

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**FRIDAY, 22 NOVEMBER 1907**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 22 NOVEMBER, 1907.

The SPEAKER (Hon. John Leahy, *Bulloo*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

CAPTAIN KENT AND FRASER ISLAND.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): It will be remembered that some weeks ago a charge was made against me, when I was administering the Lands Department, by the *Brisbane Courier*, in connection with an application made by an individual who called himself Captain Kent, in regard to the Fraser Island matter. I have laid two batches of papers on the table of the House in connection with the matter, and I now ask leave of the Chamber to lay upon the table the final batch of papers in connection with the matter which have recently come into my hands.

The SPEAKER: Under these circumstances I think it is a reasonable request. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member should lay the papers on the table?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: These papers, which I now lay on the table, show that Captain Kent is a man who has served four terms of imprisonment, and the particulars regarding the character of the man who made those charges against me which were reproduced by the *Courier* will be found in the papers. I move that the papers be printed.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Privilege?

Mr. BELL: It is not privilege.  
Question put and passed.

ORDER FOR RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

PROPOSED RESTORATION TO PAPER.

The PREMIER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*), who was received with Government "Hear, hears," said: I move—

That the Order for the resumption of the Committee of Supply be restored to the paper.

I move this motion in order that I may afterwards move, with the permission of the House, that a Supply Bill be passed through all its stages. Some days ago I informed the House that the Governor had been pleased to grant a dissolution. In order that we may go to the country, I now propose to ask the House for the necessary Supply, so that all the services may be carried on without any loss to the public service and without any inconvenience to the country. It is usual, after the defeat of the Ministry and in view of a dissolution, to ask for a grant of Supply.

Mr. BOWMAN: Why are you there?

The PREMIER: I hope the House will grant Supply. It has always been the custom in England to grant Supply under these circumstances.

Mr. BOWMAN: Not to a minority.

The PREMIER: I hope the House will grant the Supply asked for. The date of the dissolution has already been fixed. The Governor, in the exercise of his prerogative, has been graciously pleased to grant a dissolution on my recommendation, and I want it to be clearly understood that, if there is going to be any abuse at all, hon. members should abuse me. I take upon myself the whole responsibility.

Mr. BOWMAN: You can stand a lot of it.

*Mr. Bell.*

The PREMIER: The Governor, in the exercise of his prerogative in a quite constitutional way, has granted a dissolution. Now I ask the House to vote Supply to carry on the public service until we can meet the House again. The elections will take place as soon as possible, and as soon as the elections are over Parliament will be called together. No time will be lost. I hope that when we go to the country we shall be back here in January. It is not very likely that we shall be away more than two or three months at the very outside. I would rather have passed the Estimates that are now before the House, have passed the railway plans, and have gone on with the necessary work this session, and have met the House again early next year. But the House, in its wisdom, refused to grant Supply. My motion now is to put the Order for the Resumption of Committee of Supply on the paper, in order that I may afterwards move the suspension of the Standing Orders, with the view of getting Supply for the next two or three months.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*), who was received with Opposition and Labour "Hear, hears!" said: Mr. Speaker, I think before we restore the Order for the Resumption of Committee of Supply to the business-paper, this House has a very important duty to perform. Under all the circumstances of this case I think the House will be well within its rights to advise His Excellency direct at the present time. I therefore move as an amendment, that all the words after "That," in the motion just moved by the Premier, be omitted, with the view of inserting the following:—

To His Excellency the Right Honourable FREDERIC JOHN NAPIER, Baron Chelmsford of Chelmsford, in the County of Essex, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Governor of the State of Queensland and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

We, His Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, in Parliament assembled, desire to assure Your Excellency of our continued loyalty and affection to the Throne and Person of our Most Gracious Sovereign.

We venture to approach Your Excellency upon a subject which we deem to be of the utmost importance to the welfare of the State—a subject upon which we have reason to fear that Your Excellency has been misinformed.

On Wednesday, 20th instant, the Premier, the Hon. Robert Philp, informed this House—

I gave His Excellency to understand that there was no possible hope of carrying on good government with the condition of parties as they are in this House at the present time.

So inaccurate a statement made to Your Excellency is calculated to mislead Your Excellency, and we therefore deem it our duty to submit, with the greatest respect, the following statement of facts for the consideration of Your Excellency:—

- (1) This Assembly was elected on the 18th May, 1907, and met for the despatch of business on 23rd July—and therefore it is a most recent expression of the will of the country;
- (2) During the last four years there has manifested in the Legislative Council a spirit of obstruction to the measures sent up by this House, which obstruction has in the present session become so pronounced that our obligations to the country make it imperative that we should find a remedy;
- (3) With this object in view, the Kidston Ministry, supported by a majority of this House, accordingly advised Your Excellency to recognise the principle that there resided in the Crown the power to nominate to the Legislative Council such a number of new members as might be required to overcome obstruction, and that such power should be exercised if, in the opinion of Your Excellency's responsible advisers, such a course became necessary;

- (4) That on Your Excellency declining to accede to this request the Kidston Ministry resigned, and Your Excellency then asked Mr. Philp to form a Government and carry on the work of administration;
- (5) That on Mr. Philp meeting this House on Tuesday, 12th instant, this House refused to adjourn at his request, and next day (that is at the earliest moment the forms of the House permitted) unanimously passed a resolution expressing the disapproval of this House at the contemplated change in Your Excellency's advisers;

(Government laughter.)

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON:

- (6) That Your Excellency thereupon sent for Mr. Kidston and requested him to ask the Assembly to grant an adjournment from Thursday till Tuesday to give Mr. Philp an opportunity of forming a Ministry, which adjournment was, on the motion of Mr. Kidston, agreed to by this House;

Mr. ARMSTRONG: At His Excellency's request.

Mr. KIDSTON:

- (7) That Mr. Philp and the new Ministry met the House on Tuesday, 19th instant, and asked for Supply, which this House at once refused. In spite of this, Mr. Philp continued to carry on the work of administration, and on Wednesday, 20th instant, again met this House, and gave notice of a Supply Bill. He then moved the adjournment of the House, and was again defeated;

- (8) That to-day, 22nd instant, Mr. Philp again met this House, and moved the suspension of the Standing Orders with a view to passing a Supply Bill, and that this House, while entertaining a most sincere respect for Your Excellency, is constrained by a sense of the duty it owes to the people of Queensland to again refuse Supply to a Ministry who have not the confidence of this House;

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: They have the confidence of the country. That is better.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Government laughter.

Mr. BOWMAN: You will find out about that later on.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask hon. members on this occasion kindly to refrain from interjections on either side of the House. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. KIDSTON:

- (9) We respectfully ask Your Excellency's attention to the foregoing facts; and we further submit to Your Excellency that the Kidston Ministry has never been defeated, and still commands the support of a majority of the whole of the members of this House.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON:

We therefore submit to Your Excellency that Your Excellency has been misinformed as to the possibilities of this House having been exhausted, or that it is impossible to carry on Your Excellency's Administration with the present Legislative Assembly;

- (10) We respectfully submit to Your Excellency that it is probably unprecedented in any self-governing State of the British Empire that a House fresh from the people should be dissolved under the circumstances hereinbefore narrated;

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON:

- (11) That, apart from the political and constitutional aspect of the question, we further submit

to Your Excellency that in the present state of the country it is highly inadvisable that a dissolution of Parliament, implying a suspension of all Bills dealing with railways and public works—a suspension which will entail probable distress to thousands of workers—should take place, that the time of the year is highly unsuitable for a general election.

Mr. JENKINSON: No; a good time.

Mr. KIDSTON:

Both on account of the proximity of the Christmas holidays and also on account of the approaching wet season.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON:

That the public interests will be materially injured thereby; and that so far no necessity has arisen through any vote of this House for any action that would justify such a sacrifice of the public welfare;

- (12) Being assured that Your Excellency has been misinformed as to the state of feeling in the House, and that you have been advised to take a course of action based on such misinformation, we pray that Your Excellency will take into consideration the facts herein set forth, and will be pleased to refrain from any exercise of your high prerogative which would conflict with the expressed wishes of this House, and could only at the present time result in serious injury to the interests of this State.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Rats!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That address has kept some of you busy, at any rate.

Mr. KEOGH: Fairly well read—that.

Mr. KIDSTON: I think that little requires to be said in support of that address to His Excellency the Governor. In courtesy to His Excellency, we sent him an advance copy—the original copy of the address—yesterday; and this morning I sent a copy to the Premier as soon as it was printed.

Mr. JENKINSON: And to a Downs paper.

Mr. KIDSTON: I think that everyone will recognise that, in presenting this address to His Excellency, this House is exercising a right which it unquestionably possesses.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: A right which has always been possessed by the Commons of England, and which for hundreds of years has been resorted to when necessary. I have no intention of wearying the House with long quotations from authorities on this matter; but I wish to make two points clear—points that seem to be innate in the minds of every one of our people who understand anything about constitutional history. I wish to make those two points clear in other words than my own. Sir Erskine May, in his "Constitutional History of England," dealing with the powers of the House of Commons, in volume ii., page 86, says—

It (the House of Commons) has a right to advise the Crown, even as to the exercise of prerogative itself; and, should its advice be disregarded, it wields the power of impeachment, and holds the purse-strings of the State.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: What is the date? The conditions are different now.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. KIDSTON: I might read another quotation to show that our Constitution is such that any public officer who carries out an order of His

*Mr. Kidston.]*

Excellency's—who attempts to do what the Premier is attempting to do—will be personally liable to the law.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Government laughter.

Mr. JENKINSON: Another threat? Do you want to get back by threat?

Mr. McMASTER: That is a threat.

Mr. KEOGH: The Premier is looking bad on that. (Government laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. KIDSTON: The silly laughter of certain hon. members opposite is an ill beginning for the consideration of such a question as this House is now discussing.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I shall now quote one of the best authorities on the development of the British Constitution—Professor Freeman, in his work on “The English Constitution,” page 114—where he says that the sovereign power is held immune under the law. No matter what is done, the King cannot be challenged, but the men who carry out the King's behests can be challenged if they are contrary to the law. Professor Freeman says—

The written law is satisfied with holding that the command of the Sovereign is no excuse for an illegal act, and that he who advises the commission of an illegal act by Royal authority must bear the responsibility from which the Sovereign himself is free.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Put him in the stocks.

Mr. KEOGH: He is prepared to do that.

Mr. KIDSTON: I think this situation is important enough and grave enough to cause hon. members on both sides of the Chamber, no matter what opinion they may hold, to forget for a little time all little personalities, and even party animosities, and to address themselves to a question of this kind as it deserves.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Why not give the dates of your authorities?

Mr. KIDSTON: The crisis through which we are passing is one affecting the fundamental principles of our whole Constitution. (Hear, hears!) It affects the basis on which rests the whole fabric of our liberties, and any weakness on our part, or any carelessness on our part, would be a treachery to the best traditions of our race and country. What is the basic principle of our Constitution? It is this—that the people have the right of self-government—the right to manage their own affairs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: That is exactly what we want them to do.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: It is the right of the elected representatives of the people to carry out the wishes of the people in the government of the country without let or hindrance.

Mr. JENKINSON: No, no! The people are supreme.

Mr. RYLAND: We are the people.

Mr. KIDSTON: These things have been for centuries so recognised by the men of our race that I am almost ashamed to quote authorities on the matter. Why, in the darkest days of feudalism in England it was never doubted that, no matter what the tyranny of noble or King, Englishmen had the right to manage their own affairs.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: That is what we want to-day.

Mr. KIDSTON: And now in this modern day we are given the prerogative in a matter of

[*Mr. Kidston.*

this kind. The prerogative is unchanged. This is Professor Freeman on the “Growth of the English Constitution,” page 15—

The law leaves the power of the Crown untouched, but the Constitution requires that those powers should be exercised by such persons and in such a manner as may be acceptable to a majority of the House of Commons.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Ninety-one years ago.

Mr. KIDSTON:

In all these ways, in a manner silent and indirect, the Lower House of Parliament, as it is still deemed in formal rank, has become the real ruling power in the nation.

Mr. JENKINSON: Queen Anne is dead.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: King John is dead.

Mr. WHITE: King William is dead.

Mr. KIDSTON: I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen should twit me with giving them something which they all know. It would be a shame if any hon. member of this Chamber admitted that he did not know these things.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Some do.

Mr. KIDSTON: I appeal in this matter, not only to the self-consciousness of members of this Chamber, but to all the men of Queensland.

Mr. JENKINSON: The galleries.

Mr. KIDSTON: Why, it is hundreds of years since this thing has even been questioned, but it is being questioned to-day not in words but in deeds. The right of this Chamber to manage the affairs of Queensland is being questioned to-day.

Mr. BELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: The claim that I make as to the powers of the people's Chamber runs like a golden thread through all our history, and I do not at all hesitate to say that that instinct for self-government has been the most glorious tradition in the history of our people.

Opposition and Labour cheers.

Mr. KIDSTON: In the old days, when it was difficult to resist the encroachments of the Crown, or the bad advice of Ministers, men stood for that principle, and we should be ashamed to-day to admit for one moment that we may go back on it for any purpose whatsoever.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Who gave the wrong advice first?

Mr. KIDSTON: I have not the slightest fear that in this modern day the men of Queensland will be unfaithful to that great tradition.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Try them.

Mr. KIDSTON: Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, and the present advisers of His Excellency, are attempting to pretend—and it is a mere pretence—that they are wanting to consult the people; but, as I say, it is a mere pretence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The strongest party in the House.

Mr. KIDSTON: Mr. Speaker, it is a mere pretence.

Mr. JENKINSON: No, no!

Mr. KIDSTON: What is the use of consulting the people if the people's representatives are not to be allowed to carry out the people's wishes?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Do these hon. gentlemen imagine for one moment that the fight for constitutional liberty in England meant the right of a man to vote? Is that constitutional liberty? If you take away from the representatives whom

the people have elected the power to carry out the people's wishes, what is the value of their vote to them?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Have not the party who are numerically the stronger some rights?

The SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members to preserve order. This is a very rare and historical occasion, upon which hon. members desire to hear the views of the leaders of the House and of one another. I trust, therefore, that hon. members will restrain themselves from interjecting and listen to what is being said.

Mr. KIDSTON: If, after our people have elected representatives and sent them to this Chamber, those men have to defer

[4 p.m.] to the Crown nominees, and only pass legislation that will please the Crown nominees; have to whittle down the wishes of the people to please the Crown nominees, and have to sit here and be told that the real Premier of this State is the leader of the Conservative party among the Crown nominees—is that self-government? Was that the thing that Englishmen fought for? Is that self-government? It is an idle pretence to go to the country and say that we appeal to it, if after the country has been appealed to there resides the power in the Crown nominees to defeat the wishes of the people and send the representatives back to them and back to them, and harass them by frequent and costly elections. Mr. Speaker, no man in this Chamber who asserts that principle, or who will support any party in the Assembly in asserting that principle, deserves the confidence of any Queensland constituency.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Interruption on Government side.

Mr. KIDSTON: I put out of court all other questions which have led up to this. That is the situation we are face to face with here. (Hear, hear!) The hon. gentleman told us that he had advised His Excellency to exercise his prerogative in opposition to the wishes of the representatives of the people.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I venture to say that no Australian Premier and no King of England for 100 years back has got such advice from a responsible Minister.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RANKIN: It was inaccurate advice.

Mr. KIDSTON: No Minister who is conscious of the responsibility that accrues to him when he is made Premier—when he gets His Excellency's confidence—no Minister who is conscious of that responsibility would have dared to have given such advice.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I assert that our people have not only the right to elect their representatives, but they have the right to know that after those representatives are elected they will have the power to manage the affairs of this country as the people want them managed—(hear, hear!)—unchecked and unhindered by any power whatsoever. (Hear, hear!) That is my idea of constitutional liberty. That is my idea of self-government, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to go to the country and try it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and interruption.

Mr. JENKINSON: We will take up that challenge.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: We are ready.

Mr. KEOGH: We are there every time.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. KIDSTON: If this House submitted in silence to such a position, to such an attempt to override the first principle of self-government, we would be the first elected Chamber in the British dominions that ever admitted such a right.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Why, in the old days, the Parliament of England did not submit to such a right when it knew the power of the King, and when the King could imprison them.

Mr. KEOGH: In Cromwell's time.

Mr. KIDSTON: Long before Cromwell—in the Norman Period—the people of England never admitted to any such claim on the part of the King. Why, the very barons who forced King John to sign Magna Charta would not admit the King had such a right. They appealed to the older Constitution, to the ancient rights of Englishmen, and they asserted that the things they complained of were a tyrannous exercise of the King's prerogative, at variance with the inborn rights of Englishmen. It has never been admitted by any representatives of the people in any British-speaking country at all. I have just a word to say about another point. The first statement, made unofficially, but none the less made, apparently with a desire to frighten and coerce members of this Chamber—that the Governor had exercised his prerogative and granted a dissolution—I refused to believe. It would be an unheard-of exercise of the prerogative—an exercise of the prerogative subversive to all our liberties. Why, there is not a man in this Chamber would believe for one moment that even His Majesty, with his world-wide reputation for sagacious statesmanship, would attempt such an exercise of the prerogative. (Hear, hear!) No man in this Chamber believes that. But I was glad when the Hon. the Premier assured us in quite a casual way on Wednesday that that statement was untrue. He said that he had informed His Excellency of so-and-so, and that he had advised His Excellency so-and-so. And now, Mr. Speaker, we are in the advantageous position to-day of not having to deal with His Excellency in this matter at all. We have to deal with the Premier. We have to deal with His Excellency's present advisers. Now, when the House finds Ministers—responsible Ministers—unconstitutionally attempting to remain in office in opposition to the repeated expressed wishes of this House, when we find that those Ministers have been misinforming His Excellency as to the position of affairs in this House, as to the possibilities of carrying on government by means of this Assembly—

Mr. RANKIN: It is Brisbane *versus* the country.

Mr. KIDSTON: And advising His Excellency to exercise his prerogative against the declared wishes of the members of this Chamber, I think it is time that this House asserted its rights and privileges. When this House met for the first time, Mr. Speaker, you went with a number of members of this House to Government House, and claimed the rights—the ancient rights and privileges of the Legislative Assembly.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Mr. Speaker, we will have to go back again—

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: And seek anew.

Mr. Kidston.]

Mr. KIDSTON: We will have to go back to His Excellency and again claim that His Excellency will govern this country according to constitutional usage, and that he will protect, according to his oath, the rights and privileges of this Chamber.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I take up this position in the first place: That Ministers should not remain in office under our Constitution when it has been conclusively proved that they have not the confidence of this House—(hear, hear!)—and no self-respecting Ministers would remain in office under such conditions.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: We have the confidence of the country; that is good enough. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIDSTON: I further assert that a newly-elected House, able and willing to grant Supply to carry on His Excellency's Administration, should not be dissolved because its members are carrying out their promises to the country. (Hear, hear!) That, Mr. Speaker, is the ground we stand on, the claim we make.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No, no!

Mr. KIDSTON: Mr. Speaker, we stand on that ground.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No!

Mr. WHITE: You have broken your pledges.

Mr. KIDSTON: To deny us those things, or try, under such circumstances, to intimidate members with a talk of dissolution, is an unexampled outrage on our Constitution—an unexampled outrage. I venture to say that never since the Restoration has such an exercise of the prerogative been attempted as His Excellency is being advised to attempt in Queensland at the present time.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Nonsense!

Mr. KEOGH: You brought it about.

Mr. KIDSTON: I think I may well close my speech on this occasion with the noble words of an old battler for constitutional liberty—an old battler for the rights of the people.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A Scotchman, too.

Mr. KIDSTON: "We humbly pray your Excellency to be advised and guided by His faithful Commons."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Kidston's amendment*) stand part of the question—put.

The PREMIER, who was received with Government "Hear, hears!" said: I quite agree that the present position is a very grave one—a position that no Ministry should take up unless they are quite satisfied that they are right in doing so. Now, what is the position of the House just now? We have three parties.

Mr. RYLAND: We have four parties.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: That is a question. The party on this side is the largest party. The late Premier has now a following of twenty-three or twenty-four, and the Labour party seventeen. What led up to that resignation was a letter he wrote to the Labour party, asking them to join him in a raid against the Legislative Council.

Mr. MULCAHY: And they are with him up against you every time.

The PREMIER: And they declined to do it.

Mr. MAUGHAN: That is not what led up to it.

[*Mr. Kidston.*]

The PREMIER: I will not read the Premier's letter—(laughter)—but I will read the latter part of the letter. It is signed by—

DAVID BOWMAN, Chairman, P.L.P.

GEO. P. BARBER, Secretary, P.L.P.

M. REID, President, C.P.E.

ALBERT HINCHCLIFFE, Hon. Secretary, C.P.E.

Mr. BOWMAN: I would like you to read this week's *Worker*, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask hon. members to be good enough to hear the hon. member. I have endeavoured to secure the leader of the Opposition a fair hearing, and I hope hon. members will extend the same courtesy to the other side of the House.

The PREMIER: The latter part of the letter reads as follows:—

Moreover, experience has shown that while individuals, some for the sake of position, have seen fit not merely to leave the party—which is their right—but have repudiated their signed pledges, and have done their utmost to destroy its identity as a political factor, it can never be truthfully said that organised Labour, as such, has ever proved unfaithful to its trust. We, therefore, regard it as our bounden duty to preserve that unbroken record of fidelity, and on no account can we accede to the propositions which you have submitted.

Mr. COWAP: That was not applying to the Council.

The PREMIER: After receipt of this letter, Mr. Kidston, the member for Rockhampton, went to His Excellency, and, in the amendment that he has read, clause (3), he says—

With this object in view, the Kidston Ministry, supported by a majority of this House, accordingly advised Your Excellency to recognise the principle that there resided in the Crown the power to nominate to the Legislative Council such a number of new members as might be required to overcome obstruction, and that such power should be exercised if, in the opinion of Your Excellency's responsible advisers, such a course became necessary.

His Excellency declined that request, and Mr. Kidston resigned. Now, I think there is a big constitutional point involved. Has any Government the right to nominate as many members as they wish to the Upper House?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

The PREMIER: That is the point.

Mr. BOWMAN: Is there anything to stop them?

Mr. KIDSTON: Does that right exist in England—the right that is claimed here? Does not the Crown have that right in England?

The PREMIER: At the present time we have the right to have the Government of the day represented in the other Chamber. I say that no Ministry in Queensland, at all events, ever asked any Governor to put in as many members in that House as they chose to put in.

Mr. COWAP: A Conservative Government need never want to force the Upper House.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They have put in eighteen already.

The PREMIER: A question arose in New Zealand.

Mr. RANKIN: What was the number?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RANKIN: What was the number asked to be put in here?

Mr. KEOGH: Fourteen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Ask your leader.

The PREMIER: I do not know the number. I only know he—

Mr. RANKIN: There was no number.

The PREMIER: He said himself he asked sufficient numbers to carry out the measures that he passed here.

Mr. KIDSTON: I rise to a point of order. The statement of the hon. gentleman is not strictly accurate. If he will read again he will see that I did not ask for any number; I did not ask for any appointments to the Council. I asked for the public recognition of the principle that has always been recognised in England.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I accept the hon. member's word, but I understood he asked for sufficient —

Mr. KIDSTON: I did not intend to appoint any just now.

The PREMIER: To carry out his measures in the Upper House. I say there was a way of carrying out this wish of his, either by trying to make the Upper House elective, or putting the dispute he had before the Secretary of State in England. We have a notable example of that. Mr. Ballance found himself with five supporters in the Upper House. He had passed a Bill which had met with the full approval of the majority of the electors of New Zealand, and he sought to put sufficient men in the Upper House to carry a Bill. What did he do? He put his case before the Governor; the Governor stated his case; and the whole thing went home.

Mr. KERR: He went over the head of the Governor.

The PREMIER: No; I say he put his case through the Governor.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: His case went to England, and the Home Secretary in England decided that in this case the Premier was justified in getting sufficient members in that House in order to carry his measures, as he had been before the country.

Mr. KIDSTON: That is not quite accurate —

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I appeal to hon. members to give each speaker a fair hearing. I do not care what party they belong to, they are entitled to a fair hearing in this Chamber, particularly when they are making statements that other hon. members wish to hear. If hon. members listen, and wish to reply, they can make a note, and reply later on. I will ask hon. members to hear without interruption the Premier or any other member of the House who rises in his place to address them. (Hear, hear!)

The PREMIER: I maintain that at the present time the Upper House is full—more than full. I know there is no statute limiting the number in that House, but for some time the recognised number was thirty-nine or forty. I think the late Premier, Mr. Morgan, finding he had not sufficient in that House for a quorum, got His Excellency to give him four more, and I think the number now is about forty-three. But, as far as I understand it, the Premier's request was to practically swamp the Upper House, and, because his request was refused, he resigned. He had no right to resign. But having resigned and thrown up his office, the Governor was justified in sending for somebody else. He sent for me. I have formed a Government and have met this House, and this House has refused Supply. I am justified in going to the Governor now and stating what I have said, and the Governor has acted within his rights in granting a dissolution. The question now before the House is whether this House is prepared to grant Supply in order to let the Ministry go to the country. The Premier has warned me about spending money without the authority of this Parliament.

Mr. KIDSTON: I have not warned you, but the public officers.

The PREMIER: He says I am responsible. I am prepared to take all personal risk and be responsible for what money we spend.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I think that this is a case on which the people should decide. (Hear, hear!) Are the other side afraid to go to the people? We have been told always that the people should govern; that we should "trust the people." This side of the House is quite prepared to trust the people, and we will go to the country as soon as we possibly can and get the matter settled. It is time that electors of the country should decide such an important matter as this. As it is, this Assembly and the Upper House are discussing matters which have never been before the people at all.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is wrong.

The PREMIER: As far as the postal vote is concerned, that is a question that has only arisen since the last election. The Wages Boards Bill is not the Bill that was before the country.

Mr. BOWMAN: Just the same.

The PREMIER: No, it is not. Many of the members—sometimes as many as six—supporting the late Government, voted with us when we moved amendments to exclude the farmers from the provisions of that Bill. I want to point out to this House what they are doing now. They are obstructing a vote for Supply in order that we may go to the country. On the other side will rest any blame if they stop Supply in order to prevent us going to the country.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: We will take all the blame.

The PREMIER: The practice invariably in England upon a Ministry being defeated and going to the country is to get Supply. It has not been always the case in Australia, but it is becoming more and more the case, and I hope the good sense of this House will prevail and that Supply will be granted, in order to let us go to the country without any irregularity. But, in any case, I am prepared to accept the full responsibility if we go to the country without Supply.

Cries of "Divide!"

\* The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*): The document the hon. gentleman has read to the House leads off by saying that the Governor has been misinformed, and the grounds upon which that is based is the statement that there was no hope of carrying on good government under the condition of parties as they were at the present time. That constitutes the alleged incorrect information which His Excellency received, and yet it is identical with the information contained in the statement made by the ex-Premier when the House met on the 25th of July last. Then he practically told this House that the constitution of parties here was such as to make it impossible to carry on good government, and I propose to give to the House, in his own language, the words which the hon. gentleman used on that occasion. On page 35 of *Hansard* for the present session, he says—

The broad result of the general election is that three parties have been returned in nearly equal numbers.

That, of course, was not strictly correct, the present Government party being the largest party.

None of these three parties are under any obligation of allegiance to any of the others, and none of them can command a majority of this House. I thought—as my colleagues thought—that it was highly probable

Hon. D. F. Denham.]

that at least one of those parties would make a pretence of supporting the Government. I frankly confess that I did not think it would be any more than a pretence, but I thought there would have been a pretence.

And then the closing remarks of the hon. gentleman, which are more particularly in accordance with the statement he has made in this petition—

There are a good many things I could say about this matter, but I refrain from saying anything at all of a personal nature. I refrain from saying anything of an acrimonious nature. I am simply dealing with the facts of the case as they are—simply telling the House what I consider the position to be—that I consider it is a bad position. Because, apart altogether from the personal feelings of individual members, or the personal feelings of Ministers, this position of parties is not a good thing for the country.

Then he goes on to say—

It is not possible—

Mark the words—

to get anything like really good government out of this situation. And we are now seeking to alter that situation.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are always altering the situation.

The HOME SECRETARY: The ex-Premier then went on to say—

It is not a situation that conduces to the parliamentary machine doing its best work; it is a situation that conduces, and will inevitably tend, to bringing out the patriot and the more personal side of our public life. For these reasons, although I have not gone into the matter fully, I have moved that this Order of the Day be postponed until Tuesday next to give opportunity for further consideration of the position.

That was the deliberate conviction of the late Premier in July. And he evidently found it to be true a fortnight since, because he then made another effort to secure a readjustment of parties, in which he lamentably failed. He affirms that the cause that led him to resign is his dispute with the Upper House, but it is impossible to dissociate his resignation with the communications that had passed immediately before between his party and the members of the Labour party. This House now finds itself in a very difficult situation, and yet it is not so difficult of adjustment as may appear at first sight. There are members of the Kidston party who were members of the Morgan party who are with us on the question of immigration, the question of land settlement, assistance to primary industries, and they are with us in being opposed to the taxation of land values. So on many important points there is an affinity between the two parties that does not prevail as between the old Morgan party, now merged into the Kidston party, and the larger section of the Labour party. I grant you that there are members of the Kidston party who are more in affinity with the Labour party than they are with this side of the House. I think if the hon. members who are sitting opposite representing farming constituencies had looked upon the situation in its true light, that this crisis might even now have been averted. But altogether apart from this aspect of the case, what constitutes the ground of appeal to the country? The late Premier has said again to-day that it has reference to the Upper House. What is his desire? A large section of the Opposition—namely, the Labour party—desire the abolition of that Chamber. They have never wavered from that plank of their platform. But there are others of the Kidston party who do not desire its abolition, but, on the contrary, that it should be increased. The present number of that Chamber is forty-one, and yet there is a desire on the part of a certain section on the other side of this Chamber to increase the number of the Upper House out of all due proportion. What would be the value of the second Chamber if it only

reflected the opinions of the Assembly—if each succeeding Premier was at liberty to go to the Governor and ask him to appoint more nominees to the Upper House merely for the purpose of passing any legislation that he might bring in? What value would that Upper House have at all under such circumstances? It would merely be a repeating Chamber.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Wipe it out.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say, do not wipe it out, because as a revising Chamber it has done good work, and has been of great value to Queensland. As a revising Chamber, it has rendered great and signal service to Queensland, and I think it would be a violation of a general understanding and of the Constitution to pack it merely for party ends. Reform it if you can, by all means.

Mr. COWAP: Abolish it.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, not abolish it. It is probably not the best thing that a man should be appointed there for life. Well, let the appointment be for a limited period. It may be that it will commend itself to the [4.30 p.m.] wishes of the country that it should be an elective Chamber, its members being elected on a certain basis. I say reform it, by all means, but do not abolish it, and, last of all, do not pack it, as it is evidently desired by hon. members opposite that it should be packed. We have now come to a difficult situation. The late Premier said at the beginning of the session that it was an impossible situation. Who can determine the situation? It can only be determined by a final appeal to the country, as we desire, and as the Governor has granted by his consent to a dissolution. It is the people who should determine what policy shall prevail in this State. The hon. gentleman has given us some quotations, and it is perhaps as well that other quotations should be furnished to the House. Todd, in his "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," page 760, says—

The personal sanction of the Sovereign—after deliberate inquiry, and in the exercise of an unfettered judgment—must be given to the advice or recommendation of a Minister whenever it is proposed to have recourse to the prerogative of dissolution. "Upon such an occasion, the Sovereign ought by no means, to be a passive instrument in the hands of his Ministers; it is not merely his right, but his duty, to exercise his judgment in the advice they may tender to him; and though, by refusing to act upon that advice, he incurs a serious responsibility, if they should in the end prove to be supported by public opinion, there is, perhaps, no case in which this responsibility may be more safely and more usefully incurred than when Ministers have asked to be allowed to appeal to the people from a decision pronounced against them by the House of Commons. For they might prefer this request when there was no probability of the vote of the House being reversed by the nation, and when the measure would be injurious to the public interests. In such a case, the Sovereign ought clearly to refuse to allow a dissolution."

Ministers confidently appeal to public opinion on the point at issue—that is, the abolition of the Upper House or the packing of the Upper House—and we have no hesitation whatever in recommending a dissolution.

Mr. HUNTER: You will wish you had not.

The HOME SECRETARY: We shall see all about that. It is the only constitutional way of solving the difficult question that now presents itself to the House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: There are cases to be found in connection with the Government of British Colonies which go to prove the correctness of the position which the Government have taken up to-day.

Mr. GRANT: Quote them.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will quote them. I may tell the House that on one occasion a Governor of a British dependency—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Name!

The HOME SECRETARY: New Brunswick.

Mr. GRANT: What about the Canada case?

The HOME SECRETARY: If you will allow me, I will deal with these cases in order. Cases are not wanting in which the Governor of a British colony has suggested to Ministers the expediency of a dissolution. There was such a case in New Brunswick. Certain legislation had passed the Chamber in advance of public opinion, and the Governor, noting that it was inimicable to the public interests, suggested to the Ministry that they should revise that legislation. They declined to revise it, and resigned, and an appeal was made to the country, with the result that the Governor's opinion was proved correct, inasmuch as the House was so constituted that legislation was brought in to revise the measure referred to by the Governor. We have also a very significant and apposite case to that which has taken place to-day—a case in which a petition was presented to the Governor of an Australian colony, a petition similar to that which has been submitted to this House to-day—with a view to its ultimate presentation to the Governor. I refer to the case of South Australia, which is thus dealt with at page 771 of Todd's "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies"—

In 1871, the Governor of South Australia (Sir James Ferguson) agreed to allow a dissolution to his Ministers, after their defeat on 16th November, on a vote of want of confidence, which was carried against them in the Assembly by the casting vote of the Speaker. Whereupon both Houses of Parliament passed addresses, praying the Governor to dismiss his Ministers at once, and not to grant them a dissolution. In reply to these addresses, the Governor informed the Legislative Council that he regretted his inability to comply with their request; and he informed the Assembly that, under the existing circumstances, he did not feel justified in refusing to his advisers the appeal which they desired to make to the constituencies from the vote of the House. On the same day the Governor proceeded to prorogue Parliament with a view to its immediate dissolution.

Mr. COWAP: That was on the casting vote of the Chairman.

Mr. GRANT: And Supply was granted—that is the point.

The HOME SECRETARY: The motion in that case was decided by the casting vote of the Speaker. The quotation which I have read to the House shows the principles laid down in that case. Then we have a case recorded in connection with New Zealand.

Mr. BELL: Supply was voted in that case.

The HOME SECRETARY: These cases are all pertinent.

Mr. GRANT: Supply was granted in every case.

The HOME SECRETARY: Now I come to the question of the dissolution—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask hon. members to preserve order. It is not easy for an hon. member who is addressing the House to make himself understood if he is continually interrupted by interjections.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have called attention to that case merely to show to what extent a Governor may exercise his authority. According to Todd, when Sir George Gray, in New Zealand, applied to the Governor (Sir Hercules Robinson) to grant him a dissolution of Parliament, His Excellency responded in a memorandum in which it is stated—

I have carefully considered the position in which

Ministers are placed by the defeat which they have just sustained in the House of Representatives upon a no-confidence motion; and I am clearly of opinion that they have a fair constitutional claim to a dissolution.

No doubt, a general election at the present moment would be inconvenient, having regard to the condition of public business (the prevailing financial depression) and the circumstances of the colony generally—especially the native difficulties upon the West Coast. But I presume that Ministers have carefully considered the consequences of such a step before tendering to me advice to dissolve; and I am, therefore, prepared to adopt their recommendation, leaving with them the entire responsibility of such a proceeding.

Mr. GRANT: In all those cases Supply was granted.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will give you a case directly where Supply was not granted. There is a very remarkable case in connection with Tasmania which is recorded at page 784 of "Todd." The writer says—

In Tasmania, in May, 1877, the Fysh Ministry having been defeated in the House of Assembly on a vote of want of confidence, the Premier requested the Governor to grant them a dissolution, inasmuch as they had lately acceded to office upon involuntary resignation of their predecessors—

Similar to our case—

and because for years past there had been a want of co-operation between the two Houses of Parliament.

Similar to our case again—

The Governor, Mr. (afterwards Sir) F. A. Weld, in a memorandum dated 11th May, 1877, reviewed the position of Ministers. He admitted the reasonableness of their request and consented to the dissolution, but in a subsequent despatch to the Colonial Secretary, he took occasion to declare "that in all cases the representative of the Crown should be more careful in granting a dissolution than the Crown might be in England, as he must sometimes be advised by Ministers not sufficiently determined to waive small party advantages, somewhat accustomed occasionally to the sledge-hammer style of political warfare, and not uniformly imbued with that constitutional knowledge and spirit which often seems hereditary and is generally inherent in British statesmen."

His Excellency did not refer in his memorandum to the question of Supply, because he thought that "the Crown ought not beforehand to express its decision upon a theoretical question not immediately before it," and because "he had no right to suppose that Parliament would depart from the most usual and most constitutional course of voting necessary Supplies for the period that must elapse before the meeting of Parliament."

Todd's comment upon that is very pertinent.

Adverting to the observations contained in Governor Weld's despatch to the Secretary of State of 20th May, 1877, in reference to the necessity for a grant of Supply by a Colonial Assembly in anticipation of a dissolution of Parliament in consequence of a Ministerial defeat, it may be stated that in England Parliament has never hesitated to vote whatever Supplies may be required for the public service. But upon a change of Ministry, or other Ministerial crisis which may necessitate a speedy dissolution of Parliament, it is obviously improper to ask the House of Commons to vote either the whole amount or to approve of all the details of the proposed Estimates, and so commit Parliament to the financial policy of a Ministry whose fate is about to be determined by a general election. Under such circumstances it is customary to limit the grant of Supply to the amount absolutely required for ordinary expenditure until the reassembling of Parliament. This affords, moreover, a guarantee that there will be no unnecessary delay in convening the new Parliament.

Mr. GRANT: You are evading the whole question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not evading the whole question. I will now quote a case in New South Wales, where a dissolution was granted, even though Supply was not granted.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: I have been asked for such a case, and I cite this one. It is referred to on page 789 of "Todd," and refers to a communication from Sir Hercules Robinson, the Governor of New South Wales, to the Colonial Office.

Mr. BELL: What date?

The HOME SECRETARY: 1877. "Todd" says—

It appears that it had become customary in New South Wales to delay the grant of the annual Supplies until after the commencement of the year to which they were applicable. Sometimes this delay was protracted until eight or nine months of the new fiscal year had expired. Meanwhile the services were carried on by temporary monthly Supply Bills, based on the Estimates of the previous year. Frequently a Ministerial crisis has arisen under such circumstances, and the request of the Crown for Supply in furtherance of an intended dissolution has been met by obstruction or refusal. When thus obstructed by the Assembly Ministers had obtained leave of the Governor to dissolve Parliament without any grant of Supply. Once the services were paid by an arrangement with the Government bank, and without parliamentary authority.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN: What are you quoting from?

The HOME SECRETARY: "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," by Todd, page 789, where Sir Hercules Robinson refers to a dissolution without Supply being granted. The despatch sent by Sir Hercules Robinson to Lord Carnarvon was referred to Sir Erskine May and Mr. Speaker Brand. Sir Erskine May's opinion is to be found on pages 791 and 792 of "Todd," and Mr. Speaker Brand's opinion on page 793. Now, let us see what an extraordinary position we, or any Government, would be in if there was a condition that Supply should first be granted. In such a case it would be a veto upon the Governor's prerogative. On page 792 of "Todd," Sir Erskine May, commenting upon the situation in New South Wales, says—

At the same time the form in which his conditional assent was given appears open to some objections. His resolution being communicated by his Ministers to the Parliament, it practically gave to that body a veto upon its own dissolution, and even encouraged it to withhold the Supplies. And, further, the Governor took upon himself the responsibility of granting or refusing a dissolution, instead of laying that responsibility upon his constitutional advisers.

I have given cases where Parliament has been prorogued and dissolved without Supply having been granted. It has been done in Great Britain, and the most that "May" says concerning it is that it is not unconstitutional, but it is irregular. Well, if this House forces us into an irregular proceeding, we must accept, and we will accept, all the responsibility in connection therewith.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: "Todd" goes on to say on page 792—

It is the duty of a Governor to consider the question of a dissolution of the Parliament solely with reference to the general interests of the people, and not from a party standpoint.

He may, at his discretion, grant a dissolution to a Ministry defeated in Parliament, and desirous of appealing to the constituencies, notwithstanding that one or both branches of the Legislature should remonstrate against the proposed appeal, if only he is persuaded that it would be for the public advantage that the appeal should be allowed.

Now, is it to the best interests of the country that the Council should be abolished or packed? Is it desirable that the two branches of the Legislature should be so unified as to become practically one? Would it not be a farce to have a revising Chamber, if it is to be merely a repeating Chamber—such a Chamber as some hon. members apparently desire?

[*Hon. D. F. Denham.*]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: An echo.  
Mr. BOWMAN: It has been an echo of your side for years.

The HOME SECRETARY: In nearly all the British dependencies there are two Chambers. It is quite true that in some of the provinces of Canada there is only one Chamber; but there the principal questions of public policy are reserved for the Dominion Parliament. I hope the day will never come when Queensland will have merely one Chamber, and we shall be under the dominance and control of the Commonwealth Parliament. There is no instance of a single Chamber in any British colony with full parliamentary powers. The question of abolishing the second Chamber has often been discussed; and I think a Bill was passed some years ago in Prince Edward Island, but it has never yet received the Royal assent. In my opinion the second Chamber is necessary for the welfare and good conduct of the business of the country. But I prefer on this subject to give the opinion of one who is often quoted in this Chamber, and who is looked upon as one of the highest authorities on a question of this sort. On page 697 of "Todd" I find this quotation—

In small communities, and in provinces where the business of legislation is mainly of a municipal description, experience has shown that two Chambers are cumbersome and needlessly expensive, but in colonies entrusted with the powers of local self-government, and where the policy of administration, as well as the making of general laws for the welfare and good government of all classes in the community, are under the control of a local Legislature, a second Chamber is a necessary institution. It is a counterpoise to democratic ascendancy in the popular and most powerful Assembly, it affords some protection against hasty and ill-considered legislation and action, and serves to elicit the sober second thought of the people, in contradistinction to the impulsive first thought of the Lower House. These great benefits of a second Chamber are in addition to the advantages derived from the revision and amendment of laws, which frequently pass through the Assembly in a crude and defective state.

Had that been written on the position of affairs in Queensland at the present moment, "Todd" could not have more accurately depicted the state of affairs. This undesired—this unthought-of crisis has been precipitated. For what? What good can come of it? There are two questions which the Upper House dealt with this year to the displeasure of this Chamber, one dealing with electoral reform. After the Council sought to amend the Bill, it was sent back to them, and they laid it aside. Before another general election, in the ordinary course of events—but for the extraordinary action of the late Premier—two more sessions of Parliament must have elapsed, during which time the Bill could have gone back to the Council; and I think it has been the experience that, when a Bill has gone back to that Chamber after a recess, the Council have very carefully considered their action. No harm would have been done to the public if that Bill had been introduced next year, and, if things had gone on all right, even the following year.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is convenient for you to carry out the elections without that Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was no need for a crisis at the present time. The House could have gone through the session and into recess, and—what would have given infinite joy to the late Premier—he would have had a glorified tour through Great Britain. The other question had reference to the Wages Boards Bill and the excision therefrom of the farm labourers. Now, as I pointed out the other day, the extraordinary position is that a large number of the Kidston supporters supported the amendment of the Upper House in eliminating farm

workers from the Bill, and yet, forsooth, we find them on this occasion shoulder to shoulder fighting against the other Chamber for having preserved the interests of their constituents. I hope for the sake of good order and regular government good sense will prevail, and that Supply will be granted so that the election may be conducted under the best and most constitutional methods possible.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Fortitude Valley*): We have heard a great deal, both from the Premier and the Home Secretary, respecting the question of majority rule and "trusting the people." Now, last May an election took place, and it is just as well that this House should know exactly the way in which the electors voted for the respective parties as they appear before us. The Kidston party had 65,309 votes, the Labour party had 53,561 votes, the total of the two being 118,432. The Philp party obtained 83,183 votes, the difference between the Philp party and the two parties now constituting this side of the House being a majority on this side of 35,259 votes.

Mr. WHITE: That is taking both parties.

Mr. BOWMAN: Of course it is. You do not expect me to take one party. (Laughter.) We on this side are one on this question.

Mr. WHITE: Abolition?

Mr. BOWMAN: We are at one in our desire to see carried out the expressed will of the majority of the representatives of the people.

Mr. WOODS: They do not like it.

Mr. BOWMAN: Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us that they have the largest individual party. Why, the Philp party had the chance of a lifetime at the last election—three parties fighting together—and we fought the Kidston party more bitterly than the Philp party, because of the difference that existed at the time, and had there been no enmity between the two parties, the Philp party would have come back as small as it did in 1904.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Or even less.

Mr. BOWMAN: When they speak of majorities let me remind them that we on this side have the majority of representatives, and those on the other side should recognise that they are only there on sufferance—only there by the will of the King's representative. No Government that has ever sat there has done so under conditions so belittling to themselves and their constituents.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: A Government thrice defeated within eight days, and yet they have to appeal to His Excellency to give them an opportunity of going to the country. We have had here this afternoon one of the finest addresses I ever listened to in this House. I think the facts put before us this afternoon by the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston, were unanswerable, and the flimsy efforts of the Premier and his henchman, the Home Secretary, were poor indeed by comparison.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: I was somewhat interested to find the Premier to-day taking up the *Worker* and quoting from it an article signed by myself as leader of the Labour party, Mr. Barber as secretary, and by Messrs. Reid and Hinchcliffe, president and secretary of the political executive. I suggested then that the hon. gentleman might do a very good thing if he were to read from the same paper an article that appears in this week's issue—an article which places the case more clearly before the electors of Queensland than any I have read, and I propose, if the rules

of the House permit me, to read that article, and show to the House and the country the real situation as displayed by one of the ablest writers in Queensland.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not know the purport of the article which the hon. member proposes to read, but I want to remind him that one of the most definite rules of the House is that an article from a newspaper cannot be read on a question then under consideration. The hon. gentleman may illustrate his argument from the article, but he will not be in order in reading the entire article from the newspaper in question. The hon. member, of course, may give the substance in his own words. He would be in order in doing that.

Mr. BELL: Refer every one to the article.

Mr. BOWMAN: I do not wish to go against the Standing Orders, or against your ruling. The copy of the *Worker* to which I refer is dated 23rd November.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member would be in order in conveying to the House in his own words the contents of the article, but he will not be in order in reading the article. It would not be out of order to convey the substance of the article.

Mr. BOWMAN: The question before us to-day is one which has been very faithfully stated by the leader of the Opposition—the preservation of the rights of the people in this Chamber. I contend that His Excellency's advisers have placed Queensland in the position of a Crown colony, instead of a self-governing State.

Hon. R. PHILP: Your leader "threw up the sponge." He would not go on.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is not a question of "throwing up the sponge," but if there was any honour in the present Ministry they would, after what they have been subjected to, have "thrown up the sponge," and never come here again.

The PREMIER: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Fortitude Valley in order in saying that the Premier has no honour?

The SPEAKER: No; the hon. member for Fortitude Valley did not say that. He said, "if there was any honour in the Ministry," which is a different thing. I do not think he is going outside the limits of order in saying that. If he said the hon. member was without honour, he would be out of order.

Mr. RYLAND: He might have honour and throw up.

Mr. BOWMAN: Mr. Speaker, His Excellency has practically dispensed with Parliament by the advice or the prerogative that he has given to his advisers.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You cannot say that yet.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is so far as we know from the Premier. The Premier has told us that he could get a dissolution on [5 p.m.] information which, in my opinion, was not correctly given to His Excellency.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: He quoted his exact words.

Mr. BOWMAN: He quoted his exact words, but he gave His Excellency to understand that he could form a Ministry and carry on, and the amount of browbeating and the amount of fishing for members on this side of the House has never been excelled for years in this Chamber. Even threats were held out to certain hon. members sitting behind the Opposition to-day if they did not go over and support the Government.

*Mr. Bowman.*]

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is only your statement.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is not my word only at all. It is the word of hon. members who have been approached, and when a Government has to descend to that kind of thing to enable them to carry on—

The PREMIER: It is not true.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is true.

The PREMIER: I say that it is not true.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortitude Valley must accept the hon. member's denial.

Mr. BOWMAN: In conforming to the rules of the House I have got to do it. We heard the Home Secretary this afternoon telling us what the real trouble was in connection with the present crisis. We have also been told and referred to previous statements that have been made by the leader of the Opposition during the early part of this session. We have also stated time after time in this House, as a party, that we were prepared to support that hon. gentleman in the progressive legislation which he brought in, and we have done so.

Mr. BOUCHARD: So long as it suited you.

Mr. BOWMAN: Which we are prepared to do at the present time, and over which has arisen the present trouble in connection with the Council.

The PREMIER: You also said that you could turn him out of office when you liked.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: Of course I said that we could turn them out when we liked. We are in the happy position to-day—in the position of third party—that we hold the balance of power, and we can turn out any other party we desire to.

Mr. BOUCHARD: You boasted of it.

Mr. BOWMAN: When I made that statement I also said that so long as any Government introduced measures that did not conflict with our platform we would support them. I also said that I did not care whether such measures came from the Premier who was then in office or whether they came from the party then in Opposition, if they were progressive measures this party would be found supporting them.

Mr. GRANT: You never had any reason to do other than support the then Government?

Mr. BOWMAN: No; up to the present we have had no reason to do other than support the legislation which has been introduced by the late Premier—the present leader of the Opposition.

Mr. WHITE: You took good care of that.

Mr. BOWMAN: So much the better for the country and for the party that I am identified with. The late Premier has passed, and has also endeavoured to pass, legislation this session that the Philp Government in years gone by had opportunities to pass, but they always refused to obey the will of the people. (Hear, hear!) The late Premier has also endeavoured to get the will of the people carried out in another Chamber. That, to my mind, is the main point. If a majority of this Chamber determine that a certain Bill shall pass, I contend that no power in another House should make this Assembly subservient to their will. We, to-day, are the elected representatives of the people, and the majority of the elected representatives of the people are sitting on this side of the House. The Home Secretary this afternoon told us—and it has been repeated during this week—that the

[*Mr. Bowman.*]

Wages Boards Bill was a different Bill altogether to the Bill that was introduced last session. I deny that.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAWTHORN: It was exactly the same.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was introduced exactly as it was introduced last session.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was introduced in exactly the same form as it left this House last session, and as it went to the Upper House, where they threw it out on the second reading. They never made any attempt to take it into the Committee stages, so that they might amend it if they thought it desirable, but in one act they simply cut it off on the second reading, and with very little discussion. I contend that that particular measure was before the people at the last election, and 118,432 electors favoured it as against 83,182.

Mr. MANN: Some of them supported the Philp party.

Mr. BOWMAN: I admit that while there were certain members belonging to the farming electorates who voted with the Opposition on certain questions in connection with that Bill, at the same time we have some hon. gentlemen who sat on the Opposition side of the House who voted with us.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Only one.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Only one.

Mr. BOWMAN: We had the hon. member for Croydon with us.

Mr. GRAYSON: And the hon. member for Charters Towers.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Paull, was with us both in this session and in last session on that question.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: The Home Secretary stands here to-day and flouts the representatives of the farming electorates because their interests are more identical with that of the Government; yet we find they are with the Opposition still, and it is paltry in the extreme to make such a statement as that.

Mr. WOODS: It is "the last straw."

Mr. BOWMAN: The very fact that these farming representatives are found sitting behind the Opposition to-day is the clearest evidence that they have no sympathy with the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches. The very fact that their votes have been given against the present Government in this particular crisis should satisfy the hon. gentlemen that, with all their special pleading, it is useless for them to expect any members on this side of the House to go there in support of them. We were told this afternoon by the Hon. the Home Secretary that the question of parties to-day wanted altering. I do not know one hon. gentleman in this House who wants altering more than that hon. gentleman himself.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear, and laughter.

Mr. BOWMAN: No one has altered more or somersaulted more than he has, and to-day he is distrusted by some of his very colleagues.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: No, no!

The SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in saying that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. BOWMAN: We were also told on one memorable occasion, when the Federal election was taking place, that the fight was to be anti-socialism against socialism, and the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Home Secretary to-day was the individual who told the ladies in South Brisbane at a public meeting that for the time being the ladies of Brisbane were to make friends even with the working men's wives that ride in cars or omnibuses, so that they might elicit their sympathy. This was a man playing the hypocritical part of a politician, and you know, Mr. Speaker, as an old parliamentarian, what the record of that hon. gentleman is.

Mr. BARNES: You supported him since.

Mr. BOWMAN: He was a member of a Government, and, according to the statements he made only the day before yesterday, he was unworthy to be trusted by that Government, because when certain measures were introduced by the Cabinet, which the Cabinet resolved that they would endeavour to carry out not only through this Chamber but through another Chamber, that hon. gentleman sat in the House and told us that while he was a fellow Cabinet Minister in the late Morgan-Kidston Government he hoped that the Council would throw it out. Do you call a man honest in politics that will do that?

Mr. BOUCHARD: There was another member who said the same thing in the Government.

Mr. BOWMAN: I would not be surprised at what this hon. gentleman says. (Laughter.) He is also just as topsy-turvy as the hon. member for Oxley. (Loud laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOWMAN: It has been a question of see-saw with the hon. member, the same as the hon. member for Oxley.

Mr. BOUCHARD: You know that is absolutely untrue.

Mr. BOWMAN: All I can say is this: that we had him sitting behind us as a coalition party last Parliament, and he did all he knew against the man he was pledged to support. He was like a rat running from a sinking ship. He thought there was a chance of getting in with a stronger party, and at the last election he fled from the party he pledged himself to and went with the present Government party.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Sensible man.

Mr. BOUCHARD: I rise to a point of order—to make a personal explanation. The hon. senior member for Fortitude Valley has just said that I ran away from the late Government, which I promised to support, on the eve of a general election, in order to save my seat. I say that it is an absolute misstatement.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOUCHARD: I appeal to the hon. member for Dalby—

Mr. BELL: I hope you will not. (Laughter.)

Mr. BOUCHARD: I appeal to the hon. member for Dalby—whom I believe to be a honest man, although he is opposed to me—I appeal to the hon. member for Enoggera, the hon. member for Warwick, and also the hon. member for Ipswich—all of whom are opposed to me, and all of whom I believe to be honest men—to say whether I ever promised to support Mr. Kidston in the campaign that was about to come forward.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

1907—5 r

Mr. BOUCHARD: I say that the statement of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley is absolutely false and unfounded.

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. gentleman has made a very strong statement that he never gave a promise to support the late Premier, Mr. Kidston. I ask the hon. gentleman to turn up the "Votes and Proceedings;" I ask him to turn up the debates, and then tell me whether he did not support Mr. Kidston as Premier. We have there a record of his votes. We have also a record of his speeches, and I want no more than that to brand a man a follower. But the hon. gentleman thought, as I have truly stated, that he was going to be left if he went under the Kidstonian wing, and he flew to the Hon. Robert Philp; and he happened to retain him for a time—I think it will be a short time. I think the electors of South Brisbane, at any rate, will give him his quietus if the election takes place at an early date, and here is one who is going to do his best to down him if I can. (Hear, hear! and laughter.)

Mr. BOUCHARD: That goes without saying.

Mr. BOWMAN: Now, reference was also made this afternoon by the Home Secretary, Mr. Denham, that the question of electoral reform was a matter that could have stood over for either one or two sessions—that we should not have thought of that question. I dealt with this at a previous sitting of this House, but I think a majority of this House recognises that after the corruption that took place in connection with the system of postal voting during the late election this side of the House would be unworthy of their places here—that even the late Government would have been unworthy of support after the evidence which has been tendered. And who tendered the strongest evidence in this matter? Why, the present Minister for Lands stood in his place here and told us the case was so glaring. He actually challenged the Minister for Works—he challenged the Government even—to take proceedings because the case was so strong. Is not that a sufficient reason that we should follow the hon. gentleman's advice and get rid of a system in connection with which so many evils were perpetuated during the last election? And, as I stated the other day, while it was used in a limited sense during the last election, if the opportunity offers for the postal vote to be used, we know that hon. gentlemen sitting on that side of the House have the financial institutions, and money has been subscribed by various large organisations.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is not a fact.

Mr. BOWMAN: It has been subscribed so that they could down both the Federal Labour party and—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member for Fortitude Valley correct in repeating a statement which has been denied—that hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the Chamber have had money to fight elections from financial institutions?

Mr. MULCAHY: You can only speak for yourself.

The SPEAKER: I do not know that the hon. member is out of order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: The statement may be true or untrue. It may be true as far as the hon. member is concerned; it may be untrue as far as other hon. members are concerned. To say that an hon. member receives money from a financial institution does not mean corruption unless it is given for a corrupt purpose. I may say that a

*Hon. J. Leahy.]*

great deal of the discussion to-night has been irregular. It has often ranged outside the question before the House; but I recognise that there is a great deal more before the House than any particular vote, and for that reason I have thought it advisable that we should allow fair latitude in debate. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. BOWMAN: It is a well-known fact that money was sent from the South during the last election to help candidates here running in the Philp interest—to defeat both Kidstonians and the Labourites.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You know that you cannot prove that.

Mr. BOWMAN: In 1902, in the contest I was engaged in for the Warrego seat, I know that a sum of money was contributed towards the support of my opponent at that time. I know that it was from the South. I know that it cost the Minister for Works and Mines between £500 and £600 to defeat me on that occasion—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has conveyed the idea that I was assisted by money from the South. I take this opportunity of stating that I never received one penny.

Mr. BOWMAN: I know from the hon. gentleman's own remark to myself that it cost him and his party between £500 and £600 to defeat me.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: I never received a penny.

Mr. BOWMAN: What is the good of telling lies?

The SPEAKER: I must point out that there is a well-known rule of debate which requires an hon. member to accept the word of another hon. member. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. BOWMAN: The question of the postal vote is one that is going to command a good deal of money in order to fight the elections with the postal vote. And I am satisfied, as the junior member for Ipswich says, that, despite the money, despite the power of the Press, despite the forces they can bring against our party—and, I believe, even against the Opposition—when the facts are made known throughout Queensland as to the position as to the way in which the gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches have gained that position, they will give them the greatest roundabout they have had for many years.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What are you afraid of?

Mr. BOWMAN: We are not afraid, but, as the leader of the Opposition stated to-day, there is more than the question of an election at stake. There is a constitutional question at stake that has been more ably put before this House by the leader of the Opposition than I am capable of putting it. But hon. members will recognise that the fight we are engaged in is one that was fought hundreds of years ago, and it has been resurrected by the present Administration, on the advice that they have tendered to His Excellency, to try and bring about a dissolution while the majority of the representatives of the people sit here and are willing and able to carry out their desires. And yet, on the other side of the House they sit there at the pleasure of this House, so long as we care to keep them. I never saw anything more contemptible in my life. They sit there, and take the composition of the party! There was a great deal of talk about the Kidston Government having almost the whole of its Cabinet lawyers. I think we might, at any rate, reply that the bulk of the

men who sit on the front benches are, instead of being lawyers, middlemen—the butter box and timber combine. (Laughter.) We recognise the anxiety of the hon. gentlemen, who are anxious for a dissolution. We recognise what their policy would be. Let us take the past experience of the gentleman who is leading the Government to-day, and I ask, in the name of the people of Queensland, what are we to hope from the record that to-day occupies the Bills on the statute-book and also in the "Parliamentary Debates" of this Chamber, as the result of the government of that hon. gentleman? Supposing that hon. gentleman is ever privileged to carry out the programme that he may submit, what are we to expect? Have not his party been regarded as the black labour party of Queensland? Have not some of their lady friends, who recently attended a conference in Melbourne, been telling the country at large that the question of black labour is not yet at an end? The white men of Queensland have been libelled in a manner such as no white men have been belittled by these so-called "ladies." We have been told by one lady from New South Wales at that convention she did not take so pessimistic a view as the ladies who came from Queensland, but she stated that "if you return a Liberal Government you will get the kanaka back again." And the party that are sitting on that side of the House—the anti-socialists, the anti-labour to the backbone, the anti-everything that is progressive—are prepared to support the sentiments that were given utterance to by those ladies.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is a Federal matter.

Mr. BOWMAN: I have evidently suggested something to the hon. gentleman that he does not relish, but he must take my remarks as I give them to him. We must recognise that in the event of an election taking place we will have to fight a party that has advocated a policy of having every acre of the land in this country sold—a party that is prepared to boom syndicate-railways as they did of old. Speaking more particularly for my own party, I may say that we will fight the election on behalf of the rights of the people and against syndicates and trusts. We recognise the world over to-day that it is a fight against class. And such a class war will begin here during this present week. We have here a body of men who do not possess the confidence of the majority of the electors of Queensland, and yet, for their own aggrandisement, for their own designs, they are prepared, by the aid of His Excellency's advisers or representatives, to do anything to get the necessary power to dissolve this House. And they want Supply that they may go to the country to carry on as if they had the confidence of this House. I, for one, speaking on behalf of my party, will refuse point blank to grant one penny of Supply to a Government that is, in my opinion, discredited beyond all power as regards the attitude they have taken up in endeavouring to carry out a policy which the majority of this House has told them thrice—and will tell them a fourth time to-night—that they cannot carry out. If they go to the country the fight will be sharp and hot, and the question of getting a dissolution from His Excellency, on the misinformation that has been given by his chief adviser, is a disgrace to the Government that sent its representative to give it to His Excellency.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Cries of "Divide."

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*): The political situation has been rapidly undergoing trans-

formation. At first it was a small quarrel between both Houses. Then it developed into a fight between two parties. Now it has become a great constitutional battle on behalf of the rights and liberties of the people. I will not attempt to add anything myself to the good and forceful speeches which have been made on this occasion. But as the struggle will be an important one, and as the numbers of those who vote in division will weigh with His Excellency, and as what happens on this occasion will doubtless form a precedent, I would like, in order to account for the absence of one member from the Chamber, to read a telegram. I do this as an act of duty to my friend, the hon. member for Clermont, Mr. Lesina. If he were here I know well, knowing his mind as I do, how his vote would go. But he unfortunately has been called away by a sad circumstance. His wife has been sick for a long time, and he was called away to Sydney by a telegram sent to him by his wife asking him to come to her, as she was seriously sick. Yesterday I went to his house to obtain his address, and I was given by his father the original telegram which called him away, and which I would like to read. It is from Sydney, and is dated 18th November. It is addressed to J. Lesina, Merivale street, South Brisbane, and reads, "Very ill. Come at once." It is signed P. Lesina, which is Mrs. Lesina's name. If I received a telegram of that kind from my wife, political crisis or no crisis, I would go at once and do my duty towards her. I merely give this information in order to justify the absence of one of the members of this House, who, if he were here, would give his vote in the interest of the people.

Mr. BOUCHARD (*Brisbane South*): We have just listened to a speech from the senior member for Fortitude Valley which has been brimful of personalities and abuse.

Mr. BOWMAN: It stung you.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Not a bit of it. Probably before I have finished I shall say something that will sting the hon. senior member for Fortitude Valley. Nothing that he [5.30 p.m.] has said has in any way stung me. The hon. member twitted me with having left one party and supported another party at the last election. When I went before the electors of South Brisbane at the last election I put my position fully and clearly before them. I was returned to this House on the 29th of August, 1904, for the purpose of supporting Mr. Morgan, who at that time had formed a coalition Government with the Labour party. After the House had passed through four sessions, Mr. Morgan left his party and went to another place. I was then in the position that I was without a leader. Those of us who were elected to support Mr. Morgan appointed another leader, in order to preserve our entity. That leader was Mr. Denham, and when Mr. Denham left the Kidston Ministry I left with him. I explained to the electors of South Brisbane the position which I took up, and they returned me to this House.

Mr. PAGET: That was their answer.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Yes, that was their answer; and I have no hesitation in saying that I came back here with a clean and consistent record.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you electioneering just now?

Mr. BOUCHARD: There were certain members on the other side of the Chamber who, if they acted in accordance with the dictates of their consciences, would, when this amendment

which has been moved by the leader of the Opposition went to a division, vote, not with the leader of the Opposition, but with the Premier.

Mr. BARBER: Another bait to them?

Mr. BOUCHARD: I am the keeper of my own conscience, and I would like some hon. members who are not feeling very happy on the present occasion to have some regard to their own consciences. At the last election the present leader of the Opposition went to the country with the pronounced intention of forming a party of his own, he not being satisfied with the existence of the two parties behind him. I admired the hon. gentleman for his courage on that occasion, and for the utterances which he made during the election. The hon. gentleman then stated that he would have no divided allegiance—that he must have returned to support him a party whose first business must be to support the Government policy. The Home Secretary read an extract yesterday from a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman at Toowoomba, in which he said that he would not be in the position of Alfred Deakin for twenty-four hours. He told the electors of Toowoomba, and through them the electors of Queensland, to make no mistake about it—that if they wanted him to control the affairs of this State they must return him with a majority that would enable him to carry out his policy. What was the result of the general election? The hon. gentleman did not get that majority, but came back in a minority. He was not even able to elect a Speaker or a Chairman of Committees, and he admitted his inability in that respect from his position in this Chamber, and said he could not carry on under the existing state of affairs. A little later the late Government directed their attention to certain measures—measures which were of no urgency, even if they were of any importance to the State. They brought in a Bill to practically abolish the postal vote. That Bill was passed and sent to the Council, and was then remitted back to this Chamber with certain amendments, which the Government refused to accept. The Bill was then returned to the Council, and it was dropped. There would have still been at least two more sessions of this Parliament in which to have passed that measure before there would have been any necessity for the exercise of the postal vote, had not the present crisis arisen. The other measure to which the Opposition attach importance is the Wages Boards Bill. Up to the present time that measure has not been returned from the Council. We find that certain members in this House are supporting a gentleman whose object was to stuff the other Chamber, with the view of passing through that House certain legislation of his own. The Government party opposed the inclusion of the farming industry in that Bill. They had before them the legislation which had been passed in New Zealand, and which excluded from its operations the farming industry. They had also before them the experience of the Victorian Legislature, which exempted from the provisions of its Wages Boards Act the agricultural industry. Yet we find that certain representatives of the farming industry, who supported the present Government in their opposition to the inclusion of the farming industry in the Wages Boards Bill, are now standing by the Opposition in their effort to pack another Chamber in order to force through that House certain legislation which is obnoxious to those members. Later on, we saw in the daily Press a copy of the circular which had been sent out by the secretary of a new federation league, designated the "Liberal and Labour Federation League."

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A good name, too.

*Mr. Bouchard.]*

Mr. BOUCHARD: The object of that league—

Mr. COWAP: It will knock out the likes of you.

Mr. BOUCHARD: The object of that league is precisely the same as the object which the leader of the present Opposition had when he went to the country—that is, to wipe out the Labour party.

Mr. BOWMAN: And they are still here.

Mr. BOUCHARD: And they are still here. The senior member for Fortitude Valley has talked about consistency in this Chamber. I have heard him revile time after time certain persons who do not belong to unions. The leader of the Opposition was at one time a member of the Labour party, and was its leader. Now we have the hon. member forming a Labour league of his own in order to crush the Labour party. The hon. member for Fitzroy has subscribed to the platform of the Labour party time after time, and he has "ratted" on that platform. Where is the consistency in those cases? I say that the senior member for Fortitude Valley is not consistent—that he is sitting behind a gentleman who has deserted the Labour party, of which the hon. member is the leader.

Mr. BOWMAN: Did you expect him to sit behind your leader?

Mr. BOUCHARD: I have it within my knowledge that on a very recent occasion when, during the passage of the Estimates, the hon. member was criticising a certain department, he produced a piece of rusty iron in support of his position, and I remember how the hon. member was threatened with arrest for stealing Government property—a piece of rusty iron. (Laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: I am still free.

Mr. BOUCHARD: And yet the hon. member is still sitting behind the hon. gentleman who said that, and is giving him his support and the support of the Labour party.

Mr. KERR: Is this comic opera?

Mr. BOUCHARD: We have before us a position which is not the creation of the Government. The position has been created by the leader of the Opposition; and, as the Premier has stated, he would not have been a man if he had failed to take up the position which has been thrust upon him. As has been pointed out before, the Labour party have time after time raised their cry in this Chamber—"Trust the people!" That is precisely what the Government wish to do. They desire to go to the people and get a mandate from them.

Mr. HUNTER: They will not trust you.

Mr. BOUCHARD: I think I have a better chance of getting back to this Chamber than the hon. member for Maranoa. I know the hon. member is trembling in his shoes. (Opposition and Labour laughter!)

Mr. BOWMAN: Why, you would make a good undertaker's mute.

Mr. BOUCHARD: He considers he is on the verge of an earthquake. It is only necessary to see the demeanour of the hon. member and of other members during the last few days to know that they have been led to believe there was no chance of a dissolution. He and other hon. members have been held to allegiance by a promise of that kind. We saw the late Secretary for Lands, the hon. member for Dalby, the other evening producing certain precedents and authorities with great gusto. He was satisfied that there was not going to be any dissolution.

Mr. BELL: I am perfectly satisfied there ought not to be a dissolution.

[*Mr. Bouchard.*

Mr. BOUCHARD: They had what they considered was the "right bower" in refusing Supply. But it would appear as though the Premier had up his sleeve the "joker," and that is what has disappointed certain members on the other side. The position is a perfectly clear one. We are being forced to the country by reason of the action of the leader of the Opposition. The Premier was perfectly willing, in the present circumstances of the country, to go on with the business of the House. It is an admitted fact that the present is a very undesirable time for an election. I believe it is not in the best interests of the country that there should be a general election at the present time; but the action of hon. members opposite has made it compulsory, unless they see fit, in the interests of the country, to adopt a different attitude.

Mr. COWAP: How could you have a dissolution if you adopted another attitude? What sort of a dissolution is that?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. BOUCHARD: I am afraid it may not be in order to say so, but I wish the hon. member possessed a little more intelligence than he has shown in making such an interjection.

Mr. BELL: Let us get a division.

Mr. BOUCHARD: The hon. member for Dalby will get a division when I have spoken.

Mr. BELL: The leaders on your front bench have agreed not to speak, and we have agreed not to speak, so that we might get a division.

Mr. BOUCHARD: I know nothing about that. I claim my right to speak in this Chamber, and I intend to exercise that right, despite the protest of the hon. member. The responsibility for the present position is on the Opposition and those behind them. There are certain railways which it was absolutely necessary, in the best interests of the State, should be constructed. And who is deterring us from carrying out any railway policy?

Mr. COWAP: The Philpites.

Mr. BOUCHARD: Who is causing this inconvenience in the conduct of public affairs? It is the Opposition and those behind them. Notwithstanding any pique that hon. members may feel at the turn affairs have taken, I look to them not to create any inconvenience by withholding Supply, because it has been pointed out that, even if Supply is refused, a dissolution will follow. The solution of the present situation is in the hands of hon. members, and it is upon them that the responsibility for the situation which has been created by the leader of the Opposition and those behind him must rest.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Divide, divide! Question!

Mr. CREAGH (*Croydon*): I would like to address one or two words to the Chamber while the height of excitement is centred in this debate. I have more than one reason for doing so. Practically, the present position has been brought about by a resolution which was passed in this Chamber the other day, and for which I voted. I happened to be absent from the Chamber a few moments ago when the leader of the Labour party mentioned my name. A couple of friends just arrived from the North, and they sent up their names to me, and I went out of the Chamber to see them, and I understand that while I was out of the Chamber the hon. member made a reference to me.

Mr. BOWMAN: Only to where you sat.

Mr. CREAGH: I have no reason whatever to doubt the accuracy of what I was told, though the words that were reported to me may have

conveyed something different to what I grasped at the time. I have had a good many conversations with the hon. member, both political and private, and I take this opportunity of saying that he has never been anything towards me except what was absolutely honourable. I understand that the hon. member made reference to where the hon. member for Croydon sat. I do not know whether the remark was made satirically or whether it was made by way of reference to the present situation. If it was meant to convey that in sitting on the Opposition cross benches I was not doing what was right I wish to say that, when I went before the electors of Croydon when I was asked where I would sit I said, "I will take up my seat on the Opposition cross benches, and whether the Philp party be returned to power or whether the Kidston party be returned to power I will retain my seat there till I come back to you and give you an account of my stewardship." I ask any hon. member whether I have done right or whether I have done wrong? I have been one of those people who have yielded to the voice of the people, and, no matter how I vote, I am perfectly justified in sitting on the Opposition cross benches. I want that to be thoroughly understood. The ex-Secretary for Lands laughs. That may convey something also. (Laughter.) It is quite time that the whole situation should be clearly defined by the electors. I take this opportunity of congratulating the leader of the Labour party on what he has said. He and his party are, of course, perfectly entitled to sit where they like and vote as they like, and I claim the privilege of doing the same thing. I ask the ex-Secretary for Lands whether I am not entitled to do the same thing? And as to his satire—well, I am perfectly indifferent to it. Now, the other question to which I wish to allude is this—

Mr. KENNA: Are you in favour of a dissolution?

Mr. CREAGH: The hon. member asks me if I am in favour of a dissolution, and I tell him candidly and straightforwardly that I am not. When I take up that stand I am speaking as independently as I did when I first came into this Chamber. I am not going back to my constituents to be accused of having forgotten my pledges to them or forgotten to do something which I promised them I would do. Every vote I have given is, I am pleased to say, recorded, and there is not one which I have given, whether in favour of the leader of the Opposition or of the leader of the Government, which has not been fair and square, and in accordance with the promises which I gave to my constituents.

Mr. BELL: Let us get to a division.

Mr. CREAGH: Never mind the division. I have my own division to look after—(laughter)—and I am going to have my say. There are sixteen or seventeen members sitting round me who have the leader of the Labour party as the exponent of their views. No doubt those views have been endorsed in caucus; but I have no one to speak for me, and I will pursue my present attitude as long as I like. I consider that there is a certain amount of honour and courage required in the position I have taken up here to-day. I know that every possible detail will be brought up against me at the election which is going to take place in a few weeks.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

Mr. CREAGH: Well, it may or it may not. I have no information about the matter, and I

am merely giving expression to what I understand. At all events, I shall have no hesitation in going back and telling the electors of Croydon what I have done.

Mr. BELL: Why do you not say all this to the electors?

Mr. CREAGH: I would ask the hon. gentleman why the leader of the Opposition did not say what he had to say to the electors? He made a very good statement from his point of view, but why did he not keep it for a Rockhampton audience? When the ex-Secretary for Lands quoted constitutional authorities the other day, why did he not keep what he had to say for his electors instead of trying to get an electioneering speech in advance into *Hansard*? Surely to goodness the hon. gentleman will give me the same opportunity as he had himself! I am very pleased to say that I am not in the hon. gentleman's hands, and that under our great and glorious privileges I can speak as long as I like, so long as I speak to the point and within the rules. The election will take place at no distant date.

Mr. MULCAHY: Are you serious?

Mr. CREAGH: Yes, I am serious. I care not whether I am returned or not, although I confess I would like to get back amongst the friends I have made here. No one has treated me in anything but a courteous and considerate manner since I have been here, with the exception, perhaps, of a couple who are sitting quite close to me. (Laughter and interruption.)

The SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members to preserve order while the hon. member is addressing the House.

Mr. CREAGH: I recognise the seriousness of this situation, although the hon. member for Fortitude Valley and some others do not appear to do so. As far as this election is concerned, I do not think there is a man in this Assembly who would sooner not go up for a new election than I; not because I am afraid of a fight, but because there is no man less able to bear the expense of an election. But I am as independent now as when I first came here, and am prepared to fight my battle over again. Now, in reference to the memorial. The leader of the Opposition has told us that this is a fight between the Upper House and the Assembly. I contend that is not so.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is.

Mr. CREAGH: The only two matters which have arisen in connection with this situation are the refusal to repeal the postal-ballot provisions in the Elections Act, and one clause in the Wages Boards Bill. The ex-Premier told us he was bent on seeing the matter through. I was glad he took up that position, and I went over and supported him. The next thing we find is that, when there is a little bit of wavering on the part of the "black soil crowd," he said the question of including the farmers was a very small matter and of no importance, and if it had been in the Bill originally it would not have been worth talking about. We heard next that the Government were not going to fight the Council on the matter, and next that he would insist on the provision going into the Bill, and it is now currently rumoured that the ex-Premier informed the "black soilers" that he would not insist on the measure. Although I am going to vote against the memorial presented by the leader of the Opposition, I want to say that if he had brought the fight with the other House to a head in another way I would have supported

Mr. Creagh.]

him, and if he makes a separate fight on that question at the election, I am quite prepared to form my own idea as to what course I am going to take. (Laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: Are you going on the fence? Are you a George Reid?

Mr. CREAGH: No, I am not on the fence. I am in a similar position to the hon. gentleman. I am in the same position that the hon. gentleman said he and his party are in. He said they had come here to do what was right, and I claim to have come here to do what I think is right, and to act independently.

Mr. BOWMAN: Then what are you growling at?

Mr. CREAGH: The hon. gentleman said that, even if the Premier of Queensland wanted the Labour party to alter their course, they would not do so. He asks me what I am growling at. My position is intelligible, I have never allied myself with any party. I have always given an independent vote. Whenever I have given my vote on any question, I have never gone back [6 p.m.] on it. I came to a certain decision over this matter after due consideration, and I recorded my vote in accordance with the conclusions which I had come to, and I will record my vote in the same way to-night when it comes to a division. I want the matter to be understood, and I would like to say, in answer to the leader of the Labour party—

Mr. BOWMAN: You do not know what I said.

Mr. CREAGH: I took the precaution of asking the hon. gentleman what he said, and I think he will admit that he said it. I do not wish to delay the House any longer—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CREAGH: The moment is a very exciting one; and, as the ex-Minister for Lands said on one occasion, the limelight is thrown on. Well, I am able to take the full glow of that limelight. I stand here to-night as I have always been—independent of any particular man or party. I came here as an independent. I came to cast my vote as I liked, and I am not responsible to anyone for it. If I have done wrong in the way I have voted, the electors will throw me out; but I am certain that when I explain my position to the electors, then, in the very near future, you will see me sitting here again. (Hear, hear! and laughter.)

Cries of "Divide, divide!" and "Question!"

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Kidston's amendment*) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 27.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Millican
" Barnes	" Moore
" Blocksidge	" Paget
" Bouchard	" Pault
" Campbell	" Petrie
" Creagh	" Philp
" Cribb	" Plunkett
" Denham	" Somerset
" Forrest	" Stephens
" Fox	" Stodart
" Hanran	" Swayne
" Keogh	" Walker
" P. J. Leahy	" White
" McMaster	

Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. White.

[Mr. Creagh.

NOES, 37.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Land
" Barber	" Lennon
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" McIntyre
" Bowman	" Mann
" Brennan	" Maughan
" Cowap	" May
" Douglas	" Mitchell
" Grant	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Nevitt
" Hardacre	" O'Sullivan
" Hawthorn	" Payne
" Herbertson	" Rankin
" Hunter	" Redwood
" Jackson	" Roberts
" Jones	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Sumner
" Kerr	" Woods
" Kidston	

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Maughan.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Macartney and Mr. Cameron.  
Noes—Mr. Grayson and Mr. Maxwell.

The SPEAKER: Question resolved in the negative.

Cheers and counter cheers.

Mr. BOWMAN (to the Government benches): Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Kidston's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 37.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Land
" Barber	" Lennon
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" McIntyre
" Bowman	" Mann
" Brennan	" Maughan
" Cowap	" May
" Douglas	" Mitchell
" Grant	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Nevitt
" Hardacre	" O'Sullivan
" Hawthorn	" Payne
" Herbertson	" Rankin
" Hunter	" Redwood
" Jackson	" Roberts
" Jones	" Ryland
" Kenna	" Sumner
" Kerr	" Woods
" Kidston	

Tellers: Mr. Maughan and Mr. Barber.

NOES, 27.

Mr. Armstrong	Mr. Millican
" Barnes	" Moore
" Blocksidge	" Paget
" Bouchard	" Pault
" Campbell	" Petrie
" Creagh	" Philp
" Cribb	" Plunkett
" Denham	" Somerset
" Forrest	" Stephens
" Fox	" Stodart
" Hanran	" Swayne
" Keogh	" Walker
" P. J. Leahy	" White
" McMaster	

Tellers: Mr. White and Mr. Bouchard.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Grayson and Mr. Maxwell.  
Noes—Mr. Macartney and Mr. Cameron.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Original, as amended, put and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I take this to be a vote to refuse Supply in order to enable the Government to go to the country.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It is no use prolonging the debate now. I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. KIDSTON: Oh, no! This House does not adjourn until we have received a reply from His Excellency.

Question put.

Mr. KIDSTON: This is an atrocious proposal—to propose that this House do now adjourn, when we are in communication with His Excellency.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: With the King.

Mr. KIDSTON: Shall we not wait till we get His Excellency's reply? The hon. gentleman does not seem to have the slightest idea of the position we are in. (Interruption.) I understand that His Excellency has been pleased to intimate that he would receive this advice within half an hour or so after the House has adopted it. Shall we not then adjourn for tea? Let Mr. Speaker present the address to His Excellency, and come back at half-past 7 or 8 o'clock with His Excellency's reply.

Mr. BOWMAN and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Do you expect a reply in that time? It may require some consideration.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Are we to sit here a week?

Mr. KIDSTON: I am quite willing—it is for His Excellency to say when he will give his reply. (Hear, hear!) His Excellency has only to intimate to this House what time he wants a reply, and I am sure the House will wait—be pleased to wait.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And will meet again at that time.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Next week if he likes.

Mr. KIDSTON: We can meet at 8 o'clock.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What for?

Mr. KIDSTON: Till His Excellency has been pleased to receive Mr. Speaker, and give his reply.

The PREMIER: I have no objection at all. GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

The PREMIER: But there is no guarantee we can get any reply to-night.

Mr. GRANT: We can adjourn then.

Mr. KIDSTON: This is a question for His Excellency.

The PREMIER: An important resolution has been passed, and very likely it will require some time to get a reply, but if the House desires, we can adjourn the House till 9 o'clock, if it please the leader of the Opposition, or till 8 o'clock.

Mr. KIDSTON: Say 8 o'clock.

Mr. BELL: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I may mention, for the information of the Assembly, that His Excellency was good enough to convey to me—because it might be for the convenience of the House—that he would be pleased at any time within half an hour of the passage of a motion—which he understood from certain information he received would

go through—to receive the address. Of course, it is getting on to the dinner hour now. I cannot say whether His Excellency will be prepared at the present time to receive it or not, because it is rather an unusual hour.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Give him time.

The SPEAKER: I intimated this to the leader of the Opposition. I had intended to intimate it to the Premier, but forgot to do so—so that the leader of the Opposition was in possession of information which the leader of the Government had not got at the same time. I propose to resume the chair at 8 o'clock, and in the meantime to get into communication with His Excellency, present the address to him, and probably I may be able to bring a reply by that hour. If not, I will communicate to the Chamber His Excellency's message. I shall resume the chair at 8 o'clock.

The SPEAKER left the chair at twenty minutes past 6 o'clock.

[8 p.m.]

The House resumed.

The SPEAKER: I have to announce to the House that I waited upon His Excellency this evening and presented to him the resolution which had just been previously adopted by this House, and that His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:—

Government House,  
Brisbane, 22nd November, 1907.

MR. SPEAKER,—

An address carried by thirty-seven members out of a House of seventy-two must receive the gravest consideration.

I have to thank you, gentlemen, for your courtesy in allowing me an advance copy of your address before being moved in the House.

I do not propose to answer the points of your address seriatim, but shall briefly put before you the position as I see it.

The paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of your address deal with the constitutional position of the Upper House.

That is the great constitutional issue with which my late Premier invited me to deal.

I declined, because I considered the matter too grave for a Governor to touch without a mandate from the people.

By the exercise of the prerogative of dissolution the people are asked to say what they wish done.

I fully recognise the inadvisableness of frequent general elections. I appreciate the peculiar inconveniences of an election at this time, but I regard it as of paramount importance that the country should speak its mind on this question, and therefore I have to decline the prayer of your address.

I recognise to the full the responsibility I have taken on my shoulders throughout this disturbed political period.

From time to time, under the Constitution, a Governor has to take responsibility, and I cannot shirk it when laid upon me.

CHELMSFORD,  
Governor.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: Now you "black soilers" have it before you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. KIDSTON: This is a somewhat extraordinary position. His Excellency has turned down his thumb.

Mr. KEOGH: Turned you up, at all events.

Mr. KIDSTON: The Czar has dismissed the Duma. And now this matter is for the people of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: That is what we want.

*Mr. Kidston.*]

Mr. KIDSTON: Queensland to-night is face to face with a situation which I do not believe has ever occurred in any British-speaking community.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Several times.

The SPEAKER: I would like hon. members to recognise the gravity of the occasion. The circumstances are exceptional, and I would ask hon. members to preserve order.

Mr. KIDSTON: And one of the not least noticeable features of this situation is that the Premier, who has advised His Excellency to this extraordinary course, quietly rises in his place—having previously given the House to understand that it is to be dissolved—says not a word—even by way of courtesy—to the representatives of the people as to how affairs are going to be financed for the next two or three months. I venture to say that such a situation never existed in the Parliament of any British community.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You are responsible for that.

Mr. KIDSTON: I do not think interruptions are good on an occasion like this, but I thank the hon. member for that last interruption. The Hon. the Premier, before he adjourned, tried to put the responsibility on this House when he said he would take this vote as a refusal of Supply.

Mr. JENKINSON: Is it not right?

Mr. KIDSTON: That is an important matter and it is not correct. This House has not refused Supply. On the contrary, this House specially pointed out to His Excellency that it was not only able to give Supply, but that it was willing to give Supply if His Excellency administered the affairs of the country in accordance with the wishes of the people's representatives. In what British-speaking Parliament will Supply be granted on any other terms? That is not refusing Supply. We did not refuse Supply to the Governor. Let there be no misrepresentation on this matter. This House has not only not refused Supply, but it has specifically pointed out to His Excellency that it is perfectly willing to give him Supply.

Mr. JENKINSON: Under humiliating conditions.

The SPEAKER: I trust hon. members will preserve order. This is an occasion on which members desire to hear what may be said by the leaders on both sides of the House, and I hope that hon. members will not interrupt the speakers by frequent interjections.

Mr. KIDSTON: Since when has it become a humiliation for a King of England to get Supply in accordance with the wishes of the representatives of the people? Since when has that become a humiliation? For centuries it has been recognised that the King of England, and in his self-governing dependencies the representative of the King, had no right to govern at all, had no right to use the people's money, except to govern and use the public moneys in accordance with the wishes and opinions of the representatives of the people. That is constitutional government, that is self-government, and to claim anything else for the King or a Governor is to set up the claim that caused Charles I. his head. A great principle is a great principle always, and although this is only the Parliament of a small State, and although we may be only small men who discuss this matter, yet the great principle is there all the same; and the men who are to-day taking up the position in Queensland that it is humiliating for the representative of the King to have to govern this country in accordance with the

[Mr. Kidston.

wishes of the people of the country are taking up an extraordinary position—a position that has never before been taken up in any Australian State. I have no desire to continue this discussion; I have no desire at all to beat the empty air. We have fought a good fight in a good cause.

Mr. MAUGHAN: We are only just commencing the fight.

Mr. KIDSTON: I just wish to say that I am proud of the men who have stood by me in this matter. I know that many of them, having undergone the cost and worry of an election only six months ago, no matter how confident they may be of the continued trust and confidence of their constituents, do not want to be put to the cost and worry of an election six months after they have just fought one; and I do not wonder that there has been much anxiety felt by members on both sides of the House—because there is no difference in regard to that particular point. I do not wonder that there has been a good deal of apprehension felt on this matter. And all the more, because of that, am I proud of the way in which the men of this party have stood by this great principle, without regard to the consequences to themselves. After a term of four years in office this Government goes out of office without having been once defeated.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: This Government goes out of office because they believe in the right of the people of this country to manage their own affairs.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And for no other reason whatsoever; and, let me say, it is worth while going out of office to maintain that great principle.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I would much rather go out of office, and I would much rather be beaten for Rockhampton, in addition to going out of office for such a cause, than I would stay in office after being defeated on four separate occasions in this House.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Five.

Mr. KIDSTON: I would much rather do that than still cling to office under the skirts of His Excellency. Wait till those hon. members see what the people of Queensland will say about this matter themselves.

GOVERNMENT and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ARMSTRONG: A swan's song.

Mr. KIDSTON: They think that a Queen-street Ministry is safe in Brisbane, and perhaps it is, but—

There are hills beyond Pentland, and lands beyond Forth.

Queen street is not Queensland, and this purely Brisbane Ministry—

MINISTERS: No, no!

Mr. KIDSTON: This purely Brisbane Ministry—that is too wide a name for it—this purely Courier Ministry.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear, and laughter!

Mr. KIDSTON: This Ministry, born and cradled in the Courier Building, in the Courier office, will find out—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That they will be on top.

Mr. BOWMAN: You will sink in the Warrego.

Mr. KIDSTON: I say this purely Brisbane Ministry, fighting this battle, will find that Queensland is a much bigger place than Brisbane. The fight here is over; there is no good in deceiving ourselves about the matter. I have no personal feeling in the matter, but I say that I have altogether misunderstood the character of Australians, and I have altogether misunderstood the character of the people of Queensland, if the result of the coming election is not a disastrous defeat for the party that have dared to flout the Parliament and people of Queensland as they have done.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: You brought it about! You brought it about!

Mr. KIDSTON: I did not start this fight without knowing, and without taking into account, the forces which would be arrayed against us.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: You said that twice.

Mr. KIDSTON: I know quite well the agencies that are ready to assist hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. KEOGH: Name them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is more than we know.

The PREMIER: Untrue!

Mr. KIDSTON: I know quite well how unscrupulously—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh!

Mr. KIDSTON: I know quite well how unscrupulously the power of the metropolitan daily Press will be used in the coming battle. Everyone who has been paying attention to these matters during the last fortnight must admit that probably never before in Queensland have such unscrupulous methods been resorted to in order to debauch the public mind—

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. KIDSTON: To misinform the public mind, and to pervert the issues in the public mind, so that the public would not be able to give a sound judgment. I was just shown this afternoon by one of my colleagues a paragraph in this afternoon's *Telegraph*. It is a mild example of the thing that I am going to mention. This paragraph gives in a kind of semi-official way a long list of names which are said to have been nominated to the Legislative Council. Let me explain to the House. The late Government did not nominate anyone for appointment to the Legislative Council just now at all.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. KIDSTON: The late Ministry did not ask the Governor to make any appointments to the Legislative Council.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Then why resign?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KIDSTON: What we asked was this: that it should be publicly recognised that the Governor had the same power in regard to the Upper Chamber here as the King of England has regarding the House of Lords. We believed that, just as the recognition of that principle in England had obviated the need for stuffing the House of Lords, so would the recognition of the principle in Queensland obviate the need for stuffing the Legislative Council.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Everybody knows what has been the moral effect in England of that power

in the Crown. It has scarcely ever been required to be used. The late Government believed that the same moral effect would follow upon getting the public recognition of that power in this State. I do not say that nominations to the Upper House might not have been made next session had His Excellency granted our request. But there would certainly have been none made this session. I refer to this as a concrete instance of how the public mind is misled. Although it is a strange thing to say, the unfortunate people of Brisbane cannot believe any statement about a public man which appears in the Brisbane daily newspapers.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Untrue!

Mr. KIDSTON: They cannot even believe a report of a public occurrence. They cannot even believe a report of the proceedings in this House.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They are very fair reports.

Mr. KIDSTON: They cannot believe a report of the proceedings in this House that appears in a Brisbane morning or evening newspaper.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Or a Sunday paper. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIDSTON: I quite understood all that before we went into this battle. I quite recognised the forces opposed to us. It does not trouble me at all how strong are the forces opposed to us, so long as I can be certain of the men behind me.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: They will not come back, though. (Opposition and Labour laughter.)

Mr. HAWTHORN: Speak for yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KIDSTON: In a great fight of this kind there is something better even than coming back.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: Going forward.

Mr. KIDSTON: Men who can only look at a question of this kind per medium of little considerations for their own skins are entirely unworthy to be in public life at all.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: That is yourself, I think.

Mr. KIDSTON: I hope to come back; and I hope every man who has stood with me in this battle will come back.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And no effort will be spared on my part to get back every man who has stood with us in this fight.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: Whatever little differences—nay, whatever great differences, personal or political, there may be amongst the men sitting on this side of the Chamber, I hope every one of them will recognise that this is a fight involving the most vital principle of democracy.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Not at all.

Mr. KIDSTON: This is a fight that will either set up Queensland in an exalted position

*Mr. Kidston.]*

of honour amongst British dependencies, or will sink her politically to a depth to which no dependency of the British Empire has ever yet sunk.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Government laughter.

Mr. MAUGHAN: To the level of a Crown colony.

Mr. MAY: More like a penal settlement. (Government laughter.)

Mr. KIDSTON: I am afraid that it is difficult to speak to men who are frivolous, and who have little conception of the issues which are at stake in Queensland at the present time—who do not know enough about the merits of the question to realise that there is a great principle involved. It is of little use speaking to such men. But the instinct for liberty that is so universal amongst Australians—that is so universal amongst Queenslanders—will show these men before they are three months older, if we are going to have an election, what the public think of them. And I may just point out, Mr. Speaker, that, if His Excellency can run this country for three months without a vote of Parliament, he can run it for three years without a vote of Parliament.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It could not be run much worse, anyhow.

Mr. KIDSTON: I would like to know, if this is in accordance with constitutional government, why Parliament meets at all?

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KENNA: We will impeach him.

Mr. MANN: The Commons impeached Strafford and Laud.

Mr. KIDSTON: I had really no intention of making a speech on this occasion, or of quoting high authorities on the matter, but the Minister for Lands has put into my hand—

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The Minister for Lands? (Government laughter.)

Mr. KIDSTON: The best Minister for Lands we have had in Queensland for many years.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Until the present one. (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. KIDSTON: The hon. member for Dalby has put into my hand the eleventh edition of "May's Parliamentary Practice," and has shown me a footnote on page 552—

On the advice of Mr. Pitt in 1784—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Oh—ancient history!

Mr. KIDSTON: In 1784, and on the advice of Lord Grey in 1831.

Mr. JENKINSON: A century and a-quarter ago.

Mr. BELL: Yes, as far back as that, when there was less popular government than there is now.

Mr. KIDSTON: Let me read the quotation without interruption—

The Commons in 1784 resolved that the persons who acted on Supply grants, unsanctioned by an Appropriation Act, would be guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: 1784! Long before the Reform Bill of 1832—long before even the Charter

[Mr. Kidston.

of the people's liberties was carried in England—the Commons asserted the principle that "Persons who acted on Supply grants, unsanctioned by an Appropriation Act, would be guilty of a high crime and misdemeanour." Has there been any reversal of that constitutional principle since that time?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Certainly.

Mr. BELL: Never!

Mr. KIDSTON: The Hon. the Premier knows as well as I do that before money can be paid out of the Treasury there has to be [8.30 p.m.] a warrant signed by the Auditor-General, the Treasurer, and His Excellency the Governor; and before it goes to His Excellency at all it has to have the signature of the Auditor-General certifying that there is money to pay it, and that the money has been appropriated by Parliament for that purpose. That is the method of procedure.

Mr. PAGET: What about your own expenditure?

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Did you never spend any money without a warrant?

Mr. BELL: We always had a majority.

The SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members to preserve order, although I do not object to a pertinent question being asked.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Mine was a pertinent question.

The SPEAKER: I am not referring particularly to the hon. gentleman, but these constant interjections are very disconcerting to any speaker.

Mr. BELL: That is the most disorderly cross bench in the House. (Laughter.)

Mr. KIDSTON: Now, under these extraordinary circumstances the leader of the Government quietly stands up in this House and moves that the House do now adjourn. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What else could he do?

Mr. KERR: He takes the cake.

Mr. KIDSTON: Why, if this was a quite constitutional Government; if they were carrying on by the will of the majority of the House—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They will be presently.

Mr. KIDSTON: Under the most ordinary circumstances, before Parliament was dissolved, before Parliament separated, the leader of the Government would at least notify when the election was going to be held, and give us all the information in his possession. But there is nothing of that sort here.

Mr. KROGH: You will know that in time enough.

Mr. KIDSTON: Never in any British-speaking community has such a slight been put upon the representatives of the people.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is your own fault.

Mr. KIDSTON: This is not a matter of fault. There is a right and a wrong way of carrying out the affairs of this country, and it does not matter if I am to blame; it does not matter if you say all the blame is mine, that does not excuse His Excellency acting on the advice of the Premier—

The SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in criticising the action of the Governor. His Excellency's administrators are responsible.

Mr. MULCAHY: He is a partisan.

Mr. KIDSTON: I have no intention of pursuing that line. This is not the proper place to discuss it.

Mr. KERR: We will discuss it outside.

Mr. KIDSTON: I just mention this point because it will be made much of outside. A gentleman said to me this afternoon, "But the Governor cannot be blamed, because he has to accept the advice of his responsible advisers."

Mr. KEOGH: That is perfectly correct.

Mr. KIDSTON: Mr. Speaker, he got advice from his late responsible advisers.

Mr. WOODS: Who had a majority.

Mr. KIDSTON: Perhaps that advice was not in accordance with his Excellency's wishes, but advice which was quite constitutional in the carrying out. He would not take that advice. So that, clearly, there is no obligation on His Excellency to take the advice of his responsible advisers.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And now he has taken the advice of his responsible advisers, when that advice was advising him to an exercise of his prerogative which the King of England would not exercise—which the King of England has never exercised, and which no one who knows the high character of the present King would believe for one moment he would even discuss, or consider that he should exercise.

Mr. KEOGH: The Governor took the advice when you resigned.

Mr. KIDSTON: I would just like to say, before I sit down, that the hon. gentleman opposite has broken the record amongst Australian Premiers.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MULCAHY: In more ways than one.

Mr. KIDSTON: A few years ago we thought that the Hon. Robert Philp had an excellent record—an excellent record for us.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: And he has still.

Mr. KIDSTON: He had such a record for managing the affairs of Queensland that it was an excellent record for us.

Mr. KERR: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: But on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, I think he has not only broken his own record—not only improved it for us—but I believe he has put up a record amongst Australian Premiers which it will take a long long time to equal. Now, there is just another word I would like to say in regard to one of the disadvantages that we will be under in the coming contest.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: This is an election speech.

Mr. KIDSTON: Do not let hon. gentlemen run away with the notion that, so far as the main question is concerned, there will be any doubt. They will be beaten out of the field.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Mr. JENKINSON: No special trains.

Mr. KIDSTON: But I just notice that this election has been hindered on before the postal vote could be abolished.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: This is an election speech very unworthy of you.

Mr. KEOGH: Intimidation again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The smallest thing you have done.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Quite what you might expect of him.

Mr. KIDSTON: And I have not the slightest doubt that the evils we feared from the use of the postal vote—the undue influence, the intimidation of the wives of working men—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. JENKINSON: A libel on the wives of working men.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KIDSTON: And those who are dependent on others for their living, will be very fully exercised. I think that in this respect the coming election will show how wise it was and how beneficent a thing it would have been for the great mass of the women voters of Queensland if we could have abolished the postal vote before going out of office.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: How small you are!

Mr. KIDSTON: I know quite well that these things are likely to be done now, but I sincerely hope that the women of Queensland as well as the men of Queensland will rise to this occasion.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: As their representatives in Parliament have tried to do.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: On this side.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have got as low as you can.

Mr. KIDSTON: And fight a good fight in what is, after all, their cause—securing the re-establishing of our violated Constitution—because if the people of Queensland will stand firm, in the end we are bound to win.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: And just let me say this: we are bound to win in the end, whatever happens in this election.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I have no fear about that. But I sincerely hope, for the credit of Queensland, apart from every other reason—I sincerely hope that this great principle will be reasserted by the men and women of Queensland in so overwhelming and unmistakable a way that it will be a caution to the next man—the next Premier—who may feel tempted to adopt the same course of action as the present Ministry have adopted.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I do not know that I have any more to say.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: You have made the first election speech of the campaign.

Mr. KEOGH: You need not go to Rockhampton after that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The first manifesto.

Mr. KIDSTON: I am just reminded of that paragraph in the address presented to His Excellency in which it is stated that it was unprecedented for a newly-elected Parliament which was able to grant Supply to His Excellency, and able to carry out the policy on which it had been sent to the country, and on which it had been returned—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: No.

Mr. KIDSTON: To be dissolved.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KIDSTON: I would just point out in that connection that this very question of the Upper House was before the country last election.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no; referendum.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was proposed to submit it to a referendum.

Mr. KIDSTON: In the Rockhampton manifesto is a distinct expression of policy in regard to the Upper House.

Mr. KEOGH: You put eighteen men in the Upper House yourself.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The public defeated you on that manifesto.

Mr. KIDSTON: It was proposed to establish a referendum to take away from the Upper House their power of veto, and to make the people's Chamber the supreme power in the State of Queensland.

Mr. MAUGHAN: It was also mentioned in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. KIDSTON: Yes; in the Governor's Speech at the opening of this Parliament, the same thing was referred to, and this matter is now on the business-paper before the House that we propose to deal with.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It was not your policy.

Mr. KIDSTON: There is now a Bill drafted and printed and ready for introduction into this House.

The PREMIER: It is not on the table of the House.

Mr. BOWMAN: It was a pity that it was not passed and sent on to the Upper House for them to reject.

Mr. KIDSTON: I hope I have not wearied the House. I had no intention of discussing the matter at this stage. It will be discussed a great deal in the next few months. I will only say again that I thank the men who have stood by me in this great fight, and I assure hon. gentlemen opposite that I will have great pleasure in meeting them at Philippi. And God defend the right.

Opposition and Labour cheers.

Mr. BELL: I would like to know if the hon. gentleman will inform the House as to the probable date on which the elections will be held.

The PREMIER: I will be pleased to tell the House that.

Mr. BELL: Very well.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I can assure the House that there will be no delay in bringing the elections on, because I have promised His Excellency that there will be no time lost in the matter. The House will be called together as soon as possible after the elections are over.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAUGHAN: What about the electoral rolls?

The PREMIER: I have already given this information to the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Several times.

The PREMIER: If there is any blame to be attached to anyone—

Mr. BOWMAN: You are quite blameworthy.

The PREMIER: I am quite prepared to take the blame.

Mr. KENNA: You will have to take it.

The PREMIER: When a Ministry goes to the country after it has been defeated it has always been the practice in England to grant Supply.

Mr. JENKINSON: To the defeated Ministry.

[Mr. Kidston.

The PREMIER: The late Premier would imagine that this has been the first dissolution granted to any Assembly. Why, there has been scores of dissolutions granted in Australia. Of course I must congratulate the hon. member on his speech. He made a good electioneering speech, but I am not going to follow him.

Mr. JONES: You have not got the ability.

The PREMIER: I may say that I am going to take all the responsibility of seeing that the public servants are paid their salaries without the consent of this House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I will take that responsibility, and I am quite willing—if the late Premier comes back with a majority and digs up that 1784 Act—I am quite willing to take up my share of blame, and he can convict me of a criminal offence!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I have no wish to put any members here to any unnecessary delay at all in connection with the elections. I will study their interests as much as I can. But we have a big principle to fight. We are just as much prepared to fight on this side as the late Premier is.

Mr. KIDSTON: What are you fighting for? The supremacy of the Legislative Council?

LABOUR MEMBERS: Yes, that is it.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Star Chamber.

The PREMIER: We will fight to prevent any Government or any Premier trying to stuff the Upper House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: That is the fight. Supposing the late Government had put twelve, fourteen, or fifteen members in there, the following Government might well ask for the same privilege. Why, we would soon have 100, 150, or 200 members in there. With regard to the Bill which the late Premier said was before the House relating to a referendum, I say that that Bill is not before the House at all. At the late elections there was some talk of a referendum to come before the people, but the House did not agree to it, as there has been no effort to bring that Bill forward. If the late Premier was going to do that, why did not he wait until that Bill was brought up before he started this fight at all? Why did he only ask His Excellency for permission to put more members in the Upper House? And when His Excellency did not grant permission, why did he resign?

Mr. KEER: You would not have resigned.

The PREMIER: I have taken up this fight, and I intend to see it through.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Whether we come back with a minority or a majority, we are going to see this fight through to the end.

Mr. GRANT: Is it such an extraordinary thing for men to resign on a matter of principle?

The PREMIER: I do not say that it is. Sometimes the Premier who resigns has a majority. I resigned at one time when I had a majority of two. This is a question that has never yet been before the electors, and it is just as well to bring it to an issue. I am quite satisfied that we will come back with a majority.

Government cheers.

Mr. MITCHELL: You have no hope. You said that last time.

The PREMIER: Last time the late Premier said he would not occupy the position that he occupied here all this session if he were to be Prime Minister of England.

Labour members interrupting.

The PREMIER: I have no wish to go into electioneering matters now. I have asked this House for Supply and they have refused to grant it, and I am going to the country without Supply.

LABOUR MEMBERS: When will the elections be held?

The PREMIER: We will have them as soon as possible. We cannot say the exact date on which they will be held. They cannot take place until the end of eight weeks.

Mr. KERR: That will not be before Christmas.

Mr. MAUGHAN: Will there be time for the electoral rolls to be printed?

The PREMIER: It will take some time to print the rolls. There is a lot of work being done at the Government Printing Office now in connection with the Franco-British Exhibition.

Mr. KENNA: Can you carry on for three months without Supply?

The PREMIER: There will be no time lost in getting this matter before the country and summoning the House together as soon as possible after the elections.

Mr. BOWMAN: We have got the notification from His Excellency which you, Mr. Speaker, have read to-night of a dissolution, and, before this House adjourns, I would like to say a few words in addition to what has been said by the leader of the Opposition respecting the position that has been taken up by this side of the House. I agree very largely with what he has stated, but I think the Governor, on the advice of his advisers, has made a serious mistake. The two divisions that have been taken this afternoon, I think, should have indicated to His Excellency that the memorial presented by yourself, Sir, to-night was a clear indication as to how this House felt on the question of going on with the business of this country. But His Excellency, with the power of prerogative he possesses, has been able to take out of the hands of the majority of this House, at the wishes of a minority, the control of the business of the House. I feel that the question is one that will command probably one of the strongest fights that has ever been made in Queensland; and, if I mistake not, that fight will be directed against the Philp party stronger than it ever has been in the history of our elections since he has had the honour to sit as Premier of this State.

LABOUR and OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: I think the attitude taken up by the Government has been of such a character as to belittle them in the eyes of the electors. Reference has been made to the differences that have existed between the two parties sitting on this side of the House. While we will go as independent parties to the country, I can say this: that the personal spleen that was poured into the Kidstonians by the Labour party and *vice versa*—I believe that whatever differences have existed in the past, the parties at the present time are determined, whatever happens, that the Philp Government, at any rate, will never occupy that position after the elections.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: While we, as a party, are pledged to act as a distinct party, we can use, and probably will use, a contingent vote that might have been used at the last election had there been an arrangement made, and I am going to ask the women of Queensland, through this House, that they, wherever an opportunity offers, will not be persuaded or cajoled by some of the unscrupulous justices of the peace who went through Queensland at the last election.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: And adopted all the dirty tactics it was possible to adopt to get certain members into this House. I hope that the candidates who are on this side of the House will at least urge upon every woman in Queensland who can get to a polling-booth to go there with their male relatives and record their votes, and not be cajoled, as they have been hitherto. As I stated this afternoon, I feel that the fight is one that will command perhaps more attention from the democratic forces than ever it has done in the history of Queensland.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: I feel, as I also stated this afternoon, that we are now on the eve of a class war. Men may deny it as they like, but we have at the present time the powers of wealth, the powers of the Press, and the powers that are behind the forces of syndicates and trusts in Queensland, that are desirous and have prayed for the last four years that the hon. gentleman could get on to that front Treasury bench, so that he could do as he did some years ago. When men sat on this side of the House as a Labour party and fought against the tactics of the hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister, they sat here for seventy-two hours and fought the battle, and he was the man that brought down the "guillotine" and the "gag" to stop the mouths of men who were fighting against monopolies and against syndicates. The hon. gentleman probably feels that he is in a happy position, because he is going to the country as leader of the Government, and no doubt those trusts and syndicates will do their best and spend money to their fullest limit, so that they can effectively get those men back. But I say there is a greater power than money—(hear, hear!)—a greater power than the Press—(hear, hear!)—and that is the men and women who believe that the traditions of Parliament should be upheld in an honourable way.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: I believe that the appeal which will be made from one end of Queensland to the other will not be made in vain, and that when the election takes place—whether it is in a short time or in two months' time as the Premier has indicated—I feel certain that from one end of Queensland to the other the Philp party will be defeated. Even at the present time wires are coming from many centres stating, "What we desire to do is to put down the Philp party." And that shall be the cry at the next election.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Interruption.)

Mr. BOWMAN: It shall be the cry that the will of this House in the passing of legislation will receive just recognition from the other Chamber, and that we are not to be thwarted. When the facts are laid before the people of Queensland—when the tactics that have been adopted by gentlemen occupying the front benches to-night are laid before the people of Queensland—I think that they will be inclined to

*Mr. Bowman.]*

hide their faces in shame for the tactics they have adopted merely to gain a nominal victory, by way of a dissolution, from the hands of a majority of this House. But the majority will rule. I gave this afternoon the figures—I may give them again to-night—showing that the combined parties who are here had a majority of 35,000 over the men who occupy the Ministerial benches to-night. I feel confident, if this fight is entered upon with spirit in the interests of the people and with a desire to safeguard their sacred rights, that it will not be 35,000 but it may be 60,000, and that they will be left as helpless as they were in 1904.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: I trust that now the battle has been finally conceded by His Excellency, we will go to the country with all the heart and soul we possess, determined to bring about the defeat of a Government which, I believe, will

stink in the nostrils of the people of Queensland more than any other that has ever occupied that position.

OPPOSITION and LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear! Applause and interruption.

Mr. KIDSTON: I would like to ask the Premier what the motion for adjournment means? Is it that the House is to meet as usual on Tuesday, or that there is to be an immediate dissolution?

The PREMIER: The House will probably be prorogued to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

The SPEAKER: I would like, before parting, to say to hon. members on both sides of this House that I thank them very sincerely for the kindness and courtesy they have all extended to me during my term of office. (Hear, hear!)

The House adjourned at three minutes past 9 o'clock.

---

[PROROGATION.]

*Parliament prorogued by following Proclamation in Gazette Extraordinary, Monday,  
25th November, 1907:—*

A PROCLAMATION by His Excellency the Right Honourable FREDERIC JOHN NAPIER, Baron Chelmsford of Chelmsford, in the county of Essex, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Governor of the State of Queensland and its Dependencies, in the Commonwealth of Australia.

[L.S.]

CHELMSFORD,

*Governor.*

IN pursuance of the power and authority vested in me as Governor of the State aforesaid, I, FREDERIC JOHN NAPIER, Baron Chelmsford, do, by this my Proclamation, Prorogue the Parliament of Queensland to Tuesday, the tenth day of December, 1907.

Given under my Hand and Seal, at Government House, Brisbane, this twenty-third day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seven, and in the seventh year of His Majesty's reign.

By Command,

ROBERT PHILP.

GOD SAVE THE KING!