

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 28 JULY 1909**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 28 JULY, 1909.

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. T. Bell, *Dalby*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*): With the permission of the House I desire to make a personal explanation with reference to the remarks which fell last night from the hon. member for Barcoo.

Mr. MANN: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has already made an explanation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I think we might hear what the hon. member has to say. A serious accusation was made against the hon. member last night, and I think if he has something to say very briefly, he should be permitted to speak.

Mr. MANN: He has not spoken on the motion. He has the right of reply.

The TREASURER: Last night the hon. member for Barcoo was fully seized of certain facts when he alluded to what had taken place, and I was taken at a disadvantage in having to speak on a matter that occurred some eighteen months ago.

Mr. KERR: No; not eighteen months ago.

The TREASURER: I have made full inquiry at the Lands Office in regard to the matter, and I now wish to put before the House a full statement of exactly what occurred. The hon. member last night insinuated that I, as a member of the Ministry, had given Oliver Smith and Co., or assisted to give them, a preference.

Mr. KERR: No; you acted as their agents.

*Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.*]

The TREASURER: Whereby they obtained for practically  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. an acre, land for which, subsequently,  $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per acre was got, from some selectors.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is not what he said.

The TREASURER: I may say that Messrs. Oliver Smith and Co. were the proprietors of two runs in the Blackall district—Isis Downs and Avington. The second run—Avington—was cut up in accordance with the 1884 Act—a portion resumed, and a portion leased to them as lessees. It was divided in 1886, and 221 square miles were resumed. In 1895—that is fourteen years ago—five portions were opened for grazing selection, but up to the year 1907 only one had been taken at 1d. per acre. In 1907 two were taken at  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. an acre, and the remaining two are still vacant. The lessees, meantime, had a depasturing right over the balance at 16s. per square mile. In August, 1907, the lessees asked that 124 square miles, including the two portions remaining unselected, be opened for lease, so that they could have a permanent tenure, which would enable them to put down bores on what was practically waterless country. Commissioner Robson Scott, reporting on the country, stated it to be scrubby, heavily timbered, and almost waterless, and that, riding along the Avington boundary fence for several miles, he saw nothing but gidya scrub—partly open, but chiefly dense.

Mr. KERR: He was never on the land.

The TREASURER: He did not consider that the country would be selected, and recommended that it be opened for lease.

Mr. KERR: He was never inside the boundary.

The TREASURER: It was accordingly decided to open for lease, with priority to the lessees, at a rent of £1 7s. 6d. per square mile, and a minute was brought before the Cabinet to carry that out, and amongst the signatures to that minute was the signature of the hon. member for Barcoo.

Mr. KERR: No; I was absent.

The TREASURER: The hon. member said last night that he was away at the time, but the minute shows he was present.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to a purely personal explanation.

The TREASURER: In view of the statements that the land would now be selected if opened it was withdrawn and instructions given to design it for selection. The land has not yet been opened for selection. The land referred to as lately having been selected at  $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per acre does not comprise any of the land which was to have been opened for lease. The selected land is that recently resumed from Avington holding for settlement, and is first class sheep country. I think that will absolutely absolve me from any accusation the hon. member for Barcoo made.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: As personal explanations seem to be the order of the day, I rise to make a personal explanation, too. The *Courier*, in its "Gallery Notes," says, "But in his speech Mr. Mann trespassed much more seriously!"—

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I gather from what the hon. member is reading he is about to reply to some statement which appeared in a newspaper.

Mr. MANN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: I should like to point out to the hon. member that that can fairly be considered outside the scope of subjects under which a personal explanation can be made. I am aware

[*Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn.*

that the hon. member can tell me that the other day I permitted the hon. member for Fassfern to make a statement based on a publication of that kind. I am aware of that. But, when that took place, I was under the impression that I was giving too much latitude, and since then I have referred to authorities, and I found I had certainly given too much latitude. Hon. members will see that if a member, when a criticism distasteful to him occurs in a newspaper, is going to make it a subject of a personal explanation in Parliament, the business of the country will never be finished.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: I would point out that the hon. member for Clermont referred to some remarks in the *Worker*, and you allowed him to proceed.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. member is quite correct. I undoubtedly gave too much latitude to the hon. member for Clermont. I did not realise for some time that he was referring to a statement in a newspaper. I regret very much not being able to allow the hon. member to make a statement, but I am convinced I am acting in accordance with the precedents of Parliament.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: I am fully satisfied. I wished to get up to show the House how this can be carried too far. I did not intend to bring this matter up, but as you allowed the hon. member for Enoggera to make an explanation, I wished to show that it could be carried too far.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY.

#### WANT OF CONFIDENCE MOTION—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

HON. R. PHILP (*Townsville*), who was received with "Hear, hears!" said: I have listened very carefully for the last five weeks to hon. members' speeches—

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Five weeks! and laughter.

HON. R. PHILP: Six weeks, I think. I have listened to a number of speeches delivered for and against this motion, and I must confess that I have so far found no good reason why I should vote for the motion of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. (Opposition laughter.) I have no reason to abuse anyone, and there will not be any personalities in what I have to say. I think there has been a great deal too much abuse, and that a good many things have been said which many hon. members will regret afterwards, and wish they could unsay. Last night the hon. member for Barcoo told us that when he brought the Mount Elliott Railway Bill in the House he told the Premier that the bringing in of the Bill would cause a rupture with the Labour party. He told him that, but still he persisted in bringing the Bill in. He passed the Bill, and he says now that the Bill was a good Bill, and that he is not ashamed of it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: How can the hon. member for Barcoo now give a good reason for his action in leaving the present Government? He was one who brought about the rupture with the Labour party. After that rupture, if the Government carried on, they must get the assistance of some other party. They got their assistance, and now, forsooth, because the Premier has got the assistance of the Philp party, the hon. member for Barcoo thought fit to leave the Government and oppose the present fusion of parties. And for

what reason? Is it in order that he will not be able to bring in any more Bills like the Mount Elliott Bill, which was, he admits, a good Bill, and a Bill which has done so much for that part of the country? I like to see a member logical in any action he takes up. I maintain that there are six members on that side of the House who refused to join the fusion—the coalition. I have no fault to find with them for refusing, but I think every member of the House must admit that their position now is not a logical one.

Mr. MANN: And the Philpites.

HON. R. PHILP: They went to the country to fight for the policy enunciated by the present Premier; and, forsooth, what matters it who joins the Premier to carry it out? They are in honour bound to carry out the pledges made to the electors, and to support every plank of that platform.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KERR: The first plank was no coalition.

The SPEAKER: Order!

HON. R. PHILP: When the Premier attempts to bring any legislation in against that policy, then is the time for those hon. members to oppose it, and not before.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: I say unmistakably that those six members—I am not going to use any term of abuse—I say that they have utterly mistaken their position in this House, and I claim that they cannot go before their electors, and tell them truthfully that they have carried out the behests of the electors.

Mr. MANN: My constituents told me never to support you.

HON. R. PHILP: Now, there are six other members in the House who all agreed to the fusion of the parties—that is, the hon. senior member for Ipswich and those hon. members sitting round him. We were told in this House that the hon. member for Ipswich was the most eloquent member in that caucus for bringing about the fusion. Now, every child in Queensland knows the reason for that gentleman's defection—every boy and girl attending the State schools around Brisbane and Ipswich knows the reason was because he was not made a judge of the Supreme Court in Brisbane.

Mr. WOODS: What nonsense!

HON. R. PHILP: It was for no other reason whatever.

Mr. BLAIR: It is a peevish absurdity.

HON. R. PHILP: In his speech the other day the hon. gentleman indulged in a long tirade of abuse against the Premier. He said—

That advice was laughed at and ridiculed by the Premier, and I kept silent in this House rather than betray my leader, and you are all aware of the treatment he has meted out to me.

(Government laughter.)

That is the sole text of his sermon to this House, the treatment he has meted out to me. What cares he for the country? What cared he whether Queensland prospers or not so long as he got that position as judge. I know from my own knowledge that from the time he passed that Bill in this House, making it within the power of the Government to appoint five judges, he was doing all he could to get that judgeship. You, Sir, who were in the House at the time, will bear me out. I told the hon. member himself, "I cannot blame you if you take the position, but I should blame your colleagues very much if they did appoint you."

Mr. MANN: Did you mention that to Mr. Kidston?

HON. R. PHILP: I never spoke to Mr. Kidston on the matter at all. However, that goes by the way. I say that so far as that gentleman's interests in this country are concerned, I do not think he cares one fig whether the country prospers or otherwise. All that he has been seeking since he has been in this House is to get a position on the Supreme Court bench of Queensland. I am very glad to think that Judge Shand got the position, and I think every man who knows anything of him will say that it was the right appointment to make.

Mr. MURPHY: They promised Macnaughton a judgeship.

The SPEAKER: Order!

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member for Croydon has not yet spoken, but when he does speak I will listen carefully to him. There is another speech that I wish to refer to—I refer to it "more in sorrow than in anger"—that is the speech of the hon. member for Fassifern.

Mr. BLAIR: He chasteneth those whom he loveth.

HON. R. PHILP: He made a number of remarks in that speech which I think he should not have made.

Mr. JENKINSON: I have a perfect right to say what I like—I tell the truth.

HON. R. PHILP: So long as you tell the truth I do not object, but I say you have not told the truth.

Mr. JENKINSON: I have told the truth. I have stuck to it closer than you have.

HON. R. PHILP: I am going to prove it, and I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. member for Fassifern's difference with the head of the Government is because he is not included in the Ministry.

Mr. JENKINSON: Nothing of the sort—you have no right to attribute motives.

HON. R. PHILP: I know that, for some time after the coalition, the hon. gentleman would not look at me at first.

Mr. JENKINSON: I am not particularly anxious to look at you now. (Opposition laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: I say that the hon. member for Fassifern was in favour of the fusion of parties. He only made one reservation, and that was that he was opposed to the Trade Disputes Bill; but that was only one plank, and it was not sufficient excuse for the attitude of the hon. member.

Mr. JENKINSON: You are not to judge of that.

HON. R. PHILP: That is my opinion, and I have just as much right to my opinion as the hon. member for Fassifern. In reading his speech I find that he said that I went out of the caucus downstairs and came back stating that the Premier had promised four portfolios. I say most distinctly that I never went out of the caucus at all.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: I never stated in the caucus that the Premier promised any portfolios at all. Again, the hon. member called a caucus meeting.

Mr. JENKINSON: No; I did not.

HON. R. PHILP: He came to me and asked me if I would attend it, and I said "Yes, I will attend it," and he was to telephone to all the people. At that caucus meeting he said distinctly that a resolution was carried by the whole party to oppose the Trade Disputes Bill.

Mr. JENKINSON: No; I did not. You have not read it sufficiently. You read it again.

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

HON. R. PHILP: I say distinctly that no resolution was carried at that meeting at all.

Mr. JENKINSON: It was.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: I say it was not. There were fourteen or fifteen members at that meeting, and the hon. member for Fassifern did nearly all the talking himself.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: As usual. (Laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: And there were no resolutions at all carried before the meeting adjourned.

Mr. JENKINSON: That is not so. What did the hon. member for Mackay say? Be fair.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: What has that got to do with it at all? What does it matter what took place at that caucus meeting? The hon. member for Fassifern withdrew his support from the Government because of its intention to introduce a Trade Disputes Bill, but he goes over to the other side to support Mr. Bowman, where he is certain to get a Trade Disputes Bill introduced.

Mr. MANN: Tell us about the wire-netting.

HON. R. PHILP: Those five members, led by the senior member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, complained, and the Labour members over there have also complained, that the Government did not bring in a Trade Disputes Bill, so what consolation can the hon. member for Fassifern have in sitting over on that side at all? He withdrew his support from this Government because they proposed to introduce a Trade Disputes Bill.

Mr. JENKINSON: You are not speaking the truth now.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Withdraw!

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand the hon. member for Fassifern is rather hard of hearing.

Mr. JENKINSON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: I have called out "Order" on a number of occasions in as loud a tone as I could command, and I directed my remarks to him. I hope that the hon. member will bear in mind that it is quite disorderly to keep up a running comment while another member is speaking. If there is anything he wishes to contradict in the speaker's remarks, he can make a personal explanation by leave of the House, or he can get another hon. member to make an explanation for him later on in the debate.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. JENKINSON: I can do my own talking, thank you.

HON. R. PHILP: I am quite satisfied to leave my statements in the hands of the House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member for Fassifern brought in another conversation, which he stated we had when we had lunch at Eschenhagen's. He said that I offered him a portfolio. I never offered him a portfolio.

Mr. JENKINSON: Yes, you did; that is quite true.

HON. R. PHILP: I asked him if he would accept one. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. JENKINSON: That is right.

HON. R. PHILP: That is quite a different thing to offering you a portfolio. (Opposition laughter.) What is more, I advised him not to accept a portfolio because it looked, owing to

[Hon. R. Philp.

the attitude which the hon. gentleman had taken up, as though he had been bought with a portfolio.

Mr. JENKINSON: What did you ask me for, then?

Mr. BLAIR: It was very tricky.

HON. R. PHILP: I strongly advised him not to take it, and I will tell you what he said. He said to me, "What I want is the Speakership." (Government laughter.) He said, "If you don't take it, Mr. Philp, I ought to get it, and I want it." (Government laughter.)

Mr. JENKINSON: No; I said I would accept the Speakership. That is the difference. (Government laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: There were a good many conversations, which I am not going to repeat to this House.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member for Fassifern is going about posing as a martyr—as a man who refused portfolios.

Mr. BLAIR: More honour to him.

HON. R. PHILP: He said that Mr. Redwood and Mr. Douglas—

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: He said that the hon. member for Cook offered him the Treasurership. (Government laughter.)

Mr. JENKINSON: And what did I say to that?

HON. R. PHILP: You said you would not accept a portfolio under Redwood or Kidston. (Laughter.)

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

The PREMIER: It was the Speakership or nothing. (Laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: I say now that if the hon. member for Fassifern had been offered a portfolio when the Ministry was first formed he would have accepted it.

Mr. JENKINSON: You know nothing about that.

HON. R. PHILP: But his hostility to the Government was so strong.

Mr. JENKINSON: Didn't you want me to have a position when the Ministry was first formed?

HON. R. PHILP: I will tell the hon. member that I always recognised him as being fit for office.

Mr. JENKINSON: Hear, hear! I am glad you say that.

HON. R. PHILP: But since his speech the other night I look on him as being quite unfit. (Government laughter.)

Mr. JENKINSON: So are you unfit.

HON. R. PHILP: I wish to deal tenderly with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JENKINSON: I don't want your tenderness. I don't want your charity.

HON. R. PHILP: He posed the other night as being a very strong supporter of mine, but when he came into the House he opposed me right and left as much as he could.

Mr. JENKINSON: Quite right. I will do it again.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: He was one of those members who from high principle voted against me on the Stamp Duties Bill, and yet he voted for the very same Bill three weeks afterwards.

Mr. JENKINSON: I did not.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member for Fassifern will obey my calls to order. I reminded him before that he was not in order in making running comments while a member is speaking.

Mr. JENKINSON: This is most unfair to me.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. JENKINSON (rising): I have no hesitation in saying that I will sit perfectly quiet if the hon. member for Townsville will quote some authority for what he is saying. The mere *ipse dixit* of himself is not sufficient to prove it. He has got *Hansard* at his disposal, and I am perfectly content to take that if he quotes it. (Government laughter.)

The SPEAKER: I understand quite well that it is rather annoying to be criticised—

Mr. JENKINSON: Not if it is fair criticism.

The SPEAKER: Especially, as the hon. gentleman thinks in his case, if that criticism is not justified. But if the hon. gentleman will think for a moment he will know that he has abundant opportunities for replying to the hon. gentleman in the immediate future, and he can then correct any inaccurate statements with regard to himself which he might think have been made. One of those opportunities is through the mouth of a subsequent speaker, or to make a personal explanation.

Mr. AIREY: Like the Treasurer did last night.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Hon. R. Philp to proceed.

HON. R. PHILP: There is nothing I dislike more than talking of these personalities.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. JENKINSON: You have been doing nothing else.

HON. R. PHILP: There was nothing else for it after the speech of the hon. member for Fassifern the other night. There is another little matter. It is just as well to have these things out and have done with them. The senior member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, said that the Premier wanted me out of the House altogether.

Mr. BLAIR: That is true.

Mr. KERR: Perfectly correct.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member must know that the only people who can put me out of this House are the electors of Townsville.

Mr. MANN: The Premier wished you to resign.

HON. R. PHILP: A friend of mine told me that Mr. Blair went to him—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Ipswich.

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member for Ipswich went to him and proposed that I should retire altogether from the House.

Mr. BLAIR: He was pulling your toe. (Opposition laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: I am here because I was elected a member of this House by the electors of Townsville, and I will stay here as long as I wish—as long as I am allowed by my electors.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: Neither the hon. member for Ipswich nor anyone else are going to get me out of the House because they wish it. That was the coolest thing I ever heard.

Mr. BLAIR: I never said it.

HON. R. PHILP: You cannot deny that you went to my friend and made that proposal.

Mr. BLAIR: I never made a proposal about putting you out. I said that I would put you out if I could.

HON. R. PHILP: It reminds me of the child who was being chastised by a servant. She said, "I hope Mary will die, and go to heaven." (Laughter.) That may have been the pious wish of the Premier and the senior member for Ipswich with regard to myself. I do not want to bring up these matters, but they must be answered.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: They are not worth answering,

HON. R. PHILP: I would not have mentioned them, only that the hon. member repeatedly appealed to me to say that he was offered a portfolio which he did not want; and after all his talks about what happened at those caucus meetings, which I consider that no member had a right to mention outside of those meetings—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. JENKINSON: What meeting do you refer to?

HON. R. PHILP: I have to make these statements to refute what has been said by the hon. member for Fassifern. What happens in caucus ought to be secret and should be kept to the people who are assembled there.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAMILTON: I thought we were the only party who held caucus meetings.

Mr. RYLAND: What is this caucus?

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: We have had a number of speeches from members since this debate started. Some took one hour, some two hours, and what is the sum total of these speeches? "Down the Premier! Down Kidston!" has been the text of nearly every man who has spoken.

[4 p.m.] I say every man in this House, every man on both sides of the House, is pledged to support the policy which is now before Parliament. The Labour party two years ago, and again twelve months ago, went to the country under the wing of the present Premier.

Mr. BOWMAN: We did not.

HON. R. PHILP: They agreed with the policy which the Premier put before the country.

Mr. BOWMAN: We did not.

HON. R. PHILP: They did not agree with syndicate railways, I admit, but everything else in the policy now in front of us has been approved of by those hon. members. Certainly the eleven members on the cross benches are pledged to support that policy.

Mr. WOODS: No coalition.

HON. R. PHILP: "Coalition" is not a policy. As I have already said, members went to the country and asked the electors to return a party with a majority. The electors did not do that. The electors were asked a second time to return a party with a majority, and again they did not do so; and I say the proper course for the leaders of parties under those circumstances was to arrange that some two parties should come together and form a strong Government.

A LABOUR MEMBER: And you have done it!

HON. R. PHILP: I believe that the country approves of what has taken place.

Mr. HARDAIRE: Give the country a chance to say whether it does or not.

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

HON. R. PHILP: I am willing to give the electors a chance to-morrow.

MR. HARDACRE: Give us Supply, and you can go to the country to-morrow.

HON. R. PHILP: The most numerous party in the House ought to get Supply, and that is the party on this side of the House. Give us Supply, and I am willing to go to the country to-morrow. It matters not to me whether I come back to the House or not; it matters not to me whether I sit on that side of the House or on this; but it does matter to me whether the country is progressive and prosperous. It is not possible to form a Ministry on that side of the House which can formulate and carry out a policy that will be of benefit to the country, because members there disagree on almost every matter. See how they disagree on the question of immigration!

LABOUR MEMBERS: No, no!

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: And on the question of a land tax.

HON. R. PHILP: They disagree on almost every subject. The Labour party have always said how solid and consistent they are, and they have insisted upon every plank of their platform—that or nothing. When a sum of £50,000 was first put on the Estimates for immigration two years ago by the present Premier, did they oppose that proposal?

MR. LESINA: It ought to have been opposed.

HON. R. PHILP: Not only did they not oppose it, but they voted for it, or rather the vote went through without a word of opposition. I remember sitting in the House till 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning to see how the vote would be treated, and that it went through without any opposition.

MR. J. M. HUNTER: With the "gag."

HON. R. PHILP: No; it went through without a single word against it, and without a single vote against it. That was two years ago.

MR. LESINA: That was an oversight. (Laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: The Labour party voted for the £50,000 for immigration that year, because they were then supporters of the Government. But they appear to have changed their opinions with their change of sides in this House. When they supported the £50,000 for immigration they were sitting on this side supporting the Government.

MR. BLAIR: You have changed your opinions very greatly.

HON. R. PHILP: I have not changed my opinions very greatly. Certainly I have not changed my opinion about the hon. member for Ipswich. Year after year I am more than ever confirmed in the opinion I formed of the hon. member. But it is not a fault in a man to change his opinions—he has to go with the times. But the Labour party have a plank in their platform against immigration.

MR. LESINA: No.

HON. R. PHILP: Well, they had at one time a plank in their platform opposed to State immigration, but it has since been knocked out. At one time they had "socialism in our time" as a plank in their platform, but that also has been knocked out. At all events, two years ago they voted for £50,000 for immigration.

MR. LESINA: No; we tried to reduce the amount.

HON. R. PHILP: No; the Labour party did not try to reduce the amount. I have looked up *Hansard*, and I find that they voted for the £50,000.

[*Hon. R. Philp.*]

MR. BOWMAN: Last year we moved a reduction in the vote.

HON. R. PHILP: Why did not the party move a reduction two years ago? Because at that time they were supporting the Government.

MR. J. M. HUNTER: No; because there was a scarcity of labour.

HON. R. PHILP: There was a greater scarcity of labour last year than there was two years ago. The last time a vote for immigration was before this House the Labour party moved that the vote be reduced by £20,000, and the hon. member for Fortitude Valley has stated since this session began that if he had succeeded with that amendment he would have moved a further reduction.

MR. BOWMAN: Yes; as long as there are unemployed in Queensland.

HON. R. PHILP: You will always have unemployed more or less, and I say we have just as much need for people now as we had two years ago, and it would be a lamentable thing to stop immigration. Of course, I would not go in for immigration on the scale suggested by the hon. member for Cook. I would not advocate the introduction of 2,000 or 3,000 immigrants per week.

MR. MANN: You did.

HON. R. PHILP: I never did advocate that.

MR. MANN: I can show it you in print.

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member cannot find any such statement in print. During the forty or fifty years that immigration has been a policy in Queensland, I do not remember more than 2,000 immigrants a month coming to Queensland, and that was about 24,000 or 25,000 a year. That is the largest number I have known to come here.

MR. BOWMAN: And you knocked off immigration once.

HON. R. PHILP: There was a reason for doing so at the time, but since then times have been better. We have had splendid seasons, and there has been an enormous boom in land settlement, and to make the best use of the land which has been taken up we want a number of immigrants to come to Queensland. Since we have gone in for building railways we have thrown open more land for settlement than any other State in Australia has done. Only two years ago the Under Secretary for Lands, Mr. Scott, called attention to the necessity for building more railways. I have his report here.

MR. HARDACRE: Why did you oppose the Premier when you were sitting on this side of the House?

HON. R. PHILP: I knew the Premier could not carry out his railway policy with the party who were then supporting him, but, as a matter of fact, the party with which I am associated voted as often with the Government as they voted against them. We believed in the principles that we had enunciated, and we supported them. Under date the 30th June, 1907, the Under Secretary for Lands wrote to the Minister of the Department, as follows:—

Remarkable as has been the record of the year under review in comparison with what had previously been accomplished, it could easily be surpassed if a point had not been reached where settlement has practically overtaken the railways. Unless branch railways are built without loss of time to open up the vast areas of good land lying within the line of sufficiency of rainfall, but beyond practicable access from the present railway systems, there must be a falling away in the rate of settlement. Perhaps the most regrettable feature of the position, that is imminent if not actually present, is the disappointment which must be experienced by settlers from the Southern States who are seeking opportunity to found new homes.

for themselves in Queensland, if such opportunity is not associated with land within reasonable distance from a railway. Settlements have already been arranged at from 40 to 60 miles from a railway and 270 miles from a port, but the confident hope which these settlers hold that the quality of the land will on its merits claim and obtain a railway will not inspire more than a limited number to take such risks. Rather than that disappointment should be the lot of Southern inquirers, with, as perhaps a natural if not an artful consequence, the dissemination of incorrect reports as to the true cause thereof and to the permanent injury of our State, it would be better to deter rather than to further encourage the further advent of southerners, for such time at least as a programme of railway construction is undeclared. It is to be hoped, however, that the near future will see the construction of many lines in progress providing for the extensive tracts of good land, which are otherwise available, reasonable access to the seaboard and the markets.

I do not think this Government has been unmindful of railway construction. I voted for most of the railways that have been brought in—some of them I did not vote for, as I did not think they were desirable lines—but I voted for three out of four. The plans, etc., of other lines are here now, and I say if we want to keep opening up lands, we have to build more railways.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: That is a plank of the platform of the present Government, and they have not deviated one iota from that platform.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: We did not oppose those railways.

HON. R. PHILP: I understand the Labour party do not believe in borrowing money.

MR. BOWMAN: We voted for the loan last session.

HON. R. PHILP: You voted for it after a good deal of talk against it. There was a good deal of talk against the floating of that loan, and I pointed out at the time that most of the money had been spent.

MR. J. M. HUNTER: You imagine those things.

HON. R. PHILP: I do not imagine those things. The member for Fassfern attacks the coalition Government because land selection was less than the previous year. I have looked up the figures and find last year was a record year for land selection in Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: In area.

HON. R. PHILP: There were 607,000 acres of land taken up as agricultural selections as against 689,000 the previous year—only 80,000 odd less. The reason of that was because less land was available, because not so many railways were passed. At all events 4,091,000 acres were selected as against 4,000,000 the previous year, and a larger sum in rent was received. There was only a difference of 80,000 odd acres in agricultural selections, and it seems to me an enormous quantity of land to be selected in one year.

MR. ALLEN: You say nothing at all about the number of selectors.

HON. R. PHILP: There were 1,608 selectors who took up agricultural farms last year, and the year before 1,904. Surely, the hon. member for Barcoo cannot complain, because he was a member of the Ministry for nine months out of the twelve.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: If he complains he is condemning himself. I think it is a wonderful amount of land that has been taken up, and I hope all who have taken up land will be successful farmers.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: But I certainly think unless the Government assist them with plenty of

labour they will fail somewhat. Another cry from some of the young men on the other side of the House is they are afraid the present Government will get conservatised by the old Philp party. It is rather amusing coming from the hon. member for Cook, who made that remark.

MR. DOUGLAS: I do not think I made any such remark.

HON. R. PHILP: Oh! yes, I think you said it. However, considering the hon. member came to me and said he did not know whether to come out as an independent or come out as a Kidstonite—

MR. DOUGLAS: I did not come to you—you sent for me. (Laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: I did not send for the hon. member.

MR. DOUGLAS: The hon. member wired to me.

HON. R. PHILP: He certainly came to my office, and he was in doubt as to whether he would come out as an independent, or whether he would support me or support Mr. Kidston.

MR. DOUGLAS: I told you I would not support you.

HON. R. PHILP: I advised him—I knew his father, and I thought it was rather a pity that he should spoil his career by going into politics at all. I said: "Come out either on one side or the other; you will make a mistake if you come out as an independent." When he left Brisbane he had not made up his mind on which side he would come out.

MR. DOUGLAS: Stick to the truth.

HON. R. PHILP: It is the truth.

MR. DOUGLAS: Who said so?

HON. R. PHILP: I can assure you he told me so himself. He said he would wire me from Cooktown which side he would come out on. When he got to Cooktown he did wire; he kept his promise.

MR. DOUGLAS: You asked me to consult my constituents—my leading supporters—and I told you I would do so, and that I would not support you unless my supporters wished me. (Government laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: However, it only shows that this cry of conservatising the Government is only imaginary. In the olden days there was a squatting party and a town party, and I may point out that Sir Thomas McLlwraith came into this House as a liberal. The Hon. John Macrossan also came in as a liberal, and they opposed the squatting party, but they found the liberals in those days were full of promises which were never kept, and they crossed the floor of the House. But nobody can truthfully say that either Sir Thomas McLlwraith or John Macrossan were ever conservative. To my mind the greatest democrat who has ever been in this House up to the present day was John Macrossan. (Hear, hear!) You never heard that man say he was a democrat. I claim that our party has passed just as democratic measures as the Labour party, or any party in this House. We passed the Shops and Factories Act, and we passed the Agricultural Land Purchase Act. We passed the Sugar Workers' Guarantee Act. Are they conservative measures?

MR. RYLAND: They are very imperfect.

HON. R. PHILP: There is nothing perfect. Even the hon. member for Gympie is not perfect.

MR. RYLAND: Very near it.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: Those five members who crossed the floor of the House, up to the present

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

time have given no valid reason for their action. They were strong supporters at the time of the fusion of parties. The hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Redwood, came to me and boasted of what he had done. Before the coalition he came to me and urged me to bring it about. I certainly thought it was the best thing possible at the time, and I think so still, and I only regret that eleven members sitting on that side of the House—five of whom really believed that the coalition was necessary—have seen fit to go back on the understanding they came to and the agreement they made. But for those five members there would have been no coalition at all—no fusion at all. They brought it about. Had they opposed it at the time, there would have been no fusion.

Mr. MANN : We never got a chance.

HON. R. PHILP : I am not referring to the hon. member for Cairns. I am referring to those five hon. members who agreed to come together and have since seen fit to go to the other side of the House. I say there has been no valid reason given by any one of those members for their course of action. The hon. member for Toowoomba talked of a great meeting at Toowoomba where the Premier did not get a fair hearing. I was at that meeting. Nearly every member representing the Darling Downs was at that meeting—the only member absent was Mr. Redwood—and I say that that meeting was distinctly favourable to the Premier. It is said that the policemen had to keep order. I only saw two policemen at that meeting.

Mr. MACKINTOSH : Hear, hear !

HON. R. PHILP : At most meetings there has generally been a noisy crowd behind, and there was in Toowoomba ; but, so far as I could see, the feeling was favourable to the Government, and I am just as good a judge of meetings as any man in the House. The hon. senior member for Toowoomba was not there at all. He only knows what somebody told him, and I say his information is incorrect. At the second meeting, at which he and the hon. member for Cook spoke, I was not present ; but I have a friend whom I believe on his simple statement, and he told me he was never at a colder meeting in his life. He was not an elector of Queensland, but simply a stranger there. He did not know the hon. member for Toowoomba, or the hon. member for Cook, and he came from New Zealand. He said there was not a sign of life ; that the meeting was as cold as charity. The denunciations of the hon. member for Toowoomba seemed to fall flat. I believe the meeting which I and the Premier were at was the better of the two.

Mr. RYLAND : And the liveliest. (Laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP : I hope that yet these hon. members will reconsider their position. They are now allying themselves with a party which is utterly opposed to the farmers of this country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS : No, no ! Not true.

HON. R. PHILP : We know that the Wages Boards Bill, including farmers, was carried by the Labour party.

Mr. BOWMAN : And by your chief.

HON. R. PHILP : Most of the farmers in this House were opposed to it.

Mr. HAMILTON : How many farmers on this side voted for it ?

HON. R. PHILP : Look at the land tax proposed by the Labour party, and by Mr. Fisher, in Melbourne, that land should be taxed when over £300 in value.

Mr. HARDACRE : Land monopoly.

[Hon. R. Philp.

HON. R. PHILP : Some say that all land should be taxed. The farmers in Queensland are heavily taxed enough already.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

HON. R. PHILP : They have to pay a railway tax—half a dozen different taxes altogether—in addition to which the hon. member for Gympie proposed a land tax in Queensland. His friend, Mr. Fisher, proposed a land tax in Melbourne.

Mr. HAMILTON : And George Reid said if the States don't put it on they will do it.

The SPEAKER : Order, order !

HON. R. PHILP : Who is making this speech, Mr. Speaker ? I consider that those members who represent farming interests are standing in the light of their constituents by going to the other side of the House.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : There is a combine against them.

HON. R. PHILP : At all events there is a combine against the Government.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER : Not on this side.

HON. R. PHILP : Here we have the Labour members, and those twelve members prepared to form a Ministry against the Government.

Mr. BLAIR : What an astounding offence !

HON. R. PHILP : I say it is not possible for that party to agree on any policy which will suit the views of this country.

Mr. BOWMAN : More than the present Premier.

HON. R. PHILP : I have said before that the policy announced by the Premier and myself are so nearly alike that my friend said, "Why are you fighting ?"

Mr. BARBER : What are you making all the row about ?

The SPEAKER : Order ! I would like to again remind hon. members on the end bench not to continue ejaculating while other hon. members are speaking. I hope the hon. members will observe my call to order.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

HON. R. PHILP : These two policies were so similar. The reason I opposed the Premier was that I knew the Labour party would not allow him to carry out that policy. In the first place there was immigration. When they were supporting him they said it was only £50,000 ; when they were opposing him they opposed that amount as much as they possibly could.

Mr. BOWMAN : Why did you oppose the Premier at the last two elections ?

HON. R. PHILP : Simply because I knew that he could not carry out his policy with the aid of the hon. member and his party.

A LABOUR MEMBER : That is a reason why you should have helped him.

HON. R. PHILP : I say so now. No prosperity, or progress, can ever be carried on, so long as the Labour party have got the running of the Government.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER : They ran the Morgan Government for two years, and it was the best thing that ever happened for Queensland.

HON. R. PHILP : That is a matter of opinion. I know that the Morgan Government sold land freely, and the Labour party did not object to it at all.

Mr. HARDACRE : Yes, they did.

HON. R. PHILP : The hon. member for Clermont and the hon. member for Leichhardt did

object, but none of the others did, but sat calmly by. I did not object, because I agree with selling the land.

MR. LESINA: I went through Queensland against the Premier, and fought two elections.

HON. R. PHILP: Yes, the hon. member for Clermont and the hon. member for Leichhardt did oppose it, and spoke very strongly. The Labour party could have turned the Government out at any time if they had wanted, but they allowed one of the chief planks in their platform—that is the selling of land—to be utterly ignored for two years.

MR. THORN: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: That shows how inconsistent the Labour party are when they are supporting a Government.

MR. HARDACRE: They were too considerate to them altogether.

HON. R. PHILP: That was the Morgan Government that sold the land. I would say again that there are forty-nine members of this House at the present time who believe in the policy of the Government. How can any of those members vote with the leader of the Opposition in his want of confidence motion? Each and all of these men have gone to their constituents, and practically said "We will accept a policy similar to this one." Some have said "We will accept this policy"; and now, because there has been a fusion of parties, they say that is the reason for their opposition.

MR. MURPHY: That is the reason.

HON. R. PHILP: That is no reason. I say they ought to be better pleased to find that a large section of this House have come over to help them to carry out their policy. They felt that they could not alone carry out their policy, and they were quite satisfied to do it. They were not selfish in the matter. They said, "So long as this policy is carried out, it is for the good of the country, and we do not care who carries it out."

MR. HARDACRE: It is not the same policy though.

HON. R. PHILP: I say the policy now before this House is exactly the same policy on which the Kidston party went to the country and came back to this House.

MR. HARDACRE: No; no coalition first. (Laughter.) They have taken your policy now.

HON. R. PHILP: That is not the policy at all. I want to say that no man on this side of the House has interfered less with the members of the Government than I have done. I have been satisfied to find out from the local Press and this House what the Government were doing. I was quite satisfied, and I am quite satisfied now to go on and support the Government, so long as they carry out the policy which they propose to do.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: No member has any right to get up and twit me with being the Premier of Queensland. I say nobody has interfered with the Government less than I have done. I can refer to Ministers on the Treasury bench now, and to those who were there before we came over here. The hon. member for Barcoo is not here. The hon. member for Ipswich cannot say that I went to his office asking for anything at any time.

MR. BLAIR: I beg your pardon.

HON. R. PHILP: Did I ever go into your office and ask you for anything at any time?

MR. BLAIR: No.

MR. MANN: You used to interfere.

HON. R. PHILP: If ever I wanted anything, I always went to the Under Secretary, because any member can always get any [4.30 p.m.] information he wants from the Under Secretary instead of interviewing Premiers and Ministers and begging for things for themselves, as that is a thing which I have never done and do not propose to do.

MR. LESINA: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: There is no one in this House who has interfered less with the Ministers than I have.

MR. HAMILTON: Sometimes it is good policy not to interfere with Ministers.

MR. LESINA: You should always go to the Under Secretary, and not be under a compliment to the Minister. I never went to any Ministers either.

HON. R. PHILP: I cannot understand why those members who agreed to the coalition have gone to the other side of the House. There has been no good reason given as to why they have done so—none whatever. One man left because he was afraid of being conservatised. The hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Redwood, said he left because the Premier was not carrying out his policy. If the last session was a short one, who was to blame for that?

MR. MANN: The Premier.

HON. R. PHILP: Who voted the money for the Premier to go home, and who voted four months' Supply on last year's Estimates?

MR. BOWMAN: You did.

HON. R. PHILP: And the Labour party did too.

MR. BOWMAN: You gagged us last year.

HON. R. PHILP: I say that the whole House voted for that four months' Supply.

A LABOUR MEMBER: No, not at all.

HON. R. PHILP: I admit that there were some members of the House who did not know what they were voting for. (Government laughter.) The Treasurer, Mr. Airey, explained that it was for four months' Supply for the next year, and the money was voted by the House, and the money for the Premier to go home was also voted by the House.

MR. KEOGH: And it was money well spent.

HON. R. PHILP: Yes; I consider it was money well spent. The Premier did a lot of good for Queensland when he went home. The money we voted for that exhibition in London was also a good thing. I think that the advertisement which we got from that exhibition in London was a better advertisement than we ever had before in London, and it is likely to be a still better thing for this country.

MR. MULLAN: You got two syndicate railways. Those were your terms.

HON. R. PHILP: These railways were no more given to me than they were given to the hon. member for Maranoa.

MR. MULLAN: They were your terms.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: I was glad to vote for those railways. I and the members of my party voted for them. We are not a "dog-in-the-manger" party. We knew that the mines to which the railways were to be built were valuable properties, and as the owners of those mines were willing to advance the money to construct those railways why should we not support them? There was no better bargain made for any country than the Premier made with these people over the construction of those railways.

MR. HARDACRE: You said the terms were worse than yours.

HON. R. PHILP: I said that I thought the Government were making rather hard terms with the company.

MR. HARDACRE: You said the terms were worse than your own.

HON. R. PHILP: You can turn up *Hansard* and you will see what I said. I said that the Government were making hard terms with the company, as I thought it would be better if that £100,000 had been spent in developing the mines—opening them out and working them. It was a good bargain for the country, but not for the company. The company put £100,000 into it. I believe in lines being built to mining fields. I am a good friend to the miners, although I do not represent a mining field, and it is far better for all mining fields to be connected by railways. Would it not be a good thing for the Carpentaria district if that railway to Lawn Hills was constructed by the company? The hon. member for that electorate knows that it would be. It would open out that silver-field and would be a good thing for the country. But apparently the company, after going into the matter, are not going on with that railway, and I am very sorry, indeed, that they are not.

MR. MULLAN: They got a concession and hawked it.

HON. R. PHILP: It is a pity that the Lawn Hills line was not built, and the people of Queensland will suffer through that line not being constructed. The construction of that Mount Elliott line will be a good thing for the miners of Cloncurry. It is a valuable mine, and it is the only valuable mine which is working to some extent, and will be the only one for some time owing to the low price of copper. The people of Queensland cannot lose a single shilling by the construction of that railway line to Mount Elliott.

MR. HARDACRE: It will be ten times the price when we come to take it over.

MR. J. M. HUNTER: It ought to have been a State railway.

HON. R. PHILP: I would have been prepared to vote for it as a State railway.

MR. HAMILTON AND OTHER LABOUR MEMBERS: So were we.

HON. R. PHILP: I had some experience of the introduction of railways in this House. The Northern portion of Queensland is not largely represented. Three-fourths of the representation is in the South, because three-fourths of the people live in the South, and that means that the requirements of the South are first considered.

MR. HAMILTON: Yet you want to reduce the representation of the North.

HON. R. PHILP: Besides, at that time the Government had built the line to Cloncurry, and they got the company to assist in the building of the Mount Elliott line. That was a fair thing for the State, because if £100,000 is provided by companies for railway construction, then every shilling which the Government gets outside for that purpose means that they have that much more money available for the construction of other lines. The Mount Elliott line is being built by the Government and it will be worked by the Government. How anyone who wishes this country to prosper votes against a railway line of that description I cannot understand.

MR. HARDACRE: It will be ten times the price when we take it over.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: I am sorry I cannot follow the hon. member for Leichhardt as to how much

[*Hon. R. Philp.*]

the State will have to pay when they take the line over. The State takes the line over in ten years, and the payment is based on the average receipts for the last five years.

MR. HARDACRE: They will bump up the receipts.

HON. R. PHILP: They may bump them down. The mine might be worked out in ten years, or five years. Taking it on the whole, the Government have got a splendid bargain in that line.

MR. MULLAN: The worst bargain made in Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: I say that the company got the worst bargain, but the State got a good bargain. I am digressing somewhat from my speech. I want to point out what chance the State has of getting a line like that from the Independent Opposition with the Labour party behind them? It will mean that all the mines in the outside places will have no communication at all. It is not possible, in this young country with its small population, to build all the lines of railway that are required. The hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Airey, spoke of the large loan expenditure which we are incurring, and he said we were spending a million a year now. I always held myself that this State should spend a million a year. I consider that is good policy.

MR. MANN: It is money wasted.

HON. R. PHILP: That comes with very bad grace from the hon. member for Cairns, for there is no district which has been so well favoured by the Government in the matter of railways as the Cairns district. (Hear, hear!) I believe in the policy of the Government at the present time. (Hear, hear!) I certainly think that the agricultural centres ought to be tapped by railways, but we certainly want a line in Western Queensland. Anyone who knows anything about the Western country must know that we would be able to carry double the stock that we have at the present time if we had a Western railway built.

MR. HAMILTON: Longreach to Winton.

HON. R. PHILP: That is purely a local line.

MR. HAMILTON: It serves a big pastoral district.

HON. R. PHILP: But the people there are only 50 miles from a railway now. I would go 200 miles further west of Longreach, Winton, and Charleville, and I would build a line to Camooweal. If we built such a line, it would double the carrying capacity of the sheep country of Queensland. Some people are always sneering at the pastoral industry and the squatters, but it is the biggest industry that Queensland has at the present time. It is not so long ago that our flocks and herds were down to one-third or one-fourth what they are now. The country was in a bad state then. The hon. member for Barcoo knows that, and also the hon. member for Maranoa. But these flocks and herds have increased since then, and it is a good thing for Queensland. Everybody benefits when our flocks and herds are increasing in that way. Such a line as I propose would not be a political line at all. It would be a national line, and a line that every member of this House ought to subscribe to. If that railway were built, it would open out this back country, and we would get more people here to-day. All this underlies the present policy of the Government, which is going in for immigration, for land settlement, and for railways.

MR. HARDACRE: That was not in the Rockhampton programme.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: This is your programme.

HON. R. PHILP: Is it not a good thing then if we can improve the Rockhampton programme?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Ah, ah! and laughter.

MR. BOWMAN: I am afraid you have smothered it.

HON. R. PHILP: Does the hon. member for Leichhardt object to that?

MR. HARDACRE: I object to your party.

HON. R. PHILP: It is only a personal matter with the hon. gentleman. That is his only objection against it, because I suggested it to the Government. That is sufficient for him to oppose it.

MR. HARDACRE: I said your policy, not you.

HON. R. PHILP: Wherein does my policy differ from the Government policy? As we grow older we get wiser.

THE PREMIER: We can all improve.

MR. BOWMAN: There is no sign of improvement in you.

HON. R. PHILP: I should like to see members on both sides of the House try to come together and do something for Queensland. (Hear, hear!) We did very little last session, because, in my opinion, of the unwise opposition of hon. members opposite.

MR. RYLAND: Why didn't the Premier come back after Christmas?

HON. R. PHILP: I came back after Christmas once, and was sorry for doing so. The Hon. Sir Arthur Morgan came back after Christmas once, and I think he, too, was very sorry he did so. That hon. gentleman also met the House once in May, and I think he was very sorry for doing that. It is very easy for hon. members who have no ministerial responsibility to talk about coming back after Christmas, but it is a different matter with those who are charged with the administration of departments.

A LABOUR MEMBER: When did you find you had made a mistake?

HON. R. PHILP: I do not suppose there is any action in a man's life that he does not find he could do better the following day. The criticisms of hon. members on this matter, and their criticisms of the Government during the course of this debate, are not of a very serious nature. You may take up any department and find something that is bad in it or its administration, but on the whole the administration of the Government departments is exceedingly good. We have a splendid staff of men in the service, from the under secretaries and chief clerks downwards, and it is really the permanent heads of the departments who are mostly responsible for the administration. Ministers have to prepare their policy, to receive deputations, and to attend to the requests of members of Parliament. And, as I have said, on the whole you will find that the administration of the various Acts is mostly done by the permanent heads of departments. Were it otherwise matters would often be at a standstill. How could Ministers do all those things?

MR. BOWMAN: Sometimes one Minister runs the whole show.

HON. R. PHILP: When we sat on that side of the House, and the Labour party sat on this side, they had no objection at all to the administration of the Government. It was a capital Government, a splendid Government.

MR. HARDACRE: No.

HON. R. PHILP: Well, that was the opinion of members of the party—with two exceptions—the hon. member for Leichhardt, and the hon.

member for Clermont. Occasionally the hon. member for Fortitude Valley chipped in, but since he has been leader of the party he has been most mild.

MR. HAMILTON: Why didn't you come over and help us?

HON. R. PHILP: I never agreed with the methods of the party.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will refer as little as possible to these disorderly interjections.

HON. R. PHILP: I have no desire to be drawn away by interjections, but it is not always easy or desirable to pass them unnoticed. I have said that I do not think it is possible for a liberal policy to be carried out with the support of the Labour party. They are too much tied up, and they have to consult the Trades Hall.

MR. BOWMAN: They have not. Prove that statement.

HON. R. PHILP: Read the two letters which passed between the Premier and the Labour party just before the last election. The Premier is only responsible to his constituents, but the members of the Labour party are tied up by an organisation. Moreover, the Parliamentary Labour party decide in caucus how each member shall vote on a measure which comes before the House. I am certain that in his heart the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. May, wanted to vote for the railway to which I have alluded, but he could not do so, because his hands were tied by the Labour party. The Labour party may at some time have a majority in the House, but at the present time they can do nothing on their own initiative.

MR. BOWMAN: You are wrong.

HON. R. PHILP: We know that at one time Mr. Reid, of New South Wales, was supported by the Labour party, that they held a meeting, that nine voted for Mr. Reid, and eleven for Mr. Lyne, and they turned Mr. Reid out. Is that a state of things which should exist in any democratic country? Certainly not.

THE PREMIER: We have had it scores of times in Queensland.

HON. R. PHILP: Personally, I have nothing against the Labour party. Some of the members of that party I think a good deal of, and others I do not think much of. I helped the party with some planks in their platform, but I say that as a party they can never be a success in Queensland. They have never been a success in any part of Australia, because as soon as any of their members gets into a position they become jealous of him, and some of their best men have left them for that reason. That has been the case in Queensland and in other States of Australia. Mr. Glassey was the first man who came into this House as a Labour member.

MR. BOWMAN: No.

HON. R. PHILP: I say yes.

MR. BOWMAN: You are wrong.

HON. R. PHILP: No, I am not wrong.

MR. BOWMAN: Mr. Ryan was the first pledged man in this House.

HON. R. PHILP: Mr. Mann was in Scotland when Mr. Glassey entered the House. Mr. Ryan was the second Labour member who came into the House, and Mr. Glassey was recognised as the first leader of the Labour party.

MR. BOWMAN: Mr. Glassey was first returned as an independent supporter of Sir Samuel Griffith.

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

HON. R. PHILP: Ever since he was returned he was looked upon as the leader of the Labour party, and when he did something that was not approved of by the party he resigned, and appealed to his constituents. The Labour party put up a candidate against him, but he beat his opponent.

Mr. BOWMAN: But we beat him in the end.

HON. R. PHILP: Again, when the present Premier, Mr. Kidston, found he could not work honourably with the party, he left it and went to the country. Afterwards the party left him. Mr. Watson was also one of the leaders of the party, and he too was compelled to retire from the position. One of the reasons why Mr. Watson would not take a prominent position in the party was that he was too much tied up, and I dare say that you will find some day that he will join Mr. Deakin. Mr. Watson was at one time the leader of the Labour party in New South Wales, but he found that he was too much tied up.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER said: I hope the hon. member will not reply to these repeated interjections.

HON. R. PHILP: I am endeavouring to give a reason for—

The SPEAKER: I endeavour to prevent interjections, but the hon. member encourages them.

HON. R. PHILP: I am not responsible for members interjecting, but wish to go on the even tenor of my way without referring to them at all.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have supported a deputy-leader of the Labour party before to-day.

The SPEAKER: Order!

HON. R. PHILP: I think I have referred to Mr. Kerr, the hon. member for Barcoo, and need not say anything more about him. In my opinion, this debate has been going on too long. Very much the same thing has been said by each speaker, and I should have liked to have seen a division the third week of the debate. The hon. member for Nundah began his speech by saying that he thought a division might have been taken after the Premier, the leader of the Labour party, and the leader of the Independent Opposition had spoken, and then, for an hour and a-half, gave us reasons why he was going to vote against the Government. That hon. member came out last election as a strong supporter of Mr. Kidston.

Mr. ALLEN: And bound himself against a coalition.

HON. R. PHILP: Even if he said he would not support a coalition, what other course was open to him if he wanted the Government, which he was pledged to come here and support, to remain in office? The Labour party said distinctly they would no longer support the Kidston Government.

Mr. MANN: No, no!

HON. R. PHILP: They refused to go on with the Mount Elliott Railway Bill.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: They refused to give Supply after a time, and if the Philp party had not supported the Government at that time the Government would have had to resign.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: They would have been in chaos, and I say, as patriotic men, the only course open for us was to assist Mr. Kidston to carry out his policy.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[Hon. R. Philp.]

HON. R. PHILP: Then again, I say not one of those twelve men has given a good reason why they are sitting on that side of the House. Their position should be to support the measures brought in—measures they went to the country on and said they would support. When they find that policy being departed from, then they are justified in voting against the Government.

The PREMIER: It is only a personal matter.

HON. R. PHILP: It is only a personal matter against the leader of the Government, because for some reason—some say because he has joined our party—they commenced to paint him black, red, and all colours. Why should they object to him joining a respectable party?

Mr. MULLAN: Who said that?

HON. R. PHILP: I say distinctly they are a respectable party. What is the position? What is the cause of it, if it is not personal? It cannot be principle. There is no principle violated. Not a single principle is involved in this opposition. The policy of the Government is now before the country—before the House—and if any item in that policy is departed from, then—if they are vital—I say it is for those hon. members to oppose the Government. But while the Premier carries out the programme on which he went to the electors, and the agreement under which this party joined him—if these are carried out, I say there is no reason why any one of those twelve members should vote against the Government.

Mr. HAMILTON: Why did you oppose him last election if your policies are the same?

Mr. HUXHAM: Was it personal then?

HON. R. PHILP: I told this House the reason. We went as a party against Mr. Kidston because he was associated with the Labour party. I was thoroughly convinced that so long as he had them tied to his back he could not carry out his policy.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS interjecting,

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

HON. R. PHILP: That was found out in this House. The hon. member for Barcoo (Mr. Kerr) said last night he told the Premier if they "brought in the Mount Elliott Railway Bill you will offend the Labour party." The hon. member for Barcoo brought the Bill in, and he said, "this is a good Bill," and what objection did the Labour party have, because they themselves have gone against that policy. They have taken up a position in opposition to the present Government. I do not blame them. But none of the other forty-nine members have any right to vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley. Some of those hon. members were in the Cabinet and they are responsible for nine months of last year's administration. Also what objection have they to one of their own colleagues—the present Secretary for Mines? He is one of the first practical miners to be appointed to that position. We have had a good deal of information as to how bad things are in the mining districts. An hon. member last night said there were over 2,000 miners out of work. Therefore it is a good thing to have a practical miner—a man who has gone through the mill—in the Mines Department. Surely that is a good reason why he should be Minister for Mines. I know of my own knowledge that the hon. member for Kennedy has been amongst miners for many years.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Where?

HON. R. PHILP: In North Queensland. He knows a good deal more about mining than the members for Charters Towers—one of whom

is a bricklayer and the other is a telegraph operator. The Secretary for Mines has been connected with mines for many years.

MR. MULLAN: He has never been down a big mine in his life.

HON. R. PHILP: He has a good deal more knowledge of mining than either of the members for Charters Towers.

MR. MULLAN: You know nothing at all about it.

HON. R. PHILP: The new Minister for Mines has also lived a long time in North Queensland. He knows his electorate well, and knows Charters Towers well. He has the confidence of a great number of miners in Charters Towers and other parts of Queensland, and I would have thought there could have been no possible objection to the hon. member for Kennedy being appointed as Minister for Mines. Hon. members cannot say he knows nothing of mining. They might have said that of the late Minister for Mines. The present Secretary for Mines is also a man who has always taken a deep interest in mining matters in Queensland. I know when I passed the Mining Act in 1897 no member took a keener interest in that Act than the present Secretary for Mines, and Mr. Browne, the late member for Croydon. Out of fifteen or sixteen mining members those two hon. members took the leading part in criticising that Act, and helping me to make it better. He is an old member—I think he was returned in 1893—and certainly there cannot be any personal objection to Mr. Jackson. Then, again, the hon. member for Mackay, Mr. Paget, the present Secretary for Agriculture and Railways, has a good knowledge of agriculture. Certainly there can be no personal objection to him as a Minister. None whatever. Again, Mr. Barnes, the Minister for Education. He has only just taken office. There are three ex-Ministers on that side of the House; and if anything has been done that should not have been done, it has been done by their old colleagues. Then, again, we have Mr. Appel, the member for Albert, as Home Secretary. He is a native of Queensland, and I think it speaks well that we should have a native of Queensland in that office. Then we have the member for Oxley as Minister for Lands. I think everyone will admit that he is an excellent Minister. There can be no personal objection to him at all. Then, again, the Treasurer. He is also a native, and he was the colleague of those three hon. members, who at one time sat on this side. What objection can they have to their old colleagues? The Premier at one time belonged to that party. When the Labour party was supporting the present Premier they could not find a better man in the whole of Australia. He was carrying on the policy he is carrying on now. It took hon. members opposite years and years to find out how bad he is, forgetting that they are condemning their own action, because they supported nearly all the measures he has brought in. Now, I contend that this opposition to the present Government is only a personal matter. There are forty-nine members of the House pledged to support the policy now brought in by the present Government.

MR. J. M. HUNTER: No coalition.

HON. R. PHILP: Fancy any man saying that there is to be no coalition in politics! The two strongest men who ever sat in this Chamber were Sir Samuel Griffith and the late Sir Thomas McIlwraith, and they [5 p.m.] thought that, in the interests of Queensland, they should come together. It was a splendid thing in the interests of Queensland that they came together. It

stopped a great deal of squabbling, and prevented chaos in the affairs of Queensland. The party which objects to a coalition is having a coalition itself. The hon. member for Toowoomba, the hon. member for Cairns, and the hon. member for Woothakata have coalesced. The hon. member for Woothakata was at one time Labour, at one time Kidstonite, and I have heard him say at one time that even I was not a bad fellow. He has gone back to the other side of the House—I believe they have promised him a Minister for Railwayship, but I do not know whether it is true or not; at any rate he has gone there. (Laughter.) I cannot for the life of me understand why there should be any opposition at all. I say it is simply personal animus directed against the head of the Government. If I was there the same men would be against me.

MR. BOWMAN: It has taken you a long time to find this out.

HON. R. PHILP: I have been there before, and the Labour party was just as bitter against me as they are against the Premier.

MR. BOWMAN: They have every reason to be.

HON. R. PHILP: That is their policy—intense bitterness.

LABOUR MEMBERS: No; untrue!

HON. R. PHILP: That is the policy of the Labour party—down Kidston! With the exception of two members, they allowed him to sell as much land as he liked.

MR. BOWMAN: They did not.

HON. R. PHILP: I agree with the selling of the land. The hon. member for Clermont and the hon. member for Leichhardt were the only two men in this Chamber who raised their voices against it.

MR. HARDACRE: We voted against it.

HON. R. PHILP: I say they were the only two members.

MR. BOWMAN: No; you are wrong.

HON. R. PHILP: At that time they had thirty-five members, and could have turned the Government out if they liked. I think I have taken up as much time of the House as I ought to take up, but I certainly cannot see any justification for the vigorous opposition against the Government. The Government are carrying out their policy as they promised to carry it out; if it has not been carried out very hastily it is because of the unseemly opposition they have been subjected to. Members of their own Government have turned round and betrayed Cabinet secrets on the floor of the House, and denounced their former leader. If I could not agree with my former leader I would say nothing about him. I say, in regard to the hon. member for Ipswich, the hon. member for Brisbane South, and the hon. member for Barcoo, that their conduct has not been in good taste at all, and it would be better, if they could not agree with the Premier, to walk across the floor of the House and say so. It shows their bitterness. I wonder what we are getting to in public life. It is getting so that men who can find other employment outside the House will not be induced to contest an electorate at all. I hope that when the division comes the Premier will have a majority—I hope he will carry on the business of the country, even with the majority he has got.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: A majority of one?

HON. R. PHILP: Yes, even if he has only one.

MR. BOWMAN: He has got a good master.

THE SPEAKER: Order, order!

*Hon. R. Philp.]*

HON. R. PHILP: I am satisfied that the country are with the present Government, and I am not afraid to go to the country—I was not afraid last year.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: You would carry on with one.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not suppose that this House is prepared to say that I am taking a wrong course in endeavouring to suppress ejaculations.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: No one can show me any authority in the records of any Parliament, or in our own Standing Orders, which go to show that I am wrong in doing so; and yet I find, despite my constant efforts to repress these ejaculations, that hon. members who have been in this House as long as I have—the oldest members here—are apparently the most persistent interjectors. I hope the overpowering good sense of this House, on both sides, will support me successfully in endeavouring to suppress these ejaculations.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: You will always have my support, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I would much prefer that the hon. gentleman would ignore these ejaculations.

HON. R. PHILP: It is very difficult to do so. I do not care about talking in spite of the interjections. Remarks were made which were not strictly true. I repeat again that this opposition to the present Government is purely a personal one. There has not been a reason given by any member on that side of the House why a vote should be given for the want of confidence motion.

Mr. LESINA: I gave one.

HON. R. PHILP: I think you gave as many for as against. (Loud Labour laughter.) I am satisfied that the country wants a Government like the present one. They want a Government that will open up the country; which, at all events, knows the wants of the country; and they also want a Government that will have the confidence of the people here and in the old land as well.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have not got a monopoly of knowledge there.

HON. R. PHILP: At all events, I am satisfied that there is not a monopoly over there.

Mr. BARBER: We do not claim it.

HON. R. PHILP: I do not claim to know more than most people, but I do claim to know more about the country than many members of this House. I am not sitting on the Government benches now, and my services are available to the House at any time. I am not exclusively tied down to one side of the House, but I am going to support the Government so long as they carry out the policy they have enunciated. I hope the good sense of the leader of the Opposition will permit him to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BOWMAN: No chance.

HON. R. PHILP: The debate has been attended with a good deal of personal bitterness, which is deplorable.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is not my fault.

HON. R. PHILP: I am glad to say the hon. gentleman delivered a temperate speech, but there has been a good deal of bitterness during the debate, which is not of benefit to Queensland. I say the electors of Queensland are not benefited one iota by this debate. What do

[*Hon. R. Philp.*]

they care whether so-and-so said so-and-so or not? They want business done. They find no business being done; and remember, when the elections come forth they will blame the gentlemen opposite for the stoppage of business. I say the blame will fall on the right shoulders when they blame the other side of the House for stopping the business.

Mr. MANN: They blamed you for stopping it once.

HON. R. PHILP: I have been in the House for twenty-three years. I have never known a debate take so long before.

Mr. BOWMAN: You had fourteen speakers on that side of the House and we had only fourteen speakers from the Labour party.

HON. R. PHILP: For every speaker on this side there were two speakers on the Opposition.

Mr. BOWMAN: No. Decidedly not.

HON. R. PHILP: Only yesterday afternoon two members from that side of the House occupied the whole day. Just fancy two members taking up the whole of the time for one day! If we went on at that rate of progress, we would be here for thirty-six days discussing this motion.

Mr. BOWMAN: The Minister for Mines was the chief aggressor. He made the longest speech.

HON. R. PHILP: And he made a very good speech. He was unjustly accused of doing something which he did not do, and he had to make his position clear, and I consider that he made a very good speech. I hope that hon. members on the other side will endeavour to bring this debate to a close this week.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

HON. R. PHILP: I think it is only a fair thing that we should come to a vote, seeing that this is the fifth week.

A LABOUR MEMBER: Take it now.

HON. R. PHILP: So far as I am concerned I will sit down at once if a vote is to be taken. I certainly think that we should arrange to take the vote on this question to-morrow night.

Mr. BOWMAN: Arrangements may be made to take it earlier than that if you are willing.

HON. R. PHILP: I am not the leader of the House. You will have to ask him about that.

The PREMIER: We will take the vote to-night if you like.

Mr. BOWMAN: I am willing.

LABOUR MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: You will take the vote when we are ready to let you take it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Ah! and laughter.

HON. R. PHILP: The party led by the leader of the Opposition want to coalesce with that party over there, and they are refusing their allegiance to the Labour party already.

Mr. LESINA: There is no coalition with this party.

Mr. BOWMAN: No; and that is a statement which you made two or three times this afternoon, which is most unfair.

HON. R. PHILP: I am pleased to hear that there is not a coalition. But you are working together.

Mr. BOWMAN: So did your parties work together.

HON. R. PHILP: I thought you were coalescing, but if it is not so, I must apologise. The two parties in opposition only agree on one thing, and that is to down the present Government. (Opposition cheers.) What is to happen

after that they do not care. If they succeed in putting the present Government out of office, after that there will be nothing but confusion and chaos. I think there should be an election.

Mr. RYLAND: Not necessarily.

HON. R. PHILP: It is not possible to carry on for very long with the position of parties as it is at the present time, and I think it would be better for the country to have an election. Let the country settle it. The country will have a better opportunity this time of settling the matter, because we will have one solid party going to ask them to return us here again. I am satisfied that the country are not in accord with this stoppage of business, and they are not in accord with this internal private complaining and digression into things which ought not to be brought into this Chamber at all. The country does not want to concern itself about what the hon. member for Ipswich says, or what the hon. senior member for Toowoomba says. They want to know what the House is doing; what is the best thing for the country, and what this Parliament is going to do for the country. We say that at present they are doing nothing. What sort of a position are hon. members in on the other side of the House? They are only animated by personal animosity. They are thinking of nothing but personal animus. I pointed out the individual members of the Ministry and they could not find fault with any of them on personal grounds. Personal animus is at the bottom of it, just because the Premier was at one time a member of the Labour party.

Mr. BOWMAN: Because he sold us.

Mr. MURPHY: Because he betrayed the country.

HON. R. PHILP: The hon. member for Croydon was a member of the Labour party and he left it to join Mr. Kidston's party, and now he has left the Kidston party to join the Blair party. He has only been in the House for a few years and he has belonged to a different party every year. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: I never left the Labour party. The Labour party shifted me for saying that Kidston was a good man.

HON. R. PHILP: I would like to see this vote taken to-night. Look at the business we have to do. There are four railways lying on the table looking at us. (Opposition laughter.)

The PREMIER: They have been there for a month.

HON. R. PHILP: Look at the big programme of the Government. When those Bills are brought in, that is the time for those forty-nine members who are pledged to the Rockhampton programme to say whether they will support the Government or not. I hope that when this vote is taken we shall be able to get to business.

Mr. MULLAN: With a majority of one?

HON. R. PHILP: Yes, even with a majority of one.

Mr. BOWMAN: You will hang on to it.

HON. R. PHILP: Let me tell hon. gentlemen that one of the finest men we ever had in this Parliament, Sir Arthur Palmer, carried on right through a whole Parliament with a majority of one vote. And there is no reason why we should not do the same. Thirty-six men are better than thirty-five any day. (Laughter.) There is no reason why the thirty-six members sitting on this side of the House should not carry on the business before this session closes. This is July, and we could go on till Christmas. We have four or five months ahead of us in which to do business.

If the leader of the Labour Party is at all sincere when he says he will support measures and not men—

Mr. BOWMAN: Hear, hear!

HON. R. PHILP: He will support these measures. He said he supported measures and not men.

Mr. BOWMAN: I did.

HON. R. PHILP: And yet the hon. gentleman, after telling me that, once went and voted against it.

Mr. BOWMAN: Because it was a bad measure. (Laughter.)

HON. R. PHILP: It was not a bad measure at all. I hope the hon. gentleman has learned something since then. If he is sincere in saying that he supports measures and not men then he will support the Government in carrying out the business which it has put before the country.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*), who was received with Labour "Hear, hears!" said: As an old member of this House, I wish to express my deep sympathy and regret at the death of the late Hon. John Leahy, and also the death of the late Mr. Campbell, the hon. member for Moreton.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. HARDACRE: Although they were both political opponents, I think that all members sitting on this side of the House—

The SPEAKER: Order! I called the House to order, and I hope hon. members will preserve order.

Mr. MANN: I rise to a point of order. I cannot hear the remarks of the Speaker owing to the conversation which is going on between the hon. member for Townsville and the Premier.

Mr. HARDACRE: Although both of those hon. members who have passed away were political opponents of ours, I think I am expressing the views of members sitting on this side, as well as my own, when I say that we regret as sincerely as any portion of the House that those two gentlemen have passed away. (Hear, hear!) Whilst I have been in this House I noticed that apart from whatever political opinions they held they were men who were worthy of respect. (Hear, hear!) I exceedingly regret the loss which this Chamber has suffered by the death of those gentlemen. Now, there has been in this debate a great deal of irrelevancy. There has been talk on all kinds of questions and subjects. It reminds me of the man's address on "Rambles through the Universe," with remarks on magicians, geni, and also various other matters by the wayside. The debate so far has been something of that description, and I am going to bring the question back to the point so far as I am able. I will first deal with the hon. member for Townsville, who has just sat down. One thing he was remarkable for was the utter recklessness of his statements. There was scarcely a statement made by the hon. member that was not received by refutations, contradictions by the very men with whom he is now associated. He guessed at his facts, then multiplied them by two, brought them into this House, and put them forward as truths.

HON. R. PHILP: I always spoke the truth.

Mr. HARDACRE: I think hon. members must have enjoyed the position the hon. member for Townsville occupied this afternoon, hearing his powerful pleading in support of the Premier and his policy—hearing him support a man who twelve months ago went through the country

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

trying to hound him out of office as the man who was trying to rob the people of this State of their constitutional rights, who was trying to override the rights of the people, and who made assertions in regard to the hon. member of a most opprobrious character. It was said last night with truth that the Premier is the new political Rizzio, who is clinging to the robes of the hon. member for Townsville in order to save himself from political execution. The Premier had to sit there this afternoon listening to the pleadings of the hon. member for Townsville in his support, knowing that without the hon. member's help he could not retain office for one moment. This motion of want of confidence is the second motion of want of confidence that has been levelled against the Government since the coalition was formed. The first motion last session was to the effect that the Government did not possess the confidence of this House because the coalition was formed against the will of the people as given expression to at the ballot-box at the last election. This new motion is much wider than the first, and for an extremely good reason, because it not only includes all that was stated in the first motion, but it also deals with the effect of the coalition. The hon. member for Townsville could not see how any of the twelve members who have left the Government since the coalition was formed could oppose the Government. Now, I see a good many reasons for their doing so. It is about fourteen months since the coalition was first formed nominally—of course it was actually entered into at a much more recent date; but we all know that in essence and in fact it was formed fourteen months ago, before the Premier went to England. And what has happened since then? The hon. member for Oxley in one of his speeches last year told his constituents that the Premier had done nothing but sow confusion in the political affairs of the State, and that assertion has been borne out by the results of the coalition. We have practically done nothing for fourteen months. First of all, the Premier went to England, and we had a suspension of this House for about six months. After he came back, we had a short session, when we had everything put through with the "gag" and the "guillotine." Then we had another long recess, and here we are once more face to face with the fact that, just as we had a barren session last year, so there is every appearance of nothing being done this session, and for some time to come. In fact, the whole effect of the coalition has been to produce political chaos, and to cause nothing but dissatisfaction in the public service, and in regard to public affairs generally. Practically we have had a suspension of representative government. Practically we have had the rule of autocracy. The Premier spoke of the Czar suspending his Duma. Why, ever since the coalition was formed we have been a Duma with no rights; with no power to criticise the administration of the various departments of State; and, as a result, there has grown up utter dissatisfaction in the departments. Nearly every department is reeking with dissatisfaction. Men are leaving the Police Department because of the low pay and the unsatisfactory conditions. One member of the New South Wales Parliament pointed out that in New South Wales they were living in a fool's paradise so far as the Police Force was concerned, and I say we are living in a fool's paradise so far as our Police Force is concerned. There is discontent throughout the service. Then take the Railway Department—more dissatisfaction again. We have had members in this House stating that there is sufficient cause for dissatisfaction in the department to warrant the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into it. Then take the

[*Mr. Hardacre.*]

case of the Lands Department. The present Secretary for Lands the other night tried to make out a good case for his administration.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:** And he succeeded.

**MR. HARDACRE:** He succeeded in showing what they were going to do.

**THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:** In showing what they had done.

**MR. HARDACRE:** Why, the hon. gentleman has only been practically a few weeks—two months at the most—in office! What credit can he take for the administration of his department? But I do not want to deal with the administration so much as to get to the main question. I wish to point out sufficient reasons for every member of that Independent Opposition party voting against the coalition, even if they have been favourable to the coalition in the past. There is sufficient justification for them voting against it now, because of the evil results brought about by the coalition. Practically it has suspended parliamentary representation, and has given us a rule of autocracy; it has caused dissatisfaction in the public service, and it has prevented hon. members from criticising affairs of State. As the Hon. Mr. Barlow said in South Brisbane last year—

If Mr. Philp gets into power there will be an end to humanitarian legislation.

If Mr. Philp gets back into power he will start on a reactionary career, and with the "gag," the closure, and the Standing Order called the "guillotine," no Opposition will be able to stop him.

That prophecy has been absolutely borne out by the results of the coalition. Practically the hon. member for Townsville has got back to power. I know that he is not nominally in power, but he is behind the Government, and he is dictating terms to the Government. He is compelling the Premier to go on the course that he wants to go, and, as the result, we have had nothing but "gag" and "guillotine" and suspension of parliamentary representation ever since the coalition was formed.

**OPPOSITION MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDACRE:** That is ample justification for any man in this House who knows what has gone on since the coalition was formed determining to vote the Government out in the best interests of this country.

**OPPOSITION MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDACRE:** The motion moved last session, to my mind, is the wider and the most important question. To me the greatest justification for voting the present Government out of office is because they have betrayed the people. They have got on those Treasury benches by false promises. They have issued a false political prospectus. They have got there by trickery. One of the chief accusations of the Premier against the hon. member for Townsville, when the latter was in office some twelve months ago, was that he had first lied—as the Premier said—to the Government, and that he had afterwards lied to the representatives of the people. My charge against the Premier is that he and his supporters have got on those Treasury benches—not by lying to the Governor, not by lying to the representatives of the people, but by lying to something greater and far higher than either Governor or representatives of the people—by lying to the sovereign people of this State.

**OPPOSITION MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. HARDACRE:** Twelve months ago the Premier went through this country raising the great constitutional issue. He told the people that self-government was in danger; that the rights of the people were being ridden over

rough-shod by the hon. member for Townsville and those supporting him. I say that to-day the issue is just as great, just as high, and just as inspiring, as it was twelve months ago, because, after all, the issue is just the same. It is the constitutional issue. The question is not their policy—not the personal good qualities or bad qualities of any member on that side of the House; but the one supreme question is that they have got there, not merely without the consent of the people, but that they have got there against the consent of the people; and, having got there against the consent of the people, it is the supreme duty of every member of this House, no matter what his political opinions may be, if he has any respect for the principle of self-government, if he has any respect for the principle of the people ruling over the affairs of the State, to turn that Government out and compel them to go to the electors and get a mandate from them before they occupy a position of that kind.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Well, alter the wording of your amendment and I will vote with you.

Mr. KENNA: We don't want your vote.

Mr. HARDACRE: I can quite understand the hon. member for Townsville being surprised at anyone voting against the Government [5.30 p.m.] ment, and seeing no reason why they should vote against the Government, because he did not see any reason why members should vote against his Government after they had been defeated five times in this House by a majority of the people's representatives. The hon. gentleman had a good policy, and he asked why members should not support him in his policy—the same policy, he says, as he is supporting now. There was one good and sufficient reason, and that was that he was there without the consent and against the wishes of the people. If that was a good and sufficient reason then for turning the Government out—and the people of the country said it was—then it is a good and sufficient reason why we should vote the present Government out, no matter what their policy may be, because they are in office against the wishes of the people.

Mr. KENNA: They are there by false pretences.

Mr. HARDACRE: They are there by false pretences and by political trickery. They have got there by making statements to the people which they are not carrying out. Indeed, they are doing the very opposite of carrying out those statements.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Members on this side advocated the coalition at the time of the election.

Mr. HARDACRE: Last year I unintentionally did the hon. member for Townsville an injustice. I said he also was to blame because he had entered into the coalition against the wishes of the people. I made a slight mistake in that statement. At the election in 1908 the hon. member stated at one meeting that he was prepared to enter into a coalition, so that as far as he is concerned there is some excuse for his action.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Does that not break down the whole of your argument?

Mr. HARDACRE: No; because the Premier, with twenty-four of his supporters, and members on this side of the House, made the distinct and clear assertion that if they were returned to Parliament they would not enter into a coalition with the Philp party. In order that there may be no disputing of that statement, I shall quote

a few words uttered by the Premier at Rockhampton immediately before the election. The hon. gentleman said—

As to the broad results of the election, there were many little matters in dispute concerning which people might differ. But one thing was settled so that there could not very well be any dispute about it. That was that the electors of Queensland did not want the Philp party back at any price.

The hon. gentleman made that statement, not merely the night before the election, but again and again, at almost every centre that he spoke in throughout the election campaign. He made it, in various forms and phrases, at Toowoomba, Rockhampton, at the Exhibition Building in Brisbane, and at various other places in the country. The leader of the Labour party made a statement, practically, to the same effect. At Charleville, the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, in one of his first speeches in the campaign, said—

Mr. Kidston and Labour were combining to oust the Philp Government.

There are two statements made by the two leaders of two large sections in the House who constitute the majority. In both it was clearly put before the electors that the one supreme issue at that election was that, whatever little differences there might be between themselves, they were combined to put the Philp Government out, and to keep them out. But, in spite of that statement, hon. members opposite have done what the electors told them they should not do, and seeing that they have gulled and deceived the people, they are now wrongfully on the Treasury bench. That reason alone, if there were no other, makes it the supreme duty of every member who desires to see public policy—

Mr. KENNA: And public decency.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; it is the supreme duty of every member who desires to show respect to public policy, to public decency, and to the great democratic principle of modern times that the people themselves shall rule, to vote against the Government. It is our business to put them out.

Mr. KENNA: That is one of the chief justifications for the amendment.

Mr. HARDACRE: I have given proof of the betrayal of the people by the Premier. I want now to show how great that betrayal is. The issue at the last election was one of the highest, greatest, and most inspiring issues that has ever been put before the people of this country. It was the supreme question of the people's right to absolutely control the government of the State, the right of the people's representatives to rule in Parliament against an oligarchy which was trying to override their rights which had been won after centuries and centuries of struggle and battle in English history. I should like now to read some statements made by the Premier during that election campaign, particularly his last inspiring message to the people of Queensland. On the eve of the election he gave the following noble message to the people:—

GANG FORWARD TO VICTORY TO-MORROW.  
Message to the Electors from William Kidston.

Electors of Queensland—

Once to every man and nation  
Comes the moment to decide,  
In the strife 'twixt truth and falsehood,  
For the good or evil side.

To-morrow is a day of destiny for Queensland, and you are the arbiters of fate that day. The future of Queensland is in your hands. His Excellency has asked you to decide to-morrow virtually whether you mean to maintain your rights as a self-governing people or whether you are willing to surrender those rights.

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

Let your answer be "No Surrender." Shame on all who desert the people's cause to-morrow. Men and women of Queensland, the eyes of Australia are upon you. Fear not, hesitate not; but gang forward to victory.

Another occasion at Rockhampton, he said—

We will teach Robert Philp and his supporters not to lay profane hands upon the ark of self-government.

The men whom he d-dred to lay profane hands on the ark of government have now got hold of the ark of government. He told the electors that the Philp party were reactionaries, and that the fight was really between the forces of conservatism and democracy, which were in a death grip over this great question. The then Premier, Hon. R. Philp, simply brought about the election as a gambler who has been ruined already—he made a last desperate throw—a last desperate chance to recover himself. He said it was a last desperate chance for the old Philp party, and to-day they have got another chance. This is their last desperate chance. It is the chance given to them by the hon. member for Rockhampton—the Premier. He has given them this new desperate chance by coalescing with the Philp party, so that, notwithstanding the violation of the people's wishes, it will keep him in office. I have proved not only the betrayal—I have proved the greatness of the betrayal—and I say when we recognise the supreme question at issue, no man in this House who can rise to the full responsibilities of the position, who can rise to the full issue of the question, can do anything else but vote to put the Government out, no matter what consequences may follow. We have no desire at the present time to keep the Government in office for the sake of their policy. Why, we simply take up the same stand as the Premier did last year. We do not care what the policy is. What we want to know—what we have to settle—is, how they have got there, and what right they have to be there at all. When the Hon. Robert Philp put forward practically the same policy as the Government to-day put forward, that is the stand the present Premier took up. He said, "The hon. member for Townsville, the then Premier, is trying to evade the issue—he is trying simply to make a blare of promises to throw dust in the eyes of the people, to evade the question at issue. The question is not their policy, but how they got there, and what right they have there at all." As I told the Premier last year, "The wrong king is on the throne. The king has got there by usurpation of the rights of the people. He has got there by cheating the people out of their rights." And as one man who objects to that, I am going to give my vote against the Government. I call to mind, when I think of the way the people rose in response to the Premier's appeal to them, and as the results of it—I cannot help thinking of the derisive way in which Lowell ridiculed the voters who believed they were voting for something in the way of progress, and voted for something almost totally opposite, as they did at that time.

So they march in processions and get up "hurrahs,"  
And tramp through the mud for the good of the cause,  
And think they're kind of fulfilling the prophecies.  
When they're only just changing the holder of offices.  
Where A sat afore, B is comfortably seated,  
One humbue's victorious, the other defeated.

Mr. AIREY: This is Constitution Government. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: I said the Premier must be proud to see the position he is in to-day—the position of having to hang on, as one of his followers said, by "the skin of his teeth," and by the assistance of the very man he made such harsh accusations against last year. What did he tell the country? That the party he now

wants to support him had tried to rob the people of their constitutional rights. He told them they had disfranchised the electors by fixing the date of election before a certain 9,600 electors became fully registered electors in order to vote. He told them that the party now supporting him were a party who had actually used the postal vote for intimidating the electors—the women. He told them the party now supporting him were a party who actually had tampered with the judiciary of the country for political party purposes. We are told that the real reason for voting against the Government is one of personal feeling—as the hon. member for Townsville says—that we are simply imbued with personal animus.

Mr. AIREY: The feeling is only on this side of the House. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes. I would just like to say this with regard to the Premier's own statement on this matter. This is an old gag of his. I heard it somewhere about thirteen years ago when the Premier was in the unfortunate condition in Rockhampton that he had to go into liquidation. I remember well he made the same excuse to me then. I was one of his colleagues at the time, and I asked him in a friendly way how he managed to get into that position. He said, "It is the personal animus of the Rockhampton people against me. It is the personal vindictiveness of the Rockhampton merchants against me. Because I took up a certain position in politics they have hounded me out of my business." Whatever happens, it is personal animus against him. The hon. member said, "They do not believe in me."

Mr. KENNA: His politics and me. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: In case there should be some mistake in that matter—we are all liable to have prejudices; we do not know sometimes we have prejudices. I freely admit that; and, therefore, in order that I should make no mistake upon that matter, I thought I would refer to some impartial persons and organs for the purpose of finding out their opinions. You know that when a gentleman is personally accused in court the lawyer on his side sometimes brings a respectable citizen to give testimony as to his character. I thought I would go to some of the hon. gentleman's present supporters and friends just to see whether I was wrong—whether I was actually imbued with prejudices, or whether my opinions of him were actually based upon good grounds. And the first organ that I went to was the *Brisbane Courier*. Surely no man—not even the Premier himself—can object to the *Courier* being brought in the witness-box to testify to his character. It is the paper that eulogises him to-day—he is the statesman of the day, he is the one man Queensland cannot do without to-day, he is everything noble, everything virtuous—and if its opinion is worth anything, if its support is worth anything to-day, surely its testimony of twelve months ago ought to be taken in regard to his character.

Mr. BOWMAN: It wanted to crucify him then.

Mr. HARDACRE: I find the *Courier* said some very nice things about the hon. gentleman, and unfortunately for the hon. gentleman they do not agree with the opinion of the hon. member for Townsville, though, rightly or wrongly, it agrees with the opinion I have formed of the hon. gentleman. I find the *Courier* describes him, amongst other things, as a bundle of contradictions, a Premier without a policy, a political recalcitrant, a master in the art of prevarication, a political adventurer, a shallow politician, a discredited politician, with playing different characters at every place he visits, as a political

[Mr. Hardacre.

adventurer who would stoop to almost anything for the purpose of regaining office. It describes him as a man who has no sincerity—insincerity is one of the main features of his character. Some of the things have already been mentioned, but there is one thing I would like to quote—

There appears no limit to the depths of dissimulation to which Kidston will descend, either for the sake of regaining or retaining office.

Mr. BOWMAN: That is true.

Mr. HARDACRE: I think, if anything has been proved, that has been proved.

Mr. LENNON: As true as Holy Writ.

Mr. HARDACRE: It has been proved by the fact that he has to-day submitted to enter into coalition with the very man whom he described with the most opprobrious epithets some twelve months ago. Perhaps the Premier at this time was rather vindictive. He might have been, as the Premier says, imbued with personal animus, so I watched the paper, the *Daily Mail*, which states as follows:—

What has Mr. Kidston done to prove himself or justify the people's trust? He has had the very best of seasons, and what does the country get in return? Simply a harvest of broken promises. The man's own capacity for turning political somersaults is responsible for the present unpopularity of Kidston.

I want to know what the Premier says in regard to that? Is the *Daily Mail* also imbued with personal animus and bitterness against him.

Mr. KERR: He takes it as a compliment.

Mr. HARDACRE: Now, sometimes I am inclined to think that the Premier is imbued with personal bitterness, and it is just as well to say something with regard to the character that he gives the men who are now supporting him. We were told the other night by the Premier that the men who were opposing him were simply a discordant, furious section; that they had no policy or agreement in any way whatever. There was spleen here, and disappointed hopes there; they wanted a land tax there, but they did not want it here; they wanted immigration there, and they did not want it here. I would just like to say that, even if that be so, we never got a tax on land values from the present Premier. We supported him for years, and we never got a tax on land values; and, therefore, there is no inconsistency in our getting support from those gentlemen, even if they do not give us a tax on land values, but give us other good measures. With regard to immigration, whilst it is true that this party is against the system of immigration for the character proposed by the hon. senior member for Townsville, this party is not opposed to immigration on right lines. Apart from the question of State-aided immigration, this party is as much in favour of populating this country as any party in the State. I quite agree with that. There is no inconsistency in the members of the Independent party being on this side of the House in regard to this matter. But there is a serious inconsistency on the part of the Premier, and I would just like to refer to some of the names that he called them—the lack of harmony on the Government side of the House. He described the hon. members who are sitting with him now—the senior member for Townsville and his party—as pirates, who had got hold of the ship of State, and they had no consideration for the passengers or the ship itself. I would like to know what the hon. member for Bulimba thinks of that. We know what he called the Premier. The Premier called the hon. member for Townsville a buccaneer—"the mildest mannered man that ever cut a throat or scuttled ship." He

went further than that, he called them pirates who got hold of the ship of State, and now he, once having been the captain of a loyal merchant ship, has joined the pirates. Besides that there are some other discrepancies and discordancies amongst hon. members on that side of the House. The hon. member for Townsville said of one thing that the Premier did in his own personal capacity of Premier, that he actually committed a political job—with regard to the wire-netting which was sold to a certain firm in this city at the instance of the junior member for Rockhampton, he said that the Premier had gone out of his way in this matter, and had actually committed what he termed a great political job.

Mr. MURPHY: Moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes. Then the hon. member for Bulimba also termed another transaction that the Government carried out as a political job—the purchase of Jimbour. The Premier also described the action of the hon. member for Bulimba in the purchase of the Maryvale Estate—I don't know whether he called it a political job, but he inferred it—he said it was an illegal transaction perpetrated by the hon. member without the sanction of this House, and that he had not the legal power to enter into the transaction.

Mr. LESINA: For electioneering purposes.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes. Then the hon. member for Toowong said of some members on the front benches that they had not clean hands—actually were guilty of carrying on the Government without clean hands.

Mr. MURPHY: The member for Brisbane North said that they ought to be in gaol.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARDACRE: Those are some of the things which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have said one against the other. They have described each other, with the most opprobrious epithets, as being pirates buccaneering the ship of State, as perpetrating political jobs, as having disfranchised the electors, as having used the postal vote for intimidation, as having tampered with the judiciary of the State, and of having robbed the people of their constitutional rights; and now all these gentlemen are sitting together for some purpose against the people. There is an old saying that "When rogues fall out, honest people will get their own"; but in this case the people will not get their own.

Mr. LESINA: They want to keep us out of office. (Laughter.)

Mr. HARDACRE: On this ground alone, there is ample justification for any man in this House who believes in political honesty to try to do something which will lift up the politics of this country until there is something like respect for political morality—there is ample justification, whatever comes, to turn that Government out, and let the people have a chance of saying whether they are with them or not. When we have a Government born of evil, born in defiance of the will of the people, born of deception, the result is inevitably bound to be evil. And that is proved by the position of affairs in the country. Practically

[7 p.m.] all legislation is suspended; there is a state of chaos; and there is no promise of any good business being done by the coalition on the other side. Attempts have been made by the Premier and other members opposite to evade the issue, and they have adopted the lawyers' argument—"If you have

*Mr. Hardacre.*<sup>1</sup>

no case, abuse the other side"—and have made charges of various kinds against members on this side. Take, for example, the hon. member for Woolloomooloo the other night. All he could say was practically this: "If I did wrong, I know somebody on the other side who had a cousin who did wrong, too," and the Premier practically adopted the same line of argument; he never touched the question at issue—the question of the unconstitutional position of the Government. You know that at the back of our Constitution is the self-governing principle—the people's right to rule; and it is just as politically immoral to try to carry on the Government against the consent of the people as expressed at the election as it was for the hon. member for Townsville to try to carry on against the will of the representatives of the people. In fact, it is a far greater wrong. As Macaulay has shown, and Erskine May has shown, there have been times in the history of the British Parliament when the House of Commons itself has been corrupt, when the destinies of the country and the well-being of the people were at the mercy of a corrupt Parliament. If a Parliament can be corrupt, it does not justify its existence by remaining there against the people's will; and it is just as wrong for the Premier to get there and stay there as it was for the late Premier, Hon. R. Philip, to try to carry on last year against the will of the people's representatives.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: That is the gravamen of the charge against the Government. And how have they replied? By making all sorts of counter-accusations. The Premier charged members of this party with bribery—that we held out bribes of office to members to take their allegiance from the Government. As far as this party is concerned, we have made no offer of any kind. The only position we have taken up is the position our leader took up when he supported the present Premier two years ago; that is to say, that we are here for the purpose of supporting measures, not men, and as long as we get good measures, and they do not violate our platform or our principles, we will support them. And if there are members who are prepared to bring forward a progressive policy embodying such measures as those, I say we have as much right to support those members as we had to support the present Premier two years ago. And if there are members of this House who are willing to bring forward progressive measures, I don't know that they have not just as much right to the emoluments of office as the present Premier.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: A jolly sight more.

Mr. HARDACRE: The charge of bribery comes ill indeed from the Premier, because members on his own side have distinctly asserted that he has attempted to bribe—in fact, has bribed—members to retain their allegiance. Is it not public property—is it not the talk of the whole community—that some time ago, when the Premier was in doubt as to what members would stay with him, he sent his "Whip" and other emissaries to certain members to offer them certain things to retain their allegiance? I have heard that early in the period of uncertainty the late Government "Whip," the hon. member for Burke, went to the senior member for Toowoomba and asked him what was the matter with him—what did he want?

The TREASURER: A very fair thing to ask.

Mr. HARDACRE: What would he take to come back and give the Government his support?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no

[Mr. Hardacre.

Mr. HARDACRE: And the reply was that nothing the Premier could give him would make him go back.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: Do we not know that last session when there was a little trouble in the House one member got a railway to his electorate in order to retain his support?

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Two railways.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Who was that?

Mr. HARDACRE: The hon. member for Cambooya.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Absolutely untrue.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is common talk in this House.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I can assure you that it is absolutely untrue.

Mr. HARDACRE: We know that is true.

Mr. MURPHY: He threatened to leave the Government if he did not get it.

Mr. HARDACRE: I want to sheet home the absolute proof of an attempt to corrupt members—to retain their allegiance by offering them bribes—dangling before them certain things connected with the expenditure of public money. I am just going to give the utterances which were made by members of this House to their constituents.

Mr. KENNA: Members on that side.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; members on the Government side who it was well known were very uncertain in their attitude. It was stated that they were going to leave the Government, who are now holding on by a slight slender thread, and in order to retain the votes of these members bribes were given to them in the shape of public money expended in their electorates in one form or another.

Mr. KENNA: Quite true.

Mr. HARDACRE: I will first take the hon. member for Rosewood. We all know that the hon. member for Rosewood had stated in many ways, privately and publicly, that he was not going to support the Government.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: What happened? At once there was the influence of intimidation held over him.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: This was done in order to whip him into line.

Mr. KENNA: And yet they talk about us over here.

Mr. HARDACRE: Whilst they did not go into the hon. member's electorate, at that time somebody went into that electorate.

Mr. AIREY: That is so.

Mr. HARDACRE: All at once the hon. member for Rosewood hurried up to explain his position. This was what the hon. member for Rosewood said when addressing his constituents—

One of the great reasons why he was there was that a short time ago he received a communication from the Rosewood Progress Association stating that they had passed a resolution strongly protesting against attempts to overthrow Constitutional Government and go back to the three-party system. That letter also requested him to give his strongest support to the present Administration. He did not find fault with those gentlemen holding a meeting. But it would have been more honourable to have given him notice so that he might have been at the meeting.

He then went on to say how he had changed his

political attitude, but he did not say he was going to follow the Premier. He said he was going to follow his leader, the hon. member for Townsville. He further said—

He had been elected to follow the Hon. R. Philp, and so he had done. So long as the Hon. R. Philp supported the present Administration he was prepared to follow him.

Mr. COYNE: He made a distinction between the two leaders.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes. There we have the Premier retaining office, not by members who believe in his policy, not by members who are prepared to support him, but by members who are prepared to support another leader of this House, and who have no faith in the Premier at all.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: Then the hon. member for Rosewood, evidently as a reason why he was prepared to change his political attitude, said— They would get their railway from Rosewood to Marburg and even Glamorgan Vale, and also the line up the Bremer Valley. (Applause.) They would get what was even more important and that was conservation of water. They were getting those from the present Administration, and would he not be an ingrate not to support them?

And a voice interjected.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What did he say?

Mr. HARDACRE: You will be sorry you asked when I read it out. A voice interjected, "Don't get away from that." Then at the close of the meeting he made the position very clear. In moving a vote of thanks to the chairman, Mr. Keogh said—

He told the Government he would not support them unless he got something for his electorate more than he had done in the last four years, and he had got it.

Mr. MURPHY: They gave him three railways.

Mr. HARDACRE: Now there is a distinct admission on the part of the hon. member for Rosewood—a distinct assertion on his part—that he was only supporting the present Government because of what he got out of it, and he would not support the Government unless he got the expenditure of public money in his electorate as the price of his support.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not know what you would call it, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I would be out of order in calling it bribery and corruption, but it is as bad as anything I have ever heard of in the history of the country. It is the expenditure of public money—the taxpayers' money—not because there is merit in the proposed expenditure, not because there is any justification for it, not because there is any ground or reason for that expenditure, but as the price of political support. And without that support the Premier could not retain his majority for five minutes.

Mr. KENNA: And they have the cheek to talk about this side!

Mr. HARDACRE: And yet the Government had the audacity to make charges of bribery against this side of the House. The Premier made an attack on myself and on other members in order to divert attention from his own actions. I have drawn attention to the maladministration which has been going on in connection with the expenditure of the taxpayers' money for political purposes in the Rosewood electorate. It is amusing also to think of what happened in the case of the hon. member for Toombul. (Opposition laughter.) We know that the hon. member for Toombul and the hon.

member for Rosewood were always bosom friends, and one said he would not support the Government unless his friend got something.

Mr. PETRIE: Untrue, and you know it.

Mr. HARDACRE: They remind me very much of the couplet in "Tam o' Shanter"—

Tam lo'd him like a vera brither—  
They had been fou' for weeks together.

(Opposition laughter.) The hon. member for Toombul also explained his position. At that time he had not got the whipship. (Laughter.) He went on to say—

But for his old friend, Mr. Keogh, there would have been some little trouble as to whether he was going to stick to the present Government or not.

(Opposition laughter.)

Mr. PETRIE: Good joke!

Mr. HARDACRE: He further said—

Mr. Kidston was no doubt the strongest man in the House, although he had done some little tricks. He personally had never sought for a portfolio, and would not take one. (Laughter.) He would never be bought for thirty pieces of silver, and he was very sure of his old friend, Mr. Keogh, so long as he stuck to his Rockhampton programme. There were fifteen railways being built, and more to be built, and he was going to back the Government that was doing that. . . . Mr. Keogh and himself were going to be faithful to their old leader, Mr. Philp.

Mr. KENNA: They are all on that line.

Mr. AIRBY: They are all on that gag.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. HARDACRE: He went on—

They need have no fear of his friend, Mr. Keogh. He might have been a little off colour for awhile—

(Opposition laughter.) But they were going to have a majority. And then the hon. member for Rosewood pointed out that they were going to have a majority, because he had told the Government that, unless he got public money spent in his electorate, he would not support them. I shall now reply to some other reasons given by the Premier. He says that the Government have been a most democratic Government—that they have passed all the progressive measures that the country has been blessed with for the last five years. He said that they were the most fruitful years that Queensland has ever seen, so far as progressive measures are concerned. And the reason, he said, why he adopted his present position was in order to give us more measures of that kind. When I think of the Premier and his utterances of that kind, I am always reminded of a character in Longfellow's "Hiawatha"—a character called Iagoo, who became the jest and the by-word of his tribe because of his boasting. Longfellow described him in these words—

Very boastful was Iagoo.

\* \* \*

Would you listen to his boasting?

\* \* \*

No one ever shot an arrow  
Half so far and high as he had,  
Ever caught so many fishes,  
Ever killed so many reindeer,  
Ever trapped so many beaver.

None could run so fast as he could,  
None could dive so deep as he could,  
None could swim so far as he could,  
None had made so many journeys,  
None had seen so many wonders  
As this wonderful Iagoo.

Thus his name became a byword  
And a jest among the people,  
And whenever a boastful hunter  
Praised his own address too highly,  
Or a warrior home returning  
Talked too much of his achievements,  
All his hearers cried, "Iagoo!"  
Here's Iagoo come amongst us!"

Henceforward it should be Kidston. Whenever I

*Mr. Hardacre.*]

hear the Premier making boasts, I always think of Iagoo the boaster. I know something of the progressive measures we have had. I know of the trouble we had with the hon. gentleman to make him pass some of those measures. I know we had at times to threaten that we would revolt against him unless he did something to justify his position, and at times we had to do something to prevent him doing things which were against the country's interests.

Mr. KENNA: We never could trust him.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Premier talks about those Tuesday mornings that he used to have with us. We remember those Tuesday mornings. We remember how often we pleaded with him not to do evil. (Laughter.) Many a time we had an acrimonious Tuesday morning with him, caused by his dictatorial and arrogant attitude and the way he was going crooked in regard to matters. Many a time I was forced to get up and say, "Mr. Kidston, there is an easy way out of this difficulty—cease to do evil, and there will be no quarrelling among us." But he chose the crooked path, and we know where it has led him. I would like to ask: Has he no Tuesday mornings now?

Mr. AIREY: It is one long Tuesday morning now.

Mr. HARDACRE: Why, every Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and Monday is a Tuesday now. He has to send his "Whip" to sleep with some members to get them to support him. He has to hunt them round, take them to public meetings, and make them commit themselves in public. He has to send men to their electors to intimidate them in the present critical times. We know something of those Tuesday mornings. It is ancient history, but it is worth recalling some of that ancient history. When we joined the Morgan Government, in which the hon. gentleman was Treasurer, we did so with hope and enthusiasm, believing that at least we were getting an honest Government. I admit we got some good measures, but, for every good measure we got, we got two bad ones. I know that immediately we joined them and began to support them, we found them going down the wrong path, doing the very things that we had to put out the old Philp Government for doing. The Premier says he told us the right way to go. As a matter of fact he intrigued without the knowledge of this party.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Didn't you support him all along?

Mr. HARDACRE: We did not support him in any intrigue. We did not know of that intrigue. I helped to defeat the old Government on their proposals to impose stamp duties on business people by my persistent attitude in our own caucus, getting our party to take up the question of the stamp duties, and I had almost to drive the Premier and the late Hon. W. H. Browne into taking up that attitude, and it was only after a lot of persuading and pleading that I got them to take up that attitude of antagonism, and we defeated the old Government. But almost immediately afterwards the new Government that we were supporting actually passed the very same stamp duties that we had put the old Government out of office for proposing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And you voted with them.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not remember whether I voted with them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You did.

Mr. HARDACRE: Well, possibly I did; and, as I said before tea, we were far too considerate and generous to the Government. We hoped

[Mr. Hardacre.

we would get honest and progressive government, and we were unfortunately so considerate that for the time we permitted them to do things against our better judgment; and it was only when again and again the hon. gentleman did crooked things—things inconsistent with our policy and our platform, that we were driven to take up an attitude, first of reproach, dissension, a little quarrelling; then the quarrelling became more bitter and more acrimonious, until at last we were driven into revolt against these crooked things. One of his first measures was to reimpose the Special Retrenchment Act against which we had pledged ourselves at the election. Another thing in those early days was to continue the poll tax. Then there were sales of land. Then there was drastic retrenchment of the railway men. Then there was a gun tax, and other new taxes, all opposed to their election pledges. Then there was the passing of the obnoxious Queensland National Bank secret agreement Act. Then there was the stoppage of loans at a critical time in the history of this State, which made me denounce the hon. gentleman when he was Treasurer for having by that policy driven people from this country to other States, and particularly to New Zealand.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Don't you think you are laying big charges against your own party in that argument?

Mr. HARDACRE: No. I am now trying to show that by degrees, bit by bit, we were forced to take up an attitude of hostility towards the Premier, because of the iniquitous nature of some of the measures he was passing.

Mr. HAMILTON: He was carrying out the Philp programme.

Mr. HARDACRE: Then finally there came the so-called "syndicate railways," then the semi-syndicate railways; and I just want to deal briefly with that matter. One of the excuses made by the Premier was that he could not get on with our party. Well, anybody who knows the hon. gentleman knows that nobody can get on with him. The whole history of the hon. gentleman's public career is one of frequent and continuous quarrelling—quarrelling with the old volunteer corps about 1888—quarrelling with the *People's Newspaper* in Rockhampton—quarrelling with the Democratic League—quarrelling with the Separation party. Why, the Hon. John Murray said, I think in this Chamber, that the hon. gentleman had killed every party that he had ever joined—that even Death itself could not hold a candle to the hon. gentleman in his power of destroying parties or associations with whom he associated himself. He killed the Separation party, the Hon. John Murray said; he nearly killed our party;

he killed the Kidston party; and [7.30 p.m.] I predict that before long he will kill the Philp party. The hon. gentleman says the reason for the present coalition is that he could not get on with the Labour party—that they would not help him to pass the Rockhampton programme. The real cause of our final quarrel was something which was not in the Rockhampton programme. We supported the Rockhampton programme last session but one, and the final cause of quarrel was something external to that policy. The real cause of the complete separation of ourselves from the Premier was the passing of the Mount Elliott-Hampden semi-syndicate railway.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: You sat in opposition long before that. After the second election you sat in opposition.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is quite true that we sat in opposition, but we gave him our support. The Minister for Works made this excuse for leaving the Labour party, that it was because of the socialistic objective of 1905; but his interjection proves the fallacy of that statement, because he says we sat on this side of the House before 1905. The real reason why we separated completely from the Premier was because of his introduction of two measures which were not in the Rockhampton programme, and because of certain acts of administration. The Mount Elliott-Hampden railway proposal was not in the Rockhampton programme.

Mr. SUMNER: It was not in the Governor's Speech either.

Mr. HARDACRE: No; it was not. But I do not want to say too much about that. With regard to the two railways I have referred to, I say that if the hon. gentleman had had any consideration for the principles of our party—if he had any respect for our political opinions even if we held them erroneously, and if he had had any desire at all to work with our party and carry on what he calls good government—he would have tactfully avoided bringing in those measures.

Mr. COYNE: Was not he intriguing with the senior member for Townsville long before that?

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes. Anyone who will think for a moment over the repurchase clause in the Mount Elliott Railway Act will recognise that it leaves the way open for the company to fix any price they like for the repurchase of the railway. They can manipulate the traffic receipts by sending over the line a sudden rush of traffic—not *bona fide* traffic, but any kind of traffic—for the purpose of bumping up the receipts in order to increase the purchasing price which the Government will have to pay for the railway. Thus it opens up the way to corruption, and the way to make the country pay an extortionate price for the railway at the end of fifty years. Talk about that being a business agreement! I say no business man in Queensland would say it was a business agreement. No business man would make such a bargain in his own affairs. There was another matter which contributed to bring about the present state of affairs, and that was an act of administration—the granting to one of his political supporters a valuable franchise without obtaining a single penny from that supporter for the concession. That concession gave to a political supporter the monopoly of the right to supply for thirty-three years electric light and power to Fortitude Valley and New Farm. Members have told me that that valuable privilege was worth £5,000 a year before a single penny was spent on it. I do not know if that is a fact, but I know that it is a valuable concession, and that if the country had got fair remuneration for it, that remuneration would have amounted to a considerable sum. I was reminded of this to-day by a little paragraph which appeared in the *Courier*, in which a user of electricity complains of the enormous price people have to pay for electric light and power as compared with what is paid in the cities of Melbourne, Sydney, and, I think, Adelaide.

Mr. KENNA: An extortionate price.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, an extortionate price—something like 3½d. per electric unit. That was an act of administration perpetrated

or committed—"perpetrated" is, I think, the proper term to use—without the knowledge of Parliament.

Mr. KENNA: To placate a follower.

Mr. HARDACRE: What the reason was I do not know, but it was an act on which we felt we could not support the Government. Talk about Americanising our politics! This was as near bringing Tammanyism and Boss Tweedism into this House and the country as anything I know. If the thing were done in America we would cry out in horror at the atrocious malversation of public funds in giving away a public utility for nothing to a follower. Any elector of this State who knows of those two things alone must honestly confess that we took up the right and honest attitude when we put ourselves in antagonism to the Premier. Then we know how he gagged the Estimates through, and how he got the unauthorised expenditure passed by a trick—expenditure which he told the electors would never be passed unless certain things were done. I do not want to go through the whole of the arguments which were advanced by the Premier and other hon. members opposite, because very many of them are like the argument of the old woman who, when charged with returning a washtub in a damaged state, made the defence, first of all, that she did not borrow the tub, then that when she did borrow it it was already damaged, and finally that when she returned it it was without damage. The arguments used by hon. members opposite are equally self-contradictory. The Premier, first of all, said that the reason he left us was because we would not carry out the Rockhampton programme. Then he said, "Oh, no; it is the Trades Hall"—we had to consult the Trades Hall. If it was because of that reason, it was not because we could not follow the Rockhampton programme but some other reason altogether. Then it was because of the socialistic objective of 1905, and then it was for something else altogether. I want, in passing, just to say a word about the necessity of approaching the Trades Hall. He asked us to do two things. He asked us first to support him in the attitude he was taking up in regard to the Legislative Council—a matter which was entirely within our rights to deal with as members of Parliament. And then he asked us to do something with which we had no right to interfere at all.

Mr. BOWMAN: He admitted he made a mistake in asking.

Mr. HARDACRE: He asked us to give his supporters immunity at the election. There are political organisations in whose hands alone is the choice of their candidates. We, therefore, rightly said, "That is no business of ours—it is a matter with which we cannot deal. It is a matter with which we as members of Parliament have no right to deal—it is a matter which concerns the organisations outside of Parliament altogether." The hon. gentleman now has established a number of organisations of a similar nature. They are called the People's Progressive League, and in the same way they have the choice of nominating their own candidates. They are supposed to have; but in the recent election for Moreton they were not permitted to choose their own candidate. The Government, in their autocratic way, sent their own candidate over the electors' heads, and that caused a good deal of trouble in that electorate, and rightly they protested that the organisations ought to have the right of selecting their own candidate. But I say

*Mr. Hardacre.*

if he had sent to the Premier and asked him to do certain things in this House, and also in addition to give immunity to ourselves as members, he would have been rightly entitled to say, "This is a matter I have no power to deal with. I must first of all consult those organisations." I should just like, before I go any further, to put on record once more the testimony of the Premier himself of the loyal support our party gave him in all the constitutional trouble and generally in supporting his measures up to the time of the final quarrel. He said in Rockhampton—

No man could have wished for more staunch support from any body of men than I received from the Labour party.

And yet notwithstanding that support, notwithstanding also another assertion he made, that he was proud of the self-sacrifice members, like the hon. member for Nundah, had made in standing to principle even though it cost them money to go through another election—notwithstanding all that, he threw over the loyal support he got from this side, all the self-sacrifice of those men. For what? For the purpose of joining with the party who he himself declared were a party of conservative reactionaries who had blocked all progressive measures, and whom he fought strenuously at the last election. Just one word in regard to the other statement he made. He really went further than I have. He boasted not only of his legislation, but he boasted that he had caused the prosperity of the country. Everybody who looks round knows the reasons for that prosperity. The good seasons we had, the high price of wool, the high price of cattle, the high price of tallow.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: What about minerals?

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; the high price of minerals.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh, no!

Mr. HARDACRE: The high price of coal.

Mr. KENNA: And copper.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; copper, tin, and every one of the minerals went up in price. Besides that the price of coal is high as well. We know the price of all pastoral products has gone up and that good seasons have prevailed, and the hon. member for Townsville only last year said the present prosperity is due to the industry of the people and the good seasons. Mr. Kidston has done nothing to advance the country. And now he practically says the prosperity has been brought about by the Premier, and the Premier claims he has brought it about. It reminds me of that old fable of the fly upon the chariot wheel. The chariot was being driven along furiously and a tremendous amount of dust was created, and the fly on the wheel said, "Look at the great noise and dust I am making." I shall say something more in regard to the present measures in the Governor's Speech. We are to support the present Government not only because of the great amount of good they have done, but also because of the good they are going to do. The hon. member for Townsville also said a great deal about the Rockhampton programme that was contained in the Governor's Speech. It is a remarkable thing, if the senior member for Townsville believed the Rockhampton programme was such a good programme, that we had him twelve months ago fighting the Government over it, although the Premier had the Rockhampton programme

[Mr. Hardacre.

then as he has now. He gave as a reason, because of the Premier's association with the Labour party. If that was a good reason for the senior member for Townsville opposing the Premier—because of his association with the Labour party—it is just as good a reason for us opposing the present Premier, notwithstanding the Rockhampton programme, because of his association with the Philp Conservative party.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: It is rather amusing to go back to the 1907 manifesto, and see what the senior member for Townsville had to say. This is what he thought of the Rockhampton programme. At that time he did not talk of it in eulogistic terms as he did a few minutes ago. He said it was—

A grandiloquent manifesto on a scale that is intended to dazzle the unthinking by its cheap grandeur, but which to the eyes of those who know has the word insincerity written across its face.

That document is both clever and dishonest. Do you notice the way it flirts shy of giving definite promises? "The Government hopes to do this. It is desirable to do the other thing." That is the language of the sheer opportunist.

Then he said another thing—it had escape doors all round—

The proposing and considering tricks colour the whole of the Premier's speech. His speech is like an unreal stage production, with escape doors everywhere round, whenever the hour should come for him to honour his pledges.

Then he made another statement, which is more important. He called this policy new. It is new to him. He had become a sudden convert to half its present planks. Half of them were copied from the National Liberal Federation, the others are put in to placate his old allies, and the small remaining few consist of glittering generalities and fine humbug.

Mr. KENNA: He says that of the Rockhampton programme?

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; of the Rockhampton programme. That last statement contains the real gist of the matter—half the Rockhampton programme is taken from the old Conservative party, the old Patriotic League, the old National Ass—

Mr. KENNA: The People's Progressive League.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes. Half of it was taken from their platform, and half put in to placate the members of our party. During 1908, when the hon. member for Townsville was fighting against the present Government, we managed to carry half these planks which were put in to get our support, and there is nothing left in the Rockhampton programme now but half of the National Liberal policy; and now, because there is nothing left but the old conservative planks, the Hon. Robert Philp is going to support the Government which is going to pass those conservative measures. The hon. member for Oxley tried to evade the question, too, by saying that after all it was not a coalition, it was a fusion. I could not understand the distinction between a coalition and a fusion—it seemed to be a distinction without a difference. I thought a dictionary might throw some light on the matter, and I found the definition of "coalition" to be—act of coalescing, union of persons particularly under one body, confederation. Fusion was defined as—act or operation of fusing, state of being melted or blended together. (Opposition laughter.) I do not know that there

is much distinction between the two. Coalescing means the joining of two bodies into one body, and fusion means the melting or blending of two bodies also into one body. When we find, as we do in the case of metals, that when two different metals are fused together, the result contains the qualities of both bodies in proportion to the different quantities of the metals fused together—I have just been thinking that probably that is the correct description. There are, I think, thirteen members of the old Kidston party now supporting the Premier, and twenty-four members of the old Conservative party—at any rate, it is very nearly that. Therefore, there is one-third of the old Kidston party and two-thirds of the old Conservative party behind the present Government, so the result must be that the Kidston Government have been conservatised to the extent of two-thirds—in fact, as one hon. member said some little time ago, in a year or two the Premier will be the biggest Tory in Australia. I have just gone through the Government programme, and I find that the policy foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech actually continues on the lines of the fusion I have indicated—the programme is really two-thirds of the old Conservative party's policy and one-third of the Kidston policy.

Mr. THORN: What is the definition of "conservative"?

Mr. HARDACRE: Anything that is reactionary. In the Government programme there are several items from the Rockhampton policy, and there are twelve items in it that are not in the Rockhampton programme—they are from the old Conservative party. There are only six that are in the Rockhampton programme. The others are not in it.

Mr. THORN: What are they?

Mr. HARDACRE: There is first of all a Land Act Amendment Bill, a Coal and Mineral Oil Bill—

Mr. THORN: Do you object to that?

Mr. HARDACRE: I think I shall object to some of the things in it. From all accounts that Coal Mining Bill is for the purpose of giving big areas to coal syndicates, and was particularly intended to apply to the Dawson Coal Field. A Margarine Bill, a Companies Act Amendment Bill, a Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill, a Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Bill, and another particular thing—the Transcontinental Railway, north-west by south-east. I want to know something about that. What I know is that that was not in the Rockhampton programme, but it was in the hon. member for Townsville's speech in 1907. Hon. members who care to look at the *Brisbane Courier* of, I think, March, 1907, will find a map of that Transcontinental Railway, which was given as one of the reasons why people should support the senior member for Townsville instead of the present Premier. Now, remarkable to say—or not remarkable to say when we know the hon. member for Townsville—we find that the Transcontinental Railway is brought down as one of the measures in the Governor's Speech. Do not forget that it goes past a certain pastoral holding in which two members behind the Government are interested. That shows that we are not going to get the Rockhampton programme; we are going to get the programme put forward by the senior member for Townsville.

Mr. THORN: You think you know everything, but you know nothing.

Mr. HARDACRE: I know the hon. member for Aubigny wanted a railway as a reason for supporting the Government.

Mr. THORN: That is not true.

Mr. HARDACRE: We know what the hon. member said. It was said that the hon. member for Aubigny told his associates one night that he was going to have done with the Kidston Government; the hon. member said "No, wait," and the next day there was brought down the Goombungee Railway.

Mr. THORN: Nonsense!

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I brought down that railway, and the hon. member for Aubigny knew nothing about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must be allowed to make his speech without interruption.

Mr. THORN: I rise to make a personal explanation. (Opposition laughter.) The hon. gentleman has accused me of [8 p.m.] being bribed by the Government over that railway. I give that a flat contradiction.

Mr. HARDACRE: Members of this House know many things that the outside public do not know.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You evidently have an intimate knowledge of bribery.

Mr. HARDACRE: Not nearly as much as the hon. gentleman. Dealing further with the Rockhampton programme and the policy put forward by the hon. member for Townsville, we have this remarkable coincidence—that immediately the coalition was formed we had the inauguration of a loan policy; a loan of £2,000,000 was put on the London market; and we had brought down no less than fifteen railways—a return to the old policy of "borrow, boom, and burst."

Mr. THORN: You voted for them all.

Mr. HARDACRE: That is incorrect. The hon. member for Clermont and myself said we would not support any railway unless there was sufficient evidence in its favour by expert testimony; and we opposed several on those grounds.

Mr. THORN interjected.

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I must ask hon. members to refrain from making interjections.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is true that in the Government programme we are promised a Trade Disputes Bill and a Workers' Dwellings Bill; but we know that after a caucus of the members of the Philp party the Trade Disputes Bill was dropped; and, after a deputation of building societies to the Treasurer, the Workers' Dwellings Bill was dropped. But, after all, what does it matter what we have been promised in the Government programme? In "Æsop's Fables" there is the story of an eagle who met a kite one day, and was lamenting that he could not find a mate. The kite said, "Well, why not take me?" The eagle said, "What can you do?" The kite said, "I can carry an ostrich to you in my talons." So they mated; and, after the marriage was over, the eagle said to the kite, "Now, catch me the ostrich." The kite went away, and after a long delay brought back a small mouse. The eagle said, "What is this you have brought me? Did you not promise me an ostrich?" The kite said, "Yes; and I would have promised anything to obtain your royal hand." So the present Government would promise anything—

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

they would fill the eyes of the electors with a glare of promises, as the Premier asserted of the hon. member for Townsville, to retain office.

Mr. MURPHY: Do you accuse the Premier of kite-flying?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARDACRE: I would like to ask the Premier, in the words of the hon. member for Townsville, how can we trust a man who has made so many promises and broken every one of his pledges to the electors? And if he has broken his promises in the past, is there any hope that he will keep them in the future? I look upon the Government programme, after the Premier has betrayed the people and again asks for their support, as I would look upon a burglar coming out of a house with the loot and saying, "Let me go—I am going to be a philanthropist in the future." The Premier made the promise that he would have no coalition with the Philp party.

Mr. GRANT: That is not so.

Mr. HARDACRE: If he broke that promise, would he not break any other promise? It is rather amusing to read what he said of the senior member for Townsville. Speaking of reform, he said at Toowoomba that many would show respect to the Hon. Robert Philp, but it must make them smile when they were asked to accept the Hon. Robert Philp as a reformer, because in all the years from 1890 to 1903 he has opposed reform and has adopted every measure to block reform. He blocked electoral reform, fought against a white Australia, wages boards, old-age pensions, arbitration and conciliation, the Trade Disputes Bill, the Shearers and Sugar Workers Accommodation Bill, against an amendment of the Constitution Act, and only last session—only a few weeks ago he told the people at Toowoomba that we were the enemies of the farmers because we included them in the Wages Boards Bill. What hope have we from a Government backed up by the hon. member for Townsville and his supporters—men who have blocked reform, like the hon. member for Moreton—men who have behind them all the wealth and all the conservatism of the country, and the venal *Courier*, as the Premier called it—the *Courier* that has always supported a Government that blocked reform?

Mr. KENNA: Always against the working man, according to the hon. member for Woolloongabba.

Mr. HARDACRE: Now I come to the real reason for the coalition. I remember that the Premier said something very nasty about the senior member for Townsville. He referred to that hon. gentleman as "the peevish Philp, who was never satisfied until he was in office, but when he was in office he was all smiles, and would promise anything." And the senior member for Townsville also said something of a similar character in regard to the Premier. He said that the Premier resigned in a fit of pique, and that no man in Queensland ever kicked himself so much as did the Premier for what he had done. We know that the Premier said that it was the last desperate chance of the Philp party—the Philp reactionaries—to get into office. They called each other all sorts of names during the election—

Mr. THORN: Not true.

Mr. HARDACRE: And all the public papers, including the *Courier* and *Daily Mail*, heaped all sorts of terms upon the present Premier when he was fighting the battle of

[*Mr. Hardacre.*

democracy, and what happened immediately after the election? On the morning after the election the *Daily Mail*, which fought the Premier so strenuously and called him all the names it could lay its hands on, on the morning after the election it turned round and said, "The only thing to do for this State is to try to get the Premier to take in the Philp party."

Mr. BLAIR: He took him in, too.

Mr. HARDACRE: It reminds me very much of the Siege of Troy. Troy was invested by the armed Greeks for fourteen years without their being able to capture it by storm. They got tired of making assaults upon it so they thought they would get into Troy by a trick and decided to give them something instead. So they got a wooden horse and filled it with soldiers and offered it to the soldiers of Troy, and when they got inside the Greek soldiers jumped out and opened the gates and let in their other soldiers. So that they succeeded in capturing Troy by cunning when they could not capture it by force, and that is the position with this coalition to-day. The conservative forces made their last desperate throw like the gambler who had already lost everything. They made their throw and failed, and what they could not succeed in doing by open assault they did by cunning. What did the *Morning Bulletin* of Rockhampton say of this coalition when it was first proposed? The *Rockhampton Bulletin* is the inspired organ of the Premier. It is the Premier's principal supporter, and this is what it said regarding the manipulations and stratagems that were going on just before the coalition took place.

Mr. BLAIR: What date was that?

Mr. HARDACRE: In February, 1908. The *Bulletin* said—

The Brisbane Press is making its customary appeal to Mr. Kidston to take in Mr. Philp. It will be remembered that before the last (1907) election the Brisbane Press attacked Mr. Kidston with sustained ferocity, and the morning after the election when it discovered that Mr. Kidston had not been destroyed by all its maledictions, it coolly proposed that he should take Mr. Philp into his Cabinet and unite the Kidston and Philp parties.

History is reneating itself. For the last four weeks the Brisbane Press has surpassed even its own record in the fury of its attacks on Mr. Kidston. Throughout the whole controversy it has invariably described Mr. Kidston and his followers as socialists. . . . But on the morning after the poll he was a "statesman." There was not a word about him being a socialist. . . .

On Monday Mr. Kidston was a revolutionary and a liar, as big a revolutionary as Mr. Bowman, and a bigger and more original liar than Mr. Hawthorn. . . . On Friday the *Mall* declared that this revolutionary, this socialist, this liar, this shameless slanderer of the King's representative, was the one fit and proper statesman in Queensland to be Lord Chelmsford's first Minister provided that he would take over Mr. Philp and his following.

That is the real reason of the coalition. That is the real cause of the existing combination of the old conservative reactionaries and the Kidston party. And as a result of that we have practically in full blast, in full power once again, the old Philp Government that we have fought for years, and that the people of this country have fought for years, and who by an overwhelming majority decided at the last election—as the Premier himself put it—declared that they would not have the Philp party at any price.

Mr. THORN: They have not got him.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; they have.

Mr. HARDACRE: Just a word in passing as to the policy of the Government which has been put forward as a justification for the

present coalition. The policy of material development is not against the platform of our party nor against all the aims of our party. The hon. member for Kennedy put it forward the other night that the one way to give employment and to create prosperity was by expanding production.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: When I heard that I was not surprised that the hon. member left our party. I saw at once then why he left our party. The senior member for Townsville put the policy of the Government as land settlement, railways, and more population. At once the hon. member for Kennedy and our party came into conflict. We do not oppose material progress. We believe in that. We believe in railways, we believe in land settlement, and we believe in population. If our platform was carried into effect, and if our system of land settlement were adopted, then instead of the people coming in here at the rate of 3,000 a week, as suggested by the hon. member for Cook, they would come in by tens of thousands.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: We would open the gateway of opportunities for all who would come here. The only reason that we oppose the immigration policy of the present Government is because they are putting the cart before the horse. They are bringing in the people first without giving them the opportunities. We prefer to make the opportunities first and then the people will come themselves. In the early days of Australia 750,000 people came to this country without the aid of any immigration at all. Why did they come? Because they were attracted by the prosperity of this country.

Mr. THORN: Who were in power then?

Mr. WHITE: Not the Labour party.

Mr. HARDACRE: That number came here between 1850 and 1860, and they came from all parts of the world. Stalwart manhood, the best and most virile of the youth of England, America, and Europe, came to our country not by a State-aided policy, but because of the splendid opportunities they saw here and the splendid chances they had when they came. If we abolished the monopoly that exists here we would create many opportunities, and we would have not only prosperity for the people already here but prosperity for those who come here afterwards. And they would come in numbers if those opportunities were provided. Therefore, we come into conflict at once with the Government on this matter. Anyone who has studied political economy at all, or who has given the slightest attention to the social conditions of the country, must know that the problem to-day to make for prosperity is not increase in the production of wealth, for in spite of the enormous increase in the production of wealth there is a tremendous degradation of large masses of the people. We look back over the last century of invention and its enormous increase of wealth on every hand, and we see that, in spite of all that wealth, the social question has not been solved, and that, in regard even to material wealth, the great mass of the people are in the same state that they were previously. If we take that as an axiom of statesmanship, then we should expect more prosperity in New South Wales than in Queensland. In New South Wales they have a larger population, there are more railways, more settlement, more wealth, than in Queens-

land, and on the lines of that argument there should be greater prosperity for the worker and the tradesman than there is in our own State.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: They are just as well off as we are.

Mr. HARDACRE: But they are no better off; and yet, according to the argument of hon. members opposite, the greater population, greater production, and greater material wealth in New South Wales should mean greater prosperity to the workers. As a matter of fact, "Coghlan" has pointed out that 1 per cent. of the people of New South Wales own £250,000,000, and more than half the people do not own a single stick of property of any kind. Victoria ought also to be more prosperous than Queensland. It has a larger population, more railways, greater settlement and production, and yet we find that the people are being driven out of the State for lack of prosperity—by depression. Coming back to our own State, I would like to compare the years 1883 and 1890. In 1883 there was a smaller population than in 1890, and yet we had more prosperity in the earlier year. The year 1883 was one of the most prosperous periods we have ever had in Queensland, although there were more people here in 1890, although there were 113,000 more people, although there were 1,000 more miles of railway, although there were more than £1,000,000 more exports, £750,000 more imports, 3,000,000 more sheep, 500,000 more cattle, 70,000 more acres under cultivation than in 1883. Yet, in spite of all those things, in 1890 we were just on the verge of a commercial crisis, a period of stagnation and unemployment and bad times, which lasted for nearly ten years.

Mr. THORN: What brought that about?

Mr. HARDACRE: Never mind what brought it about. If the argument used by the Premier and the hon. member for Townsville for the coalition were sound, then in 1890 the people of Queensland should have been more prosperous than they were in 1883, and they ought to be more prosperous now. We have 2,000 more miles of railway, we have a much greater population, more settlement, still larger exports and imports, still larger production of minerals. I admit that we had prosperity for a time—the prosperity which comes for a time from increased production. Our party has laid it down again and again—and it is proved by historic facts not only here but elsewhere—that such increased prosperity is merely temporary. There are periodic cycles of commercial stagnation and depression in trade, and they are brought about by economic causes, which it is the duty of this party to remove. The temporary prosperity that is brought about by the building of new railways is only a passing stage, ending in a burst, ending in the dislocation of commerce and trade. Instead of spending money in building railways, for all the permanent good they will do, we might as well scatter the money in golden coins out of that window to a crowd outside. Some would get it, but the great multitude would still be without it. The wealth would be in the hands of a few, and the great multitude would be just as they were before. The hon. member for Townsville, with his sunny optimism, bumps his head against the rocks every time. He is like the captain of a ship who gets wrecked every time he puts to sea. He comes home, and sails again just as merrily as before, with just the same result. Our party maintain that permanent results

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

cannot follow from a period of material development, without social and economic reform. Within a short time from now there will be a dislocation of trade and commerce; or, in the old colloquial phrase, a period of "Boom, borrow, and burst." It is all a question of the distribution of wealth. Hon. members have dealt with the objective of this party. So far as the objective is concerned, I am not altogether satisfied with the objective.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Then you have no right to be in the party.

Mr. MULLAN: What is wrong with it?

Mr. HARDACRE: I think it might be improved. The Secretary for Mines moved the adoption of the Federal objective, but, if the State objective is socialistic, the Federal objective is socialistic also. To my mind, our objective is not so clear, but I do not for one moment think that we have yet reached perfection in the phrasing of our objective. Neither State nor Federal objective is perfect, but I am certain our party will improve the objective. We are the party which has for its aim and object the uplifting of the masses. We come nearer to that ideal than any other party in this State. I am like Macaulay in his attitude towards the Whigs. He said that, in spite of imperfections, in spite of the errors of the Whig party in England, it was the party which had brought about all the reforms in Great Britain; and, in spite of any imperfections, he would not leave that party, but would always be found with them. Although this party, like all other parties, has its imperfections—I do not say that it is absolutely free from error—but everybody who has followed its history knows that it is above all other parties—the reform party—the party that is in the van of the reform movement, which has in season and out of season brought forward reform measures, and which has forced reform on other parties. After all, it does not matter to members of Parliament what the objective is, because we are not here to carry out the objective. The objective adopted at the convention of 1905 does not say the nationalisation of "all" the means of production, distribution, and exchange. As a matter of fact, the convention specifically omitted the word "all" in order to meet the objection of the Minister for Works.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Do you admit then that it does not mean "all" the means of production?

Mr. HARDACRE: The words used in the objective are "the collective ownership of the means of production, distribution, [8.30 p.m.] and exchange." "The" is a limited particle, and does not mean "all." The hon. gentleman believes in the federal objective, which aims at "the collective ownership of monopolies." Both objectives set out that this object is to be obtained by "the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the State." Who objects to the State taking over an industry in some cases? Who objects to the extension of the economic functions of the State? I do not think there is a member in this House who objects to that, and that is exactly what our objective states. It does not say "all" means of production, and as far as I am concerned I do not believe it ever will be all. I believe there will be a fast growth of private enterprise as well as State enterprise, but at the same time I say there is no theoretical

[Mr. Hardacre.

limit to the functions of the State, provided the proposed extension is justified on its merits.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The hon. member was never a socialist, I admit. He was a single taxer, but never a socialist.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not know what the hon. member means by "socialist." I believe it is a good thing for a man to make two blades of grass grow where only one grew before. I believe it is a good thing to establish industries, because they give employment to the people; and, if the establishment of industries is a good thing for the individual, it is a good thing for the State. But I cannot understand this differentiation between the two objectives.

Strange that all this difference should be "Twixt tweedle-lum and tweedle-de-dee.

The matter is the same, though the phrasing may be different.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It is more than a matter of phrasing. It is a matter of principle.

Mr. HARDACRE: No, the two objectives are the same—"the extension of the industrial and economic functions of the State." But, after all, it does not matter to members of Parliament what the objective is, because we are not here to carry out the objective. We are here to carry out a specific platform which we have signed. The objective is a matter for the organisation. The convention of 1905 laid it down that it was not the objective of the Parliamentary Labour party, but the objective of the Labour organisation, and no candidate had to sign that objective.

Mr. MULLAN: But he is expected to believe in it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The *Worker* will give you a bad time for this.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not care. I am stating my position, and I am not afraid to state my position. I do not believe that the *Worker* or any loyal member of this party will find fault with me for making such a statement so long as I fulfil my pledges, so long as I adhere to the Labour platform. The trouble with the hon. gentleman is that he did not fulfil the platform.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Yes; I did.

Mr. HARDACRE: No one would find fault with a man for leaving the party on conscientious grounds, but the trouble we have with the hon. gentleman and with the Premier is that they signed those pledges, or if they did not sign them they made pledges to the electors, and then when they got into responsible positions in Parliament on the ground of those pledges, they broke their pledges.

Mr. GRANT: What are they?

Mr. HARDACRE: They signed a pledge against syndicate railways and against the sale of land. The hon. member knows that as well as I do.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The whole of the party agreed to sales of land. The hon. member knows that.

Mr. HARDACRE: I say the Premier broke his pledge in regard to that matter. All that members of this party have to do is to sign and be loyal to the platform and policy of the Labour party, and that does not include the objective. But the Premier trotted out the bogey, as he calls it, of socialism, and said we had to advocate it whether we believed in it or not. Many of us do believe in it, but

what we as soldiers of the movement are concerned with is to carry out the platform we have signed, and there is no justification for anyone leaving the party, or opposing our movement on the ground that it is socialistic.

The SPEAKER: Order! I should like the hon. member to connect his remarks with the question before the House.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; I will endeavour to do so. I wish to show that I do not believe in a land tax, but in a land value tax, that no member on the other side of the House can find a land tax proposal in our platform.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member dealing with that matter on the assumption that it is not included in the policy of the Government?

Mr. HARDACRE: My justification for referring to a tax on land values is that if the present Government are displaced, and this party have the opportunity, it will be their duty to propose such a tax. We have in our platform a tax on publicly created land value—value created by the State or by the community. You cannot build a railway or any public work or bring about any material development without increasing the value of land. Therefore, we say that instead of putting a tax on farmers, on tradesmen, on workers—on any trade or industry—we should remove some of those taxes, and impose a tax on land values—tax land monopolies, and thus make land cheap for the farmer. By so doing we shall increase prosperity to a greater extent than it is being increased at the present time. There is one other matter I should like to refer to before I conclude. The Premier has challenged this side of the House to go to the country. The hon. member for Kennedy said that I was formerly in favour of a coalition with the senior member for Townsville. If the hon. gentleman will look up *Hansard* for the session of 1907, he will find that immediately before the Premier went to London I said that there ought not to be an adjournment of the House unless it was an adjournment for appealing to the people with the view of getting a mandate with regard to the coalition. I am not afraid of an appeal to the country on that ground. I believe the country has declared and will again declare that they will not have the old Conservatives at any price, even if associated with the Premier to carry out his Rockhampton programme.

Mr. KENNA: They will be decimated.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, they will be decimated at an election, judging from public opinion as expressed at meetings held by the Premier at Charters Towers, Mount Morgan, Rockhampton, Townsville, Toowoomba, South Brisbane, and various other places. If ever there was shown disgust in the Government and the coalition it was at those meetings, and public opinion is as much against it now as it was in 1908. The electors will declare for the "passing of Kidston."

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. HARDACRE: The passing of the Premier, as he declared for the passing of another hon. member of this House, the hon. member for Townsville. As far as I am concerned, I welcome the call to battle, and I am very much mistaken if the result of that appeal to the people will not be the last of the hon. member for Rockhampton, as well as the Hon. Robert Philp. I would just like to read one

verse out of that well-known poem—it has not been quoted so far during this debate. The people will recognise that these remarks, at any rate, are appropriate—

For life is change and blades that smite  
For the cause of truth to-day,  
To-morrow may strike for falsehood if  
Their owners are built that way.

I believe the result of the election will be that this side of the House will come back stronger—that the country will give support to this motion as hon. members in the House will support it; and, in any case, whatever is the result of the division, as I declared at the commencement of my address, in the interests of public honesty, in the interests of the great principle that the people alone should have the right to rule—that their wishes, as declared at election time, as emphatically as any body of people could declare them, are respected—in the interests of that principle, and in the interests of public honesty, before any business is done at all, we should appeal to that ruling power and get their sanction to the coalition taking place—whether they are in favour of it or not, before we do any business of any kind in this Chamber.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

After a pause,

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Question, question!  
Question stated.

Mr. HERBERTSON: (*Port Curtis*): With the indulgence of the House I desire to say a few words in support of the motion moved by the senior member for Fortitude Valley. In doing so I would like to be brief in my remarks. I do not propose to do as a good many other hon. members have done during this discussion, and I hope to avoid all personalities.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HERBERTSON: I propose to deal with what the Government has done in the past and what they have failed to do. I am very pleased the people of Rockhampton North, and I may say the electors of Central Queensland, have settled the Port Alma Railway question.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. WOODS: Finally settled it.

Mr. HERBERTSON: I hope finally so. It was stated when this measure was brought before the House the people of Rockhampton were asking for it. Now, it is plain they have not been asking for it. The question has been submitted to them two years following, and on the last occasion they gave absolute proof that they did not require this measure, and yet the Premier tried to force it through this House in the last two sessions. I object very strongly to this, and that is one of the reasons I left the Government. I would just like to say, on behalf of the people of Rockhampton, that the Nelson Government undertook to give them a deep-water port as near that city as could be found, and after exhaustive reports had been got from experts in the various departments, it was decided that Broadmount should be the port of Rockhampton. The Government at once carried out that scheme. They built a wharf at Broadmount and also a line from that wharf to the Emu Park Railway, and they built a bridge over the Fitzroy to connect with the city. That work was carried out very satisfactorily, but the balance of the work that should have been done by the Government—that is, open the channel from Broadmount to the sea—was not

*Mr. Herbertson.]*

carried out, at least satisfactorily. The result is that the work has never yet given the satisfaction it should have given, and I say that no Government which has been in power since the Nelson Government have done their duty to Rockhampton by completing the channel from the railway wharf they built at an expenditure to this country of something like £200,000. In the year 1904 the Government called for a report on that channel. It was furnished, and if the Government of the day had carried out the recommendation that was suggested by the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers, it would have given all the satisfaction required to Rockhampton. But there was a power behind the throne there which seemed to be pulling the strings in another direction. The people of Rockhampton had really objected to the Port Alma scheme for a number of years. Over twenty years ago they returned two members for that city pledged against this very scheme, and yet it has been going on year after year; they never seem to be satisfied about it, although when the Nelson Government dealt with it and decided on the Broadmount port two-thirds of the people of Rockhampton were satisfied with that. The trouble has been that the Government which undertook to carry out that work did not complete it, and I say that the Governments up to the present have failed in their duty to these people by not completing the work they undertook to do. I claim that the Government of the day should complete that channel as suggested by Mr. Cullen. I will just refer to Mr. Cullen's report for 1904. He says—

For restoring a minimum depth of 17 feet throughout the Middle Channel from sea to Broadmount, and of regulating same at No. 6 Cutting, £11,050.

In another portion of the report Mr. Cullen says—

From this and the statements as to the draughts of the ordinary coasting vessels that would use the channel, it will be gathered that the majority of boats, including the "Barcoo" would practically not be detained at all if bound to Broadmount, for lack of water, even if they arrived or departed at low water, provided a minimum depth of 17 feet at low water be obtained throughout. Under the most unfavourable conditions conceivable—such as the "Wyandra," fully laden, drawing 20 feet and arriving just before low water—the period of detention would not exceed five hours, and such conditions might not occur twice in a year.

Now, that was the contention of that port, and I maintain that the people of Rockhampton have not been justly dealt with by previous Governments. This Government so far have not been able to do much, because they have been almost defeated twice within the last few weeks.

Mr. KENNA: They are not likely to do, either.

Mr. HERBERTSON: It is only right and just that the present Government should give these people what they have been asking for. With regard to the Broadmount wharf and its accommodation, I may say that the accommodation which has been provided up to the present has done very well. The line of steamers which is coming out now under agreement with this Government—the British-India Company's steamers—have been using this wharf for ten years, and I have had a small return made out of vessels passing in and out of that channel to this wharf, which has been condemned by what I may term the Port Alma harbour people. The vessels which berthed at the Broadmount wharf between 1898 and 1908 numbered 213, and yet we hear of people who advocate this Port Alma scheme saying that the Broadmount wharf channel

and accommodation is not good. I would like to say, too, that the tonnage of these vessels is the largest of the shipping on the Queensland coast. One of the vessels, when loaded, was 11,900 tons, drawing 26 feet of water. When vessels like that can get in and out, I am certain it cannot be said that there is no port there. The average gives twenty-one vessels a year for the past ten years. I think that that shows that the wharf and the channel are very satisfactory. There is another matter I would like to refer to—that is the Torres Strait mail steamship service. I quite agree with the hon. member for Carpentaria, who dealt with this question a few days ago, when he said that Queensland had gained no advantage by this service. It has not. It is apparent to anyone who knows anything about this service of steamships to Queensland that this service was running years before with the same vessels.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Not the same vessels.

Mr. HERBERTSON: We are paying £37,000 a year in a direct subsidy, in addition to the attendant expenses, for this service, which was going before ever there was any agreement entered into at all. It is called a Queensland service. It is not a Queensland service at all, any more than it ever was. The vessels leave London; they come out to Queensland *via* Singapore and Torres Strait, and when they arrive in Brisbane they have done with that service. They do not go back the same way; they go on by Southern ports back to England, and, whilst in the agreement it is provided that they shall come out here within a given time, from the time they leave Brisbane to get to their port of destination in England there is no set time—they can take six months if they like. Yet we are told what a splendid bargain it is for the people of Queensland—for the producers. This was put on for the producers, and we had another service going in Brisbane, the principal port—the Orient liners, for which we were paying another £26,000 a year—and the Government is subsidising this Northern service, which they expect is going to be an advantage to Central and Northern Queensland. Of course, Southern Queensland is provided for by the Orient line. The so-called Torres Strait service is no more a service for the Northern people any more than it was before the agreement was entered into. There is another question in connection with that service which I would like to bring up. The agreement provides that only certain ports shall be called at, and it specifies the ports of call coming down the coast. Some three or four months ago I was informed, on very good authority, that one of these [9 p.m.] vessels was coming down the coast with about 800 tons of cargo for Rockhampton after having discharged a considerable quantity at Townsville. The captain of the vessel had often been at Broadmount with his steamer, when he wanted to take in or discharge cargo; but under this agreement he was not allowed to do so. He sent to the authorities or agents to get permission to go to Broadmount, because when he was leaving Townsville he thought that when he arrived at Broadmount he would be able to go alongside and discharge into the railway trucks, so that the cargo might be carried by rail to Rockhampton; but he was advised almost immediately he reached Keppel Bay that he must anchor there and deliver the cargo into lighters. While the people generally are paying for this line to Broadmount, the Rockhampton people have to

[Mr. Herbertson.

pay for the lightening of cargo that might be carried by that line into Rockhampton, and produce some revenue for that railway. Now, I come to the matter of lands. I think the system of alienation is a bad one; and I think the system of tendering is very bad, and ought to be abolished.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Hear, hear! I think so too.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are on the wrong side.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No.

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: You can always come over.

Mr. HERBERTSON: I think all the lands should be balloted for; and, in connection with balloting, I would like to see a stop put to allowing a number of dummy applications to be put in for a portion of land. It is a well-known fact that a man may choose a piece of land, and have it put up; and perhaps somebody in the vicinity is desirous of getting it. This person may have a dozen relations who put in their names against the man who got the land put up, and the result is that he has no chance. I know a case in point where a man applied to have two selections put up. The holder of the run on which the land was selected, as soon as the selections were put up, also applied for them; so did his brother; and their wives applied; also, their brothers and sisters, and the whole of their relations. There were something like seventeen applications against the application of the man who applied for the land first; and the result was that he lost it, though he had waited twelve months for it to be put up. I believe in the principle of selection before survey. I believe in the land being mapped out, but it should be carefully mapped out. That is to say, four or five selections, or a few selections, should not take all the water frontage and the best of the country, because that means picking the eyes out of the country, and the land that is left is no good to anyone. I have had some complaints about this picking the eyes out of selections in my own electorate, and I will just read a letter I got to-day from one of my constituents dealing with this very matter—

Dear Sir,—As the representative of a good many of local people, I am writing you to see if you could use your influence in having the portions of the old Riverstone run—viz., 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18, parish of O'Connell, in the Gladstone land agent's district—withdrawn from selection by a group known as the Laidley Group, and in having the land put up for selection, and thereby giving us a chance of securing some good land. These six blocks are the pick of the country, and it is manifestly unfair to us to have to stand aside and see strangers secure what we have been applying to have thrown open for the past few years. The remainder of the country, not being considered good enough for the group, was considered good enough for the local people, who were asked to select the pieces, under the impression that the better land was to follow, not knowing that it was held back for a totally different purpose.

As you are no doubt aware, I have been in the past an opponent of yours politically; but, after the way things have been moving lately, I am very pleased to see you take the stand that you have done, and, should you be able to do anything in the matter in regard to this land jobbery, I think that I can guarantee that any candidate put forward by Kidston, Philp, and Co. will not secure half a dozen votes locally at next election.

Mr. KENNA: Hear, hear! Great applause! The same all over the State.

I must say that that letter influenced me very much. And that is the opinion of other people. Whilst dealing with land matters, I would like to deal with mining on private property. I think that the Government has been very lax in not bringing forward a Mining on Private Property Bill, and passing it through this

House. (Hear, hear!) Such a measure would give the miner a chance of getting on the freehold land, which he is unable to do at the present time, and it would also give the selector a chance of getting on to land which is now locked up as mining reserves. In my district alone there are hundreds of thousands of acres of mining reserves, and this land is completely cut off from selection. With a Mining on Private Property Bill passed into law the working miner would have all the lands of the State open to him.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: We have got it all ready to bring forward.

Mr. MURPHY: Was it the Bill which Mr. Blair drafted;

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HERBERTSON: There is a great interest in getting these mining reserves thrown open. In my own district one-third of the land is embraced in mining reserves.

Mr. WOODS: They have issued instructions to prevent the miners from getting homestead leases.

Mr. HERBERTSON: That has not been my experience. I find that the Government has been very fair in regard to that. These mining reserves, generally speaking, are situated where there is the biggest population. I think that it is a very small mining field that does not keep more men at work than many of the big pastoral properties. (Hear, hear!) I would like to deal shortly with the Mines Department. I know a little about this business, I think. I have had a little experience of it. I think that the Government—I am not particularly blaming this Government, but all past Governments—have been very penurious indeed to the mining community and mining generally.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MANN: This Government knocked £20,000 off the mining vote last year.

Mr. HERBERTSON: I maintain that there ought to be more money provided for deep sinking. (Hear, hear!) That ought to be provided particularly on goldfields where they have gone perhaps beyond the ordinary working miner or the small company. In addition to that, I think that prospecting parties ought to be better subsidised than they are at present in opening new fields. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. KENNA: They starved the prospecting vote.

Mr. HERBERTSON: In New South Wales for a good number of years now they have been giving £25,000 and £30,000 a year to assist the mining industry, and the mining industry of New South Wales is not to be compared with the mining industry of Queensland. It is a great field for the miner is Queensland—all over it. In Victoria, which is only a handful in comparison with Queensland, the Bent Government three or four years ago passed a vote of £150,000, to be spent at the rate of £50,000 a year, in support of the mining industry in that State.

Mr. MURPHY: They want to give it to the dress circle crowd now.

Mr. HERBERTSON: What do we find here? You cannot get £50 to put down a small water shaft to supply a few miners with the wherewithal to live.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Has the hon. member only just discovered this?

Mr. HERBERTSON: I discovered it a long time ago.

*Mr. Herbertson.]*

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Why did not you protest before?

Mr. MURPHY: He went on the deputation with us.

Mr. HERBERTSON: I have been at this very thing for some time. (Hear, hear!) The Minister for Mines has been there only a short time and he has not had much opportunity of hearing it.

Mr. MURPHY: Our Government will be all right for the mining industry. (Laughter.)

Mr. KENNA: We will not starve it anyway.

Mr. HERBERTSON: Another matter I would like to touch on is that of the railways. I would point out that whilst we hear a good deal about the amount of money that is going to be spent in putting down new railways, I think they ought to make the railways which are at present built more efficient than they are. (Hear, hear!) They spend thousands—aye, and millions—in putting down these main lines of railway, but what about the accommodation provided on these lines? With regard to the raw producer, in whose interests these lines were built, how is he treated?

Mr. WOODS: Like a dog. (Laughter.)

Mr. HERBERTSON: As a matter of fact, many of these stations are only little bits of wayside dog kennels, I call them. (Hear, hear!) There is no accommodation for the travelling public at all. When the producer brings his produce to these stations he has to throw it on the ground and leave it there to be ruined by the weather.

Mr. MURPHY: Our Government will alter all that. (Laughter.)

Mr. KENNA: These things are worse since the coalition.

Mr. HERBERTSON: That is the experience all along the line everywhere I have gone. They spend a lot of money in putting down the lines and then they are penurious about spending a few hundred pounds in putting up decent station buildings and shed accommodation for the producers who are going to use that line. As a matter of fact, the people who bring their cream into the country wayside stations have to leave it on the sidings, and there it is left in the open sun. We talk of putting railways into the country to settle people on the land. Yes, we settle them. The land settles them.

Mr. KENNA: Under the land mostly.

Mr. HERBERTSON: Yes, they get under the land before they do much good. This is the position of affairs with regard to our railways. Only a few days ago I had occasion to go to the Railway Department to ask them to put up a small shed on an old siding which had been in use for eight or ten years. It was to enable the farmers to put their stuff into it before it was trucked away. I was told on inquiry that there was no money on the Estimates. What money had been placed there was all used up. These people had to dump their stuff on the sidings, and if it came on to rain it was ruined. These are the people we are putting on the land and that is the provision we are making for them. We build the railways out of the public purse, and these people assist to pay for them. I had occasion to get a small siding put down some twelve months ago. When I went to the Railway Department to ask about it they said it would cost £70. There was a great deal of timber sent away from that station—or proposed to be sent away—and as they had filled up the station yard with log timber they could not get any more in. I said to

the officer in charge here, "Well, what is £70? There is £200 worth of freight lying on that siding and they are waiting to get a chance to put it on the trucks." He said, "I will have an inquiry made into that, and have a report made on it." The report was made, and some five or six months afterwards the work was put in hand. Some little time ago I went to Longreach, and I found the station accommodation a disgrace to the Railway Department. After you leave Westwood there is not a decent railway station. At Bogantungan, one of the refreshment stopping places, there is a hotel a long distance from the line, and you have to make a bolt for it to get breakfast, if you know where to find the hotel. This is the way in which this Government assists the producers and travelling public. The same thing occurs all along the line, and at Longreach you find the station buildings consist of a wretched pokey little place, which is a disgrace to the department. In the first place, it is only about 20 feet by 10 feet. On inquiry from the station-master I learned that the takings for the previous year were over £20,000, and he was in a little bit of a box measuring about 10 feet square, together with his clerk, and they have to receive all the packages that come by train in that place. Then the station is on the wrong side of the line. I saw by the papers a few days ago that the Deputy Commissioner was up there, and he informed a deputation of townspeople that he was afraid he would not be able to do anything for them, and yet we are squandering thousands of pounds on new railways when we cannot make things decent on the railways we have already built. I contend that something should be done in this direction for the producers of the country and the travelling public. I have another complaint to make in regard to the freight on cream. In my district we pay much higher freight on cream than on anything else. There are two stations 43 miles apart, and the freight on cream between those two stations is £1 8s. per ton. And yet we are told that the railways are built principally for the convenience of the primary producer. I say they are nothing of the kind. It seems to me that everything is done that can be done against the small farmer. Instead of assisting him, everything is done to discourage him. In consequence of these complaints, and in consequence of what I have enumerated in the past, I am going to vote for the amendment moved by the senior member for Fortitude Valley.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

\* Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): I desire to make a few casual observations upon the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. The party on this side have been very anxious to bring the debate to a division—(laughter)—but owing to the obstructive tactics—

Mr. GRANT: Don't be sarcastic.

Mr. MURPHY: Of the supporters of the Government, we have been unable to obtain a division as early as we would have liked. During the debate we have heard a lot about judgeship. We have had the Premier, we have had the Secretary for Mines, we have had every member on the Government side of the House who has risen, attacking the leader of this party in connection with a Supreme Court judgeship. But I have a complaint to make against the Government. I say they treated Mr. Macnaughton, the leader of the Northern bar, most atrociously.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[*Mr. Herbertson.*]

Mr. MURPHY: They asked him whether he would accept the Northern District Court judgeship. That gentleman accepted it, took the word of the Government, sacrificed his business in Townsville, and was then told by the Government that the matter of the appointment of a Northern District Court judge had been postponed indefinitely. Why did that postponement take place? When Mr. Macnaughton accepted the position, he was to take up his duties on 1st May. What might be termed a political crisis occurred. The Government were in a hole. They did not know how they were going to hold their supporters. They thought they would have to reconstruct the Cabinet. In order to find billets for some of their followers who were threatening to leave them, they were going to put the Hon. T. O'Sullivan on the District Court bench, and put one of their other followers into the Ministry. However, the fact remains that Mr. Macnaughton was very badly treated, and the treatment which he received at the hands of the Government does not warrant any party in this House in supporting them. When you cannot accept the word of a Government upon a point like that, when their Attorney-General makes an agreement with the leader of the Northern bar, and then the Government refuse to ratify it, the sooner that Government is out of office the better for Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: I suppose that before the division takes place we shall have either the Secretary for Public Instruction or the Treasurer getting up to make a personal explanation in connection with the matter. The matter requires explaining, undoubtedly, and I am sure the country will agree with me that Mr. Macnaughton was very badly treated by the present Government.

The TREASURER: Did he tell you that he got the promise of the judgeship?

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know Mr. Macnaughton. I have never spoken to him in my life, but when I was coming to Brisbane it was stated in the papers that he had accepted the Northern District Court judgeship.

The TREASURER: Does that make it a fact?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MURPHY: Why does not the Treasurer or some other member of the Government rise in his place and explain the matter?

Mr. BLAIR: They cannot deny it.

The TREASURER: It is the first time you have raised it. I say distinctly there was no promise ever made to Mr. Macnaughton.

Mr. MURPHY: It was published in the papers.

The TREASURER: That does not make it a fact.

Mr. MURPHY: The matter was referred to by interjection by myself on the night that the Premier was criticising the leader of this party. Why does not some hon. member on the other side get up and make a personal explanation? We have been told that we are obstructing business in this House. Why, most of the time has been devoted to personal explanations by hon. members on that side.

The TREASURER: You have made a few on your side.

Mr. MURPHY: I never made any personal explanation.

The TREASURER: I said on your side.

Mr. MURPHY: I have no necessity to make a personal explanation. When the coalition was formed, I said it was a betrayal of the promises made by the Premier to the people of Queensland, and I was not going with him. And what happened? The Secretary for Mines went to England. He was not here at the last caucus meeting. When he came back, did he say that he believed in the coalition? Did he say that he believed it would be a good thing for the country, and that he was going to support it? Not at all. He went down to the newspapers and made them contradict the assertion that he had said he would support it. What did he do then? He sat on the fence till he got it. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I said I was going to support the Government in their policy.

Mr. MURPHY: Then he went away to Ravenswood to consult Johnny Moran—(laughter)—and a few of his prominent supporters—to consult his committee—and he came back and rose in his place [9.30 p.m.] in this House and stated that, after interviewing his committee, he thought he would be able to give independent support to the Government. He was to be only an independent supporter then; but, now he is Secretary for Mines, we find him going back on a land tax, on his temperance principles, on the promise with respect to a Northern Dunwich, and on his desire for fairer treatment of the mining industry.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: You ought to prove that, not make an assertion.

Mr. MURPHY: During this debate the full story of the coalition has been told, and what do we find? We find that, so far as the Premier is concerned, he basely deceived his party. While he was coming to us and telling us that there was to be an unconditional surrender of the Philp party, he was going to the Philp party and telling them that they should have four portfolios.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not so.

Mr. MURPHY: We have it on the authority of the hon. member for Fassifern. (Government laughter.)

The TREASURER: The hon. member for Townsville denied that.

Mr. MURPHY: Did the senior member for Townsville say that the Premier, Mr. Kidston, had not promised him four portfolios? No. What he denied was that he went out of the caucus meeting of the Philp party, saw Mr. Kidston, came back, and said they were to get four portfolios. The four portfolios were promised him before that caucus meeting.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not so.

Mr. MURPHY: We have been told that some members of the Kidston party have been guilty of giving away caucus secrets. Why, the secrets had been given away before the caucus was finished. We had hardly got down to the corner of the street before the organ of the Government, the *Daily Mail*, was selling a special edition, announcing that there had been a fusion of parties.

Mr. AIREY: And publishing the Premier's statement.

Mr. MURPHY: The statement must have been supplied to the paper before the caucus was held. If the Premier had told the members present at that caucus that the Philp

*Mr. Murphy.]*

party were to receive four portfolios, and had named the members who were to get those portfolios, there would have been no coalition. The coalition was brought about on the blind. It was all on the blind. The only man in the party who was not going on the blind was the Premier, and he laid it down very clearly to both parties that they had to accept him as their leader. He was not going on the blind. If the late Minister for Education, who used to go round the country referring to the Premier as "our Cromwell," "our Mell-wraith," had known that the result of the coalition was going to be that he was to be shifted from the Education Department, we should not have had him rubbing his hands at that meeting and telling us what a grand thing it would be for Queensland to bring about a fusion of parties. The hon. member for Woollongabba said the coalition was brought about when the Philp party came over in the session of 1908, and helped the Premier to pass certain railway proposals. But it is a strange thing if the hon. member for Woollongabba thought that we had then agreed to a coalition, that even on the night of the caucus he should have come down to the meeting prepared with the Premier's Rockhampton speech, with all the paragraphs marked in which the Premier had stated that if he agreed to a coalition with the Philp party he would be guilty of gross betrayal of his party. That hon. member also stated that we had plenty of time to discuss the proposal. Why, the hon. member would not record his vote either for or against the coalition, because he said the Premier had not given the party sufficient time to debate such a big question.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He was playing the game.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; he was playing the game, but he won't play the game when he has to face the electors of Woollongabba the next time. Even the silvery-tongued orator of Burke will not be able to induce the organisation formed under the auspices of the People's Progressive League to accept the hon. member for Woollongabba again.

Mr. BLAIR: No.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member for Woollongabba referred to a dream that the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba is supposed to have had. By a singular coincidence what has been termed "Hunter's Dream" has dropped into my hands, and I think it would be interesting if I made just a short reference to it. I do not know whether Secretary Robinson is responsible for the effusion, but it is possible that he is. It reads as follows:—

The hon. member for Woollongabba lay lapt in a deep teetotal slumber, broken only by casual dreams.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is that?

Mr. MURPHY: It is a poem. (Laughter.)

The member for Woollongabba lay lapt in a deep teetotal slumber, broken only by casual dreams. He recalled in his visions the last general election, and fancied he heard again the voice of the electors asking him, "Davie, would you join any Philp coalition?" Again his chest expanded—again his voice rang out, "No, never!"

Another dream passed through his brain, and he was talking to himself in this fashion—

"My election committee secretary, Robinson, got a good billet as his reward for joining the Kid-Philp coalition—a billet as secretary of the P.P.L. Shall I have any such luck when I am fired out next election? And a hollow voice replied in dismal tones, 'No, Davie, no, never.'"

[Mr. Murphy.]

Again he dreamt that he was addressing the free and independent electors of the Woollongabba. "I'm a trades unionist to the backbone, and I am also a loyal member of a bitter political anti-trades union party. Can I not persuade you that the men like the hon. member for Bulimba who previously opposed the Trade Disputes Bill are now good democrats and friends of the trades unions, and that I am missionary working among the heathen Tories to convert them to the truth! And the electors roared like one man—"

LABOUR MEMBERS: No, never!

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think a quotation of that character is a creditable one to make in Parliament; I hope the hon. member will conduct his contribution to the debate in a serious way.

Mr. MURPHY: I noticed that when the hon. member for Woollongabba was giving the particulars of a dream no great exception was taken to his doing so. However, I have no desire to further dilate upon that question, because I feel confident that when he next faces the electors of Woollongabba it will not only be a dream that he would be fired out, but it will be a reality. This coalition has taken place, and thereby a great and growing political party was basely betrayed by the Premier. Speaking at Rockhampton, after the declaration of the poll, when he was very much elated at the great democratic victory, the Premier said—

Mr. KERR: Was he addressing the dress circle then?

Mr. MURPHY: This is what the Premier said—

As to the apparent result of the election there were still a few little matters in dispute, but one thing had been settled, and that was that the electors of Queensland did not want the Philp party back at any price. (Great applause.) That party had put up fifty-four candidates, and of that number they had secured twenty-four seats.

Then the Hon. the Premier went on to refer to the lower orders who returned Mr. Grant and himself and the superior class who had opposed him. That is one of the remarks made by the Premier, who was then leader of the Opposition, on the occasion of the big democratic victory when the Labour party and the Kidston party fought side by side practically to down the party which the Premier then described as "political pirates." Now he tells us he only plays to the dress circle—he has nothing to do with the lower orders—ho does not want their votes.

Mr. JACKSON: It was only a joke, and you know it.

Mr. MURPHY: Every time the Premier and his colleague have been returned for Rockhampton, they have been returned, as the Premier pointed out on the occasion of the last election, by the votes of the lower orders, and in spite of the antagonism of the superior class.

Mr. MANN: He won't recognise the lower orders now.

Mr. MURPHY: I remember the Premier making a speech in which he said while he was in command of the ship of State, "he would not allow the vessel to be steered from either the saloon end or the steerage end—it would be steered from the bridge." The ship of State may be steered from the bridge at the present time, but in my opinion the present Premier is not captain on the bridge.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: He is on the rocks.

Mr. MURPHY: The Premier told us his legislation would be coloured by the decision of the majority of the party. (Hear, hear!)

It has been shown by quotations from *Hansard* that the majority of members who are now supporting the present Government, voted against all democratic legislation introduced into this Chamber, so that when we say we are going to vote for the amendment moved by the leader of the Labour party, I say that we are voting for what we believe to be in the best interests of the people of Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: The Secretary for Railways during the course of his remarks pointed out that the Kidston party and the Philp party polled more votes than the Labour party. That is quite true. He claimed that those two parties had gone out to fight the Labour party. That was not so. If the electors had wanted to return Philp candidates, they had fifty-four persons to select from, and they only returned twenty-four. You will recollect, Sir, that every candidate who stood in the Kidston interest at the last election was bracketed "Kidston Socialist" by the *Brisbane Courier*. In your case, Sir, "K.S." was put after your name when standing for Dalby. (Hear, hear!) The Treasurer was branded "K.S."; the Secretary for Mines was branded "K.S."; the hon. member for North Rockhampton was branded "K.S."; and the hon. member for Toowong was branded "K.S." They were all "Kidston Socialists." The Kidston candidates were called as bad as the Labour party. The Secretary for Public Lands, to suit himself, says both parties went out to fight the Labour party, and consequently there has been no betrayal of the people, because both parties are sitting together on the Government benches. After the elections the *Courier* laid it down that the electors had returned 25 Ministerialists, 25 Kidston Socialists, and 22 members of the Labour party, so that the paper which was then supporting the Secretary for Public Lands was quite satisfied that the verdict of the majority of the electors was against the Philp party. It was quite true, as the Premier said at the last elections, "that the people of Queensland had made up their minds that they wanted nothing more to do with the old Philp Administration."

Mr. KEOGH: Oh, yes, they did.

Mr. MURPHY: During this debate a great deal has been said about offering portfolios and the forming of new Governments. It is only fair on my part that I should inform the House that no blame for such proceedings rests either upon the leader of the Labour party or upon the leader of this party. I am the guilty party. (Laughter.) I must confess to this House that since the formation of this coalition Government I have developed a weakness—I might also say a mania—for forming Governments and offering portfolios. (Renewed laughter.) To be exact, I should say that I offered about five dozen and six portfolios during the last few months.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A portfolio mania. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: That is exactly what I pointed out. To some I offered one, and to others I offered two, and when I could not induce them to accept a portfolio, I offered them the Speakership. (Laughter.) It speaks well for the purity—(continued laughter)—of the tone of this Assembly that I still retain all those portfolios, and that the hon. member for Fassifern and the hon. member for Rosewood—

Mr. KEOGH: You did not offer me a portfolio, did you?

Mr. MURPHY: Both declined my offer. (Laughter.) But, with regard to the Speakership, the hon. member for Rosewood and the hon. member for Toombul dallied, and they almost yielded. (Renewed laughter.) It is only fair to point out that the hon. member for Cambooya, in particular, was adamant. Three times did I approach him, and three times was I rebuffed. (Laughter.) In the words of Shakespeare—

You all did see how on the Lupercal  
I thrice did offer him a kingly crown,  
Which he did thrice refuse.

My method of procedure was very simple. I simply walked up to, say, the hon. member for Rosewood, and I said: "Dinny"—

The SPEAKER: Order, order! I should be glad if the hon. member would connect his observations to the amendment before the House.

Mr. MURPHY: We have been accused on this side of the House of having hawked portfolios all over Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: The leader of this party has been accused of offering portfolios, and members of the Labour party have been accused of offering portfolios, and I am just showing to the House that it was I who offered the portfolios. (Laughter.) Other reference has been made to portfolios here. The hon. member for Townsville explained how he offered the hon. member for Fassifern a portfolio. He gave the conversation which occurred on that occasion, and I only desire to point out that when I approached Mr. Keogh, the hon. member for Rosewood, and asked him if he would accept a portfolio in a new Government, I simply said to him, "Dinny!"—(Laughter.)

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MURPHY: But I am giving the conversation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall be very glad if the hon. member will endeavour to realise that he is in Parliament. The speech he is making now is, in my opinion, distinctly one not becoming the tone which should be observed in this Chamber.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not desire you to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hear the hon. member for Bowen making *sotto voce* remarks. If the hon. member has any criticisms to make upon my ruling he knows what course to pursue.

Mr. KERR: He might take the first opportunity.

Mr. MURPHY: I would just like to point out that I do not know that it is the duty of a Speaker to criticise the utterances of any hon. member.

Mr. WOODS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: My experience in reading the debates in the House of Commons and other parliamentary debates does not convince me that it is the duty of a Speaker to criticise adversely the utterances of any member.

Mr. KENNA: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member appears to be labouring under a misapprehension. It is essentially the duty of the Speaker to endeavour to preserve the proper tone in a debate. A Speaker is not doing his duty—there are precedents for that in the House of Commons—a Speaker is not doing his duty if he allows a member to make a speech that he considers unworthy of the House without calling attention to it.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

*Mr. Murphy.]*

Mr. MURPHY: I do not agree with you on that point, Mr. Speaker. What may not suit you may suit the country and may suit the House. I have no desire, of course, to criticise your ruling in this respect, but I would just like to point out to you that last night you, in your capacity as Speaker, rose—

Mr. AIREY: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: And defended a department you had control of some time ago.

Mr. AIREY: A most unheard-of proceeding.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must realise that if I then did what he considers wrong, he should have called attention to it at the moment, and taken what he believed to be the proper step. The hon. member cannot justify himself, or criticise my ruling now, by referring to anything that has occurred on a previous occasion.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: I was explaining to the House in connection with these portfolios. I considered it my duty, as one who had made the offer of portfolios to certain members of this Chamber, to show that the leader of this party and the leader of the Labour party were not to blame in that matter.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: I have only to point out that my experiences in that connection were somewhat varied—perhaps I might say variegated, as a more expressive term. I say that it is to the credit of this Assembly that, although I have offered so many portfolios, we are still short. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. KENNA: Are not there a few left?

Mr. MURPHY: Now there is a matter to which I desire to refer, and it is this: That while we have been accused of wasting time in this House, what is the position of members of the Government? We have heard the Premier deliver an electioneering speech; we heard the Secretary for Mines deliver an electioneering speech, and we know that thousands of copies of the Premier's speech are being circulated throughout Queensland to-day. In that speech the Premier explains why he left the Labour party, or he tried to explain why he left the Labour party.

Mr. AIREY: That was quite irrelevant to the motion—he spoke for an hour on it.

Mr. MURPHY: Quite irrelevant. But he neglected to explain why he burst up the Kidston party, or what was known throughout the country as the Kidston party. He told us that at the end of the 1908 session no arrangement had been entered into between himself and the leader of the then Opposition with regard to that coalition, but the fact remains that during the time the hon. gentleman was in London he was in constant communication with the secretary of the National Liberal Association, which shows that prior to his departure for London he had entered into an agreement to try and bring about a coalition of the two parties. He told us that if he went down now he would come up again. I very much doubt that. The hon. gentleman will be unable to find any party in this House to trust him or support him. We know that the members of the Philp party have no particular love for the Premier; there is no reason that they should have any love for the Premier.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: And I say that it is to the great credit of that party that they are at the present time supporting their own leader, who

[Mr. Murphy.

undoubtedly is now giving the Premier every support because it suits that party to give the Premier support at the present time. Of course we all recognise that the senior member for Townsville is undoubtedly the leader of that party at the present time; and if we go to the country, if there is to be an election, if the people of Queensland are going to be given an opportunity of showing whether they believe in this coalition or not, I feel perfectly satisfied that after the election the parties now sitting on the Opposition side of this House will have to cross the floor and take possession of the Government benches.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: Now, a great deal has been said during this debate by members on the Government side of the House, that the party in opposition are particularly anxious to impose a land tax upon the farmers. The hon. member for Clermont made a speech on the land question the other evening, and we notice that thousands of copies of that speech are being circulated amongst the farmers, in order to try and induce them to believe that if there is one party in this House which desires to drive them from their farms, it is the Labour party. I notice in the *Queensland Times* of Saturday last, 24th July instant, a communication from the junior member for Ipswich, in which he referred to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Clermont—

LAND VALUE TAXATION.

To the Editor of *Queensland Times*.

Sir,—In reference to the recent remarks made by Mr. V. B. J. Lesina, M.L.A., regarding land value taxation, the extravagance of which carries its own condemnation, please permit me to say that "a thumping big land tax of 3d. to 1s. in the £1" has never been proposed by any responsible Labour leader or member of the Parliamentary Labour party at either a Labour convention, Labour caucus, or in Parliament assembled.

Whatever pronouncement Mr. Lesina has made in this connection is entirely his own individual opinion, and I know no member of the party, nor have I met a single supporter of the Labour party in the constituencies, who would subscribe to any "big, thumping" land tax proposal which would have the effect of "taxing the farmer off the land."

Indeed, if such a proposal were made, I would make one to fight against it to the bitter end, and the farmers of West Moreton know quite well that I would do so.

It is no pleasure to me to criticise remarks made by Mr. Lesina, but as they are calculated to give an incorrect impression of the policy of the Labour party upon the land question as affecting the *bona fide* settler, I feel it my duty, as a member of the party and a member of its Central Political Executive (the Labour party's "board of management") to take advantage of your columns and make this explanation.

Yours, etc.,

WM. J. R. MAUGHAN.

Ipswich, 23rd July.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: I am very pleased that the junior member for Ipswich referred to the speech of the hon. member for Clermont, and pointed out that no party in this House desired to confiscate anybody's farm.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: It would be madness for any party to want to do so. All parties advocate settling people on the land and

[10 p.m.] helping to keep them on the land; and it would be ridiculous for any

party to impose taxation which would have the effect of driving people from their farms or making the conditions so unjust or unfair that they could not make a decent living. We are told that the great policy of this Government is railway construction. They tell us there are several railways they desire to pass this session.

We know they have promised certain railways ; but are they building all the railways this House has already passed?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, except one. The Bill is now waiting to be introduced.

Mr. MURPHY: We are told that these railways are required to open up land for settlement. We already have railways that have cost the country millions of pounds, and I ask if all the good land in the vicinity of these railways has been taken up and is occupied by close settlement.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: The senior member for Townsville said this afternoon that the Opposition party object to borrowing. I am one who objects to indiscriminate borrowing. I say that the policy of borrowing can go too far, and that the first duty of the Government in connection with settling people on the land is to see they have an opportunity of getting and working the good land in the neighbourhood of existing railways. But what do we find? It has been pointed out by the Secretary for Lands that some of our railways run through large estates which ought to be taken over by the State and cut up into small areas for farmers. I am one who never favoured to any great extent the repurchase of estates. The farmers have had to pay too dearly for repurchased land.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: And if they were wise they would recognise that a good stiff graduated land tax would break up those estates and then they would have an opportunity of getting good land much cheaper than they can get it to-day.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: Last night the hon. member for Barcoo pointed out that it was very easy for the hon. member for Clermont to advocate a land tax, because there were no small freeholds in his electorate. It is equally easy for me to do so, because I represent a district where there is no freehold land. All the land in Croydon is held under goldfields homestead leases, at 5s. rental for thirty years, and at the end of that time 1s. a year. The advantage of that system of tenure is that when the place goes down and it does not pay to speculate in land or hold land, we do not bother about paying the rates; and at the end of the year we do not pay the 5s., and it becomes Crown land again. I believe in a higher exemption than appears in the Labour party's platform; I would give more than a £300 exemption in land value taxation. But have the farmers nothing to fear from the hon. members who occupy the Treasury benches? Are there no land-taxers on that side? Is not the Secretary for Mines a land-taxer? Is not the Treasurer a land-taxer? Is not the Secretary for Lands a land-taxer?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And the Premier.

Mr. MURPHY: Did not the Secretary for Lands, the Secretary for Mines, the Treasurer, the hon. member for North Brisbane, and several other members on that side vote for land taxation?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: People settling on the land have no more to fear from the party now sitting in opposition—

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: They have less to fear.

Mr. MURPHY: I will say they have no more to fear from the party in opposition than from the party who now control the ship of State. It has already been said that the

Government have no sympathy with the mining industry; and it is a remarkable fact that after the coalition was formed and a majority of the mining members refused to follow the Premier any longer, one of the first acts of the new Government was to reduce the mining vote by £20,000.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: The Secretary for Mines said the other night that the Premier had never promised us £50,000.

Mr. WOODS: He knows better than that.

Mr. MURPHY: The Secretary for Mines introduced the deputation which waited on the Premier with regard to the mining vote.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: I never denied that—I supported it.

Mr. MURPHY: Having looked up the papers, I say it must be admitted that the Premier in his reply did not expressly say £50,000; but every member of the deputation, including the present Minister for Mines, left the building under the impression that the mining industry was to get not less than £50,000. The Premier gave us to understand that if more was needed than £50,000 it would be got. When the session was closing the House voted a certain sum of loan money; and the senior member for Gympie and myself went to the Premier and pointed out that we had been to the Treasurer, who told us that no money would be available for mining unless we obtained instructions from the Premier—that he could not make the money available before the end of the financial year—and the Premier went with us to the Treasurer and told him to make the money available. When the junior member for South Brisbane, Mr. Airey, made up his last Estimates as Treasurer he put £50,000 down for mining upon the Estimates.

Mr. AIREY: I was told by the Under Secretary for Mines.

Mr. MURPHY: As Mr. Blair told us last session, the Under Secretary for Mines received instructions from him that £50,000 was available for mining. What happened? I am not blaming the Secretary for Mines in regard to anything that was said about those conversations, because he left for England before the session closed.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: That is so. I know nothing about them.

Mr. MURPHY: When the mining members left the Premier what did he do? He took £20,000 off the mining industry in order to pay to the dress circle and talk about a University. (Hear, hear!) With regard to a University, about which we have heard so much, I think that that money could be better utilised for technical education in some of the outside centres, in making scholarships and bursaries for Grammar schools more valuable in order to allow the children of poor people in outside centres who win scholarships to have an opportunity of taking advantage of them. What opportunity has a child of a poor man living in Croydon of getting a scholarship and taking advantage of it at the Townsville Grammar School?

Mr. ALLEN: Absolutely none.

Mr. MURPHY: Absolutely none. Before we spend large sums on a University we want to spend more money with regard to our present system of education. I know that the Treasurer wants to get a surplus. Well, he got his surplus. The Federal Government took good care to send him along a surplus, and I sincerely trust they will continue to do so. I am not one of those who wanted to follow the Premier because he wanted to fight the Federal Labour party, because

*Mr. Murphy.]*

he said Mr. Fisher would not give him back sufficient money from the Commonwealth. We were sitting behind the Government at the time the coalition was brought about. What were we asked to do? We were asked to vote for the old party that wanted to keep on black labour in Queensland. We were asked to support the old party which opposed democratic legislation in the Commonwealth.

Mr. AIREY: Poll tax.

Mr. MURPHY: We were asked to support the party which would put on the poll tax. (Hear, hear!) We were asked to support the party which wanted to hand over the mining fields of Queensland to the moneyed people who did not want to fulfil the labour conditions as they do at present. If we had followed the Premier into the coalition we would have had to agree to all these things. I know that members are very anxious to get a vote to-night, but there are two or three other matters I wish to refer to.

Mr. WOODS: No hope of a division to-night.

Mr. MURPHY: We are told that if we turn this Government out of office that immigration will cease. We have also been told that there are no unemployed in Queensland. That statement is absolutely incorrect. We have also been told by the Premier and by other members sitting on that side of the House that they wanted to bring out immigrants to populate the waste spaces of the North. What has this Government done to help the North?

AN OPPOSITION MEMBER: Nothing.

Mr. MURPHY: There is some fine land in the far North in the Gulf country, which is just as good as the land on the Darling Downs. (Hear, hear!) But before you can get a large population in the North you must find a market for the people who settle on that land. Until we find these markets we should develop the great mineral—particularly the gold—resources of the North. This afternoon the senior member for Townsville complained that the hon. member for Toowoomba and the hon. member for Cook wanted to bring out too many immigrants—that their policy was to bring too many immigrants into Queensland. The hon. member said he never wanted to bring in too many people at one time.

The TREASURER: Three thousands a week, he said.

Mr. MURPHY: I have been handed a copy of the *Brisbane Courier*, containing a speech delivered by the Premier, and I find here that he said—

Mr. Philp complained that the Government immigration scheme did not go far enough. He wanted to see immigrants brought in by thousands every week.

Mr. MULCAHY: What date is that?

Mr. MURPHY: 28th March, 1907, on the eve of the election. As I pointed out, unless the Government are prepared to give more assistance to the mining industry than they are at the present time, unless they will give the Mines Department more money to open up our mineral tracts, then there is no providing for settling the people on the land in far Northern Queensland. This afternoon the senior member for Townsville twitted me with having been a member of the Labour party, and with having supported the present Premier. That is quite true. Why did I leave the Labour party? I was fired out by the Labour party because upon many platforms in Queensland I expressed my utmost confidence in the Premier. I pointed out that I believed he was a sincere democrat. And when I stood in his interests for Croydon at the last election I was asked on several platforms whether, in the event of the present

Premier agreeing to a coalition with Mr. Philp, I would be a supporter of his. I pointed out that for over twenty years I had been a strong opponent of the Philp policy, that I had supported a leader of the Labour party for years, and under no condition would I agree to a coalition with the Philp party.

Mr. WOODS: Every one of us did the same thing.

Mr. MURPHY: I quoted from the speeches of Mr. Kidston, and pointed out to the electors that there was no possibility of a coalition, because Mr. Kidston said that that would be a base betrayal of the people.

Mr. AIREY: And you believed him?

Mr. MURPHY: Of course I believed him. When the Premier brought about that coalition, and when he went back on his pledges, and when he basely betrayed the people of Queensland, then I, with five others, left him and came over here. A good deal has been said about those who continued to support the Government last session. We have been told that they supported the Government last session, and consequently they should continue to support them. I say that when those hon. gentlemen crossed the floor of the House they did quite right, because when they supported the Premier in his coalition with Mr. Philp they did wrong. They were pledged, as the whole party was pledged at the last election, not to agree to a coalition.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: I am glad that those hon. members saw the errors of their ways. (Hear, hear.) I am glad they left. We have been told by the Premier, by the Secretary for Lands, by the hon. member for Townsville, and by the hon. member for Woollongabba, that we are blocking business this session. Did not he have a majority of fourteen last session, and what business was done?

Mr. KENNA: Nothing.

Mr. MURPHY: Did they attempt to do any business?

Mr. KENNA: No.

Mr. MURPHY: Absolutely none. When they had a majority of fourteen, with a strong, coherent, progressive party, what did they do?

Mr. KENNA: No divided allegiance.

Mr. MURPHY: They scurried for recess. What about the no-divided allegiance, the Rockhampton programme, the Trade Disputes Bill, and everything else? The debate has been going on for four weeks. We have met three days a week. Business starts at half-past 3 o'clock, and we have been closing down at 10 o'clock at night. Members on this side have not objected to sitting five days a week. When we sat behind the Premier from 1904 to 1908 we had very late sittings; and, if it is in the interests of the country, if it is necessary to transact public business, that the members of this House should sit every day in the week, we are quite prepared to do it; but we are not prepared to be bulldozed and browbeaten, and told to sit down and not allowed to talk just because it suits the convenience of the Hon. the Premier. We are not here to consider the convenience of the Premier at all. I, for one, would always be prepared to try to consider the convenience of the Speaker, but I would not be prepared to go to any great extent in trying to consider the convenience of the Premier and the front Government bench, because they can come in and go out of the Chamber just as other members can. We are prepared to come here every day and help to transact their business. We know they want to put through some more railways. They

[Mr. Murphy.]

have to put through some railways or they will lose their majority. It has been said that there is no maladministration. I pointed out earlier in the evening that I considered there had been maladministration with regard to the Northern judgship, and I want to point out that members on this side are being wretchedly treated by the Government at the present time. What happened to the hon. member for Cairns? As the representative of the district he put in an application for certain medals for the Atherton show. A refusal, on the ground that there were no medals available! A letter comes down from Atherton to the Government asking for the medals. Another refusal! Then down comes an application since the crisis. The Government are anxious to win the Cairns seat. The Premier told them in Cairns that he would do anything he could for Cairns. Although they refuse the application of the hon. member for Cairns, they grant the medals to another party subsequently to the refusal.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: Surely a few medals would not buy that constituency?

Mr. MURPHY: A few medals would not buy them. But what happened to the hon. member for Carpentaria? An application came in for a grant of money to help to sink a well on the Normanton-Cloncurry road. The hon. member was told that no money was available.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He was not told that there was no money available.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: That was by the Home Secretary before he left the Mines.

Mr. MURPHY: Later on a wire was received in Normanton from the hon. member for Moreton—a one-time member for Carpentaria—"Yes, the matter will be favourably considered." He said he had an absolute promise of it.

Mr. KERR: This is the Government that buys no support.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He went to the wrong department. He went to the Home Secretary instead of to the Mines Department, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. BOWMAN: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. MURPHY: I have written to my friends in Croydon and told them, "Now is the time to go in for some money. Get in early. Get somebody who is known to be an opponent of mine to put in an application, and the thing is as good as done." What have the Government been doing lately? The hon. member for Fassifern said that he was going to vote for the no-confidence motion. Special trains into his electorate to intimidate the hon. member and influence his vote!

Mr. BOWMAN: One of the most scandalous things ever done in Australia.

Mr. MURPHY: It is most scandalous that Ministers should be running round the country trying to intimidate members of this House.

The TREASURER: Educating the people.

Mr. MURPHY: Fancy the Treasurer going round the country trying to educate anybody! (Opposition laughter.) What did he say at Enoggera at the last election? He stood up on the platform and said, "Ladies and gentlemen, you can rely upon this: that never shall I agree to a coalition with the Philp party."

The TREASURER: I never said any such thing.

Mr. MURPHY: It was reported in the *Freeman*.

The TREASURER: I was never asked the question.

Mr. MURPHY: If I were to produce the *Freeman* I could produce exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, and

A, B, C, showing how members on the other side pledged themselves to their electors never to agree to a coalition with the Philp party.

The TREASURER: You cannot produce it in my case.

Mr. MANN: I think we can. I saw it.

Mr. MURPHY: I have no time just now.

The TREASURER: I should think you have not.

Mr. MURPHY: If I cannot produce the *Freeman* in the case of the hon. gentleman, I can produce it and also the daily papers with regard to other members on that side—members who said that a coalition with the Philp party would be a betrayal of the people. Did not the junior member for Toowoomba make that pledge?

Mr. ROBERTS: I never made any pledge.

Mr. BOWMAN: You have broken many a one.

Mr. ROBERTS: I never did.

The SPEAKER: Order, order, order!

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: You mean you never kept one.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member says that he never made any pledge, but I will point out that on the eve of the election there was a great gathering in Toowoomba, when the Premier went up and delivered an address in support of the two hon. members for Toowoomba. Did he not attack the Philp party? Did he not say that they were Tories? Did he not refer to the Philp-Leahy reactionaries? Did he not point out that, if they ever controlled legislation, there was no further chance of getting democratic measures through this Chamber? And did not the junior member for Toowoomba say, "Hear, hear!"?

Mr. ROBERTS: No. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: I remember when I was a member of the Labour party I was appointed as one of a committee to interview the Central Political Executive and try to fix up the disruption which had then taken place in the party. The hon. member was one of the Central Political Executive. We went up there. We talked about the land question. We were told we had ratted on the platform, that we had to get outside, that we were "scabs" and "rats."

Mr. AIREY: Not by the junior member for Toowoomba, surely?

Mr. MURPHY: He was one of the worst. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. ROBERTS: No.

Mr. MURPHY: There were several of them there, but he was one of the worst. I have no objection to the hon. member changing his policy if he does it sincerely. If he has gone back upon his years of advocacy of no freehold land, if he has gone back upon his land tax proposals, if he has gone back on his socialistic objective—he was one of those who passed it at the Rockhampton Convention—if he is absolutely sincere in that, then I find no fault with him. I have kept my speech free from personalities. (Opposition laughter.) I have followed the very good example of the hon. the senior member for Townsville in that respect. (Renewed Opposition laughter.) I know that we are going to take a division to-night, and I anticipate that when the vote is taken the Government will have a [10.30 p.m.] majority of one. There was an occasion in my history—it has been

referred to in this debate—when I was a majority of one, when the Government were fighting a big democratic battle; when the men who are now keeping the Government in power were sitting on this side of the House, and were trying to oust Sir Arthur, then Mr., Morgan. I saved the situation, but I did not know as much about politics then as I do now. The Premier talked about his present strong

Mr. Murphy.]

party last session, when he had a majority of fourteen. To-day he is anticipating a majority of one, and he is not certain that he will get that majority of one. In conclusion, I will repeat a verse—

The TREASURER: By the same author as the last.

Mr. MURPHY: Not exactly. We have whips of brains in this party. On the other side when the Premier and the Secretary for Lands speak they are finished, and there is absolute silence. Even the hon. member for Rosewood will not get up and pass a few casual observations on the motion of want of confidence.

Mr. KEOGH: I might say too much if I did. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY: We thoroughly understand that, and that is why we have been so anxious that the hon. member should address the House.

Bill Kidston had a barty—  
Vere ish dot barty now?  
Vere ish de shmile of Ylliam proud,  
The joy of Cow-ay's brow?  
Vere is their proud dress-circle shokes,  
Their hom-o-geneous glee?  
Gone away mit the lager bier,  
Of der last "Lucinda" spree!

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

In division,

Mr. COYNE (rising): Mr. Speaker,—I desire to draw your attention to the fact that two members have entered the House since you ordered the bar to be closed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will state his point of order seated.

Mr. COYNE: Yes. My point is that the hon. member for Lockyer and the hon. member for Toombul entered the Chamber after you ordered the bar to be closed.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: It was not down.

The SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member for Lockyer and the hon. member for Toombul whether they entered the House after the bar was closed.

Mr. COYNE: No, I did not say that. I said they entered after you ordered the bar to be closed.

The SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. member to state that there was a delay in the closing of the bar?

Mr. COYNE: Yes, Sir.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: There was not.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: The bar was not down.

LABOUR MEMBERS: The bar was down on one side.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: Mr. Speaker,—As a very old member of this House, and knowing full well what the rules of the House are, I wish to state that when I came to the bar—the hon. member for Logan preceded me, and the hon. member for Toombul was slightly behind me—the bar was not down.

Mr. COYNE: The order was given to close the bar.

The SPEAKER: Order! What does the hon. member for Toombul say?

Mr. PETRIE: I came in following the hon. member for Lockyer, and the bar was not down.

The SPEAKER: Do I understand that either of the two members mentioned interfered with the closing of the bar?

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

[*Mr. Murphy.*

The SPEAKER: I decide, then, to admit the votes.

Division taken—

AYES, 34.

Mr. Appel	Mr. Hunter, D.
" Armstrong	" Jackson
" Barnes, G. P.	" Keogh
" Barnes, W. H.	" Kidston
" Barton	" Mackintosh
" Brennan	" Maxwell
" Cottell	" Moore
" Cowap	" Paget
" Denham	" Petrie
" Forrest	" Philp
" Forsyth	" Rankin
" Fox	" Roberts
" Grant	" Somerset
" Grayson	" Stodart
" Gunn	" Swayne
" Hanran	" Thorn
" Hawthorn	" Walker

Tellers: Mr. Maxwell and Mr. Swayne.

NOES, 33.

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

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Jones.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Cribb and Mr. White.

Noes—Mr. Sumner and Mr. Jenkinson.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The announcement of the numbers was received with Government cheers and Opposition counter cheers.

## ADDRESS IN REPLY.

### RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

Question (motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply) stated—

Mr. RYLAND: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. HARDACRE: Before we go to a vote I think we should hear something from the Premier.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: The Premier just now is sitting with a Government which, after a long debate on a want of confidence motion, has been carried by a majority of only one.

Mr. FORSYTH: We knew that all the time.

Mr. HARDACRE: He certainly ought to do something more than treat practically a vote against them—with something more than merely allowing the debate on the Address in Reply to go on as if nothing had happened.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: It is not a very dignified position to occupy.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: Your own side has moved the adjournment of the debate.

The PREMIER: I rise to a point of order. Is this discussion in order on the motion moved by the hon. member for Gympie?

The SPEAKER: I think on the question of the adjournment of the debate, according to parliamentary usage, the hon. member is in order.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Government have come to a vote, and they have got a majority of one, and now they attempt to go on with the Address in Reply. I say it is a critical time. Immediately a moral defeat has occurred, it is the duty of the Premier, in the interests of the business of this State, in the interests of the dignity of Parliament, and in the interests of his own self-respect as the Premier of this State—it is his bounden duty to get up and make some statement that he will consider his position before we go one single step further.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: You know five weeks ago there was only a majority of one. The question now is that the debate be adjourned.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. HARDACRE: I think it is the duty of the Premier to make some statement to the country and to this House in regard to his position. In fact, it ought to have been the plain duty of the Premier himself to move the adjournment of the debate, in order that he might have time to consider whether he is justified in going one single step further. It is the plain duty of the Government, with a slender majority of one, to resign, and make a statement now that he will resign. It is impossible for a Government with a majority of one, out of a House of seventy-two, to carry on the business of this State. It is merely a waste of the time of the country, it is a waste of the time of the House, and will continue the political chaos and confusion he has already brought into the political affairs of this House. It simply means holding the Parliament of this country up to ridicule and derision by attempting to carry on with a slender majority of one.

Mr. MAXWELL: The minority want to carry on.

Mr. HARDACRE: I submit it is the Premier's duty to make a statement now, because, if he intends to carry on, it is plainly against all constitutional precedents.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARDACRE: We know very well there was a case when the Government was carried on by a majority of one, but I would like to point out that that was in a House of only twenty-five members. There were eleven members for and eleven members against, and the questions were sometimes carried by the vote of the Speaker. The result was chaos. What resulted was a deadlock—they had to suspend Parliament and go into recess because they could not carry on. The ultimate result was that they had to disentangle themselves from that position by transferring a member of the House to the judicial bench as a way out of their difficulty.

Mr. KEOGH: You cannot carry on with a minority of one.

Mr. MULLAN: We might get your vote.

Mr. HARDACRE: I say it is against all parliamentary tradition; it is against all precedent. When the late Sir Thomas McLlwraith only managed to carry the border tax on the casting vote of the Speaker, he at once resigned; and when the hon. senior member for Townsville in 1903 actually managed to carry his proposal by a majority of two, he had the honour—the respect for himself and for the dignity of his position—to at once announce that he would consider his position, which ultimately ended in his resignation. In the traditions of the British Parliament there is a certain historic case which lays down the principle in regard to these matters. When Lord Melbourne's Administration managed to

carry a proposal by a majority of five he offered his resignation, because, although he had a slight majority, it was a moral defeat, and he had not got sufficient members to effectively carry on the business of the country. I do not intend to delay matters, but I claim that it is the duty of the Premier, in the interests of the country, and with any self-respect for his position, to at once rise and support the motion for adjournment, and at the same time make an announcement to the House and to the country that he intends to consider his position.

Question put—

Mr. BOWMAN (*Fortitude Valley*): I had an idea that the proper time to discuss this matter was on the adjournment of the House, but you, Sir, said the hon. member for Leichhardt was in order in speaking of the narrow majority that the Government has received on the division. I think the circumstance that the Government are holding on to office by the very narrow majority of one cannot be satisfactory to the Premier nor yet to his Government, and I do not think it is satisfactory to the country.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: The hon. gentleman has brought down a programme with a very wide range of Bills, and I would like to ask him whether he thinks that by his majority of one he is going to be able to carry on the affairs of the State.

Mr. BLAIR: No chance.

Mr. BOWMAN: I do not think he can. We have an instance of a Government led by the hon. senior member for Townsville, and when he had a majority of two he resigned his position. We were told this afternoon that the late Sir Arthur Palmer carried on for some time with one; but I take it it was in a very much smaller House than the present one, and perhaps a less pugnacious House. I would like to read the following paragraph from "Todd," page 200—

But on 6th May, 1839, the Min. sustained moral defeat upon their Bill to suspend the Constitution of the Island of Jamaica, the second reading of which was made an occasion for a trial of party strength. It was carried by a majority of five only, in a full House. Upon the following day Lord John Russell informed the House of the resignation of Ministers, alleging that it had taken place on account of their not possessing such support in the House of Commons as would enable them efficiently to carry on the public business.

Again in the same volume, page 203, I find—

Sir Robert Peel moved a vote of want of confidence, which embraced two propositions: (1) that Her Majesty's Ministers do not sufficiently possess the confidence of the House of Commons to enable them to carry through the House measures which they deem of essential importance to the public welfare; (2) that their continuance in office under such circumstances is at variance with the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. HARDACRE: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: Now, I think that if the hon. gentleman leading the Government has any feeling at all of self-respect he will not continue as leader of the Government and attempt to carry on business. Either he will tender his resignation and allow an opportunity to be given for another Government to be formed, or he will bring about a dissolution and let the country determine what is the best thing to be done.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: At present, I venture to say that if the Bills are unsatisfactory there will be little progress so far as this Government is concerned. I know there are many contentious Bills—whether the hon. gentleman is in earnest about passing that legislation is another matter. We must not judge him by what he promises on this occasion, but we must judge him by past experience.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

*Mr. Bowman.]*

Mr. BOWMAN: And the past experience of last session is sufficient to warrant me in saying that the hon. gentleman, so long as he can get through a few railways—so long as he can get his Estimates through—and probably he may call for an adjournment for a fortnight or even a month to go to the Premiers' Conference—will be perfectly satisfied to get into recess. But if he did the honourable thing in the interests of the State, with the narrow majority he is hanging on to, he would resign. As I said when I moved the vote of want of confidence, the way the hon. gentleman hangs on to office is simply like a barnacle hanging on to a ship; he will not be shaken off until the majority is reduced by another vote. I think if the hon. gentleman studied the affairs of the State from a right standpoint, he would at once tender his resignation, or make a statement, go to the country, and let them determine whether the Government is strong enough, with a majority of one, to carry out the programme—not to carry out the programme, because he has violated many promises from the time when he was returned in 1908. I venture to think that if an opportunity is given, despite all the prophetic utterances of the hon. member for Townsville, the majority I see in front of me to-night will be reduced considerably after another election.

Mr. BLAIR (*Ipswich*): I desire to say one or two words on the position to-night. It is, I think, a position practically unparalleled and unprecedented in the history of Queensland politics. We have here a pitiable position, one which shows the depth of degradation to which politics in Queensland have come—

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and loud ironical laughter.

Mr. BLAIR: Under the leadership of the present Government party. We have the spectacle of the so-called Premier sitting there adhesively to his seat—(laughter)—supported by a doubtful majority of one—a benefit of the doubt majority—sitting there silent, treating a hostile vote of this House with absolute indifference and contempt, and occupying the position with a reckless disregard of the business of the country and a reckless disregard of political decency.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: Hanging on there practically without visible means of support. (Laughter.) That is the position. As has been said by his colleague, the junior member for Rockhampton, "hanging on by the skin of his teeth."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: Is not that saying illustratively exemplified to-night? There they sit hanging on by "the skin of their teeth." It [11 p.m.] is not my phraseology, but it is aptly descriptive of the position to-night.

What is the position? In practically a full House, with every member accounted for, those not voting being accounted for by pairs, the Government hold on by 34 to 33; and the Premier, with ineffable effrontery, declines to make a statement. I say the people of Queensland cry aloud for some pronouncement as to what he intends to do. The constitutional position is this: Can that Government carry on the business of the State with efficiency? Have they a majority which will enable them to carry out the slightest thing they attempt to do? It must be abundantly apparent that, so far from having power to do anything of the kind, the position is practically chaos. They say we have a minority of one, and they have a majority of one; but that does not alter the position one jot. Their bounden duty is, if they cannot conduct the affairs of the country efficiently, to

[*Mr. Bowman.*

resign; and I challenge them to say how it is possible for them, in a full House like this, to carry on with a majority of one—a majority which may at any moment disappear.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: We may have the Premier coming down shortly and telling us that he desires to go down to the Premiers' Conference to represent Queensland—a man at the head of a strong, coherent, homogeneous party to go to the Premiers' Conference. (Opposition laughter.) To do what? To represent Queensland with a majority of one!

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. BLAIR: It would make Queensland the laughing-stock of the conference. It would reduce us to a position of ridicule and contempt; and I protest with all the emphasis and force of which I am capable against men clinging to office—in spite of insults, in spite of jeers, in spite of everything which should induce the Premier to get up and make a statement—with a majority of one. I can promise him that from this portion of the House he will get the most strenuous opposition; I can promise fight on every point.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BLAIR: And I feel certain that at the back of this party is the voice of the country. (Government laughter.) If they are willing to back up their laughter by resigning and having an election, they will find exactly what was found when Arthur Morgan went to the country—they will be reduced, decimated, annihilated. I do not wish to protract this discussion. It is a sorry spectacle—a contemptible spectacle—and I protest against a vote like this being allowed to pass without some comment from the Premier.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put and passed.

The PREMIER: I move that the resumption of the debate be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow. I will say what I have to say on the motion for the adjournment of the House.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. I think this is the proper time to say what I have got to say on the present position. As to those who say that the Premier ought to consider his position, I may say that the Premier considered his position five weeks ago, and is just in the same mind as to his duty in regard to Queensland as he was then. The vote that has been taken to-night has not altered the position that much (snapping his fingers). The hon. member for Nundah told us over a week ago that if the vote had been taken after the leader of the Opposition had spoken and I had replied, it would have been just the same; and there is not a member but knows that is so. Everything possible has been done to alter it. What the senior member for Ipswich says about the insults the Premier has to sit here and take from hon. gentlemen like him does not affect the question one little bit, and will not affect my conduct one little bit.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: It will be a sorry day when I have to alter my line of conduct—

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: We will alter it for you.

The PREMIER: Because hon. gentlemen like those abuse me. They have been telling us for the last nine months what they were going

to do. Why do the malcontents rage and the socialists imagine vain things? (Laughter.) They are like so many hungry dogs after a bone has been taken away from them.

Mr. MANN: I rise to a point of order. Is the Premier in order in addressing members of this House as hungry dogs?

The SPEAKER: I did not understand the Premier to apply the expression to hon. members, but I regret that he should use such a metaphor.

The PREMIER: I regret having made use of the metaphor—

Mr. MULCAHY: I understood you to rule, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier was out of order in calling members on this side hungry dogs. I ask that the words be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: From what I heard, I do not think that the Premier applied the epithet mentioned in the sense attributed to it by the hon. member for Gympie. He used it in a metaphorical sense and an objectionable sense, and I hope he will not employ metaphors of that kind.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw!

The PREMIER: Like yourself, Mr. Speaker, I regret having used such a metaphor; but it occurred to me at the time that it just fitted the situation. Why are they so angry? They have been abusing me at their sweet will. If there is anything ill-natured they did not say about me—anything spiteful, anything dishonouring—it was because they could not think of it. And now, having used all their best efforts, or their worst efforts—honourable and otherwise, perhaps—to defeat the Government—

Mr. BOWMAN: No insinuations.

The PREMIER: And having been themselves defeated they cannot take their defeat like men.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! (Opposition laughter.)

The PREMIER: It is quite true that the majority on this side is only a majority of one; but, small as that majority is, it is better than a minority of one. (Government cheers.)

Mr. MITCHELL: Even if you have it locked up.

Mr. KERR: You have to watch your majority pretty closely.

The PREMIER: As the members on this side of the House have determined to see this thing through, it behoves me to help them to see it through. (Opposition laughter and Government cheers.) And there is another reason, which does not occur to hon. gentlemen opposite to clearly postulate for themselves, and I will tell them what it is. The no-confidence motion did not deal with specific legislation, and there are forty-nine members of this House pledged to carry out the policy laid on the table of this House. (Opposition dissent and cries of "No coalition.") And they do not want to be brought to book by voting against that legislation and the proposals of the Government.

Mr. MURPHY: We will chance it.

The PREMIER: They want, if possible, to have revenge for their disappointment—they want to have revenge on the Premier without having it said that they voted against their own policy. They have got to vote against their own policy before they turn this Government out. (Government cheers.) They have got to vote against the policy they pledged themselves to support before they can turn this Government out. (Opposition dissent.)

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: Don't get excited.

The PREMIER: The men on this side of the House quite understand the situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope hon. members will keep their seats during this discussion.

The PREMIER: The members on this side of the House quite understand the tactics which have brought the present situation in the Queensland Parliament.

Mr. HARDACRE: We understand it, too.

The PREMIER: The hearty "hear, hears!" which came from this side of the Chamber when the senior member for Ipswich told them that the present position showed to what a low condition politics had come, showed that they fully appreciated where the Premier was. The few remarks which I made on this motion of the hon. gentleman opposite—the motion which has just been defeated—

Mr. MULLAN: By a majority of one.

The PREMIER: It makes an awful difference to you that majority of one. (Government laughter.) Anyone who looks at the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite can see what an awful difference it makes. (Loud Government laughter.) There is an awful difference between being dead and only nearly dead.

Mr. MURPHY: You are nearly dead.

Mr. BOWMAN: You are dying fast.

The PREMIER: Oh, yes! I have no doubt that this Government will share the fate of all Governments in due time; but not now. Not with forty-nine members in this House pledged to carry out their policy.

Mr. AIREY: No coalition.

The PREMIER: No honest conduct of the business of this House can defeat the Government. (Government cheers and Opposition laughter.) Someone, by some other means, may succeed in doing it, but he will have to stand up and do it. I told the House before that I was not going to haul down my flag at the behest of deserters, and I am not.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and Opposition laughter.

Mr. BLAIR: You deserted every party you belonged to. You are an arch deserter.

The PREMIER: I would just like to say that the Government is going on with business.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear hear!

The PREMIER: When a majority of the members of this House want another Government they will intimate it in the ordinary way. Until hon. gentlemen opposite can get a majority—even a majority of one—they will have to remain where they are. (Government laughter.) And I will just ask them to be a little better tempered about it. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. MULCAHY: And let you call us dogs.

The PREMIER: Just be a little better tempered about it. If I am beaten, I shall try to take it as well as I can.

Mr. BOWMAN: How did you take it when you were put out last year?

Mr. HAMILTON: What did you do when you lost your position last year?

The PREMIER: It would have looked better if they had tried to take their defeat with a little better grace. (Opposition laughter.) I hope that now they are defeated—even although it is only with a majority of one—they will show a little more grace in the matter and take it in a little better way. Meanwhile, the Government have no reason to believe that a majority of this House is against them putting through the business

which they have proposed, and, if there is a majority who are determined to defeat the Government, that majority will have to do it.

Mr. BLAIR: Certainly.

The PREMIER: They will have to vote against their own policy. I know that the senior member for Ipswich will do anything. He would vote against the four Gospels if I introduced them.

Mr. HAMILTON: Yet you wanted to make him a judge.

The PREMIER: I know that he will vote against anything that the Premier introduces. But there are other members in this House besides the hon. member for Ipswich and the hon. member for South Brisbane. There are other members in this House who are not quite so sore over personal grievances as the hon. member for South Brisbane. There are members in this House who are not altogether so little as the hon. member for South Brisbane. And it is to be hoped that we may be able to go along and pass the railways that we want to pass and the number of Bills that we want to pass. And, as I told hon. gentlemen when I was speaking on the motion which has just been defeated, I am perfectly willing to go to the country whenever they want it.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: I am perfectly willing to go to the country whenever they want it, and they know that very well.

Mr. HARDAIRE: It will be the last time you will go to the country.

The PREMIER: I have been told that a promise was made to members on this side that while Kidston only had a majority of one or two he would bring about a dissolution, but if there was another Government put in there would be no dissolution.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: Who made that promise?

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition knows, and all hon. members on that side know very well, that they can have a dissolution whenever they want it and whenever the Governor grants it.

Mr. COYNE: You are not the Governor.

The PREMIER: No, I am the Premier.

Mr. LESINA: No member of the Labour party made that promise.

Mr. GRANT: No, it was the other side who made it.

The PREMIER: In this matter I am not bothering to go into little matters like this. I know it was said.

Mr. D. HUNTER: And I was going to support them, they said.

Mr. LESINA: Why blame the Labour party for it?

Mr. BOWMAN: You insinuated it, you know. You are very good at insinuating.

The PREMIER: I think that I have made the position sufficiently clear to soothe the troubled feelings of hon. members opposite, and I hope that proceedings will now go on more pleasantly.

Mr. BOWMAN: The excuse that has been made by the Premier is a particularly weak one. He tells us that he has a policy, and that there are forty-nine members of this House pledged to that policy. I would like to remind him that when he came into this House after the last election he had twenty-five followers and there were twenty-two Labour members. They were the forty-seven

members whom the country sent here to carry out that democratic programme and to work together.

The PREMIER: And who refused to work together?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: You.

Mr. BOWMAN: It is just as well to repeat that the hon. gentleman got support from the Labour party on specific conditions, both in 1907 and in 1908.

Mr. GRANT: What support did they give?

Mr. BOWMAN: The most valuable that the hon. gentleman ever got since he became Premier. The democratic legislation that the hon. gentleman has been instrumental in placing on the statute-book was placed there through the assistance he received from the Labour party. The very men now associated with him were opposed to some of the items of that legislation and to amendments to that legislation. The hon. gentleman who sits beside him, the Secretary for Public Lands, was one of the bitterest against the Wages Boards Bill, and one of the strongest supporters of the amendment which was proposed to exclude from the operation of the Bill agricultural labourers, pastoral workers, and sugar workers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: The Secretary for Public Instruction, and even the Home Secretary, were strongly in favour of that amendment, and there was another Minister who was with them. Those four hon. gentlemen fought strongly—as did the whole of their party—on that question. And bear in mind that, when the Premier was returned in 1907, he told us that if we made even the pretence of sitting on that side of the House he would go on with the business of the country; but, because we determined, as a Labour party, to take the Opposition cross benches, he said he would have to consider his position. Who was the messenger he sent to the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Speaker? You know how arrangements were made at that time for a coalition, and you know how I was sent for a few days after, and how the hon. gentleman—he cannot deny it—said that, if he ever coalesced with the hon. member for Townsville, he would be committing political suicide, and that, rather than coalesce with the hon. member for Townsville, he would retire into private life and live on the record that he had put up in the interests of democracy. That was what he thought of the senior member for Townsville at that time. When the last election took place, although the Labour party had some differences with the hon. gentleman with regard to the appointment of the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, I challenge the hon. gentleman to say that he ever got more loyal support from any twenty-two men than he got from us in support of the democratic legislation he introduced in 1907 and 1908.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to point out to the hon. member that it has been very clearly laid down as the practice of this House, more particularly by Mr. Speaker Morgan, in the year 1899—I have before me three distinct and clear rulings by him on the subject—that on the motion for the adjournment of the House, discussion is confined to questions addressed by the leader of the Opposition to the head of the Government as to the general course of public business, and that a general discussion cannot take place on that motion for adjournment. I therefore express

the hope that the hon. member will keep in mind those very sound rulings for the conduct of the business of the House.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: I do not wish to go against your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I am only following the previous rulings.

Mr. BOWMAN: The leader of the Government laid down very specifically that there were forty-nine men in this Chamber who were pledged to the policy of the Government. There were twenty-five men who were returned as Kidstonites at the last election, and they were returned in opposition to the position in which the hon. gentleman now finds himself.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN: And the hon. members who have left the Government are justified by the mandate that was given by the people of Queensland at the last election in leaving the Government. The Rockhampton policy, the hon. gentleman has told us, is on the table. I do not know that anybody has disputed that policy, but they have disputed the nature of the Bills that are likely to be placed before us, judging by the policy the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to carry out. The hon. gentleman has referred to certain members sitting on this side as deserters. I think he should never attempt to throw stones while he lives in a glass house. The hon. gentleman is one of the greatest deserters that the people of Queensland have had experience of, after the promise that he made at the last election and the non-fulfilment of that promise as evidenced by the position in which we find him to-day.

The SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not continue that line of argument.

Mr. BOWMAN: All I will say, in conclusion, with reference to the statement made by the Premier that he is going to hang on so long as he has a single vote to hang on by, is that I hope the good sense of some members on the other side will even yet show them that the hon. gentleman is unworthy of their support, and that he will meet with an early defeat is my sincere wish.

Mr. BLAIR: I desire merely to say a few words before this motion for adjournment is put. The first observation I wish to make is this: The Premier gave as a reason for not taking any decisive action on the present vote that forty-nine members of this House were pledged to the Rockhampton policy. All I can say with regard to the Rockhampton programme is that, having had experience of it last session, and finding that the State Insurance Bill has been dropped at the behest of the hon. member for Townsville—

Hon. R. PHILP: That statement is quite untrue.

Mr. BLAIR: And finding also that the Workers' Dwellings Bill, which was brought down, was such an egregious farce, I, for one, am absolutely at liberty to say that, if the legislation which the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce is of the same class as that which has been already introduced, then it is my bounden duty to oppose it by every means in my power. There is only one other word. The hon. gentleman has alluded in contemptuous terms to members here as "deserters." He has also used the phrase "dogs"—

Mr. GRANT: No, he did not.

Mr. BLAIR: And the Speaker has called him to order for using it. In judging a man's criticism, we look at his record. And from his record, I am sure he will pardon me if I fail to regard him as the censor of either honour or anything pertaining to honour, or state that I cannot accept his criticism except as the criticism of a man who has been distinguished by a life-long career of betrayal and desertion. He has betrayed everyone who has had anything to do with him, and every party that has had the slightest connection with him.

Mr. AIREY (*Brisbane South*): The Premier has made allusion to the tactics which have brought about the present situation, and he used the words "disreputable tactics." The "disreputable tactics" that have brought about the present situation were the tactics pursued by the hon. gentleman when he defeated the intentions of the people in forming a coalition with the Philp party.

The SPEAKER: Order! I again express the hope that the hon. member will remember my ruling and not start a general discussion on the motion before the House.

Mr. AIREY: Yes; I will remember your ruling, and will not start a general discussion. I have also to remark that we have to thank the hon. gentleman for another phrase. He spoke just now about somebody being "near dead." I think as the "near dead" Premier he will be known throughout Queensland for a long time. The junior member for Rockhampton has told us that the Government are hanging on by "the skin of their teeth," and the senior member for Rockhampton that it is a "near dead" Government. The Premier also told us that he wanted to go on with business. Last session, when he had a majority of twelve or thirteen, he found that he could not go on with business, and now he has the effrontery and pomposity to say to the House that with a majority of one he is going on with business. I would ask you, Sir, if in all your parliamentary experience or reading you have ever heard or read of a Government going along with legislative business with a majority of one. The thing is unprecedented. There is not a man here who does not know that the situation in this House renders legislation an absolute impossibility.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will remember my ruling, and not enter into a general discussion.

Mr. AIREY: Yes; I will not enter into a general discussion. In conclusion, I wish to say that I have yet to learn that it is the mark of a strong man to hang on to the control of government when he is in so weak a position that he cannot carry out the duties of a Government. The hon. member for Ipswich referred to the fact that very shortly we shall be having a conference of Premiers, and that the hon. gentleman will want an adjournment for a fortnight or three weeks to go down to that conference. Think of the position when the hon. gentleman goes down to that conference and has to tell his friends who ask him about the situation in the Queensland Parliament, "Oh, my majority is one; I am that majority, and, by coming away, I have made it perfectly safe." The hon. gentleman has alluded to the division which has just taken place, and how he is going to take shelter under his majority and trust to the loyalty and strength of his followers. Let me say, slightly altering his own words, "Let Rizzio shelter, and get under the skirts of the hon. member for Townsville."

Mr. HARDACRE: Mr. Speaker—

*Mr. Hardacre.]*

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member will remember my ruling, that there can be no general discussion on the motion before the House.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not intend to enter upon the general question, but in a few words I desire to make clear the political situation at the present time.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the hon. member is going to discuss that matter, I shall have to rule him out of order.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Premier has made reference to the Opposition in his statement, and surely I have a right to correct that statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already referred to the ruling which was given by Mr. Morgan ten years ago, in which it is laid down that discussion on a motion for the adjournment of the House is restricted to the leaders on either side of the House. The leader of the House makes a statement, and then the leader of the Opposition may ask a question as to the course of business, but there can be no general discussion. The ruling reads—

Discussions on general questions upon the motion that the House do now adjourn after having completed the business of the sitting are most irregular. The practice ought not to be encouraged. Reasonable latitude is generally allowed to the leaders to interrogate Ministers as to the course of business at the next or any future sitting, but, as I have said, a debate on general questions under cover of the motion for adjournment after the House has completed its labours is most irregular.

The hon. member has already at some length discussed the political situation, and he cannot discuss it further on the present motion.

HON. R. PHILP: I have no wish to discuss the political situation at all, but simply desire to contradict the statement made by the senior member for Ipswich that at my behest certain legislation has not been brought into this House. I give that statement a flat contradiction. I have never at any time asked the Premier not to bring in any measures.

Mr. HARDACRE: I rise to a point of order. After you have refused me the right to discuss a general question, I should like to know if the hon. member for Townsville will be in order in discussing a general question?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is making a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: In reply to the hon. member for Leichhardt, I may say that what I have said in regard to his discussing the general question is equally applicable to the senior member for Townsville.

HON. R. PHILP: I wish to make a personal explanation. The senior member for Ipswich stated that at my behest the Bill providing for State insurance was not introduced by the Government. I give that statement an unqualified denial.

Mr. MANN: I have a personal explanation to make. The Premier during the course of his remarks took occasion to refer to myself in rather harsh terms—as a deserter, and I propose to show to the House that I am not a deserter, that I have been faithful and loyal to the pledges I have given, and that the Premier has deserted every party that he has belonged to.

Mr. MAXWELL: I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. member in order in making a personal explanation without the consent of the House?

The SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is entitled to make a personal explanation, but I

[Hon. J. T. Bell.

am bound to point out that I shall undoubtedly have to rule him out of order if he is going to make a speech on the general subject.

Mr. MANN: I do not propose to make a speech on a general subject. I simply wish to make a personal explanation, and to point out that during the late election campaign I was asked by an elector at one of the centres where I addressed a meeting, if, in the event of a coalition being formed by the Kidston and Philp parties, I would support that coalition, and I emphatically stated that, if I got the Cairns seat on a shovel, I would not be a party to any coalition between the Kidston and Philp parties.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Order!

Mr. MANN: The Premier made a somewhat similar pledge to the electors of Rockhampton and to the people of Queensland, and he has gone back on that pledge and deserted his party.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty minutes to 12 o'clock.