

person because he happens to be a political supporter of the party in power should get special privileges.

Mr. McTIERNAN: Do not make unjust charges!

Mr. NESS: I do not say that legal aid was granted on those grounds, but I say that if a man is to get the benefit of it he should be a poor person. If it costs a man £100 to get possession of his own property because he is not able to get costs against the defaulting individual, the law has not been applied fairly. I ask Mr. Stuart-Robertson how that case compares with his statement yesterday afternoon, with regard to the "rapacious landlord" and the "blood-sucking agent"?

Progress reported.

CASE OF ALFRED EDWARD SHORT.

Mr. STUART-ROBERTSON brought up the report of the select committee.

LEWISHAM CEMETERY BILL.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

DAY BAKING BILL.

Bill returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Motion (by Mr. McTIERNAN) proposed:
That this House do now adjourn.

Mr. LANE (Balmain) [5.48 p.m.]: I desire to make a personal explanation. As regards the statement of Mr. Bavin that I attributed corruption to him when he was Attorney-General and to the Crown law officers I wish to withdraw the word "corruption." I used that word in the heat of the moment. At the same time, I believe that the practice I referred to is very undesirable, and that it should not be permitted in our law courts. I consider it is a practice which should be discontinued.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

House adjourned at 5.48 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Monday, 21 December, 1925.

Appointments to Legislative Council (Adjournment) -
New Members—Members Sworn.

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

APPOINTMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PRESIDENT: I have received a notice from the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers that he desires to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, "The appointment by his Excellency the Governor of a large number of new members to this House at the present juncture and in the present circumstances."

There being no objection,

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS moved:

That this House do now adjourn.

He said: I think the circumstances fully warrant the course, unusual thank God, which I propose to take. It is the only opportunity afforded to this House to consider the unprecedented action which is about to be consummated. The information which I have received and which I have every reason to believe is correct—there are the arguments facing us—is that his Excellency the Governor has approved of the advice tendered him by Mr. Lang, the Premier, and has summoned at least twenty-five new members to this Chamber—an action unprecedented in the history of constitutional government in New South Wales, in the midst of a session, not in recess, when the two Houses have been proceeding with their work—to swamp this Chamber, because it is swamping this Chamber, for the avowed purpose of passing legislation in the form that the Government has submitted it to Parliament. There is a proviso in our Constitution and in our standing orders which gives an opportunity for the two Chambers, if they have any differences of opinion on the legislation submitted, to reconcile their

differences of opinion by the process of a conference and by messages from one Chamber to the other. It has happened times out of number that in the course of conferences and the exchanging of messages, a common agreement has been arrived at and the legislation has been passed. We have got to the stage now that most of the legislation proposed by the Government has been before this Chamber and we are within a few days of the closing of the session. There has not been one invitation sent forth by message to us for a conference on differences which have arisen between the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. No attempt has been made to use the constitutional powers which are provided by law. But there is to be made a determined attempt, and apparently it is going to succeed, to swamp this Chamber, to butcher the Constitution, and to do what has never been done before in this country, and by the exercise of an extraordinary power which is in the hands of the Governor to alter the current of our political life.

I am informed, and probably the hon. gentleman in charge of the Government business in this House knows, that the gentlemen who have been appointed are appointed under some pledge that they will assist in passing the Government's legislation, practically, I suppose, word for word as it has been submitted to this Chamber and the other Chamber. But there is some other idea—how far it is well-founded I do not know—that those gentlemen are pledged to abolish this House. There can be no distinction in a matter of that character. If those gentlemen come here pledged to carry out the Government's measures all the Government has to do is to submit a bill for the abolition of this House and as it is a Government measure, they have to carry it out. No pledge given by the head of the Government that the appointments will not be used for abolishing the Legislative Council can be regarded as binding on the appointees, especially when they are members of a party, the first plank on the platform of which in regard to the Constitution is the abolition of the Legislative Council.

[The Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers.

That is what we have to face. If there is any honesty at all in this matter if it is not merely a swamping to carry the legislation submitted by the Government; if there is any honesty in the action of appointing sufficient members to swamp this Chamber, it must mean the abolition of this Chamber.

If the constitutional power of nominating—not a dozen members, as we have had in most cases in the past—is to be used for thus violently changing the course of events and butchering the Constitution, the sooner this House is abolished the better. It has been a credit and an honor to men to be members of this Chamber, which for so many years has performed so nobly its part in the public affairs of this country, but if we are to be mere instruments here in the hands of the Government and if this power violently and excessively exercised as it is at the present time is to be used, the sooner this Chamber gives way and something else takes the place of it the better.

Supposing this Government is defeated, as undoubtedly it will be defeated when it appeals to the electors of the country, if the electors have an opportunity fairly to express the wishes of the majority, what confronts the incoming Government? We have today a House of seventy-four members. Twenty-five new members are to be appointed—there may be more as far as I know. There will thus be ninety-nine members or nine members more than there are in the other Chamber. What would the new Government have to do? It would have to appoint up to forty more members and then you would have a House, supposing there were no deaths, of nearly 140 members. And so it would go in arithmetical progression and so you would have a House inordinate in its members until it worked down to a *reductio ad absurdum*. We can only imagine on what ground the Premier tendered his advice to the Governor, but in my judgment and in the judgment of all right thinking people in this country there is no warrant for tendering advice of such a character, and if the constitutional practice of years gone

by had been adopted, such as that which was adopted by Sir Robert Duff when he refused to swamp this House at the instance of the late Sir George Dibbs, the advice which Mr. Lang has tendered would not have been accepted. This Chamber has given every opportunity to the Government to carry out whatever mandate it had from the people. What we stood against is the attempt on the part of the Government to do more than Mr. Lang ever promised in his address when appealing to the people. We go further and say what is common knowledge, that so far as the mandate of the people is concerned you have to go beyond mere numbers in the other Chamber—you have to have a reckoning of the number of electors and how they voted. In the last general election there was a clear and distinct majority of 25,000 votes given to the Nationalist party and the Country party, over and above what was given to the Labour party, leaving the Independent party entirely out of consideration. Who then can say there is a mandate of the majority of the people behind the Government? We say more than this—we say that Mr. Lang got his vote and support on the Lidcombe speech in which he distinctly says, "Those are the things I propose to submit to Parliament and no more." He has gone beyond that. He has introduced many things, in addition. I think the first measure we had was for the abolition of the death penalty, and that was not mentioned in his policy-speech at Lidcombe. So we can go on to measure after measure and clause after clause in the measures, which never were submitted to the people. Every man, except the man who is deaf, dumb and blind, knows that within the past few weeks, almost within the past few days, the people of the country again had the opportunity of expressing their judgment as to the form of legislation and the form of Government they required, and, in the Federal elections, we had this result: That to the Senate, where five Senators were to be elected, every Nationalist Senate candidate in this State was returned, and they had a

majority of 70,000 votes. In the election to the House of Representatives there was a sweeping victory for the candidates of the Nationalist party. Those two facts—the actual figures of the last State elections, and the figures at the Federal elections—are convincing evidence that the people of the country are not behind this Government, either in the legislation which was put forward by Mr. Lang at Lidcombe, or the legislation which he has brought forward which is beyond that which was included in his policy speech.

The honest and the straightforward thing for the Government to do, first of all, would have been to have tried to reconcile the differences between the two Chambers, and, failing that, if the differences were found to be too great, to have given consideration to whether it would not be better, in view of the attitude adopted by this House, to solve the differences once for all by making an appeal to the electors, or to submit the matter of the continuance of this Chamber to a referendum of the people. But the Government did not dare to take that course. The Government does not dare to take that course to-day. What it does is to appeal to twenty-five men, now sitting behind the chair, to come here to perform the part of destroyers of the Constitution. If the people of this country had the opportunity to do so they would uphold the constitutional rights of this Chamber. The Government will not give them that opportunity. It is the last thing that it wants.

In our treatment of the legislation proposed here we have acted in a dignified manner. I am not going to refer particularly to events which have happened in another place. But it is a matter of common knowledge, to every man in this country, and to every elector in this country, that we have had to submit to the task of considering measures here occupying pages and pages of proposed legislation, which have not been considered in the other Chamber by any form of discussion or consideration which could be dignified by the term of deliberation. Measures have been put through that House by this new idea of

the "guillotine," without permitting reasonable discussion, and the consequence is that we here have had to do work which should have been shared in by the other Chamber. The proof of the fact is that on probably the best measure which this Government has submitted—to endow the widows of this country—the hon. member at the head of the Government violated the constitutional practice here, after he had been warned by his colleagues that we could not amend one word or one line of that bill, being a money bill. We on this side of the House did not attempt to violate the constitutional practice, but, strong in the appreciation of their strength and their power, the Government has dared to do that. Will the Speaker in the other Chamber call attention to that fact, and will that measure be thrown under the table in that House, on account of the unusual procedure which was adopted by the representative of the Government in this Chamber? It only shows that the measures of the Government come to us in such a way that the Government itself has had to come here and use the opportunities which the calmer atmosphere of this Chamber affords for giving the measures greater deliberation.

In submitting this motion I have had very little opportunity to prepare my remarks. I have had to prepare them in the course of the last few minutes. Only ten minutes ago I heard of what was about to happen, but I do think this Chamber should have the opportunity of lodging, in the only way now left to it, a protest against this procedure, which means nothing more nor less than the butchering of this Chamber. However, if this Chamber is destroyed and abolished, from the ashes of the dead, Phoenix-like, there will arise again in its place something more secure, that cannot be destroyed at the mere whim of one man who gets the ear of the gentleman administering the affairs of the Government of this country. We shall have something in its place that cannot be destroyed; some-

[*The Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers.*

thing that will give greater expression to the will of the people than even this Chamber has done.

If this Chamber has to end, if this is the last stage in its proceedings, we can look back with pride, those of us who are here, on having had the honour to have been members of a Chamber which has served this country well; which, at times, has been the bulwark of the liberties of the people; and which has never been found fault with at any time for the delaying of legislation which, upon reflection, has been shown to be in the interests of the people of this country. My time is limited, and I therefore beg to move my motion as a protest.

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: It is not my intention to take up the time of this House in attempting to reply to the rather heated expressions used by the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers. I am more than surprised to find that hon. members who could sit here, smiling, week after week, so long as they had everything in their own hands, and were able to work their will as they liked, can at the present moment, when circumstances, as they apparently think—I do not know why they should think that—appear to have changed, immediately allow themselves to be worked up into a passion of resentment. It seems as if something terrible has happened—that the sacred precincts of this House should be invaded by twenty-five more Labour men. One would think—I was going to say—by the way the hon. member has spoken that twenty-five animals from Taronga Park, had been brought here. Instead of that they are twenty-five citizens of New South Wales; twenty-five gentlemen who have the welfare of New South Wales as much at heart as the hon. member who has just resumed his seat. He says the present position is without precedent. I think the elections took place in 1917, about March. Very shortly afterwards twenty-three new members, I understand, came into this Chamber. Not one of them was selected from the Labour movement although even at that time there was a majority of members in the House who did not belong

to the Labour party. We did not find the Labour party working itself into hysterics over that. The Nationalist Government appointed them; it had the power to do so, and I believe the hon. member was the leader of this Chamber at this time.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: That is not so!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: At any rate he was a member of this Chamber and there is no record of his having voiced any vigorous protest against those appointments.

The Hon. J. H. WISE: Some Labour members were appointed!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Not in 1917. I would like you to name them. No members of the Labour party were appointed in 1917.

The Hon. J. H. WISE: You may have repudiated them at that time!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: To-day there are in the Nationalist party some who were once in the Labour party, and I may take this opportunity of referring to a statement the hon. member is reported to have been responsible for making some time ago. As to the Labour men who have been appointed to this Chamber, it is true that a number of those he referred to were at one time Labour men, but they were not appointed to this House by a Labour Government. They were appointed by the Nationalist Government, in our opinion, in some instances, as payment for their treachery to the Labour movement.

The Hon. E. H. FARRAR: Name them!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: The Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers, referring to the Widows' Pensions Bill, said I violated the Constitution. To begin with, I did not say that it was unconstitutional for this House to move any amendment to that bill.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: Your colleague did!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: But I did not. I do not know whether my colleague was right or not; he may have been right but I did not think he was. That, however, did not appear to me to

be material. The amendment which I moved was something that tended to improve the bill.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: This House allowed you to move your amendment!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Yes, the House allowed me to move the amendment and I believe you thought it was an improvement. The other House thought the same. It was from there the amendment came and I was asked to move it here because it was thought it made matters clearer. The Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers said that conscious of our power I had actually taken this step to violate the Constitution of this House. I am afraid that personally I was not too conscious of my power at that time.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: No, but there is a remarkable change in the hon. member's demeanour to-day. I would not have believed such a difference was possible!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: I am glad you are looking at it like a true sport. I certainly think things are on a more equal basis at the present time than they have been.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: You do not think anything of the kind. You would not be satisfied if you thought that!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: So far as numbers go at the present time I certainly think we have not got a majority in this House.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: If that is your view, I am surprised at your being satisfied with twenty-five!

The Hon. Sir ALFRED MEERS: Numbers of your people stopped away from all divisions!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Circumstances arise over which people have no control which prevent them from attending.

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: It is extraordinary how continuously it has occurred just recently!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: I want to submit to this honorable House that in taking this present action, all the Government has done has been to take steps to see that the promises made to the

electors if it was returned to power are carried out. Unless the Government is able to do that, it ceases to be a Government. It is a farce to go to the country once in three years to ask the people to elect a Government, only to find, after they have expressed their will as far as they are able, that the decisions of the Government are subject to the goodwill of this honorable House; to the goodwill of men who, in some instances, appear to think they know far better what is good for the country than the people or any Government that can be elected.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: You say these appointments are being made to enable the Government to fulfil its pledges!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Yes, that is so.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: Then this House is to be abolished as a result of those appointments!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Sir Joseph Carruthers appears to know; I do not.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: That is to say, that is the one thing the hon. member does not know. All the other planks of his platform are substantial, but not that?

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: I do not know. But I am sure of this that apart from the people who write the articles in the daily newspapers no one else knows either. If the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers has taken his views from these newspapers, it probably accounts for his outburst to-day. It is astonishing how a man's feelings can be played upon by the press, if he is susceptible. After reading the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the *Daily Telegraph* day after day, and all the unkind things which have been said, I can quite understand his outburst, but I can assure hon. members that so far as I am aware no statement bearing upon that question has been made in any shape or form by the Government nor by anyone authorised to speak on behalf of the Government.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: No statement to what effect?

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: I only refer to this just to show the motive or feeling behind the hon. member's outburst. He said the Federal party

[The Hon. A. C. Willis.

has just been to the country, and the results of the elections show that this Government has not the confidence of the electors. If ever an election was fought upon a false and malicious issue, it was the Federal election. I am surprised that the hon. member has the temerity to refer to it, after the High Court decision. The deportation question was made the election cry throughout the length and breadth of this continent. People were led to believe they were living on the edge of a volcano and that anything might occur at a moment's notice. A bogus tribunal was set up to do a job which the Federal Government could not get a decent judge in the country to do—to bring in a verdict—

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: The High Court did not say the tribunal was appointed to bring in a verdict. It said that it was a straightforward and honorable tribunal!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: I think they would probably be straightforward.

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: You did not say so just now. You said they were appointed to do a certain thing and they did it!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Yes, I say they were appointed to do a certain thing and they did it.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: That is the hon member's idea of an appointment!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: All the courts of the land were at the disposal of the Fuller Government, if there were any wrongdoers about, but they were all brushed aside and the Government picked three outside gentlemen to conduct the inquiry. They may be honorable and honest in the decision they have come to, from their point of view. You could probably pick a similar commission from this House which would honestly come to the same decision. But when those gentlemen came to their decision the court, which ought to have dealt with the matter first found that they were wrong.

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: They were not found to be wrong. It was a constitutional question!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: The hon. member says it was a constitutional question. He has just challenged the Government for violating the Constitution.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: Butchering it!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Why does he not charge the Federal Government, in view of the High Court's decision, with attempting to get behind the Constitution or violating it? What has been done by the State Government has been done in a quite straightforward manner. In his policy speech, Mr. Lang stated that there were certain things he would endeavour to give effect to. And when he stated that there were certain things he would endeavour to give effect to it meant this, if it meant anything, that whatever obstacles stood in the way he would as far as was humanly possible, endeavour to remove them. That is what it meant. Otherwise he would be merely fooling the people if he did not try to fulfil the promises he made. Mr. Lang has asked the Governor to appoint twenty-five new members to the Legislative Council. From my experience in this Chamber I think that number of new members will not give the Government any undue advantage here. I have noticed that in some divisions the Government has had about a dozen members sitting behind it while the seats opposite have been packed. Looking at the House I cannot see how we can manage with less than twenty-five.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: If you can arrange for the gentlemen who have been in the habit of staying away when divisions are taken, to continue to stay away all will be right!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: I am sure the hon. member will not doubt my word. If he likes to look at the file in my office he can see the letters I have repeatedly sent to members on this side urging them to attend regularly—they are there for him to read.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: I do not doubt that. But I never saw much unanimity amongst members before!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: The absence of some hon. members has been attributed to other than the right reason. I want to say in fairness that although when it has come to a vote the other side has voted on some matters pretty solidly against the Government, on other matters I have been surprised to find how we have been able to agree. On several occasions I have been indebted to some hon. members opposite—I will not mention any names—for the assistance they have given me. I do not begrudge them that tribute, but whilst they have been quite fair to me, when it has been a matter of deciding the issue they have solidly voted against me.

HON. MEMBERS: Not always!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: On certain vital matters. Mention has been made of the guillotine. The guillotine was introduced in the Federal House by a Nationalist, not by a Labour Government. I am not called upon to-day to defend what takes place in the other branch of the Legislature, but all that has been done by the Government to get its legislation through has been to adopt the practice of the Nationalist Government in the Federal arena. If it is bad in our case, it must be equally bad in theirs. After this little display of feeling has passed over, I hope the House will settle down to real business and that the representatives of all parties here will place the interests of their country first rather than take advantage of any particular set of circumstances that may arise to say they have scored a point on one side or the other. I feel sure the gentlemen who are honored by a seat in this House upon the nomination of the Government will approach the questions which come before them in that spirit.

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: Will they be free men with open minds?

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: Yes, they are quite free. They are freer than any members of the Nationalist Association. They are freer than any member of the Employers' Federation. If a member of the Employers' Federation did not act in conformity with the policy of that organisation, as a business man, it would

practically be the end of him. All that binds the members of the Labour movement is their honor. They are pledged to do what they agree to do, and that is all that is expected of them.

The Hon. S. R. INNES-NOAD: You must have been reading the mendacious press you spoke about, to make statements like that!

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: I give the hon. member my word that I have not looked at the papers since Saturday morning. I do not know what has occurred since then. After this expression of feeling I hope the House will go on with the business before it.

The Hon. E. H. FARRAR: In supporting the motion moved by the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers, I want to point out the course followed in the past. The constitutional practice has always been in case of a disagreement between both Houses—that is when a bill has been amended in this Chamber and the other House has refused to accept the amendment—for the Assembly to ask the Council to appoint managers and in that way they have tried in a constitutional way to get over any constitutional difficulty that has arisen. A number of measures submitted to the Legislative Council during the session and amended in Committee have been at once dropped by the Government, and no explanation has been given. Those measures are still on the business-paper, and as far as hon. members know, they are, with one exception, still there to be dealt with. The first measure to be sent up to this House this session was the bill to abolish capital punishment. The House in Committee dealt very fairly with that question. It was stated that there were thirteen offences for which the courts could inflict capital punishment. Those were all to be abolished. This House amended the bill and left in only one, and that was where violent murder was premeditated and committed by some inhuman monster. That bill has been left on the business-paper, but it has not been further dealt with by the Legislative Council from that day to this. If the Government was honest in its intentions it would at once have followed the constitutional procedure

[*The Hon. A. C. Willis.*

for reaching finality on that question. The next bill which the Government submitted to this House provided for an amendment of the municipal franchise. That included two clauses dealing with preference to Australian industries. The second reading was carried. In Committee the measure was amended by throwing out the unfair clauses which dealt with the electoral franchise. In the bill was left the clause relating to preference which the Vice-President of the Executive Council put so forcibly to the House as being of great value to the manufacturing industries. To-day that bill is still on the business-paper. No attempt was made to use the constitutional means at the disposal of the Government to finally deal with it, and so those whom the bill was intended to protect are still left without the protection of the law. The Allowances to Members Bill was passed by this House. The Forty-four Hours' Bill passed its second reading here and was debated at great length in Committee where an amendment to make that bill workable was agreed to. The Minister himself admitted that when the bill came here from the Legislative Assembly it contained certain clauses which applied to the industries of this country were unworkable. This Chamber containing as it does men of experience and ability framed that measure properly and sent it back to the Legislative Assembly where it was accepted by the Government. The second reading of every one of those bills was agreed to here. When this House approves of the general principle of a measure it always agrees to the second reading. In Committee it deals with the merits of the measure in detail.

Then we come to another innocent little measure, namely, that to confer on women the right to sit as members of this House. The Vice-President of the Executive Council in a more or less hilarious speech moved the second reading of the bill. The Hon. Mr. Magrath followed him and he it was who was responsible for the bill being defeated. Hon. members on the right of the President walked across the floor of the House on the strength of the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Magrath. Hon. members

could gather nothing else from the general atmosphere surrounding the measure than that the Government was not sincere, and had put the measure forward only to placate a certain section of the Labour movement.

Next we come to the Fair Rents Bill. The second reading of that bill was agreed to, and when it was in Committee certain amendments were made. There was no party vote on that question. No matter what their politics were hon. members voted on the merits of each amendment. That bill reached a stage in Committee when a certain amendment was made. Then we had the only statement we have had from the Vice-President of the Executive Council. He said that as far as he was concerned that measure would not be gone on with in its amended form. No other statement of the kind has been made by the representative of the Government regarding the other measures on the business-paper, although they have been there for some months.

We now come to a bill which was defeated on the motion for its second reading, namely, the bill dealing with loyalists. What were the facts in regard to that bill? The court had at 11 o'clock in the morning decided an important question. Before lunch time another place had suspended its standing orders and the bill was pushed through all its stages at one sitting. Sir George Fuller who at the time of the strike in 1917 was leader of the Government in the absence of the Premier, Mr. Holman, was refused a hearing though he was the only man in the State who could put the case from that side. He was gagged while he was standing on his feet. The leader of the third party who represents an important phase of political life in this country also rose to speak, but after he had been speaking for a little time a motion was carried that he be not further heard. Such was the consideration given the bill in another place. Members there were told that it was a matter of urgency and vital importance. It came to this House and remained on the business-paper for three weeks before

it was dealt with. If it could remain untouched for three weeks in this House where was the urgency in the other House? That showed the mockery, the hypocrisy, and the cant of the Government in another place, when it said it was a matter of greatest urgency. It was here for some days, and then the House adjourned over the Federal elections, and again some days elapsed after the House re-assembled before the measure was taken up. I am not certain as to three weeks having elapsed, but it was a considerable time, sufficiently long to prove the hypocrisy of the Government.

That measure proposed to absolutely upset the decision of the court given in connection with the instructions the Government had issued to the Railway Commissioners. The Commissioners were carrying out the pledge and the promise made by the Holman Government through Sir George Fuller as Acting Premier. When the strike took place Sir George Fuller made a promise and gave a pledge to the men that if they stood by the State the State would stand by them. That pledge was honorably kept till the present Government came into office. As soon as it came into office it gave instructions to the Commissioners and the Commissioners acted on those instructions. One individual took a test case to the court and got a prohibition against the Commissioners. It was to evade that prohibition that the special bill was put through the other House. It came here and was calmly and deliberately debated and after every hon. member had had an opportunity of expressing his views fully and fearlessly the House divided on that question and stood loyal to the pledge given by Sir George Fuller. Then we come to another measure the Parliamentary Electorates and Elections Bill. That bill was passed through the other Chamber and was sent here. It dealt with electoral reform and contained a provision for what was known as "first-past-the-post" elections. This House calmly and deliberately debated it and in Committee amended the bill on the suggestion of the Vice-President of the

Executive Council himself. I was standing at the table moving an amendment to give preferential voting.

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: My suggestion was as an alternative not to the "first-past-the-post" principle contained in the bill, which I wanted to retain, but to your proposal for preferential voting!

The Hon. E. H. FARRAR: I was moving that the word "shall" should be put in, so that there should be a continuous preference for all candidates nominated. The Vice-President of the Executive Council interjected that if I would alter the word "shall" to "may," he was prepared to accept it. I said that I was willing to alter it, but that I could only speak for myself, and would not prevent any other member of the Committee from moving that the word "shall" should be reinserted. I altered my amendment by inserting the word "may," thus making it a contingent vote, so that the elector could plump either for one candidate, or carry on his preference to the second, or third, or fourth, or more candidates, and whichever way he voted it would be a valid vote. Following my amendment in that direction the Hon. Mr. Dick moved to amend my amendment by inserting the word "shall," instead of the word "may." We divided on that matter, and the word "shall" was defeated. The proposal to retain the word "may" was carried, and that was the amendment which was made in the Electoral Bill as it was passed by this House. There was another amendment, but that did not violate the principles of the Government. The Government's principle was that it wanted the right of electors to vote for their candidates, without continuing the preference. By giving a contingent vote this House agreed to that, and by passing that into law the Government would have an Act which would give its supporters the right to vote for their own candidates if they so desired without any continuous preference. Yet at the same time other electors could have the right of giving contingent votes for the second, third or fourth or other candidates, as they might desire.

[*The Hon. E. H. Farrar.*

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member has exceeded the time permitted under the standing orders.

The Hon. E. H. FARRAR: There were a number of other matters I should have liked to refer to, such as arbitration, workers compensation, and others, which were dealt with in another place without proper consideration. During this session this House has attempted to calmly and deliberately analyse the proposals of the Government. I know of no principle in the Premier's policy speech which this House has violated. All we have done has been to take advantage of our rights and privileges to deal with legislation in the way we thought best, in the interests of the country. I feel sure that when the people of this country get the opportunity to express their opinions with regard to the work done by this Chamber, they will show that the Chamber stands high in public estimation, for the services it has rendered to the people of New South Wales.

The Hon. T. WADDELL: I do not propose to traverse the ground that has been gone over by the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers or the Hon. Mr. Farrar, but I would like to say to the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers that I hope he will not press this motion to a division. I cannot see that any good would be gained by doing so. We must smilingly take the position, as good sports. The Government is supreme, and we have to bow to its supremacy. My own feeling is that now the Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers has made his protest, and also the Hon. Mr. Farrar, the motion should be withdrawn, or, at any rate, not pressed to a division, and the business of the House should be allowed to proceed. I would like to take this opportunity of saying that it is only fair to the Vice-President of the Executive Council that we should say that since he has been in his present position he has treated the House with all reasonable courtesy. I do not think that any hon. member on either side of the House, could say that the Minister has ever been discourteous. He has treated the House reasonably, and he has had a very difficult task, because he has had to try to pilot through this House legislation

in a most obnoxious form, quite different from what we were led to believe, by the Premier's policy speech, that the Government would introduce. As far as he has gone up to the present I consider that he has shown every courtesy, and has performed his duties with very great ability, a great amount of forbearance, and an evident desire to be reasonable in every way. We may just as well accept the inevitable with smiling faces as with frowning faces, and take the action of the Government as good sports. As far as I am concerned I shall not vote for the motion of adjournment.

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: I do not think there can be any doubt as to the significance of the movement which is on foot to-day with regard to the appointments to this House, and if the gentlemen who are to be appointed here are coming pledged to support everything connected with the programme of the Government, instead of coming here as free men, the very purpose for which this Chamber exists will be at end. The history of this Chamber shows that it has always been a revising and a deliberative body, and a part of the Legislature that has never, in the long run, stood against the declared will of the people. That rule has been followed by members during this session. Every consideration has been given by members to the Government programme, and where there was a clear mandate from the people, and a clear expression of the public will, I do not think anybody can say that this House has ever failed to give recognition to that expression of opinion. The Government should have been well satisfied with the progress it has made during this session. It has had a very full programme of legislation, and this House, owing to the failure of the other Chamber as a deliberative body, has been called upon to do the work of that Chamber in close detailed analysis of the various bills that have been sent here. If this House is to be reduced to the position the other House has been reduced to, of simply recording the decrees of the Government, as representing the influences behind it, then this House will no longer

be able to play any useful part in the Constitution of this country. I hope, if this proposal to appoint these gentlemen is given effect to—I am told it has been given effect to, and that they are waiting outside now to be sworn in—that they will realise that duty to country is something more important than duty to any party, and that every man who comes here will endeavour to determine the questions that are put before him irrespective of any party consideration.

There has been a considerable amount of misapprehension as far as the action of this House is concerned with regard to the various bills which have been promulgated by the Government. A little while ago I saw a statement that had been made by the Premier with regard to the Municipal Franchise Bill, in which he said that the bill merely sought to impose upon the municipalities of this State the Sydney Municipal Council franchise. Well, either the Premier did not know the bill he introduced, or he was misrepresenting the position. Every hon. member knows that that was a bill to provide for the parliamentary franchise in all the shires and municipalities of this State.

The Hon. J. F. COATES: It went further than that!

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: I do not think it could go very much further than that.

The Hon. J. F. COATES: It preserved the right of voting to a property-owner living outside the municipal boundaries!

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: That right was not worth the paper it was written on. The whole effect of that legislation was to impose the parliamentary franchise on shires and municipalities. That had never been put before the people of this country, and it was not embodied in the programme of legislation that the Premier had submitted to the people in his Granville speech outlining the policy of the Labour party, and in which he laid down certain things on which he would legislate, and in regard to which he said his Government would go that far, but no further.

So far as Government measures are concerned I have adopted the attitude that where they were clearly within the ambit of that policy-speech they would receive my general support. Other hon. members have done the same, and we have passed those measures which were included in the policy-speech.

In regard to the Electoral Act the Minister in charge of the bill said, when the Hon. Mr. Farrar was speaking, that if he would make it the contingent system he would accept it. I believe that every hon. member of this House thought he was speaking on behalf of the Government, and that that was the amendment he was prepared to accept. The hon. member has pursued the course of acquiescing and in approving of amendments, but when bills go out of Committee, it is the last we hear of them. They are apparently held up to make a case against this House, instead of our honestly meeting and endeavouring to compose the differences as provided by constitutional practice in this country. Any Minister who has been in charge of legislation knows that the free and independent deliberations of this House have been of constant value to every Government in this country since the inception of Constitutional Government. When the Hon. Mr. Kavanagh was leading the last Labour Government he frequently expressed the opinion that the bills that had been critically examined and amended in this House had left the Chamber infinitely better measures than when they came. I have been looking forward and hoping—although I have not quite fathomed the opposition of the gentlemen at the head of the Government—that before now he would have been generous enough to have said in connection with the work of this House that we have already improved many of the measures sent here during this session.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: The Hon. Mr. Willis has admitted that on more than one occasion, I do not say very emphatically!

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: The Hon. Mr. Ashton says the Minister has admitted it on more than one occasion, but it has been the custom

[*The Hon. W. E. V. Robson.*

previously when the third reading of a bill has been carried, to have some expression of opinion from the Minister in charge as to the work done by this House; and I am sure it would have been a pleasure if the hon. gentleman had expressed that view. The history of this House has been a notably dignified, and useful one to this country. I hoped—though one scarcely dares to hope under the circumstances—that its career of usefulness as part of the legislative machinery of this State would have continued. I am afraid however that if men are to be appointed to this House pledged body and soul to any Government, then the usefulness of this Chamber as part of the arm of legislation of this State is at an end.

The Hon. J. ASHTON: But for one consideration I would be disposed to say, "We, who are about to die, salute." That consideration is that I am not at all sure we are about to die. The Vice-President of the Executive Council has laid it down that the object of the Government in securing the addition of some twenty-five new members to the ranks of the Legislative Council is to get its programme to the country on to the statute-book of this State, and that it is its duty so to do. I do not propose to discuss that proposition in detail, for though I spoke with the tongues of angels and with the irresistible logic of a Socrates the result would be very much the same as if one spent the next twenty-four hours beating one's head against a stone wall. During the time I have been in contact with the members of this Government I have never expected to make any effective impression on the minds of any of its members or supporters, for the very good reason that politically their minds are closed. They are pledged to certain matters, and though in private they may occasionally drop hints that their policy does not represent the highest degree of wisdom, I have never met one in the whole of my political career who has had the boldness to say so in public. Perhaps that oversteps the mark a little, because I have known several to say it, but they have been out

of the movement almost before you could say "Jack Robinson." I have every reason to believe that the new members will vote solidly in favour of all the Government measures. I am perfectly certain that they will do so, no matter how cogent the arguments may be, advanced by other members of the Council, why they should be amended in any particular. They will admit the force of the arguments, but they will not dare to record a vote which will be a formal acknowledgment of them.

There is one point, however, upon which I entertain very grave doubts indeed. While I believe that every man who is to be appointed to this House and every member of the Labour party who is in this House will honestly and faithfully vote for all the items of the Government programme, on the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council I do not think they will have a chance of recording a vote. The Hon. Mr. Robinson has referred to this question. I think that if the Government has a majority in the Legislative Council the next logical step in the sequence of events should be the introduction of a bill for its abolition. I know quite a number of people who think practically with me on many other questions who do not agree with me on that. A Legislative Council containing a majority of pledged Labour members is in my opinion not only of no use whatever, but it is a constitutional excrescence, a so-called legislative chamber which merely imposes a charge upon the taxpayer for its maintenance, but serves no useful purpose and discharges no useful function. That I think ought to be just as readily admitted by the members of the Labour party as by myself. What is the position? We know that when a legislative measure is approved generally and in detail by the Labour caucus, no amendment of that decision shall be arrived at in the House of Assembly. It may be discovered that a "t" wants crossing or an "i" wants dotting, and that may be done, but beyond that no individual member dare go. That is to say, for half a dozen members of the Labour party in the Legislative Assembly

to oppose an amendment in a caucus approved bill and carry it with the aid of the Opposition is an unthinkable proposition. Not only are their minds closed, but so far as action is concerned, their hands and feet are tied. I know it is part of the system and it is supposed that the end justifies the means. That may be so. I am simply dealing with the facts. What is the position of a Legislative Council which contains a majority of pledged Labour members? Will the representatives of the Labour party in the Council dream of doing what the representatives of the Labour party in the Legislative Assembly would not do—alter or vary in any degree a decision of the caucus? The answer is obvious. It is out of the question. Then, what in the name of heaven is the good of a Legislative Council so constituted? Not only is it the solemn obligation of the Labour party, which has placed the abolition of the Legislative Council as the first plank in its constitutional platform, to give effect to it as soon as the power is in its hands, as it will be in a few minutes, but it ought, in my opinion, to receive every possible assistance from hon. members who are not members of the Labour party but who do not believe in mockery and make-believe. I tell the Hon. the Minister that it will be one of my few remaining duties—because I do not think I have any further useful duties to discharge in this House, for the simple reason that it is not a favourite pastime of mine to beat my head against a stone wall—to try to induce the Government to carry out its pledge to its supporters and the people of this country to abolish the Legislative Council.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: You did not say that a week ago!

The Hon. J. ASHTON: While the Legislative Council was, in my opinion, a useful instrument, I wanted it preserved. I make no secret of that.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: With a Nationalist majority?

The Hon. J. ASHTON: When it passed legislation which was good for the country, I wanted it preserved. In my opinion, that time has passed. But I am

giving an additional reason. I say that from the Minister's standpoint the Legislative Council cannot possibly, as part of the Labour movement, serve any useful purpose whatever.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: Hear, hear! I would vote to abolish it to-night!

The Hon. J. ASHTON: I hope the hon. member will do something more than that. I understand he has some influence with the Premier, Mr. Lang. I should be glad if he would try to induce Mr. Lang to take the necessary steps.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: Will you promise to vote for it?

The Hon. J. ASHTON: Absolutely. The hon. member can rely upon my unqualified support.

The Hon. R. W. CRUICKSHANK: And the Nationalist support?

The Hon. J. ASHTON: I cannot pledge anybody but myself, and I do not propose to. But I can assure the hon. member that if the members of his party are present—as occasionally they have not been—and vote solidly, my vote will be sufficient to enable them to give effect to what they have told the country for very many years is the principal and most vital plank in their programme. If there is any answer to that proposition, I would like to hear what it is. I have been in politics for thirty odd years. I have long since lost any illusions that I had in connection with politics. I suppose I can say that for the past twenty or twenty-five years, what small part I have played in the politics of this country has been in the reluctant performance of what I conceived to be a duty—a duty which I realise has been very imperfectly performed. But I have now reached the point where the future politics of this country are so repellent to me that I do not want to take a hand in them. I am prepared to lend a hand, for the purpose of clearing out of the way an institution which in future will cumber the earth—the Legislative Council as it is proposed to constitute it.

Although it sounds like a paradox to say so, I think that during recent years the Legislative Council has been

[The Hon. J. Ashton.]

of considerable assistance to the New South Wales Labour party. It has enabled Labour candidates to go round the country year after year telling their gullible audiences that they can establish the millennium if only they are given a chance; and at the next election they tell them they would have established it had it not been for the Legislative Council. I think they ought to have a chance to demonstrate their ability, or inability, to translate their preposterous undertakings into concrete facts. In that respect, I think the Legislative Council has been a good friend to the Labour party. But the country, and no one else—not the members of the Legislative Council—has been responsible for the present situation.

My view of the conduct of the Legislative Council during the past session is that every vote on the principles has been founded on clear, unmistakable and conclusive reasoning, to which there has been no effective reply from the Government's representatives or of its supporters, and in most instances no attempt at effective reply. I admit all the logical arguments against the insecure basis of a nominee Chamber. I am quite prepared to admit it rests on no logical basis whatever. The sole justification for the continued existence of the Legislative Council of New South Wales during recent years is that it has been composed of fairly clear-sighted, fair-minded, honest men. Whether they are the elect of the people or not, you cannot have higher qualifications in any legislature; and, whether they come from the people or are nominated by the Crown, if they comply with that condition the country is exceedingly lucky to have its Government carried on by men of that character. I am speaking by and large. That they are exposed to the charge of favouring Nationalist legislation is a perfectly true statement. But it is due to the fact that there have been certain wild, franciful, extreme proposals put forward by half-baked radicals in this community, which any man of mature judgment must be opposed to, and must

say he is opposed to if he has the courage of his convictions. That is why you frequently find the Legislative Council expressing, as it were, the views of what are called the hard-boiled conservatives outside—because they have got sense; because they have got the sense which the youthful half-baked idealist, beautiful in character as his ideas may be, does not possess, because he has not yet reached the stage at which he can distinguish between the practicable and the impracticable, between the visionary and the real. I have been thirty odd years in Parliament. For several years I was animated by many ideals, some of which I still possess, but most of which have gone. There was one mistake I did avoid. In my earliest political days I was invited to become a member of the Labour party. I thought it over for a considerable time, very seriously. I refused on the ground that I was not prepared to put my conscience and my reason in the care of any body of men whoever they were, and I insisted upon the right to express my views on all occasions, and to vote as I pleased on any question. Lots of young men in this country have missed the path. Attracted by the ideals set out in many sections of the Labour party's programme and finding little attraction in an attitude of mere conservatism they joined up with the Labour party, but at a terrible price. They barter their souls away. I do not expect hon. members to admit it, but many of them in their heart of hearts recognise the truth of what I say, that on numerous occasions they have been driven along paths they did not want to go. What is the alternative? To be declared bogus, and have their faces spat in, metaphorically speaking.

There is a terrible danger of the Labour movement in this country degenerating into one of the most tyrannical organisations the world has even seen, and it remains for the most intelligent, the most conscientious members of the movement to see that that end is not attained. I say that if those acts of legislation which the Council is charged with throwing out—the

measure which involved the degradation of men who stuck to this country and the Empire in the most extreme crisis in its history; and the other measure which said, "Before you can eat you must place yourself under the domination of the Trades Hall"—are a sample of the legislation the people are going to live under during the next few years, there will be mighty little difference between it and Moscow. If I were perfectly free—if I had not a family of four boys whom I have just started in life—I would pack up my traps and get out of this country, for liberty is at an end if legislation of this kind is to be carried. All that, however, has very little to do with the case, and I suppose that but for your kindness, Mr. President, I should have been ruled out of order; but I think we have arrived at a very serious crisis. Instead of this country being subjected to the mockery and make-believe of a second Chamber which will exercise no useful function whatever, and cannot, if it is true to the fundamental principles of Labour politics, exercise any useful function, I hope the Government will make clear recognition of that fact at an early date, and follow up the step which has put the Legislative Council in its hands by a measure to provide for its abolition.

The Hon. T. J. SMITH: The motion for adjournment appears to me to be a protest against the action of the Government in nominating twenty-five new members to the Legislative Council. Many grounds have been urged why the Government should not take the action proposed. I want to say that, whether one likes it or not, the Government has acted constitutionally, and when hon. members say that the Government has exceeded its mandate I would remind them that the Government is elected to govern. You cannot tie its hands or limit its work to mere expressions of its policy speech. I hold that the Government is justified in appointing new members here and that it has done so in a constitutional way. The twenty-five gentlemen who have been nominated to seats in this Chamber are representative of the whole State. There are

among them men who have earned distinction and honor—be it humble or high—in the various callings and organisations of which each one of them is an ornament. The new members will have just as much regard for the high traditions and honorable status of this House as any other member, and they are indeed lucky, privileged men. I welcome them and I trust that other hon. members, irrespective of their political viewpoint will show a sporting spirit and also welcome them. I do not propose to follow the argument about the alleged tyranny of the Labour movement. I sometimes think that the constitutional law is not as strong as the conventional or the common law, and that the pledged men of a party are not as strong in their mutual regard and purpose as men who are united, not by signatures on paper, but by mutual interests, financial or otherwise. With all its shortcomings I am proud to be a member of the Australian Labour movement, and I welcome the new members, because I feel certain that the traditions of this House will be safe in their keeping.

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS, in reply: I listened with some interest to the attempt of the Vice-President of the Executive Council to draw a herring across the trail. The hon. member referred to the Federal election, and because there has been a decision of the High Court on the Deportation Bill, he assumes that the verdict of the people at that election is to be set aside. The hon. member and his colleague in the other House ought to be consistent. Before the ink was dry on the judgment, before he had seen the judgment of the Supreme Court of this State on the question of employment of loyalists in the railways the hon. member came down with a bill to set aside the judgment of that court. Where is the consistency of the hon. member? I know he did not believe a word of what he was saying. He has too much sense to say that the High Court decision was really an issue before the people. It was really a decision on a technicality, on the legality of a certain

[The Hon. T. J. Smith.]

Act and the procedure. Applying the hon. member's own logic and going further and applying real logic, now does the hon. member justify what his Government did? Some days afterwards when the bill came here, the hon. member said he had not read the judgment of the court. He had received it just at that moment; he held it in his hand and would not lay it on the table. He would not wait to read the judgment and know what it was but preferred to rush in pell mell and upset the decision of the highest court of the State. I make the hon. member a present of that analagous case. He will be able to digest it and make out a better case as regards the will of the people. I can give him an instance of what previous Governments have done. I was a member of the Parkes Government and we always took care in the appointments made to this Chamber to appoint representatives of the other side. There was the case of Mr. Richard E. O'Connor and the Heydon brothers. They were not supporters of ours, but they were men whom we could regard as fit persons for this Chamber on account of their ability. We did not mind their opposing us on a particular question of Protection or anything of that kind. Sir Henry Parkes always nominated to this Chamber with every batch of appointees, representatives of the other side. Sir George Reid did the same. When we had a conflict with this Chamber on one memorable occasion, on our taxation proposals, we could have gone to the Governor and have got sufficient new members to swamp this Chamber. But we had the courage of our opinions and appealed to the country. I give that instance to the hon. member, but I know it is the last thing he will recommend his Government to follow. In building for the appeal to the people that must inevitably arise the Government will not have the Legislative Council to point to now as spoiling its legislation. It will have the legislation itself to point to, passed in all its crudities, as originally introduced, and God help the people of the country who will have to endure it. It makes a crime of government; a crime of

loyalty to the spirit of truth, of service to the public—for that is what the Government is seeking to do and has sought to do in regard to those 20,000 loyal railway servants who carried on. And it rewards them for that spirit of service, which is the foundation of the stability of any country, by refusing them the right to earn their living.

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: There are only 400 left!

The Hon. W. E. V. ROBSON: Why not leave them alone?

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I do not care if there are only four—do not kick them out.

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: The Government does not propose to kick them out; it is prepared to let them stay where they are; but it restores to others the rights they have had taken away from them. That is all the Government is doing!

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: I suppose all these interjections only amount to this, that before the Government did this it had counted heads and because there were not sufficient to turn the scales the Government thought it safe to do it. The principle does not count but it is a poor day for this country when seated firmly in the saddle we have a Government which broadcasts to the people and to the public service that it does not matter how they serve the public but it does matter how they serve their political friends. That is the dogma that has gone forth, and that is the dogma to which this House would not subscribe. I was only led to refer to that because of the inapt illustration and reference of the hon. member to the decision of the High Court in the deportation case and his absolute forgetfulness of the fact that his Government had the audacity, before the ink was dry on the judgment of our court in the loyalist case, to come down with a measure to set that judgment aside. I am proud of the fact that I was a member of the Reid Government, which, when it was thwarted after it had a

mandate from the public in regard to land and income-tax proposals, went to the country and got the verdict of the people. That is a precedent that ought to be followed. The Government will not follow it, because it sees the writing on the wall. It knows that the electors who put it in by a chance majority, represent a 25,000 majority of votes against it. Then with the recent Federal elections the deluge came, and this Government itself contributed to it because, after all the vote at the Federal election was not merely a vote for Mr. Bruce and his policy but it was a protest against the doings of the Lang Government in this State. People knew that the alternative was to get in Australia a Government which would do what the Premier of this State was doing.

A moving factor that impelled the Government to take action to get that Electoral Bill through, including the "first-past-the-post" principle—that was the Government proposal—was the knowledge that in a constituency of 15,000 electors in which there were ten candidates, and each polled 1,000 votes, the one that polled 1,050 votes would be returned notwithstanding the fact that there might be 10,000 votes recorded against him. The idea was not to secure representation of the people but to assure getting the best electoral machine for the Labour party to work. Then, perhaps, with our amendment gone, which provides for a proper commission to readjust the boundaries, we may have a repetition of what has taken place in Queensland. The Labour Government having abolished the Upper House there readjusted the electorates, and where there was a Labour electorate the quota was made small and where there was a Liberal electorate the quota was made large. That means that in Queensland by the manipulation of the electoral law the Labour Government, returned by a minority of the votes of the people, has a majority of representation.

The Hon. A. C. WILLIS: It is the same thing in Victoria only the other way about!

The Hon. Sir JOSEPH CARRUTHERS: That is what is moving the Government in its action to get its Electoral Bill with the "first-past-the-post" principle. Instead of representation of the majority of the people, it will have representation of the minority. It represents the minority to-day and it wants to stereotype on the statute-book representation by the minority. I shall not ask the House to divide because some of my friends prefer there shall not be any division. I moved this motion to give the House an opportunity of registering a protest. We had no other opportunity. There is no other course open to the House except to take the course I have adopted to-day, and, with the consent of the House, I will now withdraw my motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

NEW MEMBERS.

The PRESIDENT reported that the under-mentioned gentlemen had been appointed members of the Legislative Council:—William Ainsworth, Esquire, Simon Hickey, Esquire, John Culbert, Esquire, William Carey, Esquire, John Keegan, Esquire, William Brennan, Esquire, James Matthew Concannon, Esquire, Anthony Alexander Alam, Esquire, James Denis Lyons, Esquire, Daniel Malone, Esquire, Charles Brill Bridges, Esquire, Robert Pillans, Esquire, Arthur William Yager, Esquire, Lawrence Cotter, Esquire, George Wrench, Esquire, William Patrick Kelly, Esquire, Thomas Patrick Doyle, Esquire, George Stacher Archer, Esquire, Carl Adrian Akhurst, Esquire, James Edward Hoad, Esquire, James Mark Minahan, Esquire, Frank William Spicer, Esquire, Lionel William Ryan, Esquire, William Edward Dickson, Esquire, Duncan Malcolm Smith, Esquire.

MEMBERS SWORN.

The new members, with the exception of Messrs. William Ainsworth and William Edward Dickson, took the oath and subscribed the roll.

House adjourned at 4.35 p.m.

[The Hon. Sir Joseph Carruthers.

Legislative Assembly.

Monday, 21 December, 1925.

Printed Question and Answer — Questions without Notice—Widows' Pensions Bill—Lewisham Cemetery Bill — Supply — Appropriation Bill—References to Public Works Committee — Supply (Loan Bill)—Adjournment (Appointments to Legislative Council).

MR. SPEAKER took the chair.

PRINTED QUESTION AND ANSWER.

GENERAL LOAN ACCOUNT: SALE OF FUNDED STOCK.

Mr. DRUMMOND asked the COLONIAL TREASURER,—On page 4187 of the *Government Gazette*—General Loan Account—Account current of receipts and expenditure during quarter ended 30th September, are shown the proceeds of sale of 6 per cent. funded stock totalling £1,774,724 15s. 7d. Will the Treasurer state the amount of such proceeds received in the months of July, August, and September, respectively, and price at which the stock was sold?

Answer,—

Month.	Issue Price per cent.		Proceeds.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
July ...	98	10 0	1,773,000	0 0
„ ...	99	0 0	1,438	15 7
Total July ...	...	...	£1,774,438	15 7
August ...	99	0 0	286	0 0
September ...			Nil.	
Total, July to September ...	...	...	£1,774,724	15 7

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

HOWLONG COMMON.

Mr. KILPATRICK: Is the Minister for Lands aware that the Hume Shire Council is attempting to acquire part of the temporary common at Howlong as a gravel reserve and that this proposal is viewed with disfavour? Will the Minister go carefully into the matter, with a view to granting a gravel reserve and take into consideration the fact that