

# Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 17th August, 1910.

Questions:	Page
Agricultural Bank and Machinery	352
Manufacturers	352
Labour Bureau, reports on employees	352
Agent General's office, reorganisation	353
Electorate boundaries	352
Mines loan to Callion G.M. Company	352
Sewerage works, Fremantle	353
State Fire Insurance	353
Bills, Early Closing Act Amendment, 1a.	353
Roads, 1a.	353
Address-in-Reply, ninth day, conclusion	353

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

## QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK AND MACHINERY MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. BATH asked the Minister for Agriculture: What are the specific rates of pay and conditions of employment to be observed by local manufacturers of agricultural implements, as approved by the trustees of the Agricultural Bank, to entitle such manufacturers to be registered under the provisions of "The Agricultural Bank Act Amendment Act, 1909"?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: Blacksmiths, Perth and Fremantle, 10s. to 11s. per day; body-makers, Perth and Fremantle, 11s. to 12s. per day; wheelwrights, Perth and Fremantle, 11s. to 12s. per day; painters, Perth and Fremantle, 10s. 6d. to 11s. per day; trimmers, Perth and Fremantle, 10s. 6d. to 12s. per day; strikers, Perth and Fremantle, 7s. to 8s. per day; fitters, Perth and Fremantle, 10s. to 11s. 6d. per day; improvers, Perth and Fremantle, 8s. to 8s. 6d. per day; labourers, Perth and Fremantle, 7s. to 8s. per day; drillers, Perth and Fremantle, 7s. 6d. per day; turners, Perth and Fremantle, 11s. per day; moulders, Perth and Fremantle, 11s. per day; furnacemen, Perth and Fremantle, 7s. 6d. per day; eight hours per day. The trustees consider that the rates of pay are satisfactory in all cases except in regard to unskilled labour, and they hope to see the rate increased to a minimum of 8s. per day.

## QUESTION—LABOUR BUREAU, REPORTS ON EMPLOYEES.

Mr. BATH asked the Premier: 1, Is it the practice of the Government Labour Bureau to file reports of employers in regard to employees which have been sent to them through the agency of the bureau? 2, Has such been done in regard to any particular instances? 3, If so, will he take steps to see that the opinions of employees are also registered?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, This is already done.

## QUESTION—AGENT GENERAL'S OFFICE, REORGANISATION.

Mr. BATH asked the Premier: 1, Will he place before Parliament a report of the result of his investigations into the working of the Agent General's office in London and his plan for the reorganisation of same? 2, What are the future intentions of the Government in regard to—(a.) The appointment of the Agent General, and (b.) The future conduct of that office?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, It is intended to appoint an Agent General when the report referred to has been dealt with.

## QUESTION—ELECTORATE BOUNDARIES.

Mr. HORAN asked the Premier: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a non-political Commission to adjust the boundaries of the proposed new electorates? 2, If not, is the Premier satisfied that any re-arrangement made departmentally will absolve the Government from partisanship therein?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Yes, if the matter is impartially considered.

## QUESTION—MINES LOAN TO CALLION G.M. COMPANY.

Mr. MURPHY asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Was an application made by the Callion Gold Mining Company for a loan of £1,000 from the Mining Develop-

ment Vote. If so, when, and for what purpose? 2, By what officers, and when was it recommended? 3, Was it submitted and approved by Cabinet? 4, Was a request made to amend the original application by the erection of a mill in lieu of a rock drilling plant? 5, Was the amended application approved by the officers of the department? 6, Was the amended application submitted and approved by Cabinet?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, An application was made on the 5th July, 1907, to assist in the purchase of a boiler, winch, rock drill plant, etc., to cost £2,783. 2, It was favourably reported upon by Inspector Greenard on the 16th July, 1907, and by the State Mining Engineer on the 25th July, 1907, who considered a good case for assistance as the company had already expended £3,843, and proposed also to erect a battery. 3, Yes, on the 16th August, 1907, and this House was so advised in answer to a question by Mr. Scaddan on the 10th September, 1907, and later in reply to a further question by Mr. Bath on the 6th November. 4, Yes, on the 14th October, 1907; and on the 16th April, 1908, in reply to a further request, the Minister replied that the offer of £1,000 would hold good if the company erected a ten-head mill, gave crushing facilities to the public, and good security, but subject to Cabinet approval. 5, Yes, by the State Mining Engineer. 6, Yes, on 16/10/1908.

#### QUESTION — SEWERAGE WORKS, FREMANTLE.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Works: When is it the intention of the Government to proceed with a further instalment of the sewerage works at Fremantle?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: The first reticulation area is now nearly ready. It is expected that it will be gazetted under the Act about the 27th inst., giving the statutory month's notice, after which the work will be put in hand.

#### QUESTION—STATE FIRE INSURANCE.

Mr. SCADDAN asked the Premier: In view of the actions of the fire insurance companies in raising their rates since the passing of "The Fire Brigades Act, 1909," in some cases as much as 50 per cent., will the Government consider the desirability of introducing a measure to provide State fire insurance?

The PREMIER replied: I am prepared to have inquiries made as to what increase, if any, has been made since the passing of the 1909 Act, but I am not aware that the rates have been raised.

#### BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Early Closing Act, 1902, Amendment Act (introduced by Mr. Angwin).

2, Roads (introduced by the Minister for Works).

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### *Ninth Day—Conclusion.*

Resumed from the previous day.

Mr. McDOWALL (Coolgardie): I am perfectly well aware in rising to speak on the Address-in-Reply that it will be very difficult indeed for me to find any new matter. I think it must be admitted that all the questions have been debated almost from every possible point of view; but I think that the only matter which might really be considered new would be the visit of the Premier to England. New as that is, however, the diary has been entered into so extensively that I shall refrain from alluding to it further than to say that I believe the Premier honestly and conscientiously did his duty towards the State during that trip to the old country. While it is difficult to find anything new to speak about, I certainly think it is incumbent upon me to speak my mind upon various subjects that are introduced into the Governor's Speech. The first matter that I desire to refer to is in connection with the Transcontinental railway, and that paragraph in the Speech which says—

Feeling that the delay in beginning the construction of the Trans-Austra-

lian railway is fraught not only with great injury to the interests of Western Australia, but is also a menace to the safety of the Commonwealth as a whole, my Advisers are of opinion that rather than incur a further indefinite postponement, the project should be undertaken by the two States through whose territory the line will pass.

Mr. Underwood: That is only a joke.

Mr. McDOWALL: The member for Pilbara says it is only a joke. It may be a joke, but I would remind the hon. member who is always endeavouring to make jokes not to take things so seriously.

Mr. Underwood: I should be ashamed of that one.

Mr. McDOWALL: In connection with this matter I certainly think with the member for Pilbara that it is a ridiculous thing to place in the Governor's Speech. This high falutin business in consequence of Mr. King O'Malley making an unofficial statement is, to my mind, altogether undignified. What was the necessity for it? It seems extraordinary that high falutin business of this kind should be indulged in the moment the Federal Labour party come into existence, when we know perfectly well that for many years past little or no notice has been taken of the matter, and during all that time Sir John Forrest occupied a Ministerial position in the Federal Cabinet. We further know as far as this question is concerned that it was the Labour Ministry that pushed the survey through. We know further that if it had not been for the neglect of Sir John Forrest at the inception of Federation, the Transcontinental railway would have been made a condition of Federation. Now, I think to mention the matter in this way is certainly unnecessary and uncalled for. Further, we must realise that the late Prime Minister dealing with the matter stated he would be disappointed if it were not dealt with during the coming Parliament. Contrast that statement with the calm, dignified utterances of the present Prime Minister, who declared distinctly that it was part of the

policy of the Labour party, and it would be pushed on as soon as possible. Under the circumstances I take this as a direct tilt at the Labour party in connection with this matter. When the subject was referred to it was discovered at once, that we had valuable land even in the far interior of Western Australia and we are told that the country Mr. O'Malley wanted to obtain from this State would represent something like two and a half millions sterling. Now, I marvel that everywhere in this State magnificent land can be found for all purposes except in the direction of Esperance Bay. I know the Esperance railway also is not a new subject, but at the same time I think every goldfields member has the right to declare that he believes that railway should be constructed. We have heard so much in connection with this matter from the recent deputation to the Premier, so many statistics have been furnished, that it is not my intention to labour the question. But we, on the goldfields, realise there is land in that direction, and that from many points of view this railway should be constructed. I want to say I think the agricultural policy of the Government is running mad. I do not wish to be misunderstood; I believe as firmly in the development of the agricultural resources as anyone can possibly do, but at the same time I think they should not be developed to the neglect of every other industry in the State. That seems to be the position at the present time. It might appear unnecessary to speak upon this question and upon goldfields matters generally to any great extent; because I think nearly all residents of the State realise the vast importance of the goldfields. But when we have men of the calibre of Sir Walter James and his late opponent, Mr. Nathaniel Harper, speaking disparagingly of the goldfields it is, I think, for us to show in a marked manner the importance of those goldfields to the State. At Beverley Sir Walter James said there were three great industries, mining, farming, and timber.

Mr. Underwood: That was a joke.

Mr. McDOWALL : Everything is a joke according to the member for Pilbara, except when he himself is speaking.

Mr. Butcher : Then he is the joke himself.

Mr. McDOWALL : Then, as an hon. member has interjected, he is the joke himself. Of course I know that he intends then to be a joke. Still, although in consequence of his extensive information the member for Pilbara may realise that these utterances at Beverley were merely by way of joke, there are thousands of people in the State who would not see the joke of it, and it is in consequence of this that I am mentioning the matter. It was declared by Sir Walter James that the life of the timber industry was, unhappily, short; and mining, he regretted to say, was showing signs of shrinking. The agricultural industry, however, was growing and expanding. Agriculture lay at the root of the State's prosperity, and mineral development was no good unless it helped to settle the lands of the State. Now, if that is not agriculture run mad, I should like to know what it is. The goldfields are no good except they tend towards the settlement of the agricultural lands of the State. That, of course, is a joke, I agree with the member for Pilbara; but it is a joke calculated to do considerable injury, and one that we should not allow to pass. Mr. Harper, in the course of his campaign, also made remarks not complimentary to the goldfields—remarks that certainly are not borne out by facts.

Mr. Heitmann : And the goldfields have made remarks not complimentary to Mr. Harper.

Mr. McDOWALL : The goldfields have served to make him comfortable, and he should be the last to speak disparagingly of them. However, I am not interested in the petty affairs of an individual; it is only because these matters have been mentioned in this way that I desire to raise my voice in protest, and at the same time to protest against the neglect of an industry that has made this State. Under the circumstances can we wonder that mining members object to this sort of thing? In the Governor's Speech it is set out that the mining industry continues

to be a great factor in the prosperity of the country. We are told that most encouraging reports have lately been received from various portions of the auriferous areas etcetera. "Continued developments through the existence of payable gold at great depth"—and so on it goes. But I cannot help observing that notwithstanding this there is no apparent desire on the part of the Government to talk about the encouragement of the great mining industry. Now, contrast this with the paragraph concerning agricultural railways. "Recognising that much of the future prosperity of the State depends on the rapid construction of railways" etcetera, "an advisory board has been appointed." Also, "a comprehensive scheme of agricultural railway extension will therefore be submitted." There is to be all this encouragement for agriculture. Understand that I am not objecting to any such encouragement; I am simply endeavouring to point out that this and other industries are being pushed forward to the detriment of the goldfields. Now, in order that we might look into the question of the sources of the wealth of the State let us glance at the abstract of accounts for the year just ended. The total revenue amounted to £3,657,670. Now, stripping this of all verbiage—I mean, reducing it practically to a profit and loss statement, taking away from the trading concerns the contras, and bringing the whole down to net revenue—we have something like £2,187,000. We have £2,226,036 with a debit balance, so far as the law costs are concerned, of £38,837, placing to the credit of this net revenue account £2,187,199. That money has been applied as follows:—Loan Acts, £1,003,204; special Acts, £55,545; His Excellency the Governor, etcetera, £14,769; the Treasurer, £175,901; the Minister for Agriculture, £58,539; the Colonial Secretary, £345,572. Of course, you understand I am taking the contras off and bringing it all down to a net revenue account. Then there was electoral and Crown law, £15,213; education, £183,699, and public works £124,819, leaving a balance to credit of £209,938, which, of course, reduced our deficit. Now I have only dealt with that because I wish, if I

enn, to illustrate the sources of revenue of the State. From taxation we have only £322,056; the railways produced £537,390—that is, taking off the £1,500 for the Commissioner's salary which is paid under a special Act. The Commonwealth return gave us £703,723. I could give you all the details, but I desire merely to point out that nearly the whole of the revenue is from indirect taxation to which the whole of the country contributes. And, the wealth being so largely produced by the goldfields, my object is to show that they are deserving of much greater consideration than they appear to be getting. The profit of the railways this year amounted to £537,390. Now that is largely made up of traffic on the Eastern Goldfields line; and in a goldfields' publication issued some time ago, when we were agitating for the Esperance railway—the Minister for Mines smiles, but I feel convinced he will be unable to disprove this—it was stated that since the construction of the line the Eastern Goldfields have returned, over and above interest and working expenses, the £1,300,000 which the line cost. That being so it necessarily follows that the revenue which has been produced in this connection is revenue brought into the coffers of the State—to pay the general debts and expenses of the State—very largely by the people of the goldfields. Under these circumstances my object is to try to bring home as well as I can the necessity to foster an industry that has been of so much importance to the State. At this stage let me repeat that, so far from its being my desire to injure any other industry, I will be just as pleased as any other member to do what I can to help such other industry forward. Again, we are told that our yields are diminishing considerably. Yet the mining report says that 1,070 more men are employed this year than last year. We have no fewer than 18,336 men engaged in the mining industry in this State; that is more than the white men employed in the farming, pastoral, orchard, and all other industries of that kind, as I shall presently show. It is the industry that brings the revenue-producing power to the State, and has enabled the State to reach the proud posi-

tion that is hers to-day. I know that during this debate the Minister for Mines has given you figures which are more up to date than I can give, because I must of necessity confine myself to the last mining report. From that we find that the dividends paid last year amounted to £1,359,115, while the total dividends paid amount to £20,323,010. Looking into the exports of the State we find gold is of paramount importance. Last year the exports were—gold £5,720,265 (the total production was £6,776,274); wool, £1,013,180; timber, £867,419; wheat, £129,025, and pearls £274,960. So far as wheat is concerned I think for the first five months of this year it has reached about £330,000, and we must admit that the production and export of wheat have rapidly advanced, but it is the gold industry that produces the wealth of the State. Now, to come to my own district, I do not wish to be parochial, but according to the mines report the district shows a decrease of 5,894 ounces, which is almost entirely to be attributed to the closing down of the Westralia Extension mine at Bonnievale. We are of opinion at Coolgardie that the mine should never have been closed down. It was worked for years on tribute, and then Warden Finnerty recommended exemption. They were entitled to exemption, but the warden placed a clause in that they should keep the mine fit for working, that is keep the water out of it, but that was not done, and the result is shown in the report—the mine was closed down for over a year. It is now being worked again, and by tributers, but there is no doubt that had that mine been working at the proper time we should not have that decrease in production. Every endeavour was made to prevent the granting of the exemption without the conditions necessary. I hold a typewritten document addressed to the Minister for Mines showing the whole of the circumstances in connection with the case, and showing the gold won by the tributers, and various other matters of the kind. However, no good will come of delving into that matter too deeply. I simply wish to point out that we do not consider we are receiving the sympathetic treat-

ment that should be extended towards an industry of so much importance. The other night the Minister for Mines said that capital seemed to have an antipathy to coming to this State, and he inferred, of course, that it was in consequence, I should imagine, of perhaps labour conditions or fixity of tenure or something of the kind—he did not use the words to that effect, but still that is the position to be assumed. As far as I can see the capitalist is protected in every possible way and receives every consideration; therefore, I do not think capital fails to come to this country in consequence of that. I maintain the industry should be fostered in every possible way. The Minister will reply that we have spent something like £275,319 in State batteries. That is true; but it is also true that, barring depreciation, the loss has not been very considerable upon these batteries, and in any case the treatment of these batteries has produced £3,127,794 worth of gold. According to the mines report the working expenditure has exceeded receipts by £19,015 5s. 9d., but the Minister the other evening gave the total loss on working as £32,000.

The Minister for Mines: I gave the Treasury figures. I explained there was a difference owing to stocks not being taken into account.

Mr. McDOWALL: It seemed extraordinary there should be a difference of £12,985 in six months, which is really an increase of about 65 per cent. However, that is only by the way. I only mentioned it to show the discrepancy between the report and the Minister's figures. Now, there is the question mentioned by the member for Kalgoorlie the other evening, that of water supply. I am not going to enter into any lengthy discussion of that question, I think it was well expressed by the hon. member, but I heartily concur with the hon. member that the mines are not treated as well as they ought to be in connection with water supply. Their owners feel it is hard, indeed, to have these harsh conditions imposed upon them, and to be compelled to use the scheme water only or pay a very much increased figure for it. I wish now

to refer to the case of the Redemption mine in my own district. It is an unfortunate matter. The previous proprietor was forced to give up and the Mines Department took hold of the lease. Some little time ago I submitted to the Minister a proposal to let the men, to whom some £230 of back wages was due, work it on a tribute system, or anything of the kind, for six months in order that they might have some chance of getting their money out of it, but the Minister would not agree to that, and he made a counter-proposal which the men found it impossible to comply with. I have ever so much correspondence in connection with the matter, but I have no desire to weary members by reading the whole of it. I will simply read a letter from Mr. Andrews, the solicitor acting for the men, who, after various correspondence and reports had passed between us, wrote to me as follows:—

The men are anxious to hear further from you what definite arrangement Mr. Gregory will come to. I see no reason why the proposal we made should not be turned into the form of a tribute if Mr. Gregory prefers it so, provided there is no royalty charged until the men's first charge for wages is satisfied. All that the men ask for is permission to use the plant to see if they can work their wages out of the mine. Surely Mr. Gregory ought to find some way of doing this. Let him refer to his mining inspector if he is afraid of the practical difficulties.

We could not possibly get the men together a second time. They were prepared to go in and work for the wages due to them, but nothing could be done. Tenders were called for the mine, with the result that it was practically put off for a month, and now the men are scattered everywhere, and they feel they have a considerable grievance in connection with the matter. Having dealt with these questions I wish, if I may digress, to go into figures in connection with other industries in the State, farming and agricultural particularly. Those engaged in farm work are—males 10,201, females 2,242, total 12,443; those engaged in

dairying are—males 540, females 413, total 953; those engaged in orchards and market gardens are—males 2,623, females 357, total 2,980; those engaged in the pastoral industry are—males 4,615, females 1,675, total 6,290. This makes a grand total of 22,666, of which 4,687 are females. Those of the white races employed are—males 15,193, females 3,263. I wish at this stage to point out that the white males employed in all these industries of the State are less than the white males employed in the mining industry, being 15,193 as against 18,336. The Asiatics employed in our industries are—males 790, females 7, total 797. The aborigines employed are—males 1,996, females 1,412, total 3,408. My object in mentioning these figures is to again show the absolute importance of the mining industry, and that it should receive the utmost consideration from the Administration. I am well aware that I shall be answered that it does receive every consideration and that it will receive every consideration, but the little points I have mentioned will go to show that there are little pin pricks that are felt in every mining district. I venture to assert that every mining member in this Chamber knows of similar cases to those I have mentioned. I have not attempted to enlarge on them, because I think it unnecessary to do so, but I am convinced that the majority of mining members find a want of sympathy and a want of desire to push ahead the mining industry that makes the State. Now, just a word or two in connection with immigration. The policy of the Opposition in that regard is well known. There is no objection to immigrants, provided there are suitable openings, especially in the country. That being so, we maintain there should be an opportunity for those persons to get on the land and to obtain their livelihood in that direction. It is said that such is not the case at present. I have no instances of that kind at my command. I am not brought so much in connection with agriculture, but in connection with immigration I think that if money were expended in pushing the mining industry—as all roads lead to Rome, everything comes back to mining

—the population of this country would vastly increase. We have only to take the lesson of the past. In 1894 our population was 82,014. Then Coolgardie was just becoming known. In three years the population increased to 161,694. It nearly doubled, and that splendid population that came to the State then is now peopling the lands of the State. If, by the fostering of the mining industry, another Kalgoorlie could be discovered—and there is ample room in this country for a dozen more Kalgoorlies—then the population would flock to the State, and every industry would advance in consequence. It is for these reasons I maintain that every possible assistance should be given to our great mining industry. A business man with several branches of his business would be looked upon as very foolish if he neglected the one that was the best paying in order to foster others that might eventually become of greater importance. One question I desire to say a word or two about is that of education. I am pleased to know that the Government are desirous of extending educational facilities in the State. They talk about the establishment of a university, and this, if established on proper lines, must commend itself to all of us. They also talk about having continuation classes for young people whose period of education in the primary schools has terminated. We want many more primary schools, and there is no doubt, as the Attorney General said the other night, that the education of the people will do both sides of the House an immense amount of good. I think he was especially referring on that occasion to this side of the House. It is a good move, but at the same time before becoming too ambitious, so far as education is concerned, we should see that none of the teachers in the department are being sweated. It is a well known fact that teachers are very poorly paid, and that there is a certain section actually being sweated. I allude to a number of unclassified teachers who do equally as good and important work as classified teachers, and are recognised as being among the very best in the State, and yet they receive a miserable pittance of a

salary amounting to something like £90 a year on the fields, exclusive of the goldfields' allowance. Mr. Chubb, one of the inspectors, in dealing with this question says—

Something should be done for some of the unclassified teachers. We have a system of classification which depends in the first instance upon passing examinations in scholarship. We have some assistants who cannot pass such tests but who do really first-rate work. Cases are not unknown of where an unclassified teacher may be in one room and a classified in the next room with almost double the salary, and yet the unclassified is much the better teacher. It is a pity that in cases where unclassified teachers do work of exceptional merit the regulations do not permit of higher salaries being paid as some recognition of such superior work. If we could institute a special certificate, say a "D" certificate, for teachers, tenable only while they show excellent work, and allowing them something extra in salary while they retained the certificate, we should only be doing a fair thing. For such teachers the salaries received are very small.

Some attention should be paid to that recommendation, for it is not right that this State should employ people to teach our children at a starvation wage, a wage on which it is absolutely impossible for them to keep themselves decently. I hope the Minister will take that question into consideration. So far as the other educational matters are concerned, I am extremely pleased, as I have said, to see that the Government are moving; but at the same time I trust that if there is a question between primary education and a university, the former will score on every possible occasion. A question agitating the minds of the people of the State at the present time is that of redistribution of seats. We are told by the Attorney General that it is intended to remove certain anomalies in connection with various electorates. It must be admitted that there are some anomalies, but I am convinced that at the present time the goldfields have not too much repre-

sentation, and any attempt to lessen that representation will meet with the most serious and strenuous opposition. There may be some justification for altering certain boundaries, and as a matter of actual fact it must be realised that my electorate is one in which the boundaries should be altered.

Mr. Heitmann: They are going to wipe it out altogether.

Mr. McDOWALL: I do not think there is much chance of doing that. Coolgardie will always be—

Mr. Scaddan: Coolgardie.

Mr. McDOWALL: Yes, Coolgardie. And it will always be entitled to representation of some kind or other.

Mr. Daglish: It will always make its views heard.

Mr. McDOWALL: Always. This might be a joking matter so far as some members are concerned, but it is not so in my case. It must be admitted that Bonnievale and Burbanks, and even the 25-Mile, should always have been in the Coolgardie constituency. A rectification of anomalies would mean that the boundaries of the Coolgardie electorate would be altered in some such direction. There is a table dealing with the various electorates, and this shows that in Coolgardie we have 1,689 people on the roll at the present time. There is a difference between Coolgardie people and those on the roll elsewhere, for they are worth far more than the ordinary person, as they take the trouble to vote at an election. At the last election, for instance, no less than 90 per cent. of the people on the roll voted.

Mr. Underwood: An intelligent vote too.

Mr. McDOWALL: Thank you; so it was. One must not always go entirely by the extent of an electorate, for the intelligence of the electors and the way they turn up to vote must also be taken into consideration. If this is done it will be realised that even now we have a fair voting population in Coolgardie. On the Northam roll there are 4,770 voters, and on the Yilgarn roll 2,149. I see no objection whatever—I am only uttering my own sentiments—to bring the Yilgarn seat into a portion of the Northam seat, and extending Coolgardie to take in Bur-



banks and Bonnievale, and a portion of Yilgarn. If the Government mean to rectify anomalies by such a means as that, then a Redistribution of Seats Bill is necessary, but if they do not mean that, if they are going to lessen our goldfields representation, and add it to the farming and coastal districts, it will be distinctly unfair. The mass of figures I have presented showing the number of men employed in the various pursuits of the State, and showing the valuable gold production of Western Australia, should be sufficient to prove that the goldfields should retain their present representation. After all is said, however, there are really no tremendous anomalies. Northam and North Perth are, I think, the most glaring.

Mr. Daglish: What about Subiaco?

Mr. McDOWALL: That is somewhat large, but I think the member for the district rather appreciates it. These anomalies are nothing like those that existed in the early days. There was no great outcry for redistribution then. In 1901 the Mount Burgess electorate, now really Yilgarn, had 2,450 electors on the roll; on the other hand East Kimberley had 107, West Kimberley 263, Pilbara 428, Beverley 551, Gascoyne 308, Greenough 397, and Irwin 237; total 2293. Those people were entitled to seven representatives as against one for Mount Burgess. These conditions were disgraceful, and the result of the existence of such anomalies was a misgovernment of the State for a considerable time. I admit the position was altered to a certain extent, but anyone can appreciate how glaring was the unfairness then. So glaring a state of affairs does not exist now, hence I cannot understand the anxiety of the Ministry to do away with some goldfields seats.

Mr. O'Loghlen: They have not yet said they will.

Mr. McDOWALL: But there is a very shrewd suspicion that they intend to do so. It has been whispered that such a thing is likely to occur. I am giving my opinions on this question of redistribution without knowing what the Government proposals are; but at all events the Government will have no doubt as to my sentiments on the question. This matter re-

quires very grave consideration, and is not one to be trifled with. On giving consideration to it, it is evident that there is really no necessity for a redistribution. If the population statistics are examined, it will be understood readily that there is no warrant for a reduction. An alteration of boundaries might be warranted, but a reduction of districts never. Here are some figures published in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* the other day as to the number of men engaged in mining on the goldfields. In 1908 the number engaged was 17,266, and for 1909 18,336, showing an increase of 1,070. On the Eastern Goldfields generally the increases were as follow:—East Coolgardie, 363; Phillips River, 30; Dundas, 62; Yilgarn, 111; Broad Arrow, 48, and Mount Margaret, 8. The decreases were:—North-East Coolgardie, 30; Coolgardie, 74, and North Coolgardie, 12. Does a decrease of 30 people in the North-East Coolgardie district warrant any chopping and changing, and humbugging about with the electorates? Coolgardie only showed a decrease of 74; but, now that Burbanks is going ahead, and if the Minister gets the Redemption and other mines at Bonnievale going, that number can be made up in a week. Everyone who has been in Coolgardie once, and obtains an opportunity to return there, rushes back like lightning. That is all I desire to say on the question of redistribution. I sincerely hope the Ministry will very seriously consider the question.

Mr. Troy: Do not apologise for the fields; let the Ministry apologise for their poor representation—the Premier's seat, and several others.

Mr. McDOWALL: As the hon. member points out, there is really no occasion for us to apologise for the fields. As I have said there are now 1,689 voters on the roll in my constituency. If you run down the list you will find that Gascoyne has only 1,409, Greenough only 1,440, Geraldton only 1,674, all less than Coolgardie. I did not intend to trespass upon the time of the House so long, but now that I have started I shall give a few more of these figures. If we are to be interfered with on the goldfields, the

coastal seats should also be interfered with. Even at Kanowna, about which there is so much talk, there are 1,880 electors, while Kimberley has only 1,413, Murray has only 1,142, Roebourne has only 521, Sussex 1,609, Wellington 1,760, and so on until we come to Bunbury which has only 1,647, something like 40 less than Coolgardie has. The member for Mt. Magnet asks why we should apologise for our small constituencies.

Mr. Daglish: That shows the need for redistribution.

Mr. McDOWALL: It shows the need for a readjustment of boundaries, but it does not show the necessity for cutting out representation affecting the various industries.

Mr. Foulkes: Give us the figures in the metropolitan area.

Mr. McDOWALL: East Perth has 3,852, North Perth has 3,425, West Perth 4,550, and so on around about Perth.

Mr. Scaddan: What are the Perth figures?

Mr. McDOWALL: Only 2,729. Hannans has 5,210 and Kalgoorlie has 3,520. As I have stated it was not my intention to go extensively into this question but merely to express my opinion that a redistribution should be in the direction of the re-adjustment of boundaries and not a reduction of seats affecting the various industries in the State. It must be admitted that although agriculture is advancing it has had more representation in the past than it has been entitled to. It is not a serious matter to adjust the boundaries of the agricultural districts, and giving them some representation. If we were to do that we would have fair representation; that is what I maintain should be done, and the same course could be followed on the goldfields. I have no objection to the boundaries of Coolgardie being altered: as a matter of fact I maintain they should be altered. As the member for Boulder has pointed out, Coolgardie at the present time is an ideal constituency, inasmuch as it only goes three miles from the post office, and I can go to the Tivoli theatre and the town hall and address the whole of my constituents from the plat-

forms. It is very satisfactory from that point of view. Joking aside, I think it must be admitted that there are certain districts around Coolgardie which should be included in it. For instance, it is ridiculous that Yilgarn should come all around Coolgardie, which is the case at the present time. Yilgarn absolutely encloses Coolgardie. That is all I desire to say in connection with this question of the redistribution of seats, though I believe there will be a word or two said before the matter is disposed of. And now I desire to add that that is all I have any wish to speak about on the present occasion. I have other notes, but I think I have said sufficient to keep things going for at least a little while, which is all that was necessary. I trust that the mining industry, which I have endeavoured to show is, after all is said and done, the mainstay of the country, will receive more encouragement in the future than has been the case recently. Of course, there was a time when mining received a great deal of attention, but since agriculture has made rapid advances there seems to be a desire to overlook any other industry. That desire should not exist. I trust sincerely that the goldfields will receive that just measure of treatment to which I think they are fairly and properly entitled.

Mr. HAYWARD (Wellington): My remarks will be very brief, and I intend to confine them to the one important matter, that of immigration. Having spent the best years of my life on farms in England, I think I may claim to be in the position to know something about the relations between farmers and their employees. Before going into the general question, however, I would like to make a few remarks in reply to what the member for Brown Hill stated regarding the employment of immigrants in this State. He said that at the present time immigrants were being sent out here as farm labourers, and that they were finding positions in the country and were content to work for lower wages than our own people in the State who were following similar occupations. I may say that in England at the present time there is a divis-

ion of labour in connection with farming. For instance, one man will carry out the work of ploughman on a farm and he will do nothing else. Another will be engaged on manual labour, doing draining, ditching, filling and spreading manure, harvesting and preparing corn for market. All this has to be done in a neat and workmanlike manner, and not in the rough and ready style of this State, where appearances are a secondary consideration. The same thing applies to men who look after stock. They do nothing else, and never have anything to do with manual labour on the land itself. One cannot expect people from England, and who have been occupied in this kind of farming occupation, to come out here and go out in to our back country, and to receive the same wages as qualified local men, or men who have had long experience. The new arrivals are perfectly at sea in our country. You would find on many farms in England that the men employed there have never done any work with an axe. Send this class of man into our back country and you will see that he will not know what to do. I merely make these remarks just to show that if the member for Brown Hill had understood the question he would not have spoken as he did. No doubt, if we could get men from the other States they would be better for our purposes, but I do not believe in taking away people from the other States; I think we should go beyond the seas for our immigrants. Our object would be to increase the population of Australia generally, and not go on robbing Peter to pay Paul, as it may be said we are trying to do. With regard to labour at the present time there is really no surplus. The numbers who have emigrated and who have gone into the cities have reduced the available labour which, at its best, was barely sufficient to enable the farmers to carry on operations. With the great areas of land which are being thrown open for selection, and which are being taken up, there must follow an even greater demand for men. The immigrants who make up their minds to settle here must expect to work longer hours. I have studied the question for many years, having spent 20 years of the

first part of my life on two large farms in an Eastern county of England, places that I have since revisited. I have spent the greater part of my life mixing with farmers and their men, and am still corresponding with them, and I think I can claim to understand their position. In England a farmer receives 14s. or 15s. a week, out of which he has to pay for everything, including his house rent. Compare that with the wages they get here.

Mr. Bolton: That is not a fair comparison surely?

Mr. HAYWARD: But we must compare the conditions existing in the two countries. I have relations in England engaged in farming, and they keep me well posted.

Mr. Taylor: Is it a general custom in England for an employer to pay wages, and for the employee to find everything for himself?

Mr. HAYWARD: Yes; that is the position. The employee has to find everything for himself. Owing to the strenuous efforts on the part of the Premier during his visit to England, we are now getting a fair number of immigrants, but we can never hope to compete with Canada and other countries which are spending much more money in advertising that we are doing. Our only course, therefore, is to turn our attention to other countries.

Mr. Heitmann: You will have to treat them better than the Government treated the Stirling Estate settlers.

Mr. HAYWARD: I do not know anything about that. I have had experience among different nationalities, and I think that if we could only get some Germans they would make the very best settlers. I know a good many of them who are here, and who are, without exception, as useful settlers as anyone would wish to have. I do not know, however, whether the Emperor of Germany would allow them to come out here. We have plenty of them here and perhaps we could get some more. Then again, in respect to the dairying industry we could with profit turn to Denmark, and Sweden and Norway. Denmark produces the best butter in the world, while for the invention of

the cream separator we are indebted to Sweden and Norway. I certainly think some effort should be made to get immigrants from these countries. Touching upon another aspect of the question, I think the introduction of, for instance, the hardy Norseman would exercise a beneficial influence over the physique and stamina of the next generation. Another race of immigrants who, notwithstanding certain prejudices, will be found to be desirable is that of the Italian. In my own district there is a number of Italians, very good settlers. They get a little land of their own and go in for wine-making, and drink it themselves in moderation. They cultivate fruit generally, and I must say for these men that never have I known one of them to appear in the police court. From different parts of Italy you get different classes of men. However, as I have said, we have a number of them in my district and I would be glad to see more of them. I think we should attempt to bring out here some of the young English farmers who, although possessed of a little capital, have no opportunity of carrying on farming operations for themselves in the old country. In England the number of farms is limited, and if a man has four or five sons it is impossible for them to obtain farms of their own.

Mr. Taylor: Owing to the deer parks.

Mr. HAYWARD: Parks reserved for game in England usually consist of poor, sandy land of very little use for cultivation. Only one son can succeed the farmer; the others must come out of England if they want to follow the old occupation. It seems to me we have a better prospect of getting some of these young fellows here than we have of securing farm labourers.

Mr. Gill: What would you do with them—would you give them land?

Mr. HAYWARD: Yes, they can get land.

Mr. Gill: They will require to know more than others know.

Mr. Bolton: You would have the Government buy up a few more estates.

Mr. HAYWARD: There is plenty of land available: it is only a question of

time. Another matter touched upon is the proposed manufacturing of machinery by the State. I would be glad indeed to see the price of harvesters reduced, but I doubt very much whether the Government could in this respect successfully compete with private enterprise. Then we would have to contend with our neighbours on the other side of Australia. There is the question of royalty on patents.

Mr. Angwin: You could build a good machine without interfering with any patents.

Mr. HAYWARD: If that be so it might alter the case, but most of the parts of a harvester are patented and covered by royalties; in fact everything in connection with harvesters is covered by royalty. Again, we have not in this State timber fit for use in the manufacture of harvesters.

Mr. Angwin: Is not our jarrah as good as Tasmanian blackwood for the purpose?

Mr. HAYWARD: Our jarrah is very heavy. I myself have sent samples of all our timbers to manufacturers, but all declined to use them, simply on account of the weight. Portable machinery, it must be remembered, is of necessity made of the lightest wood possible. I am quite satisfied that we have no timber in the State fit for the manufacture of farming machinery. I think the proposition of the Minister for Works was about as good as any I have heard. He proposed that we should have small manufactories in different parts of the State where the manufacturers would be certain to apply their inventive genius to the bringing out of new machines and the modifying of old ones. The largest manufacturers have all started in a very small way by taking out patents for one implement or machine of which they have made a specialty. Messrs. Ransome & Sims, formerly Messrs. Ransome & Sons, started in a very small way. In the early part of last century Robert Ransome took out a patent for a self-sharpening, chilled ploughshare, which has since been adopted all over the world, and has proved the greatest boon ever conferred

on farmers, saving them many thousands of pounds. Later on, the firm began the manufacture of ploughs with wooden beams and handles. They now manufacture about a hundred varieties, all iron. This firm commenced in a small way in one of the back streets of Ipswich; to-day their works cover nearly thirty acres of land and they employ upwards of 2,500 hands. Then there is the firm of Messrs. Turner, who began by patenting a smooth roller mill for crushing linseed, which was for a time used for feeding cattle. Now that firm, employing a large number of men, do a vast business in roller flour mills. I could name several other firms, which from small beginnings have grown into immense commercial propositions. Now if these small factories were to be established in our State and were given slight assistance in the beginning, it would meet the case, and probably certain of them would develop into large concerns. There is only one other little matter to which I would refer, namely, the proposal to establish State flour mills. That, perhaps, is the last thing the Government should touch. I have had considerable experience in flour milling myself, and I can say that it has become almost a science. It is most difficult to procure a thoroughly competent manager, for not only must he understand the manufacture of flour but he must also have to his credit a considerable experience in the buying of wheat.

Mr. O'Loughlin: Is the business more difficult than that of gold extraction?

Mr. HAYWARD: No, I think not. Perhaps they are about on a par. The member for Geraldton mentioned that in his district at the present time there are three flour mills working, while others will soon be established by private enterprise. What is there to prevent the farmers all over the State going in for co-operation in their respective districts? Certainly the establishment of flour mills is the last thing the Government should be asked to undertake.

Mr. Taylor: Are you against the proposed purchase of a number of cows?

Mr. HAYWARD: I know nothing of that. I have merely been giving a few

ideas of my own—merely throwing out a few practical hints; and if they should prove of value I shall indeed be glad.

Mr. A. A. WILSON (Collie): I had not intended speaking on the Address-in-Reply, but as the debate is getting a little weak it seems to me that, like Johnny Walker's whisky, a bit of Scotch might put some life into it. I have read the Governor's Speech, and I find it contains many subjects that, perhaps would have been better left out, and others that, perhaps, will be discussed in the near future. Among these are the amendment of the Constitution Act, the redistribution of seats, liquor law reform, the agricultural railways extension, and the Trading Accounts Bill. But the Government have omitted to make any reference to the Workers' Compensation Act, the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and the Coal Mines Regulation Act. I regret these subjects should have been left out, because I feel that some consideration should be given to the workers in these matters. When such provision is not made plenty of scope is afforded hon. members to tell the House what they would have done if given the chance. I desire to correct a statement made by the member for East Fremantle in connection with the Donnybrook jam factory. I regret that the statement should have been made, because, as a rule, the member for East Fremantle is very correct in his utterances.

Mr. Angwin: I cannot make a statement without having at least rumours to go upon.

Mr. A. A. WILSON: Rumours are ugly things and best left alone. When the hon. member was speaking on the Address-in-Reply he said—

I notice from the Governor's Speech that it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Trading Accounts Bill. I was hoping when the Minister for Lands was speaking the other night that he would have given us some information with regard to the Donnybrook Co-operative Society. It is known that this society started a factory at Donnybrook for the purpose of manufacturing jam on the co-opera-

live principle, but it was such a side issue as far as co-operation was concerned that they could not co-operate together without getting some financial assistance from the Government to carry on. What is the position to-day? There are some rumours about, and I have heard that the factory is closed down, and I have also heard that a meeting has been called to wind up the concern. If such is the case, and the Government have advanced several hundreds of pounds towards these works, I consider it is necessary that we should have some information with regard to the security which is held for the money advanced. If the Trading Accounts Bill is for the express purpose of assisting industries such as this, I only trust that hon. members may give close attention to it when it comes before them for consideration.

When once you have attacked any person or society with a rumour it is very hard to get that rumour off; when you fling mud some of it sticks. I have here a letter from the secretary of the Donnybrook Co-operative Society touching upon the remarks made by the member for East Fremantle. The letter reads—

I draw your attention to remarks made by Mr. Angwin in the House on Thursday (cutting enclosed) which I have no doubt you have seen. I have written the *West Australian* giving an emphatic denial, but it will be impossible to entirely counteract the mischief. The remarks are unfair and unmanly, and appear, judging from the quarter from which they come, to be done with a distinct purpose.

It is bound to have a disastrous effect on getting in the calls, and will injure our credit, which so far has been good. Mr. Angwin should be asked to disclose the source of his information in the House.

I have an intimate knowledge of the society, and I knew the rumour was incorrect. I knew it was on a sound basis, and in this morning's *West Australian* members will find a letter in which the

secretary of the society gives the rumour a denial. I mention this because, where farmers or co-operative parties set out to benefit themselves and the State at large, it is unfair for members to come to the House with rumours without first trying to substantiate them.

Mr. Angwin: We want information.

Mr. A. A. WILSON: I think the hon. member should have got the information before making the statement. If the Trading Accounts Bill means assistance to industries like the jam factory at Donnybrook it shall have my support. I trust it is for that purpose. In regard to workers' compensation, I have always held that when a man receives an injury compensation should start from the time he meets with the accident, and I think the Government would be justified in at least getting that clause of the Bill introduced by the member for Dundas through the House. I also consider that in coal and gold mines bad ventilation or bad air should be treated as an accident. A man working in an atmosphere loaded with powder and all the foul gases attached to it has sometimes to knock off work for two or three weeks at a time because the poisonous fumes have been injurious to his health. In my opinion that is an accident, and I consider the Government would be justified in treating it as an accident. I trust the Bill introduced by the member for Dundas will get the consideration it is entitled to by humanity, if not by the Government. Last session I introduced a Coal Mines Regulation Amendment Bill, but I got no further than moving the second reading. However, from a remark passed by the Minister for Mines I understood he was going to introduce an amending Bill, and I am disappointed to find there is no mention of it in the Governor's Speech. At present in the Collie coal fields they are making preparations—I should not say preparations, but they are cutting the life out of the mines so much that in the near future, I warn the Government, there will be a Whitehaven disaster at Collie. They are cutting the pillars and supports out of the mine. This is bad and inefficient management, and one mine

has collapsed altogether. In yesterday's paper there is this report—

Collie, August 15th. A subsidence of the roof of the regular workings in the Collie-Cardiff mine occurred early this morning, the area affected extending considerably over 100 yards. A heavy mass of ground came down over the pillars but none of the miners were injured. Mr. Briggs, the inspector of mines, ordered a cessation of work, and it may be several days before the workings are cleared and passed as secure enough to permit of the resumption of coal-winning operations without danger.

I want to correct this slightly. It was the management who ordered the cessation of work and ordered the men out, not Mr. Briggs, the inspector of mines, and it is only fair to say it. The report, while it gives some idea of the state of affairs, is not altogether correct. Where the fall occurred the pillars were taken out for yards and yards. The same state of affairs exist at another mine adjacent to the Collie river. I say, as a man with 30 years' experience, that with a little tremor in the earth and the men working below, we will have a disaster unequalled in this State. I warned the Labour Government of the same thing in 1905, writing to Mr. Hastie, who was then Minister for Mines, as follows:—

Dear Sir, I have been instructed by my union to draw your attention to the fact that the Collie Proprietary Coalfields of W.A. Limited, are at the present time "slicing the pillars," that is coal supports, at the Wallsend lease. The union have no desire to in any way interfere with the management of the mine, but they emphatically protest against any innovation in coal getting that will constitute an obvious menace and palpable danger to the lives of the workmen employed; under such circumstances our union desire an assurance from your department as to what is their intention in such a matter of grave importance to all concerned.

That was in 1905. But still the pillars are being taken out. I may say that in connection with the same mine it cost the

Government £900 to underpin the railway owing to the pillars being cut away.

Mr. George: How is it they get favoured?

Mr. A. A. WILSON: I do not blame the inspector, but there is some person doing something wrong, and I think it is up to the Government to step in before many valuable lives, perhaps, are sacrificed.

Mr. George: I could not see why the railways should have to pay that money.

Mr. A. A. WILSON: The Cardiff mine is in the same danger. And in speaking of this mine I may say the taking out of the pillars was enhanced by the Newcastle strike. Wherever they could get a pound of coal they ripped it out, and in some cases they ripped out the shale or roof and sent it away to the oversea steamers who were getting coal from them. I make this charge that I can take any nominee of the Mines Department to where the roof and the shale were absolutely blasted down to the floor and sent away to the ships as coal, and I stand on my privilege as member of the House in saying it.

The Minister for Mines: What mine was that?

Mr. A. A. WILSON: The Cardiff mine. They absolutely shot the shale from the roofs in the old bords and then filled the stuff into the trucks they sent away to the boats for coal. That was killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. Any company that sends away inferior stuff will not get customers. No customer will come back to a mine that supplies bad coal.

Mr. George: Who is inspecting it?

Mr. A. A. WILSON: The trouble is there is no inspector for other than Government coal.

Mr. George: But what are the miners doing? Why do they not protect themselves?

Mr. A. A. WILSON: The miner is told to fill that bad coal and he fills it; if not he gets the sack.

Mr. O'Loughlen: A miner is doing something now in asking for better inspection.

Mr. Angwin: We ought to have sent these managers to prison for the protection of the State.

Mr. A. A. WILSON: Personally speaking, I think it is up to the Government to appoint a Commission to see if these statements of mine are correct, and to see that the very best coal is sent out of the State. If the companies will insist on sending away bad coal we should take away from them any allocation of the Government trade. That is one of the ways in which I would punish these people. Now, in regard to the coal trade as a whole, I congratulate the industry, and the Government incidentally, on the fact that there was 39,052 tons increase in the output between the years 1908 and 1909, while the increase in comparison with 1907 was 70,000 tons. It shows that the coal oversea trade has come to stay, and it behoves the Government to protect that trade, now it has come to stay, from exploiters and from men who would deliberately send away pure shale and dirt in order to get a few pounds extra when a strike is on. The Government pay 10s. 6¾d. for an article of 10,500 British Thermal Units. If the quality of the coal goes under that, the price is reduced 1d. for every 100 B.T.U.; but if it goes to 11,000 B.T.U. no more is paid. I do not consider that is encouragement to any coal company to try to get better coal. Instead of merely reducing the price when inferior coal is supplied, the Government should also tell the companies that if they supply coal over 10,500 B.T.U. they will get the same increase per hundred. Instead of that, however, if the company produce coal good as Newcastle the Government will not give any increase, because 10s. 6¾d. is the maximum price for the value of 10,500 B.T.U. and over. I consider that any Government that wants to encourage the industry should encourage the people to produce a better article and then we would have a better trade.

Mr. George: You get the same thing if you reduce the price by so much.

Mr. A. A. WILSON: No; if you produce an article of 9,500 B.T.U. you are paid 9s. 8¾d. If you produce an article

of 14,000 B.T.U. you get 10s. 6¾d. just the same as for producing an article of 10,500 B.T.U. So the companies are not trying to get above the standard of 10,500 B.T.U. There is a shoe loose somewhere, and I believe the Government could, with satisfaction to themselves, give 1d. increase per 100 just as they reduce the price by 1d. per 100. It is proposed to build a railway from Wagin to Darkan. Now the settlers in the Beaufort and Arthur River districts were promised a railway years ago. Plans were given to the settlers showing a railway route to their district, but now it is intended by some people to cut the line straight across and leave these people out. I believe that if settlers are encouraged to go on the land, and if they get maps showing a railway will be given to them, the Government should in all seriousness carry out their promise. Therefore, I shall cast my lot for the people in that corner who have been promised a railway, and who are entitled to it by reason of the promise given to them, and because of the maps issued to them before they went on the land in the district referred to.

*(Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.)*

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. Frank Wilson): Owing to my indisposition, and consequent absence from the House during the past fortnight, I have not had an opportunity of listening to the various and many speeches which have been delivered in connection with the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. I regret that all the more, because one is quite unable, sometimes at any rate, to get a fair idea of what was in the minds of speakers from the condensed reports that appear in the Press. Apart from that, I have been unable, unfortunately, to follow the newspapers a good part of the time I have been absent from the House. I notice, however, that the burden of the complaints by most members who have criticised the Speech, prepared by the Government and placed in the hands of His Excellency the Governor, has been that it has been verbose, too lengthy, contains nothing new, and on



that account was unworthy of any special acceptance or commendation at their hands. These were the remarks chiefly of those opposed to the Government. I want to voice my opinion that the very fact of the Speech having caused so much discussion during the past three or four weeks is in itself a proof that it does contain matter which is of paramount importance to the State. There is no doubt the Speech would have received a like condemnation had it been curtailed, for then it would have been said that it was too short. We cannot please members altogether, we do not attempt to; but, we attempt in our best judgment to put before Parliament and the country, as concisely as we can, a true statement of the affairs of the State as they appear to us, and the programme of the Government. The remarks that have fallen from several members in connection with the opening paragraph of the Speech are, to my mind, uncalled for. I am sure members will not take amiss the expression of opinion when I say that the three paragraphs, brief as they are, with reference to His late Majesty the King, should have been received by members at any rate in silence, if not in commendation.

Mr. Heitmann: That is a matter of opinion.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To my mind there has never been a sovereign equal to the late King, and the expressions of regret at his demise were in proper form, and in proper language in that Speech. I know it is a matter of opinion, but unfortunately every member who has criticised those three paragraphs has thought fit to preface his remarks by saying he disclaimed any idea of not having as high an opinion of His late Majesty as those who drafted the Speech.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Everything can be overdone.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The criticism was undoubtedly overdone, but the paragraphs which referred to that unfortunate episode in the nation's career certainly were not. I did not intend to speak to the motion until I saw some rather severe criticisms of the Government, and more especially of the administration of the department which comes

under my own management, by the member for Kalgoorlie. I could not, of course, in justice to myself, and in justice to the officers who work under me, allow the many charges which that hon. member indulged in to pass by without making some reply, and some explanation, and showing indeed where that hon. member was very far astray and very erroneous in the charges he made. It would be expected, especially of a gentleman who fills the high position he occupies in the legal world, a gentleman who has had the advantage of sitting in this Cabinet for three years or more, and who knows the inside running, that when he took up the role of critic he should make himself absolutely certain of his facts, and state facts only to this House when indulging in such criticisms. I notice that the hon. member—I am sorry he is not in his place at the present time to listen to my reply—complains very bitterly that the Speech which had been placed in the hands of the Governor was verbose. With all due respect, if anyone wants something that is verbose and pedantic, I commend him to the speech of the member for Kalgoorlie as reported in *Hansard*. He accuses the Government of want of sympathy with the goldfields, and at the same time endeavours to point out how anxious he is to heal any little difference that may exist between the goldfields and coastal districts; how anxious he is to allay the feeling that the goldfields have not had extended to them by this Administration that sympathy he justly claims they are entitled to; and he goes on to endeavour to prove his statement by quoting certain cases in connection with the administration of the Goldfields Water Supply Department. Were he perfectly correct in what he said, I might perhaps give him credit for endeavouring to allay the feeling of suspicion against the coastal districts, and the Government in particular, which he says exists on the fields. Seeing, however, that his statements from beginning to end are erroneous in the extreme, inaccurate, as I shall prove shortly, I am justified in casting some slight doubt upon the claim the hon. member has made that he is endeavouring to suppress strife between the goldfields and coastal dis-

tributers. In connection with the water supply on the fields, he accuses the Government of want of faith, and quotes a case in evidence, that of the Hannans Reward Company. He led this House to believe, and I am sure members will agree that I am not exaggerating when I say that from the language he used he led members so to believe, that the Goldfields Water Supply Administration had oppressed the tributers who had been working on the mine, had behaved like Shylock towards them, had pounced down on their victims, and had practically ruined those men who were struggling to make a low-grade proposition pay its way. I want to point out to the House that in so far as the Goldfields Water Supply Administration are concerned, they have never in any way harassed the tributers. The fact of the matter is that the proceedings taken were against the company, and not against the tributers. Action was taken against the Hannans Reward Company. But the hon. member himself is the solicitor for the company, and the writ issued by the department was served upon the firm to which he belongs. That being so, one is justified in asking, even if I pass over the evident impropriety of a solicitor ventilating the case of one of his clients in this Chamber in this manner, why he did not make himself conversant with the full facts of the case, and give those facts to the House, so that members might judge as to the position he took up and the fairness of his criticism. The facts of the case are as follows: Since 1906 this mine has been supplied with water by the department at low-grade rates, namely 3s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons, which, as members know, is equal to one-half of the ordinary rate charged at present for mining supplies, namely 7s. The tributers were working the mine at that time and, getting into difficulties, they went to the Minister for Mines to assist them. A grant of £250 was made from the Mines Development Vote in 1908 to assist them to carry on operations. The member for Kalgoorlie distinctly stated, or he is reported to have stated, that it was not the tributers who got this amount but the company. The tributers, Hunt

and Williams, got credit in the books of the Goldfields Water Supply Department for £250, which the Minister granted them. In April, 1909, the year following, the tributers had run into debt to the tune of £504, representing nearly two months' supply of water, against which the department had a deposit of only £55. After many attempts to get payment, and many warnings that the department could not go on supplying them with water, the water was cut off. Then the company came to the assistance of the tributers, and they gave a guarantee that the debt would be paid, and that the future accounts of the tributers would also be paid. Then the water was turned on again. In October, 1909, the company came to the department and absolutely took over the whole of the account amounting to £708 then due under their guarantee, and they signed the ordinary application form, a copy of which I have here, to be supplied with water in the ordinary course. On the 14th of that month, in accordance with the promise they paid £405, leaving a balance owing which practically only represented the September account of £303. Hon. members will see at once that the company came in and took over the whole thing. I do not know whether they took over the tribute: at any rate, they took over the whole of the water accounts, and they signed the ordinary application and paid a sum of money off the account, which left a balance representing one month's supply of water. From that period up to the present time the tributers had had nothing to do with the department. From October, 1909, to April this year, when the mine closed down, the company took from the department water to the value of £1,907, and they paid on account of that sum in three instalments £856, increasing the debt, as hon. members will observe, to £1,355, against which we hold a deposit of £55. The net liability, therefore, is £1,300. In February last, two months before they closed the mine down, the company thought, evidently, that it was advisable that they should use Mundaring water only for steaming purposes and salt water for treating ore, and by that means make a saving. They came then to the depart-

ment, and I would point out that the department did not go to them or pounce on them and say, "You are using salt water, and you must pay a certain rate." They made an application to the department for a partial supply of Mundaring water, which gave them the right to use salt water for treatment of the ores on the mine for other purposes, and they signed an application, a copy of which I have here, asking that they should be supplied with Mundaring water at the scheduled rate of 10s. per thousand gallons. It was not owing to any action of the Goldfields Water Supply Department as insinuated or suggested by the member for Kalgoorlie, but because the company through their attorney, Mr. Sinclair, thought that their operations might be carried on more economically than had hitherto been done. I want to point out that the attorney frankly admitted to the secretary of the department that the man in charge of the mine, Hunt, I think it was, while managing it, certainly behaved foolishly in continuing to use salt water after it had been demonstrated that he could work more cheaply with scheme water under the regulations. Since the mine closed down £150 has been paid off the amount which was owing in May, and it was reduced to £1,150, an amount which now stands. Before the mine closed down the officers of the department, contrary to the implication that they harassed these people until they closed down, offered, under my instructions, to allow the old debt to stand over as long as the company would pay cash from day to day, or from week to week for the water they required to carry on operations. The attorney stated it had been decided to close the mine down for reasons apart from any question of water supply. Of course, the department has been pressing for the payment of this amount, and we have taken this position that we gave them credit because we knew they had assets on the mine which were valuable, and we kept ourselves posted as business men should do as to the position of the company. We knew they owed £600 outside and that they owed us £1,100, and on a conservative estimate made by our own officers, we reckoned that they had £2,000

worth of property on the mine, and that they should pay 20s. in the pound if sold up. We allowed them time, but we felt we were acting rightly in pressing for payment through the attorney, or that we should ask for some security if they wanted the account to stand over indefinitely. This was not forthcoming, and in June last, after all this time in giving concessions and in assisting these people to carry on, we issued a writ against the company. Immediately afterwards, within a couple of days, the attorney, Mr. Sinclair, left for London. He heard of the issue of the writ before he left, and on arrival in London cabled out to say that he expected to be able to make arrangements on his return to resume operations and to make a proposal for settlement of the account. I took particular pains to find out that he did propose to return, and on ascertaining from London by cable that he was leaving there on the 12th August, and that he would be here about the middle of September, next month, I stayed proceedings against the company pending his arrival. That is how the matter stands at the present time. I ask the House whether there is any justification for the charge which has been made, and whether this case can be quoted as evidence of want of sympathy on the part of the Administration to the goldfields, or with those who are struggling to make low-grade propositions pay. I want to point out that there is no harassing of the tributers. The writ was issued against the company and not against the tributers after every means had been taken to endeavour to meet them and as long as we could get our accounts secured. The company deliberately applied for a partial supply of Mundaring water, having decided to use salt water for treatment purposes, presumably because they thought it was cheaper.

Mr. Jacoby: Was that application granted?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Certainly; and there was no such thing as pressing the men who had been driven to the last extremity, as the member for Kalgoorlie stated, to use salt water in

order to get a livelihood and keep operations going. The statement was also made by the hon. member that the amount had been doubled through the increased charge for partial supply. That is obviously a gross exaggeration of facts. I have had the figures gone into, and I find that of £1,150 which this company owes to the department at present, only £174 is for the increased cost during the two months that they asked for a partial supply. Only £174, and yet the member for Kalgoorlie would have the House believe that the amount has been doubled because the department pounced upon those people like a Shylock on his victim to make them pay an increased price.

Mr. George: Does that £174 represent the increased charge per thousand gallons?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It represents the increased cost of water at 10s. per thousand gallons during the time that they were using salt water for treatment purposes. The next point that the member for Kalgoorlie made—and I want here to take exception to the very excessive language that he used in making these charges—was with regard to a clause in the agreement. This seems to be the usual method of procedure, and when one hears so many misstatements made and misrepresentations of the actions of Ministers and departmental officers by some hon. members, one might be pardoned for saying it is their usual method of procedure. The hon. member has put a wrong construction upon the clause that he criticised. He said that the clause was harsh in the extreme, and provided, so the hon. member said, that if the company installed any machinery which enabled them to minimise the waste of water, they were to incur a penalty. There is no such thing in the clause. The clause reads—"I agree that on the mine mentioned hereunder no appliances shall be installed which will materially reduce the consumption of water without your consent being first obtained." There is no intention, and there has never been any action taken to encourage waste of water. On the contrary, on many occa-

sions the officers of the department have advised their clients that they have seen wasteful methods in the use of water adopted at the different mines. It must be obvious if any big installations of condensing plants, for instance, were undertaken by the mining companies which would interfere to a large extent with the revenue of the department, the department must have the right to readjust its scale of charges. And when I point out that this matter was fully debated and discussed during the two days' conference I had last year with the executive of the Chamber of Mines, representing, as they said they did on that occasion, the interests of the whole mining industry, when I point out that we were entering into a three years' agreement, hon. members will see, how obviously necessary it was that I should take some steps to safeguard an extreme position of that character.

Mr. Holman: They represented only half a dozen mines.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They represented a large percentage of the revenue obtained by the Goldfields Water Supply Department, and I might here point out that the total revenue from the Kalgoorlie mines for all purposes last year was £120,000. Roughly, 60 per cent. or £72,000 is derived from water sold for steam purposes—that is, for boiler purposes. Now it was shown to me by our engineers that the use of special mechanical appliances for condensing water, such as those of the Fouché type, might reduce the consumption of water used for boiler purposes by as much as 90 per cent., which would be equivalent to a loss of revenue of from £50,000 to £60,000 per annum. Of course it is understood that those condensers if used would mean the consumption of a considerable amount of steam, and necessarily of fuel to create that steam; and it is a moot question as to whether it would pay companies to instal those condensers in a large way, going to the enormous capital expenditure and the cost of extra fuel, even with the water at 7s. per thousand gallons as it is today for the high grade mines. Indeed I

am of opinion that it would not pay; otherwise the mine managers would not have entered into the three years' agreement with the department. But surely if I had entered into that agreement for three years to supply these mines, who are by a long way the largest consumers of water from the scheme at a fixed rate, and I had not safeguarded the position; and supposing they had installed these mechanical appliances for condensing water and I had thus lost £40,000 or £50,000, or £60,000 in revenue, I wonder who would have been the first to condemn the administration of the Mines Water Supply Department? I venture to think the member for Kalgoorlie would have got up in his place and asked what sort of business man I called myself to enter into an agreement which left the door open for the mine managers to place me in that position, and to depreciate our revenue to that extent. I want to say again the department does not dictate to its customers. It does not prevent any economical methods being adopted for the use of water. It certainly does not prevent any one from using any means he can for the prevention of waste. But it does say in effect, we have entered into an agreement with you to supply you with water on the understanding that you will use a certain quantity and return us certain revenue; if, therefore, you adopt some means by which to reduce that quantity materially, 20, 40 or 50 per cent., then we must have the right to re-adjust our scale of prices, in order that we may make the proposition a paying concern, or at any rate keep it as near to being a paying concern as it is at the present time. The next complaint to which I am bound briefly to reply is that in regard to deposits. The complaint has been made by the hon. member, and other hon. members also, that a rearrangement has been brought about in the new regulation with regard to deposits against accounts. No one has ventured to argue that the department has no right to ask for a deposit, any more than anyone would venture to argue that the Railway Department should not demand a deposit against the

credit it gives. It was said that the original deposit was an amount equal to one month's supply. I want to point out that originally a deposit equal to one month's maximum consumption was asked for; but, unfortunately, owing to some disinclination on the part of the Ministers or officers, that deposit was not insisted upon, and nominal deposits were accepted, while in several cases no deposit at all was asked for. Often such deposits as were demanded did not equal one week's supply. When this state of affairs was placed before me by the officers of the department it was decided that we should put the thing on a sound footing, that we should take the power to demand a deposit equal to a six week's average of the previous six months' consumption. In many cases it is found that this is not so great as the maximum consumption of one month. That was a reasonable proposition to put into the regulations. We take full power to insist upon this deposit in cases where necessary. When it is remembered that accounts are rendered monthly and, very often, are not paid until the 20th or the 25th of the following month, it will be readily seen that a deposit equal to six weeks' average consumption is not too great to cover the liability. A deputation waited on me in July last, when there were present, the member for Kalgoorlie, the member for Kanowna, and the late leader of the Opposition, the member for Brown Hill. On that occasion there was presented a petition bearing 138 signatures and protesting against what was termed an alteration in the regulations. I had these signatures analysed, and it was found that of the 138 only 7 were in any way connected with the mines supplied by the Goldfields Water Supply Administration—only seven who represented those mines; and of the seven only four were immediately affected by the regulation, the deposits already in the hands of the department being found sufficient in the remaining three cases. The hon. members who waited on me on that occasion will remember I pointed out that whereas the regulation only empowered me to demand a deposit equal

to six weeks' consumption, the mines trust itself demanded, under its agreement with its members, a deposit equal to two months' supply—a bank guarantee, or cash deposit equivalent to two months' supply of water. They, apparently, were taking no risks at all, and it is satisfactory to the department that they ask for that guarantee. My reply to the deputation was that I would be quite willing that an officer should go up to the fields—indeed that was in reply to the member for Brown Hill who asked, "Will you send an officer up and endeavour to meet these people and make a satisfactory settlement?" I said I was quite willing to do that or to meet any reasonable demand, so long as we protected the revenue and were making no bad debts. The member for Kalgoorlie asked, "Will the officer be empowered to waive the regulation if necessary?" I said, "Certainly, he will be empowered to make satisfactory arrangements to both sides, always safeguarding the revenue. So long as we can meet the consumers satisfactorily to them and not make bad debts we are willing to meet them." The secretary visited Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie and Kanowna and personally investigated every case, and arrived at a mutually satisfactory agreement in every case in dispute; and to-day every case has been settled on a mutually satisfactory basis. Where then, I want to know, is the evidence in regard to this condition of discontent, so far as the mining industry is concerned? The hon. member has not been content to exaggerate this position—and I am sorry to think that by his action he has accentuated the ill feeling that undoubtedly has been engendered against the Government by the *Kalgoorlie Miner* during the past five or six months. The hon. member is assisting in that direction, but I think when an hon. member lays himself out to make charges of this description against any Administration, whether it be Labour or otherwise, he should be perfectly sure of his facts before making the charges which, of course, must be damaging, not only to the Administration, but also to the officers of the department, who cannot protect themselves and who,

in this case, are honourable, straightforward men, doing their work exceedingly well. He next asks for information in regard to the sinking funds and the special provision which is made for the maintenance of the water main and other portions of the works. Although the hon. member is not here just now I may, perhaps be pardoned for explaining the position as it is to-day. The original loan of £2,500,000 carries a 3 per cent. sinking fund. The additional capital of £366,500 was obtained by re-appropriations and, of course, it carries the sinking funds attached to the loans under which the money was raised, namely,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and 1 per cent. Supplementary borrowings from the Savings Bank amounted to £371,000 carrying a 2 per cent. sinking fund. The first and second accounts, including interest, are paid by the State, and in 1908-9 they produced a deficit of £81,000. In 1909-10 the deficit was £43,000, which had to be made good by the State out of consolidated revenue. For this financial year it is estimated that the amount will be a little less, and the deficit to be made good out of consolidated revenue will be something like £40,000. Special reserves set aside to equalise the cost of accruing maintenance expenses now amount to £55,000, and the sum of £11,000 per annum has for some years past been set aside for this purpose, the purpose of relieving the heavy increased maintenance of the mains and plant in future years. As it gets older the main requires more attention and more money expended on it, and as I pointed out, four years ago the cost of maintenance was £22,000, whereas last year it was £30,000 or £8,000 more. That is bound to go on year after year, therefore we set aside this £11,000 to equalise that expenditure. The present intention is to continue to set aside at least £11,000 per annum, and probably more if it can be spared, for this purpose year after year.

Mr. Scaddan: Have you calculated the loss on the workings after making all deductions?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, all deductions are made. The total amount contributed from Consolidated Revenue to

finance this scheme since its inception is £878,200. Where then, I ask again, is the evidence of a want of sympathy with the mining industry or the people who reside on the goldfields? Where the miner who may be carrying on his operations 50 or 100 miles away from this Goldfields Water Scheme has to find his own water for the purpose of treating the ore he breaks out, and yet has, through the ordinary channels of taxation, to pay his proportion of the amount which is made good out of Consolidated Revenue, the person who lives on the coast and who has no interest whatever, probably, either in mining or the water supply in connection therewith, also has to find his proportion of the amount contributed out of Consolidated Revenue to make good the deficit. Where is the evidence of lack of sympathy in what I have retailed to-night in connection with these two cases, and these are the two main points the member for Kalgoorlie depends on to prove his statement that the Government were out of sympathy with the requirements of the goldfields. Before leaving this aspect of the question I want to point out that the administration of the Goldfields Water Scheme is one of no small magnitude and that it is no child's play to control an administration of this size. It supplies not only the mines for their operations at Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie, and Kanowna, but it also supplies 12 principal towns, 14 townships, and 14 farming extensions, comprising in all some 40 reticulation systems of which all but eight are outside the goldfields districts. Surely if the administration is so bad we would have complaints from all these different centres, we would have people crying out here and there that the management was bad and that some alteration should be made in the administration of the department. But we have no evidence of that, we have no complaints as to the administration outside the goldfields, and very little from the goldfields, that is from those who are directly consumers. I believe that the Minister for Mines on one occasion agreed to receive a deputation but no one turned up at the appointed time to ventilate the grievances.

Mr. O'Loughlen: A deputation at Leonora agreed to meet a Minister but the Minister did not turn up.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is absolutely incorrect. If anyone has any ground for complaint in regard to that Leonora episode it is the Minister of the Crown for the discourtesy meted out to him. After having sent a message to the mayor that he was going to meet him, the Minister went out of his way to drive some two or three miles into Leonora at night, but his worship the mayor and the councillors would not meet the Minister.

Mr. O'Loughlen: They went to meet you.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They did nothing of the sort. The only arrangement I had was a wire from the mayor asking if I would receive a deputation when I went to Leonora with His Excellency the Governor en route to Sandstone. I replied that I would make arrangements on my arrival. The mayor knew that the Governor and myself were guests of the manager of the Sons of Gwalia mine at Gwalia. I told the member for Leonora that I would see when I arrived at Gwalia what arrangements had been made. When I arrived at Gwalia I saw Mr. McDermott who said, "There is no one to meet you at Leonora. I have seen the mayor; he has accepted an invitation to dine at my house with the Governor and yourself at seven o'clock, and he says he will do all he wants there after dinner." On that showing could I do anything else but go with Mr. McDermott and His Excellency the Governor? We waited dinner for 20 minutes for the mayor, but the mayor did not put in an appearance. Instead, a *cart note* came saying he could not attend, and that he had been to the station to meet the Minister. I immediately asked Mr. McDermott to send a note saying I regretted there had been any misunderstanding and that I would be in at a quarter past nine to meet the mayor and councillors. I drove in accordingly and ascertained that the note had been delivered to the mayor, but that he thought it *infra dig.* to wait for me, and he went to the pictures instead. I did not see him that night, and I had to go back to

Gwalia. I want to know who was the aggrieved person, the mayor with his councillors, the member for Leonora, or the Minister for Works, acting as Premier? I was pointing out the magnitude of this water scheme. If there is anything seriously wrong with the administration, surely we would have complaints from those supplied with water in addition to the goldfields. But that is not so; we have not these complaints. In every case with regard to the farming extensions, of which there is a great number, before an extension is provided we have a guarantee for 10 years from the farmers against the cost of the reticulation put in for their purpose, and they have to lodge substantial prepayments half-yearly in advance against the water supplied to them, these prepayments ranging from £2 to £35 per individual. But no complaint is made from these agricultural centres. They realise it is a boon to get this water; and if they are satisfied with the price they willingly give the guarantee and make these prepayments in advance, the same as are asked for on the goldfields in connection with the mining industry. The increased consumption in the districts apart from the goldfields during the past year has been nearly 12 per cent., and notwithstanding the increased prices during the last nine months, arranged last year at the conference I have referred to, and the alleged restricted conditions which have been made the bone of criticism against the Government, the increased consumption for mining purposes during 1909-10 was over 40 million gallons. This does not look as though the administration was putting undue or oppressive restrictions on the consumers. I would like to ask whether those gentlemen who negotiated the increased price with me could be classed as foolish when they agreed to a clause which was shown to them as essential to protect the revenue of the department? Surely if these mine managers, with all the acumen they undoubtedly possess and their business ability, thought so badly and so strongly of that clause, which the member for Kalgoorlie has made so much of, they would have resented it being put into their agreement

and would have refused to sign an agreement with that clause in. The next matter on which the hon. member makes a great mouthful and on which I regret to say he shows lamentable ignorance, is that of finance, more particularly in connection with the Savings Bank. He alleges waste, and he is going to set the financial affairs of the State straight through the investment of Savings Bank funds. He used very strong language in connection with that. He said it was nevertheless true but scarcely credible that although for money received in the Savings Bank the depositors were paid three per cent. by the Government, yet that money was now going to the Associated Banks for one per cent.; in other words that the Government were making a loss of two per cent.; also that to-day the Associated Banks had £200,000 of State money scattered among them bearing interest at one per cent., while we were borrowing on the London market and paying  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. And he used that as an argument that we were cutting down our charity votes and our hospitals and that we were striking home to the closer sense of the people. Let me point out how erroneous the hon. member is and how ignorant he is on the subject.

Mr. Heitmann: That is what we used to point out.

Mr. Walker: You used to put him up to reply to us.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That was on legal questions. I usually reply to financial questions myself. Let me put it clearly before the House, because it is well that members and the people should know the exact position of the Savings Bank. The surplus cash of the Savings Bank is lodged with the Western Australian Bank and has nothing to do with the Associated Banks; the account is kept at the Western Australian Bank. On the first £100,000, interest is allowed by the bank at 3 per cent., and not one per cent., as the hon. member says. On the second £100,000 lying at the Western Australian Bank to the credit of the Savings Bank, we get  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. True it is that under the agreement made with the bank they could demand that half of the £200,000 be placed at fixed deposit for 12 months



at 3 per cent., and the other half at fixed deposit for six months at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., but that has not been done. The interest at 3 per cent. and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. is paid so long as the amount to the credit of the Savings Bank is not below £200,000. There is a clause in the agreement enabling the bank to demand three months' notice of withdrawal for this £200,000; but as for the balance of the fund, which bears one per cent. interest, it can be withdrawn, notwithstanding what the hon. member says, at any time at call for Savings Bank purposes. If the Treasurer wishes to withdraw any sums to meet demands of the depositors in the Savings Bank for repayment he can withdraw at any time. If on the other hand, he wants to withdraw over £20,000 for other purposes he must give 30 days' notice. We have at present in the Western Australian Bank a credit of £650,000. There is not, therefore, £200,000 scattered broadcast among the Associated Banks at one per cent. as alleged by the member for Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Bolton: There is over £400,000 at one per cent. according to your figures.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: We have £450,000 at one per cent. at call which can be drawn upon in case of need.

Mr. Holman: It is bad business.

Mr. Jacoby: That is purely Savings Bank money?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; but is it bad business? The deposits in the Savings Bank amount to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  millions of money to-day. It is a moot question as to what is considered a safe margin to be held at all; that is, a cash reserve to meet the calls of our clients in the Savings Bank with  $3\frac{1}{2}$  millions deposited. I have maintained that 10 per cent. is sufficient, and that it ought not to go below 10 per cent. with the safeguards we have in our Government Savings Bank Act by which we can insist on having one month's notice of withdrawal up to £50 and three months' notice of withdrawal of over £50. Of course that is never acted upon but it is there. For instance, for the year ending the 30th June,

1909, which was the finish of my term of office as Treasurer, the amount of the cash reserve in the Western Australian Bank to total liabilities of the Savings Bank equalled 12 per cent. During the present year we have had a large accession of deposits owing to the liberalisation of the Act. Money has been rolling in, until we find the amount of cash reserve to total liabilities on the 30th June, 1910, was 17 per cent. Of course the ordinary banks hold much larger reserves than that; they hold a percentage of cash and bullion to liabilities which varies in Australia from 39 per cent to 83 per cent. the average for the Commonwealth being 52 per cent.; and the Bank of England, I would remind hon. members, has been as high in its reserve as 63 per cent., and has never since 1861 gone below 30 per cent of its deposits. I admit at once that there is no analogy between the Savings Bank and those trading institutions, for the reason that we have the safeguard in the case of the bank that we can insist upon notice being given before depositors are allowed to withdraw. I take exception to the statement made by the member for Kalgoorlie that if inquiry were made it would be found that this money, this £200,000 he talks about, but which refers to £650,000 as I have explained, was not at call. He said that the very most the Government could obtain if they were to exercise their full right would be £50,000, and that for the balance they would have to give notice not of weeks but of months. There is a statement to make to this House and the public. I have shown to-day we could demand £450,000, if the Savings Bank required it, from the Western Australian Bank. True, they might have some difficulty in finding it but we have the power to demand it, and so long as there is a sovereign or any bullion in the bank we could obtain payment. The hon. member was not content with making this misstatement, but said we were not entitled to call up more than one-quarter or one-fifth of the amount deposited except on long notice. The member for Swan I think it was wh

interjected, "You would dispense with the reserve"? And the hon. member for Kalgoorlie replied, "I would not keep the reserve at such a low figure." On the one hand, he blames the Government for having money on hand to meet claims made by Savings Bank depositors, and on the other hand he says we should make it more. I have never heard of such an attitude being taken up by any member of this House when speaking on the financial question.

Mr. Heitmann: He desired you to earn more money on it.

Mr. George: Show him how you would do it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member brought this question in for the purpose of attacking us for not having been more economical. He said also—

While this is supposed to be good finance it is suggested that we are justified in economising in small sums in country districts, cutting off hospitals, reducing charity grants; in fact, everything that strikes home to the closer sense of the people; while this is being done money is being wasted as I indicate.

Such was said by a man who professes to have knowledge of the subject he is discussing. The means by which he suggests the finances could be put right is that the Government should erect a building at a cost of £40,000 or £50,000 so as to have all the public departments under one roof, and he goes on to say that if this were done a saving of £2,000 a year would be effected on the rentals now being paid. A school boy would be able to calculate that if such a sum were borrowed at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or  $3\frac{3}{4}$  per cent., the interest together with the cost of raising the loan and of paying the sinking fund, would be at least as much as the estimated saving of £2,000 a year. His ideas are wonderful, but they do not mean much. He knows the Government have long had on hand a scheme for housing all the departments together if only they can get hold of the block of buildings, portion of which are occupied

by the Postal Department and another portion by the Municipal Council of Perth. This is a case in which we should hasten slowly. We do not want to make a mistake now. The Commonwealth authorities have given notice to return the postal buildings to the State, and we have agreed to take them back. The municipal council want to get out of the town hall buildings if only they can obtain a suitable site elsewhere. Therefore it is worth the while of the Government to wait, to hasten slowly, so that when the work is undertaken of housing all the departments on that block of buildings a good job can be made of it.

Mr. Angwin: You are spending £15,000 on new offices for the Stores Department, whereas you have buildings at Fremantle empty.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Fremantle provided the member for Kalgoorlie with another cause of complaint against the Government. He suggested we were spending too much money at Fremantle. A huge wheat harvest is expected this year for shipment to the markets of the world, and he suggested that we had not given proper consideration to the question of shipping wheat in bulk. I want to point out how wrong his assertion was. Before a system of shipping grain in bulk can be adopted, before the system in vogue can be altered, many matters have to be taken into consideration. I would remind members that in South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales, which States have been shipping vast quantities of wheat for many years past, the question is still one of investigation. In South Australia the question of bulk handling of wheat has been under consideration for the past 20 years, and the authorities there have not been able to come to a conclusion as to whether the system is practicable, so far as that State is concerned. From that it is easy for one to understand why we should not come to a conclusion on this case immediately. We have to face this position: Last year we had great delays in the despatch of vessels with wheat from the harbour at Fremantle. Our harvest this year promises to be much

in excess of what it was last year, and if that proves to be the case we shall be exporting double the quantity we did last season. Therefore, something had to be done immediately, and we faced the difficulty in order that we should not be caught napping, but be ready to handle the wheat next harvest. Not only was there the necessity to provide facilities at Fremantle, but there was also the question of buying rolling stock. That also was faced, and orders have been placed, both with the Government workshops and at Rocky Bay. We hope by this means to be able to carry the large shipments of wheat over our railways. The system which is being installed at Fremantle is the most up-to-date of all known in the Commonwealth. All the faults that applied to the principle of bag elevators and appliances, and which have been discovered by those engaged in the work in the Eastern States, have been remedied in connection with the system now being installed in Fremantle, and we hope that we shall have a most up-to-date plant suited to the methods adopted by our farmers at the present day and by our railway system. To carry out the bulk system in a proper manner it would mean, not only that proper waggons would have to be constructed and provided by farmers for getting their wheat to the various railway stations, but there would also have to be constructed proper railway waggons, grain-proof, to carry the wheat over the system. In addition, at every siding or station where supplies of wheat were delivered, there would have to be special accommodation for handling wheat in bulk, and that accommodation would have to be of such magnitude as to enable the farmers to store their wheat if they had not ships waiting to send it to, or were awaiting better markets, or if they did not want to send it on at that time.

Mr. Bath: The greater production will compel you to do all these things.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes, but not at the present moment. It cannot be done in five minutes. The system

has not been adopted in Canada exclusively yet.

Mr. Murphy: They have never done it in California yet.

Mr. Troy: How much has California produced?

Mr. Murphy: The most in America, while I was at sea.

Mr. Taylor: You are always at sea.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Here is another aspect of the case. Suppose we had appliances for bulk handling at Fremantle or any other port, we would then have to get special trucks constructed, whereas now we can use any sort of truck, from the covered-in van to a cattle truck, for carrying the wheat in bags. There would also be the necessity for having steamers specially fitted up for the traffic. Under the Board of Trade regulations, they would have to fit up the vessels with small compartments, as they are not allowed to carry wheat in bulk in open holds. Such vessels cannot carry general cargo such as rails and heavy machinery, to any great extent on the outward passage, therefore they must look to the homeward passage as a source of revenue. The fact that it has not been proved that wheat can be properly carried in bulk through the Suez Canal or via the Cape, together with the other reasons I have given, provides a sufficient answer to the statements made by the member for Kalgoorlie. The Government acted in a practical way. So soon as we realised that we might have to face a very much larger export of wheat this season than last, we took the matter in hand and did what was best in our judgment, on the advice of the officers of the Harbour Trust, to provide those facilities which will go a long way towards cheapening the cost of shipment and enable our farmers to compete with those who grow wheat in other parts of the Commonwealth. There is another question I have been called very severely to account for by the member for Kalgoorlie; that of the Fremantle election. I have already occupied some time in answering the criticisms which have been passed upon my department. This was necessary in defence of the officers of the

department, and I am the last man in the world to allow my officers to be attacked unjustly without standing up and defending them. If there be one matter I thought I had reason to be proud of to some extent during my brief occupancy of the Premier's office, during the Premier's absence in London, it was the result of the Fremantle election. Another was the action I took, and promptly, in connection with the Transcontinental railway.

Members: Oh!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of course members say "Oh." Members are entitled to their opinion, and I hope it will be based on sounder premises than those which resulted in the charges made by the member for Kalgoorlie. With regard to the Fremantle election I would like to know what act of mine or my colleagues was so disgraceful as to call down the condemnation of the member for Kalgoorlie in connection with that matter. He mentioned the matter twice; once at the opening of his remarks, and again during his concluding remarks. He implied that something wrong had taken place. He said we had gone to Fremantle to curse the candidate and had remained to bless him. I give that an absolute and unqualified denial. Before I went to Fremantle to address a meeting on behalf of the hon. member who sits in this House I knew that he had been selected to contest that election against a Labour member. The only action I took was to ask those of our way of thinking politically to see that only one contested the election against the Labour candidate hon. members opposite put up to win the seat. I am happy to think that my efforts and persuasions were available and were acceded to on that occasion. The result of asking them, not dictating to them, to select their own man was that they were patriotic enough to submit their names to a selection committee, and the choice fell on the hon. member who represents Fremantle at the present time. He it was who obtained the confidence and support of a great majority of the electors of Fremantle. I want to make a few remarks with regard

to the Transcontinental railway question which members opposite, or some of them, have had such a lot to say about. If I understand fully the feelings of the late leader of the Opposition, he has declared that he has perfect confidence in the present Administration of Federal affairs, and that he is quite prepared to sit back and wait until the Government builds the railway. I am not going to blame him for possessing that faith, but he must pardon me when I say that I believe a responsible Minister has no right to have such implicit faith as that in the party in power in connection with a matter which is of such vital importance to Western Australia. It is passing strange that those members that have condemned any actions have never said one word in explanation or in support of the attitude of the Minister for Home Affairs when he propounded—

Members: Oh!

Mr. O'Loughlin: I did.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Except the member for Forrest, when the Minister for Home Affairs propounded that preposterous proposal that this State should give up a large slice of its territory in return for the construction of the railway. The member for Forrest says, "Of course we would give up the territory." As far as I am concerned I say unhesitatingly that there is a large majority of the people in Western Australia who would never countenance any such action. I am satisfied that the action I took on that occasion stopped the land grab proposition which was promptly repudiated by the Prime Minister.

Opposition Members: Oh!

[Several interjections.]

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, who it is that is addressing the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must ask hon. members to refrain from interjecting in this manner. It is impossible for *Hansard* to take a proper report of the proceedings while there is so much interruption.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Let me point out that this matter is much more serious—

Mr. Seaddan: Will you tell me what the Premier promised in connection with this railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Premier promised that certain rentals from pastoral leases along the route of the railway should be set apart towards any loss in the working of the railway. What does the hon. member say it is that the Premier said?

Mr. Seaddan: The papers say that the Premier promised the revenue from a strip of land 25 miles on either side of the proposed route for all time.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the papers said such a thing then they are making a howling mistake.

Mr. Seaddan: That statement was published in the *West Australian* and was never denied.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I know exactly what the Premier said. The position with regard to the railway is this. I made a proposition to the South Australian Government, and I received a reply which I was prepared for. I do not know that a discussion on this matter will tend to help the subject forward, but I may as well tell members what happened. I received a reply that the Federal Government had agreed to introduce a Bill to acquire the Northern Territory, and that they had agreed to carry it through, and, therefore, as that Bill provided for the construction of the Transcontinental railway to Western Australia there would not be any need to take action as indicated. I published that reply at the time. I then immediately replied asking for the terms of the Northern Territory Acquisition Bill, or that I should be told the main features of it, so that I might be in the position to understand what it was that was going to be passed. Then it was pointed out that the measure was similar to that which had been presented by the previous Government. A copy of the Bill was forwarded to me, and I found in it that there was one small clause which referred to the Transcontinental railway to Western Australia, a clause which stated that, "the Commonwealth may construct or cause to be constructed a line from Port Augusta to the West Australian boundary of South Aus-

tralia." Every other clause in the Bill referred to the Northern Territory, and everything in connection with South Australia was referred to in the clauses as "shall" be done. The Commonwealth enters into a hard and fast compact that it will construct the railway, that it will take over certain territory and all the liabilities in connection with it, that it will take over the existing railway from Port Darwin to Pine Creek, and take over the railway system from Oodnadatta to Port Augusta with all the accrued liabilities in connection with the working of the system. The deficiencies amount to a large sum of money. Further on the Bill states that the Government shall complete the connection by building a railway south from Pine Creek through South Australian territory to couple up with the line which ends at Oodnadatta. It also provides that the overland telegraph line has to be taken over to a certain extent, and that altogether there is a liability of between five and six millions sterling which the Commonwealth must take over, and of which Western Australia must provide its proportion. In addition extra works are to be constructed and these will run into another five or six millions sterling, according to Senator McGregor, who introduced the Bill into the Senate. The total expenditure in connection with this measure, which is still before the Federal Parliament, will be something like £10,250,000, and Western Australia will have to bear its proportion of it. If the State has not to find the capital itself it will have to bear a proportion of the interest and sinking fund on the moneys which must be borrowed to carry out the effect of the measure. We have on the other hand the fact that the Federal Government is against the idea of raising loan funds, at any rate, as far as such works as the Northern Territory are concerned.

Mr. Bath: No.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They may raise loan funds for the construction of the railway.

Mr. Bath: And in connection with the acquisition of the Northern Territory they have practically stated that they regard it as one of the greatest assets in the possession of the Commonwealth.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: As I understand the principles of the Labour Government they have declared emphatically against the use of loan funds for any work not directly reproductive. It cannot be said that the development and the opening up of the Northern Territory, which has been such a drag, and has proved such a loss to South Australia for years past, is going to be reproductive.

Mr. Bath: South Australia has had no policy in connection with it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I want to point out that South Australia has done her best in connection with the Northern Territory. That State has built hundreds of miles of railways, established a port, and endeavoured to open up the mining fields there, and she has had what hon. members opposite object to, Chinese labour working on the mines. If South Australia has not been able to make a success out of all that what will the Commonwealth Government do? Anyhow, the prospect is not too alluring. But what I want to point out is, if that railway line be constructed, and it will be constructed on the passage of this measure, it will be built before any action is taken in connection with the West Australian railway. One is the law of the Commonwealth and the other an unwritten promise to a State. If that Northern Territory line is constructed, and if it is deviated into Queensland, and every effort is being made in that direction, New South Wales will also make an effort to couple up with it, and the time will assuredly come when we will have to fight for the retention of the mail boat service on the Southern coast. As sure as we are standing here, with the vast population of three and a half millions on the Eastern side of Australia against a mere handful of 300,000 in the West, the time will come when those people will secure the calling of the mail boats at Port Darwin instead of at Fremantle. I do not want to be an alarmist, but I want hon. members to understand what is passing through my mind, and what we have to safeguard this State against. We must stand together to see that Western Aus-

tralia is not more isolated than she is at the present time.

Mr. Bath: Will the Minister reply to one question; why did not these things strike the Government when Mr. Deakin's party introduced the same Northern Territory Bill?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There was never any suggestion that we should give these millions of acres of land to have the railway constructed.

Mr. Bath: The same provisions are in the Bill now that were in it when Sir John Forrest was a member of the Ministry.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have only seen the Bill just recently for the first time.

Mr. George: How much are the South Australian Government to give?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The South Australian Government are asked to give the same as Western Australia was asked, namely 25 miles on either side of the line. Hon. members have taken me to task for saying that Western Australia would build that line. I repeat rather than have that construction delayed for two or three years longer, let alone 10 years as will probably be the case, I would pledge Western Australia to build it. I am satisfied that the line would be a payable proposition very soon after its completion, and I am satisfied from inquiries that I have made during the past few months that we could build that railway on a 4ft. 8½in. gauge, equip it, and find a plentiful supply of water along the route for a million and a half of money. I am satisfied also that I could run that line for not more than a loss, over and above working expenses and interest on capital, of £25,000 per annum. And I am backed up by the expert officers of my department in my opinion that that loss of £25,000 per annum would very soon disappear, and that in a couple or three years the railway would be self-supporting. Yet we are asked to give up 14½ million acres of good pastoral land in return for that line, and we are told also that the Commonwealth Government may tax us to construct the railway out of revenue. I never before heard such a preposterous

assertion. If hon. members are honest in their advocacy of the interests of Western Australia, if they are true representatives of the welfare of the State, they ought to back up the Government in their stand in connection with this most important matter.

Mr. Taylor: Will South Australia do her share?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Does the hon. member think that South Australia cares twopence about the railway? I do not think he does. So long as South Australia can get her Northern line and get her Northern Territory taken over by the Commonwealth in order that she might be relieved of this great incubus, this losing railway system, she will care little about our line. And in the Bill she will not only give up the railway system of the Northern Territory but the Commonwealth undertakes to take off her hands the railway to Port Augusta, which represents some two millions of money, and also take over the telegraph lines through the Northern Territory—take over, in fact, all the bad “specs” of the South Australian Government. In the circumstances, can it be expected that South Australia would care twopence about the construction of the Trans-Australian railway? And this, surely, is in support of my argument that once that railway system is installed, if we do not fight for Western Australian interests the next thing will be the running of the mail boats around the Northern coast. The masses of the Eastern States are going to be looked after first. In the words of the Prime Minister, and I thank him for his frank declaration, the construction of this Trans-Australian railway is part of the programme of his Administration: yet he is going to undertake the duty that comes first and is nearest to hand. The duty nearest to his hand is the duty to Eastern Australia, and the development that is going to take place first is the development which will isolate Western Australia ten times beyond the isolation which exists at the present time.

Mr. Scaddan: Seeing that you know that South Australia will not undertake her share in constructing the Trans-

Australian railway, why this paragraph in His Excellency's Speech?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The paragraph states a fact. It states that Western Australia has entered into negotiations with South Australia.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Put a test motion before the House.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am prepared to make the construction of the Trans-Australian railway a test question at the next elections. I am quite willing to let the State as a whole decide it at the next elections. May I be permitted to say briefly that I deprecate the evident desire of some members to cast, shall I say, contempt, on the efforts the Premier made on behalf of the State during his recent visit to London. Now, I think it is fitting that we, as members of this Chamber, should give credit to whom credit is due, and I realise that the Premier worked like a galley slave from the time he left the shores of Western Australia until the day he returned. He worked hard for the State while in England, and the very fact that he was so well received goes to prove his ability in the advocacy of the interests of Western Australia. Why should the member for Albany, for instance, say that the Premier had gained an honour at the expense of the country? Why, bless my heart and soul, if the Premier could not do more good for the country than could possibly be represented by the paltry sum spent on his visit—if we could not secure the return of at least £1,000 for every ten pounds so spent, I should say his time was wasted and he had better have stopped at home. But I am satisfied that he has done excellent work. I am satisfied the result has been already of great benefit to Western Australia in the number of people that have come to settle on our lands, and I am satisfied that the benefit still to accrue to Western Australia is going to be—

Mr. Johnson: The tramway company is getting it to-day in the shape of immigrant “black-legs.”

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: How unfair the hon. member is. He has the

audacity to say that "black-legs" are going to work on the trams, when he knows that his own members have severed their connection with the company and withdrawn their deposits.

Mr. Scaddan: "Scabs" are going to work.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What right has the hon. member to use so objectionable a term as "scabs"? After the member for Guildford has drawn his own men off and dispersed them, are no others to have the right to accept employment from the company? Does the hon. member want to coerce every one of us into a trades union, so that we may be led by the nose by the member for Guildford, who has been the adviser of these men right through? Now, as the hon. member has not been successful, as his advice has been wrong, according to those whose duty it has been to review it—

Mr. Brown: He speaks feelingly now, seeing that his job as secretary has come to an end.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Oh, I was not aware of that. In that case, of course, I will have nothing further to say on the point. But I object that the hon. member should, when he finds that his advice has been faulty, as testified to by the Judge who heard the case—

Mr. Gill: He went out of his way to give a ruling on a question not before him.

#### *An incident.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Balkatta has reflected on a Judge of the Supreme Court; he must withdraw.

Mr. Holman: He stated a fact.

Mr. Gill: I simply said the Judge gave an opinion on a question he was not asked to deal with.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member distinctly said the Judge went out of his way. I ask the hon. member to withdraw. This is done in conformity with the rules of the House, and I am going to administer them.

Mr. Taylor: May I point out that the hon. member was dealing with the President of the Arbitration Court.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure the hon. member will withdraw. It is distinctly laid down in our rules that no reflection shall be made on the Judges.

Mr. Bath: I understand that precisely the same statement was made in a journal which appeared this afternoon. There is no reflection contained in the remark that a Judge has given an opinion.

Mr. Jacoby: Let the Speaker settle it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member said the Judge went out of his way.

Mr. Bath: Well, if a Judge gives an opinion in a case which is not affected, he is going out of his way, and it is a plain statement of fact rather than a reflection. Therefore I submit the hon. member should not be called upon to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: It was distinctly a reflection on a Judge of the Supreme Court to say he went out of his way to give a certain ruling. Our rules provide that the Judges shall not be reflected on in this Chamber, and I ask that the remark be withdrawn.

Mr. Holman: On the point of order raised by Mr. Bath, who referred to the publication to-day of the negotiations entered into between an individual and the tramway company to show why they could not run the trams. That case was heard merely on affidavits. The publication referred to is as follows:—

During the progress of these negotiations the action of McPherson *versus* the company was heard in the Supreme Court when Mr. Justice McMillan in giving judgment for the defendant company declared that the men were strikers, adding that the Act which made striking an offence ought either be struck off the statute-book or be enforced.

That case was never heard before the Court. No evidence was heard in connection with that case, and no Judge has the right to condemn men, and declare them to be strikers, unheard.

Mr. Murphy: On the point of order. I heard the remarks of the hon. member. I do not think he intended to reflect at all upon the Judge concerned. But I also



think that if his interjection bore that impression, not only to you, Sir, but to any other member of the House who is likely to take an objection to it, the hon. member is fair-minded enough to withdraw the expression.

Mr. TROY: I feel a little concerned about this, because I remember that on one occasion I also made some remarks here regarding a Judge of the Arbitration Court and you, Sir, were good enough to tell me personally that my remarks were almost unparliamentary. I want specially to thank you, because you told me this personally outside the Chamber. But I would like you to read the Standing Order which does not permit members to criticise a Judge. Because there have been many occasions in history of Judges acting wrongfully. We do not stand up to justify the acts of Judge Jefferies. May I ask you to read that Standing Order for the guidance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am perfectly familiar with the Standing Order. I am sure if the hon. member did not mean his remark in the sense in which I understood it, namely, as a reflection, he will say so; but that is the construction I put on his words, namely, that a Judge went out of his way to do a wrong act. We are all human and therefore likely to err, and I am not desirous that the hon. member should withdraw something he did not mean to convey.

Mr. SCADDAN: The hon. member did not say that the Judge went out of his way to give a judgment; he said "to express an opinion on a question about which he was not asked." Any Judge might do that, and any member might remark upon it without reflecting on the honour of the Judge or his ability on the bench.

The PREMIER: The hon. member who made the remark in question is about the last member in the Chamber to say anything which would tend to reflect on the House in any way; and I feel sure that in deference to your statement that you were under the impression he intended to convey another meaning he will express himself to that effect.

Mr. GILL: I do not know how hon. members took my remarks. I made them, but they were not intended as a reflection at all.

#### *Resumed.*

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: In conclusion let me say that the Government do not profess to control the elements and the harvests as has been suggested by some speakers, more especially by the member for Kalgoorlie. We do, however, ask members to believe that the policy that has been initiated and carried out with their support in this Parliament has, at least achieved these beneficial results which all along were prophesied for that policy by the Administration. We do ask members to believe that the improvement in the financial condition of the State is due in a very marked degree to the policy which has been inaugurated, and that the near future will show the land settlement policy, together with the provision for railway facilities in our goldfields areas, to be bearing those fruits which one looked for in the days of depression in the State. I am happy, indeed, to think that the State has at last turned the corner, that our finances are on the up-grade, that remunerative employment is to be found anywhere in Western Australia by anyone wishing to find it, and that we may look forward to a continuation of those prosperous times which have now set in, I hope, for many years to come.

Mr. MURPHY (in reply): In claiming my right to reply I do not intend to take up many minutes. I was quite prepared to forego my right had it not been for what I consider the very unfair and personal references made to me by at least one or two members during this debate. Before I deal with these remarks may I be permitted to briefly congratulate the member for Ivanhoe on his election to the very high and responsible position he fills? I believe it was the member for Kalgoorlie who said that, after the position held by the Premier as leader of the Government, there is no position in the House so responsible or so worthy of recognition as the one the hon. member now holds. I suppose all

of us must recognise what the presence of a strong Opposition is to the good government of any country, and also the great part in the good government of any country the leader of the Opposition invariably plays; and although it is not a new idea as far as one State of Australia is concerned, I would like it to be new as far as actual practice in this State is concerned that some financial recompense should be made to the occupant of that position over and above the miserable pittance he is now paid as an ordinary member of Parliament. I again congratulate the hon. member, and I hope he will be spared many, many years to render good service in the position he now occupies. During this debate every member who felt called on to refer to me personally and to the recent Fremantle election has done so, with one exception, in terms of friendly criticism. I admit the language was severe, but the smile on the face of the hon. member has been so genial that any sting in the language has been taken out. It remained, however, for the member for East Fremantle to introduce something of a decidedly unfair and grossly personal character.

Mr. Angwin: But the truth.

Mr. MURPHY: Well, I will deal with the truth. This hon. gentleman, this very consistent politician, this gentleman who has never for one moment deviated a hair's breadth from the pledge given to his party when they elected him, stood up and pointed out my inconsistency as regards some statements I made when I was mayor of Fremantle, and said that had he made statements of that character he would have been ashamed to have stood in the House and supported the Government with the language I used when moving the Address-in-Reply. What was the charge? The hon. member read several things out of the files of the *West Australian*, something about a quotation I once made use of, one of Lord Rosebery's quotations. Another extract he used was some remark that we were not being dealt with fairly by the Government when they reduced our municipal subsidy on the one hand and on the other hand took away from us, in conjunction with all municipal bodies in

the State, a right we enjoyed for many years, that is the right to half the police court fines. But the greatest of all charges against me was that I said while I was mayor of Fremantle that the neglect of the town by the Government during the last few years had been to the detriment of Fremantle. And then the hon. gentleman struck a most dramatic attitude, "Fancy an hon. member who made these remarks only a few months ago now supporting the Government?" When I made those remarks I made them because I conscientiously believed them to be true. It will surprise the hon. member that from my place in the House, and supporting the Government, I say now I still believe them to be true, that neither from this Government nor from any preceding Government has Fremantle received what she has a right to expect in return for what I call a cruel, an unjust, and an intended deadly blow that the Forrest Government gave her when they took the workshops from there and dumped them down on the swamps at Midland Junction.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Roads and bridges! Cannot get above it!

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member got in by roads and bridges, is here by roads and bridges, and will be of no use when roads and bridges are taken away. The particular portion of Fremantle I have now the honour to represent has, with one solitary exception, always returned a supporter to this side of the House. And I was sent here as a supporter of what? Not of the personnel of this Government, but of their policy. It was expected from me when I was elected by the people of Fremantle what the Ministry, or any section of the House, will always find me prepared to do, that I should render a fight when I think the interests of Fremantle are being assailed. However, whether I am guilty of inconsistency or not, the charge of inconsistency could have come with far better grace from any other member than from the member for East Fremantle. No member on the Government side of the House has been so fulsome in praise of the policy and personnel of the Government, in season and out of season, as the member for East

Fremantle has been; but if the whip was to crack on the Opposition side of the House, especially if handled by my friend, Mr. Taylor, the hon. member would prove his consistency by trying to displace the Government whose praises he so loudly sang. I admit this is only a general statement. Let me give one absolute illustration of the hon. member's consistency, one I know members opposite will appreciate. The member for East Fremantle was elected on, and gave his pledged word to support and do all he possibly could to have put upon the statute-book, every plank of the Labour party in Western Australia, and one of those planks is in regard to the reduction of the franchise for the Upper House. What did the hon. member do a few months ago? We had an election for the West Province. The candidates were the President, Mr. Briggs, who fought his election wholly and solely opposed to one penny reduction in the franchise, and Mr. McLaren, the town-treasurer, who fought his election by agreeing to a reduction in the franchise from £25 to £15. Now the member for East Fremantle, who is so ready to point out my inconsistency, my opinions that I expressed as mayor of Fremantle, which to-night I re-assert—what did he do? We find him so consistent to his party and its policy that he gave all his influence to Mr. Briggs, against the man who was standing in the interests of one of the planks of his party.

Mr. Angwin: Only a small portion of it.

Mr. MURPHY: I am always prepared to take, and I think any member of the hon. member's party is prepared to take, a small portion of a policy, time after time until the whole thing can be accomplished.

Mr. Angwin: Did you not do the same thing?

Mr. MURPHY: I was chairman of Mr. Briggs's South Fremantle committee; I fought for Mr. Briggs; I was proud when I helped to have him returned; and the knowledge that the member for East Fremantle, in his own particular electorate, was on the same side of the fight as I was only conveyed to me the same satisfaction

as would be conveyed to a general of an army who knows that some traitor has come from the other side to help him. We accepted the service; we despised the giver.

Mr. Walker: Fremantle is divided.

Mr. MURPHY: Just about time. During the remarks of the hon. member the Premier interjected to the effect that perhaps I was making the remarks when mayor of Fremantle, because I was looking for a job. It appears to me that no matter what side of the House I might be on I would still have been looking for a job if I had not found one for myself. That is all I wish to say as regards the hon. member for East Fremantle. Turning for a few moments to the speech of the member for Kalgoorlie, a speech which was delivered with great eloquence, and the most perfect grace of posture, a speech which took one hour and three-quarters to deliver, and contained nothing but most unfair criticism of the present Government, I would point out that when the present Government took office the member for Kalgoorlie was, and remained up to a few months ago, a member of it. Not every member of the House is endowed with the great intelligence the member for Kalgoorlie possesses in such a very marked degree; not every member has had the advantage of such a high education, and such a professional training as he, and such knowledge tells very much in a debate of this character. but for that gentleman to indulge in cheap sneering and rude remarks about the "milk and water" utterances of other members was beneath his dignity either as a barrister, a member of this House, or an ex-Minister of the Crown. I have yet to know whether, when all is said and done, the brain and not the tongue does not tell most in the good government of a country; I have yet to know that the poorest debater in this House, the member who may find it most difficult to convey in words the thoughts his brain conceives, is not as a legislator of as much value to the State as the member for Kalgoorlie, or any other member similarly gifted. It was an interesting study during that hour and three-quarters to sit on this side of the House and watch the

occupants of the benches opposite. Every face was turned in the direction of the hon. member for Kalgoorlie. Every Opposition member listened to each word he uttered with the most wrapt attention. Any remark made which they thought told against this side was received either with laughter or cheers, and members opposite recognised that in the hon. member they had one who, in expressing an opinion against the Government, conveyed that opinion in a better way than they could have done in, what that hon. member called, their "milk and water" fashion. While, however, they enjoyed that member's criticism of the Government they must also remember that he was a critic of their side. The member for Kalgoorlie gave his opinion of the only Labour Government that ever has had the honour to sit on this side of the House, and briefly his opinion was that the Labour Government never had any right to be there, that they had remained in office longer than they were entitled to, that one of the reasons for their clinging on to office was because of the emoluments their supporters were receiving from the Royal Commissions appointed during their term of office. That is his opinion of the Labour Government. He suggested that when they had gone to the country they had not gone willingly and would not have gone had they not been kicked there. The most conservative and biased member in this House does not believe that those opinions are true. So far as I am concerned, and I believe I am speaking on behalf of the majority of members on this side of the House, I may say that, differ as we may as to the policy or the methods adopted by the party opposite, I am uttering a simple truth without trying to flatter, when I say that during the term of office of the Labour Government their conduct was actuated by as pure and honourable motives for the good of the whole community as any other Government who preceded them, and the same remarks will apply if in the future a Labour Government again get into power. For a member to make the speech the member for Kalgoorlie did in Kalgoorlie, the speech which brought about his election and the defeat of the present hon. member for

Guildford, a speech in which he made charges he must have known as an honourable man to be untrue, is hardly the sort of thing one would expect from a man whose statements hon. members opposite were so ready the other night to accept.

Mr. Walker: He is on your side; not ours.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not think he is. I believe he started at this end of the Treasury bench, and gradually drifted to the cross benches, and I believe the only difficulty that exists about his going over to the other side of the House is that they would not have him there if he went. I see no hope for the member for Kalgoorlie but to make a little party of his own in the gangway.

Mr. Troy: Have you no recollection of other politicians having somersaulted?

Mr. MURPHY: I have heard of one named Ferguson—one of the Broken Hill strike leaders—who somersaulted. You do not call it a somersault that the member for Kanowna took.

Mr. Walker: Where was my somersault? Did I take a somersault?

Mr. MURPHY: Oh, none at all, absolutely no somersault. You call it a somersault when a man leaves your party and goes to another, but it is all right when he goes to your party.

Mr. Holman: What about the Attorney General?

Mr. MURPHY: The member for Kalgoorlie paid me marked attention in his speech, and made special reference to my election. He congratulated me on the fact that I had been elected, but qualified that in a very marked degree. He said the experience I had to undergo in connection with that election, and the one immediately preceding it, was of such a character that I would not care to undergo it again. He went on to point out that two Ministers had gone to Fremantle for the express purpose of damning me out of existence, but had remained to shower blessings on my head. Then to show his knowledge of the Bible, and to illustrate his meaning, he said that the only similar instance recorded in history was something to do with a relative of his called Balaam, who had come to curse

and remained to bless. All I have to say is that Balaam's example and actions were far more honourable, far more manly, than the example of the member for Kalgoorlie who came into this House on this side to bless and remained long enough to curse the party he was elected to support. When he found he differed so much from the Government and their policy that he was compelled to make the speech he made the other night, it was his duty to go to the electors of Kalgoorlie and say that he had been elected to the wrong party, and in fact that he should not have been the man chosen at all, but that Mr. Johnson should have been elected.

Mr. Bath? Will the hon. member tell us this—

Mr. MURPHY: Yes; tell you anything for your edification.

Mr. Bath: Will the hon. member tell us the exact relationship of the member for Kalgoorlie to the Government?

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member can make up any relationship he likes. A great deal has been said during the course of the debate owing to the fact that I was finally selected as the Ministerial candidate for the Fremantle election, and during the debate that election received a prominence it is in no wise entitled to. Had there not been so much criticism, it would not have received any notice at all, but the reason why there has been so much criticism is that even the member for North Fremantle would rather have run his candidate against Mr. Lynn than against your humble servant.

Mr. Bolton: I would run against either of you.

Mr. MURPHY: But the hon. member would rather have run against both of us than against one. I would just like to recount what actually took place in connection with that election. Twenty-four hours before the day of nomination I was not certain whether I would nominate or not.

Mr. Scaddan: You had a fair idea.

Mr. MURPHY: The people of Fremantle know the position exactly, and

are aware that certain matters might have eventuated at any moment to keep out my nomination. The moment the writ was issued Mr. Lynn announced himself as a Government supporter. He naturally did what I or anyone else would do, and that was he went and saw the members of the Government and tried to get their support for his candidature. I have Mr. Lynn's authority to say that the only promise he got from the Government was that they would support the man finally selected as the Government candidate.

Mr. Scaddan: Selected by whom?

Mr. George: You are letting out all the secrets.

Mr. Holman: Do not put the organiser away.

Mr. MURPHY: He was not there. I know I am somewhat labouring this matter, but I would like to put it straight, so far as the connection of the members of the Ministry with the election is concerned.

Mr. Troy: The action needs an explanation.

Mr. MURPHY: Probably, but not so much as some of the actions of the hon. member. Two other gentlemen had come into that contest and retired in favour of Mr. Lynn. When I announced my candidature the night before, negotiations were immediately entered into between my committee and Mr. Lynn's committee to see who had the best chance. At noon on the day of the nomination no finality having been reached, both of us deposited our £25.

Mr. Taylor: Then Grenike went down.

Mr. MURPHY: Grenike had nothing at all to do with it. Anyway, when finality was reached, as the Minister for Works has stated to-night, he knew at least two hours before he was called upon to leave Perth that I was to be the candidate, and if he wished to damn me he had no reason to go to Fremantle. I do not see a face on the Opposition benches that I did not recognise at Fremantle in the attempt that was made to keep me out of the House.

Mr. Taylor: You never saw me there.

Mr. MURPHY: I saw the hon. member there; he did not speak, but he got in some quiet engineering work.

Mr. Troy: Will the hon. member explain his association with the licensed victuallers who claimed him as their direct candidate?

Mr. MURPHY: I absolutely give that a denial; and if any hon. member can prove that I am the direct representative of the Licensed Victuallers' Association in this House I will resign to-morrow.

Mr. Taylor: They say so.

Mr. MURPHY: They do not say so; if they do I give it a denial here.

Mr. Bolton: It will be read out from their own *Gazette*.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not take their *Gazette*. The hon. member must be a better customer of theirs than I am if he reads their *Gazette*. I have nothing more to say except to move the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT—RAILWAY OPENING, MEEKATHARRA.

The PREMIER (Sir Newton J. Moore): I move—

*That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday next.*

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): I certainly think an explanation is due to the House for the adjournment over to-morrow. I cannot see the necessity, even though a number of members are going away, to take part in a function connected with the opening of 20 miles of railway, for the House to miss one sitting.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): I think the member for Cue, if he looks into the matter, will realise that a number of members are going away to-morrow afternoon to take part in the function connected with the opening of the railway to Meekatharra, and as the next business on the Notice Paper consists of moving second readings of Bills it is well that all members should be present. That is my reason for not opposing the

motion for the adjournment until Tuesday.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 23rd August, 1910.*

	PAGE
Election return, Beverley	389
Papers presented	389
Urgency motion, Perth Tramway Trouble	389
Privilege: Summonses served on Members	408

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

#### ELECTION RETURN—BEVERLEY.

The Clerk announced the return of writ for the election of a member for Beverley showing that Mr. N. W. Harper had been duly elected.

Mr. Harper took and subscribed the oath and signed the members' roll.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED

By the Minister for Mines: Papers in connection with the Collie Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund (ordered on motion by Mr. A. A. Wilson).

#### URGENCY MOTION—PERTH TRAMWAY TROUBLE.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from Mr. Scaddan the following notice of motion for the adjournment of the House, which I shall first read and then submit to the House in accordance with Standing Order 47:—"I desire to move the adjournment of the House in order to draw attention to the conduct of the authorities in the present tramway trouble."

Seven members having risen in their places,