

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 1908

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 25 NOVEMBER, 1908.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL No. 1.

ASSENT.

The SPEAKER: I have to report that I this day presented to His Excellency the Governor Appropriation Bill No. 1 for the Royal assent, and that His Excellency was pleased, in my presence, to assent thereto in the name and on behalf of His Majesty.

A message was also received from His Excellency formally notifying his assent.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): With the permission of the House, I desire to make a personal explanation. I am reported in this morning's *Courier*, and also in the *Observer*, as having said yesterday—

We would sooner have the Port Alma Railway than a good defence scheme.

The words I used were "He," meaning the Premier, "would sooner have the Port Alma Railway than a good defence scheme."

DEATH OF MR. BERNAYS.

The SPEAKER reported that he had forwarded to Mr. L. F. Bernays a copy of the resolution passed by the House on the 17th instant, and that he had received from him a letter, which he directed the Clerk to read to the House, as follows:—

Toowoomba,

20th November, 1908.

The Honourable the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Brisbane.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 18th instant conveying the resolution of the Legislative Assembly recording its appreciation of the services of the late Clerk, Mr. L. A. Bernays, C.M.G., and its sympathy with his relatives in their bereavement.

On behalf of my late father's relations I have to express their very sincere thanks for the gracious action of the House in passing the above resolution.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

L. F. BERNAYS.

QUESTIONS.

UNHEALTHY IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): I desire to ask the Premier, without notice, if his attention has been called to some remarks made in another place by Dr. Taylor when speaking on the Address in Reply. Dr. Taylor said—

A matter of necessity was careful medical inspection to prevent unhealthy immigrants being brought here. Cases had recently come under his notice where men were brought out who were calculated to be a burden on the State.

Will the hon. gentleman inquire if there is any foundation for that statement?

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*): I will give the hon. member and the House full information, as far as I have any knowledge on the subject. I may say that all immigrants brought out here have to undergo medical inspection before being shipped from London. Two cases came to my knowledge recently where it was quite evident—at least it seems to me that it was quite evident—that the medical inspection had been carelessly or perfunctorily gone through in the old country. The Agent-General has been communicated with, pointing out the need of more careful inspection, and told that, if the doctor making the inspection is careless, to get another doctor.

PORT ALMA AND BROADMOUNT.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. What is the distance from Rockhampton to Port Alma *via* the route of the proposed Port Alma Railway?

2. What is the distance from Rockhampton to Broadmount *via* the railway?

3. At what charge per ton has the Railway Department promised the shipping companies to carry from Port Alma to Rockhampton?

4. At what rate per ton per mile will this work out?

5. What charge per ton did the Railway Department recently quote to a representative of the Dutch Mail Steam Packet Company for the carriage of goods from Broadmount to Rockhampton?

6. At what rate per ton per mile will this work out?

7. Will he state what is the justification for quoting such increased rate for Broadmount to Rockhampton, seeing that the distance is considerably shorter than from Port Alma to Rockhampton?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *MacKay*) replied—

1. Thirty-five miles thirty-five chains.

2. Twenty-six miles thirty-nine chains.

3. The Commissioner agreed with the shipping companies to accept, on certain conditions, 5s. per ton, exclusive of wharfage, as his proportion of the through rate for general cargo between Rockhampton and other ports, the weight to be charged according to the ship's manifest, the loss, if any, in working and interest on capital being assured by the Rockhampton Harbour Board.

4. This cannot be arrived at as the weight is charged according to ship's manifest, which is generally arrived at by measurement.

5. The Traffic Manager, Rockhampton, in reply to their inquiry, quoted the mileage rates for 27 miles, viz.:—First class, 12s. 1d.; second class, 16s. 7d.; and third class, £1 2s. 6d., but on application being made to the Commissioner he offered to quote the Royal Dutch Packet Company a special rate for shipment traffic between Broadmount Wharf and Rockhampton, and before doing so asked information as to probable extent of business, to which the shipping company has not replied.

At a meeting between the representatives of the shipping companies and the department on the 13th April, 1900, the Commissioner agreed to a special rate of 6s. per ton, including wharfage on goods traffic between Rockhampton and Broadmount Wharf. As the conditions were not fulfilled and no traffic resulted, this rate was never brought into operation.

6. This cannot be arrived at, as the weight is charged according to ship's manifest, which is generally arrived at by measurement.

7. The quotation of 6s. was never brought into operation as no traffic resulted, and the Traffic Manager was therefore quite justified in quoting the ordinary mileage scale stated in answer No. 5.

RAILWAY EXPERT.

Mr. WOODS (*Woothakata*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. Is it true, as stated in the *Brisbane Courier* of 23rd instant, that the Railway Commissioner has engaged in England an expert to take up an important position in the Railway Department?

2. What position is such expert to take up?

3. Did the Commissioner advise the Governor in Council, as required by section 53 of the Railways Act of 1888, which says that "no appointment shall be made from outside the service unless the Commissioners shall have previously certified under their official seal to the Governor in Council that there is no person in the railway service fit and qualified to be promoted to such appointment, and shall have obtained his sanction to such appointment"?

4. Is the Minister of opinion that there are officers and men in every branch of the Government service competent to satisfactorily fill any position in it?

5. If so, why should they be ignored and an outsider appointed?

6. Has the State not suffered enough already from the blunders of imported so-called experts?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*) replied—

1. No.
- 2 and 3. See No. 1.
4. I do not care as yet to express any opinion upon the officers and men in every branch of the Government service.
5. See No. 4.
6. Possibly.

Mr. WOODS : Perhaps you are going to engage one from Russia.

ADDITIONAL DRY DOCK.

Mr. PETRIE (*Toombul*) asked the Treasurer—

1. Have any reports been made by the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers on the most suitable sites in the Brisbane River for an additional dry dock?
2. If so, will the Treasurer lay on the table of the House the reports made on the various sites?

The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*) replied—

1. The Engineer for Harbours and Rivers has reported on certain sites suggested as suitable for a dry dock.
2. Yes. I now do so.

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed :—Regulations under the Navigation Act of 1876.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

LEAVE TO INTRODUCE.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS, on behalf of the Home Secretary, it was formally resolved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Local Authorities Act of 1902 in certain particulars, and for other purposes consequent thereon.

WORKERS' DWELLINGS BILL.

INITIATION.

On the motion of the TREASURER, it was formally resolved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to enable the Government to assist persons in receipt of small incomes to provide homes for themselves.

AGENTS FOR SALE OF CROWN LANDS.

On the motion of Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*), it was formally resolved—

That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing—

1. The number of persons, outside the office of the Lands Department, who have been acting in Queensland and other States as agents for the sale of Crown lands and the introduction of intending settlers.
2. Names of agents so appointed.
3. The amount paid to each up to 30th June, 1908.
4. The number of settlers introduced per medium of such agents.
5. The area of land actually selected by these selectors.
6. The number of free passes given to such intending settlers.
7. Total cost of such passes.

LAND ACTS FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

INITIATION.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. F. Denham, *Oxley*) : I beg to move— That leave be given to introduce a Bill to further amend the Land Acts.

Question put and passed.

FIRST READING.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : I move that the Bill be now read a first time.

Mr. BOWMAN (*Fortitude Valley*) : I desire that the Minister should indicate to the House in what form he wishes to amend the Land Act under the motion submitted by him.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : The amendments are of a minor nature, for the proper administration of the various Acts. I can assure the hon. member that there is nothing at all of a contentious nature in the Bill.

Mr. AIREY : Just a machinery Bill.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : Quite a machinery Bill. The latter part is a consolidation of various Acts, scattered all over the books in one subdivision under Part IV. I think the hon. member, and hon. members generally, will recognise that there is nothing of a contentious nature in the Bill.

Question put and passed.

The second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

* Mr. MAY (*Flinders*), who was received with Opposition "Hear, hears," said : I rise to support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. I fully agree with everything that has been said by the members of the House, and particularly those on our side of the House, in giving the Premier a certain amount of vituperation and a certain amount of abuse, which I think he entirely deserves.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER : And good advice.

Mr. MAY : Yes ; they also gave him a certain amount of good advice, which I hope that he will follow in the future.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

Mr. MAY : I can say that a great number of the electors, especially those in my electorate, have not been pleased with the Premier for some time past. It happened that at a meeting of an association of which I happened to be the secretary at the time that we passed a condemnatory resolution on all those members who left the ranks of the Labour party, and since that time we have had good reason to take particular notice of the action of the Premier, especially since the last election. During the last election a certain amount of friendliness was expressed between the two parties who went to the country together—the Labour party and the Kidstonites—and we went to the country on the great constitutional issue. At that time the Premier gave us his word that there would be no coalition at all with the Philp party. It was felt that the continuous Government had been in power for so many years, but they were now out of it and things were going along smoothly with the Kidston and Labour parties combined in power, while a great many progressive measures were being passed. Last session there were a great many progressive measures

Mr. May.]

brought forward and passed, and they satisfied my constituents in a great degree, with the exception of the syndicate railways. Then the Premier started for England, and when he got to Melbourne he made that speech in which he said he was entirely done with the Labour party, and that was the forerunner of what has since taken place—namely, the coalition between the Philpites and the Kidstonites. During the election campaign I said that such a coalition would come to pass, but the Kidstonites throughout the country would not believe me, and said that they had more faith in the Premier than others had.

Mr. MURPHY: They had too much faith.

Mr. MAY: Yes, they had too much faith. They said: "No, the Premier is a progressive man, and he will never return to the retrograde side of the House." We have many things to speak about, but we will be able to deal with them in the debate on the Address in Reply. With regard to the question of immigration, I can say that I know that in both the Flinders and Gregory districts in the past year a great many people have come up there from the South, and that meant that our own men have not had sufficient work to carry them through to the end of the year. There are large numbers of men walking about our electorates in the North and North-west who are wanting employment and cannot get it, yet at the same time we are importing immigrants every day in a wholesale manner from the old country. Another thing, too, they are bringing domestic servant girls out here under false pretences. I believe those who are sending them are receiving £1 a head for all they can send out. The girls are promised that when they get out here they will get from 15s. to 30s. a week. In the recent shipment of domestic servant girls—I can speak positively on this, and, if necessary, bring evidence to support what I say—not one of the girls who were engaged as domestic servants were domestics at all. Some of them were barmaids, and some had been working in factories, but out of the whole number of twenty-five not one of them had been in domestic service at all in England. They came out with the idea, as they told the matron who had charge of them, that they were going to get 15s. a week at the very least, and most of them expected to get 30s. a week, and they were also told that after they had been out here a few months, owing to the fact that there were more men in the country than women, they were going to get married to a squatter or someone else of that kind. (Laughter.) A great many of them were brought out under false pretences.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAY: I would like to refer to one little matter—that is, the bit of a row there has been between the hon. senior member for Ipswich and the Premier, with regard to the judgeship. I think this is a matter in which the Northern part of the State should receive some consideration. Whenever the judges are appointed, there is never any consideration given to the barristers residing in the Northern portion of the State at all, although I say that we have equally as good men in the North as we have got in the South. (Hear, hear!) And their claims should be considered as well as those in this city. I am not going to detain the House for any time on this question, as most of the matters will come up for discussion again on the Address in Reply. After the Constitution struggle which we had recently, I can say that there are a good many electors from where I come from who would rather see Mr. Philp in power in preference to the Kidstonites.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I have already pointed out, hon. members addressing the House

[Mr. May.

should refer to other hon. members by the name of their constituencies. The hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Philp just now. He should have said the hon. member for Townsville.

Mr. MAY: Some of my electors would rather see the hon. member for Townsville in power than the present Premier. We, in the North, reckon that this coalition has done us the greatest amount of good. It has consolidated the Labour party up North, and it has resulted in bringing those half-hearted Labour supporters and Kidstonites straight into the Labour party. If we had an election to-morrow you would find the Labour party would come back far and away stronger than what we have done in past elections.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

* Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): The Minister for Lands and the other members supporting the Government, in speaking on this question the other evening, tried to prove by figures that the present coalition was sanctioned by the people of Queensland during the last election. I claim that no such sanction was given. It must be within the memory of every hon. member of this Chamber, as it is within the memory of every individual member of the general public, that the parties now supporting the Government went to the country at the last general election as two distinct parties—namely, the Kidston party on the one hand and the Philp party on the other hand.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What about the Labour party?

Mr. PAYNE: They also went as a distinct party—as the Labour party. Each leader of those distinct parties told the electors that there would be no coalition, and that was the distinct understand-

[4 p.m.] ing on which those two parties were returned. The senior member for Townsville, in addressing the electors of Rockhampton, told them he was not going to coalesce with the Kidston party; and the Hon. the Premier, in addressing his constituents in Rockhampton, said he was not going to coalesce with the Philp party. If either of those leaders had told the electors that there was to be a coalition between the two parties, I am sure that neither would have been returned with half the number of their respective supporters. (Hear, hear!) I know that in my electorate the electors said they would not vote for a Kidston candidate; they preferred to vote for Labour. They remarked that they always knew where to find a Labour man, but they could not place a Kidston candidate. I am perfectly certain that if this coalition had been made a plank at the last general election the parties now forming the Government would not now be on that side of the House; and I am satisfied that if the Labour party had run candidates for every electorate they would have topped the poles by thousands as a party vote. Had the voters known that there was to be a coalition between the two parties opposite, many of those who cast their votes for Kidston candidates would have cast them for Labour. I fail to see how the Minister for Lands or any other hon. gentleman can say that the present coalition was sanctioned by the people of Queensland at the last election. Everything goes to show that the electors voted dead against the coalition. Whatever they may want in the future, at the last election they did not want a coalition of the two parties opposite; and, to my mind, this coalition is a distinct breach of trust with the electors. The last general election was fought on two distinct questions. There may have been three; but the two burning questions were the unauthorised

expenditure incurred by the senior member for Townsville, who was then Premier, and the unconstitutional action of the Governor in granting a dissolution to a minority in Parliament.

Mr. BARNES: It was not unconstitutional.

Mr. PAYNE: Whether it was unconstitutional or not, those were the two questions that were brought prominently before the electors at the last election. I am not now arguing whether the action of the Governor was technically unconstitutional or not. Placards denouncing the unconstitutional action were sent flying through the country like gum leaves; cartoons of Lord Chelmsford were posted up in every public place; and the public mind was worked up to a state of excitement.

Mr. BARNES: You worked it for all it was worth.

Mr. PAYNE: I say that the public mind was in an excited state on account of the idea that the people were losing their freedom. I don't think it was possible for any man to have done more to create that excitement in the minds of the people than the present Premier, who went out of his way to convince the electors of Queensland that he and those who worked with him were fighting to preserve what their forefathers had fought to secure centuries ago. I remember him standing on the floor of this House during the crisis, and I am willing to admit that older members of this Chamber than myself were carried away by the effects of the speech he made on that occasion. We know the patriotic promises that were made on this question, and we know the sincere pledges that were given; but what has become of the whole lot? They were simply a loss and a heap of fireworks, and nothing has been done. Then again, this coalition has surroundings that are such as would prevent any fair-minded man from giving it his support. The hon. member for Brisbane South, Mr. Airey, speaking here the other evening, told us that arrangements had been made for this coalition behind the backs of four of the Ministers. The Premier talks a lot about being frank and candid, but I see nothing frank or candid in making negotiations for a coalition with the Philp party when four members of his Cabinet knew nothing about what was going on. It seems to me that there was something fishy about it; and I say that the fact of the negotiations not being fair and square and above board is a reason for being opposed to the coalition. I remember that the Premier, in the speech he delivered on the floor of this House on the occasion to which I have referred, called the then Ministry a Queen-street Ministry. In fact, he said that term was too broad—he called them a *Courier* Ministry. In the name of common sense, what would you call them now? The Premier has made a great many promises to this Chamber, and I have been informed by one of his late Ministers that when he went to England he would interview the Colonial Office in reference to the action of the Governor, but we heard nothing at all about that. He created great enthusiasm at the last crisis, and, to sum it up in a nutshell, it was all fireworks—there was no honest intention in it; and the more a man sees through it, the more he is convinced that the Premier, at the time of that crisis, was letting off a great deal of fireworks. Something has been said in reference to the unemployed in this State. I do not know how they compiled those numbers, but I do know this—a more misleading statement has never been placed before this Chamber. The Premier said, according to the official figures, that there were eighty-six unemployed in Queensland. Why, I have seen more than that in my own electorate. During the last recess I have seen more than fifty shearers

unemployed, and who have never done a tap of work this year. The hon. member for Charters Towers also pointed out there were some hundreds of unemployed in Charters Towers, and the hon. member for Gympie pointed out there were unemployed there. I do not think it is a good thing for the country to make a statement that there are unemployed if there are not. I think it would be a very bad thing also to say there are no unemployed when numbers are looking for work. It must be a very faulty method of compiling these figures, because I am satisfied they are very misleading. They want to wipe that particular office out altogether, and put it on a sounder footing. There is another matter I will just touch on in reference to this unemployed question, and I mentioned the matter the very first time I addressed this Chamber. It is one of the greatest importance. There is a number of unemployed in Central Queensland—local people who are dependent on the industries, and strangers are given the work.

Mr. THORN: Why is that?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not want to make a bogey of this question. I have been through Central Queensland, having travelled many thousands of miles, and in every shearing-shed I came to in Central Queensland during the last recess, 75 per cent. of the men shearing there were strangers. I do not say strangers have to fight there; I do not think we should stop men coming from the southern States here, but I do say that it is not a very patriotic spirit for those men who are running the industries, such as grazing, to give preference to southern men, and the local men, with their wives and little children to support, are not given an opportunity to earn sufficient money to keep them in the ordinary necessities of life. I say there is something wrong about that. I do not think it would be a good thing to compel employers of labour to engage any particular man; I think he should have the right to please himself; but, all things being equal, the local man, who is dependent for his existence on that particular industry, should have the preference, and it is not being done now. I remember when the Premier was in Longreach one time, a deputation met him there, and he received it very warmly. On that occasion he threw new light on this matter. He said it was a bad thing for Queensland; they paid no income tax and there was none of the money earned in that particular industry distributed through the State. He said he did not know what he could do, but he would do what he could to see that something was done so that the local labourers should get a chance of work. Further, another point in reference to this unemployed question: I remember last June—the leader of this party may be able to throw some light on it—last June 100 men landed from Victoria in two boats on the strength of a paragraph they had seen in a local paper saying if they came here they would get six months' employment in the cane-fields, and I went to the Treasury with the leader of this party seeking to get sufficient money to take them back.

Mr. BOWMAN: Quite true.

Mr. PAYNE: While I am one of those men who believe we have a very big area of country to settle in Queensland—I think we want thousands of people here—but I think it is a very bad thing to bring a lot of working men here, into a market that is already overflooded. It is said the Labour party do not believe in immigration, but that is not true. We know very well the progress of this great State of Queensland can never go ahead without population.

Mr. HAMILTON: Of the right sort.

Mr. Payne.]

Mr. PAYNE: But what we object to is bringing immigrants here under false pretences—dumping them down here and allowing them to enter a labour market which is already overflooded. I would just like to go back to my previous remarks in reference to the appeal made to the electors at the last general election—the appeal that was excited by the Premier in reference to the freedom and liberties of the people of Queensland being at stake. The electors of Queensland responded to that cry; there is no doubt the electors of Queensland at the last general election responded to the cry that was raised for the liberty and freedom and the safeguarding of the people of this State, by sending back twenty-two Labour members and twenty odd Kidstonites—we were one on that particular question. The Labour party and the Kidston party, as far as the constitutional question was concerned, were one, and the people of Queensland at the last general election made no mistake in deciding that they did not want—they did not require any party in power that attempted to usurp the freedom and liberties that were given to them by their forefathers. That is another reason why I think this present coalition is a violation of the trust of the electors of Queensland that was given at the last election. Another reason, I think, why the people of Queensland should not be satisfied with this Government is, that there is no promise by the Kidston party for an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. I do not believe there is one question in Queensland at the present time that requires more immediate attention than an amendment of the Workers' Compensation Act. I speak with a knowledge of this subject, because in my own electorate, had it not been that the workers have a very powerful organisation behind them, a great many of them would have got nothing. In eight cases out of ten, they had to fight in the court. The employers did not care. I have seen several of them, and they say, "This is not a matter for us. We do not lose whether the men get hurt or not. We have them insured." The trouble is with the insurance companies. In every case the insurance companies try to beat the men out of their due, or else the men have to go to court. I know of three cases in which the insurance companies have come along, and offered men who have been injured a lump sum. The men did not accept this at first, and the companies kept them hanging on for a couple of months, until eventually they accepted the amount offered by the insurance companies, which was not the amount they were entitled to receive under the Act. We have been promised a Bill providing for State insurance under the Workers' Compensation Act. There is no doubt that the insurance should be nationalised, and I hope the Government will see their way to bring in this Bill soon, and also a Bill to amend the Act in such a way that a man will get compensation from the moment he is injured instead of being kept out of it for a fortnight. There is one little matter of a personal nature to which I wish to refer before I sit down. The other evening the hon. member for Fitzroy stated that, when the hon. member for Gregory was Government "whip," he always found how the Government supporters were going, and then voted with his own crowd to save his face. A more incorrect, a more unmanly, or a more miserable statement never fell from the lips of any man in this Chamber. I shall refer to *Hansard* to show exactly what took place on the occasion referred to. On page 2,159 of *Hansard* for 1905, the hon. member for Gregory made some remarks in advocacy of the principle of perpetual leases which the members of the Labour party desired

to have included in a Land Bill which was then before the Chamber. The hon. member for Gregory had spoken in favour of the principle, and the then Secretary for Lands said something in reference to the attitude taken up by the Government "whip." This is what the hon. member for Gregory said in reply to the hon. gentleman—

If the Minister had notified the Committee that he would introduce the principle next year, it would have saved a lot of discussion. As for the homily which the hon. gentleman had delivered to him, if he thought because he was Government whip he was going to swallow all his principles the hon. gentleman was much mistaken. If the Government wanted a whip of that sort, they had better look for someone else. He was a member of the Labour party, and had never departed from the principle involved in the clause; but for the sake of being Government whip he was not going to swallow his principles. He knew the opposition and intrigue which the Government had had to fight, and he had done his very best to try and assist them on many occasions, but he was going to stand by the principle of perpetual leases, because he had always believed in it.

The hon. member for Gregory then went to the table, wrote out his resignation as "whip," and took it to the then Premier, Mr., now Sir Arthur, Morgan, who was ill in bed at the time. Mr. Morgan, to his credit, asked the hon. member for Gregory to withdraw his resignation, and told him he could speak and vote as he liked. Whatever differences of opinion there may be between members in this Chamber, it is a miserable thing when a man will get up and deliberately concoct a statement with a view to injuring another hon. member in his electorate.

Mr. COWAR: It takes a lot of explanation.

Mr. PAYNE: The hon. member talks a lot about the principles of the Labour party, but we know there was a period in the history of the Labour movement in Queensland when a man had to have a backbone if he associated himself with the Labour party. We had a Conservative Government in power, and the whole powers of the law were used against us. At that time the hon. member for Gregory proved himself a man. Had the hon. member for Fitzroy been here at that time, I am quite satisfied that he would not have acted like the hon. member for Gregory. The present Home Secretary and other hon. gentlemen who were members of the Ministry in 1905 can get up and say whether I am stating the truth or not.

Mr. COWAR: The "Votes and Proceedings" show how he voted.

Mr. PAYNE: I am not accustomed to making false statements in this Chamber, and if what I say is not correct, hon. gentlemen can get up and contradict what I have said.

Mr. ADAMSON (*Margborough*): In rising to support the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, I feel that I am acting in harmony with fact, and that I am acting in harmony with what is righteous. But before proceeding to address myself to the main question, I wish to refer to two or three things which dropped from hon. members during the course of this discussion. I am very sorry to have to refer to the speech delivered last night by my friend, the hon. member for Clermont. He said some things which put this party in a wrong light; and, unless he explains them, I, at any rate, must run counter to him in my opinions regarding those matters. For instance, he stated that the Labour electors of Queensland were not careful concerning the kind of men that they voted for. Of course, I am quite conscious that he can explain that in a certain way; and, if he does explain it in that way, I have no quarrel with him. But I contend there is no party in this House, there is no party in the

[Mr. Payne.

world, which is more careful in the selection of candidates than the Labour party. We take the best method possible of trying to get the men who are most in harmony with our principles; and again and again men have been refused the endorsement of the Central Political Executive simply because their character did not come up to the standard that we believed in. Another thing which the hon. member said last night was also out of place, so far as a socialistic party is concerned. In referring to the party which is seated on the cross Opposition benches, and to those like them, the hon. member said that this party was too tolerant—that we needed to be more bigoted, more intolerant, narrower, bitterer. Personally, I hold that there is no party which can afford to be intolerant, and no party which can less afford to be intolerant than [4.30 p.m.] the Labour party. No socialistic party can take the stand that they are intolerant of other people's opinions. Why, to my mind, the essence of socialism is based on the principle of mutual respect, mutual regard, and mutual helpfulness. I would remind the hon. member of such words as those given utterance to by the poet Whittier, when he said—

Not thine the bigot's partial plea;
Not thine the zealot's ban;
Thou wilt caust spare a love of Thee
Which ends in hate of man.

And I say that no man who hates his fellow man, or engenders bitterness concerning his fellow man, or who deliberately injures his fellow man, can be a true socialist or a true follower of the Labour party.

Mr. MAXWELL: Is that why you passed a vendetta against ex-Labour members?

Mr. ADAMSON: I have passed a vendetta on no one. A great party, in protecting its rights, while not being vindictive personally, must take a definite stand in relation to principles. I am speaking against bigotry and intolerance, not against definiteness, not against a party having a definite programme and seeing that its members subscribe to that programme. I have no quarrel with that kind of thing, but I say that neither this party nor any other party can afford to cultivate such sentiments as were recommended by the hon. member for Clermont last night. I have nothing more to say concerning the matter, but in order to place this party in a right position before the country, I wish to add that the principles of this party are based upon love, based upon the Christian religion, and that the great aim and end of the party is the uplifting and betterment of humanity in every way possible.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: Another thing I wish to refer to is the speech which was made last evening by the hon. member for Bulimba. The hon. member defended the coalition, and defended it on the ground of patriotism. He took exception to a statement my hon. friend the junior member for Charters Towers made regarding the definition of patriotism. The definition given by my hon. friend was not his own—it was the definition of a greater man, and I suppose most men would say a greater man than any man in this House at the present time.

Mr. HAMILTON: Greater even than the hon. member for Bulimba.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes; greater even than the hon. member for Bulimba, and, from an intellectual standpoint, greater than any member of this House. The definition was that of Dr. Johnson. It may not be a true definition, but that is a matter of opinion. That definition was that "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." Everyone knows that patriotism, or

love of country, has led men to do very strange things at which we would blush. While speaking of one's love of one's native land, the hon. member quoted Tennyson, and one hon. member said that I was restless while he was making reference to a poem of Tennyson's, the Ode to the Queen. The only thing I was restless about was that the hon. member did not quote the poem properly. When I hear a man quote poetry which he has down on his notes, I expect him to quote it correctly. The hon. member did not quote the poem correctly, and he did not quote it as far as he might have done. I suppose he was referring to the Ministry on the Treasury bench in this House when he quoted the words—

And statesmen at her Council met,
Who knew the season when to take
Occasion by the hand and make
The bounds of freedom wider yet—

The hon. member said "greater yet," but "wider yet" is right, and is much better. He might have continued the quotation, and have given us these words—

By shaping some august decree,
Which kept her throne unshaken still,
Broad-based upon her people's will,
And compassed by the inviolate sea.

Is the policy of the Government—the policy approved by their supporters — "broad-based upon the people's will?"

LABOUR MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ADAMSON: Looking at the figures of the last election one cannot help coming to the conclusion that it is a make-shift Government, a Government of interested parties, a Government of men who care more for themselves than for the people's will. Then, there is another speech I should like to refer to, and that is the speech of the hon. member for Cook. That hon. member told us that the Premier had given all to this party, and that this party had given nothing to the Premier. Having carefully considered what has taken place during the last two sessions, I have come to the conclusion that the boot is on the other leg, that the truth is the other way. That might perhaps be an extreme statement to make, but, at any rate, it is a fair retort if the hon. member for Cook holds that the Premier has given all to us, for I can just as truly and as righteously say that we have given everything to the Premier. Personally, I would rather say that we were mutually helping each other, and mutually have been trying to give the country the laws that the country asked for. How far is that true of the parties that are fused at the present time? Were they working harmoniously together during the last two sessions? Everyone knows that on all the principal measures passed during the last two sessions the two parties that are now fused were antagonistic, mutually destructive, seeking to hurt each other. And yet the hon. member for Cook tells us that the Premier has given us all, and that that we have given him nothing! I shall further refer to this matter as I proceed with my speech. At present I shall merely say that it is a remarkable thing that the Premier should have sought an alliance with the Opposition party, led by the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, and that he did not seek to go on with his work in this House, trusting to the support which would have been honestly given to him by the Labour party. If he had done that he would have acted more in harmony with the will of the people, as expressed at the last general election, than he is doing at the present time. I also wish to make reference to the speech delivered by the junior member for South Brisbane, Mr. Airey. I want to say that that speech was one of the best speeches I have listened to in this House. For biting sarcasm,

Mr. Adamson.]

pungent humour without undue bitterness, for the production and correct marshalling of facts, for chaste, forcible language, for fine literary allusions, for appositeness of expression, and for epigram, no speech that I have heard in this House was better than the speech delivered by the hon. member for Brisbane South. He placed the situation in a very clear light, and it seems to me it is a very sad thing that when one man has supported another so strenuously, so readily, and so willingly, and has fought for him so courageously as the hon. member has done for the Premier, he should be thrown overboard after all he has done for the Premier and his programme. There is another thing I should like to refer to, and that is the episode in connection with the senior member for Ipswich. Whatever anyone else may think, my sympathies are with the hon. member for Ipswich. He may not be without faults. I do not know that any man in this House is without his faults. I am quite sure I am not. The hon. member may have done some things he ought not to have done. I have never met a man who has not. But I could not understand the bitterness of the Home Secretary in the speech he made in reply to the hon. member for Ipswich, and I could not help asking myself was there not some political jealousy in the matter? I could not help asking that; I could not help asking myself, as I thought of things that had taken place, was there some professional jealousy; was there some professional underhand work going on when the hon. member for Ipswich, after having served as he had done in the position of Attorney-General for five years, should be refused the judgeship? Of course, we may be told that it should be taken out of the domain of politics altogether, and I for one subscribe to that. I hold that such a position should not be the gift of any politician, or should not, as the Home Secretary said, be given to any man simply because he was in a position by political accident. I think it should be given to the best fitted man. I quite agree with that, but why should Mr. Blair have been the man who was to be the scapegoat in this particular? And I could not, as I watched the Premier while the hon. member for Ipswich was speaking, but notice how he seemed to turn a kind of yellowish, green, black. (Laughter.) There was a peculiar look about him as he listened to that speech. I could not help saying to myself, well that is a psychological revelation. The Premier to me is a psychological puzzle, and that is how the thing stands as far as I am concerned. I think, however, that the hon. member for Ipswich will yet get his chance politically, or his chance professionally, and I hope that in the future he may have a successful career. Now, there was another thing referred to in this debate. I refer to the words of the Secretary for Public Lands when he spoke in relation to the matter of this party stultifying itself so far as the suspension of the Standing Orders was concerned. As one of the party, I think we made a mistake in that, and I want to say that others of the party have thought that, but it was not as has been said so kindly by the versatile author of "Kosmos," or those who are under him in that remarkable paper, the *Brisbane Telegraph*—it was not because we did not know the rules of procedure, not because we were intellectually anæmic, it was because we were politically generous; it was because we did not want to interfere with the public servants receiving their salaries. Some of us felt that we ought not to have even considered that, but since we had moved a vote of want of confidence we should have protested, at any rate, against the suspension of the Standing Orders, and personally I think that that would have been the right thing to do.

[Mr. Adamson.

I only mention this because I want to convince this House that we are not such big fools on this side as some people may seem to think we are. There is another thing I want to refer to here, and I want to speak about this as strongly and emphatically as I can. The Premier said, practically, that this party receives its policy from its masters on the hill. Well, so far as I am concerned, I do not believe that. (Hear, hear!) I know nothing about that.

Mr. COYNE: And he knows it.

Mr. ADAMSON: I know of no master except my constituents. I own an allegiance to the party to which I belong, and that party's policy, so far as I know, is framed in convention, is submitted to the organisations, and it is framed in a far more democratic way than any other policy in this House, than any other policy in Australia, in my opinion. So that when he talks about our masters on the hill, it seems to me that it would be a good thing if he would just think about the masters that he has got. What took place at the caucus the other day? He talks about caucus rule, and yet to-day he is under caucus rule, and he has to take his orders from the caucus, and the policy is to be coloured by the caucus. The man who has said so much against the caucus in the past is a caucus-ridden individual at the present time. There was another thing that I could not help noticing, and I am glad that last night the Premier explained this. He referred to the class to which the hon. member for Fortitude Valley belonged. Well, I am glad he says that he belongs to the working class. I am glad that it is not to be said of him, "That he has forgotten the place from which he grew, and thinks himself the Lord knows who!" I am glad that he still thinks—

The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Don't we all belong to the working class?

Mr. ADAMSON: There are some men who think themselves a good deal better than certain kinds of the working-class men, at any rate. I am glad the Premier put his position right as far as he is concerned. I wanted to remind him of this fact—that it was men of the class of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley who made him; men who have stood by him in times of stress, and storm, and failure; men who have helped him all the way through; and he would not have been the Premier of Queensland to-day had it not been for men of this type. There is another thing that has come out from time to time in this debate, and the Premier has made a great deal about it—that we are simply opposing him personally. That is what he says. I have never opposed him personally, neither outside nor inside this House, and in any speeches I have made I have simply dealt with the principles of his policy. I say that he has not been true to the principles of that policy, and because of that I have condemned him as a politician—condemned his actions in not being faithful and consistent with the policy that he laid down. But it seems to me now that when one speaks about the hon. member for Rockhampton, one has to do it "with bated breath, with whispering humbleness," and one has to remember that he is the Prime Minister of Queensland.

Mr. AIREY: It is mentioned seven times in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. ADAMSON: We are told that the Jews used the word "Jehovah" only on very rare occasions, and they paused long before they used the word; and it seems to me that, before one speaks in Queensland of Mr. Kidston and his politics, one has to halt and think whether one is

going to please him, even if we are only going to criticise him fairly. I do not think it is a fair thing to take up that position, and it seems to me there has been too much whining of that sort. Coming to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, I want to say that I support his amendment because I look upon this coalition as a coalition of a politically immoral nature. It is said on every hand to-day that no public men can be trusted, and that feeling has been intensified by this coalition.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: Somebody has said that the time for moving this motion of want of confidence was inopportune, and that if we had been a wise party we should have been certain we could have carried the amendment before we proposed it in this Chamber. Well, we are not sure that we are not going to carry it. Some of us believe we are going to carry it, but I hold that party interests and party welfare ought to be put aside sometimes, no matter what may follow, and we ought to take our stand fearlessly whether we are going to be defeated or not for what we believe to be the right thing, and for that which the people of this State wants. John Bright used to say that the Government of any country ought to be based on the moral law—ought to be based on the Decalogue. I want to say that the coalition which has taken place is based on a subversion of the moral law—a reversal of the Decalogue.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: I hold that this is a politically immoral coalition, and that never before in the history of Australia has the politics of the country been dragged in the gutter the way they are through this coalition—politically, I mean. Now, I want to consider this. You will find that any coalition with the Philp party was denounced by the Premier in his Rockhampton manifesto. I want you to listen to what the hon. gentleman said in his policy speech in Rockhampton. He says here—

But it is due to the public that I should make a frank and clear statement as to the circumstances which resulted in my parting with Mr. Denham. (Hear, hear!) Many of you, of course, know that for some weeks prior to my return from New Zealand a great deal of negotiating had been going on amongst certain gentlemen in the southern part of the State, chiefly in Brisbane. The general object of the negotiations seems to have been a rearrangement of the Government and of parties. On my return to Queensland I found that Mr. Denham's idea of dealing with the situation was that the Government should coalesce with the Philp party. (Laughter.) This extraordinary proposal, if I had agreed to it, would have meant that, whilst I was to be graciously permitted to remain Premier, I should have to remove from the Cabinet three or four Ministers, who have always been perfectly loyal—(hear, hear!)—who have discharged their several duties ably and well, and against whom I have never had reason to utter one word of complaint. (Applause.) It would also have meant something infinitely worse than that. It would have meant the betrayal by the Government of a large number of the men who had trusted and supported them in the last Parliament—(hear, hear!)—many of whom have got into serious political trouble because of their loyalty to us.

And I would like this House to listen to this part—

But apart from this, the personal aspect of the matter, such a proposal, if carried out, would have been demoralising in the extreme to the tone of our public life—(hear, hear!)—and injurious to the best interests of Queensland. (Applause.) I told Mr. Denham these things, and that his proposal for an alliance with the Philp party was a matter which I could not seriously entertain or discuss, and that public affairs would not be dealt with on these lines whilst I remained Premier. (Loud applause.) Ministers had arranged to meet on the morning of Thursday, the 1st of February, for the purpose of discussing the details of the Government policy. But, before entering on such a work, I thought it desirable to ascertain whether Mr. Denham was still

of the same opinion with regard to amalgamating with the Philp party. Mr. Denham, when spoken to, frankly admitted that he intended to join the Philp party whether his colleagues did so or not. It was therefore deemed advisable that Mr. Denham should retire from the Cabinet—(hear, hear!)—the other Ministers proceeding with the work of formulating a policy without his assistance. From this statement of the facts you will see that the Government policy which I am going to lay before you to-night had no bearing whatever upon Mr. Denham leaving the Government. (Hear, hear!) He had never seen the programme—(Mr. KECK: That's the point.)—and even at this moment does not know what it is. (Hear, hear!) It is therefore quite clear that the character of our programme had nothing whatever to do with his retirement. The one and only difference between Mr. Denham and his colleagues was that he wished to make an alliance with the Philp party, and we refused to entertain so extraordinary a proposal. (Applause.)

And yet, while he said that in his policy speech at Rockhampton, he has carried it out now. And at a later date than that he said worse things about the hon. member for Townsville. Just listen to what he says here, in speaking during the constitutional contest. He refers to the importance of it. This was a statement he made at Rockhampton on the 8th of January, 1908—

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CONTEST.

The Philp reactionaries fully realise how important this contest is. They will try to throw dust in your eyes, they will try to get you to believe it is not worth bothering about—a little dispute about the postal vote, a wages board, or something else. They know how important this struggle is. They know that the forces of democracy and of reaction are at death grips over this question. Men with any sense of decency in them would hardly have clung to office as the Philp Ministry have done if they did not know that it was the last desperate chance. (Loud applause.)

Yet he has given them another chance—

The real truth of the matter is that Mr. Philp brought about this election simply as a desperate gambler who is ruined already makes one desperate last throw to try to recover himself. Now, realising as they do the importance of the contest, as I have already said, they are not likely to stick at trifles to win. They have put off the election to the last day they could put it off without allowing some thousands of men to vote who went on the roll at the December court. They have changed the day of polling from Saturday to Wednesday for no other reason than this—that they will prevent hundreds, probably thousands, of working men in Queensland from being able to exercise their vote and voice.

Then, again, he says worse things than even that. At the close of his speech he said—

I just want to say one word in conclusion. I have purposely refrained from touching on many questions as I wish to focus public attention on the main issue the people have to settle. I have even refrained from referring to the composition of this miserable Philp Ministry—a Ministry that was the hanging stock of its own party, the *Courier* Ministry—because if every man in it had been an angel from heaven, if he had been a Rockhampton man—(laughter)—if they had held office as these men have held office, if they had got behind the Governor and from that temporary shelter, flouted and denied the people of Queensland, I would call upon you to denounce them all the same. In this country no Ministry who defies the people, who intimidates and threatens the representatives of Queensland, must be permitted to shelter behind the Governor. (Hear, hear!) It ought to be fired out, dragged out, and made an example of, and such an example as will be a warning to all who in the future may have a desire to put a profane hand on self-government. Just these words in conclusion. If you forget everything else when polling-day comes, remember that they, and they only, have rights who dare maintain them. (Loud and continued applause.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ADAMSON: Well, this man, who could use such forcible language as that, a few months after betrays the confidence of the electors and joins with the men the electors had rejected, and gave them a place on those Treasury benches.

Mr. MAXWELL: Crucify him.

Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. ADAMSON: No; I do not want to crucify him. I will trace the history of this coalition. The present Premier, I hold, has been calculating for this coalition for the past two years. What was the result of the 1907 election? There were twenty-eight Philpites returned with twenty-five Kidstonites, seventeen Labourites, and two Independents; and then Mr. Philp sought this coalition—sought it in 1907. When we decided to sit here on the back Opposition benches as an independent party the Premier knew that he was not going to drag us at his heels; that we had our distinct policy, and we were going to stand for what we believed to be right, as our electors told us to do. What did he do? When we took our places on the Opposition cross benches the hon. member began to intrigue with the hon. member for Townsville. Listen to what the Hon. R. Philp told the electors on the 17th of January last, when speaking at Toowong in support of the candidature of Mr. Macartney. This is the report of Mr. Philp's speech which appeared in the *Maryborough Chronicle*—

The Premier (Mr. Philp) to-night addressed a large and enthusiastic meeting in the Masonic Hall at Toowong in support of Mr. Macartney, who at present is absent in England. Mr. Philp spoke at length on the events which led up to the dissolution of Parliament. He said that early in last session Mr. Kidston sent for him, and he (Mr. Philp) discussed with him the question of the amalgamation of the two parties.

But there was another question, although the Premier yesterday denied the statement made by the hon. member for Croydon, Mr. Murphy, that the Premier said he would be Agent-General. Why, in 1907 he had made up his mind to be Agent-General, and I am of opinion that if he cannot get his own way over there he will go home as Agent-General. And I think that if he does the Philp party will then be convinced that he is a man who cares more for place and power than for anybody or anything else.

Mr. KEOGH: He will make a very good man there.

Mr. BOWMAN: You want to get rid of him.

Mr. ADAMSON: It is very amusing to listen to the hon. member for Rosewood. Sometimes he is berating the Premier, and sometimes praising him.

Mr. PETRIE: He is not the only man who does that.

Mr. KEOGH: I give praise where it is due.

Mr. ADAMSON: This is what Mr. Philp said in regard to that matter in his speech at Toowong—

For the greater part of the time they were discussing the Agent-Generalship, but he did not know whether Mr. Kidston wanted him to go to London or whether Mr. Kidston wanted to go himself. However, he gave the late Premier to understand that he (Mr. Philp) would not go.

So that in 1907 the Hon. the Premier, who told us yesterday, in replying to the hon. member for Croydon, that he was not thinking about the Agent-Generalship at the caucus meeting, had had it in his mind all this time. And yet, while all this was going on, the Premier was seeking to bring the Labour party under his heel. And everybody remembers that while he

[5 p.m.] was trying to do this the momentous trip of the "Lucinda" took place;

and after they had their confab and refreshments down there the Premier came back saying he could not stomach the hon. member for Townsville, and he had then to accept the divided allegiance he said he would never accept. And this party, notwithstanding the way he had intrigued against them, gave him the best possible support he could have. He could not have got better from any body of men. What section

[Mr. Adamson.

was it that gave him most trouble during the 1907 session? It was a section of his own party—the blacksoilers, as they were called. Those were the people he was afraid of in passing democratic measures; he knew the Labour party were behind him in passing them. And the hon. member for Oxley was intriguing with this party to draw their support from the Premier, and, to a certain extent, he succeeded. We know that the hon. member for Townsville said in a certain place that the true Premier of Queensland was in the Legislative Council, and was the Hon. A. J. Thynne. Then there came the deadlock with the Legislative Council, and out of that deadlock came the resignation of the senior member for Rockhampton; then the assumption of office by the hon. member for Townsville, and the formation of the *Courier* Ministry.

Mr. AIRRY: The first *Courier* Ministry; we have the second one now.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes—the first *Courier* Ministry. Then there came the dramatic scenes in the last sittings of the 1907 session. Everybody remembers that constitutional speech of the Premier; everybody remembers the memorandum drawn up to the Governor; everybody remembers the five or six divisions in which the Philp party were defeated, and how the Premier charged them with clinging to office though defeated; everybody remembers how we met after the last sitting of Parliament in the Opposition room and how the Premier asked us to stand by him in this constitutional fight. I said to him, "Mr. Kidston, I have made up my mind to retire from politics; but you have asked us to fight this constitutional fight. I will stand and do it." I promised to do so, though I could not afford to stand and do it; and many others did the same thing. And what did he say of us in connection with that? He said this—

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.

Then take the elections of 1908, when the Labour party stood shoulder to shoulder with the Kidstonites. What was the result? The numbers returned were twenty-five Philpites, twenty-five Kidstonites, and twenty-two Labourites. From that general election the Labour party was the only party that returned strengthened to this House; the Philp party was weakened; the Kidston party remained practically the same. If the 1908 election said anything, it said that the Premier should work with this party in seeking to pass democratic measures which the people wanted. You remember the fight that took place in connection with the election of Speaker, and then in connection with the election of Chairman of Committees, and how the Premier treated us in those matters though we had stood by him at the general election. On the Address in Reply he used these words—

I said at the time that I was proud of the men who stood with us on that occasion, because if half a dozen

of them had liked to go over and support the Philip party they could have saved themselves from the risk and certain cost of an election.

Mr. KROON: Which they have regretted ever since.

I want to say that I have never regretted standing by the present Premier at that time, and I do not believe any member of this party regrets it. We went out to fight the constitutional fight, to fight for self-government, to prevent Queensland from being treated as a Crown colony, and we came back victorious. Yet the man who got most out of the fight—who got the “perks” of office and all the comforts and power of office—is the man who has thrown us aside and joined with the men who said the hardest things about him at the time.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Did you not say hard things about him?

Mr. ADAMSON: It seems to me very peculiar that the hon. member for Bulimba should be supporting the present Premier after all he said about that hon. gentleman. That leads me to ask this: Was it right for the Premier to say he could not get on any longer with the Labour party? That is the statement he made here before he went to Melbourne; it is the statement he made in Melbourne; and he made the same statement in the old country. Take the measures passed during the past two sessions. In 1907 we passed the Children's Courts Act, Poor Prisoners' Defence Act, Income Tax Act Amendment Act, and the Appropriation Acts. In the 1908 session we passed the Constitution Act Amendment Act, Land Surveyors Act, Factories and Shops Act Amendment Act, Elections Acts Amendment Act, Old-age Pensions Act, Technical Instruction Act, Wages Boards Act, Inspection of Machinery and Scaffolding Act, Sugar Works Guarantee Acts Amendment Act, Land Acts Amendment Act, and the Guarantee Railways. Those measures we helped him to pass. Yet he said he could not get on any longer with the Labour party. In what did we oppose him? We opposed him in four things during those two sessions. First, when he wanted us to give up our separate identity as a party; second, when he wanted us to allow him to amend the Wages Boards Bill in a certain way so as to please the farmers' representatives—and had it not been that we stood out against him he would have amended it in the direction wanted; third, on the question of syndicate railways—and whatever anybody may say in this House they were syndicate railways, and they are syndicate railways still; fourth, we opposed him in the matter of the Appropriation Bill. What was said in the Governor's opening Speech, at the opening of Parliament in the first session of this year, about that £687,000 of unauthorised expenditure? Just listen to what was said—

The late Parliament refused Supply to show its disapproval of my late advisers, but as I was of opinion that the country should decide on the constitutional question of the relations of the two Houses of Parliament, on the advice of my late advisers, I dissolved Parliament, and on their further advice authorised the expenditure of £687,635 without express Parliamentary authority. You will, therefore, be asked to pass a special Appropriation Bill to cover the amount so expended.

And yet, what was said at the close of that session? What was said by the Minister for Education in another place in relation to the matter? This is what he said—

APPROPRIATION BILL No 4.

FIRST READING.

This Bill, received from the Assembly, was read a first time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I move that this Bill be read a second time. I may say that it is the Annual Appropriation Bill. The first clause appropriates the whole of the expenditure for 1907-8, and

1908—N

confirms and legalises everything, and the second clause grants Supplies from the 30th June, 1908, onwards—from the consolidated revenue, £253,000; from trust and special funds, £100,000; and from loan fund, £400,000; that is to say, it grants Supply for the months of July, August, September, and October of the coming year. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

And we find that that was condoned by the Government before the Bill was brought into the House. And yet they said there was to be a special Appropriation Bill passed. Of course it has been said we were not sufficiently wide awake; that the Labour party were not up to snuff in this matter; they did not see so quickly as they ought to have seen. There might be some truth in that. We did not expect that a man who filled the position of the Hon. the Premier would have made one statement at the beginning of the session and, without ever saying a word about it, act quite contrary at the end of the session.

Mr. BOWMAN: He repeated it towards the close of the session.

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes; that is so. He said this matter would be dealt with separately. I say, granted that we were not alive in the matter: What are we to say about a man who would intrigue in that way in matters of so vital importance as the passing of the Supplies of a country, when he had promised they would be thoroughly discussed, and a special Bill brought in for it? Can it be said truthfully that the programme of the hon. member for Townsville of 1907 and the Rockhampton programme of 1907 are more in common than the Labour platform and the Kidston programme? That is what has been said now—that the programme of the hon. member for Townsville and the programme of the hon. member for Rockhampton—that is the Government programme—were more in harmony than the Labour platform and the programme of the hon. member for Rockhampton. I do not think that that is true, and I will prove that before I go much further. I want to refer to another fact, that the hon. member for Townsville issued another manifesto at the elections in 1908, and I want you to listen to what the Premier said about that manifesto. This is what he said—

Though I did not require to issue a manifesto, Mr. Philip has issued a manifesto, and I regret to say it is an exceedingly poor deliverance—(hear, hear!)—characterised by his usual inconsequence and incapacity. This feebleness really makes Mr. Philip difficult to deal with. It would be easier to deal with a stronger man. He produces an atmosphere of helplessness. I want to call your attention to one or two things in connection with the manifesto. It filled three and a-half columns of the *Morning Bulletin*, and in that space there is less than a column devoted to a statement of the issue now before the country. It is a misleading statement at that, as I will show; but Mr. Philip evidently wants to swamp the country with his promises. He evidently wants to blind the people of the country, for he puts a glare of promises in their eyes so that they will not be able to see what is the real issue they have got to settle. I trust that the people will not be carried away by Mr. Philip's promises. I received a wire to-day from a Northern constituency. It was from a candidate there—a Labour man. He wired to say that the Philip candidate there had promised, on the authority of Mr. Philip, that he would get a sugar-mill for some particular district there—I forget the name—but it was near Ingham, and he wanted to know whether I would authorise him to make a like promise. (Laughter.) I told that candidate that I was very sorry; but if Mr. Philip had descended to that kind of thing, I was not going to make any promises. (Applause.)

He says that the manifesto issued by Mr. Philip at the beginning of this year was a weak thing, an inconsequential thing, a poor thing in every way; and the hon. member for Townsville created an atmosphere of helplessness. And yet he tells us to-day that that programme is like his own programme. What have we to say about it? That the Kidston programme is an

Mr. Adamson.]

inconsequential programme? Mr. Kidston, too, creates an atmosphere of helplessness; and practically he has become so helpless before the eyes of the people that he has got to get the help of another man as helpless as himself, and they sit there, an inconsequential party, according to his own statement, with a poor, weak programme. Even on the unrealised portion of the Rockhampton programme, I want to show there is more in common with the Labour platform than with the Philp programme. I have these programmes with me, and anyone can take them and examine them for themselves—what has been realised and what is unrealised. I find that the agreement of the Kidston and Philp programmes is in the following items:—Land policy, Immigration policy, Education reform, Liquor Law reform, and Torres Strait service. Kidston and the Labour party agree in the following matters:—1st, A Comprehensive Mining Act, which will include power to mine on private property; 2nd, Educational progress; 3rd, Trade Disputes Bill; 4th, State Insurance under the Workers' Compensation Act; 5th, Reform of the Liquor Laws; 6th, Superannuation Scheme for Public Service; 7th, Development of the Agricultural Bank Act, by advancing cheap money to build houses; 8th, Reform of the Divorce Laws; 9th, Redistribution of Seats in the Legislative Assembly, but no reduction of members; 10th, A Torres Strait service. And there is another matter in which we agree with him, and that is irrigation and the conservation of water. I want to ask: Is it right for the Premier to say that he could go no further with the Labour party? Is it right to say he had more in common with the Philp party than our own platform? I can prove that his statement is not in accordance with facts. The policy hon. members opposite have to-day—the policy of the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government—is a different policy to what was put before the Rockhampton people and the people of Queensland in 1907. And why do I say that? I say that because he has not an opportunity to carry out his Rockhampton programme according to his own ideals. What was said at the caucus meeting last Thursday? I want you to listen to this—I referred to it already partially, but I want to read from the *Courier* report. This is what he said—

A feeling was expressed in some of the speeches that the way would be made much easier for members if business likely to be contentious, or to be misunderstood, were explained to them prior to being placed before the House, although it was admitted this course might not always be convenient.

And yet the Premier told us in this House that—

The proposal which I made to that joint meeting of the two parties was this: It was to be understood that, so far as I was concerned, no promise, direct or implied, has been made to induce anyone to agree to the proposal. The proposal was this—

"(1.) Are the members now present prepared to approve of me as their leader, and to adopt my Rockhampton programme of February, 1907, as the programme of a united party?"

"(2.) Are they further prepared to give me, as Premier, as free a hand with regard to any rearrangement of the Cabinet which may be necessary as I should have if I had just been commissioned by His Excellency to form a Ministry?"

He tells us that, and yet at the next meeting of these two parties he is told he must bring down his measures to the caucus—they must be submitted there.

Mr. MANN: Caucus rule.

Mr. MAXWELL: That does not happen to be true.

Mr. ADAMSON: Well, why is it reported in the *Courier*?

Mr. MAXWELL: Sometimes people report things that are not true.

[Mr. Adamson.

Mr. MANN: Just like you.

Mr. ADAMSON: The hon. member for Burke tells me that it is not true. Well, the Premier himself practically admitted it in this Chamber the other night. He said that his policy would take the colour of the members who sat with him. That is to be the policy of the Premier. The man who has denounced the caucus—the man who talked about the masters on the hill—has got other masters, and he has got to submit to caucus rule. And this is the "strong man"! "How are the mighty fallen." The reputed political Samson of Queensland has been shorn of his strength, and he is made to grind at the mills of the Philistines!

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The "Philistines." (Laughter.)

Mr. ADAMSON: I just want to glance for a moment at the nature of the party opposite. It is a peculiar conglomeration. There is a part of the old continuous Ministry; there is a part of the old Philp Ministry; a part of the Kidstonites, a part of the old Labourites. It is altogether a piebald Ministry. As the hon. member for Herbert said, it is a heterogeneous mixture of discordant atoms, and it may fall to pieces at any time. As soon as ever their interests clash, they are so discordant that they will fall to pieces. They have no coherent and common policy. It is simply a patchwork policy, that has been brought together by self-interest, by greed of place and power, and it may crumble at any moment. I now want to dwell for a moment or two on the fact that the Premier has announced his hostility to the Federal Labour party and to the Commonwealth generally. I would ask, What has the Commonwealth Government done to injure the States? What is the Commonwealth Government proposing to do to injure the States? Is the Commonwealth Government not elected by the same electors as the State Legislatures are? We find that there has been returned to the States by the Commonwealth £6,000,000 or £7,000,000 more than need have been returned. We know that the Commonwealth Government has benefited Queensland particularly by its sugar policy. We know that during the time of drought and distress the Commonwealth starved its own services in order to help the States. We know, too, that the Commonwealth Parliament has passed better industrial legislation for the workers than the States Legislatures have, and we believe ourselves that industrial unification would be a good thing so far as industrial legislation is concerned. At least I do. Then, too, what about the financial proposals? Why, they are all, as it were, in solution. Nobody can tell what is going to happen, and it is a matter for experts to deal with. It is a matter for the best men in the States to come together and try to find a way of solving the difficulty. And yet the Premier says that he is going to fight the Federal Labour members, and that it will be a sad day for them, and so forth, and so forth.

Mr. THORN: The best of experts have attempted to solve it.

Mr. MANN: Are you one of them?

Mr. THORN: No; the Premier is one of them.

Mr. ADAMSON: The experts have placed their proposals before the country, and not one of them has been adopted. The Premier of Queensland has made his proposal, but they are all in solution, and some *via media* has to be discovered before the question can be settled.

Mr. THORN: That is only your opinion.

Mr. ADAMSON: That is proof to me that the hon. member has never read the proposals that have been made for the settlement of this financial problem. He cannot have read the

proposals made by Mr. Harper, Sir William Lyne, King O'Malley, and ever so many others whose names do not come up in my mind at the present time. If he had read them he would have known that there had been proposals made, and that the matter is still in solution. In proposing to fight the Commonwealth the Premier is untrue to his best traditions; he is untrue to the best of his past life, and to the best political work of his past life. What is he going to do? He is going to array the forces of capitalism to fight the democratic forces. He is setting Australians against Australians in a warfare which, in my opinion, is a warfare of greed and selfishness for place and power. He says that he is going to do this for patriotic reasons. Other people are saying that the hon. gentleman cares more for place and power than he cares for anything else. As I have gone about the country during the last few weeks, and in my home at the week-end, men have been saying to me, "Public men cannot be trusted. We vote for certain men. They say they will do certain things, and they betray us. It only means that other, when they get the chance, will do likewise." One man who said that to me was a Labour man. I said, "Well, you are a Labour man. Get twelve other Labour men to come and say that to me, and you can have my resignation to-morrow."

Mr. THORN: That is all right; but we shall see in a few years you will change your mind, like all good men.

Mr. ADAMSON: We need not look a few years ahead. I am prepared to say that, now, if that is the idea of public life in Queensland—that the men at the head of affairs are not to be trusted—if the electors are saying that, and if a majority of them think that, I shall be glad to get out of public life to-morrow, and not have that stain on my character. There is another thing that was referred to yesterday by the hon. member for Gympie, and to which I have referred in other places. The Premier has been set up as an example for our boys to copy, as a pattern for our youth to imitate, so far as our national life is concerned. Well, I want to ask, is his example an example of honesty, of open-mindedness, of generosity, of unselfishness in the service of Queensland? A great many people think not. And, if it is not, then I hold that he has no right to be held up as an example for our boys to imitate. I hold that he stands before the people of Queensland as a man who is secretive, as a man who is selfish, as a man who has served himself, first and always. It cannot be said of him that "he came, not to be served, but to serve." One of our poets has used words like these—

Were a star quenched on high,
For ages would its light
Still falling downwards from the sky
Burst on our wondering sight.
And, when a great (good) man dies,
For years beyond our ken
The light he leaves behind him lies
Along the paths of men.

Is the light that William Kidston is shedding politically a light for people to walk in? I hold not. The words that can be aptly applied to him are the words of one of his national poets. That he will—

Go down to the vile dust from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung.

Mr. LESINA: And "unhung."

Mr. ADAMSON: The hon. member for Clermont says "unhung." Well, I hope that before very long, politically, he will be hung, and that he will pass out of political life. I would appeal to the Premier, and to those associated with him, I would appeal to hon. members

opposite, to do something to remove this feeling of suspicion concerning public men and the public life of Queensland. It is being said everywhere. I would urge upon those men who were once Labourites to walk over here when the division bell rings—(Government laughter)—and vote to send to oblivion, or to send to London, the man who has betrayed the principles that he said he believed in.

Mr. MAXWELL: "Judge not that ye be not judged."

Mr. ADAMSON: That is a good maxim. I wonder if the hon. member knows what it means—Do not be hasty in your judgments. Do not be censorious unduly.

Mr. MAXWELL: Hear, hear! Do not be hasty in your judgment.

Mr. ADAMSON: Do not come to the conclusion that you know everything, and think that everybody else knows nothing.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Why don't you apply that to yourself this afternoon?

Mr. ADAMSON: That is what it means. But, if you read on in the same chapter from which that quotation is taken, you will find this said: "Every tree is known by its fruits. Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them." And it says something more—"Beware of those who come among you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves."

[5.30 p.m.] (Laughter). The Great Being who said "Judge not, lest ye be judged" did not say that we were to put our reasoning faculties aside. He said that we should know men by their fruits, and we have a right to judge them by their fruits. A week or two before the coalition was formed, some members on that side spoke to me, and they said the hardest things they could say about the Premier, and yet we now find those hon. members joined with him in this coalition.

Mr. D. HUNTER: You have no right to repeat private conversations.

Mr. ADAMSON: I have not said who those members were, nor have I repeated what they said; but, in any case, the hon. member for Woolloongabba should be one of the last men in this Chamber to make that remark. There is a stain on the political life of Queensland through the electors having been betrayed in the manner they have been by the formation of the present coalition; and I hold that if there were an election to-morrow the Kidston and Philp parties would come back to this House in very reduced numbers. For the sake of the purity of political life in Queensland I ask hon. members opposite to come over here and say by their votes that the Premier shall not remain in office any longer. I want to close with a passage which you, Sir, brought to my notice. I ask hon. members what is the best thing in life? Is it better to have place and power and wealth, and things of that sort, or to have honesty and purity of life and purpose? To the men who are striving for place and power, irrespective of fitness for those places, I would say, in the words of Lecky, which you yourself, Mr. Speaker, taught me—

Look down, look down from your glittering heights
And tell us ye sons of glory,
The joys and pangs of your eagle flights,
And the triumph that crowned the story.

* * *
The rapture that thrilled when the goal was won,
The goal of a life's desire;
And a voice replied from the setting sun:
"Nay, the dearest and best lies nigher."

Mr. Adamson.]

How oft in such hours our fond thoughts stray
 To the dream of two idle lovers,
 To the young wife's kiss, to the child at play,
 Or the grave that the long grass covers?

* * *

And little we'd reck for power or gold,
 Or for all life's vain endeavour,
 If the heart could glow as it glowed of old,
 And if youth could abide for ever.

There is something better than place and power,
 and the things that men strive so much after,
 and that is honesty of purpose and purity of life,
 politically and otherwise. I would remind the
 Premier that an eminent poet said—

A wit's a feather, and a chief's a rod,
 An honest man's the noblest work of God.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

* Mr. BARTON (*Brisbane North*): I have listened to the speeches which have been delivered by hon. members sitting on the Opposition benches, and, as a newcomer in this House, I must say that my political education has been improved, or ought to have been improved, by the amount of knowledge which has been poured into my ears. Members claim that on that side they have only one justification for their action, and that is that they satisfy their consciences; while the only justification that members on this side can plead is that they are united by self-interest. Like my hon. friend the hon. member for Woolloongabba, I am rather in a quandary as to the reason why I am sitting here, and still more so as to the reason why I should sit over there with the Opposition. If I were to sit over there, I should probably be received in the same manner as the hon. member for Clermont received some hon. members who have gone over to that side, and that is inadmissible. Yet I am, according to the doctrine of hon. members opposite, absolutely unjustified in sitting on this side of the Chamber. I am led to make that remark because, unfortunately, my name, or at all events the name of the commercial interest I am identified with, has been brought into this debate by various members, notably the hon. member for Gympie, the hon. member for Clermont, and the hon. member for Leichhardt. Those hon. members are somewhat in error in coming to the conclusion at which they have arrived—namely, that I personally have derived some benefit from the fact that the hon. member for Rockhampton has been Premier for some time past.

Mr. COYNE: No, no—that he gave your company a concession.

Mr. BARTON: I know what is meant, and I should like to put a few facts before hon. members which will enlighten them on the subject. I hope the House will excuse me referring to a matter of this sort, but in view of the erroneous nature of that conclusion it ought to be corrected. (Hear, hear!) This is not a matter of yesterday. At the beginning of 1903 the Valley people wanted electric light. Power to supply that electric light was applied for by my company. The Government at that time was the Morgan-Kidston Government, and they refused the application of my company, and granted the necessary authority to a local company. Of course, I have to be thankful to the Morgan-Kidston Government for doing that. For two years that company held the authority granted, and then died without doing anything, because they regarded the venture as unremunerative. A few months later my company applied again to the Kidston Government for a concession—the same concession under the Act as has been granted in other parts of Queensland, including Toowoomba—namely, a concession for forty-two years. For the first time in the history of the administration of that Act a company was refused a conces-

sion for forty-two years. We were offered one for fourteen years. Naturally that offer was refused, as work under such conditions would be unremunerative. All through the year 1907 my company battled for a concession for forty-two years, and up to the end of that year it was refused by the Government. At the end of that year the company were offered a thirty-two years' concession.

Mr. BOWMAN: That was by the Philp Government.

Mr. BARTON: No; by the Kidston Government before they went out of office. We refused that offer, and when they went out of office we tried to get a forty-two years' concession from the Philp Government, but, as hon. members know, the Philp Government came to an end very soon. When the Kidston Government came into office again, they sent my company a peremptory letter, stating that we could take the thirty-two years' concession or leave it. Hon. members opposite will therefore see that I have nothing to thank the present Government for, and that, according to their arguments, I should sit on the other side of the House. If I had been sitting in opposition to the Government my company would probably have got what other companies have got—a concession for forty-two years. That concession has never been refused to any company but mine.

Mr. BOWMAN: Was it refused to your company for the reason you give?

Mr. BARTON: I understand that no honest Government ever dared to give to a supporter what they gave to their opponents. I say that is so, because I understand from the gentlemen on the other side that the only reason for sitting on this side is self-interest, and here am I not obtaining the reward which is supposed to be the reward of gentlemen on this side? I have lost ten years of my life through this Government being too honest, or attending to the political moralities that are, I understand, acknowledged, and certainly I think it would be an unfortunate result if I could not get what anybody else could get. What I wish to say is that my convictions made me a Kidstonite, and my interests make me an Oppositionist, and I have a difficulty, after what I have learnt from gentlemen opposite, who have been doing all the teaching. According to them I ought to sit on that side for my interests, and on this side for my convictions, and it is difficult to reconcile all these things. I shall have much pleasure in voting against the amendment.

Mr. SUMNER: What is your reason?

Mr. BARTON: My reason is this: I anticipated that, when this Government came before the House, no arrangement would be made, that the Government would be in difficulties because they had two parties against them, and only their own party—about 30 per cent. of the House—to uphold them, and we should have a succession of short-lived Ministries. I thought that such would be the result, and that eventually out of chaos would be evolved a coalition Government. As the Labour party say that their programme prevents them from combining with any party, and sinking their own principles to any extent at all for the purpose of a coalition, a coalition with them was absolutely impossible; and if we had gone all through chaos, and wanted to get any form of government at all, we would have had to come to some method of coalition; and coalition is only possible with those parties whose principles do not prevent a coalition taking place. The only party in the House which could possibly coalesce was a party of that kind; and I think, considering the differences of opinion—

[Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. COYNE: Why then did you go to the country on the principle of no coalition with that party?

Mr. BARTON: I did not.

Mr. COYNE: Your Premier did.

Mr. BARTON: I do not know whether no coalition was his principle. The fact is that we went to the country on two matters—the constitutional question—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: A bogey.

Mr. BARTON: It may have been a bogey—I do not know as much as some hon. gentlemen know, but they made a big song about it if it was a bogey. We went to the country on that question at all events, and in my electorate and all around that was the question. We were sent here to put right something that was wrong.

Mr. COYNE: And you did not do it.

Mr. BARTON: We did it. It has been said by the late Attorney-General that it was not unconstitutional. We are not all lawyers, and we cannot all tell what is constitutional.

Mr. SUMNER: He said you were wrong.

Mr. BARTON: I understand that the legal interpretation is that it was not illegal, and that it was not unconstitutional.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, you are wrong.

Mr. BARTON: I shall be glad if I am wrong. We must remember that the Constitution of our country is really the result of a series of battles, and that this series of battles really makes the Constitution, and when we had that fight it was merely to protect our rights. We thought it was wrong and we held an election, and if it were constitutional we helped to make it unconstitutional. We put that Ministry out, and it is a message for all time to the people of this country that the Queensland people thought it was unconstitutional, and wanted to make it unconstitutional. I am perfectly satisfied that that was the reason I came out in this particular electorate, and I am glad the result was as it was.

Mr. LESINA: What was the second issue of the elections?

Mr. BARTON: To my mind it was that the finances of the country would not be properly looked after in the hands of the Ministry which was then in power.

Mr. AIREY: Opposition to that party put you in for Brisbane North.

Mr. BARTON: I am simply trying to justify my position. I believe it is a proper thing on an occasion like this to justify and testify as to what one has done.

Several members interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order! These interjections are interfering with the hon. member addressing the House. I must ask hon. members to cease from interjecting.

Mr. BARTON: I am perfectly satisfied that if we had gone through six, twelve, or eighteen months of chaos, the best result to be hoped from that very painful process of chaos would have been a coalition. As a coalition is impossible with the gentlemen who are now in Opposition, the only basis for a solid and substantial Government is the present coalition. If it fails we shall have chaos, and the hon. gentlemen in Opposition may have the chance of coming back here strong enough to form a Ministry of their own; and, apparently, such a Ministry is the only one they can support.

Mr. COYNE: Why have a coalition at all?

Mr. BARTON: I am astonished to hear an hon. member asking why have a coalition at all.

The fact which we have been advocating all the time is that we should have retained the control of affairs. The other side have asserted that the Ministry should have worked in the same manner as it worked at the beginning of last session—that is, in a sort of coalition with the very party who are opposing this coalition now. Their feeling was that the Government of this country could have been carried on by trying to unite two parties, one of which had as their fundamental principle that they could not support any Government excepting one in which they had a majority of Ministers.

Mr. COYNE: Has any Government in the Federal Parliament yet had a majority of their own?

Mr. BARTON: That may be, but we hope to establish it now, and I hope for the next few years it will be possible to carry it on, and there will be a majority behind the Government which will enable them to carry on and satisfy the wants of the country, in administration as well as in law making, because they must remember that Government does not exist simply for the purpose of passing their laws through the House and arguing about such matters, but their administrative powers are fully as important as their legislative powers.

Mr. SUMNER: More so.

Mr. BARTON: Perhaps more so. We passed legislation last session—notably the Wages Boards Bill—that will demand all the skill in administration that can possibly be placed at the disposal of the country. I repeat that I shall have much pleasure in voting against the amendment.

Mr. NEVITT (*Carpentaria*): The hon. member who has just resumed his seat said he had to testify. I may say that I have a short testimony to make as to why I consider the amendment which has been moved by the leader of the Opposition should be carried in this Chamber, and I also want to deal with some of the idiosyncrasies of Queensland politicians, particularly of the present Premier and the Minister for Lands. It has caused me to look over Queensland history for the past 20 years, and I find that there have been several coalitions before, and they have all had a disastrous result for Queensland. I believe that if this coalition is going to live for any considerable length of time the same disastrous results will follow. In looking back during the time that Sir Thomas McIlwraith was Premier of Queensland, what do we find? We know that the principal planks in his platform were coloured labour, syndicate railways, and alienation of lands. On the other hand, we have Sir S. W. Griffith, the leader of the second party, who classified as a moderate Liberal. His first programme consisted of these measures—Bill to amend the Criminal Code, Bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act, Bill to repeal the Act relating to the introduction of labour from India. These are characteristic Bills of modified Liberals. Now, these two giants fought against each other for a number of years. Eventually they found that it was to their interest—and it has been stated times out of number that self-interest is always at the bottom of such coalitions—that these two parties should come together and no longer fight as enemies in the country. They came together; I think it was in the year 1893. For some eleven years prior to that they had occupied the position of Premier alternately, one in and the other out. In the next Parliament the other one would be in and the other out. The result was that in part of the time of Sir Thomas McIlwraith's Ministry there was supposed to have been a deal in steel rails. So strongly did the then Premier,

Mr. Nevitt.]

Sir S. W. Griffith, feel over this matter that he took a trip to England to find out as to whether it was not possible to impeach the other gentleman. If the present Premier of Queensland had done his duty, or done what he said he was going to do, he would have impeached the Premier who occupied the position of Premier at the will of Chelmsford only at the end of last year and the commencement of this year. But for some reason or other, which personally I have never been able to find out, these two giants have come together—

Mr. LESINA: Giants, do you call them!

Mr. NEVITT: They have come together in a similar manner to what the two giants came together in 1893.

A LABOUR MEMBER: These are two pigmies.

Mr. NEVITT: An hon. member behind me says these are two pigmies, and I believe that that will be proved the next time we go to the country. I firmly believe that on the next appeal to the country the people of Queensland will realise that at least they will give the party a trial who have never gone back on their principles or their promises, which is the party now sitting on the Opposition benches.

Hon. R. PHILP: Nonsense!

Mr. NEVITT: The hon. member says "Nonsense," but can any hon. member opposite offer any evidence that this party has at any time broken the promises which they made in the country or in this House?

Hon. R. PHILP: Yes; you have.

Mr. NEVITT: We can give scores of such breaches regarding the hon. gentlemen who occupy the other side of the Chamber to-day. They have frequently broken their promises. Before I have done, I intend to bring before the notice of this Chamber one or two instances at least where they have broken their promises. To go back, in 1903 the present Premier found that the dark shades of opposition were not congenial to him. He made overtures to the then Speaker, Mr. Morgan. Mr. Morgan had a certain following in this Chamber, and the two of them between them got a sufficient following to form a Ministry, with the result that those who had sat on the Government benches for so long had to go into opposition, and, when they came over here, they were not comfortable. They tried their best from day to day to upset the Government. Intrigue was rampant—equally as rampant as it is at the present time—in the party sitting on the Government benches, with the result that there was a party formed in this House, and on the death of the then Minister for Mines, Mr. Browne, those people who were sitting on the Opposition benches had got sufficient support on their side to support them—

Hon. R. PHILP: Do you say that that was an immoral coalition?

Mr. NEVITT: If that coalition was an immoral one I do not know what you would call the present one.

Hon. R. PHILP: Quite moral.

Mr. NEVITT: The Opposition was then sufficiently strong to prevent the Government from carrying out the business of the country, with the result that the Government of that day got a dissolution and went to the country. What was the result of that election? Why, the gentleman who led the party, who said that that coalition was an immoral one, was almost annihilated in a political sense.

Hon. R. PHILP: No.

[Mr. Nevitt.

Mr. NEVITT: I say almost annihilated, because his numbers were reduced by 50 per cent. in comparison with what they came to the Chamber with at the previous election.

Hon. R. PHILP: The same thing happened to your own party only three years afterwards.

Mr. NEVITT: My party are well able to defend themselves in the country; but you are not in the position to defend yourself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have laid it down on several occasions—and it seems strange that I have to lay it down again with every member who rises to speak—that hon. members in referring to other hon. members in this House must refer to them by the names of their constituencies. I take this opportunity of saying that I will insist on that Standing Order being followed in this respect, as it is absolutely necessary to preserve the courtesy of debate.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: I have no intention of disobeying any ruling from the Chair. The hon. member for Townsville interjected, and I could not resist the temptation of replying.

The SPEAKER: I do not want the hon. gentleman to misunderstand me. I did not say anything about the hon. gentleman replying to the hon. member for Townsville. He is quite in order in doing that, but he must refer to the hon. member by the name of his electorate and not by his name.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. NEVITT: It was some time later on—in 1906, I believe—when the hon. gentleman considered that it was to his interests to leave the ranks of the Labour party. After he left the ranks of the Labour party it is not too clear what his position was, except that it was to retain the position of Premier of Queensland. However, the fact remains that he left the Labour party. He went to the country some little time afterwards and said that he intended in future to have no undivided allegiance, but he came back in a minority. He had not sufficient backing to form an Administration, and it has been said that prior to the meeting of Parliament he had his resignation written out, and was going to tender it to the Governor, Lord Chelmsford. Why he did not tender that resignation that was written out has never been made clear. I understand that he tried his best at that time to form a coalition with the then Opposition, led by the hon. member for Townsville, and apparently it was unsuccessful. It has been said that after that he formed a coalition with the Labour party. It has been made clear by the leader of the Labour party that a coalition was never entered into by this party with the Kidston party. The Labour party told him clearly and distinctly, through the mouth of the leader of this party, on the floor of the House, that if he introduced legislation not in conflict with our platform he would get our undivided support, with the result that during the whole of that session the Labour party supported him, and I scarcely think there was an absentee from the Labour party at any time from the division lists, when the Labour party were supporting him. I say that the Premier cannot say the same of his own party. I have already pointed out where previous leaders of parties in this House have practically done the same thing before. The [7 p.m.] time came when the present Premier could not keep himself allied with the party he was instrumental in forming—namely, the Kidston party, and he found it necessary to throw them overboard, as the hon. member for Brisbane South, Mr. Airey, said, to

form a coherent, progressive, and homogeneous democratic party. I would like to know how the Premier is going to get some of the members on that side to support the measure in the Governor's Speech placed before us on the present occasion. Amongst the promised Bills is one to restrict the leasing of land to aliens.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will not be in order in discussing the Governor's Speech until the amendment has been disposed of. If he wishes to do so on the main question, he will be in order. In the meantime, he must confine himself to the amendment, or connect his remarks with it.

Mr. NEVITT: I think I shall be able, Mr. Speaker, to connect my remarks with the motion before the House. I find, on looking through *Hansard*, the members on that side going to support the present Premier's policy are Messrs. Philp, Forrest, Keogh, Stodart, Moore, Hanran, and J. C. Cribb. They have already voted in this Chamber against the restriction of leasing land to aliens, and I would like to know how it is possible for these members, who voted against that Bill, to prove to this House that it is equally essential now to pass that Bill as it was in those days to keep it from being placed on the statute-book. In 1904 the present member for Townsville stated that a wave of insanity had spread over Queensland. What caused him to make that remark was the fact that the party he then led had been practically annihilated at the polling-booths. According to the same line of argument, the hon. gentleman is one of those people whom he diagnosed as being insane, because he is a party to keeping on the Treasury benches the same men. I think it was during the same session the hon. member for Townsville stated that he would not trust the present Premier with a farthing candle. What do we find now? He is prepared to trust him with the Treasury of Queensland—because he is now sitting behind that gentleman, and apparently is going to back up his policy in this House. There are many idiosyncrasies in parliamentary life, and apparently this is one of them. These two gentlemen were stated by the Hon. the Secretary for Public Lands to have an affinity for each other. I looked up the definition of "affinity," and I find that it is "a relation constituted by marriage; an alliance; a similarity; chemical attraction." What affinity did those two gentlemen possess when they were on the hustings appealing for the suffrages of the people? The Premier stated, in speaking of the hon. member for Townsville: "But apart from this personal aspect of the matter, such a proposal if carried out would have been demoralising in the extreme to our public life and injurious to the best interests of Queensland." The present Premier said that at Rockhampton in 1907. He also said the hon. member for Townsville had "no sense of decency"; yet we find them sitting together to-day. And the only explanation we can conceive is that they are sitting together for their own personal ends. On another occasion the present Premier referred to "Philp, a sick devil." Yet they have now fallen into each other's arms like two lost friends meeting again. On another occasion the hon. gentleman spoke of "this miserable Philp Ministry," and "the *Courier* Ministry." And now we find them to-day sitting cheek by jowl. Another expression used was "Peevish Philp." That was on the 15th January of the present year. And, again, he said of the hon. member for Townsville that he was "not a man who would stick at trifles." In forming this coalition, it seems that the present Premier has lost every political virtue he ever possessed. It is questionable whether he possessed them or

whether it was only lip service. On the other side of the ledger we have some neat and loving expressions used by the hon. member for Townsville towards the present Premier. On one occasion he stated that he did not think this was the sort of man the electors wanted to be Premier of Queensland; he did not think that was the sort of man to make the country prosperous. Evidently the hon. member for Townsville thinks very differently now, though these words were uttered only eight or nine months ago. He also called the present Premier "an autocrat" and "a fool," yet we find them sitting together to-day. Still further, we find that he charged the hon. gentleman with "dishonourable conduct," and with being "the biggest rat that Queensland possessed." Those are some of the loving expressions made use of by the hon. member for Townsville towards the present Premier. On another occasion he called the hon. gentleman "a knave" and "a trickster." He said the women of Queensland saw through Mr. Kidston's trickery and knavery, and voted for the Philp party, because they knew that Mr. Kidston did all he could to take the vote from the women. Mind you, that was in February of this year. Three days later the electors of Queensland spoke, and the only party they could give any more confidence to than was given nine months before was the party sitting on these Opposition benches to-day. We were the only party that went to the country and came back with an increased majority. There was not one member now sitting on the Opposition benches prior to the election of February of the present year but what came back.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: How many of your people were helped in by their association with the Premier?

Mr. NEVITT: I shall deal with the hon. member for Bulimba directly. (Hear, hear!) I was remarking that this was the only party that went to the country and came back with increased numbers—that the country could trust with any more confidence; and I say if the late Philp Administration had not been in power at the time they would not have come back with even twenty-five followers. A good deal of corruption took place even at the last election, and before I have finished I shall deal with the Minister for Lands, who, at that particular time, was administering the Home Department, and I will show that he, at all events, should not be in the present Ministry, and that the people of Queensland are very indignant that such a gentleman as that should be one of His Majesty's advisers. On another occasion the hon. member for Townsville said that Kidston was kicking himself—

Mr. Kidston had resigned in a fit of pique, and had been crying and whining ever since. (Laughter and applause.) He did not know any man in Queensland who had kicked himself as Mr. Kidston had done since he resigned office.

Personally, I was one of those members in the House at that time who supported the present Premier in his action, and the party that I belong to, speaking generally, supported Mr. Kidston, and particularly that part of his programme where he advocated home rule for Queensland. There was a danger—no matter what the hon. member for Townsville may say—there was a danger at that particular time of home rule being taken away from the people of Queensland.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Why, it was referred to the people.

Mr. NEVITT: Yes, but not at the wish of the hon. member who interjects. It was referred to the people of Queensland, but if the leader of the party and his followers had been aware of the fact, when he went to the Governor, that it

Mr. Nevitt.]

would lead to a dissolution, he would not have acted as he did, and a number of his followers at that very time made no secret of the fact. They said, "Had we known it would mean going to the country, we would never have taken up the attitude we did." And I think the hon. member for Bulimba is one of them, too.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: No.

Mr. NEVITT: Again, the hon. member for Townsville says—

Mr. Kidston was a man of ability, but not stability. Mr. Phil also emphasised the fact that Mr. Kidston had abused the Socialist party, and called them ungrateful dogs—the men whose support he was now seeking.

These are the loving expressions from one to the other of the two hon. gentlemen who now find themselves in that happy position of, I may say, ruling the destinies of Queensland. As was stated by the hon. member for Townsville, in the refreshment room last year—he said the real Premier of Queensland was in the other Chamber—Mr. Thynne: I think it can be as truly stated to-night that the real Premier of Queensland is the hon. member for Townsville; that the hon. member for Rockhampton is no longer the real Premier of Queensland, because he admitted that fact in reply to the leader of the Labour party, when he said the future legislation of this country would be coloured by the majority of the following behind him. If that is not saying the hon. member for Townsville, who took over twenty-five followers, is going to be the real Premier of Queensland, what does it mean? I do not think you can take any other interpretation from it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Majority rule.

Mr. NEVITT: Yes, majority rule. This is what the Premier stated on the floor of this House the other night—

Never before the hon. member was leader of the Labour party did any leader of the party or any caucus of the party in this House ever go to the Trades Hall for instructions as to what they were to do in a matter of parliamentary procedure.

After what I have stated—giving you the expressions made use of by the hon. member, he has gone back on all those statements—can we not believe the hon. member for Croydon when he stated "it was done at your house"? The Premier, in reply to the hon. member for Croydon, made the following statement:—

I may say he evidently thought it was a much better place to be in, or he would not have been there.

What a beautiful evasive way of getting out of a very intricate question! Apparently at that time he did not go to the bill, but he fetched those from the bill to the flat to consult him. That is the only interpretation you can take from that expression. Then, again, he made use of this expression—

There is not a public man in Australia, who takes the part of the State Parliaments in this matter, who is not lampooned by the *Sydney Bulletin*. Nothing he can do with regard to any matter is good or right, because they want a party there who will work for unification.

I remember, in November last, when there was a joint caucus held in the now Opposition room, the present Premier told us he had had sent to him a letter or an article from the *Sydney Bulletin* that they were going to publish on the constitutional question. On that particular occasion there was no lampooning about the present Premier. No, it was quite the reverse, and you find he quotes the *Sydney Bulletin* when it suits his own particular case. Anyone who has followed the political history of the *Sydney Bulletin* must naturally come to the conclusion that it has done more for Australia than ever William Kidston has done or is likely to do.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

[Mr. Nevitt.

Mr. NEVITT: And if the hon. member for Rockhampton had only followed, to some extent, the lead of the *Sydney Bulletin*, he would not have found himself in the position he finds himself to-day—the leader of a party despised by the majority of the electors of Queensland—and when they get an opportunity of expressing themselves, I am firmly of opinion that it will be in no uncertain voice, and that the hon. member for Rockhampton will not come back with a following that will enable him to retain his present position on the Treasury benches. Later on in the same speech he said—

It was quite impossible for the Government to carry out the material progress portion of the Rockhampton programme so long as they depended on the support of the Labour party. I do not particularly dwell on the fact, but though I have given the Labour party a great deal of what they wanted, my only reward has been abuse, and to tell the truth I was getting a little tired of that abuse.

I do not know how to take that expression, whether it was only touting to the Labour party to put their platform on the statute-book—to get their support to retain him on the Treasury benches—or whether it was the Premier's own particular programme, or whether he believed in that particular part of the programme. Evidently it was the reverse, and he only did it in order to get the support of the Labour party, because he states he found it impossible to put the Rockhampton programme into practice. I defy him to state one measure that has been enumerated in the Rockhampton programme that this party opposed—the Labour party supported every measure that came before this House last session with the exception of two. That just reminds me that even there he betrayed the members of this House, because somewhere at the latter end of October, the hon. member, who was then leading the Opposition, asked the Premier as to what legislation was likely to be introduced before the close of the session. He enumerated two or three Bills, but there was no mention of the two measures that this party eventually opposed. The hon. gentleman distinctly states that there was no likelihood of carrying the Rockhampton programme with the help of the Labour party. Well I, as one of the Labour party, distinctly deny that, and I can speak for every member of this party, I am sure. They would have supported every plank of the platform which the hon. gentleman placed before the electors of Queensland at the last election. We practically pledged ourselves to do so. Every measure introduced that was not in conflict with our platform would have got our support; and the hon. gentleman got our support on every occasion. Did not the hon. gentlemen say at that joint caucus of the two parties, "I am proud of you men. I am prouder to be William Kidston to-day than I was to be Premier of Queensland a week ago, owing to the way in which you men have stuck to me." In speaking and acting as he has done, the hon. gentleman has acted against the expressed wish of the electors of Queensland. What were the measures in which the hon. gentleman received the support of this party last session? The Constitution Act Amendment Bill, Elections Act Amendment Bill, Factories and Shops Bill, Wages Boards Bill, Machinery and Scaffolding Inspection Bill, Old-age Pensions Bill, and other measures. Did the party now sitting on that side support him?

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Yes.

Mr. NEVITT: Why, the leader of that party said, when speaking on the second reading of the Old-age Pensions Bill, that there was no necessity for the Bill—that we could increase the indigent allowance. And yet we

now find the Premier saying there is no chance of carrying the Rockhampton programme with the assistance of the Labour party. It makes one's blood curdle when you hear such expressions from men of the type of the hon. member for Bulimba—a man who said that the Premier had been drummed out of his native town. The hon. member has not yet withdrawn that remark, made on the floor of this House, and yet we find him to-night sitting behind the Premier, prepared to do anything. One or the other has forfeited his political virtue or principles, if either of them ever had any. It was stated in the *Brisbane Courier* that the hon. member for Rockhampton, the then Premier, had made a secret arrangement with the hon. member for Townsville prior to his leaving for England. The hon. member has never yet denied the statement, showing that he never took even his colleagues into his confidence. Prior to leaving for England, what did he say to the hon. member for Ipswich, the late Attorney-General? "Blair, when I come back again, your turn may come." It did come. We all know how it came. He gave the hon. member a kick-out, which only goes to prove what I have already stated—that, if he ever possessed any political virtue, he certainly has lost it. Another expression made use of by the Premier was this: "I do not hesitate to say that the best thing has been done. Whether it pleases the Labour party, or whether it suits the Labour party, is not a factor in my mind at all. I believe the arrangement will suit me." That means, "From my point of view, I will be able to retain £1,300 a year while I occupy my present position, with the extra given in of a choice between two motor cars." If it is needed that I should give any further reasons to prove the indictment, I can only refer you, Sir, and all the people of Queensland, to the hon. gentleman's own expression where he said, "It will suit me." It does not matter whom else it displeases. I am now going to come to the present Secretary for Lands. Prior to my leaving Brisbane before the last election, I went to the Home Department and asked them to let me know what polling-places were going to be gazetted. They sent a wire to the then returning officer at Normanston, and he wired back on 9th December—

An advised by late acting returning officer that polling-places at last election suited and that there cannot be less this time.

Any unbiassed individual—any man who stood on the floor of the House the other night and said that he placed country before party—on the receipt of such a telegram would have gazetted the previous polling-places. After the receipt of that telegram I asked that Kalkadoon and Donaldson telegraph stations should be further proclaimed as polling-places. The then Home Secretary, the present Secretary for Lands, wired for further information, and this was the reply that he got—

Police inform me Kalkadoon 22 miles from Lloyd's camp polling-place last election population about fifteen Donaldson about 50 miles from Cowan Downs nearest polling-place last election population about fifteen.

Cowan Downs is about 120 miles from Normanston, and 130 or 140 miles from Cloncurry. I applied for a polling-place at what was practically a half-way house—namely, the Donaldson telegraph station, which would be 70 miles each way. But the hon. gentleman who puts country before party said, "No," although he was informed by the returning officer that there were likely to be fifteen votes recorded there. He would not give them any facilities for recording their votes. This is the gentleman who places country before party. As has been said, "How many crimes have been committed in thy name?"

This was not enough for the hon. gentleman. He sent a further wire asking for more information, and this is the reply he got—

About 100 men working in and near Kalkadoon, advise it be made a polling-place, at present decline recommend Donaldson.

Although he had stated the day before that there were fifteen people likely to record their votes there! I would like to know where he got this information from. I found in the papers in the hon. gentleman's own handwriting—

Lloyd's Camp and Thornton practically deserted. Cowan Downs, 150 miles from Normanston, five votes, some of them not Cowan Downs men.

Herbert Vale, 65 miles from Camooweal, last election few rabbit fanciers, now only two votes.

The hon. gentleman should tell this House where he got that information. In the first place, it is false information. Secondly, if the hon. gentleman acted up to his declared policy of putting country before party, he would not have acted in the manner he did. What are the facts in connection with this matter? Thornton, which was a polling-place at the election in 1907, is 40 miles from Morestone Downs, and there were twenty votes recorded there in my favour and two in favour of my opponent; and, if the truth could only be known, the hon. gentleman took his information from that political partisan and gazetted those places off the list of polling-places, although he had advertised four or five days before that Thornton, Herbert Vale, and Yelvertoft were to be polling-places. Then he states that he puts country before party every time. That is why he

[7.30 p.m.] is sitting on the Treasury bench

—he is sacrificing his own private interests so that the country may progress. That is the way he deals out justice to the men and women of Queensland. Only a few months ago I was out at Thornton, and I met a lady who told me that she had ridden 40 miles from Thornton to Cowan Downs to record her vote. Had Morestone Downs been proclaimed a polling-place she would have been able to walk from her waggon to the polling-booth, as she was with her husband at that place. Is that a fair way to treat the men and women who have borne the heat and burden of the day, and who have made the country what it is to-day? I consider that the action I am referring to is one of the greatest disgraces that has ever been perpetrated by the Home Secretary's Department. During last session, when the Estimates were going through, I casually mentioned a portion of the facts to the Committee. Since then I have got further information. I have been round the country seeing those people who were deprived of their votes. Seven gentlemen rode with the lady I have mentioned from Thornton to Morestone Downs to record their votes. Others had to remain at Thornton, some because they were not able to ride, others because they could not get horses, and Mr. and Mrs. Marr, Mr. Day, Miss Steel, and Mr. Freeman, were disfranchised. And they were disfranchised by the hon. gentleman who says he puts country before party every time. If that is putting country before party, then the people of Queensland want no more of it, and as long as members of this party have a voice to declaim they will always decry such action throughout the length and breadth of the State. Further information has come into my possession, including the following telegram from the hon. gentleman to the returning officer at Normanston:—

It has been suggested that Cloncurry is outside the electorate a polling-booth there is unnecessary. Please advise.

Who suggested to the hon. gentleman that Cloncurry should be cut out as a polling-booth for the

Mr. Nevitt.]

electorate of Carpentaria? These are questions which the hon. gentleman should answer. At the last election nineteen votes were recorded for me and only three for my opponent at that place, which proves the political partisanship of the hon. gentleman in suggesting that it should not be appointed a polling-place. The gentleman who gave him the information that a polling-booth was unnecessary at Cloncurry knew that only nine months before it was against the then Government or Philp party, and he was pulling the strings down here all he knew. The hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Secretary for Lands accepted his advice, or acted on what he was told by Mr. James Forsyth. Some people might call his action honourable, but I cannot classify it as such. But, not satisfied with the statement of the returning-officer that there were over twenty votes likely to be recorded at Cloncurry, and that he could not see his way to advise that it should be struck off the list of polling-places, he tried what he could do to get the returning-officer to recommend that other polling-places should be cancelled. The following wire was sent by the hon. gentleman to the returning-officer:—

Is it necessary to retain polling-places Lloyd's Camp and Calkadoon. Reply urgent.

Those places also would have been struck off the list had I not sent a wire to the Home Secretary telling him that I had been stuck up for twenty-one days on the Leichhardt River, and that there were a number of creeks and rivers between Lloyd's Camp and Calkadoon, and that there was every likelihood of people in that district being prevented from recording their votes unless those places were proclaimed. The following wire was sent to the hon. gentleman:—

Lloyd's Camp is about 12 miles from Calkadoon. Expect seven to twenty-five votes there. Believe kangaroo shooters and miners from Mount Oxide vote at Thornton. Difficult to get definite information about Herbert Vale and Yelvertoft. Probably two or three votes at each. It is 70 miles from Cowan Downs to Donor's Hill and about 65 miles from Herbert Vale to Lawn Hill. Advise Cloncurry be retained as polling twenty or more votes there. Doubtful if they have time to secure postal ballots. Cloncurry mail three weeks overdue.

If any proof were wanted of the state of the country at that time you have it in that telegram, in which it is stated that the mail between Cloncurry and Normanton was three weeks overdue. And yet the hon. gentleman, who to-day occupies the position of Minister for Lands, then gave instructions to cut out Herbert Vale, Thornton, Yelvertoft, and Cowan Downs as polling-places. Had there been in the office of the Home Secretary at that time a gentleman who wished to promote the welfare of the country, he would have proclaimed many more polling-booths all over Queensland in order to enable the people to record their votes with as little inconvenience as possible, instead of reducing the number of polling-places, and disfranchising many electors. But the then Home Secretary, who now claims that he always puts country before party, cut out as many polling-places as he could where I was likely to obtain a majority over my opponent. Is it likely that we shall get a fair deal from that gentleman in the future? Judging from his past actions, I say we are not likely to get a fair deal from him where his private or party interests conflict with the public interest. In order to prove that some electors in my constituency rode 75 miles to record their votes, and had to do so because some of the old polling-places were cancelled, I shall read an extract from a letter I have received from an elector of Carpentaria. He says—

I was at Herbert Vale and rode down with five others. We left eight men at the fence as on account of heavy rain horses could not be procured. There were also two women voters.

[Mr. Nevitt.

Now, if Herbert Vale had been a polling-booth, as recommended by the returning officer in the first instance, these people would have been able to record their votes. Further, he says—

I may say we rode 75 miles to vote and 75 back.

They did not have the opportunity of recording their vote. And he goes on further to say that between the time of writing that letter, the 6th of February, and the date the election was adjourned to, on account of the presiding officer not being able to get there in the first instance, there was a period of from twenty-one to twenty-eight days. He states in that letter that if necessary they were prepared to ride that 75 miles again. That would not have been necessary if we had had a man occupying the position of Home Secretary who was prepared to give every party a fair and square deal. Before concluding my remarks on this particular phase of the present combination, I may mention one little fact that caused me to draw the conclusion that Mr. James Forsyth, the late member for Carpentaria, was the gentleman who gave the information to the then Home Secretary. Amongst the correspondence in the Home Secretary's Office I found a wire. I interviewed Mr. Watson, my opponent in Burketown, and asked him if he would send a joint wire with me to the Home Secretary asking him to reinstate these places as polling-booths. He consented to do so after consulting his committee. Although he consented to do that, he considered it was necessary to send this wire to Mr. Forsyth—

At Nevitt's request have sent joint telegram Home Secretary to Herbertvale Yelvertoft Thornton Cowan Downs reappointed polling places.

That particular wire is amongst the papers in the Home Secretary's Office, so I do not think this House or the country want any further proof of the fact that the then Home Secretary took his instructions from James Forsyth.

MR. MANN: Now he wants to get into the Upper House.

MR. NEVITT: In the earlier part of my remarks I gave the House the benefit of a few of the expressions that had been made use of by the present friend of the Premier. We find that Mr. Forsyth has recently returned from a trip to London. He was interviewed on behalf of one of the metropolitan papers, and stated in that interview that he was very pleased to find that the Kidston and Philp parties had come together. I do not know how long it is since Mr. Forsyth became pleased, because it will be remembered that he said on the floor of this Chamber that the then Premier was nothing but an Aberdeen Jew. Some of my friends at the back say that was a very fair estimate of the hon. gentleman's character—that may be; it is not for me to say—but the same gentleman at a later period stated that he had not the manners of a blackfellow. (Laughter.) And yet we find this same gentleman stating to the Press of Brisbane that he was very pleased that these two old political opponents had come together. Now, what is the inference to be drawn from that? As I said before, there can be only one inference to be taken from it, and that is that it suits their own private interest. That is the sole reason that has brought these two parties together, and what we, as a party, have to fight.

MR. J. M. HUNTER: Country before party.

MR. NEVITT: Yes, country before party. I do not think I shall ever forget that expression of the Minister for Lands. Further, he stated that there was a great affinity between the two parties. It is a well-known fact in chemistry that if two distinct chemicals come into contact with each other there is very likely to be trouble. The same will apply in political life, when two

political opponents come together in the manner in which the hon. member for Townsville and the member for Rockhampton have come together. Why when it was first mentioned, out of one packet a few grains evidently fell and got mixed with a few grains of the other packet, with the result that there was an explosion. Six of his own followers deserted him, would not have any truck with him, and before very long I am afraid that a few more grains will get out of those packets, and there will be a greater explosion in political life than ever the people of Queensland have yet witnessed. We, as a party, are of opinion that when that explosion does come about, when we face our masters, we will be sent back in sufficient numbers to occupy those Treasury benches, and to deal out legislation for the welfare of the people of Queensland—by that class of the people of Queensland who are the pioneers, and who have made Queensland what it is to-day. That is the class we are working for, and which we have been working for in the past, and which we intend to work for in the future. The class the hon. gentleman spoke of the other night—he can work in their interests if he likes, but that is the class we are going to travel with and work for. In conclusion, all I can say is that I sincerely hope that the amendment which has been moved by our leader will be carried, so that the people of Queensland will have an earlier opportunity than some people think of this party occupying the Treasury benches, and I am quite satisfied that the people of Queensland will be satisfied also.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): Before I address myself to the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, I would like, with other hon. members who have spoken, to express my sympathy with the friends and relatives of the victims of the accident which has taken place at Mount Morgan—(hear, hear!)—I may say the two accidents which have happened there—and we also commend the Government for the prompt action they have taken to have an inquiry into the accident. But we cannot get away from the fact that it would have been much better if, in appointing a committee of inquiry, an impartial committee had been chosen. We have a capable warden at Mount Morgan—a man who has proved, in the various appointments which he has held in the State, that he is a capable officer—but, instead of appointing him, the Government have appointed a gentleman from Brisbane to preside over the inquiry. I have no doubt they had reasons for that, as they perhaps believed that the warden, being on the field, might be biassed in some way or other, and would not have given the impartial opinion which the Government required. But we find that one of the gentlemen who is implicated—that is the Chief Inspector of Mines—went, at the request of the Government, to Broken Hill, to make inquiries there. He ought not to have been at the inquiry as an adviser to the chairman and asking questions of the witnesses; he ought to have been as a witness to prove that the action which he had recommended would have prevented the accidents that took place. Therefore, I think that the Government were wrong in appointing one of their own officers. Why did they appoint him? There was no need for it, as there are any number of capable men in this State, and the Government need not have appointed him—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member intends to make more than a passing reference to this matter I shall have to rule him out of order on the amendment. He can only make a passing reference to it. I cannot allow the hon. member to go further into it than I allowed other hon. members.

Mr. KERR: I was only making a passing reference, just as was done by the hon. member for Gympie and the hon. member for Fitzroy. However, I will deal with that matter later on, although I am still of the opinion that the Government would have done very well in getting some impartial expert on that inquiry board. Before dealing with the amendment on the Address in Reply, I may say that I have had the privilege, as you also have had, Sir, of listening to something like fifteen or sixteen Addresses in Reply delivered in this Chamber since I have been a member, and I can say that this is the only Address in Reply I have heard in which the mover of it got up and notified the Government which he was sitting behind that he did not believe in the programme that it had brought down.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: The junior member for Mackay, in the course of his speech, distinctly said—and at the same time there were evidences of dissension among other members on that side of the House—that he, for one, was not taking any Trade Disputes Bill if it was the Trade Disputes Bill of the last session. When we find the gentleman who has been chosen by the Government to move the adoption of the Address in Reply speaking in such a frank manner, can we wonder that a meeting was called of the supporters of the Government next morning to consider their position? The Premier, and those who have spoken from the Government side of the House, said that the coalition has been formed on the lines of the Rockhampton programme. The senior member for Fortitude Valley, who moved the amendment to the Address in Reply, said he objected to the present Ministry retaining office because they had not consulted the people of this State, and because he believed they had not got the confidence of the people as recorded at the ballot-box at the last election.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman pointed out clearly what his position was. What was the Rockhampton programme? So far as I can remember of the Rockhampton programme—and I was present when the Premier delivered his policy speech—one of the first items in it, and in the Premier's opening speech at Rockhampton, was, "No coalition with the Philp Government."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman laid that down clearly and distinctly. He was most emphatic on that point. He pointed out that that was, as it were, the basic principle that he was going to the country on, and the other part of the programme followed on naturally. The Premier also pointed out that he, for one, wanted no divided allegiance, and that the programme he was going to the country on was no coalition with Philp.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: What do we find at Townsville? The then leader of the Opposition, in expounding his policy to the electors at Townsville, and through them the people of this State, laid it down clearly that there was to be no coalition with Kidston.

Hon. R. PHILP: Why do not you quote my speech?

Mr. MANN: He said the same thing at Mareeba.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is not true.

Mr. WOODS: Yes, it is. You said it half a dozen times.

Mr. Kerr.]

Mr. KERR: I will come to that later on.

Hon. R. PHILP: I said I would not join a Ministry with Mr. Kidston as Premier.

Mr. KERR: That is a distinction without a difference. Mr. Kidston, speaking at Rockhampton—

The SPEAKER: Order! You should say "The Chief Secretary."

Mr. KERR: The Chief Secretary, in speaking at Rockhampton, in dealing with the hon. member for Oxley, the present Minister for Lands, said—

The one and only difference between Mr. Denham and his colleagues was that he wished to make an alliance with the Philp party, and we refused to entertain so extraordinary a proposal.

Mr. Denham's proposal was made, as you are aware, in the month of January, 1907, and it had this to recommend it—that it was made to the Premier before a general election. Mr. Denham also said that if they went to the country, and the people did not support that proposal, then the country would have spoken on the matter. The difference between the coalition that has been formed by the present Premier and that proposed by the hon. member for Oxley was that while the hon. member for Oxley's proposal was made before an election, when the country could speak upon it, Mr. Kidston's proposal has been made after a general election, when the country cannot speak on it for two years.

Mr. ARREY: And when the country pronounced against it.

Mr. KERR: And when the country had pronounced most emphatically against that coalition. There is no getting away from the fact that there are a number of members sitting on the Government benches at the present time who, if they had run as Philp candidates, or who, if they had said they would support a coalition between the Philp and Kidston parties, would never have been elected as members of this Chamber.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: Do you think the hon. member for Rockhampton North would have been returned if he had said that he was in favour of a coalition with the Philp party?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. KERR: Do you think the hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Barton, would have been returned if he had said he was in favour of a coalition with the hon. member for Townsville?

Mr. WOODS: No.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What about Toowong?

Mr. KERR: Do you think that the hon. member for Toowong would have been elected if he had said he was in favour of a coalition with the Philp party?

Mr. WOODS: No.

Mr. KERR: And the same thing would apply to others sitting on the Government benches.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: Cambooya, Aubigny, and Woolloongabba.

Mr. KERR: The Premier says that he appealed to the country at the last election on the Rockhampton policy, and the Rockhampton policy was construction of railways, immigration, free grants of land, Torres Strait mail service, referendum proposals, wages boards, Trade Disputes Bill, nationalisation of grammar schools, and old-age pensions. There are very few of the items mentioned in the Premier's policy speech that are now left to be dealt with; and I want the country to remember that the portion of the Premier's policy, as presented to the electors of Rockhampton and afterwards placed on the

statute-book, was not carried by the assistance of the men now occupying the Treasury benches and those supporting them. The present Minister for Lands opposed the Wages Boards Bill. We had them opposing the abolition of the postal vote; and they opposed the other measures brought forward by the late Government.

Hon. R. PHILP: That is not so.

Mr. KERR: And we had some of them opposing the Old-age Pensions Bill.

Hon. R. PHILP: No.

Mr. KERR: If the hon. member for Townsville turns up *Hansard*, he will find that he said there was no need for the Old-age [S p.m.] Pensions Bill, because the indigence allowance could be extended. And the hon. member for Lockyer opposed it.

Hon. R. PHILP: I did not oppose the Bill, all the same.

Mr. KERR: They did not oppose the Bill, but they opposed it in its vital principle. In a leading article published in February, 1908, in the Rockhampton *Bulletin*, the organ that officially represents the Premier, it was stated that "Mr. Kidston will neither retreat into the rigid conservatism of Mr. Philp nor be hurried into the wild schemes of Mr. Lesina." But what has he done? He has thrown himself into the arms of the hon. member for Townsville. I remember when the Premier came to his party and explained the proposal he was about to make. The proposal made at the joint meeting of the parties was not the first proposal made by the Premier. The hon. gentleman had other proposals, but he thought the hon. member for Townsville would not swallow them. If he had thought the hon. member for Townsville would have swallowed his first proposal, the proposal made to the joint meeting would have been quite different. The Premier, in explaining the matter to his party, said, "Did you ever know of an Opposition who completely gave themselves away like the Opposition are doing?" He said, "They are quite prepared to accept our proposal: they are quite prepared to come in behind us, to accept our policy, to swallow up rump, stump, lock, stock, and barrel—(laughter)—with the exception of the Trade Disputes Bill." The hon. member for Townsville asked him what about the Trade Disputes Bill, and the Chief Secretary said, "That is in the Rockhampton programme; but you do not need to swallow it all; you do not need to take every item of it."

Hon. R. PHILP: He never said that to me.

Mr. KERR: He said that to his colleagues, and I think the late Treasurer can bear me out in that. He said, "There is no need for you to swallow it all; it can be easily amended." Yes, it can be easily amended so that its grandfather would not know it. That is what will be done with the Trade Disputes Bill. We know that the Premier did not appeal to the country at the last election on the Rockhampton programme. Those who have followed his speeches will remember that he appealed to the country on the proposal to sack the Governor. And he was going to deal with the Governor after he got back to the House. One of his proposals was to limit the power of the Council; and that Bill was brought in and passed. Another of his proposals was to smash the Philp party for spending money without the approval of the House. You remember what a noise he made in the country about this matter, and how he appealed to the country to return him and his supporters so that he might smash the Philp party. And we know how he did it.

The TREASURER: You helped to endorse the spending of that money.

[Mr. Kerr.]

Mr. KERR: I just want to make it clear that I do not shirk responsibility for any of my actions while I was a member of the Cabinet. I am not one that does a thing, and then is ashamed or afraid to acknowledge that they have done it. I am quite prepared to take the responsibility for anything I have done, and I will ask no one to bear my sins.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: But this was the policy the Premier went to the country on. The Premier, on 13th January, 1908, speaking at the Exhibition Building, said—

I have been twelve years in the Queensland Parliament and never was I so proud of being a member of it than when my supporters said to Robert Philp that, dissolution or no dissolution, they would not have him at any price.

That is what the Premier said in reference to those who supported him during the constitutional crisis. And then he said—

This man, Robert Philp, deceived the Governor as to the possibilities of the Legislative Assembly, and by means of that got the Governor to assent to a dissolution, and no sooner had he got a dissolution than he abandoned the reason which the Government gave to justify the dissolution. First they lied to the Governor, and then they lied to the people.

That is a quotation from a speech made by the Premier in the Exhibition Building. That is the man who accused the present member for Townsville, and those who were supporting him, of having deceived the Governor of this State about the possibilities of the Legislative Assembly, and getting a dissolution, and then he says, "First they lied to the Governor, and then they lied to the electors."

The SPEAKER: Order, order! A great deal of latitude is allowed in speaking of a party or in making charges against them as a party, but it is not in order to say that the hon. member for Townsville, or any other hon. member, lied to the Governor, or to anybody else. What would not be in order in the House, cannot be introduced by way of quoting what someone else has said outside the House.

Mr. KERR: This is a quotation, and I understand quotations are allowed—

The SPEAKER: Order! Quotations can only be allowed subject to the condition I have laid down. It is a well-known ruling of Mr. Speaker Peel, in the House of Commons, that a reflective quotation, that would be improper if made in the House, cannot be used in the way I have mentioned. I did not take any objection to it when it was used towards the party, because a great deal of latitude is allowed in speaking of a party, but such expressions are distinctly out of order when applied to an individual member of the House.

Mr. KERR: I may have applied it too personally towards the hon. member for Townsville.

Hon. R. PHILP: It is just like you.

Mr. KERR: There is this about it. It was not I who used the words, it was the hon. gentleman who is now embracing him, the gentleman whom he is now sitting behind and supporting in this House. A gentleman who is now—I was going to say his leader, but we know very well that he is not his leader. He is not recognised by members on that side of the Chamber. The hon. member for Normanby, in speaking the first day the House met, referred to the hon. member for Townsville as leader.

Mr. SUMNER: Force of habit.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Oxley twitted the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Airey, with having run with the Premier

and aided and abetted him in a policy, although he had so bad an opinion of him. The hon. member for South Brisbane did not abuse the Premier with regard to his general political career at all. No one who listened to the hon. member for Brisbane South could say that he abused the Premier in any way.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: When you speak the truth they call it abuse.

Mr. KERR: He simply attacked the Premier on his scandalous action in forming a coalition that he told the electors and all his supporters in the country that he had no intention of forming.

Mr. HAMILTON: He said there would be no coalition.

Mr. KERR: That is my stand also. The Premier's career contains a great deal that is praiseworthy, as the hon. member for Brisbane South said when he spoke—a good deal that is praiseworthy; but his last step has been the betrayal of the men and women that have supported him throughout the length and breadth of Queensland. There is no getting away from the fact that the Premier, and the hon. member for Brisbane South, and myself, stumped the country to form a middle party. The Premier and ourselves thought that it was necessary to have a middle party in politics. Not only did we travel the country from Cunnamulla right up to the Gulf, but we also got a large number of men and women of this State who agreed with us, and who became part and parcel of the middle party, and believed in the principles advocated by that party. The middle party was brought into existence for this reason: There was a large number in this State who did not believe in the extreme conservatism of the hon. member for Townsville, and as a party they did not believe in the extreme socialism of the hon. member for Clermont. (Laughter.) There was a large number of that opinion, and the Premier stumped the country to get the people to believe in him, and he formed a party, and what do we find? The very man who endeavoured to bring that party into existence has sold it by forming a coalition against all the principles of honest government in this State.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: What was the price?

Mr. MANN: £1,300 a year and two motor cars.

Mr. KERR: The Premier made a great point when he said that he never approached any member with a view to inducing him to join the coalition. But the hon. gentleman did not tell the members of this House and the people of the country that he laid an embargo upon his Ministers before he left for England that they should not address any public meetings with regard to a coalition.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Ha, ha!

Mr. BOWMAN: Silence does it.

Mr. KERR: He said that they were to allow the public to come to a decision, and it would be the opinion of the people without the influence of politicians.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are using too strong a term. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KERR: The late Secretary for Lands will probably remember that, when I went to Gayndah to open the railway in my official capacity of Secretary for Railways, an address was presented to me by the mayor of Gayndah, and that special mention was made of a coalition in that address, and the wish was expressed that the three-party system should become a thing

Mr. Kerr.]

of the past. I spoke pretty plainly at the railway station, and said that I, for one, was not in favour of a coalition.

Mr. MULCAHY: Hear, hear! I was there and heard you.

Mr. KERR: In the evening, at the banquet—with very bad taste—the matter was again brought up and thrust upon me. I replied to what was said more fully, and my remarks were reported in the newspapers; and I then gave the reasons why I did not favour a coalition. Then one of the Ministers reported me to the Premier. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MANN: Barlow, Barlow!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KERR: I was reported to the Premier. The Premier did not write to me, but he wrote to one of my colleagues, and said that he thought I ought to have let the matter alone.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: Now the matter was thrust upon me. It was not of my seeking. No man can say that I ever broached the question. There are members sitting on the other side who can bear me out that, when I was travelling round in my capacity as Secretary for Railways, though the question of a coalition was brought up—by two members on that side of the House—at one place in the Warwick district, in particular—I never referred to it at all.

Mr. GRAYSON: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: But, when the matter was forced upon me at Gayndah, I expressed my opinion, and the watchdog of the Cabinet reported it to the Premier. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. BOWMAN: Who is the watchdog?

Mr. MANN: Barlow!

Mr. LESINA: J.T.B.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KERR: I will say this about the late Secretary for Lands—that, though we may have differed when we were sitting in Cabinet on matters connected with his electorate, and in connection with my department, yet, when I resigned from the Ministry, the hon. gentleman was the only one of my late colleagues who wrote to me expressing his regret at my leaving the Ministry.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Because I sincerely did regret it.

Mr. KERR: I shall never forget the hon. gentleman's expressions of regret.

Mr. MANN: He is a gentleman.

Mr. KERR: The Premier made a great point about not holding out any inducements to members to form a coalition. As a matter of fact, this thing has been carefully engineered ever since the last election. I do not say the Premier has gone round begging members to help him; but the matter has been negotiated by one emissary and another, by suggestions and hints, and indirect assurances.

Mr. LENNON: "A wink is as good as a nod to a blind horse."

Mr. KERR: Nearly every member of the Opposition knew, without hearing directly from the Premier himself, that he was ripe and ready to fall into their arms. (Opposition laughter.)

Hon. R. PHILP: That is not so. That is quite untrue.

Mr. BOWMAN: This is the chapter of Revelations.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

[Mr. Kerr.

Mr. KERR: I had it on the word of one of my late colleagues some months ago that it was common talk among the late Opposition that vacancies were to be created in a very simple manner, namely, by one Minister being made a judge, by another being appointed Agent-General—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Ah, ah!

Mr. CAMPBELL: That has not come off.

Mr. KERR: Moreover, it was quite likely that a third Minister would retire from the Council. Those were the inducements that were held out to bring about a coalition.

Mr. CAMPBELL: No inducements were held out at all.

Mr. COYNE: Timber concessions.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Barton, said this afternoon, "I have nothing to thank the Government for," and he went on to say that he would have done better with the Government if he had been a supporter of the hon. member for Townsville. We all remember what was said in this Chamber last session about the City Electric Lighting Company and the concession that was granted to the hon. member.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: Now, I want to know from the hon. member if he saw the Premier when he was at home. (Opposition laughter.) It was a wonderful thing how, on the Premier's return, the Press immediately discovered that one, if not two, hon. members who had been at home, were going to sit behind the Premier. Did those gentlemen interview the Premier in [8.30 p.m.] the old country? I think I shall be able to prove before I sit down that at least the hon. member for Brisbane North had an interview with the Premier, and that he did very well at that interview. The junior member for Brisbane North must have had more than one interview with the Premier, for some most important public business in which his company was concerned had suddenly to be stopped for some mysterious and occult reason best known to himself and the Premier. Does the hon. member for Brisbane North know anything about an allotment of land at the corner of Margaret and William streets?

Mr. BARRON: That you tried to take from me? Yes.

Mr. KERR: The matter I am speaking of is not a private matter, and in what I am about to say there is no breach of Cabinet confidence. The Government proposed to buy certain river frontages which abut on William street, with the idea of building public wharves and renting them to shipowners. An important shipping company had made an offer to rent the wharves at £2,000 per annum. The scheme, if carried out, would have been a magnificent thing for Brisbane. The Government held certain river frontages from the bridge downwards, and other frontages were required in order to give them the right of access to Margaret street. The allotments to which I specially refer now abut on William street. Those who remember Pettigrew's Sawmill will know the site I refer to. The Government purchased two allotments, and there remained one or two more at the corner of William and Margaret streets, which it was necessary to secure—allotments belonging to the Brisbane Electric Light and Power Company. The initial proceedings for the resumption of those allotments were taken a few months ago, but all of a sudden those proceedings were stopped. The Premier probably can tell us the reason why they were stopped. I thought that on his return the proceedings would be resumed, but they

have not been resumed. The matter, we are told, is under consideration. That looks rather fishy, I think.

The PREMIER: When did it begin to look fishy, and why?

The TREASURER: Were not legal difficulties raised?

Mr. KERR: Yes, but were not the legal difficulties got over?

The TREASURER: No; they have not been decided yet.

Mr. KERR: The legal difficulties were not the reason for delay. The hon. gentleman and the Premier know what were the reasons for the delay. The hon. member for Brisbane North says the Government want to take his allotments from him. The hon. member knows that under the Public Works Lands Resumption Act the Government can resume any land required for public works. I have heard the senior member for Brisbane North, and other hon. members interested in the city, point out in this Chamber, with a good deal of emphasis and with a good deal of reason, that the river frontages should be secured, in order to provide wharfage accommodation for shipping which is likely to come here in future years.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: I say so now.

Mr. KERR: I am glad to hear the hon. member says the same now.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: What does his colleague say?

Mr. KERR: His colleague says the Government want to take the land from him or from his company. The Government had no intention of taking the land from the hon. member—they were prepared to pay a fair price for the land, believing that it would be a magnificent thing, a splendid investment, and a splendid convenience for the public to have wharves running right from near Victoria Bridge to Margaret street. I have stated that a shipping company were prepared to rent the wharves at a rental of £2,000 a year. The Press of Brisbane was enthusiastic about the proposal when it was mooted that the Government were about to resume land for the purpose of building public wharves for the convenience of the people of this State. They had purchased two allotments, and they had given notice to the company represented by the hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Barton, that it was intended to resume their land; but proceedings were stopped because the hon. member for Brisbane North saw the Premier in London. (Hear, hear!) The hon. member did not tell us anything about that matter when he was speaking this afternoon. He did not tell us anything about his objection to wharfage accommodation being provided for the city. We hear a good deal about wharves being extended at Pinkenba and Bulimba. But here was an opportunity of bringing vessels right into the centre of the city, which would have benefited not only North Brisbane, but South Brisbane as well, and the wharves would have belonged to the people of the State. The State would have received a good rental for the wharves from a reputable shipping company, so that there would have been no loss to the State by the transaction. But the matter was hung up; there were no inducements held out. The fact is that if something is not done soon the whole matter may easily fall through, for the shipping company's offer will not stand for ever, and they have already shown signs of impatience. Now, here is a scandalous state of things. Some £4,000 or £5,000 of public money has been spent in purchasing two allotments,

and the money is practically thrown away unless the Brisbane Electric Lighting Company's land is also secured.

Mr. BARTON: And you were offered the frontage and would not take it.

Mr. COYNE: How could they take it after you?

Mr. KERR: No. Now, why was this matter blocked while the Premier was in England? Was it not to secure the allegiance of the hon. member for North Brisbane? And why is it delayed now? The Press, as I say, were enthusiastic about the scheme, and the public approved of it. It was a scheme of great public importance, and has been hung up for a purely political reason. Let the Premier explain it if he can.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: What kind of light does this throw on the assertion—is it Kidston light or electric light? (Laughter.) What kind of light does this throw on the Premier's assertion that he never tried to influence anyone on the matter of supporting him? The hon. member for Brisbane North was returned opposed to the Philip party, and he believes in the coalition. A lot of them believe in the coalition because it suits them.

Mr. LENNON: It pays.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Brisbane South, in speaking on the Address in Reply, wanted to know why an amendment of the liquor laws had not been brought in. He said that our liquor laws are probably the most backward liquor laws in Australia. There are good reasons why the Government should take action, but they will not bring in the Bill. Many of their strong supporters are against it being brought in. We will take Rockhampton for example. I have it on the authority of a member of this House that Sunday closing is not carried into effect there.

Mr. SUMNER: Quite true.

Mr. GRANT: It is carried out as well as in any other town.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member is not correct. I know townships in the West where the police will even walk in at 11 o'clock, and every man has to leave the hotel, and on the Sunday they are watched very closely. But in Rockhampton—and the hon. member for Nundah corroborates me—the Act is evaded, and it is well known that it is evaded. Now, even the present Act is defective, but if stringently administered it can do excellent work. As I have said, there are certain towns—Rockhampton, for example—where it is notorious that the administration of the Act has become an absolute farce.

The TREASURER: Why did you not bring that under our notice when you were in the Cabinet?

Mr. KERR: It was not brought under my notice then. Will the late Home Secretary tell me here, without a blush, that he tried to enforce the Sunday Closing Act?

The TREASURER: Certainly he did. Did you ever say that it was not properly enforced while you were a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. KERR: No; I said it was not brought under my notice.

The TREASURER: Those are two different things altogether.

Mr. KERR: But I know the hon. gentleman has not enforced it in the manner that his predecessor, the hon. member for Brisbane South, enforced it when he was in the position.

The TREASURER: I made absolutely no change in the system. I carried it on exactly as I found it.

Mr. Kerr.]

Mr. KERR: Will the Home Secretary inquire if it is not so? An amendment of the Act is necessary, but strict administration of the existing Act is even more necessary still. I find that since the hon. member for Brisbane South spoke on the Licensing Act, the *Courier*, the paper that is now backing the present Premier and his Government, has the information that a delegate is to be sent to New Zealand. Now, with what object?

Mr. MANN: After stalling the thing off as long as they can.

Mr. KERR: Was the Chief Secretary himself not in New Zealand less than three years ago?

Mr. BOWMAN: He was studying railway laws then.

Mr. KERR: Did he not visit the towns in New Zealand, and see how the Act was being carried out there? It is not necessary to send a delegate to New Zealand.

Mr. LENNON: It is a sheer waste of money.

Mr. KERR: If he wants to introduce an amendment of the Licensing Act, the only thing it is necessary to send a delegate to New Zealand for is to bluff the people of this State, and no other.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: That is quite unjustifiable.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have got their laws to guide you if you want to follow them.

Mr. KERR: There is no need to go to New Zealand. The temperance people of this State ask for three things at present, and the Government have the information and can carry them out if they desire to do so. First, they ask for a reform of the licensing benches. They do not want to have the licensing benches packed as they are packed. All that they ask is that the licensing benches should be constituted by our stipendiary magistrates. What do we find on the present licensing benches? We find partisans, say, of the temperance people, and partisans representing the liquor interest of this State, sitting on the bench, and very often it is carried just with a majority of one; and we have other instances. We have only to take up the Brisbane papers to see how many times the licensing benches are packed to get these licenses. Then the second thing that is asked for is the extension of the local option clauses.

Mr. AIREY: The franchise.

Mr. KERR: They ask for an extension of the franchise. Is there any need to go to New Zealand for that?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. KERR: There is no need to go to New Zealand for the first thing that is wanted, and there is no need to go to New Zealand for the second thing—the extension of the franchise.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not see what this has got to do with the question before the House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I have allowed the hon. gentleman a great deal of latitude. The matter he is referring to may well be discussed on the Address in Reply, but unless the hon. member connects it obviously with the amendment I shall have to rule him out of order.

Mr. KERR: The amendment moved by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley is to this effect—

That the constitution of the Ministry is a violation of the will of the people as expressed through the ballot-box last February, and the Government therefore does not possess the confidence of this House.

[*Mr. Kerr.*

I am entitled to show, Sir, that the Government are not sincere in their promises about carrying out the amendment of the Licensing Act, but I will deal with that when the amendment is disposed of. The Premier, in speaking at Rockhampton after they had formed that beautiful coalition, said, in speaking of those who had left his party—

These men have taken what they consider the honest and right course, but which he (Mr. Kidston) thought was the easy course. That might seem a hard saying.

The hon. gentleman said that certain gentlemen had left him, and added that they had taken the easy course. Now, I leave it to the members of this House, and to the people of the country who may read it in *Herald*, to give their opinions as to who has taken the easy course. The course which the hon. member for Brisbane South and the other members with myself have taken is one that anyone who knows anything about political life knows very well is not the easy course. We had an example of that last night when an hon. member attacked us in this Chamber. Do you not think that those of us who were leaving the Kidston Government, those of us who had supported the Premier in foul weather and fair weather, those of us who had helped to build up the party with which we were connected and who had broken away from the party we were connected with years ago—do you think we were taking the easy course? At that meeting, when the late Minister for Lands was expressing his sorrow that certain members could not see their way to follow the Premier in the course that he was taking, the Premier said, "Those men are going out into the wilderness," and he was speaking very coolly, because we were breaking our allegiance—breaking our connection with a man with whom we had been connected—

Mr. BOWMAN: It was he who broke his allegiance with you.

Mr. KERR: A man who had been connected with some of us for twenty years—

Mr. BOWMAN: And whom you had your suspicions of years ago.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: I am not going to allow the hon. member for Fortitude Valley to put words into my mouth.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: I am giving my own statement.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KERR: The Premier, when he was expressing his sorrow at Rockhampton at a public meeting there, in referring to us sneered and said, "They will not be long out in the wilderness." I can tell the hon. member this: that rather than I should join a coalition, or alliance, as he formed with the hon. member for Townsville—a man whom I have every respect for privately, a man whom I have always respected in his private life, but a man whom I have always fought as a politician ever since I took any interest in politics in Queensland—do you think it was likely that I could follow a man whom I had always opposed and a man whom I will always oppose because of his Conservative platform.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: I may have gone out into the wilderness—and he followed it up with a sneer—but the hon. member for Barcoo, when he takes a step, weighs it; and there is not a man in Queensland—even those who are bitterly opposed to me—who can say that I ever went back on my word or went back on any position I took up.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS; Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: What about the Labour platform which you went back on? That was one of the worst things you ever did.

Mr. KERR: I will deal with that hon. gentleman at the proper time. (Laughter.) It was not the members who came over to this side of the House who took the easy course. It would have been much easier for us to have remained on the other side of the House.

Mr. KEOGH: Yes, £1,000 a year is not too bad.

Mr. KERR: £1,000 a year might buy some people, but it will not buy me.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: You had lost it.

Mr. KERR: I might have lost it, but I have at least retained my honesty in politics.

Mr. WHITE: The Labour party don't think that.

Mr. KERR: I do not care what the Labour party think or what you think. There is this about it: I will satisfy myself, and the man who satisfies himself does very well. (Hear, hear!) Who took the easy course? The Premier took the easy course. The Premier had the Premiership in one hand and the Agent-Generalship in the other.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: He might lose both yet.

Mr. KERR: He said he took great risks, but he knew he was not taking any risks. Anyone knows what the ballot was to be. It was only to be whether he was to be leader or not. I know the Premier did not take any risk, because he has never taken any risk since he has been on the Treasury bench. The hon. gentleman is always talking about sacrificing himself—(Opposition laughter)—and he is still sacrificing himself—on the altar of the Premiership. What a fine fat burnt-offering—(laughter)—with Digby Denham, the member for Oxley, as high priest! (Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not refer to other hon. members by name.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Oxley went to the Premier early in 1907 and made a certain proposal. The Premier told him he would not have the proposal, and pointed out

[9 p.m.] that it would not only be a betrayal of the party who supported him in the House, but a betrayal of the men and women who had supported him in the country. The hon. member for Oxley left the Ministry and sat in Opposition. You know what they called each other at Rockhampton. The member for Oxley called the Premier a renegade, and so forth; the Premier replied and called the member for Oxley a renegade. I do not know which was right; but I think if they were to fight it out on the Address in Reply we would find that they were both right. The Premier, referring to a certain meeting held in South Brisbane, at which he was denounced, said he was reminded of a certain Pharisee who went to the temple and thanked God he was not as other men. When a certain politician commented on the proposal made by the hon. member for Oxley for a coalition eighteen months ago, he spoke of it as demoralising to the public life of Queensland, and said that things would not be dealt with on those lines while he was Premier. Talk about Pharisees! Here was a fine specimen of one—a man who stood up and thanked God he was not Mr. Denham, the member for Oxley. How deep a Pharisee the hon. member was is only to be judged now, when we see the complete somersault he has turned. It is of a great deal worse description than that proposed by the hon. member for Oxley. The present Home Secretary, who was

1908—o

Minister for Lands, I think has good reason to say, "The Lord save me from my friends!" (Opposition laughter.) We heard the Premier the other day speaking on the Address in Reply, and we know what he said when he was asked why the late Minister for Lands was taken from the Lands Department. It is well known to the people of this State, more particularly to those in and around Brisbane, and those on the Darling Downs, and to the members of this House, that the *Courier* newspaper has always been very bitter against the hon. member for Dalby. It has criticised his administration; it has endeavoured to show up his failings; and it has made a set on his action in the matter of appointing agents; and what do we find in connection with the formation of the new Cabinet? That the Premier had to take the hon. gentleman out of the Lands Department. And we saw in the *Courier* a few days ago that the Cabinet were considering the fees paid to agents. The *Courier* told them they must get rid of the agents; and the late Minister for Lands had to be sacrificed on the altar of the *Courier*.

Mr. LESINA: I think he was very foolish to start the agency business.

The HOME SECRETARY: That's all you know about it.

Mr. KERR: I will not weary the House by reading all the Premier said in praise of the late Minister for Lands, but this is what he said afterwards—

I believe that we are wanting in Queensland a root and branch overhaul of the whole of our system of land settlement and land administration.

Could there be a greater condemnation by a Premier of one of his colleagues than to say that the department he has been administering wants a thorough overhaul? Now, I want you to know what the Premier said further down in his remarks. He said—

I hope as soon as the present bother is over—

Mark you, there is going to be more changes. (Opposition laughter.) He said—

I hope as soon as the present bother is over, that the present Minister—

The hon. member for Oxley—

Or some other Minister in his place, will go into this matter, because on it depends the rapid progress and development of Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: I want to inform the Premier that he is not going to so easily get rid of the hon. member for Oxley as he thinks. The hon. member for Oxley made a proposal to him, but he refused to accept that proposal, and the result of the coalition is this: That the Premier had to back down, and accept the man whom he stated he had told to leave his Cabinet—he has had to accept, at the bidding of the party and at the bidding of the *Courier*, the hon. member for Oxley back into his Cabinet.

Hon. R. PHILIP: It is quite untrue.

Mr. KERR: He had to take him back.

The PREMIER: Who made him take him back?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: The *Courier*.

Mr. KERR: You know who made you take him back. You know very well you had to take him back.

The PREMIER: That is as bad as the hon. member for Leichhardt; we want some evidence.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is as good as the hon. member for Leichhardt. It proves my statement.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Oxley is there, and I know—I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet—(laughter)—but I will tell you

Mr. Kerr.]

this: that they will make it that hot for the Premier that he will be jolly glad to take the Agent-Generalship. (Laughter.)

The PREMIER: Let us hope no worse fate befalls him.

Mr. KERR: There is this about it—whoever is sacrificed, the Premier will not sacrifice himself. You can rely on that.

Mr. BOWMAN: Heads I win, tails you lose.

Mr. KERR: When he finds he can no longer retain the Premiership—

Mr. COYNE: He will take a motor car.

Mr. KERR: There is no need to take a motor car—he will appoint himself to the Agent-Generalship, and they can whistle.

Mr. KEOGH: He is a fool if he don't.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Dalby got up last night and apologised.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are mistaken.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Bulimba felt very indignant at what the hon. member for Dalby said, which was quite correct. He did not refer to himself. He has no need to refer to himself, but he referred to hon. members sitting over on this side of the Chamber, whom, he said, could not bear the odium of the Philp party. It is quite correct. I state it, and I do not make any bones about it. (Laughter.) I would not be found dead alongside the Philp party. (Loud laughter.) If anyone was afraid of the odium of the Philp party, it was the Premier himself, for he said he would on no account coalesce with that party. Why? Because he was afraid of this same odium.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: I hope you will die in such good company.

Mr. KERR: That reminds me of what the hon. member for Bulimba said last session—what he said about the Premier being drummed out of his native town.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: And never apologised.

Mr. KERR: And the hon. member for Maryborough, a fellow townsman, got up and defended the Premier.

Mr. HUXHAM: That was a Labour man.

Mr. GRANT: I had to defend you from the Labour party once.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Bulimba made that statement, and he has never withdrawn it, and now he is sitting "cheek by jowl" with that man. What sort of a feeling could there be when a man like the hon. member for Bulimba makes a statement of that kind, and when asked to withdraw it, said he would withdraw it because he was compelled to do so. But he has never apologised to the Premier, and if the hon. member for Bulimba is the man I take him to be, he will get up in this Chamber—it may be humiliating—he will get up and apologise to the Premier, and to the House, for having made use of those words—that the present Premier was drummed out of Falkirk—and he has nothing to prove it. I want to deal with this phase of the matter. Was it not the odium of the Philp party that put the present Home Secretary on to the Ministerial benches? You will remember the time when he was Chairman of Committees. You will remember the pair that was made, and you will remember that when the then Premier, the hon. member for Townsville, had a narrow division in this House, he resigned the Premiership.

Mr. KEOGH: With a majority of two.

Mr. KERR: No doubt it is within the memory of every hon. member how the hon. member for Townsville and Mr. Cameron, the late member for

Brisbane North, and also the hon. member for Clermont—(laughter)—used to get up and remind the hon. member for Dalby that he had been supplied with money by the Philp party, and he deserted them.

Hon. R. PHILP: I never did.

Mr. KERR: Yes. It is in *Hansard*.

The PREMIER: What kind of a man must you be who associated so long with these people?

Mr. KERR: It was the odium of the Philp party that put the hon. member for Dalby on the Treasury benches. The Home Secretary stated that certain cross-bench members feared that odium so much that they dropped their portfolios.

Mr. MULCAHY: It would not make him drop it.

Mr. KERR: Perhaps the Home Secretary loves his portfolio too much to drop it. I had reasons why I could not work with the Philp party, and I left the late Ministry in an honourable manner.

The TREASURER: Of your own accord.

Mr. KERR: I left of my own accord. I did not believe that the coalition was going to accomplish the work that it was said it was going to accomplish. The Premier says the Philpites are all fine democrats now.

Mr. CAMPBELL: So we are.

Mr. KERR: Let us see. The hon. gentleman has the black labour party behind him; he has the poll taxers behind him; he has the friends of the postal vote behind him; he has the opponents for years of the extension of the franchise behind him; he has the battlers against constitutional liberty behind him—the men he denounced eight months ago as conspiring to overthrow Parliament. It is a funny hotch-potch. It is a kind of lobsouse party.

Mr. MURPHY: Is that a Scotch dish?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KERR: No, it is a dish you would get if you were at sea. I think the hon. member for Bundaberg will bear me out in that. Those of us who have been before the mast know what lobsouse is—(laughter)—and we have a pretty fair idea of the party with whose assistance the Premier says he is going to carry out his Rockhampton programme. There is another matter that I want to deal with. The Premier said that he felt like Pilate. He took a very peculiar character by way of illustration. Those of us who have read Biblical history know very well that Pilate was convinced that what he was doing was wrong; that the man he was sentencing was not guilty; that he had not committed what he was charged with; and he even went so far as to wash his hands. Would not the Premier like to wash his hands of the coalition? (Opposition laughter.) He says the rats are gnawing at the ship now.

The PREMIER: No, he would not like to wash his hands.

Mr. KERR: The Premier has given several reasons why he formed the coalition. First, he found it was impossible any longer to work with the Labour party. He would have liked a sufficient number of the democrats sitting behind the hon. member for Townsville to have come over and supported him. But they were not giving themselves away like that. They were all going to be hanged together—they were determined that they must all be taken over together. When the hon. gentleman was discussing the situation with his party, he asked if there was any alterna-

tive to forming a coalition with the Philp party. I and others believed that there was an alternative, and my alternative was this—the honest course for the Premier to have followed was to have come down with his Rockhampton policy, and put the onus on the Labour party of defeating him. I am certain they would never have defeated him (if he had come down with his Rockhampton policy) to put the Philp party in power.

Mr. LESINA: I am not so sure about that.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: I know the hon. member for Clermont would have been favourable to that.

Mr. LESINA: I would as soon see Philp in power as Kidston.

Mr. KERR: The hon. gentleman could not see that that was the course he should have taken, because he had been carrying on negotiations for some considerable time with the other side. He had made up his mind that he must have a coalition, and that coalition was to take place, despite the fact that he would be coalescing with a party that was entirely opposite to him in policy. No man, no Minister, and no party have a right to enter politics if they are afraid to leave the Treasury benches and go into opposition, because that is very often the place where you have to be.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: This leads me up to one of the Ministers who is always a Minister—(Opposition laughter)—the gentleman whom the Premier had acting as his spy upon the other Ministers when he was away.

Mr. KEOGH: Is that my old friend Barlow?

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I think, as a matter of public decency, that remark ought to be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in making that remark about one of the Ministers.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—That is not sufficient. Such a remark ought to be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Of course, when I say that the remark is out of order, it follows that the hon. member must withdraw it.

Mr. KERR: Well, I will withdraw it, and say that the Secretary for Public Instruction was in constant communication with the Premier, with cuttings out of papers referring to the movements of the other Ministers. I think I am in order in saying that. When anything appeared in *Truth* about the late Secretary for Public Lands, that was quietly cut out. When anything appeared about the late Attorney-General, that was quietly cut out.

Mr. BOWMAN: Anything in the *Worker* about him?

Mr. KERR: And these things were supplied to the Premier.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—This is about the most disgraceful exhibition I have ever seen in this Chamber.

Mr. BOWMAN: You do not like it.

The PREMIER: I do not like it.

Mr. LESINA: Mr. Speaker,—I rise to a point of order. Is the leader of the Government in order in referring to the speech of an hon. member of this Chamber as "a disgraceful exhibition," and thereby impugning your ruling?

The SPEAKER: I understood that the Premier was not referring to the conduct of business in the House, but rather to the remarks

of the hon. member for Barcoo with reference to some Ministerial action. If the hon. member used the expression in connection with this House, it is out of order.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw!

Mr. LESINA: Is the Premier entitled under our Standing Orders to describe an hon. member's speech as a disgraceful exhibition?

The HOME SECRETARY: You have said three times worse than that.

The SPEAKER: The Premier did not describe the hon. member's speech as a disgraceful exhibition, so far as I understood his remarks. I understood that what the Premier said had reference to remarks concerning transactions between Ministers.

Mr. KERR: Well, I will leave the Old Man of the Sea. Coming back to the sorrow expressed by the Premier, who also [9.30 p.m.] said that the Labour party were delighted that I and other hon. members had crossed over to this side of the House, I would point out that, in taking the action we did, we did not expect that we were going to get the support of the Labour party. The hon. gentleman said, in a sneering way, that we would have to make a sad coalition. I want to inform the hon. gentleman that I am not so fond of making coalitions as he is. With my party I coalesced with the Morgan party when the Morgan-Kidston Government was formed, but I did not coalesce with the Philp party when the hon. gentleman coalesced with them. The coalition formed by the present Premier and those who support him will have to wait a very long time before I will ask to coalesce with them. "Once bitten, twice shy."

Mr. CAMPBELL: What about the Morgan programme?

Mr. KERR: Let the hon. member for Moreton look after himself. The Labour party cannot say that at any time since I left them I have approached them and asked them to coalesce with me—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You knew you had no chance.

Mr. KERR: And I have no intention of coalescing with the Labour party.

The TREASURER: They say they will not have you.

Mr. KERR: They may say what they like.

The TREASURER: The hon. member for Clermont said so last night.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Clermont is not the whole of the Labour party. If I were like the hon. member for Enoggera, I would always stick to my billet. (Labour laughter.) I entered this Chamber in 1893, at the same time as Mr. Speaker. There are very few members left who entered the House in 1893. There are the hon. member for Dalby, the hon. member for Toombul, the hon. member for Ravenswood, the hon. member for Leichhardt, Mr. Speaker, and myself.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the hon. member for Townsville.

Mr. KERR: No; the hon. member for Townsville entered the House before 1893. Every one of those members I have mentioned as having been first elected in 1893, with the exception of the hon. member for Toombul, has held an official position in this Chamber. We have been in the full light and blaze of political life since 1893. I knew what it meant to leave the party with which I was originally associated. I knew very well that I could not expect to have an easy course, but no man can charge me with throwing

Mr. Kerr.]

away my principles, and remaining a member of a coalition at the price of being a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. LESINA: What about selling public lands?

Mr. KERR: The hon. member knows very well that every member of the party on the occasion he refers to voted for the sale of public lands. That was acknowledged by the leader of the Labour party when speaking at Roma.

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

Mr. KERR: The leader of the Opposition when speaking at Roma pointed out that every member of the party voted for the sale of public lands on that occasion.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is not correct.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Clermont was one of those who voted for the sale of the public lands. I am quite prepared, as I said earlier in my speech, to take the consequences of my action in leaving the present Government. I have gone into the wilderness, as the Premier says.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He says you have taken the easy course.

Mr. KERR: I have taken the easy course now. Those of us who have left the coalition are—

Mr. SUMNER: Between the upper and nether millstone.

Mr. KERR: As the hon. member for Nundah says, we are between the upper and nether millstone. We have the Press trying to down us, we have some members of the party we left trying to down us, and we have some members of the Labour party trying to down us; but as long as I remain in political life I shall steer the course which I consider I ought to steer, and I will be responsible only to myself and to the electors who returned me to this House.

Mr. WHITE: You are not singular in that respect, surely.

Mr. KERR: I have always found the hon. member for Musgrave fighting with the big battalions. I have never found him fighting what may be termed a forlorn hope.

Mr. WHITE: I did for a long time.

Mr. KERR: But whether my time in this House is long or short, I say distinctly that I have taken the course I have taken after due consideration, and being responsible alone to the electors who returned me. I am certain that the coalition which has been formed is only a coalition of convenience, and that it will never accomplish what it has been said it will accomplish. Fancy a great democrat like the hon. member for Albert—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: The hon. member went down to his electorate, and told them that he was a democrat, when, as a matter of fact, he was chosen for that constituency because he was more conservative than the late member for that electorate.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: That is an untrue statement, and you know it.

Mr. KERR: That is the position. I have waited anxiously to hear the hon. member for Bowen, the hon. member for Albert, and the junior member for Rockhampton speak.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You will hear them.

Mr. KERR: And give us the details of the great trip they had on the "Lucinda." They

[*Mr. Kerr.*

came back and went round and told the other members what had taken place, and how they had been treated, and they are as dumb as dogs now. There is not a word to be got out of them. We have not heard anything about when the hon. member for Albert was requested by the Home Secretary to sing that fine German song. (Loud laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: He sung it too.

Mr. KERR: We have not heard anything about the wines used on the festive occasion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: They were very good.

Mr. KERR: We have not heard about the butler who dispensed those wines. (Laughter.) No, we were going to hear a great deal, but the coalition has been formed, and we are not going to hear anything about this great trip on the "Lucinda." But the Treasurer will ascertain, when he gets the returns of the expenses, how much was expended in wine on the "Lucinda."

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who is to pay for it?

Mr. KERR: I do not know who is to pay for it. I may have to pay my share as a taxpayer. In conclusion, I want to say that the coalition which has been formed, the coalition which is going to accomplish such great things, is a coalition which has been born out of due time, and it will not bring forth any good. I am certain of this: That the people of this State, instead of getting what they expected they would get—good democratic legislation and good administration—will yet live to rue the day that ever the coalition was formed between the senior member for Rockhampton North and the senior member for Townsville.

* The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. O. Hawthorn, *Bruggers*): I do not propose at the present hour to continue this debate at any very great length, because, as far as the motion of want of confidence is concerned, that has been a dead horse for a long time—we are merely flogging it. We know what the result of that will be. The House will certainly not say that the present Government have not its confidence. But there are one or two items in the speech of the hon. member for Barcoo which I think it is my duty, as a member of the Ministry, to try and refute. The hon. member has admitted in his speech that he left the Ministry of his own accord, and, personally, I cannot understand what he is making all this whine about. Both he and the hon. member for Brisbane South have taken up a very large portion of their speeches in abuse of the Premier. I think it would have been very much better if they had put their case moderately and in a dignified manner before the public, instead of abusing in the way they have done the man with whom they were so long associated as colleagues. However, that is a matter of taste. It is very amusing to see the members of the Labour party cheering them on—egging them on—soothing them on.

Mr. MULCAHY: It is very amusing to see the Premier fee you to defend him.

The TREASURER: During the session in April last, the Labour party could not say enough against these two hon. members while they were sitting here and carrying out legislation which they did not like; but now, when it suits them, they are prepared to soothe them on, and make use of them as far as they possibly can. Now, one of the points which the hon. member for Barcoo has raised is the

question of the construction of wharfrage in connection with the land at William street, which he says has been held over on account of some influence which the hon. member for North Brisbane has arranged with the Premier while he was in England.

Mr. HARDACRE: Will you lay the whole of the papers upon the table of the House?

The TREASURER: He knows as well as anyone in this House knows what the position is. He was a member of the Ministry while that was going on, and it seems to me a sorry spectacle that a member of the Cabinet for such a long time should come here, and make use of knowledge that he could only gain while he was a member of that Cabinet, and try and run down what was done while he was in the Cabinet and when he took part in the proceedings he is condemning in so hearty a manner.

The PREMIER: Which he did not condemn while he was there.

The TREASURER: It is not that he left the Cabinet on account of these transactions, but of his own accord.

The PREMIER: Quite other reasons.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Who is making this speech?

The TREASURER: As to this matter of the Electric Light Company, he knows very well that we gave notice of resumption of that land. He also knows that objection was raised on the ground that we had no right to resume that property from the Electric Lighting and Power Company, because, as they alleged, they were a constructing authority, and we could not come in behind them. They could carry out what they were authorised to construct, and we could not interfere with them or resume the land they have got hold of.

Mr. HARDACRE: And who gave them that authority? The Premier?

The TREASURER: They got that authority by Act of Parliament as a constructing authority.

Mr. HARDACRE: By the Premier.

The TREASURER: That matter has not been decided by legal authority yet, but, as the hon. member says, instructions came from England to leave the matter over until the Premier came out.

Mr. HARDACRE: Who sent them?

The TREASURER: There was no harm done; no one could be prejudiced; the land could not run away.

Mr. HUXHAM: But it could increase in value very considerably.

The TREASURER: The value could only be taken as at the time of resumption, no matter how long it was before we appealed. If the hon. gentleman knew anything at all he would know that. Another thing is this: After the Premier came back, the late Treasurer and the hon. member for Barcoo were both members of the Cabinet, but they never once brought up that matter until they had left the Cabinet. They never made a motion of any kind to try and bring this matter before the Cabinet, nor did they complain in any way that it had been hung up by order of the Premier.

Mr. MURPHY: The Cabinet was too busy in trying to bring about a coalition.

The TREASURER: Since they have left the Cabinet we have been too much occupied with other matters, as hon. members know, to be able to go into details of lesser moment

than we have been concerned with lately, and, for that reason, the question has not come up. I say there has been ample justification for it. I say that the fact that the hon. member for Brisbane North has something to do with it has certainly had nothing to do, since the Premier came back, with the hanging up of this question. It is under consideration. We must remember that this is a matter which, if it is gone on with, will involve an outlay of probably £40,000. We have to consider whether that £40,000 is likely to be better spent in buying new wharfrage close to Brisbane, where there is plenty of wharfrage accommodation at present—we have no complaint that there is not sufficient wharfrage to accommodate all the shipping coming here—or in railway construction, which will be of greater benefit to the people of this State. These matters all require consideration, and I say that the Government have every justification for having hung up that business so long as it has been.

Mr. MANN interjected.

The TREASURER: If the hon. gentleman's interjection were worth taking notice of, I would reply to it; I do not think it is. The other question to which the hon. member for Barcoo made reference was the question of the Licensing Act, and he wanted to know if I had carried out, as the hon. member for Brisbane South had carried it out, the administration of that Act. I say, without hesitation, that while I was in the office of Home Secretary I made absolutely no change in the way in which that Act was administered.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: I gave the Commissioner of Police a free hand to do whatever he wanted to carry out the provisions of the Licensing Act, and I never once interfered to prevent him from looking after the Sunday trading, nor did I interfere with him going on with any prosecutions which he thought necessary in consequence of that Sunday trading. I say distinctly that the hon. gentleman knew that as a member of the Cabinet. He knew that that was so, and he never once made any objection that the Act was not being properly administered by me while he was in the Cabinet. Directly he goes out of office he finds out that things are going all wrong at Rockhampton, and when I ask him why he did not tell us all about it before, he said he did not know about it then. It is only three or four weeks ago since he left the Cabinet.

A LABOUR MEMBER: But he has been up to Rockhampton since then.

The TREASURER: I think I can safely leave it to the House to consider what amount of importance they will put on the assertions of the hon. member for Barcoo when they consider the confidential relations that existed between him and the Cabinet. I say that it is a distinct breach of Cabinet confidences. I merely got up to say a word or two in explanation on behalf of my colleagues, and I will say, in conclusion, with regard to the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Brisbane South, that I do not think the Premier has treated them in such a way as to deserve such treatment as he has received at their hands.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

* Mr. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranoa*): In considering this vote of no confidence there are a number of things which should be taken into consideration before we come to a vote. We have not only to consider what brought about this coalition and the means that have

Mr. J. M. Hunter.]

been employed both by the late Opposition and the late Government to bring it into existence, but we have also to consider what is proposed to be done and what has been done during the recent Administration. We will find, when we come to inquire into the reasons introduced by the Premier, that one of the reasons advanced by him to bring about this coalition is that it is time there was a solid Government formed so that the abolition of the three-party system might be brought about. We find that in this respect the late Premier has dismally failed in producing two parties in this House. As a matter of fact, instead of having only two parties at the present time we find no less than four parties. How many parties there will be before the end comes remains to be seen. The principal reason which has brought about the coalition was the weakness of the Premier on the one hand, together with his fear of defeat and love of office; while, on the other hand, we find that owing to the hunger and lust for office on the part of the Philp Opposition—these two parties both desiring to obtain possession of authority in the country—they decided that safety lay in coming together, and in securing for themselves the position. It is a matter for congratulation that at least there were a number of supporters of the Kidston party who scorned to hand themselves over body and soul to the party with whom the Premier formed this coalition, and I think they are to be complimented on the political honesty which they have displayed in this matter. The position which we are raising in this vote of no confidence is raised for the purpose of showing that we are opposed to the political immorality which the whole of this business is strongly characterised by. We have to-day the spectacle on the front Ministerial benches of the hidebound Tories joining forces with a number of professed democrats, and the parties to the coalition say that in doing so they have proved themselves patriots. To my mind they have proved themselves as willing to sell themselves for the love of office and the desire to retain position and power. When the Premier was put on his trial and asked to defend the position he had taken up, what do we find? We find no defence offering at all. It does not matter how satisfied the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are in this matter, we find no sort of defence offering. From this side all sorts of charges were hurled at the Ministry, together with proofs and evidences, and they should have called forth some sort of defence from that side of the House, but what do we find? We find the whole party gagged. We find Cabinet Ministers sitting silent, and the Premier telling us that the only defence he had was the reasons he offered, which were that he did not want the support of the Labour party any longer, and he was unable to carry on any longer with the Labour support. We have only that bald statement, with no proof at all, but we find that the legislation which was passed during last session of which he was most proud was the very legislation which he was enabled to carry with the assistance of the Labour party, with whom he has brought about a separation. There are hon. members on this side who claim credit for having compelled him to pass that legislation. To whom is that credit due? Did the Labour party force him to pass old-age pensions? Was it against his wish that the wages boards legislation was passed? Was it against his wish that the Constitutional Amendment Act was passed in this House? The hon. gentleman is not deducing the right reason for bringing

about this coalition, or else it is not right that he worked with the assistance of the Labour party. If he succeeded so well in passing the legislation he desired with the assistance of the Labour party, why did he not continue to work with that party? On the other hand, if the legislation which he passed was passed with the influence of the Labour party, then to that party is the credit due for all the legislation that has been passed by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman can place himself on the horns of whichever dilemma he wishes to be impaled on. Either one thing or the other is right, and whichever is right, it proves that the Premier is in the wrong. Either the hon. gentleman was the astute gentleman he believes himself to be, and passed the legislation, or he was the willing servant of the House. It may be that his legislation was coloured by the support behind him. He told us the other night, when he was on his defence, that on account of a number of his followers severing their connection with him it was going to make it difficult for him to carry out that democratic legislation that they were anxious to have brought about. He also said his future legislation would be largely coloured by the support he got in the caucus. The hon. gentleman said the position he occupied was intolerable, because he was under the influence of the Labour

[10 p.m.] party. I want to know how it was intolerable, or how it could be more intolerable than the position he occupies to-day. I think it requires no seer to know that the Premier at the present time is being influenced not by his own side but by a party within a party who are influenced by other sources; that he will be jockeyed by the daily Press; that he will be influenced indirectly if not directly; and that his legislation will be coloured by the Press. If the position he occupied last session was intolerable, he will find it many times more intolerable during the coming session. He said another reason why he wished to form a coalition was that he might have a strong party to support him in fighting for State rights. It appears that he is always fighting for something he cannot get. He is always trying to raise some bogey, and this State rights bogey in connection with the finances is about one of the biggest bogeys he could raise. One of the chief complaints of the State Premiers against the Commonwealth is this: Because they have handed over certain powers in the government of the continent, it has lowered the prestige of the State Premiers, and they want to get hold of a little more money than they are getting at the present time from the Commonwealth. They say the Braddon blot will shortly expire, and then there will be financial confusion. I say that before the Braddon blot expires the State Treasurers will have evolved some other method of distribution of the finances.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already pointed out that a general discussion on the question of Federal finance is out of order on this amendment.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The Premier gives as a reason for the reconstruction of his Cabinet the necessity of forming a stable Government on account of the financial relations between the States and the Commonwealth causing insecurity. I want to show that in this regard he is not treating the House right, and that in making that charge he is not doing justice to the Commonwealth Government. I want to show that it is not a proper thing to shelter himself behind a charge of that kind, and

[Mr. J. M. Hunter.

that there is no excuse for a reconstruction of the Cabinet on that ground. I hold that the distribution of the finances of the Commonwealth must necessarily be shortened, as there are larger obligations to fulfil.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no objection to a reference to the financial relations between the States and the Commonwealth if it is connected with the amendment, but a general discussion on that matter will be out of order at this stage.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I think, under these conditions, it will be found that the loyalty of hon. members generally is as great as that of any member of the Cabinet, and I say that the Premier's desire to attack them is not justified.

The TREASURER: He has no desire to attack the Commonwealth Government. What he proposed to do is to defend the finances of the States.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: If we do lose a certain amount of revenue by not having so much returned by the Commonwealth Government, we have the benefit of a larger expenditure by the Commonwealth on old-age pensions and other important matters. The lighting of our coast is a very important matter, that ought to have been handed over to the Federal Government long ago; and when that is done, it will necessitate a greater expenditure by the Commonwealth Government. We were told, too, that there was no chance of development work being undertaken on account of the position of parties. In one breath we were told that the reconstruction was due to the need of support from the Tory side, and in the next breath we were told that it was on account of Federal interference with our finances. Now, what is real reason? I think the whole reason is that the Premier took fright, and thought the Labour party, at the first meeting this session, would turn him out, and perhaps join hands with the reactionaries. But he did not need to have any fear on that score. I do not think the action of the Premier in bringing forward syndicate railways was to be commended after receiving the support given to him by this party. But, for other reasons also, I think it was one of the worst business propositions I ever heard submitted to any body of men.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: We have also been told that without this coalition there could be no land settlement and no water conservation.

The SPEAKER: Surely the hon. member must see he is now discussing the general question. This is a matter he can discuss as fully as he likes on the main question, but it has no relevancy to the question before the House at the present time.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I am simply endeavouring to show that the Premier gave this as one of his reasons for the coalition, which there is no foundation for. I am answering the arguments that have been offered by the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Order! Even if the Premier did offer those arguments that does not bring the matter within the scope of the amendment. I do not think the Premier mentioned this matter in the House; he may have done so in other places.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I think the words I refer to were used in reply to the leader of the Opposition—that he was not able to carry on the progressive and expansive works that were necessary to the State at the present time.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I have already pointed out, the hon. member who moved this amendment spoke on the general question, as he has a right to do, and it was only a fair thing to allow the head of the Government an opportunity of replying to the definite charges that were made against him, but surely that privilege cannot be claimed by other hon. members against whom no charge was made. I have endeavoured to treat all hon. members impartially, but they cannot claim the same right that was given by courtesy to the head of the Government.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: I have no wish to trespass. My contention is that, so far as the arguments that have been submitted for the justification for the reconstruction of this Ministry are concerned, no sufficient reason has been given. That the Premier has only shown he was desirous of bringing about a coalition so that he might secure a further lease of power—that he was afraid the Labour party was about to throw him over, and he would be turned into oblivion, and that he would not then secure the Agent-Generalship. We are told, on account of this action, the immigration policy of the Government could not be carried out; that it was necessary to have a large influx of immigrants to settle the State. While this debate was on, the late Minister for Lands told us that he was unable to get the lands of the State settled on that account. I may tell this House that at the present time, and for a considerable time past, there has been a decided inability on the part of the hon. gentleman occupying that position to supply the requirements of this State. I hold in my hand a letter written by a member of a group—he had permission to form a group some fifteen months ago, and he is not settled yet—and he states if he is not settled in a few months he must give up all idea of settling in Queensland.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course, you do not mind giving the name.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: No, I do not mind giving the name.

The HOME SECRETARY: Might I ask you where it is written from?

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: It is written from Roma, and dated 16th November. The letter reads—

Mr. Hunter,—

Dear Sir,—I am forwarding McGurks' letter to you re Lands Department. He has been getting the same old yarn every time from them. I think it is time we had something done towards getting on the land. If I don't soon get there I must look for something else. Shake them up a bit.

Yours faithfully,

R. KELLY.

The HOME SECRETARY: You will understand I only want an opportunity of getting at the other side of the case.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: This is a matter I had a good deal to do with. The group represents some sixty-five souls altogether, and, as a matter of fact, this man has really been in the district for the last six months waiting to get on his land. Then we are told that the hon. member for Oxley, who is now in the position of Minister for Lands, is going to have a clean sweep in the Lands Department. I believe a good deal of change is required in the Lands Department. Not that the head office in Brisbane is not doing good work, but I believe the country offices are not in as close communication with them as they should be. I have very little faith, however, that we will have a very great change, except perhaps

Mr. J. M. Hunter.]

a change of Ministers. The hon. member for Oxley seems to have the faculty of changing very frequently. During the last eighteen months he has occupied positions in no less than three different Cabinets, and on that account we may find him leaving that department and taking some other up. I was rather interested in noticing that in trying to prove that this Government had the confidence of the country, and was really representative of the majority of the electors of the country, the hon. member for Oxley brought together the united votes recorded in favour of the Philp and Kidston parties. Why he has chosen that method of discovering what the country thinks of these two parties being brought together in this peculiar way I do not quite understand. He may just as well have brought the two larger sets of figures—the votes cast in favour of the Philp party and in favour of the Labour party, and to state on that account, if they came together, they would represent the majority of votes in the State. To my mind it is quite an absurd way to try to prove it. I think the real proof the country and the House has in this matter is the fact that the Kidston party and the Labour party went jointly to the country on the Constitution question—that they asked the country to decide between them and the Conservative or Tory party, and they gave a clear and decided answer on the matter. I can find no justification in the fact of the hon. member for Oxley endeavouring to prove that by putting a certain number of votes haphazard together, as he did, that he has any good reason for this coalition that has taken place. We find that the hon. member for Oxley was not, some time ago, in favour of a Trade Disputes Bill, yet we find to-day that he is prepared to take this Trade Disputes Bill and the Kidston party together. I maintain that the position is a lamentable one for the State. It simply means that the powers of government are being handed back to the Conservative party—that, although we have on the front Treasury bench a professed democratic leader in the person of Mr. Kidston, he is nothing more than nominal leader. His party is in a minority, and we find that the late leader of the Opposition is being appealed to, not only as leader but also as lieutenant of the Government party. Some hon. members will tell us that the coalition was a wonderful victory for the Kidston Government to have secured such a magnificent following. I do not think you can find many people in the country who will agree with that. As a matter of fact, the Philp party have simply stooped to conquer. They are winning all along the line. They have, for the time being, lain low; they have brought the Kidstonites into their net and have succeeded in gaining a certain amount of strength: and it will very much surprise me if, eventually, we do not find that Cabinet led by a member of the late Philp party—Mr. Deham, probably. That is the winding-up of this wonderful coalition that I look for. However, it is not to be wondered at to some extent, because the Premier led rather a mixed party, and he found how mixed it was during the late crisis, when part of his following were inclined to go over to the Opposition and part only were inclined to follow him into oblivion in the big constitutional fight which took place. It seems to me, after all, that the prodigals have only returned—that they are going back to where they came from, and that the Premier has simply been travelling in a circle, and has come back and brought the prodigals back with him. We are told that he is going to show some wonderful business astuteness—that he has taken David

[Mr. J. M. Hunter.

Harum as an example. Well, we shall see the astute business that he will do. The hon. gentleman had at least the credit of doing honest work during last session. What work will be done during the present session remains to be seen. To my mind, it would have been a far more honourable position for him to have taken up if he had met this Chamber with his programme, and seen if the Labour party—the party with which he went to the country—were not prepared to support him. He has done good work with that party, and he was proud to work with them. If he met with defeat, he should have taken it as the Premier of the Commonwealth did the other day, and then he could have retired, like an honourable man, into Opposition, and shown, at least, that he was an honest leader. I believe the assertion that the Labour party would not have supported him is groundless. Probably they would have supported his programme if it had been submitted to them. We are told that the Labour party are sore over this coalition. Now, I do not believe that, as a party, the Labour party are sorry over what has taken place. They have no reason to be sorry, because, as a party, their position is very much improved. But I believe that for the country it is a bad and a sorry day that this has taken place. It would have been better for the Labour and Kidston parties to have worked together than the latter to hand themselves over to the Conservative party as they have done. In that respect, during the last two sessions the Labour party have acted as guardian angels for the wanderers on the other side. They have kept a faithful eye on them, have guided their footsteps into the right paths, and have saved them from various dangers and humiliations. To-day the members of this party are proud to point to the legislation which they assisted in carrying. I contend that on those grounds the position in which we find the present Cabinet is unsatisfactory not only to the House but to the country; and I have no hesitation in expressing the belief that, were an opportunity given to the electors to speak on this matter, the Government would be relegated to oblivion. It does not matter what party went against them, I am sure that, on account of their betrayal of the confidence of the people, voters who have been deceived would prefer any party to them at the present time. I hope that when a vote is taken on the amendment we shall have a majority against the Government. The Treasurer smiles, but I can promise him that before this Parliament expires the Government will not feel so secure on those benches as perhaps they feel to-day. They only want a few more rats to go into the ship. There are still some there, and it will take a lot to keep them quiet for the next two years. For my own part, I feel that the Opposition have taken the only wise course in bringing forward this vote of want of confidence, in the interests of political morality, in the interests of this State, and of the pure and high motives of public men. No other course was open to this party than to impeach the Government for betraying the confidence reposed in them at the last election. I shall have very great pleasure indeed in recording my vote in favour of the amendment.

* Mr. SUMNER (*Nunda*): I understand that it is the intention of the Government to take a vote on this question to-night, so I shall only address a few words to the House on this occasion. I do not intend to be personal in any shape or form. Whatever other people have done in this matter, I have taken my

own stand, and I am responsible to my constituents for what I have done. For whatever other people have done they have to take the consequences, and it is no business of mine. I wish to say a few words to justify the position I have taken up. The amendment reads—

That the constitution of the present Ministry is a violation of the will of the people, as expressed through the ballot-box last February, and the Government therefore does not possess the confidence of this House.

It is not a question of whether the coalition was the best thing to do or not. It is not a question of whether it was the wisest thing to do or not, as the Premier put it. To my mind, the question is this: Was the coalition what was expressed by the electors at the last election? I think he will be a bold man who will get up and say that the electors expressed themselves in favour of a coalition. The Premier has said that he found last session that it was the best thing he could do to get the assistance of the Labour party, and now he finds the best thing he can do to carry his measures is to get the assistance of the Philp party. But there is a greater question than this. Even the Premier told us that. Speaking at Woolloongabba during the last election campaign, the hon. gentleman told us that the question before the country was far and away of greater importance even than the Rockhampton manifesto. He said that was insignificant compared with the great issues that were before the electors at that time, and he placed the issues in this order:— First, “Is the nominee Chamber to have power to so control the Legislative Assembly as to prevent the people’s representatives from carrying out the people’s wishes?” Second, “Are the people’s representatives to have power to control the Administration by dismissing Ministers of whom they disapprove, without being penalised by the Governor for so doing?”

The third was, “Are the people [10.30 p.m.] of Queensland to retain the right to manage their own affairs?” He told the electors that the Rockhampton manifesto was insignificant as compared with those three issues. We all remember the crisis that took place in this House twelve months ago. If ever I was proud of a man, I was proud of the Premier when at that time he stood up in this Chamber and defended the rights of the people, and delivered that impeachment against the Government of the day. He afterwards told the electors that he was going to do something which would make it impossible for what then occurred to happen in the future. Was the hon. gentleman in earnest then? Did he mean what he said? If he did mean what he said, why has he not carried out his promise? If he did not mean what he said, then I think a public apology is due to the people of Queensland, for he has done nothing to make such things impossible in future. The last election might have been avoided, as without it we might have had the same position of affairs as we have at the present time. The Philp Ministry, which then occupied the Treasury bench, offered us the Rockhampton programme. They offered us the same conditions as we are offered at the present time, and we might as well have crossed the floor of the House and supported the Ministry in office then as give our support to the present coalition. As many hon. members will remember, on that memorable night we had a meeting of the combined parties, and we agreed practically that as far as possible we would fight the election as a combined party—the democratic or Kidston party and the Labour party. Those two great democratic

parties went to the country on the issues I have indicated, and to have avoided that and to have disappointed the people would have been, as the Premier expressed it in his speech at Rockhampton, unwise and opposed to the best interests of Queensland, and the people would have had no more confidence in our public men. When the Premier came to one of the meetings I held in my electorate during that election, I was asked a series of questions. The first was—

If the Kidston party have all their candidates returned, Mr. Kidston cannot carry on. Will you be in favour of working with the Philp party?

I said “No; not on any consideration whatever.” Another question was—

Will you favour working with the Labour party?

To that question I replied, “Yes, we are fighting this battle together,” and the Premier complimented me on my answers on that occasion. Now, we find that the hon. gentleman, practically without consulting his party, has thrown over members who made such promises to the electors on that occasion. The result of that election was that the Kidston party gained two seats and the Labour party five, and during the short session that followed we passed more democratic legislation than has ever been passed in any Australian Parliament in so short a time. There is one strong point I want to make in this matter. The Premier says he wants to carry out his Rockhampton programme. The Labour party never opposed one single item of that programme during all the time we were working with them. It was only at the end of the session, when two railway Bills, which were not mentioned in either the Rockhampton programme or the Governor’s Speech, were brought forward, that the Labour party offered any opposition to the proposals of the Government. Members were expected to swallow those measures, though they had no inkling that they would be introduced. The Premier must have known from the policy and platform of the Labour party, and from their whole career, that that party would be bound to oppose those measures; and, looking at events which have since happened, it seems to me that they were tabled in order to bring about what has actually occurred. Like the hon. member for Barcoo, I am willing to take any blame which may attach to me in connection with those measures, but at the same time I say that many members of the Premier’s own party disagreed with some of the provisions in the agreements, and had the measures not been put through with the closure, I believe that many of those provisions would have been altered. The Labour party, as I have said, opposed no part of the Rockhampton programme, whereas the Philp party opposed almost every item of that programme which was introduced. We know what brought about the crisis. We know that the Factories and Shops Bill was thrown out in the Upper House, and we know that the members of that Chamber, as well as the Philp party in this House, fought against the abolition of the postal vote and the passing of the Wages Boards Bill.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: No.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Discussion is not opposition.

Mr. SUMNER: They opposed important clauses in the Bill, and almost every item in the Rockhampton manifesto, whereas the Labour party never opposed a single item of that programme. That being so, where is the justification for the present coalition? Hon. members will remember how in the speech

Mr. Sumner.]

delivered in this House at the close of the last session of the last Parliament, the Premier spoke of vested interests, of financial institutions, and of the power and wealth that were going to be used to crush him in the last election. The people of whom he then spoke are the very people who are supporting him to-day. What did the *Courier* say in a leading article a day or two after the coalition was formed? It welcomed the Premier's repentance, but said it was a belated repentance, and that it would have liked him to have repented before he passed the obnoxious legislation which he had placed on the statute-book. The Premier made a statement at the close of last session—I had left for Sydney at the time—to the effect that he had done with the Labour party, I suppose for ever. I understand that he made that statement without consulting even the members of his own Cabinet on the matter. It seems to me that he sold his party, without consulting either the party or the members of the Cabinet. When the hon. gentleman returned after his visit to England, I went to the welcome meeting at the Town Hall, and I said to a man who sat near to me, "Some change has come over the scene, I find no democrats here." The very people who had fought him, who were previously opposed to him, and who would have hounded him out of existence if possible, were the people who shook him by the hand and welcomed him back to Queensland.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Were we not there by the invitation of the mayor?

Mr. SUMNER: They were doing that because they knew they were going to get hold of this great democrat, and use him for their own purposes. Our party went to the country as a distinct party on certain issues, and the duty of the party was to go on and take defeat like men, if defeat was to be their lot. When the hon. member for Townsville was leading the late Government, the present Premier boasted that we were still an undefeated party, and said that notwithstanding that fact we were being forced to go to the country. At the end of last session we were undefeated. I have said that we were never opposed by the Labour party on any item of the Rockhampton programme, and to-day the Kidston party stand undefeated, and undefeated they have practically surrendered themselves into the hand of the enemy.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SUMNER: I never like to reveal anything which takes place in caucus, but it is a strange thing that when we had a caucus meeting that night everything appeared quite correctly in the papers next morning, so practically someone reveals what takes place in caucus. I say that the Premier, when he practically gave over his party to the Philp party, never consulted his own Ministers, and certainly never consulted his party. Some of his party had made promises to the electors, and they would rather go out of public life than violate them. The Premier talks about men taking the easy course.

Mr. HUXHAM: The Premier took no risks himself.

Mr. SUMNER: Has he taken any risks himself in regard to this matter? There are some of us who have crossed the floor of the House and are taking the hard course. It was no easy matter for them to separate themselves from that party, and surely the Premier, if anybody has, has taken the easy course. But he never consulted his Ministers or his party. We were brought into a room down there at

half-past 7 o'clock at night—the Philp party had one over on the other side, and we had an hour to discuss the matter. The Premier was afraid that if we had time to discuss and reason the matter out, wirepullers would get to work. He could not trust the men who sat behind him. He never consulted his Ministers before he went to England, before making that statement, and when he came back he never consulted his own party. And had he not threatened to resign that time, which I think was not a right thing to do, there would have been no coalition in Queensland to-day.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SUMNER: I want to refer to the ungenerous speech of the Home Secretary the other night. It was referred to by the hon. member for Barcoo. Speaking of the men who had gone over to this side, he said—

They only think that if they are found associated with the senior member for Townsville it will damage them in the eyes of their constituents in their respective electorates, and it will not pay them to do it. That is the bottom of the secession of some of those hon. members from us. They are not nervous about our policy. They are afraid that if they are found associated with the senior member for Townsville it will be made uncomfortable for them in their electorates.

I only speak for myself. That is not the reason why I left that party. I crossed the floor of the House because I gave a distinct pledge to my electors that I would not on any consideration have any coalition with the Philp party, and for the Home Secretary to talk about the odium that attaches to the name of Philp influencing us on this side to cross over—why, when anybody looks at the career of that gentleman they know that he followed Mr. Philp! I can say that I have never voted for a Philp candidate in my life. During my residence in Queensland I was a supporter of the old Griffith party. I have voted for a good many Labour men, but never for a Conservative. I have never had an ungenerous thought, nor attached any stigma to the name of the hon. member for Townsville, because whatever stigma there was did not attach to him personally, but to the Administration. The cause of it was because the party was too strong. The Premier told us in his speech that he wanted a strong Government. A strong Government is not necessarily a good Government. David Syme tells us in that book on constitutional government in England, that a strong Government is often one of the weakest Governments. The Premier says he wants a strong Government to carry out his programme. Why, he has carried out five-sixths of his programme already, when he only had a paltry party of twenty-three or twenty-four members, and he would have had no difficulty in carrying out the rest of his programme if he had had the courage to go on. The Home Secretary ought to withdraw the remarks which he made about the odium or stigma attaching to the hon. member for Townsville. The only thing which influenced me when I made a pledge to my constituents that I would not on any consideration support a coalition with Philp—

Mr. CAMPBELL: Do not you think you could have won your seat under Mr. Philp?

Mr. SUMNER: Yes; I could have won it as a Philp candidate; and for the Home Secretary to tell me I am afraid of the stigma attaching to Philp is not true. Another reason which the Premier gave when he landed in Australia for this coalition was that he wanted a strong Government to fight the Federal Labour party. The hon. gentleman has been nursed and fed at the breast of the Labour

[Mr. Sumner.

party, and I think that if ever an ungenerous remark was made by any man it was that remark which he made when landing on the shores of Australia. At Longreach, in the 1907 election, he said that he would never have separated from the Labour party in Queensland had they adopted the Federal objective, and he was asked if he believed in the Federal objective. He said, "Yes." How does the Federal objective differ from the State objective? They are practically the same, only couched in different language. The Federal objective says the Labour party is in favour of the nationalisation of monopolies, and the State Labour party say they are in favour of the nationalisation of all industry and exchange. Yet to-day the Premier tells us that one of the reasons why he wants this coalition is to fight the Federal Labour party.

Mr. W. H. BARNES: Had it not to do particularly with finance?

Hon. E. B. FORREST: On that question only.

Mr. SUMNER: Did the Premier say he was going to fight for State rights?

Hon. E. B. FORREST: He did so most distinctly.

Mr. SUMNER: Had he said that he was going to meet with the other State Premiers and the Commonwealth, to see that some satisfactory arrangement was come to whereby the State revenue would not be jeopardised year by year, but something definite would be arranged on which the State Treasurer could base his Estimates, then everybody would have agreed with him. Most of the members of the Federal Labour party are as zealous for State rights as anybody in Queensland or Australia. I say the Premier was responsible for the third-party system in Queensland. He made it. He nursed it and brought it up to what it was in our last Parliament. He said he would have no divided allegiance; he went to the country, and he practically won all along the line. He did not get all his candidates in; in fact, he did not have many up for election. If he had put up more candidates, he would have been more successful than he was. But still he was able to carry on his programme without being defeated. I want to repeat that the Labour party in this House never opposed any one item in his Rockhampton programme.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. SUMNER: We are told that it is necessary that there should be only two parties. There are only two parties here. There have never been any more than two parties in this House since I have been here—that is, the party who wants things to stay as they are and the party that believes in progress and wants to go ahead. Whether that progressive party call themselves the Labour party or democrats, they believe in progress and in working for the advancement of the State of Queensland. We hear a lot of boasting about our millions of acres of land and our great resources, but our acres of land and our great resources do not make Queensland. What makes Queensland, and what will make Queensland, is to have a happy and contented and prosperous people, and until you have that you will never have real prosperity in the country.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: You want plenty of them.

Mr. SUMNER: A friend of mine came out in the "Marathon" from England the other day, and he was telling me something about the immigrants that are being brought to Australia. This gentleman is a Tory of Tories, and has always been a supporter of the Phil

party in Queensland. He said there were 400 immigrants on board for the Southern States, and he said that if ever they got the scum of London they had it on that boat. On the first night they were spending hundreds of pounds at the bar, and there was fighting going on amongst them, which was something disgraceful.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: When did they come here?

Mr. SUMNER: I said they came out in the Marathon to Australia—to the other States.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: That has got nothing to do with Queensland.

Mr. SUMNER: But these are the sort of people they are bringing to Australia. I am one who believes that this great State wants filling up with white people. (Hear, hear!) I believe in that as much as anyone. And not only do I believe that, but I believe that there is a law operating in the world which is higher than members of Parliament, which is that if people resident in this State do not use the land here, then someone else should be allowed to use it for them. (Hear, hear!) It is the duty of all parties, and not any particular party, to see that this great State is peopled, and any Government that can devise a scheme for settling the people here and making them prosperous are going a long way towards making the State prosperous. We have got the great question of land settlement in Australia to settle before we can do anything else. What was the answer given to some questions asked to-day about the applications for land in the Atherton district. We are told that out of 503 applications for land there were only 107 who were enabled to get any land there. If this Government can settle the land question, and enable the people to get on the land, then I shall do all I can to help them. We passed last session an item of the Rockhampton programme, and that was to give free homesteads of 160 acres each to people arriving here or the sons of settlers already resident here. I asked a question the other night if anything had been done towards putting that Act into operation. The answer I received was that nothing had been done. No land had yet been opened for free homestead selection, but areas at and near the proposed terminus of the Dalby to Tara railway had been designed. Why, the best settlers we have in Queensland to-day are those who took up land under the old homestead clauses, and the Act we passed last session is one that will facilitate land settlement. We should allow people arriving here to get hold of free grants of land, easy of access, and it will make them comfortable settlers. I have a lot to say on this question of immigration. I am at one with the hon. member for Brisbane North that anyone who has lived in this State must see the necessity of getting it filled up with a white people as soon as possible. But we have great problems to face in connection with this matter. We want to introduce people who are producers, and the more producers we bring here the better it will be for the State. We do not want to bring men here who will be like a good many others—wanderers throughout the city. If we bring them in that way, then a good many will drift to the other States. I shall have an opportunity of speaking again on the Address in Reply, so I will reserve any further remarks I have to say till then. I have been a little bit disjointed in my remarks to-night because I have had to cut so much out. I intend to take up a perfectly independent position in this House. I have crossed the floor of the House because I made a

Mr. Sumner.]

distinct promise to my electors that I would do so, but if the Government are in earnest in carrying out the Rockhampton programme they will have no better supporter than myself to help them put it into operation.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*): I wish first of all to express my regret at the lamentable accident which occurred at Mount Morgan recently and to express my sympathy with the relatives of the victims. Some of them have been our own townsmen, as they had to leave Gympie to get employment elsewhere. I regret that the inspection at that mine was not carried out as it might have been. On this matter the old Labour platform would come in and that is to have the inspectors elected by the miners themselves. I quite agree with the amendment before the House, as I believe the constitution of this Ministry is a violation of the people's will as expressed at the ballot-box. It was never the intention of the electors last February that the party who were put in the cold shades of opposition—the party who were rejected by the electors—should be transferred to the Treasury benches to rule over the destinies of Queensland. There are four reasons given why the Premier should have deserted his class, as he calls them—why he should have deserted the people on this side of the House. There was a patriotic reason given. There was also a reason given that it was necessary that the three-party system should be done away with. Then the Rockhampton programme was put forward, and it was said that the Premier could not carry it out under existing conditions. Then there was also the question that the Premier wishes to fight the States rights questions with the Federal Parliament. These are four reasons. I think when the electors consider them they will want some more reasons, and some stronger reasons, than these appear on the surface. As regards the patriotic reason for the coalition, many things that are not very creditable have been done in the name of patriotism, just as many swindles have been perpetrated in America and else-

[11 p.m.] where by leading men professing Christianity.

Dr. Johnson's definition of patriotism is that it is the last resource of a scoundrel. I do not say that is the correct definition; but I say we should not be carried away by a highfalutin' name, such as "patriot" or "patriotism." As to doing away with the three-party system, I do not think that was the object in forming the coalition. And even if that was one of the objects, it has failed, because we have practically four parties in the Chamber at the present time. It has also been said that it would have been impossible to carry out the proposals contained in the Rockhampton programme without a fusion of the two parties represented on the opposite side. But before any attempt was made to carry out that programme without forming a coalition the *Daily Mail*, on the Monday morning after the election, had a double column advocating the abolition of the three-party system, and the formation of a coalition between the parties now sitting on the Government side. And this advocacy was not confined to the *Daily Mail*; it extended to the other metropolitan papers, and also to the country Press. And the same thing was advocated by the capitalistic Press in Victoria, where they asked why should not Mr. Deakin join with the right-thinking people in the Federal Parliament and no longer bow down to the caucus Baal? And the same thing is being advocated in South Australia. In that

[*Mr. Sumner.*

State there is a Labour Government supported by four or five of the outside Liberals. Those Liberals are supporting the Price Government, and there the capitalistic Press are howling against the three-party system, and urging all right-thinking members to combine against the socialists. The capitalistic Press consider that a multiplicity of parties at the present time is working in the cause of democracy, and that is why it is cried down all along the line. I say that in Queensland at the last election three parties went to the country, and the country sent back three parties to this House. I say, further, that in forming this coalition members opposite did not bow to the will of the electors, but went against the will of the electors. How many of those members forming this coalition have gone before their electors to get an expression of opinion on the subject? I do not know of a single instance. On the other hand, I know that members on this side have gone fearlessly before their constituents, and put the position before them; and they have been told, sometimes by resolution, sometimes by applause, that they have done the right thing. Practically, they have been told by their electors, "Well done, good and faithful servants; you are doing the work you were sent to do." I consider that the coalition is condemned because they are flouting the electors in regard to this matter. The electors sent three parties to this House, and they say we only want two. We were told last session that the pirates had taken possession of the ship, and that they were going to run the ship of State. Not only have the pirates taken the ship, but they have taken our leader too—the leader who went out to fight the pirates. They can buy and sell every position as regards the Government. They can offer to one man a directorship to look after schools, or something like that, and they offer to another man a judgeship or something else. It seems that every office in the State can be promised or bartered about. What are the public to think? The time will come when any man who is supposed to be a decent man will have to deny being a politician at all. That will be the result. As a man said to me the other day, "We are losing faith altogether in politicians, and especially in the leaders of political parties." If this is allowed to go on unchecked, where are we going to land? I think, in the spirit of the motion, that this coalition is a violation of the will of the people as expressed at the ballot-box. One of the reasons why this coalition came about was that we should have the Rockhampton programme carried out. I ask any hon. member here, Did not the Labour party give the hon. member for Rockhampton every assistance in carrying out that programme last session? Look over the work that was done. In the seven weeks we put through fifteen Acts of Parliament, nine railways, and two syndicate railways. And those two syndicate railways were not in the Rockhampton programme. They were only mentioned during the election on one occasion in answer to a question or interjection. In that session we passed the Old-age Pensions, Technical Instruction Bill, Factories and Shops Act, Wages Boards, Inspection of Machinery, Land Act, Constitutional Act—two of them—one dealing with rejected Bills and the referendum. All these things were carried, and were in the Rockhampton programme. Was better work ever done as regards Parliament than was done during those seven weeks? I reckon the amount of good legislation that was put on the statute-books during that time was a record of work

for this House. And now, after doing work like that, we are told that we would not give assistance in carrying out that programme. What did the hon. gentleman want? Was there ever in the history of this House such "gang forward" legislation as was passed during those seven weeks? There were about twenty good planks in the Rockhampton programme—about twenty good principles of needed legislation—and out of those twenty there was only one to which any exception was taken by the Labour party, and that was with regard to immigration. And even then the Labour party was not against immigration, generally speaking. We are against indiscriminate immigration. We are against bringing people here with no provision for them to find the means of getting work. Let the Government have land for the people to settle on, and then the Labour party will not be against immigration. We are against bringing them away from fairly good positions and deceiving them. I believe that many persons who have been brought to our shores have been sorely disappointed at the conditions they have had to face. I see there are about eight good Bills mentioned this session.

The TREASURER: You can support them all.

Mr. RYLAND: Of course I can; but where was the necessity for the Premier to call in the hon. member for Townsville, the hon. member for Moreton, and others to assist him?

The TREASURER: You said you would have nothing more to do with us.

Mr. RYLAND: We said nothing of the sort. It was you who said you would have nothing whatever to do with us. We were prepared to assist you—as we expressed through our leader—in everything that was in the Rockhampton programme that would not be against our platform as a Labour party. What kind of a Trade Disputes Bill are you going to get? Do you think you will get a better one than you would get with the assistance of this side of the House? You would get a genuine good one with the assistance of this side of the House. Also, with regard to mining on private property. What kind of a Bill is it going to be? Perhaps a logus one. And, with regard to State insurance, what assistance are you going to get from the hon. member for Townsville, who is the head boss of an assurance company in Queensland? What assistance are you going to get from other hon. members who are big shareholders in insurance companies? In that matter you would have got good help from this side of the House—from men who understand the question. Also, in connection with the Workers' Compensation Bill. What sort of an amendment are you going to get from hon. members who have always been opposed to its principles? But you gave us the sack—you cast us out, and now you have taken in other men to do the work. You have passed by the good men and taken in inferior men altogether for the work you want done. We have been told to-day that the Bills you want carried will have to be submitted to your caucus. As to the question of State rights, there is absolutely nothing in it. There is not a man in Australia who knows better than the Premier that there is nothing in this talk about State rights, and in this talk about "Rob Roy finance." The hon. gentleman knows that the States are getting back far more from the Commonwealth than they ever expected to get.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already informed hon. members that remarks in regard to Federal matters are not in order on this amendment before the House.

Mr. RYLAND: I remember when we had a coalition before in Queensland—when Sir Samuel Griffith and Sir Thomas McIlwraith coalesced. What was the magical force that led to that coalition? Whether there was some pressure exerted by financial institutions or not, I do not know; but the chief object of that coalition was the chief object of the present coalition, and that is to introduce cheap labour. The Premier believed that his immigration proposals would not be backed up by the Labour party. He wishes to bring out an unlimited number of immigrants. Sir Samuel Griffith and Sir Thomas McIlwraith united, after being deadly enemies, to bring in kanakas for a further term. In both cases the object is the same. It does not make any difference to the Secretary for Railways whether the cheap labour is black or white.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You are talking of something about which you know absolutely nothing.

Mr. RYLAND: This Government want plenty of immigrants.

The SPEAKER: Order! I really cannot see what this has to do with the question before the House.

The PREMIER: Nor anybody else.

Mr. RYLAND: I am giving my reasons for voting against the coalition. The reason the coalition was brought about between Sir Samuel Griffith and Sir Thomas McIlwraith was to get cheap kanaka labour, and this coalition has been brought about to get cheap immigrant labour.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not the question before the House. If the hon. member reads the amendment, he will see that it really only has reference to the last election, and to any wishes expressed by the people thereat.

Mr. RYLAND: I do not think it was the intention of the electors at the last election that there should be a great influx of cheap labour, and in that respect it is a violation of the will of the people. We may expect legislation that was not before the electors. We may expect a re-enactment of the postal vote, and the repeal of the Wages Boards Act. I am quite satisfied that we shall find the Premier very soon arguing against the very principles which he has supported in the past. I noticed a paragraph in a paper to-day stating that the hon. gentleman is going to be asked to become president or chairman of the People's Liberal Progressive League. This is the organisation which is being formed under a new name to fight the Federal Labour party. We have heard of the Premier grinding corn in the mills of the Philistines. If this is a specimen of the way things are going, we shall soon find the hon. gentleman grinding the corn of capitalistic legislation for the Philistines.

The PREMIER: That will please you, will it not?

Mr. RYLAND: It will not. I would sooner see the hon. gentleman working in harmony with our party. I am sorry he is not going to do so, since many votes were given to the hon. gentleman and to his party at the last election because they were working in combination with the Labour party.

The PREMIER: The instructions were to the Labour party to work with the Kidston party.

Mr. RYLAND: My committee got several postal votes for the hon. member for Toowoong, and they went to as much trouble to

Mr. Ryland.]

get them as if they were for a Labour man. But the Government will not work with us, and have thereby violated the expressed will of the electors. People cast a combined vote in South Brisbane and in other places with the intention that the members of the two parties should work together. But the Labour party were not "Gang-forward" enough to please the Premier. He wanted a party that would work faster. But I do not think that, in actual experience, he will find the party of the hon. member for Townsville will put through legislation as fast as he was able to get it through with the assistance of his old friends. I hope it will not be very long before we have an opportunity of going to the electors, so that hon. members opposite will hear what their masters have to say about this coalition.

Mr. WOODS (*Woothakata*): It is my intention not to delay the House, as I intend to say what I have to say extensively on the Address in Reply. It is my intention to vote for the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. If any argument has been adduced in this Chamber to show that a wrong coalition has [11.30 p.m.] taken place, it is the argument which was used by the Minister for Lands with regard to the return of the junior member for Brisbane South, the late Treasurer. The hon. gentleman contended that the return of that hon. member showed that the people were in favour of the present coalition. I maintain that the electors of South Brisbane did not show by their votes that they had any intention of approving of a coalition of the Kidston party with the Philp party.

Mr. HUXHAM: Quite the contrary.

Mr. WOODS: Yes, the result of the election proved quite the contrary, as is very clear from the fact that the members returned defeated two Philp candidates, one of whom was a Minister. It is my intention, in the discussion on the Address in Reply, to deal with the gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury bench, and to quote from their speeches words which condemn their present position. The reason I am against the Premier to-night is that I think he practically showed cowardice after his return from England. We all looked upon him as a strong man, and we thought he showed strength in the brave and noble speech which he made on the floor of this House during the constitutional crisis against members who had acted illegally and unconstitutionally. The speech he delivered on that occasion was circulated throughout the length and breadth of Queensland in pamphlet form, and it had a lot to do with securing the return of members supporting the Kidston Government. I wish to deal now with the statement made by the Home Secretary, who said that the reason why I and other members sitting on the Opposition cross benches left the Government party was that we were afraid of the odium which attached to the Philp party, or rather to Mr. Philp—for he did not go as far as saying the Philp party. I wish to tell the House that, as far as I am concerned—and in what I say I believe I am expressing the sentiments of the other members who left the Government party—that had nothing whatever to do with our position. We had made pledges to our constituents, just as the hon. gentleman had made pledges to his constituents, and among other things we said that we would have nothing to do with a Philp coalition. We considered it our duty to keep that pledge, and that is why we would not join in the coalition. If the Premier considered that he could no longer carry on the business of the country, it was his plain, honest duty to resign and go into opposition. As to saying that he

could not carry on with the Labour party, that is not correct, because, as has already been shown, no measure contained in his Rockhampton programme has been opposed by the Labour party. What was the object of the first coalition—the coalition between the Morgan and Labour parties? That coalition was brought about by the present Premier. The members of the Labour party had for a long time been travelling throughout the length and breadth of Queensland, pointing out that it was about time that the continuous Government were driven from the Treasury benches, and when the late Hon. W. H. Browne was sent for by the Governor, the present Premier stated at our caucus meeting that now that we had an opportunity it was our duty to use every means in our power to drive that party from the Treasury bench. That was the object of the coalition which was formed at that time. That was the reason that Sir Arthur Morgan was approached, and asked to lead the combined party. What has the Premier done now? He has turned round, and formed a coalition with the party he then urged us to defeat, and he alone is responsible for the coalition. I am not prepared to say that he alone is responsible for the changes which have taken place in the Cabinet. (Labour laughter.) With reference to the present Home Secretary, I do not agree with the statement which has been made by some hon. members regarding his administration of the Lands Department. Indeed, I hold a very different opinion of the hon. gentleman. I give him credit for having travelled over more of Queensland than any gentleman who has previously held office as Minister for Lands, and for having put his finger on land which should be taken from the squatters and devoted to closer settlement. I believe that he was actuated by an earnest desire to settle people on the land, and I think a greater injustice has never been done to any Minister than was done to the hon. gentleman by the Premier when he removed him from that department, and later on said that the department wanted reorganising. When the Premier gave that reason for his removal I expected that the hon. gentleman would do as a Minister for Lands in New South Wales did a few years ago—jump up and throw his resignation in the face of the Premier. But I am sorry to say that he did not do so. I want now to refer to the episode with regard to the judgeship. I do not agree that any Attorney-General should hold a judgeship in the palm of his hand, nor do I agree that an Attorney-General has a right as Attorney-General to a vacant judgeship. But that is not the question at issue. The question at issue between the late Attorney-General and the Premier is whether the member for Ipswich was promised a judgeship, and the Premier has admitted that he was promised the position. The Home Secretary very cleverly made an attempt to cloud the issue, but I do not think it was for the purpose of deceiving the House.

Mr. COYNE: What was his object, then?

Mr. WOODS: To clear the Premier. The Home Secretary stated that the Premier was perfectly frank and honest in trying to carry out the promise he made. It looks very bad for a new Cabinet, when a Premier had made a promise before it was appointed, for that Cabinet to turn round and tell him deliberately that he is not going to carry out that promise while they are there. The hon. gentleman's duty was to tell the Cabinet that they would have to get another Premier. The hon. gentleman knows that he cracked the whip over his own party. If the other members of the Kidston party did their duty to the electors, they would have done

[*Mr. Ryland.*]

the same as we did, or else tendered their resignations and gone before the electors. Last session, when some one on this side was speaking, the hon. member for Fitzroy interjected "No coalition." That was on the election of Chairman of Committees, which was taken by the leader of the Opposition as a non-party question. We now find the hon. member sitting behind Mr. Philp. I will not detain the House any longer, but I shall have a good deal to say on the Address in Reply.

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): I have material prepared for a long speech, but as the hour is late and the division will be taken in a few minutes, I desire to say briefly that I have no regret whatever to express in regard to this coalition. I have for a long time held the opinion that the Premier was gravitating towards the hon. member for Townsville. It has been said by one or two of our friends that they think the Labour party has moved this vote of want of confidence at a very inopportune time, but personally I do not think we have. Speaking as a country member, I can assure the Premier that if he went into the country electorates at the present time he would get a rather warm reception.

The PREMIER: I have always got that.

Mr. BARBER: But warm in a different sense to what the Premier refers to. The reason for which I intend to support the amendment is this: At the last general election there was a great issue placed before the country, and the Premier delivered some able and eloquent speeches in defence of the cause for which he was fighting. The electors want to know why the Premier has gone back on the stand which he took up. If neither the Kidston party, nor the party led by the hon. member for Townsville, are prepared to deal with this matter, then the electors of Queensland believe that the Labour party should deal with it. The Premier knew very well when we went to the country that the Labour party would see him through in this matter. We were absolutely sincere on the great issue that we went to the country upon, and we are sincere on that matter now. The electors will recognise that the Labour party, in moving this want of confidence vote, are doing their duty. I will not say any more at present, but I will have a great deal to say on the Address in Reply in respect to several matters. I intend to support the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*): I desire to say a few words before this amendment goes to a vote. I think we would not have been doing our duty as a Labour party had we not moved a vote of want of confidence in the Government as now constituted. I happened to be in St. George at the last election, when the numbers were being wired out, and I also went through the electorate during the contest. Many of the most energetic workers in the Labour movement in that district said to me, "No vote of yours in the House must put Mr. Kidston out and the Philp party in. It would be better for us to have saved our time and our money than for you to go down there and put the Kidston party out and the Philp party in." I have been a strong supporter of the Premier in the country, in the caucus, and in this House; and one of my reasons for doing so was on account of the electors in my district being very strong anti-Philpites. They saw no opportunity of getting the Labour party into power, and they were pleased to have an opportunity of supporting a man who would keep the other party out. On one occasion, when we adjourned from Thursday to Tuesday to consider the

political situation, I asked the hon. gentleman if he intended to go over to Mr. Philp, and he said, "I do not mind telling you in confidence." I asked him how long he would require me to keep it, and he said "Next morning." I said, "Very well." What he said on that occasion was, "Not only would I be a traitor to the men who supported me so loyally in Parliament, but I would be a traitor to every man and woman who supported me throughout the length and breadth of Queensland." It is no wonder that people have been very strong Kidstonites, because the policy of the Philp party has become so obnoxious to the vast majority of the people of this State.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LAND: We supported Mr. Kidston up to the end of last year, and at the end of the session the Premier thanked us for the solid support that we had given him. I remember when he said that he was proud of the support we had given him. He also mentioned that he had received advances from the other side, but he was too disgusted at such a proposal to entertain it. I have had a good deal of experience of politics in Queensland, and through my general struggle in life for existence I have come into contact with some of the worst class of men and women, but I have never been deceived in my life like I have been by the Premier. I would be lacking in my duty if I did not vote for this amendment, or if I did not express my condemnation, on behalf of the electors of my district, at the action of the Premier in forming a coalition with the hon. member for Townsville.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted from the Address in Reply (*Mr. Bowman's* want of confidence amendment) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided—

AYES, 39.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hunter, D.
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kenna
" Barnes, W. H.	" Keogh
" Barton	" Kidston
" Bell	" Mackintosh
" Brennan	" Maxwell
" Campbell	" Moore
" Cottell	" Paget
" Cowap	" Petrie
" Cribb	" Philp
" Denham	" Rankin
" Douglas	" Redwood
" Forrest	" Roberts
" Fox	" Somerset
" Grant	" Stodart
" Grayson	" Swayne
" Gunn	" Thorn
" Hanran	" Walker
" Hawthorn	" White
" Herbertson	

Tellers: Mr. Douglas and Mr. Redwood.

NOES, 29.

Mr. Adamson	Mr. Mann
" Airey	" Maughan
" Barber	" May
" Blair	" McLachlan
" Bowman	" Mitchell
" Coyne	" Mulcahy
" Hamilton	" Mullan
" Hardacre	" Murphy
" Hunter, J. M.	" Nevitt
" Huxham	" Payne
" Jones	" Ryland
" Kerr	" Sumner
" Land	" Winstanley
" Lennon	" Woods
" Lesina	

Tellers: Mr. Hardacre and Mr. Lesina.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Original question (the adoption of the Address in Reply) stated.

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

[12 p.m.]

Question put and passed; and the resumption of the debate made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

The House adjourned at three minutes past 12 o'clock.
