

Practically nothing. Over a million pounds a year leaves this State for butter and eggs, etc. Why do not they assist the men themselves in opening up the south-west of the State and give settlers the land, so long as they will produce the goods. We do not want that million pounds to be going out of the State every year; we want rather to keep it here. During the stagnation in Victoria it was butter that saved the situation. This will show you how vital a part that commodity played. We find here that we are importing most of our butter to-day, while we have thousands of acres of good land which, if opened up, would supply us with as much of this commodity as we require. As a representative of the Country party, I am going to say that we are out for all that makes for good, clean legislation. We are in the position that we are going to do away with the old feelings of personalities and abuse. My position in this Chamber is to consider any proposition that comes forward with an open and unbiassed mind. We want good sound legislation, and we want to do away with any personalities or abuse. Our principles are broad enough to take in all sections of the community. The Hon. Mr. Kirwan refers to revenue tariff as a dead letter. I cannot see it. We must remember that since the days of the old fight to bring about freetrade, the electors have been enlightened on the matter and they have been forced to support it, owing to the heavy drains upon their pockets. We find hundreds to-day, who were protectionists, but who have been brought round to a different way of thinking. It has brought me round to the freetrade side.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I am still on the freetrade side.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I hope the hon. member will always stick to it. I feel sure of success, I feel sure that the Country party will be the national party of Australia and that, too, at no distant date. That may seem big talk. Eighteen months ago it would have seemed big talk if I had said that we would be in the position that we are in to-day.

On motion by Hon. J. Duffell debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.18 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 7th July, 1914.

	Page.
Questions: State Trading Concerns	156
Agricultural Lands survey	157
Police Magistrates' retirement	157
Railway extension, Dwarda-Narrogin ..	157
Land Reclassification Board	157
Bills: Rights in Water and Irrigation, 1A.	
Traffic, 1R.	157
Melville Tramways, 1R.	157
Supply, £1,370,050, returned	157
Licensing Act Amendment	157
Assent to Supply Bill	159
Address-in-reply, third day	159
Papers presented	198

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (2)—STATE TRADING CONCERNS.

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Premier: 1, Whether the provisions of the Government Trading Concerns Act have been suspended in connection with any of the State trading concerns? 2, If so, which, and for what period? 3, What was the reason for such suspensions?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. But exemption from the operation of the Act was given up to 1st July, 1913, to those concerns which had only just commenced trading, and prior to the above date proper books are required by the Act had not been kept. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Answered by No. 1.

Mr. MONGER asked the Premier: 1, Will he state if the balance-sheets of the Government trading concerns submitted at the close of last session have

been finally audited and completed according to Statute? 2, If so, will he have copies placed on the Table of the House? 3, In view of the lengthy time taken last year in presenting balance-sheets of the Government trading concerns, will he direct that completed and properly audited balance-sheets for the financial year just ended be made available without delay?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (for the Premier) replied: 1, Yes, with the exception of Moola Bulla Cattle Station, State Hotels, and Boya Quarry. 2, Yes, as soon as audited. 3, Audited balance-sheets will be made available in accordance with the law.

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL LANDS SURVEY.

Mr. WISDOM asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is the work of surveying in preparation for settlement in connection with agricultural land being proceeded with? 2, If not, why not? 3, If so, how many surveyors are at present engaged on this work?

The Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister), for the Minister for Lands, replied: 1, Yes. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Thirty-two surveyors are at present employed on country surveys—28 of these are on ordinary survey work, the bulk of which includes the surveying of blocks that have been applied for, and four on classification and subdivisional work.

QUESTION—POLICE MAGISTRATES' RETIREMENT.

Mr. WISDOM asked the Attorney General: 1, Who initiated the action which resulted in the retirement of Magistrates Cowan, Roe, and Foss? 2, Did the Public Service Commissioner recommend these retirements?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, Parliament when it enacted Section 66 of "The Public Service Act, 1904." 2, Yes.

QUESTION—RAILWAY EXTENSION, DWARDA-NARROGIN.

Mr. HARPER asked the Minister for Works: Is it the intention of the Government to continue the construction of the Dwarda-Narrogin Railway easterly to Leedham's Pool or Dumbitmoony before going southward to Narrogin?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The Narrogin line has been started at Narrogin end, but it has not proceeded far enough to determine what the exact route of the line will be.

QUESTION—LAND RE-CLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Lands: With reference to his reply to Question No. 1 of Thursday last, is it a fact that Mr. H. F. Johnston, the Surveyor General, who is acting as chairman of the Re-classification Board, previously fixed the prices of the lands reported upon by the Board.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (Honorary Minister) (for the Minister for Lands) replied: No. Prices are fixed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Hon. Minister for Lands, but in most cases the prices adopted were those recommended by the Surveyor General.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. Rights in Water and Irrigation (introduced by the Minister for Works).
2. Traffic (introduced by the Minister for Works).
3. Melville Tramways (introduced by Hon. W. C. Angwin, Honorary Minister).

BILL—SUPPLY, £1,379,650.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): By permission of the House, I should like to make a short announcement. A deputa-

tion representing the different churches and the Salvation Army waited upon me this morning with reference to the proposed amendments to the Licensing Act. The deputation had previously, I understand, waited upon the Attorney General and after some discussion he had agreed, if the amendments could be kept to the three principles, to introduce the measure. He asked for some undertaking that hon. members would not take the opportunity of tabling other amendments than those which were referred to by the deputation. One was the registration and licensing of barmaids, with a view to their ultimate abolition, I presume; the second was the age limit of 16 to be raised to 18 years, that is those to whom liquor may be lawfully supplied; the third was to provide for a referendum to fix the hours of the closing of public houses.

Mr. Underwood: And open on Sundays.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hours of closing.

Mr. Underwood: What about opening on Sundays?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am simply putting forward what the deputation asked the Attorney General for. At their request, I have consulted the members of my party, the Liberal members of this House, and if the Attorney General will introduce this amending Bill, we are quite prepared—and I now wish to say that I am speaking on behalf of that party—to confine ourselves to these three principles.

The Premier: You cannot speak for everyone.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. member can take what I say for what it is worth. I give the concurrence of my party, that is, those on the Opposition side of the House, that we will not seek to table any further amendments to the Licensing Act, reserving to ourselves the right to move amendments to these principles I have mentioned. It will depend, however, upon how they may be drafted and presented to the House. Of course the matter is non-party and members will deal with it as they like. My reply to the deputation was that we reserved to ourselves the right to accept or reject the

proposals as far as we saw fit. I shall give the Attorney General my assurance that as far as we are concerned, we will not offer any opposition to the measure outside of the three principles that I have mentioned or to deal with any other principles of the measure than these three, which, I understand, the Attorney General has consented to deal with.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. Walker): May I be permitted also to make a statement or explanation. May I venture to say, with all respect to the leader of the Opposition that this is scarcely a fair way of dealing with a question of this kind. The facts are these: A deputation waited on me to request that the Government should introduce a Bill dealing with the three matters referred to by the leader of the Opposition just now, namely, the licensing of barmaids, the age limit for the supply of liquor, and the submission to the public of the question of the hours for trading in licensed houses. I told the deputation that a Licensing Bill was a very debatable measure, and that before such a measure, even with the limitations imposed by the deputation, could go through in anything like reasonable time, it would be necessary to have the unanimous assurance of both Houses that the debates would be confined only to the matters submitted in a measure as suggested by them. Now I deny that the leader of the Opposition has the full authority of all the members on his side of the House to give the assurance we have heard.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You must not deny it; you must accept my statement.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I say that the hon. member has made it in all good faith, but all the members on his side of the House are not in town.

Hon. Frank Wilson: There has been a party meeting.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: And were all the members of the party present? No.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Mr. Speaker, may I explain just for a moment. A meeting of our party took place last week. A deputation waited on me this morning—two members of it had previously

had a private interview with me—and I told them the result of the meeting of our party.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Were all the members of your party present?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The leader of the Opposition has not assured me that every member on his side of the House was present when the party meeting was held. He is not, therefore, in a position to say absolutely that every single member on his side of the House will support him in what he has told the House. Permit me to say again that I have been treated with unfairness in connection with this matter. The hon. member opposite evidently was consulted a week ago. Only this morning was I communicated with by telephone and asked if I would receive a deputation from the representatives of the churches. This was at the last minute, as it were, and the object, I suppose, was to get my assurance that every hon. member on this side of the House would support the measure containing the three proposals in question, and would not introduce other matters. As the leader of the Opposition has stated, this is a non-party question purely and simply, and therefore I cannot undertake to guarantee that every member of our party would leave the licensing question generally untouched if a measure were introduced. There was no time for us to have a caucus meeting. Even if it had been possible—and this explanation should go forth—for me to guarantee the acquiescence of every member sitting on this side of the House, not one here could guarantee what would be done in another place, and I say one cannot risk, in a short session like this, introducing a debatable measure of this kind unless there is forthcoming an assurance from every quarter that the debate will be confined to the points submitted.

Mr. Swan: You cannot trust these caucus-bound parties at all.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I adhere to the statement I made to the deputation; that I will request the Government to introduce a Bill of this character when the assurance is given from both

branches of the Legislature that they will unanimously agree to confine themselves to the three points.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not want to raise a debate on this matter. I simply stated the case and it is that two members representing the Council of Churches waited on me last week and asked whether I thought that the members of my party would agree to confine themselves to the three principles. I said that I would consult the members of the party; a meeting was held, and it was unanimously resolved, on my recommendation, that we should give our undertaking to confine ourselves to these three principles, if the Attorney General would introduce the measure. I made that announcement this afternoon, and it is treated as an unfair attack on the Government. I simply made the announcement. I cannot control another place; it is for the Attorney General to accept or reject my offer.

The Attorney General: I will adhere to the terms which I expressed to the deputation.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then the Attorney General has gone a step in that direction when he has an assurance through me in regard to the members on this side of the House.

ASSENT TO SUPPLY BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Supply Bill, £1,379,650.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day.

Debate resumed from the 2nd July.

The PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan): It is evident that the leader of the Opposition, foreseeing what might occur in the near future, has handed over the leadership of his party to the member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper), because he has evidently left the Chamber with his lieutenant the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell). I want to make some pointed remarks in connection with the hon. member's criticism, and I hoped he

would be present to hear what I had to say.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: He is frightened to take his gruel.

The PREMIER: May I repeat that the leader of the Opposition on this occasion, as on previous occasions, has nothing new to submit to the Chamber by way of criticism of the Government. He has repeated what he has said on divers occasions in the Chamber and on the public platform. It is evidence that, with the exception of one or two matters on which, naturally, we disagree, the leader of the Opposition is perfectly satisfied with the administration of the present Government. If he were in entire agreement with the administration of the affairs of State he would not be expected to be sitting in opposition to the Government. In fact, I would have to consider whether we were doing justice to the people we represent if we received from him nothing but eulogy for our administration. But I want to explain that while I have never objected to criticism, I have always endeavoured to make that criticism fair, and to keep as near as possible to the facts. The leader of the Opposition, however, on many occasions has made statements here and repeated them continuously on the public platform, as though he had not been satisfied with the explanation given. For instance, on Thursday last, when I informed him on one matter that we had proposed to take a certain course, he said he was not prepared to accept my statement and did not believe that such a course was ever proposed. I refer to the question of the sleeper contract. I explained to the leader of the Opposition that when the Federal Government proposed to cancel the contract then existing we offered to make up any shortage with other sleepers, and the hon. member replied that he did not believe it. Such may be Opposition tactics, but is it a manly course?

Hon. Frank Wilson: What did you say about the capacity of the mills?

The PREMIER: I am not dealing with that now. I am dealing with the attitude of the leader of the Opposition in point-blank refusing to accept the statement made by me as head of the Government, and he must have been in a position to

know that I would not make such a statement unless the offer I refer to had been made. I have brought with me a file of papers for the purpose of proving the statement I made, and also to show the attitude adopted by the leader of the Opposition, and when the hon. gentleman continues to refuse to accept statements made by me here, one can imagine what he would say when speaking on the public platform, where there might be no one to challenge him. On the 18th December, 1913—the time of the cancellation of the contract—I wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. It is a rather lengthy document, but for my purpose I will read that which is pertinent to the subject.

I understand there are some thousands of sleepers stacked in Kalgoorlie at the present time, but even if it could be shown that delay in the early stages of the contract would interfere with the construction of the railway, this Government could in all probability arrange for a further supply of jarrah sleepers from the hewers.

That was the first intimation we gave them. Later, when they definitely informed us they proposed to cancel the contract, I sent the following wire:—

As stated in my letter of 18th December, 13,440 sleepers will be delivered this month, February, and if required the month's deficiency can be made up of jarrah sleepers at our jarrah contract price.

The Federal Government took no notice of these communications. Notwithstanding this fact we are continually hearing the statements being made by the leader of the Opposition of the character I have referred to. Naturally one can understand the attitude of the hon. member in view of the approach of the general elections. I merely mention the matter to show hon. members that after all it is very difficult to follow the leader of the Opposition. His statements are largely tedious repetitions of what he has said here and repeated elsewhere. The speech of the leader of the Opposition was largely made up of a condemnation of the control of the finances of the present Government and myself as Treasurer.

and naturally I expected that in these circumstances the hon. member would have had a record of a successful character to which he could have pointed when he was Treasurer of the State. I admit there are others who are entitled to criticise the State finances. For instance, the real leader of the Liberal party in another place, Mr. Colebatch, is entitled to do so, because he has, as yet, not had control of the finances, and we do not know of the mess or muddle that he may leave them in when he leaves the Treasury. But the present leader of the Opposition was Treasurer of the State from April, 1906, to June, 1909, and in accordance with the returns that were submitted in the Budget of 1912, hon. members will find if they turn those returns up that on almost every occasion he closed the financial year with an increased deficit, and month after month he had to give an explanation in the public Press why such a position was arrived at, and it got to such a stage that the then Premier, Sir Newton Moore, had to summarily dismiss the hon. member from the position of Colonial Treasurer.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Are you sticking to facts now?

The PREMIER: Yes, I am sticking to facts.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Untrue, not a scintilla of truth.

The PREMIER: Then I do not know how to say it. Perhaps it would be well to say that the leader of the Opposition was persuaded by the then leader of the Government to give up his position as Colonial Treasurer.

Hon. Frank Wilson: And not persuaded.

The PREMIER: Then he left of his own accord. He gave the then Premier notice and left.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Now you have got it.

The PREMIER: At any rate, one of two things must have happened, either the leader of the Government was not satisfied with the Treasurer's administration of the finances and dismissed him,

or the then Treasurer was disgusted with his own administration of the financial affairs of the State and left. If the hon. member denies the first, then we must accept the second, that he left because he was disgusted with his own control of the finances.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How lovely!

Hon. J. Mitchell: It is beautiful!

The PREMIER: It is a fact that cannot be denied that the hon. member left the Treasury in 1909 after he had built up a deficit of £312,630. He was in charge of the Treasury from May, 1906, to June, 1909, and when he took over the Treasury there was only a deficit of £18,000, which he increased to £312,615. I know that explanations were given time out of number by the leader of the Opposition when he was Treasurer, for on the first or the second of the month there were long paragraphs in the *West Australian* newspaper when the Treasurer had to again admit an increased deficit in the Treasury. There were times when he had hoped there would be prosperity and that he would be able to produce a surplus.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Will you produce these explanations?

The PREMIER: I cannot produce the file of the *West Australian* for the past three years, and I do not propose to bring those newspapers here, but I know that even while on an election campaign, when the leader of the Opposition was still Treasurer of the State, the explanations were given why he had to admit a deficit in the Consolidated Revenue account. I want to draw attention to some of the statements then made, in order to show that if he was justified in endeavouring to explain away the position, we are doubly justified on the present occasion.

Hon. J. Mitchell interjected.

The PREMIER: The member for Northam has something to answer for in the matter, which will be dealt with later, but one requires a certain amount of courage to mention the finances in the presence of the member for Northam, for he is such a whale on that question; but I will pursue my course. In the

Queen's Hall at Perth on the 6th September, 1911, the leader of the Opposition is reported as having made the following statement:—

It was true that the Government had last year received £235,000 more gross revenue than the Labour Government had secured some six years ago, notwithstanding that the returns from the Government had decreased by £458,000. It was a pity if we did not in a progressive country like ours receive an increased revenue from year to year. He would consider it conclusive proof of retrogression and stagnation if the revenue did not increase externally with the increase of population and increasing prosperity. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Scaddan seemed to think it a crime that the Government should have received more revenue than they had, whereas it must be admitted that it was in reality strong proof of the improved conditions of the country. It was absolute proof of the progress that had been made under the Liberal policy of the Government.

And I take it this cannot be denied, because it is issued by that hon. gentleman as Premier of the State, and was distributed throughout the various parts of the State under the auspices of the Liberal League. If that was correct at that time, that they had received a slight increase in revenue—very slight—how much more should we claim the tremendous increase of revenue that we have received during the last three years, as evidence of the fact that the administration of the Government has made tremendous progress in the industries of the State?

Hon. Frank Wilson: We wiped out our deficit.

The PREMIER: But the other day the hon. member took up an entirely different attitude. Because we were receiving a greater revenue it was evidence of the fact that we were unduly obtaining money from the public.

Hon. J. Mitchell: So you are.

The PREMIER: It was not evidence then when it happened under the Liberal Administration; it was a sign of pro-

gress. But because it happened to be this Administration, the same excuse does not apply. The leader of the Opposition went on to explain the matter in connection with the railway administration, and amongst other things he said—

But we had to look at the other side of the picture. What had the Government had to face during the six years? It had had to face the requirements of an increased population, increased educational facilities, more police protection, greater hospital facilities.

If that applied then, does it not apply now? Is it not a fact that during the last three years we have had to face the increased requirements of population? The population has increased in the last three years under the Labour Administration by something like 34,000 persons. Is it not a fact that we have had to provide increased educational facilities? We have had to provide more additions to schools, more new buildings and increase the accommodation to existing buildings than has had to be provided during any other similar period in the State. Is it not a fact? No, it is not. I was going to say it was a fact that we have had to provide more police protection, but it is not so. There has not been so much need for police protection; as a matter of fact there was so little crime now that the department could hardly find work enough for the prison warders. With wise administration and better laws we have raised the moral tone of the community, and that is something to which we can justly lay claim. We had to find greater hospital facilities, just as the hon. member had to do. As a matter of fact, that statement made by the leader of the Opposition was not correct. He had not to provide greater hospital facilities. He, as a matter of fact, actually starved the hospitals, and some of those institutions had almost to close their doors because the then Government had to refuse them essential assistance. Then the hon. member went on to say—

An increasing demand for interest and sinking fund.

He was prepared to make that the ground for excusing the condition of the finances under his control.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did not excuse the condition of the finances. We had wiped out our deficit.

The PREMIER: When we point out the fact that we have a progressive public works policy, which had been refused by our predecessors, and also point out the fact that there was an increased interest and sinking fund charge on the Consolidated Revenue, we find the hon. member says that we have no right to claim that as an admission that we have been properly conserving the interests of the State through the Treasury. The hon. member said—

And above all, there was the hugely increased expenditure in our railway system.

Has it not increased under the present Administration? We have been constructing railways from loan funds at a more rapid rate than ever previously in the history of the State.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Ring off; take a back seat.

The PREMIER: And in districts where they are not paying the working expenses, let alone paying interest and sinking fund. I am trying to point out that if the hon. member then laid claim that they had to meet these requirements, and did meet them, and necessarily excused himself for the condition of the finances during the previous six years, we have a better right to-day, under the conditions which have prevailed during the last three years, similar conditions to those which prevailed during the hon. member's term, but in a more aggravated form, we have a better right to make these statements as reasons for the condition of the finances. May I explain, while admitting that the revenue has increased during the past three years at what may appear an enormous rate, due to the conditions prevailing in the Treasury under the present leader of the Opposition when Treasurer, that our trading concerns on that occasion did not pay or the Treasurer did not receive from

them or publish to the world the total amounts received for the work performed. Our Harbour Works at Fremantle, for instance, only provided a few pounds net profit on the year's operations alone, and the operations of the Boya Quarries and in other directions as well gave practically no result, but we now provide that the gross revenue from all sources shall be paid into the Treasury and duly recorded, and every expenditure of whatever nature is also recorded in the Treasury. It has admittedly increased our figures, but it does not increase the revenue we have received from the different sources. And likewise it increases the expenditure, because when departments are trading with one another there is no gain in making a profit. If one department makes a profit against another, it means nothing, because the money comes back again to the Treasury, and the work which is done for the department is done at actual cost, and therefore the increase in revenue and expenditure does not affect the financial position in the slightest degree. But over and above that I admit that we have received other revenue as pointed out by the leader of the Opposition, and it would be a pity if, in a progressive country such as this, our revenue did not increase year by year, but the leader of the Opposition now complains that it has increased under a Labour Administration.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Not at all.

The PREMIER: Then I cannot follow the hon. member's arguments. He occupied nearly half an hour on Thursday night in complaining on this very point.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I complained that your revenue had increased and that your deficit had increased. When our revenue increased we wiped out our deficit. That is the difference.

The PREMIER: I could easily bring about a similar adjustment if I desired.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No, you could not.

The PREMIER: I could do it in a period of 12 months if I desired.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are not capable of doing it.

The PREMIER: Yes, I am, but I positively refuse to do it in the same way as the hon. member would do it. When he was criticising the condition of the finances he said that we should cut our garment according to our cloth, that we should not expend money which was not available, that we should live within our means, that no matter what conditions were prevailing for the moment we should refuse to go on with public works which meant the expenditure of loan money on account of increasing the expenditure for interest and sinking fund, and that we should refuse to assist the farmer who was passing through such a trying period.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I did not say that.

The PREMIER: I am pointing out what the hon. member meant.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No, you are not.

The PREMIER: There is only one construction to be put on the hon. member's remarks, and it is that in order to square the finances and live within our means we must insist that everyone owing money to the Treasury shall pay up during each period, and if he cannot do so that we should refuse to spend money to assist him and carry him over a bad period. If this is not logic, I do not know what is.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

The PREMIER: I want the hon. member to explain what he meant. If he contends that we must cut our garment according to our cloth every twelve months, it means that if the Treasurer does not receive the money which is due to him he must not spend money which is urgently required to assist those people who are carrying on the development of the country. What would be the position to-day if we had adopted this attitude? The hon. member quoted some figures in connection with the harvest during the last five or six years, and he even had the impudence, I can call it nothing less, to make it appear that his Government had to suffer for the failure of the harvest of that year, when the figures were compiled in February 1912. The hon. member contended that his Administration felt the effects of the bad harvest of 1911, but I

would point out that they left office—they were summarily dismissed by their masters—in October 1911. This is not denied. It was after the hon. member's Government left office that the harvest was reaped, and that harvest was the worst in the history of the State. Its effects were worse than they would have been in a country where the industry had been properly established. A shortage of rainfall was experienced in a particular area which had only recently been settled. It was a district which could ill afford to suffer from a bad season. Men who had gone out with very little capital but with the assistance of the Agricultural Bank, had in quite a number of cases put in their first crop, expecting to be able to carry on for another period and to pay their interest charges on the money borrowed from the Agricultural Bank, but the season absolutely failed, and the Government instead of getting a return were called upon to go to their assistance and carry them over for a further period; or, in the alternative to permit them to leave their holdings and flock to our City and towns, and bring about a condition of affairs which would not be desirable. What was worse, they would have been unable to cultivate the land during the following term, and this would have meant two bad harvests instead of one. We faced the difficulty as it ought to be faced, and took no notice of the criticism or advice of the leader of the Opposition to cut our garment according to our cloth. We went to their assistance in a right royal fashion, and even hon. members sitting on the opposite side of the House have admitted that we did all that we as a Government should have done. Consequently, instead of having another harvest of only four million odd bushels, the State's production immediately advanced from four million bushels to over nine million bushels, and again last season it advanced from nine million to 13½ million bushels. This is evidence of the fact that notwithstanding the croaking of some of our friends opposite, the interests of the farming community of Western Australia have not been better safeguarded by a Liberal Administration.

Mr. Harper: The farmers do not think so.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is not in a position to speak for them. I claim, and I challenge contradiction—

Mr. Harper: I know the feeling among the farmers.

The PREMIER: I claim that during the last three years we have done more to assist the farmer to cultivate his holding and to produce a profit from it than any Administration under similar conditions in any part of Australia.

Mr. Harper: By increasing the freight on fertiliser, and putting up their taxation.

The PREMIER: Let me tell the leader of the Opposition that if I were to issue an order to-morrow that the farming community in Western Australia must forthwith pay up all they owe to the Treasury, instead of having a deficit of £400,000 it would be £200,000 less than the deficit with which the Treasury closed the year in 1909. The farmers owe the departments something over £200,000.

Mr. Harper: Look what you have borrowed.

The PREMIER: In addition they owe the Agricultural Bank for principal which should have been repaid, and which has been deferred, an amount of £20,000, and they owe the Seed Wheat Board about £160,000, which was advanced by way of loan for seed wheat and manures.

Mr. Harper: What are you complaining about?

The PREMIER: I am not complaining. I repeat that I am not ashamed of the deficit in the Treasury accounts because of the assistance rendered to the farmers during the trying period. When the leader of the Opposition is shown in his true light, if any notice can be taken of his criticism, he would not have rendered that assistance, but would have insisted that the men who owed money to the Treasury must promptly pay up. He would have refused to give them any assistance whatever in order that he might come to Parliament and say that he had kept the finances square.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Are you not ashamed of making such a statement?

Mr. Dwyer: You could not satisfy the Country party and the Opposition too.

The PREMIER: The country members have no reason to complain, and they have not complained. I have heard some of them state publicly that we had come to the assistance of the farmers in a fashion which was a credit to the Government.

Mr. Harper: They were supporters of yours.

The PREMIER: No, they were members of the Opposition. Surely we can sometimes admit the truth of a statement, and see in our opponents, although we might disagree with them on some matters of principle, a genuine effort to assist where assistance is necessary. As far as the farming community are concerned, recognising the difficulties they have had to contend with, we have done as much as any Government could do, and perhaps a little more than some Governments would have done, and judging by the statements and advice of the leader of the Opposition, considerably more. At the 31st May of this year the farmers owed to the Lands Department £112,685 for rents; they owed £7,048 interest on the money expended in providing seed wheat and manures, and they owed £99,417 for interest or money lent by the Agricultural Bank. These sums make a total of £219,150, which has been a charge merely on revenue account.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Is all of that sum overdue?

The PREMIER: It is the sum owing on that particular date.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Did you pay that out of revenue?

The PREMIER: The hon. member is a novice at finance. He does not appreciate the fact that the £112,000 owed in land rents would if paid have gone into revenue.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the Agricultural Bank interest?

The PREMIER: The interest on the money owing for wheat and manures, £7,000, is lost to the revenue.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You said the sum was £160,000 which was owing to the revenue.

The PREMIER: I said nothing of the

kind. I said that £7,000 was owing, rep-
resenting interest on the amount ex-
pended to provide seed wheat and manure.

The PREMIER: That is absolutely

incorrect. While carrying the farmer over

this trying period we made arrangements

with the storekeepers and merchants also

to carry them over, and thus the farmers

are able to remain on their holdings and

our harvests are increasing as a result

of this and no other action. I admit

that it was a trying time; I have said so

on scores of occasions. The farmers have

had a trying period during the last three

years, and is it the fault of the Govern-

ment that there has been a shortage in

the rainfall? Are we responsible for

that? There have been Premiers in the

past who have claimed that they were

responsible for the magnificent falls of

rain, but I have not claimed anything of

the kind, and I do not wish to be held

responsible for a shortage in the rainfall.

What I do claim to be responsible for

is coming to the assistance of the farmer

at a period when it was essential for his

protection, and in the interests of the

industry itself; and to-day we are able

to say that our agricultural industry is

making greater strides than the industry

is making in any other part of the Com-

monwealth. I suppose one might pur-

sue this topic at considerable length, but

I do not propose to do that. I am quite

prepared to accept the criticism of my

friends opposite on that basis, and pre-

pared to debate it with them on the pub-

lic platform. We will be before the

public on the matter—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Yes, we will.

The PREMIER: And when the ques-

tion is submitted to them, as I submitted

it to them on previous occasions—whether

they are prepared to accept the leader of

the Opposition as a genius of finance, who

is determined to demand prompt pay-

ments from the farmers, whilst I am

prepared to suffer a deficit for the time

being, as we are having a deficit at the

present moment—I have no doubt that

they will again answer the question in

an unmistakable manner. After all, we

have two principal accounts, loan funds

and revenue funds; and those funds have

been like any fair business man's private

merits.

The PREMIER: That statement is

incorrect. We did the very reverse. We

appointed the Seed Wheat Board which

went into every case in order to show

that we were not prepared to render as-

sistance unless it was required. Every

individual case was considered on its

merits.

Mr. Harper: And your Government

cut them off from their security.

Mr. Harper: And your Government

would have to close their stores.

the farmers to pay up the storekeepers

have stood by the farmer. If we compel

but hundreds of storekeepers also who

Not only is the farmer in that position,

which would hurt him into absolute ruin,

on a plank, the slightest movement of

man in the community to stand as it were

on revenue account than to cause every

better for the time being to suffer a deficit

business of the State as a whole. It is

would not only affect the farmers but the

farmers and I know that such action

do this. I know the condition of the

ledger is balanced each year. I will not

that we might be able to show that our

we ought to force them to pay in order

The leader of the Opposition argued that

found out of the revenue of the State.

to find the money, and it has had to be

principal, who is paying it? I have had

farmers are not paying the interest or

The PREMIER: Of course. If the

farmers are not paying the interest or

would not only affect the farmers but the

farmers and I know that such action

do this. I know the condition of the

ledger is balanced each year. I will not

that we might be able to show that our

we ought to force them to pay in order

The leader of the Opposition argued that

found out of the revenue of the State.

to find the money, and it has had to be

principal, who is paying it? I have had

farmers are not paying the interest or

The PREMIER: Of course. If the

farmers are not paying the interest or

would not only affect the farmers but the

farmers and I know that such action

do this. I know the condition of the

account. Is there a huge business in this State that has not had at some period or other to draw on capital for the purpose of bridging over some critical time? I doubt whether there are many members of this Chamber at the present time not working on an overdraft.

Mr. Thomas: That is, if we can get it.

The PREMIER: I admit that we cannot all get it, but I believe a majority are working on overdrafts. That is exactly what is happening to-day with our revenue account; and if ever there was a period in the history of this State, or of the Commonwealth, when an overdraft was essential for the purpose of maintaining our industries and keeping our country progressing as it has been kept progressing during the last 20 years, it was necessary during the last three years that we should have an overdraft for the purpose of carrying on. The leader of the Opposition on the occasion of his Queen's Hall speech made some reference to the condition of our sinking fund. He said that we had an accumulated sinking fund of 2½ millions invested in London. That has been increased during the last three years to something like 4 millions; I believe that to-day it is over 4 millions, notwithstanding the fact that we have drawn a certain amount from it. Where is that sinking fund derived from, if not from our revenue? We have paid into the sinking fund from the revenue account, and it has been an increasing amount each year, despite the fact that we have built railways, several of which, as I have said previously, are hardly paying working expenses. The leader of the Opposition in the course of his Queen's Hall speech said—

What better evidence could they have of capable administration and sound finance? Those who would not be convinced by facts and figures such as he had quoted, did not want to be convinced. Yet they had responsible men condemning their financial position, and slinging mud at the fair fame of the State.

If anyone dared to criticise the finances of the State when our friend opposite was Treasurer, the critic was slinging

mud at the fair fame of this State; but when that Treasurer becomes leader of the Opposition, then, in the interests of the party of course, he is only too willing to sling mud at the State; and he never loses an opportunity of doing it. The hon. member stated on Thursday that we had stolen his policy of homes for the workers. That, of course, is an interesting statement, which, however, is not in accordance with the facts. I remember exactly what occurred. We had been advocating the workers' homes scheme in speeches throughout the country; and Mr. Gregory, the then Acting Premier, took an opportunity on one occasion, in the absence of Mr. Wilson, the then Premier, in England, to make an announcement on this very subject.

Mr. Turvey: Just on the eve of the election.

The PREMIER: Yes, just on the eve of the election. But he did not make any definite pronouncement. He said—

I am not in a position to announce the policy of the Government, but I believe that when Mr. Wilson returns it will be found that he is in favour of providing homes for the workers.

Mr. Wilson returned, and in the meantime I had definitely announced the policy of workers' homes on behalf of this party. The difference between our policy and the policy of hon. members opposite, however, was this: we were in earnest and meant what we said, whilst our friends opposite were not in earnest. At the Queen's Hall, just prior to the general elections, the then Premier, the present leader of the Opposition, made a speech in reply to mine delivered at the Mechanics' Institute, and in the course of that reply he spoke as follows:—

In referring to homes for the people Mr. Scaddan stated that they would advance up to £500 where land was already owned, in order that a man might build a house for himself on his own land. What a good arrangement! (Laughter.) He would be glad to avail himself of it. (Renewed laughter.)

Now, I said that the then Premier had really ridiculed the proposal of homes for the workers. He ridiculed the idea of

the Government providing £500 to enable a man to own his own home.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nothing of the kind.

The PREMIER: If he did not ridicule it, I am not able to follow that paragraph.

Mr. Thomas: He is an unconscious humorist.

The PREMIER: The fact remains that he was attempting to ridicule the idea. Now what are the facts? Immediately we met Parliament, we introduced a measure which provided, not for £500, but for £550, and provided it on a basis permitting the worker to be possessed of his home at a less rental, or I should say a less demand per week, than he would have to pay in the shape of rent in the metropolitan area for a similar house which would never become his own. Even to-day we are erecting homes in the metropolitan area at costs of £550, £500, and £450, and similar houses cannot be rented at the present moment for less than from 17s. to 25s. per week; and the workers are becoming possessed of those homes for a payment of from 11s. to 13s. per week. Moreover, let me point out that our friends opposite, some of them on the cross benches last session, criticised the Government for providing such palatial residences for workers. "Palatial residences for workers," they said. They wanted us to build slum houses of some description.

Mr. Turvey: A lean-to.

The PREMIER: Yes, a lean-to. Anything would do for a worker. But I then said, and I repeat it now, that in building these homes I absolutely decline to put up anything in the nature of a slum house. I am going to put up for the worker a house with proper conveniences, because the worker is as much entitled to it as any man in the community.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Hear, hear.

The PREMIER: He produces wealth, and he should be able to call a home, in the proper sense of the term, his own. We can imagine our friends on the other side opposing it, because, under those conditions, the workers of the State will be more independent than they are under existing conditions. If you can keep a

man paying a high rent you can always keep him under your thumb. The employer always has a more powerful lever on the man who has to pay rent, than he has on the man with a home of his own. Our friends opposite are opposed to the scheme of homes for workers for that reason.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

The PREMIER: Of course they always deny when you get home on the main point. However, the fact remains that while they are not prepared to make a definite pronouncement on the subject, their actions during the last two years, and during the last 12 months in particular, afford conclusive proof that they are not in sympathy with the workers' homes scheme, and are not in favour of it from that very point of view; because, as I say, a man who has to pay a high rent, is a man who will submit to conditions that he would not consider for a moment if he had a home of his own, where he knew that his wife and family would find shelter. When he knows there is a possibility of his wife and children being cast out on the street, he will accept almost any conditions imposed on him by the employing class; and, naturally, our friends opposite are anxious to keep the worker in that condition. We, however, are here for the purpose of lifting him out of that condition, and we have been taking action in that direction during the last two years. Our friends opposite have announced their intention of giving to owners of workers' homes erected on the leasehold principle, the freehold of their land. There again the same desire exists. Our friends know that if the workers get the freehold of their land, the man with the most money will eventually purchase those homes, and by that means it will be possible to get the workers into exactly the same position as they were in prior to the workers' homes scheme—all paying rent again. Why, our friends opposite call themselves Liberals. Do not they know that the Liberals of England might almost be termed Conservatives in some respects, and yet the Liberals of England are attacking landlordism? They recognise what landlordism means to the com-

munity in England. But our friends here, the so-called Liberals, are out for the interests of the landlord all the time.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Mere assertions.

The PREMIER: It is absolutely correct.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

The PREMIER: It is absolutely correct. I am extremely sorry that it is hurting the hon. member.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It does not hurt at all; it is only amusing.

The PREMIER: Nothing hurts like the truth.

Hon. J. Mitchell: There is not a word of truth in it, and you ought to know it. It is an inaccurate statement.

The PREMIER: It is an accurate statement. When a man is presented with the freehold of his land, he will take the first opportunity to dispose of it, when it suits his convenience, without regard for the interests of the community as a whole. Under existing conditions, we are assured that the man living in a home—whether it is Tom Brown, the first applicant, or Jim Smith, following five years afterwards—is not going to be rack-rented by any landlord.

Mr. Wisdom: What does the working man think of it?

The PREMIER: The member for Claremont (Mr. Wisdom) is the last man who should speak on behalf of the workers.

Mr. Wisdom: I have done more work than you.

The PREMIER: He knows nothing about the condition of the worker, and cares less.

Mr. Wisdom: I represent more workers than you do.

The PREMIER: The working men think so much of the scheme that I am finding difficulty in providing sufficient funds to build all the homes they ask for.

Mr. Wisdom: That is freehold.

The PREMIER: No, not freehold. There is not a block in the metropolitan area that we have not had an applicant for.

Mr. Hudson: That blows him out.

The PREMIER: Let me tell the hon. member that the metropolitan area is

largely freehold not owned by the Government; and did not his friends take an opportunity of turning down a measure which would have made available for the purpose of workers' homes several hundreds of acres in the metropolitan area? And that was not done in the interests of the University so much, but because those members knew what it meant to the working men of the metropolitan area and to the landlords.

Mr. Hudson: He is blown out now.

The PREMIER: Here is a publication called the *Labour Bulletin*. I presume hon. members opposite are not likely to read it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Pass it over and we will read it.

The PREMIER: It is issued by a gentleman known as G. H. Knibbs, the Commonwealth Statistician. Its name, no doubt, would cause our friends opposite to be shy of the publication. However, there are some particulars of a very interesting nature in it, and I will read a paragraph at this stage in order to show the reason of the opposition of our friends opposite. They never take the opportunity of defining their attitude clearly; they always endeavour to explain that their attitude is for a different purpose altogether. The results, however, are just the same. When one follows them closely, and reads the history of other parts of the world, and considers the attitude adopted by gentlemen elsewhere of a similar calibre to those opposite, one can appreciate better what is the object they have in view, although they make all sorts of statements which are misleading. Knowing this, we have during the last few years been creating workers' homes; and I said at the outset that the object of introducing that scheme was not merely to provide a home for the successful applicant. The purpose of that scheme was also to bring about a reduction of the rents charged by the landlords in the metropolitan area more particularly. If the scheme has not that effect, it has none. The policy of our friends opposite is to get these homes and give to the people who bought them on a leasehold principle the freehold of the land, and then have the landlord, the capitalist, come along and

buy the worker out, and so reduce the working community to the same position as they were in previously. Our object is an entirely different one. Our principal object, I repeat, was not merely to supply a home for the successful applicant, but to break down the rack-renting landlord, and in this we have been successful to a large extent. In this bulletin, which was issued only in June of this very year, the following paragraph appears:—

Variation in prices and cost of living. The cost of living index number for 30 of the more important towns rose from 992 in the fourth quarter of 1913 to 1,009 in the quarter under review, compared with 1,000 for the whole of the year 1912. The index number for the corresponding quarter (January to March) of 1913 was 998, and of 1912, 947. The increase in cost of living since the preceding quarter is common to all the States except Western Australia, and is due principally to the advance in prices of potatoes, onions, eggs, butter, cheese, and meat. House rents show little change, though they still generally tend to rise. In Western Australia prices of food and groceries as well as house rents are lower than for the preceding quarter.

How will our friends opposite answer that?

Mr. Munsie: They will say that Knibbs is wrong.

The PREMIER: That is a proof of the result of the putting into operation of the workers' homes scheme.

Mr. Wisdom: What does he say about meat?

The PREMIER: I am coming to that directly. Here the workers' homes scheme not only provides the successful applicant with a home at a reasonable figure, but it also has the effect of bringing about a reduction of rents. May I say, moreover, that this has happened notwithstanding the fact that population has increased by leaps and bounds at the same time. I am doubtful whether a like illustration can be shown in any other part of the world, namely, that, while the population is increasing the rents are coming down. And we have the announcement of Mr. Knibbs that rents have increased in the

other States and that Western Australia is the only State to show a reduction of rents. I hope and believe that the people will appreciate what it means to them, not only to the successful applicant for a worker's home, but to others as well, and that they will warn our friends opposite to keep their hands off. These are some of the matters our friends opposite will have to make a definite announcement upon, and I say that when the time arrives the people will tell our friends opposite to keep their hands off, and that, despite the leader of the Opposition, the Liberal candidates at the forthcoming elections will be found giving hearty support to our scheme. But I want to tell the people also that the Liberal candidates' words cannot be accepted for anything. The Liberal candidate has no platform and no pledge. He might take a more liberal view than his leader, but if that party should be returned the men who will sit on this bench will decide the policy, and whatever is announced by the leader of the Opposition will be put into operation. The men on this bench will decide the matter, and those sitting behind them will have to vote for it. Our friends opposite have taken every opportunity also of claiming that they speak on behalf of the farming community. Judging by what is happening at the present time, namely, the formation of the Country party, they are no longer able to speak on behalf of the farmers, and evidently they have not been speaking correctly on their behalf in the past. I have here a cutting from the *Sunday Times* of the 10th May, 1914. The *Sunday Times* not so long since pronounced itself the official organ of the Liberal party; it now pronounces itself the official organ of the Country party.

Mr. Swan: They stole their organiser, too.

The PREMIER: Yes. What have we here in large black type?—

Found wanting.—Who are these that are opposing the Country party's claim for direct representation? They are mostly members of Parliament, led by Messrs. Colebatch and Mitchell, who are proclaiming from the housetops that they are representing the primary producer in both upper and lower Houses!

Why are they putting up the fight of their lives against us? Because opposite their names the primary producer has written these words: "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin," which, being freely interpreted, mean:—Mene—Thy kingdom is numbered and finished. Tekel—Thou are weighed in the balances and art found wanting. Peres—Thy kingdom is divided and given to the Country party.

I looked up the Bible and found that it there reads—"the Medes and Persians," so evidently the kingdom of our friends opposite is being divided and given to the Medes and Persians. That is from the organ that was once the official organ of the Liberal party and is now the official organ of the Country party. That is what they think of the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) who comes here and says he is speaking on behalf of the Country party. The leader of the Opposition on Thursday evening made some reference to the increased cost of the construction of our railways in agricultural districts. He had previously made this assertion on many occasions, notwithstanding the fact that it has been contradicted, not only by Ministers, but by engineers of the department. The Minister for Works dealt with this question last session, and if hon. members will turn up *Hansard* they will find there a statement made by Mr. Rolland, then Acting Engineer-in-Chief, which shows conclusively that, taken on the same basis, the railways are being constructed as cheaply to-day as during the period of our friends opposite. But I want to point out, furthermore, that this relates to similar conditions, whereas during the present Government's term of office we have increased the wages paid to our men employed on those railways, which should make the cost greater; that material has increased considerably during that period, and that there is evidence conclusive that we are constructing these railways to-day more cheaply in comparison with the railways which were constructed by the previous Administration, and getting better results from the construction of those railways than our friends got; and that it is largely due to the fact, as admitted by

Mr. Rolland, that our railways are constructed to-day by day labour instead of by contract. So much for that statement. Let me, furthermore, explain that shortly after coming into office our attention was drawn to the fact that light agricultural railways which had been constructed were in such a condition that the Railway Department refused to carry locomotives over them unless provided with funds to put them into proper working condition. That was in relation to railways only just then completed.

Mr. Carpenter: Who built them?

The PREMIER: Our friends opposite. And three months after taking them over the department was faced with the necessity of finding funds to put them into proper order. If we take the railways which we have built during the last two years and compare them with railways which our predecessors constructed, it will be seen that the later railways are in every way superior to those previously built. Let me explain that the cheap railways referred to by our friends are in the long run found to be dear railways; because the one process of ballasting the line and putting down proper sleepers and doing the work thoroughly is much cheaper than sending two or three gangs out at different times. If one gang does it properly it is done more cheaply and the administrative costs are less, as is also the cost of putting the men out there and bringing them back: I have here a return supplied by the Railway Department, showing the expenditure on certain sections necessary within a short time of opening to bring them up to standard. Here are the lines

On the Goomalling-Dowerin, with a length of 15 miles, opened on the 4th December, 1906, we have had to spend £4,311. On the Wagin-Dumbleyung, 25 miles, we have spent £6,119. On the Armadale-Jandakot, 10 miles, £1,500; on the Greenhills-Quairading, 31 miles, £528.

The Minister for Works: And now it is not a line.

The PREMIER: No. It will have to be done eventually. The list continues—

On the Coolgardie-Widgiemooltha, 51 miles; we have spent £1,880; on the Hopefoun-Ravensthorpe, 34 miles, £2,240; on the Toodyay-Bolgart, 24 miles, £591; on the Pinjarra-Dwellingup, 15 miles, £7,667.

Mr. Lewis: A man lost his life on that.

The PREMIER: Yes, that is so. Then we have also—

The Goomalling-Wongan Hills line, of 34 miles, on which we spent £6,075, and the Dowerin-Merredin, 97 miles, £15,549.

These make a total of light, cheap railways built by our friends opposite of 336 miles, and an expenditure by the Railway Department—which we have had to find to bring them up to a condition fit for carrying traffic, of £46,460.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Is that for sleepers and balast, or sleepers alone?

The PREMIER: Principally for earth works.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What about your own lines?

The PREMIER: I will give you the exact amounts. There was required for re-sleeping £10,430, and for ballasting and formation £35,153, and £877 for equipment, making a total of £46,460 expended on those lines—cheap lines, it is true, from the point of view of the original cost of construction, but dear lines from the point of view of the State having to find such a large sum of money. And this does not complete the work, either. I estimate that it will require another £46,000 before those lines are put into the condition of the lines we are building to-day and handing over to the Railway Department. Let me remind you of this: the Narrogin-Wickepin railway is a section of the Narrogin-Merredin line. When we had the Parliamentary delegation visiting Western Australia I arranged for a special train to meet them at Albany and take them through the wheat country, that they might see the possibilities of our agricultural industry; and I arranged with the Railway Department to take them to Narrogin and thence across to Merredin and bring them down the Eastern line. Everything progressed all right until it

was discovered that while we could take them over the Wickepin-Merredin section, then actually under construction, the Commissioner of Railways would not take the responsibility of carrying them over the Narrogin-Wickepin section. He refused to do this. This was one of the cheap lines which our friends opposite boast about.

Mr. S. Stubbs: What does the construction cost per mile nowadays?

The PREMIER: It is less than the cost of the lines constructed by our friends opposite when those lines are brought up to the same standard as the lines we are handing over to-day. The Engineer in Charge for the Works Department, who cannot be charged with political bias, made a statement there and signed his name to it. The words were not put into his mouth by the Minister, but he spoke as Engineer in Charge.

Mr. S. Stubbs: The railways, then, cost £3,000 a mile?

The PREMIER: It depends on the country. We use 60 lb. rails generally, and my friends opposite were building only with 40 lb. rails, so that their expenditure would be very much lighter on rails than ours.

Mr. Wisdom: You should give us a statement of figures.

The PREMIER: I am going to give you figures. The leader of the Opposition asserted that we were squandering the people's money. One of the grounds for the charges was in connection with our construction of railways. The actual squandering, if any did take place, was not due to this administration. We have had to find the money that the leader of the Opposition was responsible for our squandering, if it could be charged against us. They are responsible for my having had to find a sum of money represented by £46,000 for the charges of carrying on works which he started but which he never completed. Is that squandering the public money?

Mr. S. Stubbs: Was that found out of revenue, or out of loan?

The PREMIER: That is nothing to do with it. The money had to be found all the same. It does not make any dif-

ference where it comes from, if it comes out all the same in the long run, for the State does not exist merely for a year or so, as some men's businesses exist for only a few years, but the State exists for all time. If we are building railways, it is folly for us to build a light railway which has to be rebuilt in, say, two or three years after it is handed over. It is bad management, and while it may be said that by so doing we are building our lines cheaper, as a matter of fact the State eventually discovers that its railways are dear. The present Government have constructed their lines with an eye to the future rather than only to the immediate present. The charge of squandering money has often been urged against this Government. That charge has nothing in it, and I have asked the leader of the Opposition on several occasions to bring some evidence as to any unjustifiable expenditure during the past three years, but, with the exception of one or two items in connection with the trading concerns, they have failed to touch on any items of importance. Those items they have complained about amount to nothing after all. The hon. gentlemen opposite complained about our expenditure of 10 millions, but the whole of our expenditure upon trading concerns which we have put into operation during the last three years would not total more than £245,000, out of this 10 millions. What, I ask, about the balance, the 9¼ millions which they say we have squandered? They fail to answer. A little while afterwards the leader of the Opposition proceeded on the basis that we are not squandering enough, that we are not spending enough money, and he wants us to spend more. Take the dock which he built at Fremantle for political purposes. Then again, there were the smelting works that they purchased out of State funds, handed over to a company and practically ruined the Phillips River field. What, too, had been done about the opening up of a harbour at Nordalup Inlet? In the course of his remarks the leader of the Opposition complained about the non-construction of a number of rail-

ways of which I had never heard. There are quite a number of others that should have been constructed long since, and he never touched upon them at all. I have never yet been given any evidence to the effect that we have been squandering public money or in what direction. As a matter of fact, we have not to-day been able to complete the work that was promised by my friends opposite.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You should have done so.

The PREMIER: There is a tremendous difference between Mr. Mitchell and the leader of the Opposition in regard to the expenditure of public funds. During the last three years there has been an expenditure of 10 millions, and there has been no squandering in any direction.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What have you done with the money?

The PREMIER: I have not finished yet. The leader of the Opposition wishes to lead one to suppose that we have nothing to show for the money. We have the Workers' Homes for one thing—

Hon. J. Mitchell: Of course you have.

The PREMIER: I say we have the Workers' Homes to show for it, which scheme has involved an expenditure of something like £600,000. Of course, from the attitude of our friends opposite this money has been squandered.

Hon. J. Mitchell. No, it has not.

The PREMIER: At last I have an admission from my friends opposite. This has not been a squandering of money. That is all right. As a matter of fact, we had not expended 10 millions of money. The loan expenditure up to the end of March last amounted to £7,584,708, which included a balance of £783,365 up to September, 1911, against a balance of £419,789 on hand to the 31st March last. Of this sum something like £345,000 had been utilised in the provision of workers' homes. The expenditure on railways was £3,400,109. I hope the member for Northam is listening. Is that squandering money? Is it a wasteful expenditure? I am waiting for an answer.

Member: The member for Northam is not in his seat.

The PREMIER: I wish he would return to his seat and answer my questions. I am trying to point out to the hon. member something definite. There has, I say, also been an expenditure of £3,400,109 on railways. Is that another example of squandering? That included £520,501 on additions and improvements upon opened railways. The Dwellingup-Hotham extension had £46,911 spent on it, and land resumptions £251,369. If that was squandering, my friends opposite were responsible for it, for they resumed the land, and we had to find the money. Then there are:—Water Supplies £143,638, the Wickepin-Merredin line £151,355, Wongan Hills-Mullewa line £203,377, the Boyup-Kojonup line £32,602, Brookton-Kunjinn line £22,850, the Electric Power Station £19,000, the Greenough to Quairading line £54,769, Katanning-Nampup line £45,401, Northampton to Ajana line £65,290, the survey of new lines £23,108, the Tambellup-Ongerup line £78,769, the Wagin-Dumbleyung extension £23,847, and the Yilliminning-Kouidin line £23,847, the Wyalcatchem-Mount Marshall line £499,475, the Port Hedland-Marble Bar line £36,236. These figures do not include rails and fastenings, or rolling stock. The amount of expenditure upon these is as follows:—Rails and fastenings £226,979, and on rolling stock £859,293. Is that money squandered? Have we nothing to show for our expenditure of that money? Is it not a fact that during the term of office of the leader of the Opposition, when they only had a harvest of 5 million bushels, complaints were numerous because the Railway Department could not cope with this harvest within a reasonable time. Is it not a fact that in 1914, when the harvest was $13\frac{1}{2}$ million bushels—

Hon. Frank Wilson: It was all a Liberal harvest.

The PREMIER: Ha! ha! With a harvest of $13\frac{1}{2}$ million bushels by a wise and judicious expenditure of loan moneys we on our side were able to meet the demands consequent upon this great harvest without a single complaint being

heard. We have shifted that record harvest without complaint.

Mr. Harper: With facilities provided for you by a Liberal Government.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Tell us about the State steamers, and the brick works, and the quarries, and the money which has been squandered there, and tell us about your costs for railway construction.

The PREMIER: That is a question I am asking the leader of the Opposition to answer. It is due to the people that he should answer it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I will answer it all right.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition continues to make an assertion that we are squandering loan funds.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are, absolutely.

The PREMIER: In what direction? Is that squandering money? Have we nothing to show for the expenditure of £3,400,000 in railway construction and equipment? The hon. member is silent on that point. The sum of £4,000,000 has been accounted for already by workers' homes and railways. Then we have found something like £500,000 for the purchase of a Perth tramway system. Will the leader of the Opposition claim that this money was squandered also? They had only to say, when the proposal first came before the House, that they disagreed with the expenditure of this money. Did they say this?

Mr. Harper: You bought the trams too dear.

The PREMIER: The hon. members of the Opposition should have said so when the matter was first brought up for consideration. The leader of the Opposition admitted at the time that the matter was all right. He said, on behalf of the party he represents, that it was all right, and gave his support to the Bill. There was no opposition whatever in this Chamber. It is true, however, that a member in another place had raised some opposition to it. It was not because the price was too high, but because it was considered inadvisable to spend this sum of money in the capital of the State. He was up against any expenditure in Perth of pub-

lie funds, in the interests of the country party.

Mr. Harper: I am glad you admit that.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is decentralisation.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition asked me to order rolling stock. On the 3rd September, 1911, there were 320 locomotives for traffic in the State. The previous Government had ordered 68 locomotives, but not one of them has arrived—making a total of roughly 390 locomotives.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Some of them were landed.

The PREMIER: None had arrived.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are wrong there.

The PREMIER: Not at all. On the 31st March, 1914, there were 417 locomotives in traffic and 10 on order, making a total of 427. There were 68 locomotives ordered by the previous Government, but paid for by the present Government, which cost on an average £5,000.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Make it £4,000.

The PREMIER: They were ordered and paid for by the present Government. In addition to the 68 there are still 10 on order, which have not yet been paid for, as well as 27 which this Government have brought into the State. During our term of office of three years we had to pay for and put on our railway system no less than 95 new locomotives.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Sixty of them were ours.

The PREMIER: How many? There had not been a single other locomotive ordered for ten years, and then he says that we are squandering the public money.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why did you not build them in the loco. shops at Midland Junction?

The PREMIER: Why did not the hon. member make provision for building them there? Why did he order 68 locomotives, instead of building them there himself?

Hon. Frank Wilson: You charge me with not building them there.

The PREMIER: Because you could not do so. Because you made no provision for doing so. We were up against a proposition that we could not wait until we were in a position to have the locomotives built at Midland Junction. We had to get our locomotives at the earliest possible date in order to cope with the harvest and keep our railway system in working order. We could not consider the question of manufacturing the locomotives here, and therefore we had to procure them elsewhere.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why then charge me with not building them then?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The PREMIER: Before tea I was dealing with the charge levelled by the leader of the Opposition that this Government had squandered 10 millions during its term of office, and was endeavouring to obtain some idea from our friends opposite just in what direction this squandering had taken place. I mentioned a number of items, but so far have not received an answer to my questions. I mentioned items on which money has been spent so that my friends opposite might have the opportunity of withdrawing the charge of squandering which they have made. The last item I mentioned was the purchase of the Perth tramway system, and I asked whether the Opposition had offered any objection to that purchase, and whether in their opinion that was money squandered.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You paid far too much for the trams.

The PREMIER: That is rather a belated opinion to express. The matter was here for consideration by Parliament when the Bill was being discussed, but I heard no complaints.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Oh, yes, you did.

The PREMIER: At least they were not sufficient to cause members opposite to vote against the second reading of the Bill, or its passage through Committee. In any case the statement that we paid too much for the system is not borne out by the earnings during the past 12

months. The tramways have been operated most successfully, and have shown a handsome profit after paying interest and sinking fund charges. As we improve the system and also provide for the purchase of current at a cheaper rate than at the present time, so the profit will increase. That profit is being provided after the expenditure of a fair sum of money in the direction of belated repairs which will not be an annual charge against the system when it is in proper order. We have spent £200,000 on the introduction of immigrants into Western Australia. I suppose that too, in the opinion of the leader of the Opposition, is money squandered, and while they talk in generalities about the squandering of money they complain at the same time that the expenditure has not been greater. On the Agricultural Bank we spent £621,000. Although the total has not been found in real cash, that action, I take it, is held by the Opposition to be money squandered, but when we hear them speaking with another voice in the country, they complain that we have not found sufficient money in that direction. We expended £40,000 on implement works. That, too, I suppose, will be regarded by our friends opposite as money squandered. I notice they are very silent when I am trying to pin them down to something definite.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are labouring.

The PREMIER: No, I am not. I am just giving items upon which money has been expended, and I want to know whether on any of these items money has been squandered. The expenditure of £40,000 on the establishment of implement works will mean the manufacture of implements at a reduced cost, and the retention of so much more money in the pockets of the farmer without costing the taxpayer a single penny, and meaning, as it will, the employment of many men in the manufacture of these implements which in the past have almost exclusively been imported from America or the other States of the Commonwealth. Is that money squandered, or is it money wisely expended?

Hon. J. Mitchell: What was the £40,000 spent on?

The PREMIER: On plant, buildings, and generally. Then we expended £6,993 on nationalising the ferry service between Perth and South Perth. That, too, I suppose, is money squandered. My friends opposite may be able to tell that to people in some parts of the country, but I doubt whether it would be believed in South Perth where the action of the Government is much appreciated. We expended £140,000 on public buildings during our term of three years. I admit it is not as much as was spent in previous years, and the same thing may be said in connection with roads and bridges, under which heading £57,510 was spent, but we have provided more funds from revenue than was done previously.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Out of the deficit you mean.

The PREMIER: Never mind. we found the money. On the development of agriculture we spent £501,666, which included £100,000 for abattoirs, cold storage depot, grain sheds and sale yards, and £24,666 for the purchase of the Harvey estate. I suppose our friends opposite will regard that as money squandered. We expended £681,000 in the provision of water supplies and sewerage. That included £314,000 for Perth and Fremantle, £94,000 for providing water supplies in the agricultural districts, £79,000 in connection with the metropolitan water supply, £81,000 for extensions in agricultural districts, and £50,000 for supplying the town of Albany with water.

Mr. Launder: It is all wanted.

The PREMIER: It is a matter of being able to convince your supporters that you are handling the finances successfully. Listening to the criticism of our friends opposite one would think that because we spent more money than they did, that we have squandered it. I have mentioned these various items to show in what direction we have "squandered" money.

The Minister for Mines: They have been silent since you have been mentioning the items.

The PREMIER: Quite so. On harbour and river improvements we spent £326,151.

Hon. J. Mitchell: And on the dock?

The PREMIER: Including £201,749 on the dock. The hon. member ought not to mention the dock. We spent what we did quickly in order to prove that the scheme of hon. members opposite in regard to that dock was a farce. On improvements generally we spent £37,482; and on North-West jetties, £16,700. On development of goldfields we expended £187,000. This last item includes development of mining, £74,000; State batteries, £44,000; Eastern goldfields (mostly water supply), £45,000; the Murchison and Peak Hill goldfields, £20,000. If that be money which has been squandered, I would refer the hon. member to the gold returns for the last year.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The last six months.

The PREMIER: The returns for the last six months are easily explained. The falling off was largely due to the fire in the Ivanhoe mine, the introduction of a new plant at Ora Banda, and such other cases as that. Last year, however, there was a substantial increase in the output of gold as compared with the preceding years, notwithstanding the magnificent policy of our friends opposite in those years. This money has been well and wisely expended on the development of the goldfields. We come now to those points which will cause our friends to wake up. On the saw mills in the karri forests we spent £137,716. We also expended £105,000 on the State steamship service in the North-West. Again, I ask, was that money squandered? On State hotels we expended £25,239, and on brick yards £9,120. On the milk supply we expended £4,385; and on the purchase of land at Nedlands for the purpose of the university £1,585. These are the items which go to make up the seven odd millions which we have expended during our term of office, and before our friends continue to repeat the

statement that the money has been squandered it is clearly their duty to see in what direction they would refuse to spend the money had they the opportunity of doing so. The leader of the Opposition referred to the harbour schemes which have been submitted to various authorities during the recent months, and he complained that the plans had not been presented to the House. We, however, do not submit the plans to Parliament until they are adopted. We follow a course different from that of our friends opposite; we recognise that before definitely adopting a scheme, every possible information should be obtained, and after securing departmental reports we consult the people concerned, and having had the plans carefully considered by the people who are able to speak from a local point of view, we found that in each case they were adopted. The plans in connection with the Bunbury harbour were submitted to the people of Bunbury and adopted by them, and if our friends opposite had read the newspapers they would have found that the people of Bunbury much appreciated the action of the Government in providing what were recognised as essential harbour improvements. Then again, we did much the same in connection with Albany, and I learn that the member for Albany (Mr. Price) has been roundly congratulated by the people of that Southern port. He has received a number of wires asking him to convey to the Ministry the thanks of the people of that port. Mr. Meeks, the secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, wired to Mr. Price—

Chamber of Commerce congratulates you on the success of your efforts and delighted that their faith in Government carrying out harbour works justified. Wire prospects *re* harbour board.

Mr. Barnett, an ex-Liberal member of this House, and president of the Chamber of Commerce, wired to Mr. Price—

Accept congratulations Premier and self news wired yesterday, personally never doubted.

That gentleman always recognised that whenever we put our hands to the plough

we would see the end through. We promised the people harbour facilities in order to give the Great Southern districts their proper outlet and we propose to keep faith with them. We did exactly the same in connection with Bunbury, and not only have we submitted the plans to the harbour board there, but we are commencing the construction of a line from Wagin to connect with the Collie-Narrogin railway, which will bring this district nearer to a port and assist the settlers in that area.

Mr. Harper: What about the Fremantle harbour?

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You will hear enough about that yet.

The PREMIER: In regard to the criticism of the State steamship service, I will not delay hon. members by going through the whole matter again, but I would like to draw attention to the fact that we recently had an election for one of the provinces of the Legislative Council, which was contested by three candidates in the persons of an ex-Liberal Minister, the Hon. J. D. Connolly, a mayor of Midland Junction, Mr. Robinson, and an ex-member of this Chamber, in the person of Mr. J. J. Holmes.

Hon. J. Mitchell: And a Labour man, too.

The PREMIER: Yes, three candidates and a commercial traveller. If members of the Opposition took the trouble to read the newspapers, they would find that the hon. Mr. Holmes, who was successful in that election, had something to say in connection with the State steamship service. It was of a nature which does that gentleman credit, and it also provides a definite answer to the criticism of members of the Opposition.

Hon. J. Mitchell: He had a Royal Commission to inquire into the service.

The PREMIER: Not only were we committed to the State steamship service, but the leader of the Opposition also was committed to it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Oh, no.

The PREMIER: It is so and the reference can be found in the famous Queen's Hall speech, where evidently the

hon. member spoke without notes, and trusted to memory. In the report of that speech I find the following statement under the heading "The meat ring"—probably the hon. member had become convinced that a meat ring existed—

Cheapening food supplies. A steamer would be put on the North-West trade when a steady supply of fat cattle could be obtained and slaughtered.

I take it that this speech has been approved of and issued by the leader of the Opposition. We can never tell exactly what our friends on the Opposition side mean, but surely that statement is definite enough. The hon. member has been denying that he promised to supply a State steamer.

Hon. Frank Wilson: No.

The PREMIER: The hon. member for Northam only a minute since denied it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are twisting things.

The PREMIER: I will read it again—

A steamer would be put on the North-West trade, when a steady supply of fat cattle could be obtained and slaughtered.

This announcement was followed by applause.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Finish the paragraph.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Your steamer has improved on that. It slaughters the cattle before they get here.

The PREMIER: Outside of the fact that the Opposition were pledged to State steamers, we have more recent evidence of the fact that a State steamship service was essential to the North-West portion of the State. The hon. J. J. Holmes, after being returned at the election, gave an interview to a representative of the *Carnarvon Times* and he definitely stated that he was satisfied his victory was due to the fact that he, of all the candidates, was the only one who had supported the State steamship service. The result of this election is rather interesting, in view of the fact that under the preferential voting an ex-Minister, who had just resigned his seat for the Goldfields, by which he recognised the futility of ever again attempting to enter Parliament—

The Attorney General: It garrotted him.

The PREMIER: Garrotted is hardly justified.

The Minister for Mines: Squeezed him out.

The PREMIER: The ex-Liberal Minister and Mr. Robinson both stood largely on the cry against the State steamship service. It is true that Mr. Holmes criticised the management of the service, but he committed himself to support the continuance of the State steamers to the North-West. Mr. Holmes pointed out that if the Government were justified in building spur railways in agricultural districts, railways which had been running at a loss for the purpose of developing those areas, we were equally justified in putting on a State steamship service to the North-West to enable that portion of the State to be linked up with the metropolis. The hon. gentleman might have clinched his remarks by drawing attention to the fact that in 1912-1913 our spur railways in the agricultural districts—where it is supposed we have been doing nothing to help the man on the land—showed a loss of £47,878 on the year's operations, but because there is a slight loss on the State steamship service, we are told that we are doing something wrong.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What freights are you charging?

The PREMIER: The existing freights. I desire further to point out that on fertilisers carried over the railway system to assist the development of the agricultural areas the loss was £27,594, or a total loss for the year of over £70,000, in the interests of the agriculturists, and because we show a slight loss on the State steamship service to the North-West, we are roundly condemned by the Opposition. Our State steamship service is so popular that had we had another steamer we could easily have filled her this season, so great was the demand for space.

Hon. Frank Wilson: When are you going to make a profit?

The PREMIER: Never mind about the profit. I will deal with that later.

The management of the service have asked us to obtain another steamer.

Hon. Frank Wilson: And to sell one.

The PREMIER: Naturally.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What price do you want?

The PREMIER: If the hon. member, as a business man, makes a firm offer, we may come to terms.

Mr. Bolton: No agents, principals only, no commissions.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about £5,000, to break her up as scrap iron?

The PREMIER: Before the advent of State steamers—perhaps the member for the district may not be aware of this fact, although he appreciates the service—the producers outside of Kimberley had no possible chance.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Derby and Broome sent cattle down at that time.

The PREMIER: I am telling the hon. member the facts. In 1911-12, before the State steamship service operated, only 537 bullocks were shipped from Port Hedland whereas in 1912-13, after the State steamship service began operations, no fewer than 6,105 head were shipped from Port Hedland. We have reduced the freight on cattle from Kimberley from £4 to £2 10s. per head. A sum of £4 per head was asked by the charterers of the steamers which previously traded to the North-West when we desired them to bring down cattle from the aborigines station. We are now bringing them down for £2 10s. a head for the producers in the North-West. In consequence of these facilities provided by the State steamship service, Kimberley cattle have advanced 10s. per head in price.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is good for the Perth market.

The PREMIER: As a result of the service we have actually put £1,500 in hard cash into the pockets of every Kimberley producer who has shipped 750 head of cattle.

Hon. J. Mitchell: How do you make that out, at 10s. per head?

The PREMIER: I am giving the figures. As a result of the service we have actually put £1,500 hard cash into

the pockets of each Kimberley producer who has shipped 750 head of cattle.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The cattle kings, yes.

The PREMIER: Previously Port Hedland cattle were sacrificed at £3 per head; now they are bringing £5 10s. and still we are selling cheap meat. The hon. member for Northam may laugh. We have benefited both the producer and the consumer and, had it not been for the State steamship service, I venture to say we would be paying famine prices for our meat.

Hon. J. Mitchell: So we are; we could not pay more.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member can find reasons for laughing and for making flippant remarks, it may be in keeping with the policy of his party. I am giving the word of one who spoke with a knowledge of the subject. We have suffered considerably from drought in the north-western portion of this State during the past three years and under the shipping conditions prevailing prior to the inauguration of the State steamships, meat would undoubtedly have been considerably dearer to-day than it was at the time we took office, as a result of the dry season and the scarcity of stock. But what are the facts? I have a copy of the *Quarterly Labour Bulletin*, which will be a nightmare to the hon. member. It is published by Knibbs. In it is a return of the cost of living in Australia. There is an index number for each group from January to March compared with 1912. The price in 1912 is shown by the index number of 1,000 and any rise or fall is indicated above or below that figure. For New South Wales the index figure was 1,000 in 1912 and by March, 1914 meat had risen to 1,090. In Victoria it had risen to 1,030; in Queensland, to 1,078; in South Australia, 1,158; and in Tasmania to 1,047; while in Western Australia it had declined to 974. In every other State of the Commonwealth there has been a considerable increase in the price of meat since 1912 and Western Australia is the only State which has shown a reduction and it is a fairly substantial reduction, too.

Mr. S. Stubbs: The butchers say they are all broken.

Mr. Thomas: That is only bluff.

The PREMIER: It is not so many months since the market was well supplied with stock and some butchers, whether they did it by putting their heads together, or not, I do not know, opened a shop or two in the metropolitan area at which they sold meat at a slight reduction on our prices at the meat stall. Then they came to us and wanted to know why we did not reduce the price. They said, "The Government are keeping up the price and yet they talk about reducing it." We took no notice of them but realised what would happen, and as a result we can to-day continue to sell at the old price without showing any loss to the community, because we foresaw what would happen and we made provision; and the butchers are now holding indignant meetings. I know of no subject which has received so much consideration at the hands of "mother of ten," and such like correspondents during the last three months as has the price of meat and the condemnation of the Government meat stall by the butchers.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Is it a fact that you are buying meat at 7d. and selling it at 5d. per lb?

The PREMIER: No. The leader of the Opposition stated that we were buying mutton at 10d. per lb. This is absolutely incorrect. We have never bought mutton at 10d. per lb. The price we paid has been about 6½d. after allowing for the value of the skin, and we have been selling it at 5d to 7d., and averaging the whole lot it has been just about paying.

Mr. S. Stubbs: The butchers allege that you are buying it at 5d. and selling it at 7d. per lb.

The Minister for Mines: Do you believe them?

The PREMIER: I am not concerned with what the butchers are saying, but I am concerned regarding the results we have achieved. There is evidence that since 1912, when the price of meat was at an index figure of 1,000, Western Aus-

tralia under a Labour Administration and by the introduction of the State Steamship service to the North-West, notwithstanding the scarcity of stock and the bad season, has experienced a reduction in the price of meat. All the other States have shown a fairly substantial rise. Having touched so far on the question of food supply, may I make a further quotation? We have a return here showing the price of house rent and cost of living indexed under each capital town during 1911-1914. The year 1911 is the year our friends were last in office, after we had had five years of this beneficent liberal rule. Five years of that beneficent rule left us in this position. Whatever the price of commodities then, groceries, food, and rent, have been taken for the purpose of comparison as 1,000; and the other States have been placed in exactly the same position, on that index figure of 1,000. It is so with the price of groceries, food, and rent in Sydney. They moved up from 1,000 to 1,165; in Melbourne, to 1,122; in Brisbane, to 1,068; in Adelaide, to 1,057; and in Hobart, to 1,107; whilst in Western Australia they have dropped to 987. Western Australia is the only State in the Commonwealth where there has not been an increase in the cost of living during the three years, and where, as a matter of fact, there has been a slight reduction.

Mr. Taylor: You arranged that.

The PREMIER: The Commonwealth Statistician must have known we were coming into office. Now, let me quote another return. This deals with the purchasing power of money, in each year from 1901 to 1914, in each Australian capital town—what would have cost on the average £1. I do not know why Mr. Knibbs should have selected 1911, but this is rather interesting: May I point out here that Mr. Knibbs has based it on the average for the whole of the Commonwealth in 1911? He has taken what would purchase on the weighted average throughout the Commonwealth, and at that time it required in Perth 22s. 6d. Notwithstanding the difficulties we have passed through, the trying period everybody knows the past three years to have

been, notwithstanding the shortage of meat in the North-West in particular, and the fact that we have as well had large quantities of importations of food from the Eastern States, where prices have also risen, the purchasing power of the sovereign in Western Australia has been increased—what in 1912 cost 23s. now costing only 22s. 7d.—while every other State has shown a considerable decrease in that purchasing power. The figures given by Knibbs are as follow:—

Amounts necessary on the average to purchase in Capital Towns what would have cost on the average £1 in 1911 in the Capitals as a whole.

Year.	1911.	1913.†
Sydney ..	20s. 7d.	23s. 7d.
Melbourne ..	19s. 0d.	21s. 1d.
Brisbane ..	18s. 4d.	19s. 4d.
Adelaide ..	21s. 2d.	22s. 8d.
Hobart ..	19s. 1d.	21s. 2d.

†Mean of first nine months.

Western Australia is the only State again in which the purchasing power of the sovereign has increased.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They do not say that in the Arbitration Court, you know.

The PREMIER: I am not dealing with the Arbitration Court just now. I am dealing with the criticism of the leader of the Opposition. In Western Australia it now requires 22s. 3d. to purchase what could be purchased in any other part of the Commonwealth for £1. It is shown that in 1911, the year when our friends left office, on the weighted average for the Commonwealth being fixed at £1, it required 26s. 11d. in Perth. We have reduced that; and it is another illustration of the bringing about of that blue ruin which our friends talk about, when the average of 26s. 11d. is reduced to 24s. 11d. It has been reduced by 2s., while in every other State, without exception, it has gone up.

Mr. S. Stubbs: Where have all the savings gone to? They are not in the Banks.

The PREMIER: It is very evident that our friend from Wagin is not a shareholder in the Western Australian Bank, or he would appreciate the fact that, notwithstanding our trying time, that Bank has been able to distribute a 20 per cent. dividend. However, I am coming to the

aspect of banking directly. Perhaps the figures I have given might be accepted as conclusive that our administration during the last three years has been effective. We have not been talking about things; we have done them; and we did them so speedily, we got to work so promptly in these matters, that it did not require six years—as my friend, the leader of the Opposition admitted on Thursday evening in respect to his Administration—to feel the benefit of it. It took six years, he said, to feel the benefit of Liberal administration, but it has taken only three years to feel the benefit, in a very effective manner, of Labour administration. Those are figures which I believe are conclusive, and will be accepted by the general public, being issued by Mr. Knibbs, who is not concerned in party politics, and, I suppose, does not care very much about what is transpiring in Western Australia. Let me deal, too, with the State trading concerns. I was dealing with the question of the steamers, when, naturally, the question of the price of meat comes into consideration; but may I also explain that, so far as the State steamers are concerned, it must be recognised that at the outset of any service there are sure to be losses? It is possible even in the best regulated companies' services to find the retention of a steamer not suitable for a particular trade: the steamer itself being quite all right, though not suitable for the particular trade. That is exactly what has happened in the case of the "Western Australia"—a magnificent steamer, admirably suitable from the point of view of the weather conditions prevailing on our North-West coast; a steamer of which we never need have the slightest fear as to her getting out of any difficulty. She is not a steamer particularly well fitted for passenger traffic, but she is very well adapted for the conditions prevailing on the North-West coast. Being built for trading conditions prevailing in many other parts of the world, the steamer has to take in sufficient coal at Fremantle to enable her to proceed along the coast to Wyndham and as far as Derby in the Northern Territory, without replenishing her bunkers at any port en route.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Every steamer has to do that.

The PREMIER: No. Steamers going on to Singapore can get supplies of coal there to bring them back.

Hon. J. Mitchell: All the cattle boats do it.

The PREMIER: The "Western Australia" is not merely a cattle boat. She is not a cattle boat.

Hon. J. Mitchell: I know that.

The PREMIER: The large quantity of coal which the "Western Australia" has to carry leaves only a very limited space available for general cargo. That naturally makes her rather a losing concern from the immediate profit point of view. But is that the only aspect we have to consider? Should we not consider the people who are pioneering the North-Western portion of the State—a territory in itself as large as some of the Eastern States of Australia—are their interests not to be considered at all? Are only the interests of Perth to be considered, or should we give consideration to the development of the interests of that huge territory? I am not speaking only of this loss in connection with the State steamship service, but I am taking into consideration the necessity for extending our railway system to those areas for the purpose of advancing them. The hon. member opposite may laugh. He is interested only in a few parts of the State, where he has a few private interests. But I am concerned with the interests of the whole of the State. That is what we claimed at the elections, and what I claim still: that the great difference between the policy of our friends opposite and the policy of this party is that we consider the interests of the whole of the State, from Eucla in the South to Wyndham in the North; and I say we are justified in losing even more money than we have lost in doing what we have done for the advancement of the North-West, justified in continuing on similar lines. We hope to open up the North by further railway communication at an early date.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You have not got any more money to lose.

The PREMIER: The hon. member need not worry about more money. Our

friends opposite told the electors that they would be ruined if they returned Labour candidates, that no money would be lent to the State if the electors did that. Now, the point is that the money-lender took no notice of our friends, who now complain that the financiers lent us more than they should have done.

Hon. J. Mitchell: At what price?

The PREMIER: At better prices than Liberal leaders secured in any other part of the world. The hon. member knows it, too. References were made by the hon. member to our trading concerns, and to the implement works in particular. Naturally, the Opposition do not wait until these works have an opportunity of getting on a basis where they can be fairly judged. Our friends opposite rush in at once, and condemn these trading concerns lock, stock, and barrel. The leader of the Opposition condemned the manager of the State Implement Works for buying at a cheap price a quantity of valuable machinery. Some of that machinery had been hardly used, and the whole of it is now giving splendid service.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I condemned the Government, not the manager. You are too fond of putting your troubles on to others.

The PREMIER: If the hon. member condemned the Government in that connection, he condemned the manager as well. The leader of the Opposition has continually made the assertion that this machinery is scrap-iron. Yet he has to admit that he has never been near the works and knows nothing about them. Nevertheless, he continues to repeat his opinion, knowing nothing whatever about the machinery, as to whether it is good, bad, or indifferent. The hon. member went to Claremont, accompanied by the member for Claremont (Mr. Wisdom), to a Liberal rally, and on that occasion again he roundly criticised and attacked the management of the implement works. However, Mr. Davies, the manager, happened to be present; and, to judge by a report I have here from one of the newspapers—

Hon. Frank Wilson: *The Worker*?

The PREMIER: No. The *Northam Courier*, by the way. I find that the following is reported:—

Mr. Frank Wilson, in the course of an address delivered at Claremont, made an attack on the management of the State Implement Works. He asserted that the works were being run at a loss, and implied that the Government had put the works in the hands of an incapable manager. Mr. Wisdom, M.L.A., followed his leader with an implication that the works balance-sheet had been faked to show a profit. The manager of the works, Mr. Davies, happened to be at the meeting, and sought and obtained permission to reply to the two detractors of the State enterprise. He exposed in detail the inaccuracies of which the two legislators had been guilty, and invited them, or anyone else, to inspect the shops, the method of book-keeping, and the costs account, concluding with the offer to forfeit £50 to any charitable institution if he could not prove at the end of the financial year, June 30th, 1914, that the works had made a profit; his figures to be tested by any method preferred. The meeting, it is reported, gave Mr. Davies quite an ovation at the conclusion of his speech. Mr. Wilson then tried to explain that his remarks were only made in a Pickwickian sense—

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is a wonderfully accurate report. I think he must have composed it.

The PREMIER: The report concludes—

and that he did not imply for one moment that Mr. Davies was not a capable manager.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That report is totally inaccurate, whoever gave it to them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Those who attended the meeting did not say anything about that.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Who reported this?

The PREMIER: Evidently not a Liberal. Now, dealing with the implement works, may I say that we are perfectly satisfied with the system of accounting

which has been introduced in connection with those works? We appointed a special committee of experts from the departments for the purpose of drawing up the costing system, and that system has been drawn up on such a basis that there can be no difficulty in arriving at the actual cost of manufacture of every implement which is made at the works, or will ever be undertaken. There will be no difficulty whatever; and so far as faking of returns by the manager is concerned, he has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the arranging of that costing system. It is done outside his department altogether. Thus he has to stand on the actual operation of the factory and cannot fake his returns in any way. Perhaps one of the difficulties, from our friend's point of view, is not only have we established the implement works and so come into competition with some of his combine friends, but we are also setting an example in paying a reasonable rate of wage to the men employed. To imagine that we can turn out our implements at a less cost than the combines and trusts and pay better wages, is extremely hurtful to our friends opposite. The position is that the wages paid to the men in our implement works are 2s. per day better than those paid to men employed in similar work in the Victorian factories. Yet we are reducing the cost of the implements to the farmer by from 10 to 20 per cent. That is one cause of complaint by the leader of the Opposition and his friends. They recognise that the State can manufacture these implements and show a profit on the process, and supply the implements at reduced prices to the farming community as against those machines manufactured by the combines and trusts existing in America and other places. And at the same time we are keeping the money in circulation in Western Australia. These are some of the matters which I consider of interest in connection with our trading concerns. Whilst mentioning wages and cost of living, may I point out that it has frequently been urged, particularly by the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) that if we increase the wages of men in any industry, we must necessarily

increase the cost of living; and it is asserted that it increases in greater ratio until, as a matter of fact, all the increase in wages will have gone in the extra cost of living. During the last three years we have increased the wages of men in the Government service, and we have set the example to the Arbitration Court, which has also increased wages. Yet side by side with these increases there has not been an increase in the cost of living, or not to any appreciable extent. There is the answer to the argument that increased wages means increased cost of living. We have shown that it is possible to increase the wages and at the same time reduce the cost of living. The leader of the Opposition, in referring to the implement works, touched upon the fact that they were undertaking other classes of work, and he stated that it was well known in engineering circles that the class of machinery necessary for the manufacture of locomotives was not the class of machinery required for the building of implements, and that the building of our harbour workshop and making it part and parcel of the implement works would be found to be unwise in all respects, and would result in the mixing up of the cost of the implements. The machinery previously engaged in the Harbour Works Department would still be similarly engaged in doing work not in its own department. It is only a matter of administration of the two classes of work. The advantages are that sometimes the heavier class of machinery necessary to the harbour works will be found at a pinch to be available and of considerable value in connection with the implement works, and on the other hand some of the lighter machinery used in the implement works will be found of advantage when employed on doing work for outside firms or Government departments which was previously done by the Harbour Works. The manager has said that this has recently been experienced. Our bulldozers used in the production of agricultural machinery were for the moment standing idle, when active employment was found for them in some of the harbour works, and they turned out the work at about one-tenth the cost which would otherwise have ob-

tained. So it will be seen that the working of these two classes of machinery together is of considerable advantage. Moreover, these are not the only works of a similar nature in Australia. The leader of the Opposition will know that the Clyde engineering works at Sydney, one of the largest engineering establishments in Australia, is engaged in doing shipping and general work, and the manufacture of agricultural machinery. Then there is the Meadowbank factory near Sydney, and there are two factories in South Australia, Messrs. Martin and Co., of Gawler, and May Bros., of Gawler, the latter turning out nearly 1,000 harvesters per annum. They are also large makers of mining machinery. There, if required, is evidence that these firms, well established, can manufacture agricultural implements and mining machinery, and undertake shipping work as well. In connection with the Fremantle harbour workshops it was found necessary to put up new buildings. Whether we put them adjacent to and run them in conjunction with the implement works or not, we had to find the money for new workshops, and we find it economical to bring them under the one roof. By this the annual cost of administration will be considerably reduced. I do not know of anything else introduced by our friends opposite which requires very much answering. May I remind that the leader of the Opposition is very much inclined to sharply criticise the Government for its control of the finances. I want to show that the hon. member cannot claim to be a financial expert or genius, and to show, moreover, what some of his bungling, or want of foresight, during his term has cost the State.

Mr. Thomas: No one ever suspected him of being a genius.

The PREMIER: Yes, possibly one person has—the leader of the Opposition. The returns of the State Savings Bank show the following result: Cash on hand held by the Western Australian Bank on the 30th June, 1908, was £254,778. In 1909 it amounted to £343,571; in 1910 to £589,323; in 1911 to £753,549, and in

September, 1911, when he went out of office, to no less than £802,066. This was actual hard cash held by the Western Australian Bank, being the money upon which we were paying depositors 3 per cent. interest. At the 30th June, 1909, the credit balance was in excess of the amount of the Savings Bank reserve, that is, the reserve approved by the leader of the Opposition as necessary to meet excess of withdrawals over deposits. He had to decide what the amount would be, and he decided that 2s. in the pound was quite sufficient. Yet on the 30th June, 1909, the credit balance was in excess of this amount by £45,000 in round figures. On the 30th June, 1910, it was in excess by £249,000, and in June, 1911, by £354,000, and on the 30th September, 1911, by no less than £400,000. I wish to point out that these moneys were invested at the average rate of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while the Government were paying 3 per cent. on such money to the depositors. In other words, the Government paid £48,943 to depositors and received from the bank where the Savings Bank funds were deposited the amount of £24,439, or sustained a loss of £24,504. Had these moneys been invested in a proper manner and at the same rate of interest as the funds in connection with the Agricultural Lands Purchase estates something like over £60,000 would have been received, or a profit of £12,000 to the State instead of a loss of £24,000.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Did we ever show a loss on the operations of the Savings Bank?

The PREMIER: Does that affect the position in the slightest? The hon. member is merely admitting that while he was Treasurer we were charging agriculturists through the Agricultural Bank sufficient to show a profit on the operations of the Savings Bank in order to meet a loss which we were making and on which the Western Australian Bank paid its shareholders 20 per cent. Fancy allowing the directors of the Western Australian Bank to declare a dividend of 20 per cent. at the expense of the State, while at the same time the State was

made to show a profit by compelling the farmer to pay more than a fair rate for his money !

Mr. Monger: What did the Western Australian Bank pay 20 per cent. on?

The PREMIER: On paper I think.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Have you reduced the rates to the farmers?

The PREMIER: We are dealing with that; we are dealing with the whole thing. Let me also explain that we have lost something like £45,000 in six years by reason of this money not being properly invested, by its not being attended to by the Treasurer, notwithstanding the fact that the matter was submitted to him, and that he decided that 2s. in the pound would be sufficient to meet cases of withdrawals over deposits. This is the sort of finance which enables the bank holding the Savings Bank investments to make in the six years mentioned, approximately £186,000 of profit as against a loss to the State of £45,000.

Mr. Thomas: That money should have been in the coffers of the State.

The PREMIER: Not the whole of it, but about one-half of it. The position is this: They were paying us an average of $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and they were loaning that money out at an average of $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. As a matter of fact that is below the amount, for they were lending the money to people at something like 8 per cent.

Mr. S. Stubbs: That has been only quite recently, at all events.

The PREMIER: Well, say, 7 per cent.

Mr. S. Stubbs: No, it is not an average of $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

The PREMIER: Well, I claim that they have been making at least $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on that money for the last six years, and that they have made a profit of £186,000 out of our money, while we have lost £45,000; and yet we are told that we have no idea of sound finance, that it all exists in the mind of our friend opposite. We are changing that condition of affairs. We are going to arrange with the National Bank of Australasia—

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are always changing something.

The PREMIER: Yes, and making very effective changes, changes the benefit of which will be felt, not in six years, but almost at once. We are getting over this difficulty, and are arranging with the Commonwealth Bank to provide the facilities required. The balance will be invested for the benefit of the depositors. We anticipate that it will not be long before £100,000 will be in the Commonwealth Bank for investment purposes on behalf of the depositors. While taking the credit which I am entitled to do for having brought about an agreement with the Commonwealth Bank, to undertake all our banking in future, under advantageous conditions—

Hon. Frank Wilson: You are muddling it all up.

The PREMIER: We are arranging with the Commonwealth Bank, as I have said, to undertake the State's banking, and are doing it on very much better terms than the associated banks were previously doing it for us. I have published the agreement long since, and I do not require to go over the ground again. Moreover, even if the terms were not better than the associated banks were giving us, and no profits were arising out of the transactions, the public are going to get the benefit of the arrangements which have been made with the Commonwealth Bank and not shareholders. This was not the case under the conditions which previously prevailed. So much for the financial operations of our friends opposite, which the leader of the Opposition says were of so much value to the community. I was rather interested in his speech, largely from the point of view that, whilst he occupied so much of the time of the House, he hardly touched upon those particular questions which are of vital importance to the community as a whole, outside of the question of finances. And I say that figures can prove anything, and judging by his knowledge of how to handle finances, one would expect him to give most attention to that particular

subject. But he has neglected his opportunity of showing what he would have done to meet some of the conditions which have arisen during the last three years, and more particularly he has neglected to show in what way he could have brought about better results than we have to increase the wage-earning capacity of the people of the State, and at the same time reduce the cost of living. But he avoided all that and in that direction he was rather astute, but I am not going to allow him to avoid the issue altogether. I am going to call upon the leader of the Opposition and his supporters to make a pronouncement upon some of the matters which have been submitted to the House by way of the Governor's Speech. I want to know what their attitude is upon those questions, in order that the people may be able to judge whether they are likely to get better administration at the hands of our friends opposite than they are likely to get at the hands of those who are sitting upon the Government benches. He made no reference, as is usual with the Liberals, with regard to the appointment of Mr. Justice Northmore, as puisne judge of the Supreme Court.

Mr. S. Stubbs: It was a good appointment.

The PREMIER: They did not say, as they so often do, in this particular case that it was an instance of "spoils to the victors." They are, however, prepared to condemn the appointment of the manager of a State hotel and call it an instance of "spoils to the victors." But when it comes to the appointment of a Supreme Court judge, which means so much to the community, they are not prepared to give credit where credit is due. I am perfectly satisfied that we have in Mr. Justice Northmore made a wise selection. The hon. member, further, made no reference to the scheme for the provision of workers' homes. I think it is due to him here also to make a pronouncement upon this question. He did say that he would like to know what class of applicant has been successful in obtaining these homes. I thought I might, for his information and

the information of the public bring along just one week's figures, giving a return showing the occupations of those who have been successful and also the towns from which they come, and the amount which they received. This return is for the week ending the 28th March, 1914. There was one traveller of Narrogin who received £550; a sheet metal worker, Buckland Hill, £470; a confectioner, Leederville, £530; an employee at H.M. Customs, Fremantle, £375; a railway employee, Fremantle, £550; a painter, Victoria Park, £450; a lifter, West Guildford, £440; a shipping clerk, S. Bunbury, £500; a printer, Victoria Park, £550; a bootmaker, East Fremantle, £370; a carpenter, Osborn £480; an engine-driver, Narrogin, £400; a mechanic, Maylands, £510; a hardware assistant, Maylands, £500; shipping assistant, Cottesloe Beach, £400; a tramway employee, Victoria Park, £330; a labourer, Maylands, £340; a minister of religion, West Leederville, £550; a railway employee, Midland Junction, £530; a railway clerk, Katanning, £370; and a motor mechanic, West Leederville, £320. There were thus 21 applicants approved of, accounting for a total expenditure of £9,510. There is evidence of the fact that, speaking generally, practically the whole of the community are receiving benefits under this workers' home scheme. We have no right to question the occupation of any of the applicants. The only restrictions are in regard to income.

Hon. Frank Wilson: How many of them are members of Parliament?

The PREMIER: As a matter of fact, the only necessary qualification for applicants for workers' home is that their income shall not exceed £400 a year. In these circumstances I am not entitled to question the occupation of any of them. We have approved applications from employers of labour as well as from men earning wages, and men earning salaries in the public service. I contend this is the only attitude that we could adopt in this particular scheme. It is not the occupation that we have to consider but the individual himself. We are building sub-

stantial homes and the whole community are feeling the benefit of these advantages. The hon. member further made no reference to the mining industry, as it exists at the present time. Naturally, he made some reference to the value of the gold yield during his term of office. It is strange, however, that he should have mentioned that the gold yield had declined under his baneful administration. It only required, however, 12 months of a Labour Administration to pull matters together in another direction. We showed an increase last year in the gold yield over the year preceding, and we should have had every reason to hope that there would be a further increase this year, but for the circumstances I have mentioned. We hope in the near future to again revive the Phillips River Gold-fields, which were positively killed by our friends opposite. They put up smelters at a huge cost and then immediately handed them over to a company. They also built a railway which has shown a loss every year and is likely to continue to cost the country money. But the Government has taken the matter up for the purpose of reviving that field, if possible, by a judicious expenditure of public funds. The leader of the Opposition made no reference to the Health Administration of the State during the past three years and that too, is a matter which requires some pronouncement by our friends opposite. We have built up, by very careful attention on the part of our Honorary Minister, Mr. Angwin, whose administration has been most creditable to Western Australia, a health administration which is the best in the Commonwealth at the present time. I admit that it required a great deal of attention in the first stages and also a great deal of what might be termed backbone on the part of the Honorary Minister, whose department it was, because we had on many occasions, as we are doing at the present time, to compel local authorities to give more attention to the sanitation of the areas under their control and in other directions. The hon. member made no reference to that for it did not suit his book to do so. I drew attention to

the fact that last year our death rate was the lowest on record in Western Australia and the lowest in the Commonwealth, and in any country of the world where similar records are kept.

Mr. Broun : Well done, Mr. Angwin.

Mr. S. Stubbs : It was the good climate.

The PREMIER : Is the climate different now from what it was then ? The only conclusion one can draw is that if the climate is the same now, and it is only a matter of the climate, we must take credit for the difference which exists between the previous rate and the rate which exists now. Let me also point out that the infantile mortality rate was last year the lowest on record in Australia. Do these things happen just by chance ? Does the death rate rise or fall by chance, and does this infantile mortality rise and fall also by chance ? Is it not due to the proper attention to the sanitation and health of the community that these results are brought about ? It is pointed out in the Governor's Speech that it is due to the improvements in the water supply, the improved milk supply to the children's hospital and other institutions of the kind, which has been so roundly condemned by our friends opposite. But only for a little while. I hear nothing about it now. Probably they are now prepared to support and continue such action which produced a good supply of pure milk for Government institutions and the children's hospital. A pronouncement upon that question might be of some value to the community, as to whether they propose to hand things over to the tender mercies of the dairymen and to run the risks of the adulteration of milk and the consequent sickness for those who use it, or to continue the operations of the State trading concerns, which they so roundly condemned. The public want to know what their attitude is upon the question.

The Minister for Mines : The public will show what they think at the elections. They will turn them down altogether.

The PREMIER : Then there is the extension of the sewerage system of the

metropolitan area. We pushed on with the extension of that and with anything else that was likely to improve the health of the community, and also provided for the further assistance and maintenance of children who were under maternal care. All these things would affect in no small manner the rates which I have mentioned. We certainly have not performed all that is necessary, or all that remains to be done for the welfare of the community, but we recognise that we require in Western Australia an institution where we can train midwives and that question too will receive attention at an early date. As a matter of fact we are just on the point of commencing operations in the construction of that particular hospital. We recognise that our mining industry, which has produced so much of the wealth of the community, and paid such an abundance of dividends to the shareholder, has also made some inroads upon the health of the community. We recognise the fact that it is the duty of the State, if we are to push on the industry at all, to give some attention to the interests of those who have lost their health through their employment in this particular industry. We, therefore, immediately proceeded with the erection of a sanatorium at Wooroloo. That is being erected, I may say, practically regardless of cost, and from the point of view of providing proper facilities for treating people who are suffering from miners' complaint or consumption in its various phases. We hope to have it open to receive patients by September next. How much have our friends opposite done in this particular direction?

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: They put it in their policy speech.

The PREMIER: We recognise that something further is essential, however. It will be remembered that we introduced the amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act in 1912. The deletion of the clause by the Legislative Council from the Workers' Compensation Bill of 1912 in which industrial diseases were classed as accidents, made necessary the substitution of some other method of dealing with miners' complaints. The deletion was effected by the report of the Royal Com-

mission of 1911 which was appointed by Mr. Gregory. This report was extensively quoted from during the debate in the Council. Had the recommendations of the Commission of 1904, which was also appointed by Mr. Gregory, been included in the Mines Regulation Bill of 1906 instead of being ignored, there would have been little need for the Government to find the sums of money necessary to effectually deal with the trouble. Unfortunately the disease is increasing as the mines get deeper, and the Government have agreed to give £10,000 to form the nucleus of a fund, provided the mine owners give an equal amount, and to subsidise any further amount raised by employer and employee up to £7,500 annually. In other words, the Government offer a conditional grant of £10,000, and if the employers and employees raise £7,500 each per year the Government will subsidise by an equal amount. A committee, representative of employers, and employees, have been sitting some time drafting a scheme for submission to the individual mine owners and the men, and when such scheme is adopted by them and approved by the Government, a Board will be constituted to administer the fund. That is evidence of the fact that the health of the community has not been neglected by the present administration, and while we are able to claim that we have increased materially the advantage of the people by increasing wages and the salaries paid to men in the Government service, and set an example through the Arbitration Court for private employers to follow, we, have side by side with all that, decreased the cost of living. We have also brought about other conditions which it is essential should exist in a community a reduction in the death rate, and especially in infantile mortality. These are matters upon which our friends opposite must make some pronouncement because they affect the welfare of the community. But we are condemned because the expenditure has been increased. We have increased the wages of railway men, the salaries of teachers in schools; and the salaries of public servants; and if we had our time over again we would do the same thing once more. It is essential that men

should receive a living wage, and I can emphasise the fact that we have not increased the cost of living. We have done still more; we have abolished fees in schools and to-day a child can go from the kindergarten to the university without paying any fees. We wanted a free educational system, and it required the Labour Government to provide it. There must be beneficial results from an economic point of view by having children properly educated; this, however, cannot be brought about if there is to be any bar such as fees in technical schools and the university. There are other matters which our friends opposite will require to make a pronouncement upon, but they will avoid the issues and cloud them as far as possible by introducing the subject of the finances. The leader of the Opposition has admitted the fact that to control the finances is to control the affairs of State satisfactorily or otherwise, but what I say is that I am not ashamed of the condition of the finances; I would rather be ashamed of attempting to starve those employed by the Government by paying them other than a fair living wage; I would be ashamed to refuse to go to the assistance of those engaged in the primary industries and in the gold mining industry, and then come down here and express pride at the fact that I had in that way produced a surplus. I prefer to show increased expenditure as the result of providing hospital facilities, particularly out back, than to come down here and cry aloud that I had a £13,000 surplus. I prefer to render services which mean so much to the material advantage of the people, notwithstanding the fact that the finances are not what they might have been if we had been given the opportunity to pass the legislation which we submitted; but even with the conditions as they are, I infinitely prefer them rather than have it said that I neglected the interests of the community, that I neglected to provide hospital facilities and to engage in works which meant so much to the community as a whole. I stand charged by the leader of the Opposition with not being able to square the finances, but the Government are in the

proud position of being able to claim that we have done so much to assist to develop our industries, a development which has been of material advantage to the State, and which would not have been the case if I had accepted the advice tendered by our friends opposite in years past.

Hon. J. MITCHELL moved—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	24

Majority against .. 15

AYES.

Mr. Broun	Mr. A. N. Plesse
Mr. Elliott	Mr. S. Stubbs
Mr. Harper	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. Munsie
Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loughlin
Mr. Chesson	Mr. Price
Mr. Collier	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Foley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gill	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Hudson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lander	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lewis	Mr. A. A. Willson
Mr. McDowall	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McLeod	(Teller).
Mr. Mullany	

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. MONGER (York): I thought that when the Opposition applied to the Premier for permission to adjourn the debate that in his usual courteous style he would have agreed to the request. We have again this charming experience of the way in which they make use of their big majority. After the speech made by the Premier to-night, laudatory of the many trading concerns with which his Government are connected, and considering the charges which he levelled against this side of the House, it would have been fitting that he should have given the ex-Minister for Lands a fair and reasonable opportunity to make his reply.

The Premier: Absolutely unheard of.

Mr. MONGER: I suppose after having listened to these laudatory statements of

the Premier it would be somewhat surprising if I did not tender my congratulations to the leader of the Government upon the magnificent case which he has placed before the country. He has told us that everything in the garden is lovely, but I am certain that the people of Western Australia, when they read the report of the speech in to-morrow morning's paper, will not for one moment be satisfied with the case he has made out. According to the Premier, all the trading concerns are a big success. We are told that they are profitable, either directly or indirectly. But I can assure hon. members that the general opinion is that it is mostly indirectly, and that they are making very little progress. We know how advantageous the steamers have been; we know what a big success has attended the saw mills; we know also how successful the brick yards have been, and from the statements made by one of the members on the Ministerial side of the House we gather that one of the principal reasons for the starting of the brick works—I refer to the silver-tongued orator from Bunbury—was not to reduce the price of bricks but to act as a check upon the gentleman who represents the electorate of Murray-Wellington. We are told by the member for Bunbury that we shall see at the next elections what these brick yards are going to turn out, that they are going to prove a big obstacle against the return of the member for Murray-Wellington. If that is the intention of the present Government in starting their brick works, the employment of men so that their votes may be used at election time in order to turn out their opponents, the sooner that fact is made known to the people the better it will be. Is that the object then of these various State enterprises which we hear so much about? I want to know whether the Premier endorses that statement made by his colleague the member for Bunbury. It is refreshing to see the manner in which the Premier takes to himself and his party the credit that the State is able to go along so well. It is certainly gratifying to find, according to His Excellency's Speech, that the develop-

ment of the agricultural areas has been very considerably increased by the amount of improvements effected on selected lands. It is interesting to know that agricultural development is proceeding so rapidly, and I am certain that the farmers of this State must feel very proud of the statements made this evening by the Premier. According to his statements, if ever there was a spoonfed community in any part of Australia or of the world, it is the men on the land in Western Australia. According to the Premier, nothing which could have been done to assist the development of our rural lands has been left undone by the Government. How have the Government done this? I suppose I must continue in my congratulatory terms and compliment the Minister for Lands upon the issue of his edict so early after his advent to office; that new regulation which did more towards damming the progress of settlement in Western Australia than could have been done by any other method which the Government could have employed.

The Premier: You do not know, I suppose, that he never issued that regulation.

Mr. MONGER: I know how far the Minister had power to go and I know the effect of his proposal. Prior to the last elections, one of the great planks of the Labour party's platform was the non-alienation of Crown lands, and no doubt this regulation was issued in order to as far as possible retard land settlement under the favourable conditions which had met with such great popularity under the regime of the previous Minister. I wish to pay a tribute of respect to that gentleman, for, in the history of Australia, never was greater progress made in agricultural settlement than during the period in which he occupied the position of Minister for Lands. During his term of office there were thousands of buyers for our farms; to-day, under a Labour regime there are thousands of sellers and no buyers. Is that the result of good land administration? If so, I want to go back to the old regime and

find a live man at the head of this big department, not a man who will take the funk the moment he enters Ministerial office as the present Minister for Lands did, in fact, before he had time to make his office warm. I suppose the success which has attended the gold mining industry must be attributed to the magnificent brain of the Minister for Mines. It must be owing to his magnificent efforts that during the past year there has been a slight increase in the gold output. No doubt the Premier made as much capital out of that as was possible. I do not know whether the Premier endorses all the statements made by his Ministers when they are on tour. When speaking on Thursday night the leader of the Opposition congratulated the Minister for Mines upon having on most occasions preserved a wonderful silence. If he is in the habit of speaking as he did recently at Collie, it would be wise for the Premier to muzzle the Minister for Mines and not allow him to go out on his own. The Premier should not trust to him. When I heard the new member for Kalgoorlie, a very promising young gentleman, say that in the opinion of the people of the goldfields, the present Minister was the finest man who had ever occupied the position, I thought, "God help those who went before him." I have a cutting from a newspaper which I shall quote. As I was not prepared to speak on the Address in-reply to-night, I have come with very little data.

The Premier: You have no data; that is the trouble.

Mr. MONGER: The Minister for Mines is reported to have scornfully declared—

To claim to represent all sections of the community was so much clap-trap. For himself, except in matters of administration, he only claimed to represent those people who agreed with the Labour party.

This is a magnificent statement to go out to the people of Australia. It is a grand thing to encourage capital to come into Western Australia, when the Minister for Mines in effect says, "I have no time for

you; I represent only the party who placed me in power. Unless you do something for our party, I do not want you or your capital." We had a little sample of this recently at Youanmi, and it shows what would have resulted if the Mines Regulation Bill, which the Minister introduced last session, had been passed as drafted. The Minister must have had one object in view in introducing the measure, and that was to burst up the mining industry.

The Premier: Could you represent the mine and the mine owner on that point?

Mr. Chesson: If the Bill had been carried there would have been no trouble at Youanmi.

Mr. MONGER: One of the principal clauses in that Bill which would have done a great deal of injury to the mining industry, provided for the abolition of the contract system.

Mr. O'Loughlen: How do you make that out?

Mr. MONGER: By the expression of opinion from those mostly interested and concerned.

Mr. Foley: The Chamber of Mines.

Mr. MONGER: During the whole period in which the present party have been in power, they have done what the Minister for Mines openly stated was his intention to do. This has been the motto of the Labour party.

Mr. Foley: You would not get the Chamber of Mines or any mining man in the State to agree with you.

Mr. MONGER: Allow me to refer to the report of a banquet at Kalgoorlie only a few days ago, at which Mr. Richard Hamilton spoke. He referred to the Youanmi incident and expressed very great regret that Mr. Klug should have been in Western Australia when such an occurrence took place.

Mr. Foley: What has that to do with the Minister for Mines?

Mr. MONGER: It has much to do with the Bill which the Minister for Mines tried to get the House to pass and which the hon. member and his friends willingly endorsed, but thanks to the good sense of another place it did not become

law. There are gentlemen on the Government side who have worked in mines, and more power to them that they are to-day occupants of seats in this House, but let me ask them if they would not sooner work under contract than under day labour.

Mr. Foley: No.

Hon. Frank Wilson: They do not like to work at all.

Mr. MONGER: Were they satisfied to accept the daily wage in preference to the money they could earn by contract? Certainly not.

Mr. Foley: Here is one who was.

Hon. Frank Wilson: He prefers the wages he draws here.

Mr. MONGER: Then the hon. member for Leonora is a lazier man than I took him to be. As far as I can gather from men closely identified with the industry, not only in this State, but in other parts of the world, it is only the man who wants to give as little labour as he can who prefers day work to contract. What did Mr. Hamilton say—

If this were carried into effect, the good men would leave.

I am told on the most reliable authority that the best miners are leaving Western Australia and are going to other places. They are going to South Africa or to Victoria where the contract system prevails. So long as a man can earn double the wages by contract, he will not be satisfied to remain in a country ridden and driven by the Trades Hall and the agitators dependent upon them. If it is the wish of the Government to further retard mining operations, they should re-introduce the Mines Regulation Bill which was brought in last session, and give effect to it, and the result will be that a great majority of the mines now working will be closed, the good miners will leave Western Australia and the ordinary or the inferior men alone will remain to do obeisance to the gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House.

Mr. Foley: Is there one man working on contract in Western Australia?

Mr. MONGER: Every big mine adopts the system more or less.

Mr. Foley: They do not. It is a task system; it is not contract.

Mr. MONGER: In the Speech reference is made among proposed works to the intention of the Government to re-introduce the Bill for the construction of a railway from Esperance northwards. We have had that before us a considerable time, and in another place it has not been agreed to so far. I, as one who has always opposed the building of that line of railway—

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Minister for Works will start it, you know, whether he gets the Bill or not.

Mr. MONGER: I have always opposed that line. I have opposed it on the ground that experienced men who have gone to the Esperance district do not report favourably upon its prospects from an agricultural standpoint. I say now that I am not satisfied with the expression of opinion of such experts as the Minister for Works and the Colonial Secretary and my friend the Attorney General—all very good men in their way, but I do not look upon them as being capable of expressing an opinion on what should be built in the shape of a railway in the interests of agriculture. Whilst I respect their opinions on other points, I say that there are better men in Western Australia who have been sent down to inspect the Esperance district and have let us know what their opinions are. If we are to base our calculations upon the statistical returns as furnished since attempts were made to produce cereals in the Esperance district, no sane Government would for one moment think of building that railway.

Member: No honest Government.

Mr. MONGER: No honest Government would attempt to build it; but if the present Government, with their big majority, are going to foist through this House a Bill for the sake of satisfying the claims of a gentleman who has rendered yeoman service to the party—I refer to Mr. Kirwan of the *Kalgoorlie Miner*—and we are to build that railway on the expert evidence of those gentle-

men whose names I have mentioned, I say it will be a standing disgrace to Western Australia if the Government do not first sent down the best talent that this State can find to report upon the capabilities of the Esperance country from a wheat growing standpoint.

Mr. Hudson: And the same for every railway.

Mr. MONGER: As far as the Esperance railway is concerned, I have only to refer to the last statistical return, where the wheat yield is shown as 4.2 bushels to the acre, from something like 1,500 or 1,600 acres; and the return of hay is considerably less than half a ton to the acre. I say, without any fear of contradiction, that no sane Government would build an agricultural railway with such bad prospects ahead; and I will only ask the present Government to be fair and send the best experts Western Australia possesses to report upon the capabilities of that land before putting the State to so heavy an expense. There is another railway that I notice the Government proposes to build, and that is the extension of the Yilliminning-Kondinin line. As to that, I will only say that had the Wickepin-Merredin railway been carried out as was originally intended, there would not have been any necessity for the building of about 200 miles of railway which have been, or will have to be, built in order to satisfy the peculiarities of the Minister for Works.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: That is an absurd statement.

Mr. Lander: That is bunkum.

Mr. MONGER: I want to congratulate the Minister upon having straightened out a railroad. In straightening it out he has now constructed, next to the Northampton line, the most crooked railway in Australia. That is how the Minister for Works straightens out his railways. I will venture to say that any person going over the Wickepin-Merredin line to-day will see that the Minister, in carrying out his pre-election pledges, availed himself of every point, of every possible point, in order to take the railway contiguous to propositions owned by friends of the party.

Mr. Lander: That is bunkum, and you know it is bunkum.

Mr. MONGER: I do not know anything of the sort.

Member: Name the friends.

Mr. Lander: Yes, name the friends.

Mr. MONGER: The goldfields people headed by Dr. Ellis, who took up big tracts of country, very materially contributed to that railway.

The Minister for Mines: Dr. Ellis is just as big an opponent of ours as Hedges. Dr. Ellis opposed Mr. McDowall at the last elections. Is that spoils to the victors?

Mr. MONGER: I have already said that in attempting to straighten out a railway the Minister has built the most crooked line of railway, next to the Northampton line, in Australia.

The Minister for Mines: To bring it near the land occupied by his friends, you stated.

Mr. MONGER: I will venture to prophesy that when the department begin to carry train loads of products along that railway it will be found that, owing to the steep grades and the many sharp curves, only very small loads can be carried instead of ordinary loads.

Mr. Taylor: Was that line built on expert advice?

Mr. MONGER: No; it was built on the whims of the Minister for Works. It was built on the pre-election pledges of the Premier, and given full effect to and carried out in the worst interests of the people in that locality by the Minister for Works.

Mr. Lander: It was carried out on the suggestion of the late Minister for Works, the late one—Daglish.

Mr. MONGER: There is one matter that the Premier said the Honorary Minister, Mr. Angwin, was deserving of considerable kudos for; and that is that during last year the mortality of Western Australia was lower than it had ever been. That is a very good result, and it is very gratifying to know that my friend Mr. Angwin was the Minister in whose care the hospitals of this State are. I am going to say I honestly think that the Honorary Minister has done all that could be expected of him in rendering, as far as

possible, Government assistance to hospitals, and that he has done his best in the interests of the health of the people of Western Australia. I see very little occasion, in respect of other matters, to tender congratulations to my friends on the Treasury bench for what they have done. I remember when the last Arbitration Act was introduced, and after it was carried the Attorney General stated that we then had in existence here the finest Arbitration Act in the world. It is very difficult to understand, in those circumstances, how there have been so many industrial disjunctions during the past 2½ years, since the Labour Government came into power, and during the yast year or so, since that Act came into operation. There must be something wrong somewhere. Either the gentlemen in charge of the Treasury bench or those in charge of the Trades Hall, do not make a very happy family. Otherwise, how is it that so much industrial strife continues to exist?

The Attorney General: It is provoked by the Employers' Association.

Mr. MONGER: We had the Attorney General figuring in the Supreme Court a little time ago in order to plead his own pet measure—the measure that he had lauded so highly and which we in this Chamber were pleased to pass and help to make law.

Mr. Taylor: What for?

Mr. MONGER: That Act, according to the line of argument adopted by the Attorney General, was very different from what he thought it was when it was carried in this Chamber, or else he was not quite in his element in placing before the Judges of the Supreme Court the views which he had previously placed before this Chamber. Whether the Attorney General was wrong or the Judges were wrong, I leave the people of Western Australia to say for themselves. But I hope that we have heard the last of these differences between the men and the employers, and I trust that that little episode at Millars'—

Mr. Foley: What about the one at Whittakers' and Bunnings'?

Mr. MONGER: I hope that little episode will be the last of its kind for a very long time to come. While on the question

of strikes, one must refer to the little business that has recently taken place on the trans-Australian railway. Is that a matter for congratulation? The Premier did not tell us anything about that; he did not tell us that there was any unpleasantness existing amongst men working on the trans-Australian railway.

Mr. Taylor: I thought Joe Cook was Premier of Australia.

Mr. MONGER: Who is to blame? I want to know whether the law is defective, or what is wrong. I say, without any hesitation, that there is something very much out of gear in connection with the attitude adopted, according to the reports in the Press, by the men working on the trans-Australian railway. I cannot congratulate any of the goldfields members or any of the goldfields Ministry upon their attempts to arrive at an amicable settlement. Here we had the men who placed my friends on the Treasury bench, out on strike for over two months. We did not see, according to the Press, that any of the Ministers went up to visit these men. If the Ministers did so, their advice must have been very bad; or else the men did not accept it. But what do we hear? We hear that that great class, the working man on the goldfields, the man who is championed by every gentleman on the other side of the House, prefers to remain out on strike for nearly three months and accept all sorts of allowances from brother workmen. But what else do we hear? I have often heard the dago and the ski derided by hon. members opposite, and I heard for an absolute fact that amongst the biggest contributors to the Trans-continental railway strike fund were those dagos of Kalgoorlie. I want to congratulate the working men of Kalgoorlie on having such friends as the dagos in the hours of trouble, and when they could not get sufficient from my friends opposite and those who supported them, the dago went to their assistance.

The Minister for Mines: From what source did you get that information?

Mr. MONGER: Will the Minister tell me it is not true? I am giving it to him and I am stating that it is true.

The Minister for Mines: I will tell you it is not.

Mr. MONGER: That is just what I expected to hear. All one can hear from that side of the House is a denial when something they do not like is referred to. I say it is true; and in a short time I shall inform the Minister for Mines of my authority.

The Minister for Mines: I will be glad to have the information.

Mr. MONGER: I have made the statement, and I will leave it to the Minister for Mines to ask whoever was in charge of the relief fund during the progress of that strike to ascertain whether or not the dagos were the biggest contributors to the fund.

Mr. Foley: Why should they not assist; they get as much if not more than ninety per cent. of the accident pay?

Mr. Taylor: What does the hon. member mean by dago?

Mr. Foley: A beautiful sunset.

Mr. MONGER: I understand that the unions did not have the slightest hesitation in accepting money from the dagos.

Mr. Foley: Call them foreigners.

The Minister for Mines: There is nothing exclusive or restrictive about our principles; they are very broad.

Mr. MONGER: I want to know, when my friends appeal for preference to unionists, whether they will also cry out that preference should be given to Brother dago Alphonso rather than to a Britisher? I would like that question answered by some of the gentleman occupying seats on the Ministerial side of the House; and I hope when the Federal elections are being fought, and when my friends on the Government side are supporting their senatorial candidates on the goldfields, they will tell the public of Western Australia that their preference extends to skis and dagos as well as to unionists, rather than to Britishers who do not belong to their union. I would like to have this matter given some prominence, especially on the goldfields, where there is a preponderance of labour support. I have also to congratulate the Government upon the success which has attended their efforts in connection with

the sawmills. I have also to congratulate my friend the Attorney General, in conjunction with the Minister for Works, for that magnificent agreement which has been so beneficial to Western Australia—I refer to the powellising agreement. I suppose, as everything is going on so nicely in connection with the State enterprises, that this powellising agreement must also be turning out satisfactorily, and I expect the Premier will say, as he has done in regard to other enterprises, that even if we have lost a trifle there is a big indirect profit. I do not know that it can be shown that there is going to be any indirect benefit in regard to this agreement, excepting to the patentees of the process. If the Premier or any of his Ministers can show that anyone else is going to get anything out of it, the State will be glad to know it. It is also satisfactory to know that at last the sleeper contract has been satisfactorily settled, and the only thing that remains is to see how far the Government will be able to carry out the obligations they have entered into. If any reliance is to be placed on the statement of the manager of the sawmills, the Government will find that they will have just about as much as they can do to carry out this contract. It is only a few months since we had our Federal representatives, and many members of the State Parliament, going round the country carrying resolutions at every timber mill, and going through the agricultural centres condemning the action of the Federal Government in cancelling the sleeper contract. We know how our Federal Senators ranted over the injustice done to Western Australia, but one thing that amused me very much was to find that whenever these gentlemen went round purposely to show what a dastardly Federal Government was in power, after speaking for half an hour or so, they pulled out share lists in connection with the proposed labour daily newspaper, and asked the audience to take shares in the concern. From what I could see, the Senators and many of our members of Parliament went round to condemn the Cook Government for cancelling the sleeper contract and at

the same time they were acting as agents to dispose of shares in the labour daily.

Mr. Munsie: It is a pretty good proposition too.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I would not take it as a gift.

Mr. MONGER: I hope that on the next occasion when my friends on the opposite side have to go round the country condemning any government or party for not carrying out something that they individually desire to see carried out, they will not make it the medium for trying to get the poor unfortunate public to take shares in what must undoubtedly be an unpromising venture. I hope they will have something better to submit to the public, instead of asking them to take shares in a concern which has for its object the finding of employment for perhaps a few of their friends.

Mr. Foley: And the downfall of a few of yours.

Mr. MONGER: It is quite interesting to know from the Governor's Speech that it is the intention of the Government to introduce a measure having for its object constitutional reform. I presume this is an attempt on the existence of the Legislative Council. For months past we have seen Ministers going round the country, the Premier, the Attorney General, and others, condemning the attitude and the opposition of the Legislative Council. We have heard all sorts of threats, and I can remember some considerable time ago, when the Premier came back from Melbourne, we were told we would hear what the policy of the Government would be with regard to the reform of the Upper House, and if I remember correctly the Premier made one of his interesting speeches to a big Perth audience, whom he addressed for a long time. The hon gentleman, however, was wise enough to say a lot without telling the audience anything. He did not tell them what he was going to do, and I would like to know whether this promise to bring forward constitutional reform is only one of those threats which we have so frequently heard, and so seldom seen any attempt made to give effect to. It is a great satisfaction, at all

events for those of us who sit on this side, that there are in another place gentlemen who have not to take their instructions from someone outside of Parliament. We know very well that the Ministry are not responsible to Parliament, but are responsible to someone outside, to caucus, and the Trades Hall, and whatever legislation is promised by the outside authorities the gentlemen on the Treasury bench have to attempt to give effect to it. I, for one, would like to know in what way they intend to bring forward a measure which will in their opinion do away with the powers that now exist in another place. We have had the Attorney General, from Esperance up to Northampton, telling us what they are going to do, but he has never told us how they intend to do it. I shall be pleased to see the way in which they propose to give effect to this constitutional reform.

The Premier: By constitutional means, of course.

Mr. Harper: From the Trades Hall.

Mr. MONGER: We are also told that we are to have the Irrigation Bill and the Traffic Bill reintroduced. I can only hope that on this occasion the Premier will not allow his chief henchman, the Minister for Works, to adopt the course which he did last session when he would not take any amendments from this side, but said, "I have brought this Bill down, and am going to have it carried. I am not going to take any amendments; I want the whole Bill or nothing." I venture to promise the Premier and the Minister for Works that if they try the same game again this session the Minister's pet measures will meet with the same disaster once more. Before these Bills are brought down the Premier should advise the Minister for Works to be more reasonable.

The Premier: Who is the leader of your party?

Mr. MONGER: We have no leader tonight. We came here believing that you would agree to an adjournment as soon as you had finished, but you would not.

On motion by Mr. B. J. Stubbs debate adjourned.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier. 1, Amendments to Public Service Regulations between 1st January, 1914, and 30th June, 1914. 2, Audit report and balance sheet of the State Steamship Service for year ended 30th June, 1913.

By the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin) : Amendment of By-law 24 of Leederville Municipal Council under "The Health Act, 1911."

House adjourned at 9.52 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 8th July, 1914.

	PAGE
Paper presented	198
Formal Business	198
Address-in-reply, fifth day	198

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: Amendments to the public service regulations made and gazetted between the 1st January, 1914, and the 30th June, 1914.

FORMAL BUSINESS.

The PRESIDENT: The Clerk will call on the Orders of the Day.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Before the Orders of the Day are called on, may I direct attention to a notice of motion standing in my name asking for a return classifying the successful applicants and the advances for homes under the Workers' Homes Act. It is a formal motion.

The PRESIDENT: According to Standing Order 15 it is not formal.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The Colonial Secretary is agreeable to treat it as a formal matter.

The PRESIDENT: Well, I am not. Standing Order 15 states—

No business beyond what is of a formal character shall be entered upon before the Address-in-reply has been adopted. The formal business which may be entered upon includes the fixing of days and hours of meeting and the appointment of standing committees and the first reading of Bills.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: I took it that the word "includes" would not be exhausted by that list.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban): I suppose it is customary for new members rising for the first time to preface their remarks by impressions which were gained on taking their seats in this House, and it is with this object in view that I desire to fall into line with the method adopted by previous speakers prior to commencing their speech on the Address-in-reply, and indulge in some remarks of the nature of a preamble. I, like most hon. members, received certain impressions at the commencement of the session's proceedings. Apart from the pomp and circumstances, one could not fail to be impressed, sitting here as I was for the first time, having just emerged from a serious campaign and being fresh from the field of battle, by being attacked as I was by the hon. Mr. Cornell. I have since learned that, ferocious as was the appearance of the hon. member in making that attack, he is quite harmless. Therefore, under the circumstances, I intend to be very brief in my remarks as applied to the hon. member, chiefly out of respect to the people who sent him to this Chamber to represent