rockhampton, and Townsville who can change the "B" into an "A" or a low "A" into a high "A."

Mr. Rae: You have excellent teachers out there.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am not talking about the teachers themselves. I am merely pointing out that their inexperience is a decided disadvantage. At the Longreach High School we cannot obtain pupils for the Senior top. I wonder why? A short time ago I interjected when the hon. member for Burdekin was speaking. I did not wish to disturb him; I thought he might like to give credit to the editorial in the Teachers' Journal.

Mr. Coburn: Why didn't you wait to see if I would?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I should like to refer to an educational problem in the United States of America. As we know, the United States of America is a great country with a large population and naturally it has many more problems than we have. However, an acute educational problem has developed there. This is caused by a very high incidence of juvenile unemployment. Today, in the United States of America there are schools which are like holding camps for young people who cannot proceed further with their education because of their innate inability, or perhaps because they have gone as far as their parents can afford. They are attending school to keep themselves out

of mischief. We must not let that happen here. We saw a tendency in that direction last year and this year. We must see that the Government tackles the unemployment problem, particularly for young people, because if it deteriorates it will be a disaster.

I can see how the difficulty arose in the United States of America. They developed automation and mechanisation, which meant a reduction in the number of people in industry and the absorption of employees in the manufacture of machinery and as experts in automation was not sufficient to cope with the number of people leaving school. As a result, the restricted intake at the lower end of the employment scale, the school-leaving stage, brought about a lack of opportunity for young people. We know also that associated with that problem there is a birthrate bulge. We have seen it in Australia. It is not so long ago that I was talking to a member of the Federal Parliament and he said, "I forecast that before long we will have a tremendous bulge in the population group, particularly between the ages of 19 and 29, and unemployment in that group will be rife." That is a problem we must tackle. It is illustrated in the Queensland railways, and again I am not criticising but merely pointing out a fact. The Minister for Transport has a policy of dieselisation. What does that mean? What will it mean? He also wishes to make the Railway Department pay. I do not say that is a bad idea either, but there is no intake of young people into the railways today as there was in the past. As a result, lads in country towns who were previously assimilated into the Railway Department are no longer being employed. They have to go elsewhere to seek a job and naturally they drift to the big centres. If their parents can afford it they are kept at school. That is the situation that will develop in Australia. We do not want to see it develop. We today cannot conceive the miseries of the depression.

Mr. Aikens: What is your solution of the problem?

Mr. O'DONNELL: Unfortunately my solution has possibly come too late because the planning has been inadequate. Years ago we saw this coming.

Mr. Low: Your own Leader introduced dieselisation into the railways.

Mr. O'DONNELL: The hon. member for Cooroora is mistaken if he thinks I am blaming dieselisation. I am not blaming dieselisation at all. I am blaming the failure to prepare. We are not alone in this. Apparently it has gone on in the United States of America.

Mr. Aikens: It is going on over the border in New South Wales, too.

Mr. O'DONNELL: And so it will continue. We must face up to it and lessen its effect; put the brakes on before complete control is lost.

That is the problem of today. There is a problem of the future that I think the Department of Education should do something about. It is time the department took into its confidence the people in the country who are not resident in centres where there are Junior high-school tops or Senior high-school tops. I want an early pronouncement from the Government or the Minister for Education as to what is going to happen to children in the one-teacher schools, the two-teacher schools, and the three-teacher schools where there will be no facilities for proceeding to Junior or past the primary stage of education. I want these people fully informed now so that they will know what is really to ensue. Even today people speak to me about the children I taught. They say to me, "Do you think my child should go on to secondary education?" I say, "Why do you ask me that?" They reply, "Well, we have to make plans. We have to book children into schools. We do not know what is ahead of us. What is the Government going to do about providing secondary education in this centre?" So the whole set-up is one of confusion to these people. Now would be a good time to warn them what is to happen in 1964 so they will know what to expect of the school in their district where it will be impossible to establish a Junior top. I want to see it done. I have said it before in the Chamber and I repeat it because it is important. I know certain centres have made representations to the Department of Education asking for the establishment of a high-school top. The hon. member for Cooroora once said, "If you want anything, write to the Department of Education." The answer in this case was "It will be reviewed in 1963." That is far too late for these people. That is why I stress it. People must be given adequate notice. I have known people say to me, "I want to stay here but there is no facility for higher education at present. When I know what is coming I shall be able to make a decision. If the facility is provided I will certainly stay here, but if it is not provided I will have to leave." That is the important point. Take these people into your confidence and they will appreciate it.

We in the country have enough difficulties with education without adding to them that feeling of future insecurity. I know that people in the city, having all the facilities available, are inclined to become complacent and think little of the people in the country. They are, however, the most important people because they produce the country's wealth. I was listening to the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity on a TV programme—"Round Table." I think it was—and he referred to the fact that Queensland supports Australia's credit overseas because it is the only State with a favourable trade balance. He claimed that Queensland did that for Australia. Queensland is a primary-producing State, and, if it is so important to the Australian economy, surely we should protect the people who are

providing Australia with that advantage. Let every consideration be given to these people in the country; that is all that they want. I can assure you that they will endeavour to co-operate.

One final point on education is that today we have become rather confused about it. At one time we had the ideal that education was for our own personal good. It was a matter of education for the sake of education. Today it has become commercialised and people are rather sceptical about education that is not going to bring a cash return. I am deeply disappointed in that. The real value of education seems to be slipping from the mind of the community. If a boy had a Junior pass, one would not expect him to be a nipper with the council or the Railway Department, but the ideas of some people on education go no further than that.

I should like to stress that education is comparatively young in this country. I do not think that education as we know it in this State has reached even its centenary. We have advanced a long way, but we have much farther to go, and it will not be of great use if education is to be just a commercial proposition. I think that it should be valued much more than that. We are in a transitional period and educated people in the past took all the cream, but it is quite obvious that in the future not all educated people are going to be so fortunate. Unless there is a healthy approach to the subject, I am afraid that there will be many disappointed people who will perhaps, as a result, develop a wrong slant on life.

Mr. Sullivan: Don't you think that if people received more education they would realise the value of it?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am afraid that I could not catch what the interjector said. Time is moving on, and there are other things that I wish to mention.

A very important local matter to which I must again refer—I hope that I am not boring hon. members with these repetitions—is the situation at Blair Athol. We have attacked this problem in many ways. We had great hopes of Comalco's taking up its option, but we do not know what it will do. I heard a rumour—I will refer to it as a rumour because I did not see the actual report; I was informed by a person who is usually reliable—that the Premier made a statement that Comalco had renewed its option. If he did make that statement, it would puzzle me greatly. I could not understand his reason for making it. I know where the original agreement is lodged. There is no second option there, and the first option does not expire until 2 October next year. I mention that because when reports appear in the Press the people of Blair Athol and district say, "There must be something on." Their hopes rise that the centre in which they desire to stay will receive some benefit.

Some hon. members opposite have visited Blair Athol, but they would probably decline very smartly an invitation to stay there. I assure them that coalminers and railwaymen are quite happy to stay in Blair Athol, so the town must have something. Perhaps it is the goodness of the people, because the town certainly lacks many amenities.

The people of Blair Athol are particularly interested in seeing a continuation of coal production. When the Callide coalfield is developed and the power house is established there, I suggest to the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity that the Callide field should no longer supply Rockhampton with coal and that the orders should be divided between the Bluff coalfield and the Blair Athol coalfield. This would assist in counteracting the effect of dieselisation in the railways. Six diesel engines are to be used in the Central West, and this will mean a reduction in the output at Blair Athol. Although cost is a factor, I should like the Minister to take note of these figures. To the end of June 1962, Rockhampton bought 71,000 tons of coal from Callide, 30,000 tons from Blair Athol, and 17,000 tons from Bluff. If the Callide order could be given to Blair Athol and Bluff in approximately the same proportions as their present sales to Rockhampton, those mines could continue to operate. We want them to continue operating, because in the future industrial expansion may take place unexpectedly in the area and they would then be in a position to supply the necessary coal. I pass that suggestion on to the Minister as the only feasible one at the moment. If it can be done, I assure him that it will be very much appreciated. The Blair Athol coalfield has a long history, but over the last 10 years production has been declining.

Anybody who reads the daily newspapers could not fail to notice the great to-do there has been over grain production on Peak Downs. At a recent meeting of grain-growers at Emerald, I told them that there was only one solution to their problem—co-operation. There are the farmers, the Railway Department, and the Sorghum Board, which, of course, in the summer season is concerned with sorghum production. In winter the Sorghum Board is replaced by the State Wheat Board. We must realise that the Railway Department, under pressure, cannot always cope with the demands made on it, and at times the Grain Sorghum Board has marketing difficulties as a result of shipping problems. It must also be realised that grain-growers have storage problems that will be further accentuated by the fact that on many of the properties there are sharefarmers who cannot be expected, or in ordinary circumstances would not be expected, to provide storage space. As a result there is much lack of cohesion, and I do not think it helped much when the Minister for Transport passed the very strong remark, "Stop your belly-aching!"

Mr. Rae: What would you say?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I think, in the circumstances, it would have been far better to count to ten, because, irrespective of the person against whom it was directed, the hon. member, being a country man, should know, that if one attacks a man in the country others are likely to get their backs up, whether the person concerned is right or wrong. I could tell the hon. member privately the name of a certain town where the people will tell him just what they think. I consider the solution I have mentioned is the only one.

Gladstone has been declared a wheat port, and possibly the same trouble will arise again. If the Minister for Transport can supply wagons and the Wheat Board can move the grain a little quicker, perhaps the farmers might supply some sort of storage to help ease the predicament. I have a lot of sympathy for these people. They are starting an industry. They have not been established for 20 or 30 years. I have not met one man connected with this industry who is objectionable or even unreasonable.

Mr. Chalk interjected.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I am pleased that the Minister for Transport has returned to the Chamber. He has announced rail concessions to the Central West but nobody knows whether or not they apply because of the slash in prices at the chain stores. The Minister has my sympathy in this instance. Of course, the Government will take the credit anyway. However, I appreciate that he considered my representations for a reduction in the minimum from 5 cwt. to 2 cwt. It has been greatly appreciated by the small corner-store men. There are not many of them, I know, but still it has been a great help to them and, I believe, to the bigger people too. It has helped to facilitate supplies. Whereas previously they had to devise a means of overcoming the 5 cwt. minimum, they are now able to work more satisfactorily for themselves and for their clients.

One matter that puzzles me refers to the liquor question, which has been raised by the hon. member for Gregory and, I think, the hon. member for Rockhampton North. What they said may have been justified in some instances. On other occasions perhaps some people may have been harshly treated. Upon inquiry I found that the Treasurer does quite well because the hotel-keeper in Brisbane can buy bottled beer for 32s. a dozen on which he pays 6 per cent., but the hotel-keeper in Rockhampton pays 43s. 9d. a dozen on which he also pays 6 per cent. It indicates to me that 6 per cent. is paid on the freight that goes to the Minister for Transport and on the agent's commission. It is rather strange that the Government should be trying to help lift the price of liquor in the West. I thought that it was unjustified.

After all, it does inflate values. The hotel-keeper in Brisbane has a certain valuation placed on his hotel on the basis of the business that he conducts. In Rockhampton an inflated value will be placed on the hotel-keeper's premises because the figure will not indicate accurately the value of the business carried on. The Press report mentioned overproof rum in Brisbane at 31s. 9d. That is true, but it is very weak overproof rum. The rum that was quoted at 50s. was 36 per cent. overproof. Any rum over 30 per cent. overproof costs 40s. 9d. in Brisbane. I urge an investigation into the matter concerning the question of what is a wholesale price for licence-fee purposes. The people should be treated fairly. I do not think rash criticism is good enough. If complaints are made they should be made with some degree of knowledge. When a case is truly presented an inquiry can be held. I know that there has been some reduction in prices by hotel-keepers. I think it is entirely due to what has been said not only by members of Parliament but by people in public spheres outside. There should be a more realistic approach to the matter of hotel licences. It is rather odd that the wholesale price of beer is 32s. a dozen in Brisbane and 43s. 9d. a dozen in Rockhampton, merely for the purpose of Government revenue. Naturally the extra cost is passed on to the cash customer.

When I go into the country I am amused at the results of the new Racing and Betting Act. It makes me smile when I think of all the pious words spoken last year about what would happen. What has happened is only a continuation of what was going on. The good old custom has continued. It certainly makes me smile when I remember what was said here.

However, I am concerned about one matter. Money is lost at every country centre through the implementation of this betting legislation. The hon. member for Burdekin complained bitterly about money passing out of the State, but we in the rural centres can complain about our money finding its way down here. It is building up the Treasury coffers, but it will not come back. The imposition of the betting tax is making the bookmakers wary. They were doing business in the past and, in fact, they were reaping the benefit. At present they have this tax, and they do not look at the past and say, "We had the benefit then and we can pass it on to the consumer now." That is not the attitude of many business men. When people go into this business they are thinking of the catch. The starting-price provisions of the racing and betting legislation are a little tough on the bookmakers. On the other hand, if hon. members had seen the prices on offer from time to time they would have said, "Serve them right." People in the country areas every week see this flow of money to the Treasurer's coffers and I do not see any way for it to go back. If we are to get back 20 per cent. it will be only a small amount. This money is being taken

from country centres and it will affect business houses and the attitude of the people irrespective of what the bookmaker does, or who he is.

Mr. Rae: Don't you think that Central Queensland racing has benefited, or will benefit, from this legislation.

Mr. O'DONNELL: I will answer that question. I am a little sceptical because there is a 15-mile limit. At the eastern end of the Barcoo, race meetings could collapse for lack of bookmakers. Once the meetings are outside the 15-mile limit the bookmakers may stay at home.

Mr. Rae: It is 100 miles.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Fifteen miles, for betting.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gaven): Order!

Mr. O'DONNELL: Through you, Mr. Gaven, may I ask the Treasurer if that is correct? Is it true that there is a 15-mile limit on the bookmakers?

Mr. Hiley: Yes.

Mr. O'DONNELL: That could kill the local race meetings. We like to race horses in the country, but if the bookmakers wish to stay at home in almost every instance, there could be a collapse of racing in the West.

I heard a heated remark passed by an owner to a bookmaker. The owner said to the bookmaker, "Are you going to the races on Saturday?" The bookmaker said, "No, I have my S.P. licence. I am going back to starting price." What the owner said was unprintable. He realised, as we all realise in the West, that if the bookmakers decide to stay at home racing will collapse, and not very much will be left of the Central Queensland Racing Association. It can happen. Fortunately the bookmakers we have up there so far have a good approach to the game. But if we get people who are reluctant to move, there will be a collapse in racing in Central Queensland and, as a result, a collapse in revenue, too.

To sum up, I am emphatically fostering the idea of security of tenure. That means, in my book, maximum opportunity for everyone in Queensland to be fully employed irrespective of the field in which he operates.

Mr. HOUSTON (Bulimba) (3.56 p.m.): The debate so far has been confined almost solely to speeches from the Opposition. I do not know whether Government hon. members have been told not to speak or whether they simply have nothing to speak about. It is certainly peculiar to have a Budget debate confined to Opposition speakers. Perhaps Government members will rise later if only in reply to some of the accusations from this side.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition dubbed the Budget a "ballot-box" Budget. I think that is very appropriate particularly when you consider that it was brought into being through the ballot box revolt in December last year and the fear the Treasurer has of a ballot box catastrophe for the Government in the early part of next year. The fear is real because there is no doubt that Government members will be looking for a job at the first opportunity.

The Budget proves conclusively that the Treasurer is a very accomplished, keen and shrewd accountant, and a very wily politician. The tragedy is that he and his advisers have not shown that they are real statesmen. After all, the Budget relies mainly on two human weaknesses—the consumption of liquor, and betting. The extra revenue is being derived deliberately; it is no accident. The Treasurer, when he introduced the Racing and Betting Bill, and the Minister for Justice, when he introduced the Liquor Act Amendment Bill, made no apologies for deliberately seeking to attract more money into the State coffers from those two sources.

Let us look at some of the features of the Budget. I do not intend to go through it all with a fine-tooth comb. There will be other speakers from this side and when the Estimates are before us we will deal with the various departments in more detail. At this stage I should like to refer to a few figures that the Minister may see fit later to comment on. First of all, it is true that Consolidated Revenue increased from £117,325,027 for 1961-1962, to £121,246,683 for 1962-1963. In other words, it is estimated that the Consolidated Revenue Fund will increase by £3,921,656, which is near enough to £4,000,000. Let us see where these increases are to come from. I am not suggesting that these are the only departments or sections that will show increases in revenue, but they are the main ones.

First of all, the Commonwealth grant to which the State is entitled increased from £43,730,193 to £45,431,000, or an increase of £1,700,000-odd. There has also been a special grant this year of £3,640,000 as against £3,340,000 last year, and it is obvious that these amounts were received only because of the fright that the Commonwealth Government had at the December election. There is no doubt about that. When Queensland was looked upon as a Liberal State, come what may, by the Commonwealth Government, Queensland received very little financial assistance from that Government. I think that we can safely say that this extra assistance was obtained because of the fright that the Commonwealth Government had, rather than from any worthwhile agitation from the State Government. After all, it has been shown on many occasions that when the State Government has endeavoured to obtain extra money from the Commonwealth, it has failed dismally.

Mr. Lloyd: Hon. members opposite said that they had not applied for unemployment relief. They said that 12 months ago.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is quite true, as the hon. member for Kedron interjected. This has a great bearing on the functioning of the State and shows conclusively that the Government has certainly endeavoured to build up its stocks but cannot do so on any sound foundation.

If we look at the income received from taxation on liquor, it will be seen that last year it was £1,343,936. This year the Government expects to receive £1,600,000. In other words, the Minister does not know exactly how much he will get but he hopes that it will be that amount, or even more. He is expecting to get more than £250,000 extra this year from liquor licences and the like than was received last year. I do not think that any State Government can be proud of the fact that it is relying on income from liquor licences to assist in financing the State.

Betting taxation last year returned £604,959, and this year the return is estimated at £1,300,000. In round figures, there is an expected increase of £700,000 in that account. Taking those items into consideration, we find that already nearly £2,500,000 of the £4,000,000 extra has been accounted for. We also find that £673,000 is transferred from Trust and Special Funds to Consolidated Revenue.

In stamp duty, an increase is expected from, in round figures, £5,000,000 to £5,400,000, or an increase of £331,000. There seems to be little hope of any reduction in this indirect taxation. Many people find the payment of stamp duty a very great worry. This happens particularly in cases where people die without leaving wills. A property is left to a wife and children, and stamp duty has to be paid on it. There are many cases in which, even though the amounts to be paid are small, there is considerable worry, not so much because of the actual amounts but because the properties may possibly have to be disposed of. After all, stamp duties are very important in certain aspects of finance, and any Government should be very careful to see that the amounts involved are not so high that other factors come into it.

Earlier speakers mentioned the returns from short-term investments, namely £420,546. I believe that this was a brainchild of the present Treasurer some years ago. Although I criticise him on some occasions, I am prepared to say that I think this was a very wise decision on his part, or on the part of the Government, and the Government is now receiving the fruits of those investments. That makes up the other £1,500,000 that is included in the approximately £4,000,000 more than is available from Consolidated Revenue. The increased amount that the Government has

to play with on the credit side has resulted not from an overall increase in the buoyancy of the finances of the State but from an increase in taxation or the opening up of new fields of taxation.

Let us now have a look at the debit side. Interest on loans is the big killer, as I think the hon. member for Burdekin said.

Mr. Hiley: Did you say it was a big help?

Mr. HOUSTON: A big problem. "Problem" was not the word that I used, but that is what I meant. I am sure the Treasurer will agree with the hon. member for Burdekin, that the interest charges, making allowance for all the bits and pieces that have to come off—

Mr. Coburn: They are more than bits, too.

Mr. HOUSTON: That is true. It is nearly £14,000,000. Consolidated Revenue contributed £16,769,119, which actually is reduced. However, the main thing is that last year, before the reduction of the amount, it was £14,528,239. In other words, the increase in interest charges was £2,240,880, and it is that increase in interest charges that causes great concern. When we consider that the overall interest charges increased at that rate, it makes us wonder how far we can go on our present borrowing programme.

In the same period Australia's internal loan indebtedness increased by £21,000,000, and the overseas loan indebtedness increased by approximately £500,000, making a total indebtedness of £415,987,766. There could be a great deal of argument about the justice of the Commonwealth Government's receiving money from the people of Queensland and other States and then lending it back to them at high interest rates. That seems to be the crux of the borrowing programme in Australia. Overseas borrowing is on a different basis, of course. It seems to me to be completely wrong that at least £10,000,000, allowing for the bits and pieces, has to come out of Consolidated Revenue to pay interest on money that originally came from this State as a result of its own production. I agree with other speakers that as we spend money on development, the Commonwealth Government gets the benefit through income tax and other forms of taxation. The sooner the States and the Commonwealth realise the existence of this terrific interest burden, not only on Queensland, but on all the States, and find ways and means of adjusting the financing of it, the better it will be for all concerned. To me it sounds silly to say that we are getting £45,000,000 from the Commonwealth by way of financial assistance and then handing £10,000,000 of that £45,000,000 straight back to meet the charges.

I wish, Mr. Taylor, to cover as much ground as possible. Unfortunately, we do not get many opportunities to debate a variety

of subjects and to raise matters that we think should be aired. I notice that in the Estimates for the Premier and Chief Secretary's Department there is a new charge. It is a small one, nevertheless, it is there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the hon. member that he can deal with the Estimates when they are being debated.

Mr. HOUSTON: I did not intend to go through the Estimates as a whole but I think a principle is involved in this matter. I will have to refer to the figures relating to staff of the Chief Secretary's Department as they affect the new position of Deputy Public Service Commissioner. I have to refer to that because it is there as a charge against—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Can the hon. member refer to that matter in the debate on the Financial Statement?

Mr. HOUSTON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Does the hon. member say it is included in the Financial Statement?

Mr. HOUSTON: I would not know whether it is in that particular document.

Mr. LLOYD: I rise to a point of order. The Financial Statement really includes the Estimates and the Tables relating to the Financial Statement. The Estimates have already been tabled and I believe that any member of the Committee is entitled to discuss any item in a document that has been tabled by the Treasurer. He has presented them.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am not anxious to restrict any debate but all hon. members know that 16 days are allotted to discussion of the Estimates of the various departments, one following the other. I anticipate that hon. members can discuss the Estimates in that debate, which will follow this one.

Mr. HOUSTON: I abide by your ruling, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. HILEY: I rise to a point of order. I wish to say on behalf of the Government that it is intended, with your indulgence, Mr. Taylor, that the Budget debate should be on as wide a basis as possible with the fewest possible restrictions. My personal attitude will be—and I hope with your indulgence you may see fit to accept it without causing any embarrassment—that any subject raised and dealt with in the Estimates can be raised and the Government will be perfectly happy that it should be.

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

The CHAIRMAN: Order! In view of the remarks of the Treasurer, who is anxious to hear a full discussion on any financial matter, I am quite happy to allow the hon. member for Bulimba to continue with his

original remarks. However, I express the hope that it will not be a precedent that a department that is to come up for discussion during the 16 days allotted for the Estimates should be dealt with in detail during this debate.

Mr. Lloyd: I thank you for your ruling, Mr. Taylor, and the Treasurer for his remarks. We do not yet know what Estimates will be discussed and if you are going to restrict discussion now it might be possible that the department concerned will not come up for discussion during the debate on the Estimates.

Mr. HOUSTON: I also thank you, Mr. Taylor. The matter I wish to mention perhaps could have been mentioned without reference to the Estimates. It is that one of the officers of the Public Service Commissioner's Department this year will be Deputy Commissioner. I may be completely wrong in this. If I am no harm will have been done, but if my fears are well-founded perhaps the Treasurer will comment on the matter later on. I know that for some considerable time the State Public Service Union has been urging the establishment of a Public Service Commission rather than have merely a Public Service Commissioner. Such a proposal was definitely included in my party's policy and I should imagine it was included also in the policies of the Government parties. At least they gave some indication at the time that they favoured the idea. In any case I should like the Treasurer to tell us whether there is an abandonment of the idea and whether the Government is to rely on a single Public Service Commissioner with an Assistant or Deputy Commissioner to help him administer the department. After all, the whole idea of a Public Service Commission was to allow the employees of the State Public Service, through their representatives, to have a direct say in the administration of the Public Service. If this officer is to be appointed I cannot see the proposal of a Public Service Commission being given effect to. I hope the Treasurer will give us some information on that matter.

On perusing the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure of the Trust and Special Funds I notice that there has been a considerable increase in estimated expenditure for this year, the total amount being £118,000,000. The estimated expenditure by the Premier and Chief Secretary's Department has increased from £11,000,000 to £14,500,000. Of course, that is brought about mainly by the increased expenditure on the Mt. Isa railway project and the Barron River Hydro-electric Extension Project. We have no fight with either of those schemes. Speaking on behalf of the Opposition, I think I can say that the quicker they are proceeded with the better it will be for the State. As I have said on many occasions, a modern, fast, efficient rail service and the development of Queensland by the complete electrification of the State is something to be desired. After all, it is only by keeping abreast of the times that we can hope to succeed. As has

been said on many occasions, the State has a great potential, but the potential is worth nothing unless we are prepared to spend money to develop our natural assets.

In the Estimates of the Department of Health and Home Affairs, under the heading of "Hospitals", an item of £9,258,496 is shown as required from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Among the Trust and Special Funds is shown an amount of £16,000,000-odd which includes the £9,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. In other words, both the Consolidated Revenue Fund and the Trust and Special Funds are being credited with the same £9,000,000. It is a doubling-up. The amount of £9,000,000 is taken from one fund, put in another, and then credited to both. At the end of the financial year if we add up the total expenditure, to my way of thinking we will find that the total expenditure is £9,000,000 more than it should be. There is only one of three explanations. The first explanation is that it is an error; the second is that I have misinterpreted the figures, which I do not think I have done. The third explanation could be that it is a very efficient piece of book-keeping on the part of the Government. I suggest to the Treasurer that he check to make sure that those figures are correct. I should hate to think that a department, particularly the Department of Health and Home Affairs, thought it had another £9,000,000 to spend or, worse still, I should hate the public to think that the total expenditure for the State was over £9,000,000 more than the actual amount. Maybe the Treasurer can give some explanation of that.

I move now to some comments concerning the Department of Public Works and Local Government and I propose to devote a few minutes to a consideration of the Valuer-General's Department with the idea of commenting on the expert staff employed there. Provided they carry out the job they should do, the money paid to them will be well spent. However, I am worried about valuations, particularly in the city of Brisbane, and the possible repercussions when they are put into effect. I am worried more than anything else about the older people in the community. A great number of them have expressed concern about their valuations. Some protest should be made about the magnitude of the increase in valuations in the Brisbane area. I am not referring to areas outside Brisbane because I am not conversant with farming land values and the values of other types of land; many other hon. members can speak knowledgeably on those matters.

There are some very peculiar anomalies concerning valuations in the Brisbane area. When Brisbane was valued as at 30 June, 1957, the total valuation was £67,899,505 and the total number of objections was 2,102. In other words, 1.4 per cent. of landholders objected to their valuations. At that time it was said that because of the

small number of people objecting the valuations could be accepted as being fairly reasonable and just. The present valuations are incomplete so far as they affect the inner city. It is strange that the inner-city valuations have not yet been declared when, to me, they are the main basis for rating all other land for land-tax purposes. They should have been brought out first. The fact that they are incomplete throws a certain amount of confusion into valuations in Brisbane. In the outlying areas, up to 20 per cent. of objections have been lodged so far. It is estimated that new valuations for Brisbane will exceed £200,000,000. At the end of last year there were 146,000 ratable properties, valued at £70,507,563. That was due mainly to the valuation of land that had been subdivided. Because of that there was an uplift in the total number of properties and also a higher overall valuation. In June last year, when the new valuations began to come out, there were an estimated 175,500 properties with an estimated value of over £200,000,000.

Let us look at some of the strange things I found in my electorate, where I made an intensive study of valuations. This was brought about by the desire of the people to have their values looked into. There are thousands of cases but the ones I will give are typical and indicate why I say something will have to be done to find a common basis of valuation.

For a start, one property in Tingalpa was valued at £90 and the new valuation is £425. The Tingalpa area has not changed over many years. Perhaps the stench of the creek has become worse but the land has not changed. On the other hand, at Bulimba, an area that has gone ahead, a property that was valued at £290 has gone to £775. In other words, the property in an area that had not changed one iota went up 4½ times while one in an area that had improved, with a bitumen road and so on, went up only 2½ times. A property adjacent to the one valued at £290 had been valued at £340 but rose to £800. The difference in the old valuations was £50; now it is only £25.

In 1957 a property of 16.7 perches was valued at £250. Next door was a property of 34.8 perches valued at £317. On area it could be said that they were fair valuations. The new valuation of the first one is £380 and, of the other, £790. Any relativity that they had was completely lost. There are three properties adjacent to each other in another street—17.4 perches, 16.7 perches and 16.3 perches. They are all about the same size but one is in a hollow while the other two are on the side of a hill. They were valued respectively at £130, £250 and £250. The new valuations are £365, £380 and £365. Across the road a property of 24 perches went from £250 to £745.

I could go on listing property after property giving some idea of the anomalies in new valuations. One went from £200 to £450 while the property next door rose from £200 to £390. One went from £300 to £470 while the property next door went from £170 to £435.

The classic example of the lot is at Murarrie. In 1957 Queensport Road was a dirt road and, parallel to it, Woodanga Street was in fairly bad condition years ago. There are two allotments of exactly the same size, one facing Queensport Road and the other facing Woodanga Street. The one in Queensport Road was valued at £100 while the other was valued at £90. That was fair enough, I suppose, because Queensport Road was the better of the two roads and the main road. Since that time, Queensport Road has been bitumenised and has become a bus route, while Woodanga Street has got worse. I could not say it was the worst street in Australia but it is not far from it. On the new valuations the Queensport Road property went from £100 to £220 while the Woodanga Street one went from £90 to £270. Can anyone tell me that there is any logic in that? If he can, I do not know where we are going.

I give those examples for what they are worth. I know that a Government committee is looking at valuations, but the point is that it is no good taking sales of land in an area as the basis for valuations because, if it is an established area with houses and amenities, the last block to be sold, or the block sold that was part of a larger allotment that is now cut up, has an entirely different set of circumstances compared with those when the estate was opened and little developed.

I think that that is how the whole of this valuation has fallen down. I know that near my home there was an allotment that no-one knew was available for sale because it was part of an ordinary home. It was an area of 48 perches, with a nicely kept garden. Because of a death in the family, part of the area was sold. It must actually have been 32 perches, because it became two 16-perch allotments and there are two additional houses there now. I daresay that that land brought quite a large amount of money because of all the amenities.

In our basis of valuation, I believe that we have to come back to what was originally intended. The original idea was that local authorities were to be financed by those who could afford to pay. Going back to earlier years, only those with capital and the wherewithal to obtain wealth were landholders, and I think it is quite logical to assume that rating was on the basis that it should be on the shoulders of those in a position to pay.

As time has gone on that has completely changed, and we find today many people not being required to contribute to Federal or, in some instances, State revenue. The

hon. member for Baroona has thrown this into the ring many times, and I agree with him completely. We say that when a person becomes aged he has contributed during his younger and working life to State and Commonwealth finances, and therefore he is not expected, in his old age and state of non-earning, to finance these various things. However, in the case of local authorities, we say, "As you get older and as your property becomes more established, and as you improve your home and garden and as the area develops round you, we expect you to pay more." To me, there is no logic at all in that. It is completely wrong, whatever yardstick is used. It is no use councils or anyone else saying, "We will give you a rebate." That is not the point at all. Either one's land is reasonably valued, or it is not.

I do not want to get on to legislation. Suffice it to say that the Act that was passed recently is not the answer to the problem. As time goes on, I think it will be seen clearly that all it does is shift the problem from one section to another. I venture to say that those who now have the most just cases for saying that their valuations are wrong will get some relief from the legislation, but those who received relative justice on their valuations—I do not want to suggest that they are all wrong—are the ones who will receive injustice.

Let us now look at the valuation of new estates and see if it is right that the selling prices of land in such estates should be taken as the basis for valuations in that particular district. When an estate is sold, the price of the allotments includes the cost of clearing, the formation of the roads and bitumen sealing, water channelling, in some cases the grading and levelling of the property and the filling of holes, the guarantee of electric light and water, and in some cases a guarantee loan to the local authority concerned. Above all that, a charge has to be included to cover the interest on the money that the subdivider has borrowed to develop the estate. The longer it takes to develop it and sell it, the higher the charges will be.

To give hon. members some idea of costs, a sealed road costs about £168 a chain, which is £84 a house. I think these figures are fairly accurate for the type of road that is being put down now. If they are not correct, somebody has given me the wrong information.

Mr. Hiley: No, that is pretty right.

Mr. HOUSTON: Channelling costs £35 a chain, which brings it to £119 for each allotment for development. In many cases the subdivider pays 8 per cent. for the money that he borrows. I have heard of some higher than that, but I will take 8 per cent. as a reasonable figure. That brings it up to £127 or £130 that he has expended for an allotment, and that sum has to be repaid by the person who purchases the land for the use of a developed property.

Mr. Hiley: Including park land. In the Queensland Housing Commission, £150 is the least we have to spend for a developed block.

Mr. HOUSTON: I will accept the Treasurer's figure. There is no argument about that. When ground is sold at a certain figure, we must also allow for the development of the property. It is a normal business transaction, and although I might think that the price asked for certain land is too high, it is purely a matter between the developer and the purchaser. I think that these matters should be taken into account to a greater extent when valuations are made than they are now. I say to whoever is handling the matter—eventually it must come back to Cabinet and the Minister for Public Works and Local Government—that when a new formula is brought down, as I believe it must be, it should have a basis that reflects the true unimproved value of the land as it was years ago. In the last 18 months many paintings of the older part of Brisbane have been shown to me. A great number of waterholes have been shown in them, and one would not give two bob for the ground in its unimproved state. A young valuer who had not lived in the area and talked to the older residents about the old days would not know this. Let us get down to a practical basis. If it is to be an improved value, let us say so. Let us not camouflage it by saying that it is an unimproved value when it is in fact an improved value. As I said before, I think that is completely wrong and completely dishonest.

Education was mentioned by the Treasurer in his Financial Statement. It is pleasing to see money being spent for educational purposes, and our young people should have the benefit of the most modern educational facilities that we can provide for them.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. HOUSTON: The hon. member for Salisbury did not say that at all. He can speak for himself later on. The point I wish to mention is the terrific cost of education, and some figures I have might be very appropriate at this stage. The Department of Public Works will spend over £5,000,000 this year on primary and secondary education alone. The principal amounts, of course, are £1,300,000 for State school buildings, £2,500,000 for technical colleges and high schools and, of course, there are plenty of other matters that will account for the balance.

I have taken out the percentage of administrative costs and also the interest charges on capital works expenditure from the loans programme and it works out at approximately £5,000,000 from the Public Works Vote. On the Education Vote we have further heavy expenditure, totalling approximately £18,500,000. There is £13,600,000 for State schools, £1,400,000 for technical education, £590,000 for the

free-milk scheme, which is for primary children, and £940,000 for Teachers' Training Colleges. It all adds up to over £18,000,000, giving a total expenditure on education for one year of £23,500,000.

Mr. Hiley: Plus university buildings, making it almost £25,000,000.

Mr. HOUSTON: I left university buildings out of it because, to me, a university education is something we only hope our children will get. With matters developing as they are now in all political fields irrespective of party politics, we hope that every child will get the advantage of a secondary education, which is the best most of us can possibly give them.

When we consider that education will cost the State £23,500,000 we have to make sure that the State—and when I say "State" I mean the people in the State; we do not want to use the word "State" as something dead and unrealistic—or the people in the State—the people, the children, the employers, fellow-employees, everybody concerned—must ensure some return on that investment in our young people. I am particularly concerned that our State schools shall not become staging camps or holding centres for our unemployed youth. I fear, with the present trend, that unless some drastic action is taken to overcome several very serious problems, we will find ourselves in a very bad way with our young people. I am concerned first of all with the great number of young people leaving school at the end of each year. This year 22,859 pupils will be sitting for the Junior examination. The great majority of those will be leaving school. To them must be added those leaving after the Senior and those who leave after Sub-Junior or Sub-Senior. I think it is true to say that 20,000 young people will be looking for employment this year.

Last year 18,000 sat for the Junior, which means that a lesser number left school last year than will leave this year, but we have not yet absorbed all of them into employment. There could be no better time than now, while we are changing from a two-year Junior to a three-year Junior, to tackle this problem, and I should like to have investigated the possibility of creating an examination halfway through the year. Call it "post-Junior" for want of a better name. Hon. members will know that those who get particularly good results in the Junior examination are no great worry at all. Most of them go on to Sub-Senior and Senior. Those with the next grade of pass, with reasonably good Junior results, go to the Public Service and other jobs where initiative and better education are required. Then there are those who do not know what to do. Their parents are concerned about them. Is it fair to allow students to go on for another two years when they have already shown that they are not really up to the standard of those who secured good Junior passes? Is it fair to send them back to college for

another two years to become a problem at the end of that time? In my opinion it would be desirable to encourage those with the lower Junior passes to stay on at school for another six months and to sit for the equivalent of another Junior examination at the end of that time. The employer would then know that he had two sections from which to draw. He would know that some students would be available from the November-December examination and others from the May-June examination. It would mean a little extra work for the Department of Education, but compared with the investment of £23,000,000 on education the extra cost would be so small in proportion that it should not be considered. The scheme would have the advantage that the young people would not be all fighting at once for the jobs that were available. The State would have better-educated children. They would spend that extra six months on the same subjects. From their results in December they would know where their weaknesses were. By bringing them up to a higher standard in the extra six months the overall advantage certainly would pay. The State and everyone would reap the advantage. Parents would not have the worry of having an unemployed child on their hands, or having to send him back to school for another two years for a course of study for which the child had proved to have no great aptitude.

I had intended to deal with this matter when the departmental Estimates were being debated but owing to the illness of the Minister for Education and Migration it may not be possible to bring on the Estimates of that department. I would appreciate it if my remarks could be passed on to the education authorities because one of the great problems of Parliament, public figures, and parents alike is educating the children and placing them where they can be a credit to themselves and an asset to the State as a whole.

The Commonwealth Government has expressed concern about the number of tradesmen that will be available in the future. Anyone would be concerned if he realised that there is likely to be a shortage of skilled tradesmen in the years to come. The only source of good tradesmen is good apprentices. It is up to every employer to do his utmost to employ apprentices. I know that many will say, "Oh, an apprentice is a lot of trouble. He receives a lot in wages. He does not really earn his keep until his third or fourth year." Others will complain that they have to give apprentices time off to attend college during working hours. They make all sorts of excuses, but as soon as they want an extra man on the job to make an extra bob for them they try to pinch a good apprentice or tradesman out of his time from some other employer. All employers should share equally the burden—if it is a burden—of young apprentices. They should employ them, train them efficiently, and let them enter industry as qualified tradesmen. The saying that an apprentice in his first

or second year does not pay is not borne out in practice. Provided that an apprentice has had a good grounding in mathematics and drawing and has completed his manual-training course, I believe that on the first day he walks into the workshop he becomes an asset. If the employer uses him to sweep the floor, that is the employer's loss. In my generation, the employment pool consisted of 14-year-old lads. I went to work then, and so did many others. However, today the apprentices are 16-year-old lads, with the ability and mentality of 16-year-olds, and very smartly can become earning propositions for employers.

Mr. Windsor: Many young lads today are very intelligent.

Mr. HOUSTON: Of course they are. We have only to look at the college results, which are a credit to both the teachers and the apprentices. Too many employers are not carrying their share of the training of apprentices. I urge all of them to do so. After all, the apprentice of today is the tradesman of tomorrow. None of us would wish for a war or a national emergency to start the training of grown men and women to carry out work that should be performed by our young tradesmen.

Under the system in operation today, as in other sections of society, there are apprentices who do the wrong thing. The Apprenticeship Committee in certain instances is withholding their wages. The fund into which that money is paid has been building up for some considerable time. I am informed—and I do not think this is secret information because I obtained it properly—that the fund has reached quite a substantial figure. The Electrical Trades Union is aware of this fund and it has suggested that the money in it be used to employ two trade instructors, one on the mechanical side, and one on the woodworking side, to move around the State assisting correspondence students. The correspondence student suffers one great disadvantage. He lacks practical experience other than that in his particular shop. As we know, in most trades there is no shop—except perhaps the larger ones in the railways and the S.E.A.—where a lad can get training in all parts of his trade. I should like to see this suggestion thoroughly investigated and put into effect. The union was told it could not be done, but I do not think that is true. Almost anything can be done provided someone puts his mind to it. The money is there and it is coming in regularly. If it is not coming in regularly it means that someone has done a good job and the apprentices are not having their wages withheld. If it should happen that there is not enough money to employ these instructors, they may not be necessary. But while the money is there I believe it should be used to employ men to go around the State to help apprentices.

Mr. SHERRINGTON (Salisbury) (4.54 p.m.): I am amazed at the apparent lack of desire on the part of Government members, particularly on an election eve, to support the Budget brought down by the Treasurer. Thinking it over, one can come to only one conclusion, namely, that the Budget did not produce the public reaction that was expected of it.

On the opening of the debate today the Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke for an hour and 20 minutes. He was followed by the hon. member for Barcoo, who spoke for an hour, then the hon. member for Bulimba, who spoke for an hour, the Independent member for Burdekin, who spoke for an hour, and now me, and I intend to speak for the hour. So it would seem that, because this desired result has not been achieved and public reaction has not been favourable, the Treasurer has been left, like the proverbial shag on a rock, to explain to the public what he hopes to achieve by introducing the measures in the Budget.

Possibly a certain amount of disappointment has been expressed by the members of the Government because a perusal of the Financial Statement clearly indicates that the Treasurer is anxious to tie up his last five deficits with the actions of his confreres in Canberra. Quite early in the Financial Statement he said—

"Stimulated first by the Commonwealth Government employment grant and associated measures in February last, employment commenced to improve and the measure of improvement has been above the Australian average."

A little further over he said that, because of an awareness in Canberra of the needs of Queensland, there has been a heightened interest by the Federal Government in Queensland's special difficulties. Throughout the Financial Statement the Treasurer has very adroitly tried to explain away his Government's lack of ability to balance its budgets in previous years and tried to blame the policy of the Menzies Government. No doubt this view is shared by the Queensland Chamber of Manufactures. In its 1951 Annual Report, on the very first page, dealing with the economy, the chairman had this to say—

"It was not until February, after the Government had had a very close call at the polls that it finally acknowledged that its policies were inadequate, and a new financial programme was introduced."

On the next page he said—

"Subsequent activities by the Commonwealth Government indicated that it has at long last decided to give more than lip service to a vigorous development programme for Queensland."

Quite frankly, as I have said previously, right through the Treasurer's Financial statement, he draws attention to the lack of co-operation between the Federal Government and his own Government. When the

thin veneer is stripped from it and it is shown in its true perspective, what could we expect but at least that the Treasurer should have one good budget out of six! It would be a very pressing need for the Government of the day to bring down a good budget just before an election.

When we analyse this Budget, particularly the summing-up portion, we find that much that the Treasurer dealt with in the Financial Statement was concerned with work already started. He also introduced the principle of more or less claiming credit for what is being done by the private sector of industry. In the summing-up he says that the construction of an oil pipeline from the Moonie field to the coast will commence. This follows a claim by the Minister for Development, Mines, Main Roads and Electricity the other day that his Government found oil in Queensland. Then we find also the Treasurer reporting that delivery will be taken of another 12 diesel locomotives during the coming year, but he made provision for that expenditure in his last Budget.

Mr. Wharton: He is a very good Treasurer.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: That is a matter of opinion. Apparently hon. members on the Government side do not share that view because they are not here today to back up the Treasurer. It was not I who drove them out of the Chamber, because they have not been here all day. I have already drawn attention to the fact that the Treasurer was left, like a shag on a rock, to fight his own battles.

In his final summing-up, the Treasurer, after giving a glowing account of what the Government hopes to do—and I do not want to detract for one moment from what it hopes to achieve because it is its duty to bring prosperity to the State and it is remiss if it does not—went on to say—

"Weighing all these things, the Government sees the year ahead as one of a real stimulation in the economy and in the level of employment. The carefully prepared plans are now bearing fruit."

It has taken five years for those plans to bear fruit, and they have not been able to do so sooner because of the unsympathetic attitude of the Federal Government.

We on the Opposition side are always prepared to support in this Chamber any measure that we feel is of benefit to the State and that may provide avenues of employment and price stability. Quite frankly, I feel that this Budget is not one to write home about. On the contrary, it is one that should have been presented every year for the past five years that this Government has been in office.

The Treasurer states that on the expenditure side he would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the fact that, by careful control, every department was able

to live within its budgeted expenditure. He took the opportunity to commend the departments for their responsible attitude. That could be a laudable sentiment, too, but the total of those savings is £958,869. If it is to be said that that is a tremendous saving, particularly at a time when the State's unemployment figures were bad, what is the purpose of saving those moneys within those departments and not putting them into channels to provide employment? I think the Treasurer could well explain just what were the savings to which he referred. He should tell us whether they were effected by cutting down on staff, with a consequent reduction in wages, and so on. On a quick calculation, the amount saved could have provided employment for a considerable number of people had it been used to stimulate activity in the field of public works and other similar fields.

Dealing with the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Treasurer said that in the Budget presented last year a deficit of £643,574 was expected. However, owing to several factors there was a surplus in the fund of £109,719. Again, a quick calculation shows that the difference between a surplus of £109,000 and an expected deficit of £643,000 would have provided a full year's employment for 1,000 people at £16 a week.

I do not think that the Treasurer should receive any extra carnations for drawing attention to the considerable savings effected and the fact that he has been able to balance the Budget at a time when, as I said, employment was at its lowest level for a number of years. It would seem that he was prepared to balance his Budget, no matter how.

The Treasurer has also drawn attention in the Financial Statement to the huge sum of money that is to be spent on the provision of educational facilities in Queensland. No-one will quarrel with that because it is important that the children of the State should receive the best possible education. At this stage, without working the parish pump too hard, I should like to draw attention to a situation in the Inala area, which is part of my electorate. The Serviceton State School, which was opened about 2½ years ago, now has an enrolment of over 1,000 children. The headmaster has assured me that the present intake is 10 children for each school week of the year. I made representations to see whether it would be possible to have an additional school erected in the area.

Mr. Muller: Would that be an increase of 300 a year?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Allowing 40 school weeks and 10 children a week, it would be 400 a year.

About 12 months ago I drew the attention of the Minister for Education and Migration to the position. After a great deal of procrastination, he informed me in reply to a question that I asked recently that the plans

for the school were only on the drawing-board. If the present rate of intake is maintained, there will be 1,500 pupils at the school for the commencement of the next school year. If we wish to speak about what we are doing in the field of education, we must do some forward planning. The Minister must understand that in a satellite town such as Inala, where the Queensland Housing Commission is concentrating the greater part of its metropolitan work, there are great numbers of children. Schools should be planned well ahead. Unless something is done very quickly, there will be a chaotic commencement of the 1963 school year in the Serviceton area.

As this debate affords one an opportunity to speak on a very extensive range of subjects, and as the Treasurer has indicated that he wishes the debate to be as wide as possible, I feel that I should bring to the notice of this Committee some further information I have on the marketing of meat in our State. I dealt with this subject during the Address-in-Reply debate but, because of the limited time, it was necessary to restrict my remarks in that regard. Subsequent events have proved that there has been no real improvement in the meat industry in Queensland.

Mr. Lloyd: The Minister for Justice promised an open inquiry into meat prices in 1961 but has since denied it.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: That would not be the first promise that he has broken. Nevertheless, I feel that this subject is of such far-reaching importance that some action will have to be taken to satisfy, first of all the consuming public, secondly the producer, and thirdly the people of the State and the Government that restrictive trade practices are not operating in the meat industry.

In "The Courier-Mail" of 12 February, 1962, there appeared an article the subject of which was that Mr. Ian Harris told the Tiaro branch of the South-East Queensland Cattlemen's Association at Gundiah on the Saturday of that week that meat consumption in Brisbane last year had apparently fallen by from 20 to 25 per cent. Those figures are borne out by a reference to the statistics relating to the consumption of meat per head of the population of Australia. Mr. Harris gave as his three main reasons, one, that there was a reduced per-capita consumption because of the number of migrants who did not make meat a stable part of their diet; two, that there was a rise in consumption of lamb in Queensland; and three, that housewives were allocating a set amount of money for the purchase of meat.

I should like this afternoon to go into some of those reasons because I feel that, in the first instance, the influence of the migrant in Australia on meat-eating habits would be very small indeed. I think I can prove to this Chamber that one of the main causes for the decline in meat consumption

has been the increase in its price. I think that is borne out also in the third contention by Mr. Harris, that is, that housewives were allocating only a certain proportion of their spending money to the purchase of meat, because the statistical figures show that with the increase in the price of meat consumption figures have fallen.

It is very interesting to read the opinion that the "local trade in Queensland includes fresh meats for the intrastate and interstate trade, smallgoods and canning. Export trade consists of frozen or chilled meats, and cured and canned meats. The domestic market is by far the more important outlet for the varied products of our livestock and meat industry. The importance of this trade may be illustrated by statistics which show that approximately 80 per cent. of the Australian beef and veal production is consumed by the Australian public."

In other words, if we could foster the consumption of meat back to the pre-war level we would have little need to worry about our prospects for the export of beef from Australia.

If the figures were to reach the 1938-1939 per-capita consumption of 144 lb. per head, it would appear that we would be in the position of having to import meat into Australia. With all this talk of the possible effects following on Great Britain's entry into the European Common Market, it could well be that an investigation of the meat industry in Queensland at the present time could show that we would be capable of consuming the whole of the meat produced for the Australian market.

Mr. Hiley: While on this investigation, would you investigate the hamburger steak that we had for lunch today?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I entirely agree with the Treasurer. I am quite disappointed that he did not allow in his Budget an extra Vote so that we could purchase some decent meat for the Parliamentary Dining Room.

Getting back to this matter, which is a very pertinent one, I feel that it could be summed up by saying that since 1956-1957, when the apparent per-capita consumption of beef and veal for Australia reached a post-war peak of 128.9 lb., there has been a progressive annual decline to 86.4 lb. in 1960-1961, while the combined per-capita consumption of mutton and lamb, which in 1956-1957 was 74.5 lb., reached a peak of 102.6 lb. in 1959-1960 and 99.1 lb. in 1960-1961, which is 12.7 lb. higher than the per-capita consumption of beef and veal for the same period.

It might be all very well to say, "If the price of beef is too high, let us turn to mutton," but who wants to eat mutton, anyhow?

It is significant that this decline in meat consumption has brought prominently into the spotlight the comparable prices paid for

beef during the period of the decline. In 1938-1939, the peak period of our history when the consumption was 144 lb. per head, the sale price for beef at the market—quoting the price to the producer—

Mr. Muller: If that argument is sound, why don't they drink less beer?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I do not know. Ask the beer-drinkers.

In 1938-1939, when meat had reached its peak of consumption, we were paying 30s. 10d. for 100 lb. In 1957-1958, when consumption had dropped to 125 lb. a head, the cost of meat had risen to 146s. 8d. for 100 lb. In 1958-1959, when there was a further decline to 117 lb., the price had risen to 171s. 3d. for 100 lb. In 1959-1960, when consumption had dropped to 97 lb., meat prices had risen to 201s. 6d. a 100 lb., and in 1961-1962, when we reached the all-time low consumption of 86 lb. per head, the cost of meat rose to 235s. 10d. a 100 lb.

Mr. Windsor interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I know that the hon. member for Ithaca does not wish to speak. Nevertheless, he knows his chances are not too good in Ithaca and he has to get some interjections in hoping that he will hit the headlines. However, I do not wish to be interrupted because I think this subject is far too important. If the hon. member for Ithaca were to try to do something for the housewives in his electorate and help them to get meat back on the table, he would do a much better job than by helping to chase the magpies in the Ithaca Creek State School.

Irrespective of what argument is adduced, we find the significant feature that the consumption of meat has steadily declined in proportion to the increase in price. If we analyse it further, we find that for December, 1958, the wholesale price of beef was 18.49d. a lb. compared with 27.51d. in December, 1961. When we come to the poundage basis we find that there has been a considerable increase in the cost of meat. We must ask ourselves why this has happened. Most of this increase in the price of meat has occurred since the Government of the day de-controlled prices. Let us draw a comparison on a carcass of beef weighing 500 lb. I will not weary the Committee with the statistical details except to say that I have based my calculations on a screed that was prepared by the Meat and Allied Trades Federation giving statistical information on the percentage of the various cuts of meat and the wastage in a carcass. I am not quoting something that I have thought up myself.

Mr. Rae: That pamphlet looks pretty red to me.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: That is the trouble with the hon. member. He will see the good old Labour red on the Government benches next year.

Without going into the percentages, we find that for a beast of 500 lb. there would be—

- 48 lb. of topside
- 31 lb. of silverside
- 25 lb. of sirloin as a joint
- 15 lb. of T-bone steak
- 25 lb. of rump steak
- 7 lb. fillet
- 45 lb. rib, rolled
- 34 lb. blade.

Mr. Camm: How much tripe?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: That is what the hon. member for Whitsunday talks. He led with his chin that time.

To continue—

- 35 lb. chuck
- 43 lb. brisket
- 7 lb. shin

I have not included several other trimmings, which would go into the making of sausages, etc. If we take the prices ruling this year, the total paid over the counter for meat from that beast would be approximately £60 5s. 3d. The beast would be purchased on the market for about £36 5s. In other words, between the purchase of the bullock and its sale over the counter there is a margin of £23 2s. 6d. In the days when the margin on meat was 5½d. a lb., that carcass would have been worth £47 5s., or in other words the margin would have been £11 10s. Weighing these factors it will be seen that the price of meat since its de-control has risen by almost 100 per cent. After all, who has been asking for the de-control of meat? Certainly not the housewife and certainly not the wage-earner! Those who have been urging this Government to de-control meat are the ones who want to get a quick quid out of it. This was well illustrated in August when an article appeared in "The Courier-Mail" reporting that the South-eastern Queensland graziers were to ask for a price rule on meat following the claim that beef prices had fallen as low as 30 per cent. It drew a very quick response from the graziers. This is what one man had to say about it—

"My faith in the tenacity of the grazing fraternity was rocked to its foundations on reading in a Brisbane newspaper recently that the squeal over retail prices of beef was becoming louder."

He went on to say—

"We soundly criticise the unionists for not submitting to arbitration and yet because we feel that our friend and associate the master butcher is taking too much of the cake, we don't consider negotiating with him—we make a public squeal."

He goes on further to say—

"If the butchers are so highly organised that they are operating a monopoly, we would do well to emulate them."

Is it any wonder that the only people who were crying out for the de-control of meat were those who wanted to make a quick quid out of it!

At the same meeting of the South-eastern Queensland Graziers' Association another gentleman had this to say—

"I have yet to be convinced that butchers are taking the public for a ride on meat prices. If people in Brisbane want to buy cheap meat, they can by comparing prices in different shops. If they want quality, they have to pay a little more."

Let us continue with this argument about healthy competition. The gentleman that I have just quoted said that prices can be checked at various shops. Back in 1958 the Minister for Justice said that the new system of meat prices based on what was paid for stock at the saleyards would lead to competitive trading among butchers. He said that the prices of good-quality meat would probably rise slightly, but other prices would fall. I ask the Minister to give me one instance, since he made that statement, of one cut of meat supplied to the Brisbane public decreasing in price.

As a matter of fact, I want to explode this myth about healthy competition among butchers. Quite frankly, the butchers, particularly in the suburbs, have the housewives at their mercy. How close to each other are these shops? I would say that in the suburbs there is at least a mile between butcher shops, and how can there then be healthy competition? What does the Minister want the housewife to do? Does he want her to walk a mile to see what the prices are down the road? Does he seriously think that there is any competition among suburban butchers? This could possibly apply in some small measure where a number of butcher shops exist in an established trading area, but where the housewife would be forced to walk a mile, or get a taxi or bus, to check prices, how farcical is the claim that there is healthy competition among butchers in the suburbs of Brisbane! As a matter of fact, I am amazed that a person with the Minister's intelligence can kid himself into believing that there is this healthy competition.

Mr. Rae: You said that the price of meat is too high.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I say that the price is too high over the counter. To carry that argument a bit further, the hon. member for Fassifern said quite openly in this Chamber that it was not because of any increased prices to the producers that meat was dearer. He implied that a racket was going on somewhere between the producers and the consumers. I say without any hesitation that meat trading in Queensland calls for an inquiry. I have shown already how meat prices have risen almost 100 per cent. since they were de-controlled by this Government. If some hon. members are satisfied with the

prices that they pay for meat, I can assure them that I, on behalf of my constituents, am not satisfied. Meat has been priced off the table, and I have not yet even touched on what is happening in the pork and bacon industry.

Figures show that meat is part of our staple diet as Australians, and, if it is to be priced off the table, what sort of healthy Australians are we going to bring up if housewives have to resort to the use of cheaper cuts of meat, and also offal? Some hon. members may choose to make a joke of it, but I can assure them that it is no joke to me. I have been making as many inquiries as possible on this subject of meat supply in Queensland, and I find that too many questions are left unanswered.

First of all, there is no indication of how meat is actually marketed in Brisbane. When I say that, I refer to the fact that although there are about 638 butcher shops operating in Brisbane, it is not possible to ascertain how many retailers are purchasing cattle at the saleyards and having them processed at the abattoirs. It is not possible to find out how many retail butchers are purchasing their meat from a wholesaler, and, similarly, one cannot discover how many wholesale butchers are operating a chain of retail stores throughout the State, and particularly in Brisbane. There is no organised system of marketing that could bring about any reduction in the price to the consumer. It is logical to assume that the retailer who is purchasing cattle and having them processed at the abattoirs is getting the benefit of that margin of £20-odd because he buys direct. In addition, there is no indication of the number of butchers buying inferior grades of meat and selling them at prices comparable with the price of first-grade meat. That brings me back to an argument that I have advanced in this Chamber previously. A butcher with a shop in one suburb might be selling first-grade meat at first-grade prices; but because a butcher a mile away has no competition, he sells second-grade and third-grade meat at first-grade prices.

Mr. Rae: You are quite right there.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I am glad to hear that the hon. member is getting some sense at last.

Mr. Rae: It took you a long time to get to the point.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I think it is an important matter. During my speech in the Address-in-Reply debate I asked the Minister for Justice to set up a royal commission to inquire into the meat industry. If the Government is not prepared to do that, let it institute some form of inquiry. Not only has it been prepared to throw overboard its price-control machinery, but it has also thrown overboard any semblance of control over the meat trade in Brisbane. I asked the Minister for Justice, "When was the last check taken of meat prices?" and he gave me a very vague and indefinite

answer. Obviously there has been no investigation into what butchers have been charging following the de-control of prices, because the Minister, in reply to an earlier question, said that he had no evidence. He has no evidence because he has not bothered to get his officers to make a check of the meat trade in Queensland to see what is going on. As a matter of fact, one has only to look at the figures showing the number of employees in the office of the Commissioner of Prices to see that the Minister has completely emasculated the department. Even if he did de-control meat prices, he should have maintained a staff to see that no undesirable practices were carried on.

Possibly the Government thinks at this late stage in its career, when the curtain is fast falling on it as a Government, that it should not concern itself with an inquiry into meat prices. I can assure hon. members that when the Australian Labour Party is returned as the Government, I, for one, will see that my party carries out a thorough investigation to find out just what is going on.

Mr. Ramsden: You will be an old man by then.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: Do not worry about that; I won't be too much greyer than I am now. Possibly that could also account for the dearth of talent to support the Treasurer. Already they are out in their electorates getting in some early election propaganda. They may achieve something, but their performance in government will certainly not enhance them in the eyes of the electors. It is a well-known fact that because there is a dearth of operators there has been a certain ganging-up at the sale of cattle at various yards. I have heard the opinion expressed that in the Ipswich yards wholesalers will not bid against one another. It might be said that that is keeping the price of meat down, but it is not. It might keep the price of cattle down to the wholesaler and the return on cattle down to the producer, but when one studies the figures one can see how meat has been priced off the table of the average housewife since this Government saw fit to de-control it.

In addition, this sort of thing is common not only in the meat trade. I should like also to deal with some features of undesirable trade practices that are arising every day. I am not particularly throwing stones at this Government about it because in my opinion many undesirable trade practices operating at the present time amount almost to fraud. I have spent considerable time looking into some of what I feel to be undesirable means of packaging articles and the misleading advertisements in connection therewith. I did intend to bring some glaring examples into the Chamber but I found that so many products are being marketed by fraudulent advertisements that this Chamber would have looked like a cash-and-carry store had I done so.

Some of the most misleading advertising deals particularly with the marketing of various washing powders. I listened to a television advertisement only last night dealing with a product called Swerl, which is a detergent. As an introductory offer it was advertised as being 7s.; or 9d. off the price.

Mr. O'Donnell: Off what?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: The hon. member might well ask, "Off what?" The Australian Consumers' Association had a very good article on this subject, and I intend to read it to the Committee.

Mr. Sullivan interjected.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: As I said once before, when I want the hon. member to bark I will rattle his chain.

The Australian Consumers' Association had this to say in its magazine "Choice"—

"In these days of the self-service store and the supermarket the package has largely taken the place of the shop assistant. Instead of the family grocer's advice, we now have to rely on what the new 'silent salesman' tells us—usually well got up and with a very definite line of sales talk, the package tells us all that the manufacturer of the goods thinks we should know. Often this is done in a satisfactory and honest way. Too many packages, however, are deceptive and misleading, and far too many just do not give us the information we want."

If the hon. member for Merthyr wants to laugh at this let him listen for a few minutes. If they are the type of advertisements he falls for I can understand his laughing at anything. It goes on to say that in Victoria a man who asked for a small tube of toothpaste complained when handed one marked "Large." He was told that there were only three sizes—"large", "super", and "giant". The "large" size was the smallest they had. I know that the various State Ministers for Labour and Industry are meeting to discuss such matters but already in Queensland we have the necessary machinery to control much of this type of thing. Under the Weights and Measures Act the Minister has the power to declare what packages shall be used for certain articles. Under the Factories and Shops Act he has power to investigate and ask a person to show cause why certain claims about a product are advertised.

Mr. Rae: You were quoting a Victorian case.

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I know the hon. member is a "bushie", but if he walked down Queen Street without seeing examples such as I have quoted he would be blind. Let us carry it a bit further. We are spending £5,500,000 a year on education.

Government Members: How much?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: £17,000,000, if they like.

If we are to educate people and tell them that something is small, medium, or large, how are we to explain away some of these so-called sizes—

Giant Size Quart,
Starter Size,
Big 2-Ounce,
One Third Bigger Than King Size,
Super King Size,
Long Gallon,
Queen Size,
Giant Imperial Quart,
Colossal,
Gigantic,
Economy,
Family,
Giant Economy,
Not Regular 10 Oz. But Big 12 Oz.?

Any person with a scrap of intelligence—I am excluding the hon. member for Merthyr—would realise that we are fast becoming so Americanised—America is where these names have sprung from—that we are completely submerging our Australian identity. It is time that we, as sensible people, took some action to ensure that we preserve our Australian way of life. These undesirable trade practices are not confined to such commodities as breakfast foods where they employ the method of "slack fill". By this method they have enclosed in a very large carton a quantity of breakfast cereal that does not fill more than threequarters of the carton. I have a particular brand of hair tonic in mind which is packed in a very large carton. Inside the carton is a glass jar containing hair tonic that does not fill three parts of the carton. However, it does not end there, because the glass in the jar is so thick that when the contents were poured into a test tube and compared with the carton in which it was enclosed it was found that they would not fill more than one-quarter of the carton.

Referring once more to the practice of supplying only large tubes of toothpaste, it has been proved that since the inception of this large-size tube—and I am not speaking of "Sam's tube" under the river—there is much wastage of toothpaste because with children using the large tube, completely covering the full length of the brush, there is a great deal of wastage.

A Government Member: Is that a legal-size brush?

Mr. SHERRINGTON: I have a king-size headache from the inane interjections of hon. members opposite.

The Government has all the necessary power under its present legislation to control these practices. It may say that many of these articles are being packed interstate but I believe that it should take a stand and notify the packers of the articles that the method of packing is no longer acceptable in Queensland and is illegal. These steps could have been taken long before this.

The fact that the various State Ministers for Labour and Industry have seen fit to call a conference indicates that they realise packaging is getting out of hand. I commend to the Government, particularly the Minister controlling weights and measures, the institution of some investigation by his officers to see just how many of these products are being marketed in an unsatisfactory manner.

In the few seconds left to me I will refer to the packaging of chocolates. Here again we find that a certain amount of deception is practised. Some time ago there was a weight declaration on chocolate block packets and we all knew that the 1s. block weighed 2 oz. But quietly, with no accompanying publicity, the weight was omitted from the package and in October, 1961, the Australian Consumers' Association found that the 2s. block had an average weight of about 10 grammes, or over one-third of an oz., under the 4 oz. expected. Then the public were offered a larger block of chocolate. But it was found that although it was greater in size, it was not in depth.

(Time expired.)

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.

At 7.15 p.m.,

Mr. SPEAKER (Hon. D. E. Nicholson, Murrumbidgee) took the chair.

VACANCY IN SENATE OF COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

NOMINATIONS OF ALFRED EDWARD ARNELL,
GEORGE IRVINE WHITESIDE, AND
THOMAS THOMSON MCCrackEN, VICE
MAXWELL WILLIAM POULTER, DECEASED

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members, this is a resumption of the meeting called for 25 September, 1962, to elect a Senator. As there is a quorum present, I now call for further nominations.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition): I nominate Mr. Alfred Edward Arnell, State and Branch President of the Waterside Workers' Federation of Australia, residing at 375 Water Street, Fortitude Valley, Brisbane, for election to hold the place in the Senate rendered vacant through the death of Senator Maxwell William Poulter, and I produce Mr. Arnell's declaration of qualification and consent to be nominated and to act, if elected.

Whereupon the hon. gentleman produced Mr. Arnell's declaration of qualification and consent.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron): I nominate Mr. George Irvine Whiteside, State Secretary of the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association, residing at 21 Connah Street, Ekibin, Brisbane, for election to hold

the place in the Senate rendered vacant through the death of Senator Maxwell William Poulter, and I produce Mr. Whiteside's declaration of qualification and consent to be nominated and to act, if elected.

Whereupon the hon. member produced Mr. Whiteside's declaration of qualification and consent.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg): I nominate Mr. Thomas Thomson McCracken as a person qualified to occupy a seat in the Senate to fill the vacancy. I produce his declaration herewith in accordance with the schedule to Standing Order No. 331.

Whereupon the hon. member produced Mr. McCracken's declaration of qualification and consent.

Mr. SPEAKER, having called three times for further nominations: As there are no further nominations, I call on the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (7.18 p.m.): I move—

"That Mr. Alfred Edward Arnell be elected to hold the place in the Senate of the Parliament of the Commonwealth rendered vacant through the death of Senator Maxwell Poulter."

I would be guilty of tedious repetition if I stated again the reasons that I advanced a fortnight ago when, on behalf of the Australian Labour Party, I had the privilege of submitting Mr. Arnell's nomination. The circumstances are precisely the same. If anything, his nomination is strengthened on this occasion rather than weakened, despite the fact that Parliament voted against him previously.

My only additional comment on this occasion is to reaffirm that in every respect Mr. Arnell qualifies for election to the Senate of the Commonwealth. He certainly possesses the confidence of the rank and file, the administrative body, and the Parliamentary section of the Australian Labour Party in this State.

There are one or two further things that I should like to say. On the previous occasion I may have done a measure of injustice to Mr. Carrington, and I feel that it is the duty of any Parliamentarian, if he is in error, to take the first opportunity to retract what he has said. I think that I conveyed on the last occasion that Mr. Arnell defeated Mr. Carrington for the position of branch president of the Waterside Workers' Federation, and I stated either definitely or by implication that Mr. Carrington was a Communist. I was misinformed on that point. What I intended to convey was that Mr. Carrington, to the best of my knowledge and belief—I have statutory information in my possession to this effect—was supported in his candidature on that occasion by the Communist Party. The general purport of my remarks on the previous

occasion was that Mr. Arnell led a Labour team of candidates that was able to unseat the Communist members from the Waterside Workers' Federation. In justice to Mr. Carrington, I wish to say that I understand that he was not at that time, and is not now, to the best of my knowledge, a Communist, although he did obtain Communist support on that occasion. I think that in justice to him I should make that public statement.

As I mentioned earlier, the reasons for supporting Mr. Arnell's nomination on this occasion are enhanced because not one reason was advanced on the previous occasion why he should not be supported, other than that the Premier, as head of the Government, insisted that Parliament should have a choice. This time Parliament has a choice and, as I said, on the last occasion not a single reason to the detriment of Mr. Arnell was offered by Government members. The only person who introduced anything that might possibly be to the detriment of Mr. Arnell was the hon. member for Bundaberg, who said that at a triennial convention of the Australian Labor Party Mr. Arnell had indicated his willingness to accept a direction in regard to his conduct in matters of a political kind. That was the only note introduced during the whole of the debate a fortnight ago which could be said to be in any way an impediment, if it could be called an impediment, to Mr. Arnell's nomination. The Premier's requirement that Parliament should have a choice in the matter is met this evening, and I should like to indicate to the House that when the vote is taken there will be no shilly-shallying on Mr. Arnell's nomination. If Government members are sincere they will vote for Mr. Arnell, as we intend to vote for him, when his nomination is submitted for consideration by the meeting. We cannot, of course, command the votes needed unless hon. members opposite, as a matter of conscience, decide to divorce themselves from their party on this matter. If they elect to do that, they are free agents to vote as they see fit. However, if they vote in accordance with any party arrangements that may operate, we have no control over the situation. Justice and fairness should be the primary consideration in matters of this kind, and I think it is undesirable that there should be a smear on the reputation of anybody who is nominated. I do not think that anybody has put forward anything that is derogatory to Mr. Arnell's character. No-one has suggested, with the exception to which I referred a few moments ago, that Mr. Arnell is not fitted to be in Parliament, yet a vote against him could besmirch his character in some way because somebody quibbled about his qualifications or advanced some reasons why he is not a fit and proper person to be a Senator for Queensland. On the last occasion that the matter was under discussion, after the vote was taken Mr. Arnell could say, "My character has not been attacked in any way; my fitness has not been attacked in any way, with the exception of

one minor matter that was mentioned. I was rejected only because the Premier of the day insisted that Parliament should have a choice in the matter." Therefore I say that if Parliament votes against Mr. Arnell tonight, it will be doing something that is to his detriment. If justice is not given to him, the good name of every person who seeks appointment as a parliamentarian in this country will be in jeopardy, and I do not want to see in Australia a situation in which people's characters can be smeared by a vote or by innuendo. On this occasion we have the opportunity of correcting by our vote a most undesirable situation.

Those are the only two things that I wish to say. If during the course of the debate evidence is submitted to cast doubt on what I have said, it may be necessary for me to say something in reply. As I said at the outset, it would be only tedious repetition to re-state the work that Mr. Arnell performed in the election campaign and the support that he received from the rank and file. Those things are there on the record and every member present tonight was here on that occasion. I do not think it is necessary for me to go over all that again. I thought it desirable to make those supplementary remarks to what I said previously in support of this nomination, and I accordingly commend it to the meeting.

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (7.26 p.m.): This meeting is assembled on the second occasion to endeavour to elect a Senator to replace the late Dr. Poulter, and we hope that we will be able to bring this important matter to finality tonight in the interests of the State, which will then have its representation in the Senate of the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Walsh: You have already decided that.

Mr. NICKLIN: The names of two nominees have been submitted by the A.L.P. tonight—those of Mr. Arnell and Mr. Whiteside—and it is for this meeting to decide which is the more fit and proper person to represent Queensland in the Senate at Canberra.

When this question was before the previous meeting the A.L.P. submitted only the name of Mr. Arnell. The Government took the stand then that a choice of candidates or nominees was necessary to ensure that Parliament would be able to exercise its democratic right of making a selection. The A.L.P. on that occasion denied us the right of making that selection, apparently at the behest of their organisation outside of this Parliament. They failed to accept the invitation to give Parliament a choice of candidates. The Government then took the stand that a choice of nominees was necessary and essential before this election could be made and the A.L.P. has tonight added the name of Mr. Whiteside to that of its original nominee, Mr. Arnell. They have

put Mr. Whiteside forward as a second choice. These nominations at least give this meeting a choice, although it is a limited choice.

The Leader of the Opposition, I feel, is not right behind the nomination of Mr. Arnell. On the previous occasion he made, and he repeated tonight, the statement that we should accept Mr. Arnell because not a single word was said against him by any member of the Parliament. Evidently members of the Opposition think there was something sinister in that, but what was the reason for dragging Mr. Arnell's name into the debate on the last occasion? The issue on that occasion was whether Parliament's right of making a choice of candidates should be exercised. That was the only decision we had to make on that occasion, so why should we mention his name?

However, to put members of the Opposition out of their dilemma as to what we really think of Mr. Arnell, I shall proceed to tell them about what we think of him.

Mr. Newton: Why didn't you tell us last week?

Mr. NICKLIN: I will give hon. members opposite very good reasons why Mr. Arnell should not be accepted by this Parliament as a suitable representative of Queensland in the Senate.

As we subscribed to the belief that government should be by the people, we issued the invitation to the A.L.P., although as I mentioned on the previous occasion, acting on precedent we might well have ignored the people's wishes, as Labour did on three previous occasions, and elected somebody of our own choice.

Secondly, in asking the A.L.P. to submit more than one name the Parliament upheld its right to correctly interpret the will of the people and make an appointment on their behalf, and clearly showed that it will not be dictated to by a coterie outside Parliament who, if they had their way, would in fact be the Government of this State.

An Opposition Member: They will next year.

Mr. NICKLIN: No doubt they will if the A.L.P. is returned.

The A.L.P. has put forward two nominations tonight and it is now the duty of the Parliament to make its selection, ignoring any order of precedence preferred by those who would still have us do their will, not the people's.

In the Government's view it now becomes necessarily a case of choosing the better man, and I hope tonight we will choose the better man of the two nominees put forward by the A.L.P. Working on this basis I have no hesitation in saying that members of the Government parties think that Mr. Whiteside is the more suitable of the two candidates to fill the vacancy. This is not so much because

of what Mr. Whiteside has done to earn the distinction of representing Queensland in the Senate, but rather the lesser merit that Mr. Arnell has to recommend him for the position. Mr. Whiteside at least has the distinction of not allowing himself to be so blatantly used by the Communists as Mr. Arnell has—a fact so well known that it has earned Mr. Arnell the title of "Unity Ticket Alf".

A brief outline of the background of the two men will show that although Mr. Whiteside may be far from being an ideal candidate, Mr. Arnell has far less to commend him than has Mr. Whiteside.

Let us have a look at this parading of the virtues of Mr. Arnell, who has been nominated by the A.L.P. as its No. 1 choice tonight. In 1949 and 1950 Mr. Arnell opposed the official A.L.P. candidate for the Presidency of the Waterside Workers' Federation in Brisbane. But now he is the white-haired boy of the A.L.P. and is put up here as its No. 1 nominee for the vacancy in the Senate. Seeing that he was splitting the vote on that occasion the industrial groups included him on their ticket in the 1951 election, and he was elected as President of the Waterside Workers' Federation. Mr. Arnell was never an active member of the industrial groups. Some people might describe him at this time as an industrial opportunist. His opportunism advanced and from July, 1955 on we find his name on unity tickets, standing four-square with Communists. That followed the decision of the Hobart A.L.P. Conference withdrawing the party's sponsorship of the industrial groups. The pay-off for his being amenable to the new line came soon after his 1956 victory on the unity ticket in the form of a free trip to Russia as the delegate of the Australian-Soviet Friendship Society. Is this society an A.L.P.-sponsored society, or is it not? Is it a Communist front? It has been branded on many occasions as a Communist front. The A.L.P. is silent on the question of whether it is an A.L.P.-sponsored organisation.

Mr. Arnell joined the Valley Branch of the A.L.P. immediately after the 1957 "split", so his rise in the decidedly Left-wing set-up might be described as meteoric—from new member to Senate candidate in six years! Not too bad. On 24 September, 1958, Mr. Arnell and other A.L.P. members whose names had appeared on a unity ticket in the previous July elections were hauled before the executive committee of the Queensland Central Executive to clarify the position. They offered the excuse that their names were included on the ticket without their consent and they were exonerated by the Q.C.E. Since then they have continued their unity practices without interference from the Q.C.E.

It is undoubtedly easy to have one's name included on a unity ticket without one's consent, but Mr. Arnell's name has appeared

continuously, together with a photo. of him on at least one occasion. Mr. Arnell did not make very much public protest about this, but it is interesting to note that when his name was included on a non-Communist ticket he joined others on a specially-printed leaflet repudiating the non-Communist ticket.

This is the political record of the No. 1 nominee of the A.L.P. for this Senate vacancy. Here is the great contradiction: Arnell could not be associated with Wilkinson, a non-Communist, but it was all right for him and other A.L.P. men to be linked with Communists on a unity ticket! One would expect that a man who objected to being linked with Communists would be forthright in support of the A.L.P. candidate, Mr. Fitzgibbon, who was endorsed by the party to stand for the Federal presidency of the Waterside Workers Federation following the death of Mr. Jim Healy. But not Mr. Arnell! There is nothing to show that he supported the Communist candidate Nelson for the Federal presidency, but it is extremely doubtful whether he lifted a finger to help Fitzgibbon. The man who convened the pro-Fitzgibbon meeting in Brisbane was not the president, Mr. Arnell, but a vice-president, Jack Roberts. Arnell did not attend the meeting, nor did he join the "Elect Charlie Fitzgibbon" campaign committee.

Mr. Arnell's attitude to unity tickets can be seen in "Branch News" of the Brisbane Waterside Workers Federation, issued on 3 July, 1958, for which, as president, he was responsible. An item headed "Unity Tickets" says—

"Many members are asking what is the position of members belonging to the A.L.P. being put on unity tickets in the forthcoming Branch elections.

"On inquiring of our Q.C.E. delegate, Mr. P. Healy, I am informed that on the same question being asked at the Q.C.E. meeting, it was ruled that their decision referred only to political elections, and not industrial elections."

Mr. Arnell's popularity with the Communists is shown in the fact that he was elected unopposed to the Inner Executive of the Queensland Trades and Labour Council, and he received a unanimous vote of 90 to elect him to the Disputes Committee. The anti-Communist candidate for the Disputes Committee received only 19 votes.

It is being said on the waterfront that if Mr. Arnell is appointed to the Senate vacancy the Unity plan is to support Mr. Peter Pritchard (A.L.P.) and Mr. Alby Graham (Communist) for the vice-presidency. Mr. Arnell's appointment, then, would assist consolidation of Communist influence on the executive of the local branch of the Waterside Workers' Federation.

An occasion on which Mr. Arnell went out of his way to associate with Communists was when he was chairman of a public meeting on 17 May, 1961, to welcome the famous, or infamous, Collinsville convoy.

This meeting was advertised as a public meeting, not a union meeting. Mr. Arnell shared the platform with Communists E. J. Hanson, W. Parkinson, and T. Millar, and on that occasion he demonstrated very clearly where he stood. That is the man whom the A.L.P. is asking us to accept as a candidate for the Senate. We will never accept a man with Mr. Arnell's political reputation and association with the Communist Party.

Mr. Edgar Williams, in a front-page article in "The Worker" in November 1960, said—

"Any aspiring A.L.P. politician who shares a platform with Communists at a public meeting should be expelled."

I am sure that all right-thinking A.L.P. men would agree with that statement.

Let us examine Mr. Arnell's case from another aspect. I would put it this way: it is not so much perhaps what Mr. Arnell has done as what he has not done. This man held the top position of his union in this State for more than 10 years. He could have wielded a powerful influence for peace on the waterfront and the welfare of the watersiders and the community in general, not merely in Queensland but on a national scale. But what do we find when we examine his record? There is not a jot or a scintilla of evidence that he has ever raised a hand or a voice to frustrate the designs of the Communist officials who run his union nor, so far as I can discover, has he ever criticised or protested against the Communist policy of destruction as practised by his union's Victorian executive. Because of these Communist tactics, Australia has suffered tremendous losses. Time and time again there have been hold-ups on the waterfront in this community and Mr. Arnell has taken a very prominent part in many of them. Never once have we heard his name quoted as one who advocated peace and arbitration and law and order on the waterfront. Its facilities for shipping with overseas countries, its import and export trade, have all been endangered at a critical period in our history when we should be straining every nerve as a nation to develop our trade with other countries.

I repeat that Mr. Arnell, the Labour Party's No. 1 nominee for the Senate vacancy, has never at any time in his industrial career raised his voice in the national interest; never has he lifted his little finger to stop the activities of the "Red Ants" who are endeavouring to sap the vitality of industrial Labour, and succeeding. He has never been anything but supine in the face of Communist aggression within his union.

I put it to the meeting: are these qualities of representation and leadership that give any promise that he would be an effective voice for Queensland in the States' House at Canberra? No, definitely not!

The members of my Government are equally emphatic that nothing can be expected from the election of Mr. Arnell by this Parliament to such an important post in the nation's Federal capital. I hope that hon.

members on the Opposition side will now be satisfied with our opinion of their No. 1 nominee.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (7.46 p.m.): I expressed myself very explicitly and without ambiguity a fortnight ago, and I did not propose to take any further part in this debate or fiasco, call it what you will, except for the fact that certain slurs and smears have been circulated around Townsville by A.L.P. stooges and others that Aikens was a dingo who walked out of the Chamber rather than vote for Mr. Arnell. Of course, I was accused, by having done that, of inferentially smearing Mr. Arnell.

Let me say that this particular meeting of Parliament sees the Australian Labour Party at its lowest ebb. There is no doubt about that. We read in the Press that the Q.C.E., when asked by the Premier to submit two nominations to this Parliament so that a choice could be made, was going to call the Premier's bluff. As a matter of fact, Mr. Arnell quite rightly said, as reported in the Press, when it was suggested to him that his nomination might be put forward with, in addition, another nomination, "What am I, a sacrificial goat or something?"

The Q.C.E. meeting was held and, by a rather substantial majority, the members of that governing body of the Australian Labour Party decided—and published the fact—that they were going to call the Government's bluff. They came into this Chamber to do so, feeling that, if they put forward only the name of Mr. Arnell, the Government would not be game to vote against him and turn him down for fear of political repercussions or adverse public comments, or something like that. But the Premier did call the bluff of the Q.C.E. and, seeing that we are bandying nicknames round, I think that he should go down in history by the name of "Lion-tamer Frank." He tamed the roaring lions of the Q.C.E. If I may use an old English expression, they were going to play hell with a big stick and a basket of eggs, but the Premier cracked the whip and the lions of the Q.C.E.—I must admit that they are rather flea-bitten, mangey, and toothless—39 of them, went through the hoop and decided to get down and genuflect and grovel to the Government, as they are doing tonight, by submitting a second name for the Senate vacancy.

What has happened with regard to this vacancy? After the Government turned down the nomination of Mr. Arnell a fortnight ago, the word was passed round that Arnell was to be "dumped." A dagger was to be driven between his shoulder blades, and the Leader of the Opposition, just as he played this role in 1948, was to be the No. 1 scabherder. He was to organise the scabs of the Q.C.E. to dump Arnell and secure a favourable vote for the second nominee. The vote of the Q.C.E. had not been taken and the Q.C.E. had not decided to submit two nominations to Parliament so that a choice

could be made, but no fewer than 21 joined in the bums' rush to be the second nominee submitted by the A.L.P. Twenty-one hands were outstretched to grasp the dagger to plunge between the shoulder blades of Alf Arnell. One dropped out, but 20 went to the poll, including our old friend "Fossil" Forde from Flinders, who got three votes. In the final run to the post Mr. Whiteside was successful, and Mr. Milliner ran second to him. I have been in the Labour movement and in the trade-union movement all my life, and my record in both stands as high as that of any hon. member on the other side of the House.

Mr. Bennett: It stinks!

Mr. AIKENS: You listen to me. Don't buy into this.

In all the years that I have been in the trade-union movement and in the Labour movement, there has been one basic principle that has never been departed from by any dinki-di Labour man or any dinki-di trade-unionist. That is the principle that an injury to one is the concern of all, and I want to say right here and now that I have nothing but loathing and contempt for the 39 "scabs" who dumped Arnell and I have nothing but commendation and congratulation for the 26 members of the Q.C.E. who remained true to the principles of Labour and the principles of trade-unionism.

Mr. Thackeray: If you are such a good Labour man, why didn't you vote for him the other night instead of walking out of the Chamber? Be fair dinkum!

Mr. AIKENS: This Parliament has been in operation for 100 years, and I think it can be said with truth that, during all that time, the hon. member for Rockhampton North is the biggest dill ever elected to it. It is clearly set out in "Hansard" why I walked out, and why I will walk out tonight.

Opposition Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: The hon. member for South Brisbane is interjecting. It is very fortunate indeed for him that this meeting is being held tonight, because if it were being held in the day-time he would not be here. He would be either in court or in his legal chambers earning the £6,000 a year at the Bar that he boasts about.

Mr. Bennett: Don't under-estimate my earnings.

Mr. AIKENS: Today the hon. member was in court at Toowoomba. As far as he is concerned, this Parliament is merely a hobby which he engages in when it suits him.

If the A.L.P. had the guts of a little red-beak, which they have not, they would stand or fall by Arnell. They would say, "Arnell is our choice. We consider that Arnell is

a fit and proper person to be elected to the Senate. If the Government turns him down, then the blood will be on the head of the Government and our consciences will be clear. We will be able to walk down the street or go into any Labour gathering or trade-union meeting with our heads held high and our eyes looking straight and clearly forward." But what can they do now? They must slink, those 39 "scabs", led by the Premier——. (Laughter.)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Townsville South is over-exercising his privilege. I do not want any further reference to members of Parliament as "scabs."

Mr. AIKENS: Of course, I was referring to the Leader of the Opposition, not to the Premier. The other 26 men of the Q.C.E. can at least walk down the street and look any other trade-unionist or Labour man in the eye. The 39 cannot do that.

John Buchan, who is now Lord Tweedsmuir, of course, wrote a book that is the set book for the sub-Junior examination in Queensland schools this year. It is the famous book "The 39 Steps". We could get him here to write a book called "The 39" the word you will not allow me to use.

We have heard quite a lot from the Leader of the Opposition about smears. He mentioned the word tonight. He abhorred the idea that any man should smear the reputation of anyone else. Let us test the sincerity of the Leader of the Opposition on the smearing of decent men and decent trade-unionists. I am not going to quote from clippings from any newspaper or any other pamphlet; I am going to quote from the pages of "Hansard" and read what the Leader of the Opposition said about a unionist named Mick O'Brien, who is now the Federal Secretary of the Australian Railways Union.

Mr. Evans: He is in the A.L.P.

Mr. AIKENS: He is in the A.L.P. I will tell hon. members more about this but, at this point, I must remind them that we have heard that the Q.C.E. accepted the assurance of Mr. Arnell that he was not connected with the Communist Party and, to use a popular phrase, the Q.C.E. "whitewashed" Mr. Arnell.

Let us see just how much that assurance is worth. I quote the Leader of the Opposition who made these remarks in Parliament concerning Mick O'Brien. He has never retracted or qualified one word of them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I trust that this is relevant to the debate.

Mr. AIKENS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is relevant; it is very relevant because, if we are to accept the assurance of the Q.C.E. that Mr. Arnell has been whitewashed, I am going to ask hon. members what assurance can we take? What is the whitewashing by

the Q.C.E. worth? That is the point I make. This is what the Leader of the Opposition said—

"I tell the hon. member for Bowen and the hon. member for Mundingburra that a feeling is gathering force throughout the Railway Department that the sooner they kick O'Brien and others out of the job the better it will be for themselves and for the peace and contentment of thousands of wives throughout the Commonwealth."

Then Mr. Russell interjected,

"Are they self-confessed Communists?"
The Leader of the Opposition continued—

"I do not know how much of a confession you have to make. Take Gerry Dawson of the Carpenters' Union. I do not think there is any doubt about him. Take Kissick of the A.F.U.L.E., Healy of the Waterside Workers' Federation, Graham of the Waterside Workers' Federation, Macdonald of the Ironworkers' Association. O'Brien is a fellow traveller.

"The hon. member for Mundingburra talks about sectarianism. O'Brien was the biggest curse of the lot. The religious faith indicated by his name causes people to go round and say that his religious faith would not permit him to embrace Communism, that he would not be tainted with this foreign doctrine, consequently he would not be a supporter of Communist policies. And, the fellows outside who are loyal swallow this dope about Mick. For all practical purposes he might as well be a straightout Communist instead of a fellow traveller."

That statement by the Leader of the Opposition is either true or false. If it is false, then the Leader of the Opposition stands condemned out of his own mouth as the foulest and vilest smearer and character assassin this House has ever seen. If those words are true and the Leader of the Opposition has never withdrawn or qualified them, what worth can we put on the whitewashing by the Q.C.E. of Mr. Arnell or anybody else, because that same Mick O'Brien was brought up from New South Wales during the last State election at the express invitation of this same Q.C.E. and put up on the platform of A.L.P. candidates particularly in Townsville, where he slandered me from one end of the town to the other? He took the platform with my Labour opponent, and he took it with the hon. member for Townsville North and others. If he is a Communist, as described by the Leader of the Opposition, what was he doing on the A.L.P. electioneering platform?

The Leader of the Opposition can only have it one way or the other. This is one occasion on which all his torrent of words cannot get him out from under. Either that statement made by him about O'Brien is true, or it is false. He can have it either way he likes.

Mr. Duggan interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: In view of that interjection I think I am entitled to tell the House what Mr. Mick O'Brien thought about the hon. gentleman at that time. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall quote from "The Advocate," the official journal of the Australian Railways Union, dated 31 May, 1948. This is what Mr. O'Brien, who was Acting Queensland Secretary of the Australian Railways Union, wrote about the Leader of the Opposition—

"Your anti-working class action in approving the deductions from the service of employees who were on strike is nauseating. We suggest you have the records turned up and compare your action in 1948 with that of the late John Adamson when he was Minister for Railways in the Ryan Government.

"When you make that comparison, Mr. Duggan, you will understand why your action as a Labour Minister is nauseating to all decent trades unionists."

They are the men who now have their arms locked round each other's shoulders, going forward together in unity in order to try to scandalise out of Parliament decent trade-unionists like myself.

Mr. O'Brien also said—

"Your loyalty to, and admiration for the anti-Labour Mr. Wills is well known. A little of that loyalty to those who supported you and your party at election time would indicate that you appreciated that support."

I could read from pages 3, 4, 5 and 6 words even worse than that, words more condemnatory than those, and they were all written by Mr. Mick O'Brien about the Leader of the Opposition. But I will not transgress on your tolerance, Mr. Speaker, except to say that these are the men who come forward and say that everything in the garden is lovely and consequently this Parliament should accept their assurances that a man is either a Communist or he is not a Communist. Personally I know how easy it is to point the finger and say to a person, "You are a Fascist. You are a Tory. You are a Communist. You are something else." When you are talking of smearing you cannot get away from that statement by Duggan about Mick O'Brien.

I know, and we all know, that the Leader of the Opposition is speaking with his tongue in his cheek when he praises Mr. Arnell and puts his name forward as the A.L.P.'s No. 1 candidate for the Senate vacancy. If there is any body of men in this State more hated by the Leader of the Opposition than the wharfies, then I do not know of it. The genesis of that hatred goes back to the great strike of 1948 when the wharfies stood shoulder to shoulder with the railwaymen, as I did, in order to fight the Labour Government for decent working conditions and wages. But for the support of the wharfies in that strike the Leader of the

Opposition would have triumphed and, of course, the strike would have collapsed. The railwaymen might have been beaten because the Leader of the Opposition was very busily organising the type of people you will not let me talk about, Mr. Speaker. He earned himself a reputation for it. After the strike was over and the railwaymen returned to work on the agreement that there was to be no penalising of the strikers we read this in "The Advocate": "Government penalises unionists and rewards 'loyal' unions." After the strike was over and the men had returned to work, the Leader of the Opposition, as Minister for Transport at the time, penalised the strikers and rewarded the scabs.

Mr. Thackeray: That is all rot.

Mr. AIKENS: If it is all rot then you must also suggest that the Australian Railways Union "Advocate" is a rotten paper, because here it is in the Australian Railways Union "Advocate." Surely the hon. member can read it, even from where he is sitting. It was written by Mr. Mick O'Brien who was then the Acting Secretary, and the paper contains a paragraph saying that Mr. Frank Nolan, the Secretary, who had been ill, was on the way to recovery and should very soon return to work.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult to tie up this matter with the business before the meeting.

Mr. AIKENS: I am merely trying to point out what sort of people we are dealing with. The memory of the Leader of the Opposition goes back to 1948. When he spoke in favour of Arnell and put Arnell's name forward as the A.L.P. candidate to fill the Senate vacancy, he gave us the most detestable exhibition of slobbering hypocrisy we have ever had from him, and we have had some wonderful exhibitions from him in the past. The Leader of the Opposition will never forget or forgive the wharfies for their help to the railwaymen in the 1948 strike against his Government, acting as the agents of the Tories and the exploiters as stated in the "Advocate." As I said, not only did he organise the loyalists against the strikers, but after the strike was over he penalised the strikers and rewarded the loyalists. I have it here in black and white, in this issue of the "Advocate." I got this from my little black box in Townsville, and there are many other things in it that might bear production and repetition.

Mr. Newton interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: I do not know how the hon. member voted in the Q.C.E., but I suggest that as a good unionist he would vote as I would expect him to vote. He certainly would not be in the Duggan corner. I should be very surprised if he was.

My attitude tonight is exactly the same as it was a fortnight ago. I believe that this Parliament should strike a blow for the abolition of the Senate. I believe we should

refuse to select anybody to fill the vacancy caused by the lamentable death of the late Dr. Poulter.

That is why I will not vote for Mr. Arnell, or Mr. Whiteside, or Mr. McCracken. That is why, if the Labour Party had come along tonight and put forward only one candidate, and the Government had decided to nominate its own candidate, I would have walked out of the House. I would not have voted for him either because I believe that it is about time the Senate was abolished and we should do something about it.

I do not know Mr. Arnell and I would not know him if I fell over him, but I know the part the wharfies played in 1948 and I will never forget them for it. They earned my undying gratitude then and they will always retain it.

Mr. Bennett interjected.

Mr. AIKENS: I know what the hon. member for South Brisbane did in 1948. He went up to be sworn as a special policeman and asked to be issued with a revolver. If he wants any more, I will tell some more.

I know Mr. Whiteside fairly well.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are not dealing with the nomination of Mr. Whiteside. The matter before the meeting is whether or not Mr. Arnell should be elected as Senator for Queensland.

Mr. AIKENS: It is a good thing, Mr. Speaker, that this House is called to order now and again and made to conform with the Standing Orders, customs, and precedents of Parliament. If I have 40 minutes to speak on the nomination of Mr. Whiteside, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it will not take 40 minutes. I can tell the meeting what I know about Mr. Whiteside, very pungently, in about three minutes.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (8.9 p.m.): As usual, when the Government is in an unfortunate predicament—(Government laughter)—it falls back on the hon. member for Townsville South. As we have found always he has spoken in support of the Premier and the Government, and on every occasion he has voted against the A.L.P.

Mr. Aikens: I am speaking on the side of the trade-unionists, something that you know nothing about. You have never held a union ticket in your life.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Townsville South has obviously been back to Townsville and found that the trade-unionists in Townsville are crooked on him because he failed to vote for Alf Arnell. In an attempt to cover up his failure he has come back here and is trying to make a personal attack not on Mr. Arnell, but on the Leader of the Opposition. Let us have a look at the past performances of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member having nominated another candidate for the election of a Senator, he must speak either in favour of Mr. Arnell or against Mr. Arnell.

(Government laughter.)

Mr. LLOYD: The magpies on the Government benches who call themselves hon. members do not know that I can speak on both occasions. On this occasion I am speaking on behalf of the candidature of Mr. Arnell. I make it very clear that I support Mr. Arnell. I supported him at the previous meeting and again I support him tonight. If I might make that clear, Mr. Speaker—I am supporting Mr. Arnell's nomination.

Whatever the Government has done is not for me to excuse but for the Premier to excuse and, of course, for the hon. member for Townsville South, who always makes excuses for the Government. In his personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition he suggested that the Leader of the Opposition makes a practice of smearing people. Goodness only knows what relation the remarks made by the hon. member have to whether or not Mr. Arnell should be selected as Senator for Queensland. I point out that the hon. member for Townsville South is quite famous for his own smearing tactics in relation to many people who befriended him in the past. I need go no further than the late George Keyatta, a man who helped the hon. member and who took an interest in him in his early days, yet the hon. member for Townsville South from time to time went back to Townsville and endeavoured to lampoon him, a man popular in his own right, a man highly esteemed. Who merits less the right to come before this meeting and attack the Leader of the Opposition than the hon. member for Townsville South? As for the Premier, let me point out that, on the Tuesday night before last when we met, there was only one nomination before us. The Government did not take the opportunity of nominating anyone; the Queensland Labour Party did not take the opportunity of nominating anyone, nor did any of the Independents. There was only one nomination—an indication that, in the consideration of every hon. member, the man to be selected should be a member of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Walsh: That is not true.

Mr. LLOYD: If it is not true, why did not the hon. member for Bundaberg make his own nomination?

Mr. Walsh: I spoke against the nomination of Mr. Arnell.

Mr. LLOYD: Why, Mr. Speaker, and why at that time was the only excuse offered by the Premier for rejecting the nomination the fact that the Australian Labour Party did not nominate two candidates? No mention was made of any of Mr. Arnell's history, yet this evening the Premier comes

before the meeting and has the bucket full and empties it on Mr. Arnell. On the last occasion, the Premier and hon. members on the Government benches were doubtful as to the privilege of the House. Having secured legal advice, they find that they can—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I think I should advise the hon. gentleman and all hon. members that, at the previous meeting of Parliament convened for this purpose, I said that the procedure was being carried out in accordance with the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly, and I think there should be no doubt in any hon. member's mind as to the question of privilege.

Mr. MANN: I rise to support the hon. member for Kedron on a point of order. It was raised by the hon. member for Bundaberg and there was a doubt about the validity of it and that was supported by the hon. member for South Brisbane. At that time you did not deny or contradict it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The only question that was mentioned on that occasion was the validity of the election of a candidate to the Senate.

Mr. LLOYD: I do not know why you rose to your feet on this occasion, Mr. Speaker. I said—and I will repeat it—that at the previous meeting there was doubt in the minds of the Premier and the Government. I was not speaking about your mind. There was doubt whether they had privilege. The Premier knows as well as I do that he has had expert legal opinion on this occasion, and that opinion is that he is protected by privilege. Under that cloak of protection, he is prepared to empty the bucket on Mr. Arnell. Not only was he prepared to outline something that he may have secured from the security police on this occasion, but he also accused Mr. Arnell of disloyalty to his country. For a brave man of courage, what a wonderful effort on the part of the Premier! If he was prepared to say anything against Mr. Arnell, the occasion to say it was last Tuesday week, thus giving us an opportunity to reply. The Leader of the Opposition will give very adequate and accurate replies to all those statements.

One of the reasons mentioned by the Premier for voting against Mr. Arnell was that he visited Moscow, but so did Dr. Coombs of the Commonwealth Bank, no doubt with the approval of the Commonwealth Government. Visits to Russia have also been made by several members of the Federal Cabinet, whose expenses have no doubt been met by the Commonwealth Government, as in the case with many trade-unionists. Having secured legal advice and protection, the Premier has made these statements this evening, which is not a very brave act by a man who tries to establish himself before the community as "Honest Frank."

The hon. member for Townsville South, who has just resumed his seat, has become known throughout this country as a supporter of the Liberal Party. He has never been opposed by them. Let us not forget that the hon. member was expelled from the Labour Party because it was understood that he had pro-Communist sympathies.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. I was not expelled from the Labour Party for the reason given by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I was expelled, as the result of a stacked meeting, by Mr. Tom Dougherty because my conduct whilst on one of my periodic benders was unbecoming for the Deputy Mayor of Townsville.

Mr. LLOYD: Once having changed, he is now known as a supporter of the Tory party, and he has never been opposed by the Liberal Party. They want to keep him in this House as one of their supporters, and no doubt, if the Government ever wishes to do something against the Australian Labour Party, "Tory Tom" will be on his feet doing something for them.

The Leader of the Opposition will give an adequate reply to what the Premier has said, but I ask the Premier if, knowing that he had the full protection of parliamentary privilege on the last occasion, he would have made the same statements about Mr. Arnell as he has made tonight. So far as his character is concerned, I do not think that the Premier has brought forward any adverse evidence. He made some very vague statements which could not be substantiated, and mentioned some reports that he may received, in an endeavour to establish himself as a spokesman on behalf of the Australian Labour Party. He did not produce any document, and I doubt whether he could. There was a vague reference to an incident that might have occurred at a meeting of the Queensland Central Executive or the branch executive of the Australian Labour Party. Let me assure the Premier that Mr. Arnell did not join the Labour Party as recently as 1957. He has been a member of the party for many years and has a long and well-respected history in the party and in the Labour movement generally. As a result of his services, he will be retained by the Australian Labour Party for many years to come.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (8.21 p.m.): I suppose at some time in the future somebody will be looking for the name of the author or the producer of this remarkable political drama, or political farce. Up to the present stage, anyhow, I think I could hand the honour to the Premier. He certainly did not show up too well in Act I, Scene I, of the political farce, but he has come to light now with reasons that he should have given when this question was discussed previously. I gave my reasons for voting against Mr. Arnell, and I have not changed my mind. But I think it was a shocking thing

for the Government to reject the name submitted by the A.L.P. without giving the Parliament some reason for its stand.

Mr. Hiley: There was no choice.

Mr. WALSH: If there was no choice, the Government itself is responsible for that because it has the numbers. I realised at the time that it would be useless for me to submit the name of the person whom I had in mind because the Government had no intention of supporting his candidature; nor has it any intention of supporting him now, even though he is the best by far of the three candidates who have been nominated. The Premier knows that and so does every other hon. member sitting on the front bench who knows the person whom I have nominated. I am not going to debate that issue now, because I have my rights at a later stage.

Mr. Burrows: Wasn't he a Liberal candidate at one stage?

Mr. WALSH: If the hon. member invites me to go into those things, I will name for him a few Communists in the A.L.P.

Mr. Burrows: Wasn't he a member of the Liberal Party?

Mr. WALSH: No, he was never a member of the Liberal Party. If the hon. member can find a better Labour man or a better employer than Tom McCracken, let him name him. Mr. McCracken treats his employees well. He is a member of a firm that pays out over £7,000 in wages for cane-cutters and field-workers and refuses to use machines. It prefers to employ men. However, I must not let the hon. member lead me astray.

The Leader of the Opposition has made some amends for the statement that he made on the previous occasion in which he branded a man named Carrington as a Communist. He has said tonight that he was misinformed on that point. However, having made amends to the extent of saying that Carrington is not a Communist, he then proceeded to take away any credit that may be given to him and suggested that he was supported by the Communist Party. Equally emphatically can I say that Arnell was supported by the Communist Party—probably more emphatically than the Leader of the Opposition could say it because I have some understanding and some knowledge of the handling of these groups when they were unofficial and when they were official. They were approved by members of the Queensland Central Executive. But I want to say that I have never known Mr. Arnell to be associated with any activity of the group movement among waterside workers, including Carrington and many other good fellows—Meredith and the rest of them—who were actually fighting Communism. I never heard of Arnell at any stage but, as I said the other night, I am not here to smear the name of any man. If

I do not know that he is a Communist I am not going to say he is one; if I do not know he is a fellow-traveller I would not desire to say he is one. I regard that only as cheap politics. However, I know enough of the activities of Mr. Arnell in the movement that brought about the downfall of a Labour Government in this State. I have quoted from the verbatim report of the Labour-in-Politics Convention. I gave that as my reason and I stick to that reason. I still will be voting against Mr. Arnell.

The Leader of the Opposition made quite a few other statements for which he should make amends. His own words, as recorded here, show that at one stage he said that the Australian Labour Party, ever since it was a political organisation, had undertaken to give directions. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition is going to deny that one; and, a little more than five minutes later he made the extraordinary statement that in his 30 years of association with the Australian Labour Party he had known of only one occasion on which such directions were given to the parliamentary representatives. It is for the Leader of the Opposition to get out of these tangles. It is obvious that he does not know his exercise so far as the Australian Labour Movement is concerned—and I refer to the Australian Labour Movement as against the Australian Labour Party. Never in my experience have I known of any occasion on which the Q.C.E. gave directions to the Parliamentary Labour Party, but I have known frequent occasions—very frequent occasions—where the then President of the Q.C.E., Mr. Clarrie Fallon, laid it down that it was not competent for the Q.C.E. to direct the Parliamentary Labour Party or the Government.

I can speak of these matters only because of my inside knowledge of all sections, of conferences of the Labour Movement, Federal and State, of the Q.C.E. and of parliamentary caucuses. That has been my experience. I do not want to quote the words of the Leader of the Opposition; he can look at this document which is pamphlet Volume No. 5 of "Hansard" and he will see that the references I have made are contained in his speech therein. Having said at one stage that it was a customary practice, in effect, for the Q.C.E. to give directions over a period of 30 years to his knowledge, he then proceeds to deny that that was so.

There is another case that deals with this question of direction which is so fundamental in this debate. I am not giving any marks to the Government for their attitude in the matter because they are actually picking a candidate, whether it be Arnell or Whiteside, who identified himself with the motion that direction could be given to the Government of the day and that it was competent for an outside body to do so. The Premier can wriggle out of that as he likes, but my interpretation of it is that I am not going to stick to this modern protocol, as

it were, that because somebody else did something in some other State, we should follow the lead and fill the gap by the appointment of an individual of the same political affiliations, irrespective of the background of the organisation or the candidate. I have nothing to say about Mr. Whiteside, as Mr. Speaker has already ruled on the appropriate motion. I will have something to say, however, about the very subtle planning of the people who have got in over a period of years and undermined the structure of the A.L.P. All that I can see in this latest move is that it is going from bad to worse, as I will point out as I go along. I have no desire or intention—nor have I in any way ever tried to get back into the party—

A Government Member: What about Johnno Mann?

Mr. WALSH: He is entitled to his opinions as I am entitled to mine. I think it will be agreed that I have always said that. What someone else says about me does not worry me two hoots as long as I have the right of reply.

The Leader of the Opposition made another remarkable statement. Like the hon. gentleman, I have to put these things on the record. Where he might be speaking from memory, as I can on lots of matters, I want to quote from actual records on this occasion. He suggested that if I did not know it, if it was news to me, he was going to tell me something. He said that because the motion for the three weeks' annual leave had been carried against the wishes of the then Leader, the then Leader asked for a conference. That is not true.

Mr. Duggan: It is true.

Mr. WALSH: I have here the book that the Leader of the Opposition said was too big to put in my pocket. Here is the report that identifies him as one of the subjects in this report—

“Report by the Premier (Hon. V. C. Gair)—

“Mr. Gair: If I may intrude at this stage, before you proceed with the next Agenda item, to report the result of the meeting of Cabinet held last evening following on the resolution that was carried by Convention directing the Government to include in its policy speech a promise for the three weeks' annual leave, and directing the Government to implement that industrial reform in the first session of Parliament, I desire to inform Convention that Cabinet considered the matter very carefully and unanimously decided that having regard to all factors and circumstances, it did not accept the directions contained in that resolution.”

If the Leader of the Opposition wants to jump away from that report, I remind him that he was at the conference. I am not going to read the rest of the report.

Mr. BURROWS: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order? I can give a pretty effective reply if he wants to bring all that stuff in.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! At the first meeting the Leader of the Opposition was given certain latitude in placing certain matters on record. I take it that those matters are now being answered by the hon. member for Bundaberg, but I would ask that he please refrain from going into them too extensively. I think he has well answered the points put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WALSH: The Leader of the Opposition has this document. I am not going to read the rest of it because it contains a certain amount of padding—

Mr. DUFFICY: I rise to a point of order. I assume that this meeting tonight is for the purpose of electing a Senator.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have already given a ruling. The Leader of the Opposition made certain statements at the first meeting. I have given the hon. member for Bundaberg latitude to answer them. I ask him now to continue with the matter before the meeting.

Mr. WALSH: I have no desire to prolong the debate, but I desire to repudiate what was said and have it on record in the same way as the Leader of the Opposition. After all, if I place on record in the journals of this Parliament something that I cannot substantiate I concede the right to any other member of the House to bring forward the authority to deny what I have said. Here is what happened. Rather than Mr. Gair calling the conference, Mr. Bukowski, after hearing the statement by the then Premier, said—

“I desire to move that seven members of this Convention meet the Premier and the Deputy Premier.”

The report continues—

“The committee is to comprise, Messrs. Pont, Egerton, Whiteside, Devereux, Chalmers, Maxwell and Bukowski.”

As a matter of fact, the hon. member for Brisbane seconded the motion. The chairman made a suggestion that it was a most important matter and that the convention should adjourn at 4.30 in the afternoon for the purpose of the committee's meeting the Premier and Mr. Duggan and it could report back at the proceedings that night when they were commenced. Then the report continues—

“Mr. Walsh: I suggest 4.30 p.m.

Mr. Bukowski: I move—“That the Committee meet the Premier and the Deputy Premier at quarter past 8 tomorrow morning and report back to the Convention tomorrow morning.”

Subsequently a motion was moved by Mr. Lourigan and seconded by—

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I trust the hon. member for Bundaberg will not go into lengthy detail. I think he has already covered the subject adequately and I ask him to proceed with the matter before the meeting.

Mr. WALSH: As a matter of fact, I was concluding this point with the motion moved by Mr. Lourigan, namely, "That the Committee meet the Premier and the Deputy Premier at 4.30 p.m. today and report back to Convention when the proceedings commence tonight." Mr. Newton seconded the motion.

Mr. LLOYD: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Bundaberg defying the authority of the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bundaberg indicated that he was concluding that part of his speech, and I trust that he will conclude it.

Mr. WALSH: I had concluded it. All I have done is to quote from the report. I do not wish to comment on it. I only wished to quote it in rebuttal of what the Leader of the Opposition said, that the then Leader had asked for a conference. I leave it to hon. members themselves.

Mr. Mann: He agreed to a conference.

Mr. WALSH: I leave it to hon. members themselves to decide who asked for the conference. It is true that the then Leader agreed to it, as suggested by Mr. Bukowski.

Mr. Aikens: The Leader of the Opposition has made a mis-statement?

Mr. WALSH: The Leader of the Opposition seems to have an objection to my doing a certain amount of research into this matter.

Mr. Burrows: You don't want to dig too deep into the bucket or you will pull something out that you will object to.

Mr. WALSH: The hon. member for Port Curtis knows how deep I can dig into the bucket if I want to. My word he does! I am only dealing now with the issues that have been raised. If anybody else wishes to raise other issues I will deal with them as they come up.

All I can say about the Leader of the Opposition and his desire to impugn me on my loyalty is that I hope I will never be put into the position of doing the things he has done. One thing I value is mateship and one thing I have some understanding of is loyalty to principles.

Mr. Duggan: That is why you told them in Toowoomba that you would not mind going down the gutter as long as you could pull me down with you.

Mr. WALSH: The Leader of the Opposition adopts the practice in this House of seeking the licence to say what he likes about

anybody. If only he could get rid of a little of that ego and vanity as it applies to himself and give more consideration to the problems of the movement of which he is the Leader, it would be all the better for the party and the quicker this Government would go out of office. While members of the A.L.P. are going the way they are, there is no way they will unseat the motley crew of the Country-Liberal Party over there. Any failure of Labour's at the next election will not be on the part of the rank and file supporting the Leader of the Opposition; it will be through his failure to give them a lead.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have shown the hon. member for Bundaberg a great deal of tolerance. I must point out that we are not dealing with the State election but with the selection of a Senator. I ask the hon. member to confine the remainder of his remarks to the question before the meeting.

Mr. WALSH: It is perfectly true that we are; but I hope that the Leader of the Opposition will not want the same tolerance in dealing with the matter to introduce irrelevancies, as he refers to them.

I know that the decision we have to make is an important one. I have said that all along. It is an important one. But it has been treated so lightly and the Government themselves are the main culprits in the matter. All I can say for the people who stuck to Arnell in this second challenge is that at least they showed some loyalty to the man they selected in the first place.

It will go down in history that a Tory Government in this State forced a Labour section—only a section of the Labour movement—to get down on their knees and crawl to the Government, to submit to the demands of an anti-Labour party and to give that party the right to determine which of two Labour nominees should be the candidate. I think that is a shocking thing for any Labour Party to concede, that it would do, let alone do it.

If I were in the Labour Party myself, there is only one thing I would do; I would tell the Government to get about their business and Arnell's would have been the only name submitted on this occasion. I would have thrown it back, to the extent that I could, by submitting only one nominee and getting the Government themselves into the mess, because they would have a problem, believe me, in determining which of the parties would fill the vacancy. It would be a real problem. The Country Party would probably be more entitled to it than the Liberals, having regard to the nature of the structure of industry in Queensland. But if the Country Party set out to determine that the vacancy should be filled by a Country Party nominee, then you would have the Liberals in Canberra squealing for all they are worth because of the upset it would create down there. If the reverse

were the case and they selected a Liberal Party candidate, again the Country Party would be doing the storming because it would upset the balance.

I feel disappointed at the Government's failure to take charge of this matter. They had the opportunity of going out and selecting a man like Tom McCracken without my having to nominate him, and disregarding the Country Party, the Liberal Party, the Australian Labour Party, or any other political machine.

However, my main reason for rising to speak on this occasion was to emphasize again that I have only the one reason for voting against Alf Arnell. I have announced that. I stick to it, and still will vote against Mr. Arnell.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (8.45 p.m.): I do not propose to vote on this motion and, because of that, I wish to express my views tonight, after having heard the nomination of Mr. Arnell again put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, and the Premier give his reasons for rejecting it.

When Parliament met for this special business on the previous occasion, it was, as I said at the time, a most extraordinary sitting. I did not appreciate the fact that the Government sat there like a lot of mutes on that occasion and condemned a man by their actions, as well as their considered statements beforehand, without giving him a fair hearing. I can appreciate perhaps more fully now that they were manoeuvring for great political tactical warfare, and they have succeeded in a most amazing manner.

As one who belonged for years to the grand Australian Labour Party as it was in days gone by, I am sincerely sorry to sit in this Chamber tonight and see that party so humiliated and in a position in which it cannot refute the damaging statements made against it so far as Labour men are concerned. I do not propose to digress, but I wish to correct a statement by the Leader of the Opposition when replying to the motion submitting Mr. Arnell's name on the last occasion. He chided me with having taken it upon myself to advise the Australian Labour Party what to do. I never attempted to do that. What I said was that if—and I underscore the “if”—I were a member of the Liberal Party or the Country Party, I would take strong objection to the attitude of the Government in this matter, and I said that if I were a rank-and-file member of the A.L.P. and believed all that the executive of that party said about Alf Arnell, I would be very resentful of the attitude of the Inner Executive of the Q.C.E. in deciding, to use the very vivid description of the hon. member for Townsville South tonight, to scab on Alf Arnell.

Mr. Aikens: You cannot say “scab”; say “Johnnie McNab”.

Mr. HILTON: It is a word in the dictionary, and it is not in Standing Orders as being un-Parliamentary. Last Saturday week, on the south side of this city, a long queue of people was lined up to have a bet in the Premier's or the Government's gambling shop, and this conversation took place among a group of men there—

Mr. Thackeray: Were you there?

Mr. HILTON: Yes, I was. The queue was outside the shop, and I was on the footpath. There were a couple of men in railway uniform and some other fellows who looked like good honest men who worked on the wharves, and the Senate was the topic of discussion. The hon. member for Rockhampton North interjects, but I suggest that he get ready to deliver his lectures at the Labour training college in Rockhampton for prospective candidates. Imagine that! This is the man chosen by the Q.C.E. to train Labour candidates for the forthcoming election. I am speaking the truth, because I know that to be so, which illustrates the humiliating position that the A.L.P. is in today.

To proceed with my story, this was the conversation: “I think the Q.C.E. are going to scab on Alf Arnell. I don't trust that b—— so-and-so,” mentioning the Leader of the Opposition, “I don't trust that b—— so-and-so,” mentioning the president of the Q.C.E., “I believe they are going to scab on Alfie, and there will be a lot of trouble if they do.” Of course they have.

I am not supporting Alf Arnell. On the previous occasion, as one who believes in British fair play, as one who believes in natural justice, I made the suggestion that if this man was to be condemned by his nomination being rejected in this Parliament, the decent thing to do was to give him permission to come along here, if he so desired, hear the charges levelled against him, and, if he could, refute them. Did you notice, Mr. Speaker, that when I made that suggestion the A.L.P. were very reticent? They said, “Why should he be brought along here? There is no charge against him. We support him.” Yet a few days afterwards they violated that fundamental principle to which the hon. member for Townsville South and other hon. members have referred, and treated him in a most shocking way.

Again I wish to refute the suggestion strongly implied by the Leader of the Opposition that a member of the Queensland Labour Party, a waterside worker, Mr. Orreal, was on a unity ticket with the Communists. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to produce that ticket. If he is to adopt the role of being so fair to everybody, let him produce the ticket showing that man's name associated with the name of any Communist candidate for any office or position in the Waterside Workers' Federation.

Again, when I referred to a man who a few years ago openly advocated in a letter to a provincial newspaper the fusion of the Communist Party and the A.L.P., the leader of the Opposition said, "That happened years ago." I refer to the fact that in 1956 this man was refused admittance, even as a visitor, to the A.L.P. Convention at Mackay. That, of course, was conveniently overlooked by the Leader of the Opposition, but if he wants confirmation of it—I know that in his own heart and soul he does not, because he was there—I will read from the official minutes of the proceedings. This is what Mr. Bukowski said—

"A question, Mr. Chairman. As this is a matter of principle, it is a matter that has to be given consideration. Would Mr. Waters be admitted to the Q.C.E. as a member of an affiliated union?"

The chairman, who was Mr. Harry Boland, said—

"Mr. Waters would not be admitted to the Q.C.E. as a delegate representing an affiliated union."

Because of that question and that statement, the industrial wing, although it had the numbers, was not game to cross swords with the A.W.U. and the other delegates at the convention in seeking to have Mr. Waters admitted even as a visitor. That man is now on the Executive of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting well off the track. We are not dealing with the election of Mr. Waters. We are dealing with the election of Mr. Arnell.

Mr. HILTON: I am replying to certain comments by the Leader of the Opposition about my speech when this matter was first considered at a special sitting of Parliament. I make no apology for what I said then. I quoted from documents, and my stand has always been that if I am wrong I will admit it. As far as my statement that Mr. Waters went to Russia is concerned, if he did not I accept his denial. But I do know that he went to Japan to attend one of those phoney peace conferences sponsored by the Communist Party. He cannot deny that, because the same gentleman has been a leading light in this phoney peace movement that has been sponsored by the Communist Party over recent years.

However, I stood up mainly to indicate that I am not going to support this motion because I think it has been put forward in a spirit of hypocrisy. The Government played a very clever role and have assumed the position of dictating to the once great Australian Labour Party as to who will be the candidate. This hooey about a choice of selection now being available to the Assembly does not go down with me. The name of the man who has already been rejected is put forward and the name of another man, Mr. Whiteside, is to be considered. I

submit there is still no range of selection. We have already rejected one man. Can we honestly say that, as a Parliament, we have a selection to draw from if we make this appointment tonight?

I think the whole position should be reviewed. If it is going to be a matter of party politics, why make a farce of Parliament in the selection? If we are to continue to have Parliament make these selections when a death occurs, let us at least have the decency to amend our Standing Orders to make a selection by secret ballot so that if an innocent man is to be defamed by his rejection, at least those who may believe him innocent will be able to vote for him. We will not then have the spectacle of a Government with a majority at its disposal voting against a man without giving him a decent and fair hearing.

I realise that the party sponsoring this man have a right to present his case. In view of the information that has been given here tonight, they have a very difficult task to perform and, because of the humiliating position they are now in as a result of their betrayal of what we might term long-cherished, sacred Labour ideals, their position is very humiliating indeed.

However, as I said, I am not going to vote on this motion. Because of the hypocrisy and, I repeat, the humbug associated with it from both sides of the Chamber, I intend to withdraw as I did when the vote was taken on the last occasion.

Mr. Bennett: Haven't you got a nomination?

Mr. HILTON: No, I certainly have not. I have made that clear before. I may have something to say on the other nomination when the motion comes forward so I will conclude my very brief but, I hope, clear remarks. They give a clear exposition of the feelings of disgust I have at this whole business.

Mr. HANLON (Baroona) (8.59 p.m.): I cannot help but be amazed at the remarks of the hon. member for Carnarvon on the appointment of the hon. member for Rockhampton North as lecturer of Labour candidates for the forthcoming election. I say without hesitation that evidence of the work of the hon. member for Rockhampton North will be felt rather painfully by hon. members opposite.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is getting right out of line in rising to speak to an interjection. The hon. member will continue with the debate before the meeting or resume his seat.

Mr. HANLON: I do not wish to stray, Mr. Speaker, but I point out to you with the greatest respect that the hon. member for Carnarvon, the Leader of the Q.L.P. in this Parliament, referred to an hon. member as a pinhead, and I did not see you take any action then.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is criticising the Chair. I did not hear any reference to "pinhead" and if the hon. member heard it he should have risen on a point of order. If the hon. member does not continue with the debate before the meeting I shall order him to resume his seat.

Mr. HANLON: I can only say that it ill-behoves the hon. member for Carnarvon to suggest anybody would not have any competency to train candidates. As far as training candidates is concerned, he cannot even keep his numbers when he has then in Parliament. Two of his four Parliamentary members have left him since the 1960 election.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are not dealing with the training of candidates or the election of candidates about whom the hon. member is speaking. We are dealing with the election of a Senator. If the hon. member does not deal with the question before the meeting I again say he will have to resume his seat.

Mr. HANLON: I rose particularly to deal with a provision of the Standing Orders which I think actually could place some responsibility on you, Mr. Speaker, in relation to a matter that arose in the previous proceedings, and which might arise again tonight. Before I come to that particular point, I wish to point out that the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have already made it very clear that every member of the Australian Labour Party inside this Parliament and outside this Parliament is 100 per cent. behind Mr. Arnell as our No. 1 choice. We will exemplify that clearly, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, by casting our vote for Mr. Arnell when the question is put. Whether he is elected as a Senator will be decided by those who either vote against him or sneak away in the darkness because they have not the courage to vote either for or against him.

We admit quite freely that a second nomination has been submitted tonight. That second nomination is made in case the majority of this Parliament either vote against Arnell or by their absence do not support his election to the office of Senator. The Leader of the Opposition and every other member of the A.L.P. here tonight will support him. Consequently we make no apology at all for the fact that Arnell is our No. 1 choice. Nor do we suggest that we acknowledge at all the right of the Government to demand a choice of candidates from a particular party. After all, we are meeting tonight as electors. We are called together more or less as an electoral college to cast votes. The Premier has put forward the suggestion that the A.L.P. should give us, as particular electors, a choice of candidates from the A.L.P. It is quite true that we have submitted the second nomination in the event of our first nominee being defeated. I trust

that he will not be defeated. We have put forward the second tentative nomination—if I can term it that—not because we acknowledge the right of the Government to demand this, but in the interests of the Australian people who desire to see the return of an A.L.P. Government in Canberra, as they do in this State, as soon as possible. It is in their interests that the A.L.P. has not acknowledged the right of the Government to seek a choice in this regard but has put forward a second tentative nomination in case the Government tries to impose that right, which it has no prerogative to impose. After all, we are meeting tonight to elect someone to fill a vacancy. The Premier and his Government have given their blessing to the suggestion that the names of a number of candidates should be put forward by the political party previously holding the seat that is now vacant.

We know there will be a vacancy in Clayfield at the next State election. We know that four, five, six, or perhaps 10 or 12 people have all sought Liberal endorsement for that seat. We know that one of the very disappointed ones who did not get that endorsement was the hon. member for Windsor. I suggest very seriously that if the Government wishes to apply the principle that it is applying in this case, the Liberal Party should endorse Mr. Murray, Mr. Smith, Mr. Brian Cahill, Mr. Tom Ahern, and all the other people who may have nominated for the Clayfield vacancy. If they claim this right of selection from a number of candidates from one political party, hon. members opposite should say to the electors of Clayfield, "We are going to give you the same privilege as we ask for ourselves as members of Parliament when we cast a vote. We will allow all these people to be voted for at the poll in Clayfield so that the electors of Clayfield can have a choice of Liberal candidates if they want a Liberal." I should say they would not want any of them. If they want a choice let them have a choice of all the candidates who sought endorsement for Clayfield. If it is good enough for the Premier of the State, or members of this Parliament, to say that the House should have a choice of candidates from one particular party, it is good enough for the people of Clayfield to have the same choice. In 1960, it should have been good enough in Condamine for Mr. Sparkes and Mr. Sullivan to go to the poll as Country Party candidates to give the people of Condamine a choice, between Country Party candidates, but the Government does not think that is logical, purely and simply because it does not suit them. Government members have arraigned themselves as paragons of political democracy, but we know they are acting purely on expediency.

Having pointed that out Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the provisions of the Standing Rules and Orders, particularly No. 331. It refers to "Casual vacancy in the Senate." I will not read all the Standing Order because it is quite a long

one. However, I will read relevant sections. I do not wish to be disrespectful, but there are provisions in the Standing Order that were flagrantly disregarded by some hon. members at the previous meeting a fortnight ago. I desire to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the provisions of the Standing Order that were breached by those hon. members and to ask you whether you were aware of them on that occasion, and, if you were, why you did not do something about it. Again, if you were not aware of them and if they come about again tonight, what do you intend to do about them, if anything?

Standing Order No. 331 (a) says—

"Within fourteen days after Parliament has received, during a Session of Parliament, from the Governor of the State, a notification that a vacancy has occurred in the number of Members for the State in the Senate of the Commonwealth, the Speaker shall, by giving not less than seven nor more than fourteen days' notice, summon every Member of Parliament to meet in the Legislative Chamber, on a day and at an hour to be specified in the summons, for the purpose of electing a Senator as provided by Section 15 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that tonight we are present, having answered your summons as we did a fortnight ago, under similar circumstances. We have with us the hon. member for Townsville South, the hon. member for Carnarvon, who has just blown through, and the hon. member for Cook, among others. On the previous occasion, those members answered your summons and met here, in the Legislative Chamber, for the purpose of carrying out an election as specified in the Standing Orders.

I will skip over some other provisions that do not apply to the point I am making, and come to Standing Order No. 331 (f), which says—

"The method of election of a new Senator shall be by the open voting of the Members present at the meeting. Every Member present shall vote."

Mr. Aikens: Provided he is in the Chamber.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Townsville South has a great deal to say, but I suggest to him that if he listens he might learn a little.

The rule says—

"Every Member present shall vote."

I do not think that anyone will deny that this is what happened on the last occasion, and perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, did not notice it. Firstly, when the vote was taken on Arnell you called on the voices for those in favour and those against, the usual parliamentary procedure. I

do not know whether it applied in this case or not. Possibly it was superfluous. In any case, you called for the ayes and the noes and you said you thought the noes had it. You then asked those who supported Mr. Arnell to go to the right of your chair and those against him to go to the left. At that stage, after the question was put, the hon. members for Townsville South and Cook went and sat in what we call the visitors' gallery, on the floor of the Chamber. While hon. members were moving to take their positions, the hon. member for Carnarvon—and never mind about the puerile interjection by the hon. member for Townsville South, "So long as they are present when the vote was taken." He was present on the previous occasion when the vote was taken, and he went to the visitors' gallery with the hon. member for Cook. But the hon. member for Carnarvon, who has now gone through, did not go through on that occasion. He stood there while we were walking across to take our places.

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

Mr. HANLON: I am sorry. I did not see the hon. gentleman. He has been outside the Chamber and has just come back. If from my remarks it could be inferred that he had left to avoid any remarks or any position that might arise under the Standing Order, I unreservedly withdraw the suggestion. I did not see him come back. The position remains and, now that he is back, it becomes even more interesting. What happened was that, while hon. members were taking their places—and they had been asked to take their places so that they were clearly present in the Chamber when they were supposed to do so—the hon. member for Carnarvon stood there. He waved his papers in the air theatrically and said—and I do not say these are his exact words—"The whole thing is a fiasco. I refuse to vote." With that he walked out. I have no desire to embarrass him or the other hon. members who went to the back of the Chamber but I draw the same analogy here, that this is an election just as any other election for Clayfield or somewhere else, where I drew the analogy with the remarkable proposition of the Government that they should have a choice of candidates from one political party for the voters. I draw the same analogy here. There is a Standing Order of this Parliament that says members present must vote. There is also a section of the Elections Act that says all voters in the State must vote. If they do not, they run the risk of being dealt with by the Crown for not having carried out their duties. I say again that hon. members of this Parliament, whether they be the Premier or anybody else in the House, have no more right to think they can flagrantly defy the requirements of the Standing Orders of the Parliament in an election than any citizen has to refuse to cast a vote.

Mr. HILTON: I rise to a point of order. In view of the trenchant remarks of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, will you give a ruling now on whether it is mandatory on hon. members to remain in the Chamber when a vote is taken, what constitutes being present, and whether we must be present in this Chamber when a vote is taken?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Baroona, I feel, is still making his point and I want to hear his full argument before I make any announcement of a ruling.

Mr. HANLON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel that your remarks are appropriate because I am making a point and I have not quite concluded it, though I have almost concluded it. The hon. member for Carnarvon now seeks to beat the gun by trying to change my question. I do want to know two things. The first is the point that has been taken by the hon. member for Carnarvon. If, as I say, any member of this Parliament has not the courage to stay here but slinks away into the darkness before you actually put the question to the vote so that it cannot be said that he was present and left and broke the Standing Order—he just did not happen to be here—and I am not looking at the hon. member for Townsville South when I say that—

Mr. Aikens: How often have you walked out rather than cast a vote?

Mr. HANLON: I have walked out of the Chamber on only one occasion in the time that I have been here.

Mr. Aikens: Because you were not game to cast a vote.

Mr. HANLON: I walked out with other members of the Australian Labour Party and did not vote because the motion put forward was, in our opinion, a cowardly one and was aimed at the destruction of a person's personal character. It referred to the Commissioner of Police at the time, among others, rather than to the purpose for which it allegedly was put forward. That was the only occasion on which I have ever walked out. The hon. member for Townsville South has not walked out so much perhaps but he has very conveniently not been here on many occasions. When he has been here he has almost invariably voted with the Government.

I want to pose two questions. Firstly, what is the position if an hon. member slinks away before the question is actually put technically so that it could not be said that he was physically present—although I do submit that, having answered your summons to a meeting, he is present at the meeting? I realise that it would be physically and practically impossible and ridiculous for you to send the Sergeant-at-arms or anybody else out chasing around the Bellevue Hotel or the shadows outside the House to see where some member might be if he did not have the courage to stay here and vote. I feel

that your answer would be that you could not do much about it, and I am not arguing about that.

You may not have noticed what occurred at the last meeting, but I feel that if you did you might agree with me in the circumstances. If hon. members sit here this evening until the question is put and we are asked to take our places in voting for or against a candidate, and then do not vote, I ask what action, Mr. Speaker, you propose to take. That is what was done by the hon. members for Townsville South and Cook on the last occasion. There is nothing personal in my saying this; possibly they did not even know that that was in Standing Orders.

Mr. Aikens: I knew it.

Mr. HANLON: The hon. member for Bundaberg did, because it is the first time that he has not walked out rather than vote with the Government. He always walks out if he does not want to vote with the Australian Labour Party. Last week he did not, because I think he felt that he should cast his vote.

Mr. Aikens: What has this to do with Arnell?

Mr. HANLON: It has a lot to do with it, because this is to elect Arnell, Whiteside, or somebody else. It relates to the election procedure of this House.

Mr. Smith: Give the House your views on Standing Order No. 146.

Mr. HANLON: I do not know why I should worry about the hon. member for Windsor. The Executive of the Liberal Party did not worry very much about him and I cannot see why I, as a member of the A.L.P., should. He refers me to Standing Order No. 146, which reads—

“Every Member present in the House when the Question is put with the bars closed, shall vote.”

I do not even remember whether the Bar was closed on the previous occasion. I do not think there is any necessity for closing the Bars because we are meeting tonight under Standing Order No. 331, which deals with the specific matter of a casual vacancy in the Senate. I think that the hon. member for South Brisbane, if he had the opportunity, would support me in that.

I draw the attention of the hon. member for Windsor to the fact that when the House adjourned this afternoon, it was till 11 a.m. tomorrow. The Premier did not say that the House was to meet tonight. He did not say that we were to have a sub-sitting or anything else. My submission is that we are meeting under Standing Order No. 331, which refers specifically to a casual vacancy in the Senate. I see that the hon. member for Townsville South is sneaking away.

Mr. Aikens: I shall be back in a minute.

Mr. HANLON: If the other Standing Orders apply to Standing Order No. 331, I put a legal poser to the hon. member for Windsor and ask him this: if he wants Standing Order No. 146 to apply to Standing Order No. 331, does he agree, on his own argument, that Standing Order No. 331 must apply to the others, too, and that every member must vote? Why did the framers of the Standing Orders place that provision in this particular Standing Order if they thought other than that the other Standing Orders did not apply to this one?

In answer again to the hon. member for Windsor on that point, I refer to the conduct on the previous occasion of the hon. member for Carnarvon, who waited till we were about to take our places to vote and then left the Chamber. I ask whether you, Mr. Speaker, will take any action in the casting of votes by hon. members. I do not want to force any hon. member to vote, but I think you should point out that each has an obligation to vote here, just as electors have an obligation to vote on polling days. I have heard almost every hon. member on both sides of this House speak from time to time about informal voting, and these remarks are never heard more than when applied to Senate voting. They say, "Isn't it dreadful to have all those hundreds of thousands of votes cast informally at Senate elections?" Yet we have these hon. members who, if not analagous with people who do not vote at an ordinary election, are certainly analagous with those who cast informal votes, because they sit around and do not cast votes either way. They are like persons who go to a polling booth, get their voting papers, do not mark them, and place them blank in the ballot box.

Mr. Hart: What has this to do with the election of Mr. Arnell?

Mr. Dewar: Is there any chance of taking a vote?

Mr. HANLON: The vote will be taken when members have finished discussing the question. Apparently the hon. member for Wavell wants to take over the conduct of the debate. I am asking a question of you, Mr. Speaker, relating to this election. Apparently the hon. member for Wavell is half asleep and wants to go home. I understand that the vote will be taken when hon. members have made their submissions. One hon. member opposite said, "What has this to do with the election of Mr. Arnell?"

Government Members interjected.

Mr. HANLON: I could say quite a lot in favour of Mr. Arnell; but I think that the Leader of the Opposition, last Tuesday week and again tonight, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have dealt with the matter effectively, and I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition in his reply will deal very effectively with the remarks that have been made about Mr. Arnell.

Mr. Hart: Well, why don't you let him?

Mr. HANLON: I want only to say that Mr. Arnell is a man whom I feel would represent the State very well in the Senate of Australia and, for that reason, I am going to cast my vote for him, as I did before. I repeat that the second nomination has been made in the interests of the people of Australia and is under no circumstance to be taken as acknowledging that the Premier, or any Government, has the right to seek nominations from or challenge the selection of candidates by any particular party, as has been said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Before the Leader of the Opposition replies, I think I should say this. The hon. member for Baroota has raised the question of whether all hon. members should vote. I point out to hon. members that there is a vast difference between the word "shall" and the words "must" or "will". The word "shall" is not positive; the words "must" or "will" are positive. When it is stated that a member "shall" vote it is not entirely incumbent on him to vote. As far as the other ruling is concerned,—

Order! Hon. members on my left should at least show some respect when I am trying to give a ruling on a question raised by a member on their side of the House.

This is an adjourned meeting. There is no doubt about it. I announced when we started that it was a continuation of the meeting from 25 September. When the hon. member for Bundaberg was speaking on that occasion he raised a question of privilege, and I purposely announced on that occasion—I have the words here because I thought the matter might be raised—

" . . . the procedure carried out here tonight is under the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly . . . "

On no other occasion during a meeting or an assembly of the Legislature has the question of whether or not a member should stay in the Chamber and vote ever been raised. Far be it from me to say that any hon. member should stay in the Chamber and vote against his will. That would be over-exercising and over-taxing the privileges that we, as members of Parliament, are trying to uphold. Whether or not it is a special meeting of this Assembly where the Rules of the Legislative Assembly apply, I have no intention of stopping any hon. member from leaving the Chamber when a vote is taken, unless, of course, it is after the Bar has been closed. If the Bar has been closed the rule must apply, and if a member is in the Chamber when the bell ceases ringing and the Bar is closed, he must vote. Until that occurs, there is no obligation on him to vote.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. In view of the ruling that you have just given, Mr. Speaker, would you be prepared to give us an interpretation of the

mandatory provision in Rule 331 (f), which says that the Member presiding shall vote, which was followed by you on the last occasion? After indicating that you would prefer to preserve your impartiality by not voting, you said that because of the word "shall" you held it to be mandatory and exercised your vote, which you do not normally do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is reflecting on the integrity of the Chair. I never at any time said that I was forced to vote.

Government Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members on my right will take the warning I gave hon. members on my left. When I am giving a ruling I want silence.

Mr. Graham: They are boofheads.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Mackay is not in order in referring to anyone as a "boofhead." If he does so again I shall ask him to leave the Chamber. So far as the hon. member for South Brisbane is concerned, as I stated on that occasion, the chairman of the meeting is entitled to vote, and I exercised my privilege. If I care to exercise my privilege that is my prerogative. As far as any other hon. member is concerned, he is entitled to exercise his prerogative.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling is that you are not obliged to vote?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am not obliged to vote.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order. I say that if the members of this Parliament compel me to vote at any time on this or any other subject, it will be a travesty of democracy.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I appreciate the assistance of the hon. member for Townsville South but I have given my ruling that no member is forced to vote during any division and I stand by it.

Mr. BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to an authority—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for South Brisbane will cease arguing with the Chair. I have given my ruling and I stand by it. If the hon. member wishes to dispute it he can do so in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr. DUGGAN (Toowoomba West—Leader of the Opposition) (9.27 p.m.), in reply: I regret that in this very important debate I am not feeling 100 per cent. and am not able to enter it perhaps with the enthusiasm and gusto that I should desire. I think the first observation I should make

is to express my regret that the general standard of the debate that we were endeavouring to preserve last week has not been maintained this evening. There was a regrettable lapse on the last occasion, but on this occasion I think the opportunity has been seized by interested bodies to engage in a line of propaganda that I think is most unfortunate.

I will be, of necessity, compelled to answer one or two matters, but I will spend only such time on them as I think their importance deserves. The first is that the Premier intimated that Parliament must tonight settle this very important problem of securing representation in the Senate for Queensland. I agree. He said that it was the obligation of Parliament to determine who was the most fitted person to be the nominee of this Parliament. He also laid down that Parliament required some choice in this matter.

I am not again going over the arguments advanced a fortnight ago, but I should like to say that at no time prior to the Premier's declaration had Parliament been asked to have a choice in this matter. The Government, of its own volition and authority, under the signature of the Premier, asked that it be given at least two names for consideration. At that point of time Parliament had not determined that it must have a choice in the matter.

Accordingly, the very action of the Premier, as the Leader of the Government, in asking to have this choice, and submitting it to his party, indicated that they wanted to determine just how far they would go, if they went anywhere at all in the matter. It is more than a coincidence that on the last occasion when this nomination was submitted, the Government parties had a Caucus meeting to determine the question, so they did not leave it for the floor of the House to determine at all.

Whilst we are on this point of having a choice in the matter, I invite the Premier to give a declaration for the record that in the unhappy event—and I hope it will not occur—of any Senator from Queensland representing the Government parties resigning or dying before the next Senate elections, he will undertake to submit to this House for consideration the names of two members representing Government interests outside this House. Will he do that? On the last occasion when we had an opportunity of discussing the fitness or otherwise of a person to enter the Senate the then Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. G. F. R. Nicklin, did not elect to put forward even one name from this side of the House to give the Government a choice in the matter.

Mr. Nicklin: I was not the Leader of the Opposition at that time.

Mr. DUGGAN: I think if the hon. gentleman looks at my speech on the last occasion he will see that I said that. There is no

purpose in saying that a person is misquoting deliberately when obviously the matter can be checked up.

I think everybody will agree that the Premier was far from gracious in this matter. Let us canvass the background of the situation to see what sort of image the Government wanted to create outside. First of all, the Government indicated that it wanted a choice of two names. It was suggested that that was eminently fair, although it had not been done previously. Since the introduction of proportional representation, Senator Hendrickson from Victoria has been appointed to the Senate. Mr. Bolte, the Liberal Premier of that State, did not say, "I want a choice of two names." He said to the A.L.P., "Give me the name of a person representing the A.L.P. and Parliament will consider it." Parliament did consider it and Senator Hendrickson is still a member of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia. The Victorian Government did not ask for two names on that occasion. Of course, the Queensland Premier on behalf of his Government sought to create the impression outside that he wanted to have the widest possible choice in this matter. He said, "We are not going to stand any shenaneking on the part of the Labour Party. Unless they submit an alternative name on the next occasion we will be a completely free agent to act as we wish." Did not the Premier postulate on that occasion the position that if we did not accept his demand he would be a completely free agent to act in the matter? Did he not by the vote he commanded on that occasion show that he did not want Arnell? All these people outside say, "Persevere." But we have to persevere with the facts as they are. The facts are that the Government, by the mobilisation of their numbers, voted against Arnell. I think the circumstances of the exercise of that vote call for some comment, too. If the Government feels tonight that there is justification for giving reasons why Arnell's nomination should not be accepted by this Parliament, I point out that those reasons existed more than a fortnight ago. Every case that the Premier cited tonight in condemnation of Arnell occurred more than a fortnight ago. Had something happened in the last fortnight that would cause Arnell to incur the displeasure of some authority or other I could understand the Premier's advancing that reason tonight. But all the things the Premier mentioned were known to him previously and probably carefully prepared by the security section of the Police Force for the Premier's public relations man to feed to the Premier to condemn Arnell tonight. A fortnight ago these facts were known to the Government, but at that time hon. members opposite did not have the intestinal fortitude to say what they are saying tonight. They were hoping against hope that we would not proceed with the second nomination so that they could go outside and say, "Well, we gave the A.L.P.

a chance but they did not accept it. What could have been fairer in this matter? As the A.L.P. did not accept our offer there is no further obligation on us and we will proceed in the direction that we think is best." A fortnight ago they had no intention of voting for Arnell and that they have no intention of doing so tonight is equally obvious. What was the gracious way the Premier dealt with the matter? He did not say, "All right, we are going to vote against Arnell but we will accept your second nomination, Mr. Whiteside." He said that Mr. Whiteside was not used so blatantly by the Communists as Mr. Arnell in the exercise of his duties. What sort of a smear is that? I think the Premier should be thoroughly ashamed of himself.

In a moment I will deal with the evidence he put forward but not one scintilla of evidence was produced to justify even an oblique reference to Mr. Whiteside as having been in any way mixed up with any Communist collaboration or activity whatever. Yet the Premier says he will accept this nomination because, in other words, it is the lesser of two evils as Mr. Whiteside has not been so blatantly used as Mr. Arnell was allegedly used in this matter. Let us destroy for all time this myth about the Premier wanting to be fair to everyone on this matter. He has played politics and played it hard. He hoped he would get some electoral advantage from this situation. If, as the Parliamentary Leader of the Opposition, I were concerned with the State prospects alone in this matter, I say without equivocation that it would have paid us to play politics and re-submit the name of Mr. Arnell only and go down with the sinking ship. It makes me almost weep to hear these people from Townsville South, Bundaberg, and Carnarvon with their crocodile tears talking about the great A.L.P. movement and how it has gone downwards and further downwards over the years since they left it.

Mr. Hilton: The once-great A.L.P.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member says, "The once-great A.L.P." These people say how they have gone away in the face of Communism, and other evil things. We will find that these men who were here on the previous occasion are the instruments used by the Government as the muck-rakers who come in here unashamedly. It is one of the pities of politics to see the men who defect from political organisations with which they have been associated. We can go right back to the Reids, the Cooks, the Billie Hugheses, the Lyonses, and all the others. They were some of the men who won great respect in the Labour Party, but turned their backs on it and joined other parties and were the most vicious and vitriolic in their attacks on it. It is indeed pitiful to see these men in the eve of their political lives attack the Australian Labour Party. Every one of the Government members was laughing, jeering, and joking when those attacks were made on the

A.L.P. These men say they wish to get back into the A.L.P. but I say unequivocally that the A.L.P. does not want them back under any circumstances.

Mr. Chalk: The A.L.P. does not want you, and you know it.

Mr. DUGGAN: When the time comes, if the A.L.P. does not want me I will step down quite gracefully, and quite gladly.

Mr. Chalk: You won't step down; you will be knocked down.

Mr. DUGGAN: If I am knocked down it will be an honourable knock-down, I can assure the hon. gentleman.

I do not think these tactics are fair at any stage. If this accumulation of evidence was available to the Premier, why did he not bring it forward a fortnight ago? I will give the reason. Members of the Government want to be in an impregnable political position. The hon. members for Ashgrove and Herbert, and a few others of that ilk on the Government side of the House, for some time have been assiduously trying to sell the idea that the A.L.P. has been subject to Communist infiltration. Over a period they have made that the subject of direct and indirect attacks on the A.L.P. Everyone knows that they will fight the election on this so-called Communist-infiltration allegation. They allege Communist infiltration into the A.L.P. and in the next election campaign they intend to adopt the same tactics. They could not afford to vote for Arnell because these men behind the Premier have attacked Arnell. The hon. member for Ashgrove said he would walk out if he had to choose between voting for Arnell and no-one else. Government members would have been placed in an invidious position if they voted for Arnell. It would have destroyed the whole framework of their election scheme built up over a period of time. It would have been destroyed completely because we could have said, "In appointing Arnell you indicate that you do not believe the scurrilous attacks made on him from time to time." At no stage did they wish to appoint him. They wanted to go outside and besmirch him and say, "We are not concerned at all about Arnell; we want a choice." All the time they were concerned about his background, but they did not attack him. They had this information, which would have allowed the responsible Premier or the irresponsible backbenchers to get up and attack him, as they had a right to do, if they felt the evidence justified an attack of that kind.

The Premier comes along tonight and says that the Parliament objects to an outside coterie dictating to this Assembly. I want it to go on the record, if the Premier repudiates it now, that he has indicated he will vote for Whiteside and that, by voting for Whiteside he accepts the principle that the Q.C.E., as the administrative body of the A.L.P. of this State, has the right to select an endorsed candidate for consideration.

Remember that. He accepts that. It is an indisputable fact that, if you accept Whiteside, you accept the right of the Q.C.E. to make a recommendation in this matter. If you do not accept that position, the fact is that the Premier, in addressing a letter to me and taking it to his Cabinet and to his party, indicates that the Government wants to make a party matter out of this particular case. He accepts it with bad grace. He insists that he wants an acceptable man.

It has been mentioned in the debate that in 1949 Arnell opposed the official A.L.P. candidate, that he was in the Industrial Group movement in 1951 and subsequently until the abandonment of that organisation, and that the Government regarded him the whole time as being an industrial opportunist. The Premier also referred to his free trip to Russia. All these things were built up in an attempt to discredit Arnell.

I have not been to Russia and I have no particular desire to go there although some day, if I had the opportunity of exploring other parts of the world, no doubt I would like to have a look at the interesting experiments going on in that country, as thousands of other people both with communist and with non-communist affiliations have done and will no doubt continue to do for some time. But this flow of traffic to Russia, whether it is sponsored by any particular organisation or not, is not in itself any indication that the person so going is a Communist sympathiser. The very purpose should indicate that. Is anyone going to suggest of the American scholarship that Edgar Williams went on the other day that the purpose of the American Government in sending a person over there is that they consider that a person going over there is a capitalist or that he is subject to indoctrination with the democratic ideas of Government? The idea is to let these people in various parts of the world have a look for themselves and, if they are impressed with conditions there, they can tell the world what they saw.

Let us consider this business of trying to score over these periodic trips by people to Russia. As I have said on many occasions, it is all right for a British Trade Mission to go to Russia, and also for the authorities in Hong Kong.

Mr. Knox: They are not sponsored by a Communist-front organisation as Arnell was.

Mr. DUGGAN: As a matter of fact, on these matters they are trying to transfer the blame all the time. Many famous people have gone to Russia on many occasions and, as long as they are not connected with the Labour Party, they are assumed to have a perfectly legitimate reason for going. I have in my hand No. 61 of "Australia in Facts and Figures" and I recall very well the incident in March, 1959, when the E.C.A.F.E. Conference was held at Southport. Who gave a reception here to these delegates? None other than the Premier of the State, the Hon. G. F. R. Nicklin!

And remember the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, N. P. Firubin! You could not get near him for the Liberals who wanted to talk to him. You could not get within 15 feet of him. As a matter of fact, I would dearly like to recount a story told to me that evening by Lord Carrington, the then United Kingdom High Commissioner, but it might embarrass the hon. gentleman. Not that it was anything to his discredit, but I know it is not the thing to retail a private conversation. However, I am sorry indeed that, because it was a private conversation, I am prevented from making my point more explicit and perhaps more positive than I am able to do. But I can recall it as well as can be. People in the highest strata of the State wanted to get along to see this man, who undoubtedly was one of the personalities of the time. The Press kept featuring and publicising him and publishing photographs of him, but you would have needed a machete to get near him at the conference that day.

I said by way of introduction that when you want to sell something to the Communists in Russia, China, or anywhere else, it is a good thing as long as you are putting some filthy Communist money into your pocket. If a Labour man happens to go anywhere within 100 or 500 miles of the same places, he is a tool of international Communism. As long as this filthy Communist money is going into the pockets of these people who have something to sell, it is a legitimate enterprise. I object very much to this continual smearing of a man simply because he went to a particular conference. He did only what other unionists have done on many occasions.

The Premier said that he was going to deal with this matter in a fair and unbiased way. He knew all about the particular dates when Mr. Arnell went to the Q.C.E., when he nominated for this position, and so on. He went on about the Federal secretaryship that was won by Mr. Fitzgibbon, and he said that he did not support Mr. Nelson and it was doubtful whether he supported Mr. Fitzgibbon. What evidence is there one way or the other? Is it just another scientific smear? Why did he not say, "There is evidence that Arnell supported the Communist Nelson and refused to support Fitzgibbon"? He does not say it that way. He says that it is doubtful whether there is any evidence that he supported the A.L.P. man. He has no direct evidence that he supported Nelson. He used words suggesting that Arnell did this sort of thing. Is that the fair action of a Premier who wants to set himself up as putting this matter objectively before Parliament for consideration?

Of course, he attacked Mr. Arnell for his alleged actions in industrial issues on the waterfront. I suppose he is one of a number of people who believe that industrial disputes

or matters on the waterfront are for the membership to determine. It is not for me to decide the industrial rights of disputes on the waterfront. Machinery is provided for that purpose, and waterside workers are perfectly entitled to make what representations they think fit, and there is no evidence to show that Mr. Arnell has done anything except carry out the wishes of the rank and file.

I regret that I have to deal with one or two of the personal references that have been made. It might be said that I am somewhat sensitive personally, but I would be less than human if I were not disturbed by some of the darts and barbs thrown at me. I have been in political life long enough to expect some to fly in my direction from various quarters, and one knows over the years that they will come from places where there is animus, vindictiveness, and spleen. When one knows that they come from persons of very unbalanced political temperament, one naturally does not waste a great deal of time on them.

I thought that a political bomb was about to explode when the hon. member for Townsville South referred to a debate that took place here in 1948. Of course, everyone listened with great expectation, thinking that something outstanding was about to be revealed, but the hon. member has been doing that in pamphlets for about 10 years. I have seen them all over the place. I found the other day a pamphlet, distributed in the metropolitan area, attacking me personally. The moment the Australian Labour Party decides that I am not a fit and proper person to be a rank-and-file member, a parliamentary member, or Leader, I shall get out. I hope it will not come to that, but, if it did, I would retire as gracefully as I could. However, whilst I occupy any position in the A.L.P. whether as a rank-and-file member, an ordinary parliamentary member, or the Leader, I shall try to uphold the obligations attaching to those positions. When decisions are made, I shall accept them gracefully. I am not going to be like people who have been cast into the political wilderness on their own, with no political friends about them, staring into the political darkness and relying upon every political device and trick to become notorious, sometimes by importing into the debate some unusual phrase or nicknaming somebody in a way that evokes temporary laughter. We all know that these nicknames are coined not on the spur of the moment but a fortnight or even six months before. They are stored away and just pulled out of the little bag when a particular person comes into the Chamber. It is easy to imagine the chagrin and disappointment of the hon. member when he has to admit that he thought another member of the Opposition interjected and that the nickname missed its mark when it was used.

All I want to say about the 1948 dispute is that it was an unfortunate industrial dispute in which harsh things were said on both sides. I probably said some harsh things about people, and no doubt they said harsh things about me. But I do not know of any other industrial dispute that ended in such a way that harmonious relationships were resumed immediately. The hon. member for Townsville South tries continually to make a division between me and those whom I represent. I should like to tell him that when I was defeated as the representative of the Toowoomba electorate in 1957 and obliged to resign, the railway unions and other non-railway unions met at the Trades Hall and took the unprecedented step of presenting me with items relating to music and literature and also with something for my wife. The person who made the presentation was Mr. Nolan of the Australian Railways Union. In my home in Toowoomba, in pride of place in my lounge, I have a grandfather clock worth every bit of £100 that was made and presented to me by the employees of the railway workshops at Willowburn on my defeat in 1957. Inscribed on that clock is "In grateful recognition of your work done over the years." Hon. members can try to laugh that off if they like.

Dealing with Mick O'Brien, I want to tell the hon. member for Townsville South, so that his records will be up to date, that despite what has been said about Mr. O'Brien, both Mr. Nolan and Mr. O'Brien took their place on my platform in 1960. I welcomed Mr. O'Brien to that platform, and we correspond quite often on matters of mutual interest relating to the railways in the Commonwealth, and particularly to the railways in Queensland. Whatever may have happened at that time, those days are gone.

The hon. member referred in very scathing terms to certain hon. members on this side of the House, and he referred also to people who had voted in a certain way at the meeting of the Q.C.E. as political scabs. If what the Premier said is true—and the hon. member, by his abstention, will be supporting the Premier—the people who voted for Arnell's nomination can only be placed in the category of those who voted for the unity ticket on the Communist line. Reasonableness must be our prime consideration in this matter. The A.L.P. does not like being dictated to by the Government, but when one nominee was rejected we recognised, with great reluctance, that circumstances beyond our control dictated that, in order to enable us to try to bring about the defeat of the Menzies Government as soon as possible, an A.L.P. man should be elected to the Senate. If we did not put in an A.L.P. man, we should be giving them the services of a full-time Senator to organise for the Government through the length and breadth of Australia. It was only because the Federal executive of the A.L.P., and Mr. Calwell and Mr. Whitlam and members of the Parliamentary Labour Party, told the

Q.C.E. that they wanted maximum representation in the Senate that we faced up to this situation and decided to make a second nomination. The only way in which we can show how we feel about Mr. Arnell is by voting for him. All the words in the world cannot erase the action of the hon. member for Townsville South in staying outside when the vote was taken on the last occasion. He now recognises that there will be repercussions because there are many waterside workers in his electorate, and he comes here and talks a lot of mealy-mouthed rubbish in an attempt to get back on side with the waterside workers whose support he alienated by walking out and not voting previously. I want to tell the hon. member for Townsville South that on my last visit to Townsville, about three or four months ago. I met both Mr. Costigan and Mr. Oliver, respectively President and Secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation. They came to me and I was with them for three or four hours; I addressed meetings of the Waterside Workers' Federation at which they were present, and they took me out on personal inspections of the waterfront facilities.

This gentleman comes down here and uses the cunning of a waterfront rodent wanting to get back on side with the people whom he antagonised on the last occasion. People are getting sick of the sycophantic front of this man who gets up here under the guise of being a freelance Independent saying what he wants to say when all he is doing is carrying out the dirty, filthy propaganda of the Liberal Party in certain matters.

Then he referred to Mr. Forde in derogatory terms. If the Liberals were fair dinkum about it and put up a candidate against the hon. member for Townsville South he would not be in the race, but because he is carrying out their dirty propaganda they will not put up a candidate against him.

Of course, the hon. member for Carnarvon once again starts to instruct me and says he is concerned only with British justice. But what does he do? He comes and retails an alleged conversation that he heard in a queue of people at a T.A.B. agency. Is that the sort of evidence to be used in a Parliament that is dealing with the election of a Senator? There was no need for me to fabricate a story of what I heard in the street about anyone. Surely we are sinking to the depths of blackguardry doing that kind of thing here. These people who put up their hands and say, "I am speaking for the preservation on British justice", and then retail conversations allegedly taking place in a queue of waterside workers—

Mr. Hilton: It is quite true.

Mr. DUGGAN: I could say things that are quite true about the hon. member.

Mr. Hilton: Say them.

Mr. DUGGAN: No, I do not think this is the occasion. That is why I deplore the basis of the hon. member's contribution and also that of the hon. member for Bundaberg. I do not wish to enter a political dogfight with the Q.L.P., because I believe that the people outside are sick and tired of this engaging in political donnybrooks with the Q.L.P. The great mass of the people outside are looking to the A.L.P. to get back into government. I do not want to engage in political dogfights or to get off the track. It is not because of my lack of ability—and I say that with modesty. I do not want to run away from these fellows, anyway.

The hon. member for Bundaberg spoke about my fitness for these things. Let me say for the record that when the break came he said to me, "I have no designs on the Deputy Leadership. It is yours." He also said, "Don't forget, Johnny, that if they vote against us in the House what happens then with all those behind the scenes coming out in the coalition Government?" Yet there are members in the House with the temerity to accuse me. If it hadn't been for Ernie Evans, for Roberts from Whitsunday, Jim Sparkes and Arthur Fadden they, who were subsequently to join the Q.L.P., would have been sitting over there in 1957 as members of a coalition Government. All this talk here by the hon. member for Bundaberg about the three weeks' leave meeting! There is nothing new about that. That is on the record. He did not tell you that Mr. Bukowski moved that resolution because the Premier indicated he wanted it that way and it was because of preliminary conversations and discussions that it was agreed that Mr. Bukowski should make the report that he did on this matter. Why hide behind an official record? We know what was said on a previous occasion and I do not want to waste time on it now. We have nothing to be ashamed of. All this talk of my having a shocking memory! In 30 years in this Parliament I have known of only one direction that came down here. If there have been others the hon. member for Bundaberg should search his conscience because he was a member of the inner executive. I believe he issued some directions from the inner executive, but what they were I do not know. I understand that he issued one to Mr. Roberts, the hon. member for Nundah at the time, about municipal salaries. I do not know how many he issued. If he contradicts me it is only because he was a member of the inner executive and he issued directions unknown to me as a Parliamentarian. I am always subject to correction, of course, but from memory in my experience I know only one case where we have had a direction from the governing body.

During my association with the hon. member for Bundaberg I suppose I would have had less argument with him than any other Cabinet Minister at the time. He left me alone and I left him alone. It was not because we were frightened of each other

in any way. He was not afraid of me, nor I of him. It was not a matter of either of us being cowards or either of us having any particular reason to keep apart. In any event I had less occasion to quarrel or argue the point with the hon. member for Bundaberg than with any other member of the Cabinet. I pay that tribute to him—if it is a tribute. He did not push me around. At the same time, anybody who knows the hon. member for Bundaberg would know that he was not disinclined to push other people around when he was in a position to do so. Now that he is no longer in that position he can rant about the A.L.P., and how we have fallen from grace and done this and that.

Let us go through the records. Let hon. members opposite check how many times members of the Q.L.P. are here from the time Parliament convenes until it adjourns at night. They get their name on the roll, sometimes stay half an hour, and then go. On particular occasions when they feel they can make a speech and get into the news, they may make a speech. They are ever ready to castigate us but let hon. members opposite peruse the records and see how many times they speak. Better still, let the people come down, as they are in the gallery tonight, to see how often these people are in their places in the Chamber.

Mr. Hilton: If I am not in my place here, I am in my room.

Mr. DUGGAN: The hon. member is working a long way from downstairs. I would have no objection if he were downstairs.

Mr. HILTON: I rise to a point of order! The Leader of the Opposition has intimated that when I am not in my seat here I am away from Parliament House engaged on some other work. That is entirely untrue and I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw his allegation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to accept the denial.

Mr. DUGGAN: I have to accept it. I did not say he was not in the Chamber for the whole time. I said a considerable part of the time that he is not here he is away from the House. What I say applies to him applies to other people with greater force. We are sick to the teeth of this business. Both the hon. member for Bundaberg and the hon. member for Carnarvon twitted me about other matters that I could reply to. Mention was made of what I was alleged to have said about Mr. Lionel Orreal. This is what I said—

"I have here perhaps 40 or 50 tickets of various kinds by a wide variety of people concerning nominations in the water-front elections. In some cases these tickets were issued by individual people advocating, under their own authority, the

persons whom the waterside workers should vote for at the various elections that were taking place. This is a queer sort of ticket. Even at the 1960 elections I noticed that Mr. Lionel Orreal stood as Q.L.P. candidate against the hon. member for Brisbane. Has it been suggested that because his name appeared on one of these tickets which I have here, and which I will produce later when I hope I will be permitted to exercise my right of reply, he has Communist affiliations?"

Mr. Hilton: Read what you said about the Q.L.P. and the Communists further on.

Mr. DUGGAN: If the hon. gentleman will give me an extension of time I will read the lot.

We are called together tonight on the election of a Senator and I regret that these side issues have come into it, but we are faced with the position that there still remains a case put against Mr. Arnell. I say this has been done in a most vicious and dishonourable way because if the Premier felt this was the feeling of the Government parties he should have said to me a fortnight ago, "For reasons that we consider to be good and sufficient we are not prepared to accept Arnell as one of your nominees." If he had done that we could have said, "What is your evidence against him?" Mr. Arnell has been the subject of allegations. The Q.C.E. has examined him and exonerated him, and I exonerate him tonight. The people who say we have not our heart in this tonight are unmitigated liars. We have decided to give them a choice and to show their bona fides in the matter they should get behind us and say, "Our first preference for this vacancy is Alfred Arnell." If they vote for him they will be meeting my wishes, my colleagues' wishes, and the wishes of the Q.C.E. and all others in the Labour movement. If they reject him it is their responsibility, and theirs alone. For those reasons, I leave it in the hands of the House to make the decision whether he should be elected to the Senate.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Duggan) be agreed to—put.

AGAINST: 43

Mr. Adair	Mr. Lonergan
" Anderson	" Low
" Armstrong	" Müller
" Beardmore	" Munro
" Bjelke-Petersen	" Nicholson
" Campbell	" Nicklin
" Carey	" Pilbeam
" Chalk	" Rae
Dr. Delamothe	" Ramsden
Mr. Dewar	" Richter
" Diplock	" Row
" Evans	" Smith
" Ewan	" Sullivan
" Fletcher	" Taylor
" Gaven	" Tooth
" Harrison	" Walsh
" Hart	" Wharton
" Hewitt	" Windsor
" Hiley	
" Hodges	
" Hooper	
" Houghton	
" Hughes	

Tellers:

Mr. Camm
" Knox

IN FAVOUR: 24

Mr. Baxter	Mr. Lloyd
" Bennett	" Mann
" Burrows	" Marsden
" Davies	" Melloy
" Dean	" O'Donnell
" Donald	" Sherrington
" Dufficy	" Thackeray
" Duggan	" Tucker
" Graham	" Wallace
" Gunn	
" Hanlon	
" Houston	
" Inch	

Tellers:

Mr. Bromley
" Newton

Motion declared lost.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Hon. members, there are further nominations to consider. I now call on the hon. member for Kedron.

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (10.14 p.m.): Mr. Speaker, I move—

"That Mr. George Irvine Whiteside be elected to hold the place in the Senate of the Parliament of the Commonwealth rendered vacant through the death of Senator Maxwell Poulter."

In accordance with Section 15 of the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act, it is my privilege, despite the tragic circumstances surrounding the cause of this vacancy, to invite hon. members to vote for Mr. Whiteside to fill the vacancy now existing in the Senate. Action is required of us to fill the vacancy in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 331 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland.

I do not think that it is necessary for me to speak at any great length about this nominee. The Premier has already indicated that it is the intention of the Government to support Mr. Whiteside. I believe that if we, as a political party, are to accept the fact that we have the right, which is accepted by the Government, to make a nomination on behalf of the Australian Labour Party, at all times we should have an absolute right to select our own candidate. As has been indicated by the Premier, it is the intention of the Government to select whom they think should be elected on our behalf.

I believe that Mr. Whiteside is a man who will ably fill the vacancy now existing. Through his many years of experience in the Labour Party and trade-union movement of Queensland, he has proved that he has the courage and capacity to represent the people of this State. I believe that he will fill the vacancy with credit to the State, to the Australian Labour Party, and to himself.

I accept the statement of the Premier that the Government will support this nomination, but I do point out that it was not through any sincerity of purpose on the part of the Government that Parliament should select a nominee; it was definitely stated by the Premier on the last occasion that it was the intention of the Government, not of Parliament, to decide who would fill the

vacancy. I repeat that it was not the Parliament, but the governing parties. In other words, the power of the Executive predominates in this matter. I do not criticise that when the Government has the numbers to decide who will be the successful nominee.

I shall state briefly Mr. Whiteside's history. He was elected as organiser of the Federated Engine Drivers and Firemen's Association in June, 1934. He was elected as union delegate to the Q.C.E. of the Australian Labour Party in 1935. He was elected union delegate to the Australian Council of Trade Unions in 1938 and took over from Communist domination of his union. He was elected State secretary of that union in 1945. He has proved himself to be sincere in his tasks, and a man with a great sense of humility. I believe that he will fulfil his duties as a representative of Queensland with respect for his office and with credit to the State, and that he will do a considerable amount of work on behalf of the working people of the community and of the State of Queensland. As a final qualification, I point out to the governing parties that he is not a waterside worker, which appears to be the deciding factor to the Government in this question!

Hon. G. F. R. NICKLIN (Landsborough—Premier) (10.19 p.m.): Parliament tonight has disposed of the first nomination for the election of a Senator to replace the late Dr. Poulter. It has been decided that the first nominee was not acceptable to Parliament. During the debate on the first nomination, I feel that hon. members opposite were endeavouring to confuse the issue. It will be remembered that when we met on the first occasion on 25 September the issue was not whether we should accept Mr. Arnell as a Senate representative, but whether this Parliament should have its constitutional right to make a choice.

In asking the A.L.P. to submit nominations, we recognised that they were entitled to do so because the late Dr. Poulter was a member of the A.L.P. We asked the A.L.P. to give us a choice, but they did not give the House that right. Consequently, on 25 September, when we first met to elect a Senator, the issue was not whether Mr. Arnell was to be the Senator but that the A.L.P. had denied the House the opportunity of making a choice. The A.L.P., not the Government, created the issue. On that occasion, I quite rightly confined all my remarks to the fact that the A.L.P. had denied this Parliament the right of making a choice. I made it perfectly clear that, irrespective of the merits or demerits of the sole A.L.P. nominee on that occasion, the Government would not accept him because the nomination had been made by the A.L.P. with the idea of denying the House the right of making a choice.

Tonight, at the invitation of the Leader of the Opposition, I did indicate the reasons why the Government did not favour the

first nominee submitted by them. I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition is so difficult to please. On the last occasion on which we met he put on quite a turn because I did not say anything about Mr. Arnell. On this occasion, because I did say something about Mr. Arnell and gave reasons—very cogent reasons, might I say—why we could not support his candidature, he was again very annoyed. Anything that I said tonight can be said outside the House. All I said related to the political record of Mr. Arnell, and not one hon. member opposite can deny the truth of anything that I said about him.

Mr. Lloyd: Yes, we can.

Mr. NICKLIN: The facts are on record. As we have now been given the right to make a choice, as we requested, members of the Government parties intend to make a choice from the two names that have been submitted, and we intend to support the nomination of Mr. Whiteside because we consider that he is the better of the two candidates nominated by the A.L.P.

That is the attitude of the Government parties on the question, and that is the way in which we will vote.

Hon. P. J. R. HILTON (Carnarvon) (10.24 p.m.): I rise to speak against the nomination. If ever the Government has been in an inconsistent position, it is in it now. Tonight the Premier gave his reasons for the rejection of Mr. Arnell, and among those reasons he mentioned unity tickets and other aspects of the political record of Mr. Arnell. Now he says he is quite agreeable to accept the nomination of Mr. Whiteside, a gentleman who has been president of the Queensland Central Executive of the A.L.P. for the past four years or thereabouts, and during that time unity tickets have been in operation not only for positions in the Waterside Workers' Federation but for positions in other unions. Mr. Whiteside, the president of the Q.C.E., has taken no action to preserve the good name of the Australian Labour Party. He has in fact condoned and supported by his actions the running of these unity tickets, which means, of course, that A.L.P. men and Communists run together and share the leadership, as has been stated time and time again. Is it not extraordinary that a man who has supported that policy and has not raised one finger against it should now be acceptable to the Government?

Mr. Nicklin: Can you give us any members of the Labour Party who do not accept that principle?

Mr. HILTON: At the moment I should say that there are some members of the A.L.P.—some, not a great number—but if the Premier wanted to make a thorough search I think he could find a few who do, at least in private conversation with me and with

other people, decry in unmistakable terms the "running sore" of these unity tickets, to use a phrase used by Dr. Evatt years ago.

We now have the ridiculous position that on the one hand a man is rejected because he runs on unity tickets with the Communists, and on the other hand we are asked to accept a man who condoned, as president of the executive of the A.L.P., that very dangerous policy.

Apart altogether from that aspect, the point I will mention now is very important and should receive even greater consideration from the Premier and his colleagues than the matter of unity tickets. I refer to the fact that Mr. Whiteside, in common now with all the A.L.P., has accepted the firm policy and principle that the A.L.P. executive, an outside body, can dictate to any member of their party in Parliament as to what stand he shall take on any matter, whether they be in Opposition or in Government. They have accepted the policy that the organisation—the executive of their party—can dictate to members of Parliament in the implementation of legislation or on any other matter.

Mr. Mann: Santamaria dictated to you.

Mr. HILTON: Nobody has ever dictated to me. As a matter of fact, the whole sorry cause of the split in the A.L.P. was on the question of dictation and if anyone is inclined to think that I and the colleagues who stood firm with me and with the former Premier on the matter of dictation were wrong, I wish to refer them to, and will be happy to give them, a publication issued by the British Labour Party on this vicious policy designed to destroy democratic government.

I wrote to England to get from Mr. Gaitskell, the Leader of the Labour Party over there, all the information he could supply me with on the matter of their executive or their conferences dictating to the Labour Party when they were in government. Not only did he send me a galley proof of his major speech against this principle at the last conference they had—and I am referring to one about two or three years ago—but he also sent me a fairly extensive booklet published by the British Labour Party dealing with this question of direction and pointing out the number of occasions that it arose at their conventions and at other places. That contained proof that all along the line, all through the years, the British Labour Party has stood four-square against a policy of the executive or conferences dictating to or directing it on the implementation of any legislation.

I submit that here tonight we are doing a dangerous thing in electing to the Senate of the Commonwealth a man who supports a policy of dictation, particularly in view of the critical international situation that prevails now. I repeat that we are doing a dangerous thing in electing a man to the

Senate who will accept a direction as to how he should vote on foreign policy, or any other major matter, from the Federal Executive of a party that is not responsible to the electors of Queensland. That dangerous position is not fully realised by the people generally because unfortunately the daily Press, by and large, has never informed the public about this dangerous policy which is now official with the Australian Labour Party.

I rose to express my opposition to the election of Mr. Whiteside on the grounds that he has condoned unity tickets and that he is a supporter of the policy of direction from the executive of the party. I think Government members are most inconsistent in agreeing to accept him as a suitable man to represent the State.

Principles are never killed by the passage of time. I never like to bring up personal issues, but certain people have said that things happened so many years ago and that it is all in the past. It is true that time passes and that, by and large, members of the public may have short memories, but the passing of time never alters in any way the vital essence of sound democratic principles. I do not worry one iota about my own political future. I have to live with my conscience. If and when I retire from public life and from this Assembly I will be able to say that always, as a true Labour man and as a true democrat, I fought to uphold the very basic principle underlying our parliamentary system of democratic Government. I make no apology for that. I regret to see that we have this unholy combination of the two parties tonight selecting a man who believes in that policy of direction.

I have expressed my views. In order to be consistent with my attitude right from the start, I did not vote on the previous motion. Knowing that I am in a small but honourable minority, I am not going to call a division on this motion.

Mr. AIKENS (Townsville South) (10.33 p.m.): I sincerely hope that in this particular debate we are not to have from any hon. member an irresponsible fanatical and frenetic exhibition such as we have all witnessed here tonight by the Leader of the Opposition. He said that I did the dirty, filthy work—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! That matter has been disposed of.

Mr. AIKENS: To be consistent in my belief that this House should not vote anybody into the Senate as the first step towards the abolition of the Senate, I am going to walk out of the House when the motion is put. The Labour Party will vote with the Tories on this motion. Who will then be doing the dirty, filthy work of the Tories? None other than the A.L.P. They will walk over and vote with the Tories just as they always do.

I think I can speak for perhaps the most highly-industrialised and working-class electorate in Queensland. I doubt whether there is an electorate in Queensland more completely working-class than Townsville South. After the last redistribution, of course, there was much elation in the ranks of the A.L.P. when they found that places that voted A.L.P. ever since the blacks were bad—centres like South Townsville, Railway Estate, Oonoonba, Stuart, and Cluden—were all included in the new Townsville South electorate. After the Leader of the Opposition went up there he came back and influenced the Press to such an extent that "The Courier-Mail" said that I had only a rough chance of winning. He told the Press that Aikens was gone at last and Bill Edmonds would do him like a dinner, but I beat Bill Edmonds by more votes than he got, in the strongest working-class electorate in Queensland. I beat the strongest Labour candidate ever put up against me by more than two to one.

Mr. Houston: What has this to do with the election of a Senator?

Mr. AIKENS: Does that hurt the hon. member? I can support a claim that I speak as a dinky-die Labour man in this House because I received one of the largest majorities ever received by any man at an election in the strongest Labour electorate in Queensland, and hon. members opposite cannot deny it. The electors voted for me and they will do so again because they know I am a dinky-die Labour man and a dinky-die trade-unionist. They will not have an A.L.P. man because they know that today with the new-look 1962 vintage A.L.P., the initials A.L.P. stand for "Artificial Labour Party".

Reference has been made to Communism in the Q.C.E. and some suggestion has been made by the hon. member for Carnarvon that the nominee before the House at present is inferentially a Communist because he has done nothing to stop the unity tickets that circulate among Labour men in their union ballots.

I can clearly remember—and it is most amazing that the Leader of the Opposition raised this in the last debate—the Communist Convention at Southport. All the top-ranking Soviet delegates were there, because I was discussing the matter in the Chamber when the Chairman of Committees was in the chair, and he ruled me out of order and ordered me to resume my seat. I moved that I be further heard to deal with the attitude of the Government towards that Communist convention and every member of the Australian Labour Party walked out rather than vote that I be further heard. That is on record in "Hansard". They walked out on me because they did not want me to castigate the Government on their collaboration with the Communists. That is true. As a matter of fact, it was the hon. member for Brisbane who tipped me off that I could move that I be further

heard. I moved that I be further heard and then the lot of them walked out of the Chamber and left me high and dry.

I do not believe in conducting Red-smear tactics because I know how easy it is to point a finger at anybody and say he is a Communist. This matter was raised by the hon. member for Kedron, who said that I was expelled from the A.L.P. because of Communist collaboration. I told hon. members truthfully why I was expelled from the Hermit Park branch of the A.L.P. and I crave your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to tell the House just how the North Queensland Labour Party came into existence. I speak for that party on this occasion. It was originally the Hermit Park branch of the A.L.P. and instructions were received from the Q.C.E. that a certain member was not to be admitted to the branch meetings because the Q.C.E. accused him of collaboration with the Communists. I was not then a member of the branch, having been expelled previously for the reasons I have given. However, the Hermit Park branch of the A.L.P. decided to stick to this man and admit him to branch meetings, whereupon the Q.C.E. de-registered the Hermit Park branch of the A.L.P. because it admitted this man who was branded as a Communist collaborator. As time marched on, that man left the Hermit Park branch of the A.L.P., which had then become the North Queensland Labour Party, and almost immediately he was admitted to the A.L.P. Only recently the Q.C.E. of the A.L.P. gave that man a gold medal for a lifetime of service and loyalty to the A.L.P. That is the man over whom the Hermit Park branch of the A.L.P. was de-registered, which led later to the North Queensland Labour Party being formed. The presentation of the gold medal to this man was given a full page coverage in the "New Age", or the "New Era", or the "New Dillpot", or whatever the official A.L.P. paper is called.

Hon. members opposite have accused me of collaboration with the Tories. I ask the Leader of the Opposition how often he has approached the Leader of the Liberal Party in this House, pleading, crawling, snivelling and genuflecting to him, offering to collaborate with him if the Liberals run a candidate for Townsville South.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I remind the hon. member for Townsville South, if he cannot realise the fact, that we are not dealing with his election but with the nomination for the election of Mr. Whiteside to the Senate. I ask him to please continue with the debate before the House; otherwise I will have to ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. AIKENS: I thought I would reply to the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader.

Let me say this about Mr. Whiteside: I know him; I do not think that his best friend would claim that he was either a

dinky-die trade-unionist or a dinky-die Labour man; but this House, with the collaboration between the A.L.P. and the Tories, which we frequently see, will elect him to the Senate. I do not know that he will be any worse than some of the A.L.P. Senators he will meet there. To be quite candid, he will be going to meet men of his own class when he goes down there and commutes with Senator I. C. Moore—pardon me, Mr. Speaker, Senator Dittmer. And of course he will be there in a spirit of camaraderie with Senator Benn, a glorious creature who knocked down an age-pensioner at one of his—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. AIKENS: I was going to tell how the age-pensioner got up and knocked him down. He will meet, of course, the notorious A.L.P. Senator Cant, who was responsible for one of the most disgraceful scenes ever staged in the Senate Chamber. He will meet there, too—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! We are not dealing at the present time with the characters of the members of the Senate. There is one person we are exclusively interested in, and that is Mr. Whiteside. Will the hon. member please continue in the vein of the question before the House, namely, the election of Mr. Whiteside to the Senate.

Mr. AIKENS: I regret that you will not allow me to deal with an alcoholic oaf named Hendrickson, who vomited his filth at my public meetings during the last State election campaign, but he will be a good mate for Mr. Whiteside. I cannot deal, of course, with Senator Aylett, the magician of the A.L.P.; you have ruled that out.

Once again I appeal to the House not to do this thing. I appeal to the House to join with me and strike a blow for the abolition of the Senate. We know that it is an excrescence; we know that it is a financial burden that the people of Australia can no longer carry; we know that it no longer serves its original purpose. That is why, when the A.L.P. go across and vote with the Tories, as they usually do, I am again going to walk out rather than vote for the election of anybody to the Senate. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I will be up on the platform at the Regent Theatre at the first available opportunity, with hundreds of workers cheering me on, and telling them why I did it.

Mr. WALSH (Bundaberg) (10.43 p.m.): When the matter of the vacancy in the Senate was discussed approximately a fortnight ago, I did make an observation as

to whether we were properly constituted as a Parliament. You, Mr. Speaker, very rightly got up and said—

“I remind the hon. member for Bundaberg that the procedure carried out here tonight is under the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly and that any question of the legality of the proceedings is not one for decision by this Parliament.”

With the latter part of your statement I entirely agree, but I still say—and I only want it to go on record—that there is a doubt, in my mind anyhow, as to whether we are properly constituted as a Parliament. Let me refer hon. members in the first place to Standing Order No. 26, which says—

“The House shall from time to time appoint the days and the hour of each day on which it will meet for the despatch of business.”

I put it to the House as at present constituted that at no time did the House determine the time, the hour, or the place for a discussion on this question. I do not want to labour the point except to put on record, with which I do not think anybody will disagree, that Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order No. 331, took it upon himself to nominate the time and place. I leave from there on in the hands of the lawyers whether this meeting has been properly constituted. Secondly, I understand—and on this I speak subject to correction because I was not in the Chamber at the time—that at 6 p.m., when the Premier moved the adjournment, it was that the House adjourn till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. Nicklin: No, I did not.

Mr. WALSH: I have the Premier's correction that that is not so, which is a contradiction of the statement that was made to me. If I had not been given that correction, I was going to say that, if the House was adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow, I do not know how we come to be meeting now as a House.

Mr. Hanlon: Why would it be necessary for Standing Order No. 331 to state specifically that the meeting shall be presided over by the Speaker? If the other Standing Orders applied, the Speaker would naturally preside.

Mr. WALSH: In reply to the hon. member for Baroona, all I can say in fairness to you, Mr. Speaker, is that you did ask the House whether Standing Orders generally applied to this debate.

Mr. Hanlon: But the point I make is that Standing Order No. 331 states specifically that the meeting shall be presided over by the Speaker. If the House is meeting as a House, the Speaker naturally would preside.

Mr. WALSH: Having made my point, I draw attention to Standing Order No. 26.

Mr. Hart: Don't you think that it depends on section 15 of the Constitution, not Standing Orders?

Mr. WALSH: Here we have the Q.C. from Mt. Gravatt.

The question now arises of whether we are properly constituted as a Parliament under the terms of section 15 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

Mr. Nicklin: We will never settle that here.

Mr. WALSH: I agree, but the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt made his point, and I want it to be clear that my point consistently has been that we cannot meet the requirements of section 15 of the Commonwealth Constitution as we have only one House. Legal opinion may ultimately be produced to prove that it is competent for one House to do these things. All I do is raise the question that I raised earlier in the debate. The hon. member for Mt. Gravatt can argue that with his legal friends.

Mr. Hart: I do not want to argue it; all I want to do is to stop the rubbish and get on with the election.

Mr. WALSH: Having had to listen to so much rubbish from the hon. member for Mt. Gravatt, I do not think that it is too much to ask him to listen to a little from me.

I do not want to go into the question of debating the nomination that I have submitted, because that would be completely out of order. I do think, however, that I should at least put on record whom this person is, because the Premier has already indicated, since he is going to enter into a unity pact with the A.L.P. to bring about the election of Mr. Whiteside to this vacancy, that there is no chance at all of my colt getting a run.

I have had the feeling here tonight that at the summit meeting of the two parties before this meeting tonight, the Premier would have cracked the whip and said, "All of you members must vote for Mr. Whiteside."

Mr. Nicklin: No.

Mr. WALSH: There is still hope if the Premier denies that that was done. Has no direction been given to Government members?

Mr. Nicklin: No. We do not give directions to our members.

Mr. WALSH: As a matter of fact, in fairness to the person nominated by me, the Premier himself is one who should cross the House and vote for him, because he knows him. He is a highly desirable citizen and is well qualified to hold the position. He is an alderman of the Bundaberg City Council—

Mr. Lloyd: You are getting out of order.

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker will tell me if I am out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I was about to tell the hon. member that he is out of order. He is not in order in discussing his own nomination until the meeting has disposed of this nomination.

Mr. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, you know that I always respect your rulings.

I will give reasons from different points of view why I think Mr. Whiteside should not be elected. He was originally very active in the work against Communists in this State. As a matter of fact, he was one of three persons in Queensland who constituted what was known as the Industrial Group organisation at that time. It had no official backing from the Q.C.E. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that it was associated with a southern organisation, or at least with people from the South who used to come up here and discuss these matters. Its three members were actively identified with this voluntary organisation, if I might put it that way.

Mr. Lloyd interjected.

Mr. WALSH: I do not think that the hon. member for Kedron can tell me anything about these activities.

Mr. Lloyd: I realise that you know a great deal about them.

Mr. WALSH: The three members of the organisation were my great friend Dick Riordan, George Whiteside, and Joe Bukowski.

An Opposition Member: They frightened you.

Mr. WALSH: I have not yet reached the stage where I am frightened of anybody. I am just showing that Mr. Whiteside was originally a person who was actively engaged in fighting Communism. I will say for George Whiteside that at least up till the split in the party his activities were generally directed to that end. I cannot say that since the split he has completely divorced himself from association with people who are actively identified with the Communist Party. I will not go into the question now of whether or not he was pushed out of the Industrial Group organisation by anybody, because I do not know

whether he was pushed out. I do know that nobody pushed me out of it. I got out of it how and when I saw fit to do so.

In reply to an observation by the hon. member for Carnarvon when referring to the structure of the A.L.P. today, the Premier asked if there was anybody in the A.L.P. who could be accepted as being against this principle of direction. I would say, "Yes." Thirty members—Mr. Whiteside was not one of them; he was in the opposite camp—voted against it, and the branch secretary of the Australian Workers' Union voted against the show-cause and the expulsion, but stuck to the decision of the majority of the Q.C.E. when it was made. I have no fault to find with that, but the Premier must remember that every member of the Q.C.E. who made this selection is not contaminated in the same way, although for different reasons. That goes for the branch president of the A.W.U., too.

Mention has been made of the infiltration of Communists into the A.L.P. The Government does not need to supply that information, nor need I supply it. The A.L.P. supplied the information itself, because only recently a man who openly announced that he had been a member of the Communist Party and had not joined the A.L.P. till 1959 was made a member of the Q.C.E. and took part in the selection of this candidate.

Mr. Hanlon: Wasn't Laurie Short a member of the Communist Party once? Wasn't Douglas Hyde a member of the Communist Party once?

Mr. WALSH: Quite true.

Mr. Hanlon: Are you condemning them for all time?

Mr. WALSH: I am not. All I am saying is that men are getting into the A.L.P. not with the idea of assisting in any way the progress and development of the Australian Labour movement.

An Opposition Member: How do you know?

Mr. WALSH: I will tell the hon. member how I know. It has already been pointed out that different people have been refused admission even to a convention on the vote of industrial people, not on the vote of politicians.

On the matter of the selection of Mr. Whiteside as a nominee, having an admission that these men have been accepted into the party, why ask this Parliament to approve of a selection that has been made by people who are contaminated with Communist ideology? I do not fall for it. Any other member can please himself what he does about it. I am not asking hon. members to follow my particular line of thinking. All I am doing is presenting my views on the subject.

Mr. Hanlon: In other words, you want Communists to stay Communists. You want the Russians and the Chinese to stay Communists, too.

Mr. WALSH: I think the hon. member for Baroona would be like me. He would suspect anybody who has given almost lifelong service to the Communist Party if he suddenly found him within his own particular circle. I have no doubt he would do that. I am not decrying any person changing over from Communist to Labour, or from Labour to Liberal; that goes on and it is anyone's right to do it.

Mr. Lloyd: Then what are you talking about?

Mr. WALSH: I am talking about democracy and I want to know why, if the A.L.P. are so violently opposed to Communism, they accept these people into their fold, apparently without question.

Mr. Lloyd interjected.

Mr. WALSH: Quite true. I am not responsible for what the Liberal Party might do in nominating a Communist. If that is the case, they are just as bad.

Mr. Hanlon: Are you condemning the entry of Laurie Short into the A.L.P.?

Mr. WALSH: What they do in New South Wales has nothing to do with me. I am concerned with the selection of a candidate by the Q.C.E., which has within its circle certain people who have admitted that they have been continuously members of the Communist Party until recent times. I fear that the A.L.P. will get into greater difficulty as a result of the Premier and his Government backing the A.L.P. in its selection. The Premier may be doing it deliberately. He may see that, with Mr. Whiteside's selection, a vacancy will be created in the presidency of the Q.C.E. From here on the activities of the extreme Left or the "near-Comms" who have been accepted into the A.L.P., will be evident. Just watch them from now on and see who is appointed to fill the vacancy created by the appointment of Mr. Whiteside to this position.

Mr. Lloyd: Who said there was a vacancy?

Mr. WALSH: I know enough about the Australian Labour Party methods to know that they are not going to retain a Senator as president of the Q.C.E.—not by any means!

Mr. Hanlon: You are a bit out of date. You have been in another political party since you were in the A.L.P.

Mr. WALSH: I am living with my conscience and I wish the hon. member for Baroona would live with his.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Bundaberg is trying my patience, too. This is not a discussion on the election of the president of the Q.C.E.; this is the election of a Senator.

Mr. WALSH: I am making the point that if Mr. Whiteside is elected to the vacancy in the Senate, there will be a vacancy on the executive of the A.L.P.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Parliament is not responsible for that.

Mr. WALSH: I am endeavouring to give reasons why he should not be accepted. I have already stated some of the reasons—that his selection has been made by a body that is contaminated with Communist ideology. On the other hand, I am entitled to give the reason that if this man is appointed it will create a vacancy. Why not leave him there? Why should anyone ask me to vote for him if it will have the effect of creating a vacancy to which a Communist might be appointed?

The second point is that Mr. Whiteside obviously will have to vacate his position in his union. Of course, that is his business, but I only hope that those people who are talking so much about the infiltration of Communists into the trade-union movement and the A.L.P. will ensure that no Communist is elected to the official position of secretary of the F.E.D. and F.A. If the Trades Hall boys feel that Bill Lang should be there, he is the man they will put there. But if they want to put a Communist in to tie up the network for disruption throughout industry at an appropriate time, they will put the man in they want whether Bill Lang likes it or not. Those are some of the reasons why we should leave Mr. Whiteside where he is and make no attempt to remove him from those positions. I have spoken against his election. How I will vote on the motion is a matter that I will decide later on.

Mr. LLOYD (Kedron) (11.2 p.m.), in reply: I do not think there is a great deal I need reply to, but I should like to say that quite obviously the hon. member for Bundaberg is suffering somewhat from nostalgia. No doubt he decided to give some reasons against the appointment of Mr. Whiteside. His only reasons were contained in an involved argument about the creation of a vacancy on the Q.C.E. if Mr. Whiteside is appointed as a Senator. As far as I know, the hon. member for Bundaberg has no say in whether there is a vacancy on the Q.C.E. or in the way any such vacancy should be filled. Possibly he was suffering from nostalgia, too, when he referred to Mr. Whiteside's position as secretary of the F.E.D. and F.A. and who should be appointed to that position should it become vacant.

The hon. member proceeded to give some reasons why Mr. Whiteside should not be appointed. It was true, as he said, that originally Mr. Whiteside was very active in the formation of the Industrial Group movement in Queensland. In fact he was one of three who were very active at that time. That development took place round about 1946 or 1947, possibly later. The Industrial Group movement was formed not within the A.L.P. but from outside the A.L.P. to overcome the Communist domination of certain unions.

Mr. Whiteside was very successful until he found that he was being forced out by people from the South who tried to make it an all-embracing movement over the whole of Australia, completely outside politics. That was the reason for his being forced out of the organisation at that time. I think Mr. Whiteside is quite capable of telling the whole story about that matter.

The hon. member said also that he did not accept the fact that Mr. Whiteside had forgotten any of his anti-Communist principles. I agree that he has proved over the years in the industrial movement that he is an active anti-Communist. No doubt what he has done in the past he will continue to do in the future.

The hon. member spoke about whether the Parliament was properly constituted. Whether it is properly constituted or not, the fact remains that we are placed in the position of having to select a Senator to replace the late Dr. Poulter. We have that duty under the Commonwealth legislation. Whether or not the matter is legally arguable does not concern me. The fact is that we are meeting here as members of Parliament to select a Senator. I realise that according to the Votes and Proceedings and the minutes and journals of Parliament, there is no record of this meeting, or of the previous meeting, but there is contained in "Hansard" a full record of everything said and decided at those meetings. Whether we are legally constituted or not should not concern them is whether the Commonwealth legislation dictates that we should meet in conference to select a replacement Senator.

I do not think that the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville South merit a reply. He has made a number of wild statements about the A.L.P. I accept his statement about his expulsion from the A.L.P. that it was not he, but someone else who was supposed to be a Communist-supporter at that time. I accept that, and I also accept his explanation that he has not been opposed in any general election by a member of the Liberal Party.

Mr. AIKENS: I rise to a point of order just to keep the record straight. I have contested seven elections and in four of them

I was opposed by both a Liberal candidate and a Labour candidate. In 1953 I beat both of them combined. It is a matter of indifference to me whether or not the Liberals select a candidate to stand against me.

Mr. LLOYD: I accept the hon. member's explanation. I am prepared to do that.

The hon. member for Carnarvon made a rather surprising speech. When Mr. Arnell's nomination came before hon. members he said that he would like to see him brought before the Bar of the House so that he could make his own explanation about some of the accusations levelled against him, and when his request was not acceded to he decided he would not cast a vote. However, when it came to Mr. Whiteside he said that he must oppose the nomination and his reason was something about unity tickets. On the one hand he said that because Arnell was accused of certain things by Government members he would like to see him brought before the Bar. His request was not acceded to so he left the Chamber and refrained from voting, but because Mr. Whiteside is president of the Q.C.E., and because of the unity tickets business, he said he did not think he was the right man to be appointed as Senator and therefore he would oppose him. Where is the consistency in that argument? Perhaps he would like him to be brought before the Bar to be heard.

For the information of hon. members, I will now quote several extracts from a Press statement about these unity tickets. It is a statement by Mr. Whiteside in 1961 as president of the Q.C.E. when this question of unity tickets and the Waterside Workers' Federation was first raised. This is in complete rebuttal of the statements of the hon. member for Carnarvon. The "Telegraph" article states in headlines—

"Unity Tickets in Wharfie Ballot"
and then continues—

"Unity tickets were being issued freely at the headquarters of the Brisbane Branch of the Waterside Workers' Federation today, when the annual ballot for officials of the union took place.

"The union secretary, Mr. P. Healy, who is the representative of the union on the Queensland Central Executive of the A.L.P., said it would be foolish to deny there were tickets being distributed and he was aware of three of them by 'Progressives' and others. He did not know if there was one by the Communist Party.

"He and other A.L.P. members had nothing to do with them and completely dissociated themselves from them.

"No permission had been given by any A.L.P. man for his name to be on a ticket."

This is the portion relative to the statement of the hon. member for Carnarvon about Mr. Whiteside—

"The Q.C.E. President, Mr. G. Whiteside, today . . . stated, 'They know the policy of the A.L.P. as well as anyone else. They know the A.L.P. is firmly against unity tickets and that this policy was fixed by Federal Convention.'

"Mr. Whiteside said that if the names of A.L.P. members appeared on unity tickets, such matters would be dealt with by the Q.C.E. at the appropriate time."

The hon. member for Carnarvon said that Mr. Whiteside had not taken any action in the matter. There is his statement.

May I deal also with this particular unity ticket, because I intend to quote from another "Telegraph" statement relating to the same occasion—and this will concern the hon. member for Carnarvon who, I believe, is the parliamentary Leader of the Q.L.P. For the information of the hon. member for Carnarvon and other hon. members in the Chamber, this was published in the "Telegraph" of 3 July, 1961—

"Red Link at Poll

"A Unity ticket circulated before voting began in the election of officers for the Brisbane Branch of the Waterside Workers' Federation today contained the names of Communists and members of the A.L.P."

We stop there and see how these things can happen, how the Press can distort matters. Those are the headlines but further down the article goes on to state that both A.L.P. members and Q.L.P. members were associated on the same ticket. In other words, they were placed there by whoever they were, progressives or Communists, but they were placed there on those tickets without their permission.

That was the ticket upon which the name of Mr. Arnell appeared. In other words, there were a couple of Q.L.P. members; there were no Communists on the tickets. The argument of the hon. member for Carnarvon falls completely to the ground. In the first place, the name of no member of the A.L.P. would appear without the sanction of the Australian Labour Party.

Mr. Hilton interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member for Carnarvon picks on words.

Subsequent to that statement there was a decision of the Federal conference of the Australian Labour Party outlawing unity tickets for Labour men.

The hon. member for Carnarvon made some vague statements relating to so-called direction of A.L.P. members of Parliament. As the Leader of the Opposition said, he has been in the wilderness so long now that I do not think he knows or understands the Labour Party any more, so we can dismiss him.

Mr. Nicklin interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: The Premier should remain silent on the subject of direction, considering what he has to put up with. I hope he will not provoke me into an argument about direction as far as he is concerned, or the Government parties. We could go on for a long time, and it is already a quarter past 11. He has intimated that he intends to support the nomination of Mr. Whiteside and I am quite happy about it, but I hope that he will not continue interjecting about direction.

Mr. Dewar interjected.

Mr. LLOYD: If the head-scratching hon. member for Wavell is going to provoke me into an argument about direction of members of Parliament, we could say quite a lot about the Premier and members of the Cabinet, particularly over recent months, as well as over the last five years. We could talk of direction at Country Party or Liberal Party headquarters.

The arguments that have been put forward about Mr. Whiteside have been very vague. We could not find anything in them to show that there was anything wrong with the nomination. We could not find anything in the arguments of the hon. member for Bundaberg, and the arguments of the hon. member for Townsville South were a desperate move on his part to try to overcome a great deal of the criticism he is meeting with round Townsville at the present time for his attitude. He is trying to crawl into favour with the Liberal Party on this.

The Premier has not introduced any fresh matter. The Leader of the Opposition has replied on the nomination of Mr. Arnell to the arguments put forward by the Premier. I accept the Premier's statement that the Government parties, not Parliament—I repeat "not Parliament"—will accept the nomination of Mr. Whiteside.

Mr. Sullivan: Wouldn't you say that he is a better man than Arnell?

Mr. LLOYD: The hon. member who interjects knows as well as I do that the only reason why Mr. Arnell's nomination was not acceptable to the Government parties is that he was a waterside worker. They dislike waterside workers so much that they would not accept one as a Senator. I accept the Premier's assurance that the Government parties will support this nomination.

Question—That the motion (Mr. Lloyd) be agreed to—put.

Mr. WALSH: I rise to a point of order. Before you declare the ballot, Mr. Speaker, might I draw your attention to Standing Order No. 148, which reads—

"When on a Division taking place, fewer than five Members appear on one side, Mr. Speaker shall forthwith declare the resolution of the House."

All I want to know from you, Mr. Speaker, is whether you have adopted this unusual course to meet the requirements of Standing Order No. 331?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I have adopted it in accordance with Standing Order No. 331, which calls for an open vote.

IN FAVOUR: 59

Mr. Adair	Mr. Inch
" Armstrong	" Knox
" Beardmore	" Lloyd
" Bennett	" Lonergan
" Bjelke-Petersen	" Low
" Bromley	" Mann
" Burrows	" Marsden
" Camm	" Melloy
" Campbell	" Munro
" Carey	" Newton
" Chalk	" Nicholson
" Davies	" Nicklin
" Dean	" O'Donnell
Dr. Delamothe	" Pilbeam
Mr. Donald	" Rae
" Dufficy	" Ramsden
" Duggan	" Richter
" Evans	" Row
" Ewan	" Sherrington
" Gaven	" Smith
" Gunn	" Sullivan
" Hanlon	" Thackeray
" Harrison	" Tooth
" Hart	" Wallace
" Hewitt	" Wharton
" Hiley	" Windsor
" Hodges	
" Hooper	
" Houghton	
" Houston	
" Hughes	

Tellers:

Mr. Dewar
" Tucker

AGAINST: 2

Mr. Hilton Mr. Walsh

Motion agreed to.

ELECTION OF GEORGE IRVINE WHITESIDE

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I now declare Mr. George Irvine Whiteside elected to hold the place in the Senate of the Parliament of the Commonwealth rendered vacant by the death of Senator Maxwell William Poulter.

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

"That Mr. Speaker be requested to inform His Excellency the Governor forthwith that Mr. George Irvine Whiteside has been chosen to hold the place in the Senate rendered vacant by the death of Senator Maxwell William Poulter."

Motion agreed to.

The meeting adjourned at 11.28 p.m.