

grown, but the presence of this hay-stack proved that the quality of the land is all right. Several other railways are referred to. I do not know whether they are warranted; no doubt they are. I recognise that we must build railways if we are to profitably develop the country. A couple of railways are required in my province, and no mention is made of them, but I hope that the Government or any future Government—if there is to be a change—will give these matters early consideration. One of the railways is from Northampton to Geraldine, which is about 15 miles from the terminus of the present line, and in which district there are men prospecting for lead. These men, to the number of about a dozen, are there are men prospecting for lead. These there is the Geraldine mine, which produced great quantities of lead in days gone by, and if this railway is built no doubt the mine will be reopened. The Raddera mine, which was closed for many years, is now working, and last year it produced over £42,000 worth of lead. Therefore I think that the railway referred to should be constructed. It would mean much to this portion of the State, and would be very useful to the settlers who are battling there to establish themselves. The other railway to which I have referred is the continuation of the Yuna Railway on to Mullewa. There is a fine stretch of country between these two places, and there are many settlers in the district; and not only would it be an advantage to them, but it would, in my opinion, be a very great advantage to the working of the railways of the Northern system. I hope the Government will give these railways early and favourable consideration. We have referred to a great number of works, and it means money to carry them out. I think the works are warranted, but we need more people here to help to bear the burden of paying the piper. I hope that the immigration policy which was started some time ago will be vigorously carried on, and that we shall see many more people coming into this State than we have had just recently. If we are going to develop

and settle this country, we must have more people. I have great faith in Western Australia, and I like to see it prosper. I am not going to refer at length to the finances of the State. I think they are not in a very satisfactory condition. It means either that we must have increased taxation, or retrenchment, or better administration. I have only to add that, whilst associated with the Country party, I will give conscientious consideration to every measure that is brought before this House, and will vote in the way that I think would be to the best advantage of the people, the whole of the people, of Western Australia.

On motion by Hon. R. J. Lynn, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.18 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 2nd July, 1914.*

	PAGE
Questions: Wheat Areas, Reclassification Board ..	84
State Timber Yard and Joinery Works ..	85
State Steamship Service, Repairs and interest and depreciation, Steamship "Western Australia" ..	85
Powellising Agreement, Sleeper contract, Payments and timber treated ..	86
State Implement Works, engagement of welder ..	86
State Brickworks, cost ..	86
Rottneet Island, visitors ..	86
Workers' Homes, leasehold blocks ..	87
Sawnmill permits ..	87
Railway Timetable, Great Southern ..	87
State Implement Works, Exhibition of products, Duplicate parts ..	87
Poison Lands Inquiry Board ..	87
Sitting Days and Hours ..	88
Government Business, Precedence ..	88
Committees for the Session ..	88
Bill: Freedom of Marriage, 1R. ..	88
Papers presented ..	88
Address-in-reply, second day ..	88

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

### QUESTIONS (2)—WHEAT AREAS, RECLASSIFICATION BOARD.

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Lands: 1. What are the names of the

officers of the board who recently made an inspection of the wheat areas for re-classification purposes? 2. Who was appointed chairman? 3. Has this Board made a report? 4. If so, will he lay the report on the Table?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Mr. H. F. Johnston, Surveyor General; Mr. Hewby, Chief Inspector Agricultural Bank; Mr. P. Packham, farmer. 2, No appointment as chairman was gazetted. 3. Yes. 4, Yes.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Has he received the report of the Re-classification Board recently appointed to visit the dry portions of the wheat belt, and report as to the best means of affording relief to those settlers whose lands have been over-valued? 2. If so, will he lay the report of the said board on the Table of the House?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1. Yes. 2, The report, together with the Government's decision in regard to the recommendations of the Board, will be made available at an early date.

#### QUESTION—STATE TIMBER YARD AND JOINERY WORKS.

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Premier: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to establish a State Joinery factory and retail timber yard? 2, If so, where, and at what estimated cost? 3, What value of soft wood, if any, has been ordered by the Government from the Eastern States or beyond the Commonwealth?

The PREMIER replied: 1. No action is being taken at the present time. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Approximately to the value of £1,000.

#### QUESTIONS (2)—STATE STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

##### *Repairs, and Interest and Depreciation.*

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Premier: 1. What is the total cost of repairs to each of the State steamers since date

of purchase? 2, Has the amount been debited against cost of running the steamers? 3. What amount respectively has been debited for interest and depreciation?

The PREMIER replied: 1, In the accounts up to the 30th June, 1913, the repairs are included with other costs, while the accounts up to 30th June, 1914, are not yet complete. To dissect the accounts necessary to get the information would take a considerable time. 2, All accounts representing local additions and structural alterations have passed through the hands of the Superintendent Engineer before being allocated to the Capital or Revenue expenditure. The requirements of the Audit officials have been satisfied in regard to the allocations to the end of June, 1913. During the last twelve months there have been practically no additions to Capital cost under this heading. 3, Depreciation—"Western Australia," £2,666 13s. 4d.; "Kwinana," £1,750 9s. 9d.; "Eucla," £775 12s.; "Una," £413 14s.; Interest charged to Revenue Account for year ended 30th June, 1913, £3,592 12s. 8d.

##### *Steamship "Western Australia."*

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Premier: 1, Has the Government been advised that it is impossible to run the State steamer "Western Australia" except at a heavy annual loss? 2, If so, is it the intention of the Government to continue running that steamer? 3, What was the cost of renewing the furnaces which were burnt down last year?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Government recognises that there will be loss on the running of the "Western Australia" on the North-West coast under present conditions, owing to the design of the ship being unsuitable for this particular trade. 2, Yes. Consideration, however, is to be given to proposals which should obviate loss without prejudice to, or interference with, the service as at present constituted. 3, It was found necessary to replace only one furnace. The cost, inclusive of fitting, was £140.

## QUESTIONS (2)—POWELLISING AGREEMENT.

### *Sleeper Contract under the Agreement.*

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Premier: 1, In view of the recent rise in the price of jarrah sleepers, is it his intention to enforce the contract for the supply of one million sleepers, which formed a part of the famous powellising agreement? 2, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The contract referred to was for the supply of karri, not jarrah, sleepers. 2, The State saw mills are now in operation, producing powellised sleepers, and it is not at present proposed to take any action in regard to securing supplies of powellised karri sleepers from any other source.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the million sleepers?

The PREMIER: There is the answer.

### *Payments and Timber treated.*

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Minister for Works: 1, Have any payments been made under the powellising agreement? 2, If so, what amount? 3, What quantity of timber has been treated under the existing agreement?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Works) replied: 1, Yes. 2, State Sawmills, £408 18s. 2d. (to March 31, 1914); W.A.G. Railways, £829 12s. 4d. 3, State Sawmills, 1,369,655 super feet. W.A.G. Railways, 2,636,336 super feet. Note—W.A.G. Railway figures include Royalty paid on piles treated for East Perth new power station for Public Works Department.

## QUESTION—STATE IMPLEMENT WORKS.

### *Engagement of Welder.*

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Minister for Agriculture: Is it a fact that a man named Wilfred Shaw engaged under contract as an oxygen acetylene welder to the Atlas Engineering Company was induced to break his agreement in order that his services should be obtained for the State Implement Works? 2, Is it a fact that he was offered and

is being paid 14s. per day, including holidays, whereas his agreement with the company was for 12s. per day, exclusive of holidays? 3, If so, does the Minister propose to endorse the policy of enticing men away from private employers and thus become a party to inducing men to break their agreements? 4, Is it a fact that the paying of this man 2s. per day above the ruling rate has caused the demand from similar workers in the loco. shops for an equivalent increase?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, No; the position was advertised in the ordinary way and Shaw applied. He signed a form representing himself as not being in employment. 2, He is being paid 14s. per day, but is only entitled to holidays provided under the Industrial Agreement. 3, Answered by No. 1. 4, I understand that representations have been made asking for a similar rate of pay for men employed on this particular work. The manager of the Implement Works fixed this rate as being a fair one for thoroughly skilled workmen.

## QUESTION—STATE BRICKWORKS. COST.

Hon. FRANK WILSON asked the Minister for Works: 1, What is the total cost of the State Brickworks to date? 2, What is the estimated expenditure to complete same?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Works) replied: 1, Total cost of State Brickworks to 30th June, 1914, £14,022. 2, Estimated expenditure to complete same, £8,000.

## QUESTION—ROTTNEST ISLAND. VISITORS.

Mr. CARPENTER asked the Premier: What was the total number of persons visiting Rottneest Island during the last summer season?

The PREMIER replied: Records have not been kept of the number of visitors to Rottneest Island last season, but it is estimated that between 18,000 and 20,000

landed on the island between November, 1913, and April, 1914.

#### QUESTION—WORKERS' HOMES, LEASEHOLD BLOCKS.

Mr. GILL asked the Premier: 1, How many blocks of land have been made available for Workers' Homes in Leederville and Subiaco under the leasehold section of the Act? 2, How many of the blocks have been applied for? 3, Are any blocks now available? 4, If so, where?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Leederville, 37 lots. Subiaco, 31 lots. 2, All lots thrown open in Leederville and Subiaco have been applied for. 3, Not in the places mentioned. 4, Answered by No. 3.

#### QUESTION—SAWMILL PERMITS.

Hon. J. MITCHELL asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Did he withhold for a period the granting of saw-milling permits? 2, Is so, were any applications refused during that period? 3, Were permits subsequently granted without public notice of the Minister's intention to do so being first given?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No. 2, It has never been the practice of the department to grant all applications for permits. 3, The Act does not require such notice to be given, but Cabinet has approved of an alteration being made in this respect.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY TIME-TABLE, GREAT SOUTHERN.

Mr. S. STUBBS asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has his attention been drawn to the paragraph appearing in a newspaper issued at Wagin on Saturday, 27th June, wherein the proprietor alleges that the Railway Commissioner is running the present time table on the Great Southern railway at an expenditure of £3,000 per annum in excess of what it should be? 2, Is there any truth in the statement?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, There is no truth in the statement, it being merely an assertion by the mayor of Wagin and a deputation which accompanied him, and with which statement I see no reason to agree. If the suggestions of the deputation were adopted a saving of £144 per annum might be effected, but only at considerable inconvenience to the travelling public.

#### QUESTIONS (2)—STATE IMPLEMENT WORKS.

##### *Exhibition of Products.*

Mr. ELLIOTT asked the Minister for Agriculture: Is it the intention of the Government to exhibit products of the State Implement Works at the principal agricultural shows throughout the State?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: The matter is under consideration, but no decision has been arrived at.

##### *Duplicate Parts.*

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Agriculture: What steps are being taken to have duplicate parts for agricultural machinery manufactured in the State Implement Works made available in the various agricultural centres, for farmers who require such duplicate parts?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: Applications were invited from persons willing to act as agents for the sale of machinery parts in different parts of the State, and steps are now being taken to select suitable persons for this purpose.

#### QUESTION—POISON LANDS' INQUIRY BOARD.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Has a report been received from the Board which recently visited the districts west of the Great Southern Railway for the purpose of investigating matters in connection with

lands that are infested with poison? 2, Will he lay the said report on the Table of the House when it is available?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, No. 2, Yes.

### SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

On motion by the PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) ordered: That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays, at 4.30 p.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary; and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE.

On motion by the PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) ordered: That on Tuesdays and Thursdays Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day.

### COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motions by the PREMIER (Hon. J. Scaddan) Sessional Committees were appointed as follow:—

House Committee.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Underwood, Mr. Male, and Mr. Monger, with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act jointly with the House Committee of the Legislative Council.

Library Committee.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Turvey, and Mr. Wisdom, with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and with authority to act jointly with the Library Committee of the Legislative Council.

Printing Committee.—Mr. Speaker, with Mr. Price and Mr. Allen to assist Mr. Speaker in all matters which relate to the printing executed by order of the House, and for the purpose of selecting and arranging for printing returns and papers presented in pursuance of motions made by members, and all papers laid upon the Table, whether in answer to addresses or otherwise.

Standing Orders Committee. — Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Nanson, and Mr. Lefroy, with leave to sit during any adjournment, and with authority to confer upon subjects of mutual concernment with any committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Council.

### BILL—FREEDOM OF MARRIAGE.

Introduced by Mr. E. B. Johnston and read a first time.

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: Amendments to regulations under "The Mining Act, 1904."

By the Premier: 1. Report of the Workers' Homes Board for the year ending 30th June, 1913. 2, Report of the Chairman of the Workers' Homes Board for the period 20th February to 30th June, 1912.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Second day.*

Debate resumed from the 30th June.

Mr. TURVEY (continuing his remarks from Tuesday): Prior to the adjournment on Tuesday I was dealing with the question of what had been done in our agricultural and horticultural districts by the present Government, dealing with the matter of the fruit industry particularly, and I expressed the hope that Mr. Commissioner Moody and his staff would redouble their energies in the direction of coping with the dread fruit fly pest. That brings me to the matter of a Bill which passed this Chamber last session, namely the Plant Diseases Bill, a Bill which received the hearty endorsement of orchardists throughout the State. But for some unaccountable reason—probably the hon. members who disposed of the Bill in another place will be able to give some satisfactory reason for their action; I hope, at any rate, when they have the opportunity, they will give their reasons

to the fruitgrowers as to why that Bill was rejected—the Bill did not find favour in another place. If ever a Bill passed this Chamber which was of vital importance to the fruitgrowers it was the Plant Diseases Bill. No matter where one goes in the horticultural districts one will find so-called orchardists who are in possession of land which at one time was cultivated, but has since been neglected. To-day, I regret to say, even in my own electorate there are many such places. These abandoned orchards provide ideal breeding grounds for the pest I have referred to. The Plant Diseases Bill, which was asked for by the fruitgrowers, gave power to the inspectors to deal with these neglected orchards. I have always held the opinion that if the owner of a property will not keep his orchard in good condition it is absolutely essential that power should be given to our fruit inspectors to demand that the owner uproot the trees, or keep them in proper order, failing which the Government, through their inspectors, should take on the work and charge it up against the owner. Provision was made in the Plant Diseases Bill for dealing with this matter. Some hon. members in another place gave the Legislative Council to understand that they were deputed by certain fruitgrowers in Western Australia to oppose that measure. I would like those gentlemen to name the important fruitgrowers in Western Australia who authorised them to reject the Bill. Personally, I have heard the Government receive nothing but the highest commendations from all the important fruitgrowers with whom I am in touch for having introduced and passed that Bill through this Chamber. Probably some hon. members opposite will be able to supply the reasons for the rejection of that Bill. However, I wish now to deal for a moment with what the Government have done in connection with the agricultural industry and the building of agricultural railways. I remember that when the Government came into power they were faced with very big commitments, and I am pleased indeed to notice that in the last session of this Parliament the Gov-

ernment have not come forward with many big railway Bills. I believe the last Government had authorised somewhere about 515 miles of railways. They had made a start, and a start only, on about three of those railway propositions, leaving the present Government to build close on 500 miles of railway; in fact, although this Government have built agricultural railways at a faster rate than ever before in the history of the State, yet I doubt if, even now, they have had an opportunity of starting their own railway propositions, so vast a mileage was left to them by the last Liberal Government. It is a pleasant matter to me to be able to congratulate the officers and staff of the Railway Department, and the employees of that service, for the manner in which the record harvest of last year was so successfully handled by the department. This is attributable also to the good work done by the officers at the head of that department. And let me here express my regret that the two leading officers of the department, probably through having given such close attention to their work, are now on sick leave. I particularly regret to learn of the recent ill-health of the Chief Traffic Manager, a man risen from the ranks to the high position in which he has acquitted himself creditably and to the interests of the State. I believe that man's devotion to duty in his position of Chief Traffic Manager has accounted largely for the illness with which he is now overcome. May I say in passing that I did not understand, when the position of Acting Commissioner became vacant, why a man who had had the experience that the Chief Traffic Manager had in the working of our railways, and who had occupied the position of Acting Commissioner on previous occasions, should not again have been entrusted with the work. There may be some good reasons for it but I am not aware of them.

Mr. Elliott: He was ill.

Mr. TURVEY: I do not think he was ill at that time. However, it certainly seems strange that the position of Acting Commissioner should have been filled by

a gentleman taken from the mechanical department.

Mr Bolton: A superior man.

Mr. TURVEY: No doubt he is able and competent as manager of the workshops but to take on the whole of so big a department as the railways is an entirely different proposition. I am glad to note the amount of railway mileage being built by the present Government. It shows that the Labour Government, under the day labour system, have been able to carry out their railway proposals efficiently and at a faster rate than ever before in the history of the State. To-day we have over 3,000 miles of railway. When one comes to consider the population of the State, it is indeed a big mileage, working out, as it does, at about one mile of railway per 100 of the population, a record which, I believe, exceeds that of any other State of the Commonwealth. Under the Railway Department has recently been placed the control of our tramway system. I do not intend to go into details in regard to that, for the mover of the Address-in-Reply has already dealt with it, and I notice he was taken to task by an hon. member in another Chamber for having had the audacity to state that it showed a profit of some £20,000. That hon. member in another place evidently regards all our State enterprises, not for the good they will do to the community at large, but, as in the case of private enterprise, he regards them from the point of profits or dividends only. The people of the State generally have benefited, and will continue to benefit, by the Government having taken over the tramway system. The building of the power house now in course of construction will, if the Premier's predictions are fulfilled, give a big impetus to settlement along the railway line as far as Northam. The Premier hopes to carry out a scheme of electrification as far east as Northam. In this connection, as one representing many places in the salubrious climate of the Darling Ranges, may I express the hope, too, that when that electrification of the railways proposal is put into operation the people along such lines as

the Kalamunda line and the Mundaring line will be given a better train service than they have to-day. I mention this because I believe that there are many people in the State who do not fully appreciate the valuable asset which we have in this State, in having the Darling Ranges, with an altitude of 1,000 feet, within about 20 miles of the City. In other capital cities of Australia, as in Adelaide, they have the Mount Lofty ranges, and I believe the places I have mentioned such as Darlington, Mundaring, Kalamunda, and other places along the Darling Ranges, are destined to be to the metropolis of this State what the Mount Lofty district is to Adelaide to-day. Before leaving this question of the agricultural railways, I wish to refer to one matter dealt with last session. I remember the Premier making some reference to the fact that the Government had taken off the 1s. a ton additional charge on the spur lines, and I have a very vivid recollection of the member for Northam and other members sitting in Opposition saying that the taking off of this 1s. a ton was of no advantage to the farmers, and these gentlemen claim at all time to be the representatives, the sole representatives, of the farming interests of Western Australia. Speaking as the mouth-piece of the farming districts of the State, the ex-Minister for Lands, the member for Northam, threw a gibe at the Government that the taking off of the 1s. a ton impost was no benefit to the farmers. I am personally glad the Government took the action which they did and re-imposed the shilling a ton, if, as has been stated by members opposite, that the taking off of the charge was of no material advantage to the farmers of the State. The Government have gone further in their desire to assist the farmers. Wherever the farmer has gone into the back country, wherever he has struck out as a pioneer, there the Government have followed him with facilities for giving an education to his children. We find year by year the amount required by the Education Department for school buildings constantly increasing because of the number of small schools that have to be

erected, and are being erected by the Labour Government throughout the agricultural areas. It is only right that this should be so, because I have always held the opinion that it is of more importance to the people in this State, more importance to the citizens of the State, that our educational system should progress: it is of far more importance than that we should have a progressive Public Works Policy, because I believe, after all, our national prosperity depends just as much on the proper educating of our citizens as on the development of the lands. That being so, I am pleased indeed to see that we have in the present Minister for Education a man who recognises this, and the Government to-day have not only met these further needs of education to the farmers' children, but they have been able to supply them with a better class of teacher by virtue of the fact that the Government have given bigger inducements to the teachers to take up this class of work. I refer to the increase in the salaries to teachers of small schools. I believe when the previous Government were in power the salary of a teacher of a small school stood at about £70 per annum. To-day the salary has been considerably raised. I doubt if there is any teachers in the service in charge of a school in receipt of less than £110 per annum.

The Attorney General: None less; mostly more.

Mr. TURVEY: Even then it is recognised by members on both sides that the teacher of the infant mind of the State is not paid commensurate with the importance of the work entrusted to his care. I believe members all recognise that, but we also recognise that with such a vast area to develop, such a vast area in which to place our schools and over which to send our teachers, it is impossible with the small population we have at present to pay exactly what we would desire. However, I think the Government will receive the congratulations of the teachers of the State for having raised the salary a little nearer to that of a living wage. I remember being present at a teachers' conference when the leader of the Opposi-

tion, and the then Minister for Education addressed the teachers of that gathering, and expressed the hope that if they did not get reward in this world at least they would get it in the next, and I believe the teachers will; but the Government are endeavouring to give the teachers some reward in this world, too. I congratulate the Education Department for the manner in which they are carrying out the policy of the Government with continuation schools. It always appeared to me a considerable amount of waste effort on the part of the educational authorities in providing free and compulsory education to the children until 14 years of age, and just at the time when the child could be taken in hand and advanced when the mind is fitted to receive the training and the knowledge, he is allowed to drop. Frequently in the cities he is allowed to roam the streets. I was pleased recently in having the opportunity of visiting the continuation classes in the James-street School in Perth, and it was a pleasing tribute to the excellent work carried out by the Education authorities to see those boys and girls, nay, young men and young women, devoting their evenings to the furtherance of their education.

The Attorney General: And even married persons, in the domestic classes.

Mr. TURVEY: Our continuation classes have not reached the compulsory stage, and it shows that our boys and girls, and our young men and women, are desirous of advancing their education when we find some of them, as I did that evening, had to travel seven or eight miles to catch a train to come to Perth to attend the continuation classes. I hope that the present Minister will still foster those classes and encourage them in every way. Then we shall not have the wastage after children have reached 14 years, and after the Government have spent thousands of pounds on their education. We shall have children attending school up to 14 years of age and afterwards taken in hand and able to further continue their studies from the primary schools to the secondary schools and right on to the University. I congratulate the Government in having

linked up the whole of the educational system of the State. To-day education is free from the kindergarten to the University: an educational system which I believe is unexcelled in any part of the world. We heard a good deal about the University going to be established by the previous Government, but the Labour Government believe in deeds and not in words alone, and have acted. To-day our University is a going concern in the city of Perth. There is just one matter before leaving the question of education to which I should like to refer, that is, to the proposal brought forward by a country school teacher some time ago to supply our schools with a better class of desk. I refer now to the desk that is known amongst teachers as the Armstrong desk. I am sorry it was not adopted.

The Attorney General: It has not been rejected.

Mr. TURVEY: That is some little conciliation. I am rather sorry it was not adopted. I cannot think the matter was viewed properly by those responsible for holding the question over for further consideration, because that desk gives to the children what they never had before, the opportunity for freedom. How would we, as members of the House, like it if we had to be kept in cramped and uncomfortable positions for four and five hours together? This particular desk arranges for a change of position. The reports of the medical officers in this State, who have visited the schools, say that there is considerable danger to health and a considerable amount of physical unfitness and deformity brought about by the improper posture adopted in the desk in use to-day. Even curvature of the spine may be caused to children by the desk which is in use to-day.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): We have no complaints.

Mr. TURVEY: Then I ask the Honorary Minister to confer with his medical officers on this particular point and he will find out that there are a good many complaints. I understood that there had already been a report on that subject, if not. I hope the Honorary Minister will take the opportunity of calling for a

report upon it, because it means so much for the physical fitness or otherwise of the future citizens of the State. I notice among the proposed legislation for the session that of constitutional reform. I just wish to say a word or two in connection with the necessity that exists in this State for such legislation. I believe that here we are sorely in need of it. We have ample evidence in this Chamber that such a thing is necessary. We are told by those opposed to any such reform that the Second Chamber is essential in Western Australia as a Chamber of second thought to check hasty legislation, but I notice when last session the Bill for the Initiative and Referendum was sent to the Upper Chamber they did not hesitate to reject it, because I believe they thought if they gave the power to the people of the State to deal with another place the people would deal with it in a very decisive manner. I am of opinion that if ever the people of Western Australia are given an opportunity—I mean the people, not a section of the people, but the people as a whole—if they are given an opportunity to bring about reform it will be speedily done. The Initiative and Referendum, so far as the belief of the councillors was concerned, was that the Bill would give power to the people to deal with them. On looking up some matter in connection with the proposal, I was glad to notice that the Attorney General of the late Liberal Government was an advocate of the uni-cameral system. I was somewhat surprised, although I suppose it was not surprising to hon. members who have had an opportunity of following that gentleman in this Chamber, to find that he was such a staunch advocate of the abolition of the Upper House. The hon. gentlemen comprising that second Chamber will tell us to-day that there has been no mandate from the people for the abolition of the Upper House. There has been a very clear and decisive mandate already. I think, however, I am safe in saying that this Government, if the second Chamber so desired it, would appeal to the people of the State at any time and be prepared to bring about somewhat similar condi-

tions to the double dissolution which existed in the Federal Legislature, and appeal to the people direct, provided of course the Legislative Council would be prepared to abide by the decision of the people. In this morning's *West Australian* I notice that one hon. member in another place said that he was satisfied that the recent elections showed that he and his colleagues there were maintaining a right attitude in rejecting the measures as they had done. He referred also to the fact that 122 Bills had been passed, whilst only 32 Bills had been rejected. What I wish to point out, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that of the 122 Bills, if there was that number, many were minor amending Bills. The Bills of an important nature, however, which were sent up from this Chamber were incontinently rejected by another place, so I think the time has come when something definite should be done, some definite method arrived at of dealing with the second Chamber. How the Premier and his colleagues propose to deal with it I do not know. I do not, however, envy them their task. I believe under our present constitution it will be found necessary to pass a Bill in this Chamber and also through another place. We speak of British Parliamentary Constitution, but even in the Mother country the House of Lords would not take unto themselves the power and rights that hon. members in another place are taking unto themselves to-day. I believe that is due to the fact that they have there a nominee system. In this State, unfortunately, we have for our Legislative Council the elective system. By virtue of this fact, when these people are elected they have the effrontery to say "We represent the people, we are the elected of the people." They are not elected by the people only, but by a section of the whole of the people, though they certainly dominate politics to-day. We hear people say that there is a Labour Government in power in Western Australia. I have said myself, from several public platforms, that there is not a Labour Government in power in this State to-day. True, ~~there~~ is a Labour

Government here so far as administration is concerned, but so far as the passing of legislation to carry out its policy is concerned, it is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. Bolton: That is what hurts the others.

Mr. TURVEY: Reference has been made also by hon. members when referring to Second Chambers, to the Senate, and to the double dissolution. But the Senate is representative of the States as distinct States, not representatives of the people. Here we have a Chamber representing one section of the people in one State, but another Chamber, a second Chamber which takes unto itself the credit of being a Chamber to check hasty legislation, but is elected by a section of the people only. Now we want the existing state of affairs to be remedied. I am pleased that there is legislation foreshadowed to deal with it, but I have said I do not know how the Premier and his colleagues intend to approach it. I notice, however, by this morning's paper that Sir John Forrest says that he is coming at once to Western Australia to meet the people of this State face to face, and to see if he cannot get their approval to the actions of his party, and to restore self government to the people.

Mr. Dwyer: He will have a job.

Mr. TURVEY: If Sir John and his friends are desirous, they will find plenty of scope in this State. The Labour Government will. I am sure, be only too pleased to receive the hearty support of Sir John Forrest and all of his friends who are desirous of restoring to the people of Western Australia self government. When we attempt to pass measures here of a democratic nature, our friends opposite sit back and say, "God's in his heaven, all's right with the world." "The Legislative Council still exists." It is to be hoped that when we get this legislation passed through this Chamber we shall find some effective means of dealing with the Legislative Council. One hon. member in another place, in dealing with the matter, pointed out that there were very few Bills that were rejected, whilst a considerable num-

ber had been passed. I intend briefly to deal with some of the measures which were passed through this Chamber, and which were subsequently rejected, shelved, or dropped, by another place. During the first session of this Parliament the Labour Government recognised the urgent necessity for taking some steps to cope with miners' phthisis and tuberculosis, and they consulted with their expert officers to that end. I remember Dr. Mitchell, from the Coolgardie Sanatorium, and other expert officers, endeavouring to select a suitable site for a Sanatorium. Their choice fell upon portion of the National Park—a place remote from the road—and this was selected as the best known site. The Government even then were desirous right through the first session of taking some steps to check the dreaded scourge of consumption, a scourge which is ravaging the whole of this country. In fact, the people of this State as a whole have very little idea of the inroads that are being made upon the manhood of Western Australia through miners' phthisis and tuberculosis, but this Government recognises it, and one of the first steps it took when it came into office was to obtain a suitable site for a Sanatorium. I regret that the measure was dropped, a measure for the re-dedication of portion of that permanent reserve for the purposes of a Sanatorium. The measure was dropped in the Council, and so the Government, instead of being able to find its Sanatorium erected, and its consumptive patients undergoing treatment, had to look round for another site. I am pleased to note that they were successful in finding another site, notwithstanding the action of the Legislative Council, and that to-day we have under course of construction at Wooroloo a thoroughly up-to-date sanatorium, which when completed will be the finest in the Commonwealth, and will stand as an everlasting monument of the Scaddan Government for doing something to alleviate the sufferings of the unfortunate victims afflicted with this great scourge.

Mr. Bolton interjected.

Mr. TURVEY: No, they would not have been afflicted by these scourges if the hon. gentlemen opposite and their colleagues in another place had done their duty when the main provisions of the Mines Regulation Bill were before them. I have a very vivid recollection of the occasion when that Bill was passed through this Chamber. Though I do not represent a mining constituency, I was particularly interested in the efforts that were being made by this Government to give better conditions for those who were winning the gold from the bowels of the earth. But what do we find? We found the hon. gentlemen opposite saying that if the workers were to have better conditions, if the working conditions of the employees were to be improved, then we were going to ruin the mining industry of this State. On the one hand there was the weight of profits and dividends, and on the other hand the weight of human life, and they gave their vote in favour of the former. Whilst that Bill was being passed in this Chamber—whilst it was in the Committee stage, and we were discussing the necessity for better conditions for the miners and those working underground—I had occasion to visit the West Subiaco Consumptive Hospital, and there I beheld the physical wrecks of what had been the finest type of manhood in this State—the wreck due to miner's phthisis. I found these men lying there gasping for their very breath, and returned to this Chamber only to hear hon. members opposite saying that if we give these better conditions to prevent such inroads upon human life we shall ruin the mining industry of the State. If there is any industry in Western Australia which cannot be carried on without wrecking the lives of those engaged in it, then the sooner than industry is wiped out the better. I do not, however, believe that of the mining industry. I believe it can be carried on successfully, and that better conditions can be provided for those who are employed in it. The Bill to which I refer was rejected. Another measure, one of vast importance to the people of this State, that was introduced during the first session, was the Public Works Amendment Bill, and later on the Land

Valuation Bill. These too were rejected by another place, and indeed most of the measures were rejected on the second reading. They did not even reach Committee stage. In fact, it was the practice to put up one speaker and then reject the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: And now the Commonwealth Government is inviting us to pass the Land Valuation Bill.

Mr. TURVEY: It was the same with the Public Works Committee Bill. The hon. the leader of the Opposition at one time congratulated Mr. Kingsmill, who some years ago introduced a Public Works Committee Bill—I believe it was in 1901—providing for the standing Parliamentary Committee to inquire into all public works, and, as I say, he received the congratulations of even the leader of the Opposition. But when a Labour Government dares to introduce a Public Works Committee Bill the proposal at once becomes an entirely different one. Now, the Public Works Act Amendment Bill which was rejected by the Legislative Council, made provision for the resumption of land at fair valuations, and so did the Land Valuation Bill. When this Government came into power it had not been very long in office before it recognised the absolute necessity for some such measure, in order to prevent, what I may term, the robbing of the public funds which was going on at the time. I say that because it could hardly be termed anything else. We find that when some of the properties were to be resumed by the Government for public purposes an altogether fictitious value was placed upon them by the owners. Here is an instance: One property, belonging I think to Bunning Bros., of West Perth, which was required by the Government. I understand was valued by the owners upon their taxation papers at £1,000 unimproved value. When, however—and I am speaking now of the unimproved value which was set upon it—when the Government desired to resume it for public utility, the owner's valuation was not £1,000, but £10,300. Then again, we find another instance. The owner valued his land at

£1,000. Within twelve months the Government desired to resume it, and the unimproved value set upon it by the owner was £4,086. There is still another instance. The unimproved value of the land was £1,930, which was the value put on it by the owner. The Government desired to resume the land, and then the owner set an unimproved value upon it of no less a sum than £8,000. So that you see, wherever the Government desire to resume land for public purposes they are asked to pay through the nose for it. The Government recognised that the people of the State were being robbed in this fashion, and they passed through this Chamber the measures to which I have referred. When, however, they sent them up to another place they struck a death-blow to some of the vested interests of hon. members, who perhaps sit in that Chamber, and the measures were rejected—some of them on the second reading. The division list in that Chamber will generally show that the vote was something like 16 to 6 or 18 to 7. It shows the non-party attitude adopted by hon. gentlemen in another place. Then again it will be interesting to find out, and I presume the Government have the power to do so, how these properties are valued for Federal taxation purposes, and for State taxation purposes. I congratulate the Government on the manner in which they have resumed properties in the metropolitan area, particularly for public purposes, such as markets and for giving better railway facilities, but is it a fair thing when the Government desire to do this in the interests of the people, as a whole, that they should find themselves robbed in the wholesale manner which is being done. Just to deal with a few other measures rejected by the Legislative Council—and I desire to refer to them in order to show the necessity that exists for some action being taken to remodel that Chamber. The Rights in Water and Irrigation Bill was passed through this Chamber and sent to another place, where we found one hon. gentleman asking for the appointment of a select committee. When the matter was being debated in the Council even Sir Winthrop Hackett pleaded

with his colleagues in that House not to send the Bill to a select committee, remarking that he was always tempted to ask when a Bill of that nature was sent up, who would attend its funeral when it came down. Sir Winthrop recognised why the Bill was being referred to a select committee, and others of his colleagues in that House said distinctly they would support the reference of the measure to a select committee in the hope that by doing so the Bill would be defeated.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It might have been improved.

Mr. TURVEY: It might have been, but it was improved by this Chamber. Of the 30 odd amendments which were sent to this House by the other Chamber all but four or five were accepted, but these few dealt with vital principles, and was it right that the Assembly should give way where vital principles were concerned? I noticed also that Mr. Colbatch, who was responsible for referring the Bill to a select committee, now declares that he would like the Bill to be re-introduced, but that it should apply to one section only. That hon. gentleman is inconsistent in making the suggestion, and as far as the Bill is concerned, it is nothing but cant hypocrisy and humbug for any hon. member in this House to advocate the establishment of the dairying industry in the State, or advocate intense culture in the South-West, unless hand in hand with either of these proposals he is prepared to advocate irrigation. We have in the South-West—and I am well acquainted with that particular part of the State—land which is very fertile and capable of producing as much as the best lands in the Eastern States. These lands are simply awaiting development by the people of this State, and the present Government recognise that something could be done to check the enormous amount of money which is being sent out of the State, something like £2,500 daily for dairy products which could be grown on the lands to which I have referred. If that be so then it is essential that something should be done. I believe the member for Northam did something for the South-West when he sent a batch of men

down there to ringbark the karri forests. The Scaddan Government set to work to put these forests to use. They are magnificent forests and the soil is rich, and what I am advocating now is that by carrying out irrigation works the soil can be put to use, so that in a short space of time we may be exporting dairy products instead of importing them.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why do you not get on with it then?

Mr. TURVEY: The Government are prepared to get on with it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: They have been asleep for the past three years.

Mr. TURVEY: If the hon. member will direct his friends in another place to assist us no time will be lost in establishing the dairying industry. The present Government are fostering the dairying industry. One good thing the ex-Minister for Lands did was to appoint the present Commissioner for the South-West.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I am glad you have found something good that he has done.

Mr. TURVEY: It is about the only thing that I have been able to find. The measures which were rejected by the Council were brought up again and rejected again. The Plant Diseases Bill was one of the measures which was rejected last session, and it would be interesting to know what fruitgrowers instructed hon. members in another place to oppose the passage of that measure. Hon. members there claimed that they were representing the fruitgrowers when they took that action, but I should like to know who those fruitgrowers were. Then with regard to the Electoral Districts Bill, which our friends in the other place were pleased to call the Redistribution of Seats Bill, a title that I object to very much, because it somewhat stinks in the nostrils of the people of the State, that measure provided for the appointment of an independent commission. This Government, I am pleased to say, were not going to be a party to any gerrymandering; they were not going to arrange the boundaries to suit various members, and they decided

that that work should be entrusted to an independent commission.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Appointed by themselves.

Mr. TURVEY: When the Bill went to another place it was not passed through in the same record time as the Redistribution of Seats Bill, but it was rejected. The Traffic Bill I do not intend to deal with beyond saying that the main roads of Western Australia would have been dealt with effectively if that measure had received the consideration we expected would be given to it by the Legislative Council.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the Fremantle road?

Mr. TURVEY: The working bee organised by the hon. member did very good work on it, and I congratulate them. Before concluding I want to say a few brief words in connection with the State enterprises which our friends opposite and members in another place are so fond of decrying. As I pointed out a little earlier, no matter what State undertaking is spoken of, members seem to view it from the point of view of profit only. I think I am right in saying that the Government are running these enterprises, not for the earning of dividends, but in the interests of the people as a whole.

Mr. George: Wasting other people's money, and none of their own.

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member was told that a little of the people's money was wasted on him.

Mr. George: I think some was wasted on you; how much was it, £90?

Mr. TURVEY: I congratulate the Minister for Lands on having continued his policy in regard to the meat stores, which have been successful in bringing about a reduction in the price of meat in the metropolitan area. In this regard all I desire to say is, that the Government will be able to see their way to extend the operations of those meat stalls to other centres. The *West Australian*, in a leading article recently, complained, and so did the master butchers, that the Government were selling meat at a reduced

rate. It is only a little while ago that the jibe was thrown at the Government that they were unable to sell meat at a cheap price, so that it appears, no matter what they do, they cannot please hon. members opposite. The very fact that the slaughtering for the State meat stalls is being done at State abattoirs, instead of at private abattoirs, as in the past, will give increased facilities, and tend to farther reduce the price. The establishment of abattoirs at Midland Junction and North Fremantle is only in keeping with the policy of the Government right through, that is, to see that all sources of the food supply are kept as pure as possible. The desire of the Government is to see that through State enterprise the people are not only given better facilities, but where it deals with the matter of food or milk supplies, that absolute purity shall be assured to the people. Have hon. members not noticed the decrease in the death rate since the advent of the Labour Government? The member for Northam is wearing a self-satisfied smile, but is he not aware that the death-rate at the Children's Hospital, for instance, has been considerably reduced. I congratulate the Government on having established a State dairy herd in order to ensure the patients in the hospitals receiving pure milk. The records of the hospitals will speak for themselves, particularly those of the Children's Hospital. When this Government came into power the Children's Hospital authorities were complaining that the little ones were dying off like flies.

The Minister for Mines: Those were the very words of the doctor.

Mr. TURVEY: Yes, they were the words used. The Government did not establish a State dairy for profit making, but to save the lives of those little people. Hon. members are ready at all times to accuse the Government of failing to encourage immigration, but I would remind those hon. members that to save the lives of those little ones is to save the lives of the best immigrants we can get. Yet that is one of the State enterprises of which hon. members opposite disapprove. I desire to congratulate the Government on

their determination to establish a State maternity home. The State hospitals have received encouragement under the sympathetic administration of the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin) and now the Government have decided to establish a maternity home. The State Charities Department, under the sympathetic administration of the Labour Government, has done excellent work. It has tried to foster a system of giving assistance to the mother in order that she may keep her child instead of having it sent out to an institution.

The Minister for Mines: Which means an increase of £10,000 per annum on that point alone.

Mr. TURVEY: So far as our Government institutions are concerned it must be remembered that the Charities Department has given excellent assistance, not only to widows left with little ones to care for, but also to some of our invalids in the State. The sanatorium at Woorooloo will indeed do much to prevent the spread of tuberculosis throughout the State. Probably that is a State institution which will receive the endorsement of hon. members opposite.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Why, we initiated it.

Mr. TURVEY: If that does not receive their endorsement, perhaps for their own sakes the establishment of a State inebriates' home will meet with their approval. So far as the inebriates' home is concerned, I am glad indeed that the Government have shown that they recognise that, after all, drunkenness is not a crime, but a disease which must be coped with. These and other State institutions show that the Government are desirous of maintaining the people of the State in a healthy condition. They are desirous of seeing, even through the State hotels, that the quality of liquor supplied is such that it will do the least harm to those who partake of it. The establishment of workers' homes has been opposed by hon. members in this Chamber, and to-day they have something wrong to find with the scheme, simply because the matter was taken in hand by a Labour Government.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Who opposed it?

Mr. TURVEY: If the hon. member will carry his memory back he will find that

there was a good deal of opposition to and criticism of the proposal. When the hon. gentleman was in office he talked about workers' homes, but this Government have got right down to work on it.

The Premier: The leader of the Opposition laughed it to scorn at the Queen's Hall.

Mr. TURVEY: We know perfectly well that several hon. members opposite are opposed to the scheme and opposed to it solely because it emanated from the Labour Government. Regarding the State sawmills I wish to say that so far as our Crown lands are concerned, I trust the Government will do their best to conserve the forest, particularly in some of the maiden bush, as much as they can, but I hope no restrictions will be placed on the timber getters in cut-out bush in many portions of the State.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They have done that.

Mr. TURVEY: I have yet to learn that they have imposed restrictions on sleeper getters in cut-out areas. But so far as maiden bush is concerned we must all recognise the necessity for doing something, seeing that we are sending out timber at the rate of a million pounds per annum. Something must be done by policing the forest and by natural re-afforestation. In conclusion let me say that these State enterprises are of benefit to the community as a whole, and I am glad indeed that the Government do not take the view which some members opposite take, and which was expressed by a member in another place yesterday, namely, that because these enterprises do not show a profit there must be something wrong. If they are for the betterment of the community, if they do good to the community as a whole, then they will have done what the Government established them to do. The various State enterprises are expected by hon. members opposite and their colleagues in another place to pay from the very inception. But if an agricultural railway is put down there is no desire on the part of hon. members opposite to see that it should pay from its inception.

Hon. J. Mitchell: An agricultural railway is a very different proposition from that of a State steamer.

Mr. TURVEY: If the crown of a furnace drops in a State steamer it is published broadcast throughout the State, but if anything of that nature occurs on a State locomotive—and I have frequently heard of a driver dropping his plug—it is not published with glaring headlines in the *West Australian*. Because this happened on a State steamer of course it must be given prominence.

Mr. George: Did the State steamer drop her plug?

Mr. TURVEY: The hon. member dropped his long ago. I hope the Government will continue to extend their operations in respect to State enterprises. I am satisfied that if at the end of their term—which is a long way off yet—they have done no other good but to make State enterprises of some of these concerns, they will have justified their existence in office.

Hon. FRANK WILSON (Sussex): I have listened to the hon. member for the last hour, and there is one thing I have to thank him for: he has refreshed our memory as to the work we did during the last session of Parliament. He has taken an infinite amount of pains to wade through the whole legislation introduced by the Government, and as to how it has been dealt with in this House and in another place, of course with the object of showing that another place is very much to blame for the manner in which it handled those measures.

Mr. Turvey: With the object of showing that their attitude to this Government's legislation is very different from their attitude to your legislation.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Of course, it all depends on the character of the legislation. The fact that our legislation was treated perhaps better than the legislation of my friends opposite only goes to prove that it was more in the interests of the majority of the people of the State, that our legislation consisted of democratic measures—a phrase which hon. members opposite are so fond of using—democratic measures, broad and conserving the interest of all sections of the community. It is idle for the hon. member to talk about the opposition in connection with the Mines Regulation

Bill and to say that we weighed dividends and profits against the lives of the workers. That is a base assertion, having no foundation in fact, and the hon. member knows it well. It is all in keeping with the tactics which these gentlemen adopt in the hope that some of the mud may stick and that in view of the forthcoming elections a vote may be cast against the Liberals in consequence.

Mr. Foley: There is no need to make electioneering speeches in places which would have been affected by that Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I hope the hon. member will not have to trouble to make electioneering speeches to his electors.

Mr. Foley: No. I will go down among the farmers.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I would like the hon. member to come down among the farmers and see what reception he would get. Let him come down to Sussex and take the chances of winning that seat, which, of course, my friends have coveted for some years past. I want to take strong exception to the hon. member's statement that we had any such mercenary motives in our criticism and opposition to the Mines Regulation Bill. We never stated that if better conditions were given, as far as life saving was concerned, the industry would be ruined. We said that if foolish legislation were passed which had a tendency to cripple that industry it was likely to ruin the industry. That was the attitude we took up, and we proved it right through. No one wants me to go through the details of the measure again to-night, clause by clause, to show where the weaknesses were.

Mr. Munsie: What was your object in opposing the abolition of the night shift?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: What is the object of the hon. member in supporting the Ministry in putting on a night shift at the State sawmills?

The Premier: It is not a night shift.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: What is good for the goose is good for the gander, and if we are going to abolish night shift let us abolish it right through the State. The Premier has spoken of working night

and day in regard to the sawmills, and the Minister for Works made an estimate of what he could turn out, working three shifts a day. The Minister for Works made his calculations on what he could turn out by running the mills continuously, and the Government have demanded an extra price for their sleepers on account of working the night shift.

The Premier: That is not correct.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: To use the Minister's own words in the interview, it was "because of the extra cost of running the mills night shift." For this the Government are to receive 3d. per sleeper extra. It is useless for the hon. member to talk about the night shift. He might claim that it is injurious in every calling to work on the night shift.

Mr. Munsie: It is injurious in the mining industry.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I claim that it is injurious to work at all in the mining industry, and in fact in nine-tenths of the industries. Life itself is injurious and the sedentary occupation of hon. members, who leave their offices after a day's work to come to this Chamber, is also injurious.

Mr. Foley: Then why do not you sit in the day time?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Ministers sit in their offices during the day and then have to come here and work the night shift. The hon. member for Swan complained also with regard to something connected with the Land Resumption Act. I caught only a portion of his remarks, but he gave a long dissertation and wanted to argue that the Government had been robbed. He gave a statement of certain valuations of land, and compared them with claims made on resumption, and he also did what was hardly parliamentary—named certain firms. I want it to be distinctly understood that no one objects to the Government being properly safeguarded in connection with resumptions, but if I had before me certain information which I possess, I could instance many cases in which offers of less than the actual cost of the property have been made to the owners of land resumed. It cuts both ways, and yet we do not hear

that the Government are trying to rob property owners.

The Premier: It does not cut both ways.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The departmental officers believe that the value has depreciated and that they have arrived at a fair value of the day, and on that value the Government base their offer. On the other hand, the owners believe that certain values have appreciated, that they have arrived at a fair value of the day, and on that value they base their claim. So it cuts both ways, and it is idle to complain or to quote one or two instances as proving guilt on the part of property owners. We have our courts to establish a fair valuation, courts representative of the owners and of the Government with a judge presiding, and surely it is fair that the valuations to which the hon. member takes such exception should be based on the actual value at the time the resumption is made and not upon some return put in for taxation purposes. The next remark from the hon. member which caught my ear, and at which I was rather astounded was the assertion that the present Government could take credit for the establishment of the University, and the hon. member claimed that the present administration were a Government of deeds. "They do things: they do not talk." My complaint all along has been that the Government have done nothing but talk. I have been looking around to see the result of their gigantic efforts, and have looked in vain. Probably I may be able to show where the talk has been in evidence and where the deeds have been sadly lacking. But I want to claim for myself and my colleagues that we established the University of Western Australia, and that we also did our part in our day to build up that great Education Department of which the hon. member is justly proud, and which the Minister of course claims a good deal of sympathy with and credit for.

The Premier interjected.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have always been too broad for the narrow perception of my hon. friend. My party have always been in sympathy with all

the wants and requirements of the people of this country, and for anyone to claim for himself and his friends the whole credit for all advancement, as the hon. member for Swan did, is ridiculous in the extreme and cannot carry any weight with the outside public. He claimed also that the sanatorium in the hills was an evidence of the Government's deeds. Why, it was part and parcel of our policy. It was stated in the policy speech that we had obtained a report and had decided to build it.

The Premier: You will save a lot of time if you tell us what was not in that policy speech.

Hon FRANK WILSON: I will tell the Premier what was taken out of that policy speech and for which he claims so much credit. After all, the Premier can claim the sanatorium in the hills as a result of his splendid faculty for borrowing and spending and doing things. I urge the Government not to talk, but to do things. The records of all the departments show conclusively that it has been all talk and very little done excepting in the direction of undoing something which would have been better left as they found it, and the country is suffering accordingly. The hon. member stated that we opposed workers' homes. I have no recollection of ever having been opposed to workers' homes. I have a very strong recollection that my hon. friends jumped that part of my policy also. It was announced by me in the policy speech delivered in Barnard's hall, Busselton, on the 19th August, 1911. It had previously been announced by my late colleague and the present Premier thought it a good thing and immediately jumped that portion of the policy. He went a step or two further, and rather made a hash of his arrangements.

The Premier: That is not the only policy speech you delivered.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: All of them were consistent.

The Premier: I will show you that later on.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The Premier's will not bear much comparison.

Mr. O'Loghlen: From whom did you get your policy?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This is the brief outline of my policy of homes for the people—

Trustees will be appointed and advances may be made at the discretion of the trustees to the full cost of the building, who will take into consideration the value of the site which must be provided by the borrower.

That was a condition in our policy.

The maximum advance will be £500, and interest not less than five per cent., and power will be given to make progress payments against buildings as they are being erected. The principal and interest is to be repaid by weekly or monthly instalments. It is proposed to make the capital £250,000 to begin with, and it may be extended from time to time as Parliament may deem desirable. The benefits of this scheme will be open to all who comply with the provisions of the measure.

That was a broad scheme for the benefit of the people, and the Premier jumped my claim, but he got so fearfully tangled up that nobody knew where he was. First of all, he stated that they would advance up to £500 where land was already owned, in order that a man might build a home for himself on his own land. I thought that was a good proposal. Mr. Scaddan went on to say that an arrangement might be made to transfer all property without encumbrance at the death of the owner to his dependants. That was a fair proposal which met with my approval, and I said so.

The Premier: You did not; you ridiculed both.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I said—

That was a fair proposal if it could be carried out on mutually safe lines by insurance or some method of that description.

The Premier: What are you reading from now?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: From my speech in Queen's Hall, Perth. I am reading it just as it was delivered. I went on to say—

But they (Mr. Scaddan and his party) were in fact going to assist a man to

improve his freehold on the one hand, and on the other to legislate to transfer that property to someone else and make a freehold into a leasehold.

"That was when they advocated leasehold of all land. I pointed out that Mr. Scaddan said they proposed to build up-to-date residences wherever desired by an applicant, the total cost including purchase of land, if not provided, not to exceed, say, £500, and then added—

Remembering that he was on dangerous ground, Mr. Scaddan had gone on to say: "The Labour platform proposed to find the land and erect the house, but in order to protect the State and prevent that dummying of lands which was so extensively practised, it proposed to give the land itself on leasehold."

The Premier: Certainly, I proposed both.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The leasehold proposal did not form part of our policy. His Excellency's Speech gives a pretty fair resumé of what hon. members supporting the Government claim to have done during the past twelve months and prior thereto. In itself it does not contain any great proposals for the advancement of the State, excepting perhaps the suggestion that certain railways, some of which were promised long since, will be introduced and passed during the session. As a successful recapitulation of what the Government have done, I daresay it meets with the approval of hon. members on the Government side. I do not propose to weary hon. members by going through the different clauses of the Speech, but I will touch upon several of them when I deal with the acts of the Government and with the results of their efforts during the three years, or thereabouts, in which they have held office.

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

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I had made some brief reference to His Excellency's Speech before tea and I want now to say that I see the Government has taken credit for everything which has happened in the way of a good harvest, a good gold supply, the increase in the out-

put of coal, and other matters affecting the welfare of the people. Indeed, they are taking credit in no unmeasured terms for the happy results in the lowering of the death rate. I do not intend to take from them their right to this credit. Undoubtedly they have in their administration done what they thought to be in the best interests of the country. I believe that all sections of the community have helped to this end. There was one matter, Sir, which rather surprised me, and which has appeared in to-day's paper, which I think ought to have been included in His Excellency's Speech, as being of much greater importance than many of the facts stated therein. I refer to the appointment of the Minister for Lands to represent Western Australia at the Panama Exposition next year. I have not the slightest doubt that that hon. gentleman will make an excellent representative, but I do think that Parliament might have been informed that that decision had been arrived at, a decision of importance, in order that members, at any rate, might give their views in regard to the matter. For myself, I think that Western Australia would do very much better in her own interests if she spent any money that she has to spare in advertising in the Motherland and on the Continent of Europe where we have excellent markets for our produce, an outlet for our energies, and where we may hope to get some return for the money we spend. I do not see how we are going to benefit very much by attending the Panama Exposition, and how we may hope to expand our markets in that way. And now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it goes without saying that we all welcome the fact, at any rate hon. members on this side of the House do, that this is the last session of the present Parliament, and that our friends who have administered the affairs of the State will have to answer to the people for their misdemeanours. I understand full well that their quiver is absolutely overflowing in this direction. In fact, their misdeeds are too numerous to mention. Some of them I will briefly touch upon in the course of my remarks. No doubt in some quarters

they will receive praise also for their efforts, praise for their virtues which, to my mind, are somewhat difficult to perceive. Of course I do not wish for a moment to deny that my friends opposite are altogether devoid of virtue. Individually, they have many admirable qualities, but collectively, and more especially in their official capacity in this House, the members of my party have much to complain of in the treatment they have received at their hands. We have not received that courteous consideration which we were entitled to expect as representatives of a large section of the community. Our suggestions for the welfare of the community have mostly been received with contumely.

Mr. Bolton: Suggestions for what?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Our efforts to extract information in the interests of the public have ever been met by evasion, and very often scorn. I have only to refer to several of the replies which I received to-night, absolutely foreign to the questions put to the Premier.

The Premier: You had greater courtesy extended to you by us than the leader of the Opposition had extended to him by the Prime Minister.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Let me answer for my own sins and not for those of the Prime Minister.

The Premier: Both tasks are very difficult.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am not here to defend anything that may be discourteous in the demeanour of anyone, even hon. members on this side of the House. I am here to point out to the Premier that he should behave courteously to members of the House who have been returned to it in the interests of the section of the public which they represent. The answers to questions are evaded under the flimsy pretext that we require the information owing to our opposition to the policy of the Government. The Premier, in speaking, said a few weeks ago "These Liberals, they want to know. When they cannot get the information in the Legislative Assembly, they go to their friends in the Council to endeavour to obtain it there." Of course we want to

know. Are we not entitled to know? Is this House to be considered merely from the standpoint of my hon. friends who sit on the Government benches? Are the people that we represent throughout the length and breadth of this great country to have no consideration, and to be refused information when it is asked publicly and upon the floor of this Chamber? Want to know! The people want to know a good many things. They have been wanting to know ever since the Government took office why the Ministers did not fulfil their promise and reduce their own salaries. I cannot forget the promise that the Premier made on the hustings, in such holy horror, that he would do this.

The Premier: That is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier said that he would bring down a Bill and would reduce his own and the salaries of his colleagues.

Mr. George: That is absolutely correct.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is on record and yet the promise has never been attempted to be carried out. In the present state of the finances, would it not have been just and honourable, even if he had not brought down the measure, to have refrained from drawing his extra salary?

The Premier: I am built that way.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: These hon. gentlemen have taken thousands of pounds from the public exchequer and placed it in their own pockets, notwithstanding their promise that they would not touch the money but would reduce their salaries as soon as possible.

The Premier: I deny that absolutely.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is all on record. The Premier can deny it as he likes. I know what I am saying. Let him prove his contention.

The Premier: Let the leader of the Opposition prove his contention.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: He brought the Bill down to the House.

The Premier: I never promised it on the hustings.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier accused me of having raised them and

promised to reduce them and introduced a Bill for the purpose, and then induced his followers to ply the whip and vote his own Bill into the waste paper basket.

The Premier: That is absolutely incorrect; I myself took the responsibility of withdrawing the Bill.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Can I forget the cruel charges that he made against me in regard to the faking of accounts to manufacture a credit balance for the year 1911, or how he was bowled out in these charges, and how I proved that he himself in the succeeding year, notwithstanding his protestations, scored to a much greater extent in carrying forward the unpaid balance of the previous year's expenditure? That is well worth repeating.

Mr. Bolton: It is all you have.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have a great deal more than that, and the hon. member will know it. Can we forget, either, the peculiar circumstances of the vendetta that the Premier and his colleagues organised throughout the different departments and through the departmental papers, in order to find something discreditable to the previous Administration, and in order to down certain civil servants, to say nothing of bringing into this Chamber the files, producing them, quoting them, and misrepresenting the minutes to this Chamber in order to injure those who had just recently been defeated at the poll? However, notwithstanding all these faults, and they are of a very serious nature—

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: You have a few spies there.

Mr. Bolton: Indeed you have.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is not so.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The hon. members are all spies. We can see it without having any spies.

The Premier: What are you complaining about?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: After passing over these serious defects, which are a decided blemish upon members opposite, though they do not realise them as such, I must say that there are attributes which I admire, notwithstanding that these attri-

butes are in many directions misapplied. For instance, I admire the Minister for Mines for his modest and suave demeanour which, during the past three years, has saved him from much criticism. I admire the Minister for Lands for his fatal fanaticism which has brought his department to such a pitch of stagnation, and has undermined the public confidence, so essential to a country's progress, to such a great extent. I admire to some extent the bluff and bounce of the hon. the Premier, with which he so often seeks to hide his discomfiture and his bungling business incapacity.

The Premier: I like your business methods.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I admire the Attorney General for his holy eloquence, only equalled by its extravagance, which is fast losing its effect upon a deluded public. I admire the Honorary Minister (Mr. Angwin) for his pugnacious obstinacy which I think has lost him many political friends, and will assuredly lose him his seat at the forthcoming general elections.

Mr. Bolton: You are a poor judge.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I admire the Minister for Works for his saturnine and extraordinary egoism, which causes him to ignore the opinions of others and to take unto himself powers to which he has certainly no claim, and which do not properly belong to him. These are all attributes which we can admire in the individual, but collectively the result is certainly disadvantageous to the country's welfare, and has conducted very largely to a position of unsound finance and trade depression, has caused capital which is so badly required in a new country to be suspicious and shy, and has caused a state of uncertainty and a lack of confidence as to the future which, despite the good season of last year and despite the increased gold yield, are keeping this country back, and are going to cause hard times in place of the time of comfort and prosperity which we ought to expect. When the Liberal Government went out, we left the country in a very buoyant position.

The Premier: You left for the country's good.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The country was prosperous, money was easy, confidence was established, and the outlook was very bright. My friends came along and said that the people must look to them for sound finance. The Premier himself in speaking on the Budget prior to the general elections said that he wanted all classes to know that the policy of the Labour party is one that will save the country from all financial disaster. Well, he was not content with these professions. I will just shortly analyse for a few moments how this financial policy of my friends opposite has been conducted. The Minister for Works also was very eloquent in this connection. Realising, as Senator Pearce has told us, that good Government is sound finance, the Minister for Works said the people realise to-day that the economical policy of the Labour Government is sound finance: and the Minister for Lands said the first essential of good financial administration was sound loan expenditure. All platitudes—platitudes which have been repeated times out of number until the people are sick to death of hearing them. The member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) said this was a Government of deeds, and not of words. Where are the deeds? We have had the words. Conscience knows we have had words enough. Now may I, before touching on the figures of to-day, indulge for a few brief moments in a retrospect with regard to the finances? It is necessary that I should draw attention to this matter in order that the people may get a thorough grasp of the position as it existed some ten years ago, and as it existed during the past three years. The mark-time Government, it will be remembered, of 1904-5, converted a surplus of £83,000 into a deficit of £46,000. That meant going to the bad to the tune of £130,000 per annum. And they did nothing during that twelve months. In 1905 the people turned to the Liberals to put the country's affairs straight; and it certainly was a good thing that they did so, because the Liberals succeeded in straightening out affairs, although it

took six strenuous working years to do it. The result of straightening out the finances of this State was only achieved by six strenuous years of work, and by a vigorous land development policy and stringent, careful finance. In 1911, the year that the Liberals were deposed, was the first time for seven years when the ledger was squared and a surplus realised. Everything at that time, as I said before, was rosy; capital was plentiful, and development was going on apace. The people, in their wisdom, decided to change their managers, and put my friends opposite into power. No doubt that was largely due to the unpopularity caused by the exercise of strict economy—an economy which, I must here point out, was necessary in face of the falling revenue. But we were not out to seek popularity at that time; we were out for the welfare of the country and the immediate financial soundness of the country's affairs. We did not go for popularity, and we did not rush into the market to borrow large sums of money in the face of decreasing revenue in order to speculate in doubtful undertakings in the name of the State. Of course, in the face of a decreased revenue, and increased expenditure at that time, a deficit was inevitable. We were, of course, faced with very difficult financial and economic problems. We had inherited a deficit of £47,000, and the revenue was falling rapidly. The outlook of our gold-fields was gloomy, and I may even say ominous, at that time.

The Premier: And yet you wonder that the people put you out.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is only necessary to call the Premier's attention to the ever-decreasing gold yield to make even him realise that it would be difficult indeed to answer my arguments, the contention which I am putting up. In 1905 the value of gold won decreased on the previous year by £118,000. In 1906 it decreased by £682,000; in 1907 by £412,000; in 1908 by £210,000; in 1909 by £223,900; in 1910 by £530,000; in 1911 by £423,000. In those seven years the gold yield went down by over two and a-half millions in value. That shows

any man who gives the matter proper, serious consideration, and does not deal with it in a flippant manner, like my friend the Premier is accustomed to deal with these statistics, that there was at that time a decadence of our goldfields, and that it was a very serious problem as to how we were to stay the outflow of population which must ensue as employment on the goldfields decreased.

Mr. Foley: Your Government did not stop that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Dividends fell during the same period from £2,167,000 to £826,000. As I have said, the problem undoubtedly was a difficult one. The problem was to arrest the depopulation which must surely follow the decadence of the gold mining industry, if no other means of employment were found in the direction of primary industries. And we had not only that problem to solve, but a problem as to how we were to attract further population. I have said that we did not borrow money lavishly and expend it on speculative trading concerns; but we recognised that the great asset of the country lay in its land, and we immediately took up and entered upon a very energetic policy of land settlement. Notwithstanding the jeers of my friends opposite, I claim that our land policy saved this country from financial ruin. Only for that policy, our population would have decreased to an alarming extent; and I do not think anyone can gainsay it. We had the falling-off in our great gold mining industry which had done so much for the State—an alarming falling-off—and we had to supply the deficiency with something else, and we supplied it with a land settlement policy, agricultural development, and railway construction which absorbed the surplus labour arising from the depression on the goldfields. That is how the difficulty was faced, and that is how the difficulty was overcome, to which my friend the member for Leonora (Mr. Foley) referred just now by his interjection. I have said that the Labour Government went to the bad during that disastrous year 1904-5 to the tune of £130,000, and that was despite the fact

of the general revenue increasing by some £65,000. Now, I want it to be marked that this was the last year showing an increase in revenue until 1909-10. During the four years it dropped to the extent of £348,000. Is it any wonder that a deficit was incurred during that time? By £348,000 the revenue went down; and, naturally, for the first few years it was unavoidable to have some deficit. But let me point out now the difference in financial administration, a difference which is as wide as the poles are asunder. With us, where an increase in the deficit occurred, you would also find an approximate decrease in the revenue shown; and conversely, wherever you find during our years of administration an increase in revenue you will see that that is accompanied by a decrease in the deficit. This must be admitted to be obviously logical finance. It is logical finance. But with our friends opposite it is just the reverse. With increased revenue we have had an increased deficit all the time, and the larger the revenue the larger the deficit—an astounding financial result, which certainly is hardly likely to save the country from disaster, and which requires a lot of explanation at the hands of the Premier. Increase your revenue, and increase your overdraft. The more prosperous you are the bigger your overdraft, the bigger your deficit. Whoever heard of that system of finance panning out successfully? If you cannot pay your debts off when you have an increasing revenue, how on earth can you hope to pay them off when you have a decreasing revenue? But let us take the figures, because it is instructive to look upon these figures and dwell upon them. At any rate, it is certainly the duty of hon. members to weigh them very carefully. In 1905-6, the first year of the Liberal Administration, we had, as I have already pointed out, a gold yield which decreased by some £682,000. The Commonwealth contribution also decreased during that year to the extent of £155,000. The total revenue decreased by £56,000, and we had a deficit of £73,000.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Was that a Liberal Government?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In 1906-7 our gold yield decreased by £421,000, and our Commonwealth contribution decreased by a further £93,000. Our total revenue decreased by £157,000, and our deficit increased by £88,000.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Still Liberal Government?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In the year 1907-8 the gold yield decreased by £210,000, the Commonwealth contribution decreased by £26,000, and the total revenue figures showed a decrease of £24,000 on the previous year and the deficit increased by £2,000.

The Premier: But you do not take in the gold yield.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I cannot give the Premier the brains to understand. I can only give him the figures. I require all the brains I have to fight the next general election and to explain the position to the public. In the succeeding year, 1908-9, the gold yield decreased by £223,000, and the Commonwealth contributions decreased by £136,000, and the total revenue decreased by £109,000. We had the deficit increased by £101,000. During the four years, what I may term the four lean years of the Liberal Administration, our total revenue decrease was £346,000, and the deficit had increased to the tune of £264,000. It was the ordinary sequence, the logical conclusion of decreasing revenue, that you should, by force of circumstances, have an increase in the deficit. Then we had two years which were fairly prosperous. In 1909-10, although the gold yield decreased by £529,000, the Commonwealth contribution was increased by £86,000, and the total revenue marvellously recovered, due to the policy of the previous four years, and showed an increase of £390,000, and our deficit was reduced by £210,000.

Mr. Foley: So were all the subsidies to the goldfields hospitals.

The Premier: And we have had to guarantee the overdrafts of the municipalities and the roads boards ever since.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I guarantee it is not anything like the amount of money I paid during my first year of office as Treasurer. In 1910-11 the gold

yield still decreased, I am sorry to say, by £423,000, and the Commonwealth contributions also decreased in that year by £133,000. The total revenue, however, increased by £192,000, still showing that, despite the depression on the goldfields, and a decrease in the Commonwealth contributions our country was feeling the advantage of the new policy. The deficit was extinguished, and converted into a credit balance of £13,000. In fact, we made a saving that year of £115,000. The logical correctness of our financial methods, I contend, must be obvious to everyone. This was the result of our six anxious and strenuous years of work, which I think, was satisfactory to us, but I admit at once that a large number of people did not seem to realise what had been achieved, or if they did they were not prepared to keep in power the people who had done such good work for them. I venture to think that after three years' experience of my friends opposite, and after I have pointed out the disastrous results which have followed their administration, and compared them with the successful results of our administration, the people will change their views, and return us to occupy the benches opposite. Let us compare the marvellous result I have referred to with the financial achievements of my friends opposite during their first two years of office. In 1911-12 the first years of their office, the gold yield still decreased, but the Commonwealth contribution increased by £69,000, and the total revenue increased by £116,000. The deficit, however, instead of decreasing, increased by £121,000, so that they went to the bad to the extent of £134,000 in spite of an increase in the revenue.

The Premier: We paid your debts.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier knows there is not a scintilla of truth in that remark.

The Premier: It is absolutely correct.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In 1912-13 the gold yield increased by £133,000, owing largely, or almost exclusively, to the much-maligned Bullfinch mine. The Commonwealth contribution was practically the same, the decrease being only £3,000. The total revenue increased by £630,000,

and the deficit, instead of being wiped out was increased by £190,000. Two years of office with an increase in the revenue amounting to £746,000 and they accumulated a deficit of £325,000!

The Premier: Paying up your debts.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier will have an opportunity of proving his contention, but it will take him all his time to do so. I can well understand that the Premier does not like this exposure, but it is necessary that it should be made in the interests of the people, and I cannot consider his personal feelings. I do not wish to hurt them unduly, but if he wants any more manifestation of his inability to manage the affairs of this country he will get it later on. In 1913-14 the Premier estimated an increase in the revenue of £796,000, and he estimated an increased deficit of £135,000, and despite the harvest, for which in the Speech he claimed credit, his deficit at the end of March last reached £495,000, and at the end of May the colossal figures £527,000. I admit that the adjustment of the accounts on the 10th of this month will possibly and probably enable the Premier to decrease that deficit somewhat. The fact remains that the financial system is unsound. When you have an increasing revenue from your people there should not be at the same time an increased overdraft. This, let me point out, is also accompanied by increased taxation in the way of stamp duties, and an advance in railway freights and fares, and it is also, despite the very heavy expenditure of loan money. Before I leave these figures I want to draw attention to the Treasury figures for the 11 months ended 31st May last. At that time the deficit had assumed the immense proportion of £527,000, and I desire to quote some of the Treasury figures with regard to our State enterprises in order that it may be seen what the Government were returned for. For instance, for the 11 months, the implement works we have heard so much about, and in regard to which the Premier became very indignant the other night over some little tattle he had heard in regard to a meeting held at Claremont—these implement works returned a revenue in that period of £37,000, while the expenditure

was £61,000, the debit balance being £24,000. The batteries show for the same period a revenue of £41,000, while the expenditure was £51,000, the debit balance being £10,000. I might say that I am quoting round figures. The receipts from ferries and jetties was £20,000 and the expenditure £12,000, the credit balance here being £8,000. Hotels returned a revenue of £29,000, and the expenditure was £26,000, leaving a credit balance of £3,000.

The Premier: The expenditure against State hotels includes the tourist branch of the department.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is all under the one head.

The Premier: It has nothing to do with it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then it should be made clear. The State steamers returned a revenue of £57,000, and the expenditure was £69,000, the debit balance being £12,000, so that we have the marvellous result according to the Treasury figures, that for the 11 months these departments have returned a revenue of £184,000, while the expenditure has been £219,000, the net debit balance being £35,000. Of course the Premier explains in connection with the implement works, as I did at that meeting he referred to, that there was stock and probably outstanding book debts. Under other headings, tramways show a revenue of £105,000, but there is no expenditure, because it is lumped up with that of the railways and so no one will be able to get at the exact position. Sawmills and brickyards are not shown. Stock shows a debit of £24,000, and refrigerating works £39,000. We were told that we would have to look to the State trading concerns to save the position and to wipe out the deficit. We were told that on more than one occasion, but I want it to be understood that we have very little hope of squaring our finances with the aid of the trading concerns, at any rate, not according to the figures which have been published. We have been told to look to the recuperative powers of the country, and we have it on the dictum of the Minister for Works that, given normal conditions, apart from bad sea-

sons, Western Australia could easily finance its obligations, and come out on the right side. Why does she not do so? She has had normal conditions.

The Premier: I would be sorry to admit that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The State has not done so because it has been shockingly badly financed and so we have come out on the wrong side of the ledger. I think that must be obvious to everyone.

The Premier: Can you explain whether you ever had a deficit?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have given the Premier the figures of the various years, and the reasons for the deficit during my term of office. It is patent to everyone, excepting the hon. gentleman himself, who does not want to realise what the position is.

The Premier: I realise it very well.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I hope the hon. gentleman does to his advantage, and to the advantage of the State. I am getting a bit tired of prompting him. We are told that the trading concerns would restore our finances, and yet in the same breath we are told that those trading concerns are not expected to return profits. The member for Swan (Mr. Turvey) emphasised that point, and declared that so long as interest and sinking fund were paid the Government were satisfied. We also have the assurance of the Minister for Lands, given at a social a short time since at which he spoke, that in future we might expect the trading concerns to pay interest and sinking fund. Indeed I think he was rather daring in his assertion on that occasion because he blamed the increase in the interest and sinking fund bill for the whole of the deficit. The hon. gentleman remarked at that social that it should be remembered that during 1911-12 the State was incurring a largely increased interest and sinking fund bill, and that the works on which the moneys had been expended were not, owing to adverse seasons, returning what the Government anticipated.

The hon. gentleman went on to say—

That summed up in a nutshell the reason for the deficit to-day. They had just gone through a somewhat better season and from the Government

schemes in which loan moneys had been expended, there might, in the future, be expected such a revenue as would enable the Government to find interest and sinking fund on the ventures. He felt sure that the Colonial Treasurer would be able to put forward a much better statement of accounts for the financial year which would begin in July next.

We want that better statement just as early as we can get it. I desire to impress hon. members with this fact: Notwithstanding the Premier's oft-repeated assertion that we can look to these trading concerns to relieve us from the financial incubus which he has built up, it is impossible to wipe out the deficit by these trading concerns, except it be by profits earned over and above interest and sinking fund. If we are to be content with running a huge trading concern merely to pay its way and earn interest and sinking fund, we will not have a penny left to go towards decreasing our debts. That must be obvious to everyone; yet the Treasurer tells us that we are to look to these trading concerns to relieve us of our financial obligations. The State Implement-Works employ a large number of men, and according to the Premier's last Budget Speech are working for the different departments, and not so much in connection with the manufacture of implements at all. Therefore that work will only be charged up at cost to the different departments, otherwise it will show a fictitious profit. And we are told that the brickworks are to supply bricks to the Government for Government requirements.

The Premier: The men who purchase the workers' homes, and not the Government, pay for the bricks.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But the Premier is surely not going to saddle the man who purchases a worker's home with a proportion of the deficit. He has told us on many occasions, these brickworks were going to enable him to give the worker his home cheaper than he otherwise could get it.

The Premier: It means the expenditure of less Loan funds, though.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But that will not fit the object which the Treasurer has in view of squaring up his ledger and wiping out his deficit.

Mr. Bolton: Let him do what you did and have everything stopped; that will soon square it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The country was never more progressive and never had bigger works more economically carried out than during our term of office. If these works are to be carried on and the output be sold at cost, even to the workers, we are serving a few at the expense of the whole of the taxpayers. The Treasurer has got himself into a quandary and does not know where he is. He is either going to do an injustice to the majority to benefit the few, or he is going to extract a profit from those few which will only go a very short way towards extinguishing the deficit. That is what we are doing with our butchers' shops, our steamers, and our other enterprises to-day. They all show a loss on last year's operations, and every one of them, therefore, is being maintained at the expense of the great body of the taxpayers, to the advantage of the few who may be fortunate enough to get some of the output at the losing price. Now we shall probably do the same thing on a larger scale with our sawmills, and it must be patent to the Treasurer that he cannot hope to square his deficit out of his trading concerns. Of course if all else fails, I suppose we can come back upon our butchers' shops. We have been selling meat to a few favoured individuals at Fremantle, Subiaco, and Perth for the last two or three years, and, according to the Minister for Lands, we have shown a profit of £113 on twelve weeks' working. I am not prepared to accept the statement as being a correct account of the operations with that establishment.

The Premier: Of course you would close them up.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I certainly should, very promptly. I do not think they are of the slightest benefit to anyone. But I want to see a true balance sheet. I do not see why we should not have a

complete balance sheet, duly audited, from the inception of these establishments. Why should we be content with a balance sheet for twelve weeks only?

The Premier: Because that alone was asked for. They thought those twelve weeks would show a loss. It was only the butchers who asked for it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But surely we, as members of Parliament, have a right to get it for the 18 months. Surely we are entitled to the information before the butchers or any other section of the outside community. I hope the Premier will recognise that he has a duty to perform to the House, and will see that these balance sheets are immediately prepared, audited and certified to, so that we may see exactly what the true position is. The principle, of course, is absolutely wrong. If we are doing so well as Ministers would have us believe in retailing meat to certain sections of our people, then the system ought to be extended and other sections of the people ought to have the advantage also. To ladle it out to three or four thousand people in the immediate vicinity of the meat stalls at a cheaper rate than they have been able to purchase at before, and to incur also a loss on the trading, is reprehensible in the extreme.

The Premier: It is not correct; it has not cost the Treasury a penny.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am not prepared to accept that statement at all. Where is the charge for the agistment of cattle at Yandanooka?

The Premier: Paid for.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is not shown in this balance sheet. What cattle have been supplied from Yandanooka, and what has been charged for them? Let us see what the price is, and know what we are doing. It is evident the stock account has a bearing on the question, and we ought to have the stock account as well. Who pays interest on the Yandanooka purchase?

The Premier: Stock.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Who pays the loss on the stock?

The Premier: There is no loss.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Who pays the loss on the cattle sold early this year, when pleuro broke out, sold at £5 per head to Mr. Copley? Who has paid that loss? Who is paying the loss on mutton purchased lately at 9d. and retailed at 5d.? Can that be a profitable transaction? Ninepence on the hoof for mutton, and 5d. retailed over the counter. Someone is paying the loss. It would be interesting to know the source of supply in the hands of the Government as stated by the Minister for Agriculture, other than the auction sales which their agents jealously attend and where they bid for the cattle and sheep.

The Premier: We showed some business acumen there.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The business acumen, as I have told the Premier on previous occasions, is equal to that of the old lady who bought her eggs at 1s. a dozen and sold them at 13 for 1s. When asked how she made her profit, she said it was on the turnover. It is on the turnover that the Premier hopes to make his profit. I pointed out in 1911 that the Premier's policy was to purchase food from the Treasury funds and sell it at a loss to the public; and these figures bear me out, for apparently this is what has been done. The public is paying for the experiments of our friends opposite, and is paying dearly for their experience in commercial undertakings. I think I have ventilated fairly fully the state of the finances as compared with the Liberal Administration. I will await with interest the Premier's reply. Another thing which strikes me as strange when we have this financial position to face—and after all sound finance is the foundation of good government, and therefore I must be excused for dwelling upon it—is that we have no evident desire on the part of the Government to economise in small things. It is quite an axiom in business life that the man who cannot look after the pence will have no adaptability in looking after the pounds. Ministers do not seem to care two pence about that sort of thing. They retire civil servants wholesale on the slightest pretext, regardless of whether they are assisting the deficit or whether

they are economising at the expense of the State. We have, for instance, the retirement of Mr. Roe from the magisterial bench which he has occupied for 16 years. I cannot understand what prompted the Government to retire that gentleman when he has at least five or six years good service left.

The Premier: You do not worry much when somebody in receipt of 8s. a day is retired; it is only the retirement of your Weld Club friends which gives you any concern.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier has been sacking 8s. men *holus bolus* lately from the different workshops.

The Premier: That is not correct.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Included in the platform of his party is the right to work clause which, being interpreted according to him, means that the Government of the day must find employment for the unemployed citizens. Yet there are more unemployed in Western Australia to-day than at any time during the last ten years. That is the way in which he carries out his obligations. Mr. Roe, who is a man of unblemished character, as even the Premier will admit, has done good work for the State during the 16 years he has been police magistrate for Perth. Although just over 60 years of age, he is a man full of vigour, and with his long experience is well qualified to continue on that bench for the next five or six years.

The Premier: He can battle his way. What about a poor wages man dismissed?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am not taking that point. I am complaining of the Premier's stupidity. He is going to saddle the country with Mr. Roe's pension.

The Premier: The pension will not hurt very much.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is one of many. These are the things to watch. This gentleman has been retired although eminently fitted to carry on the business of the court. Indeed a substitute cannot be found who will know his business so well. The justices met and unanimously decided to ask the Attorney General to

receive a deputation in order to reconsider the decision.

The Premier: They came to my office first and I told them to mind their own business.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is typical of the Premier and I hope it will be reported.

The Premier: It will be recorded.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: According to the Premier, a body of justices have no right to respectfully ask the Government to reconsider their decision.

The Premier: It has nothing whatever to do with them.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is their business; it is the business of the public; it is as much their business as it is the Premier's business, and the Premier ought to be ashamed to make such a reply.

The Premier: We have not yet handed over the country to the justices, even if you did.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is a marvellous retort; it is just what one would expect from a football barracker. What does it matter what I did? I am pointing out what the Premier has done.

The Premier: You always hung on to your friends.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It does not matter what I did. This section of the community are entitled to respect. They are entitled to a hearing, and due consideration should be given to their views with regard to the retirement of this gentleman. I here protest at the action of the Treasurer in saddling this country with increased expenditure—this is only one sample of many—when his finances are in such a hopeless state as I have shown them to be. Is it any wonder that we have this position in regard to the finances? When we turn to the Lands Department, which has been paralysed by the fanaticism of the Minister for Lands when we compare what was done in that great department during the Liberal administration with what has gone on during the last three years—

The Premier: We know all about that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Let me tell the Premier all about it. I want to re-

fresh his memory and the memories of other people. I want people outside to understand the position.

The Premier: They know it.

Mr. Bolton: Some of the poor devils on the land know it, too.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Let us consider and compare the Liberal administration with regard to land with that of the Labour Government. From August, 1905 to October, 1911, a period of six years and two months, some 6,646,000 acres of land were alienated or in process of alienation. The administration of the department, and hon. members should note the economy of it, cost some £864,000, equal to £130 per thousand acres, or 2s. 7d. per acre. From October, 1911, to 31st December, 1913, a period of two years and three months, during the Labour administration, 1,542,000 acres were alienated, and the administration cost £316,000, or £205 per thousand acres, equal to 4s. per acre, as compared with 2s. 7d. per acre when my colleague, the hon. member for Northam, was in charge of the department. Another significant fact is that the abandonments and cancellations always increase enormously, alarmingly I might state, during the term of a Labour administration.

The Premier: We stopped some of the harvests.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In 1905, long before the present Premier was thought of as the leader of a Government, 414,000 acres were abandoned or cancelled. That was during the first year of a Labour Government. That is equal to 33.45 per cent. of all the land alienated during that year. In 1911, the last year of our reign, 205,000 acres were abandoned or cancelled, equalling 9.4 per cent. as compared with 33.45 per cent. during the previous Labour administration. In 1913, 1,001,000 acres were abandoned or cancelled, equalling 72.45 per cent. of the quantity of land which was alienated during that year.

Mr. Bolton: The man responsible is your colleague.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: This means that three out of every four acres applied

for were abandoned or cancelled during last year under the baneful administration of my friends opposite.

Mr. Bolton: Your colleague put hundreds of settlers out to starve and they have starved.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Supporters of the Government tell us that this is due to the bad season. We have heard no end of complaints with regard to the terrible seasons with which they have had to contend, and this has also been given as an explanation of the financial position and of the fact that land settlement has become stagnant, or has reached practically a standstill. Let us examine the records of the years in question. In 1908, the wheat crop was poor and averaged 8.63 bushels. In 1909, there was a good crop which averaged 12.48 bushels. In 1910, the crop was fair, the average being 10.14 bushels. In 1911, the crop was very poor—I think it was the worst on record—and averaged 7.12 bushels. That is the year in which only 9.4 per cent. of the land applied for was abandoned or cancelled. In 1912 there was a good crop, and our friends in office witnessed an average of 11.56 bushels. In 1913, the crop was very good: indeed it was one of the best, the average being 12.22 bushels. In six years we got—

The Premier: You are not taking the 1911 year as being in your term when we experienced the effects of the failure.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why not?

The Premier: We had to carry the baby.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am not talking about carrying the baby.

The Premier: You were not in office when the crop was taken off.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We were in office until October, when the crop was on. The season is calculated from February to February. The Premier must think that he is on the football field. The crop was taken off in December and January, and the statistics were made up in February. That is the rule every year, and the Premier knows it. In six years we experienced an aggregate wheat yield of 22 million bushels, and in the last two years the Labour administration

have witnessed yields which also aggregate 22 million bushels.

The Premier: That is absolutely incorrect. There have been three February's since we took office.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In the last two years the present Government have witnessed the production of as much wheat in the agricultural areas of this State as we did in six years.

The Premier: Hear, hear, and we will get more yet.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: While the Premier complains about the bad harvests during his term of office, the 22 million bushels produced in that period was due to the enterprise of my colleague and to the land settlement policy which saved this State.

Mr. Bolton: The men he put on the land are starving now, hundreds of them.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Considerable capital has always been made about settlers starving. It has been said that we put them out too far east, and the hon. gentleman is indignant over the prices we charged for the land, but the present Minister is putting them further east to-day than ever my colleague did. Land is being cut up in those parts and offered for sale, and the present Minister is charging exactly the same prices. The plans show that this is so.

The Premier: The law is there, and must be carried out.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: There is no law with regard to the prices. The present Minister for Lands is charging exactly the same prices, and he has adopted the system which was inaugurated during the administration of the hon. member for Northam. The present Government have followed that system for three years and have not altered it, and yet they attempt to cast this as a slur upon the administration of the ex-Minister.

The Premier: It will be altered.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why have the Government not altered the system and reduced the prices? It is absurd for the Premier to charge the Administration of which I had the honour to be the head with mal-administration, and to

make a similar charge against the hon. member for Northam with regard to the Lands Department, when his Government have not altered it in one jot or tittle except to bring about stagnation and a stoppage of progress. So far as the prices are concerned and the settling of the people on the land—

Mr. Bolton: You settled hundreds of them.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: With a yield three times as great as it was during our term of office, the present Government find that land is being thrown up *holus bolus*, last year to the extent of 72 per cent.

The Premier: That always happens after a Liberal administration.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier is always taking exception to my figures. He did so the other night when I offered a few remarks on the Supply Bill; yet he could neither controvert those figures nor explain them. He adopted the usual tactics of personal abuse and attack by way of reply to my statements, but from what I could gather from the few remarks he dropped, he gauges financial ability from the amount a man can borrow. The Premier said—"We were told by the Opposition that we could not get the money, but we have borrowed more money than our predecessors, double as much." So they have, but I have never stated that they could not get money at a price. I always told the Premier that he could get money at a price if he liked to pay it. Money is like any other commodity: its price is regulated by the law of supply and demand.

The Premier: Why will not you be fair? I obtained it cheaper than some of the Liberal Premiers in the other States.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier paid dearer for it at first, and I pointed out the fact to him. He started the market on the upward grade, and when the last loan was raised, and the market was easing back, he obtained it at a slightly cheaper rate. The Premier knows that he rushed to the Eastern States and collared every thousand pounds that was loose at four per cent. at par. He en-

gaged his financial adviser, Mr. James Gardiner, to try to rake in the money for him.

The Premier: If you can rig the money market, you should go away and do it. All the countries of the world are looking for a man of that sort.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have had to save this State financially on one occasion and I expect that it will be my unfortunate duty to have to perform the same sacrifice once more.

The Premier: You saved the country when Newton Moore put you out of the Treasury.

Mr. Bolton: And Colebatch will succeed you.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier is never tired of telling us, and he repeated it on Tuesday last, that the Government honestly admit a deficit this year. They cannot help admitting the fact. If there is a deficit they must either devise ways and means to pay it off, or admit that it exists, and the question is not whether the Government have honestly admitted the deficit or not, but what are the reasons for it, and is the deficit justified. These are the questions which we desire should be answered. I might admit having an over-draft at my bankers, I might honestly admit that I borrowed £50,000, and yet on the next day I might be in the Bankruptcy Court. If the Premier and his colleagues were conducting these concerns for private companies, or individuals, they would have been in the Bankruptcy Court in the first 12 months after their inception. The Premier knows full well that he could not possibly have carried on these concerns, and survived the Bankruptcy Court. But apparently, in the mind of the Government, it does not matter a rap. They are only gaining experience; they have to lose something at the inception, and it will be made good later on. They fancy that their losses will be made good later on. The Premier twisted my opposition to State implement works into a personal attack on the manager.

The Premier: So it was.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It was not. Mr. Bolton: The manager said so.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: So the manager has been telling the Premier; now I have his source of information. Let me say this, that the only reference I made at that gathering, which was a very good gathering, was to quote the Treasury figures which I have quoted here with regard to the debit balances in connection with the implement works. I was very careful to explain also that probably that debit balance would be accounted for by the stock on hand, and—

Mr. Bolton: You said they were badly managed.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I said nothing of the sort. The hon. member knows he is not stating a fact.

Member: Why did you not say that you did not reflect upon the manager?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I was pointing out the Treasury position. I did not say that it was either due or not due to the management. I said neither one thing nor the other. I pointed out that the stock and the outstanding accounts would probably cover the debit. Of course the member for Claremont (Mr. Wisdom) pointed out the danger of inaccurate costs owing to cosmopolitan works of this nature. Mr. Davis took exception to what was said, and stated that it was unfair for me to quote the Treasury figures. I induced the chairman of the meeting to give him the right to speak.

Mr. Bolton: Did you say "Please may he speak"?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I remember when the Premier and his satellites would not give me the right to speak in many centres at the last general election.

The Premier: That is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The member for Claremont knows all about it. He pointed out the danger of inaccurate costs owing to cosmopolitan works of that nature. The manager took exception to this and said he had drawn up a system of costs which he would be glad to show to anyone, and that he objected to the Treasury figures being put in.

The Premier: Did he invite you to go and look at them?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I told him that I intended no personal reflection upon him. I knew full well from my experience in the engineering line at home that it is quite impossible to keep accounts correctly if the works are of a general nature such as jobbing and manufacturing. Unless you have entirely separate establishments you cannot possibly find time to run over the accounts of the various departments. I do not mind how careful the manager is; he cannot get out the real costs of the work he is turning out. It is absurd that the Minister for Lands should be continually harping upon my condemnation of these works as he does, on the grounds that I had not exploited them from end to end. I can judge that the machinery must be adapted to the manufacture of implements, and the point is that it would be useless to expect to put a lathe, which, for instance, Messrs. Armstrong, Mitworth & Co. are utilising to turn 14-inch 100 ton guns, on to the construction of locomotives or to attempt to construct agricultural implements with plant such as we have at the Midland Junction locomotive shops. That must be admitted, for could you put machinery of that description to the work of building bicycles or sewing machines? How can you put that class of machinery on to building agricultural implements such as are constructed here?

The Premier: You do not know anything about it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I am not saying that the machinery such as I have described is being used for those purposes but I am saying this, that the Government have, wrongly, I think, accumulated all their engineering activities into one group and under the one management, whereas one ought to specialise when constructing agricultural implements.

The Premier: You are shifting your ground; your accusation was against scrap iron machinery. That was a reflection on Mr. Davis.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Oh, no, not at all. If it is a reflection on Mr. Davis, however, I repeat that.

Mr. Bolton: It is, from the start.

The Premier: Repeat it.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier ought to have sufficient knowledge from his own experience, even as an engine driver, and ought to have sufficient knowledge to appreciate the truth of what I am saying. If you are going to have works which are turning out four-fifths or three-fourths of its capacity in heavy repair work, such as is required in connection with our harbour undertakings and bridges and other work of that description, if you are going to have all this under the same roof and the same management as the manufacture of agricultural implements, which is of a different nature, you are not going to run the works economically. That is as certain as I stand here. There is no personal animosity in what I am saying. The Government have made a mistake. I repeat again that the initial mistake was in buying the second-hand plant holus-bolus, when what was wanted was the very best up-to-date plant, if you are going to compete with the huge firms which are following this occupation in America and other parts of the continent.

The Premier: Why don't you object to the whole thing?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier has made the same mistake in regard to the State steamers, although at first he would not admit it. To-day he says that the "Western Australia" is an unsuitable boat for the North-West trade. That is what I told him two years ago, but he only laughed and jeered. I told him that the boat was unsuitable and that no one could make her pay. The hon. gentleman sent instructions to the Agent General by way of a cable, to buy the best boat he could, and he knows—

The Premier: Oh no, that is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: He ought to be man enough to take his gruel; he makes a lot of mistakes.

The Premier: I am still able to sit up and take a little nourishment.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I believe the Premier will be able to do that all his life.

Mr. Bolton: There is not much body in the gruel, I am afraid.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have pointed out that this boat which he now admits is unsuitable, and cannot be run at a profit, was stated by me to be unsuitable two years ago, and the Premier jumped down my throat for saying so. Further, he gave me a direct denial at the time. I am very glad to notice that the Premier stated that no new works would be commenced during the next two months without Parliament being properly notified. More especially am I glad in view of the nearness of the general elections. It would be obviously unfair to start a lot of new works in different electorates in order to influence the people at such a time.

Mr. Thomas: So you are leaving now.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I say it would be unfair to do this in order to influence the result of the poll. I want the Premier to reconcile his statement with one made by one of his colleagues on a visit to Bunbury, when a promise was made there, which no doubt was one of the greatest pleasures, if not the supreme pleasure, in the existence of the hon. member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas), that the extension to the Bunbury harbour would be commenced forthwith.

The Premier: That was provided for in the last Estimates.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We have never had the plans. Three years after the promise of these improvements was made we have reached the stage when the Minister for Works goes down and pays a visit with the plans for harbour improvements in his pocket. He thereby gives very great pleasure to the hon. member for Bunbury, which I suppose will be some return to him for the loss of his seat. The plans have been approved but have never been placed before Parliament. Why is not this House taken into the confidence of the Government, and why are the proposals of the Government in connection with works of such magni-

tude and importance not placed before us that we may consider them?

Mr. Thomas: Did you supply the plans of all the works you carried out?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Of all the important works. We have no knowledge of what the Government intend to do at Bunbury.

The Premier: Did you put the plans of the dock on the Table?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: All the papers were on the Table. Again, we have no certainty as to what is proposed to be done at Albany. A promise was made that something should be done there. What sort of plans have been approved for the extension of the Albany harbour? I see that Geraldton is only under consideration. Poor Geraldton! Geraldton has to take a back seat, because, unfortunately, I suppose, she returned a Liberal member.

Hon. J. Mitchell: The harbour is abandoned, is it not?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I have not the plans yet. We want to know what these harbour extensions consist of. We want to know something further about the harbour improvements at Bunbury, and whether they are going to open up the inner harbour. There is some talk about an expenditure of a quarter of a million. One can hardly conceive that that is to be expended upon an outer harbour there. I hope the Premier will bring further details in regard to these big works before the House.

The Premier: They will be here.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier says that the Government have adopted a bold and courageous policy. I admire him for his courage, but I deplore his ignorance as to the policies of past Governments.

The Premier: You are a genius.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier said that if my policy had been carried out it would have cost the country ten millions of money. I have no doubt it would have cost the country that. Let us examine for a few moments and see what they have done with the money, and my friends can explain why they have not gone on with it. My policy as an-

nounced to the country in 1911, amongst other things, included a sanatorium in the hills.

The Premier: Amongst other things.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier has certainly carried out that portion of my policy because it is now almost completed. But university buildings were included and he has done nothing in that direction.

Mr. Bolton: He has only paid your debts.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We outlined a big scheme of increased expenditure on immigration. They have done nothing in this direction. They have gradually doled off the immigration policy until, for the period covered by the past five months, we had only an excess of arrivals over departures of 5,000. Railway construction was a big item in that programme, and many railways were outlined in it. The Yuna to Murchison-Geraldton railway is only just being talked about. The Southern Cross to Marvel Loch and Nevoria line is passed out altogether. Where is the member for Leonora that he may bear this in mind? We outlined a railway to open up the country in the Lake Marshall and Mount Brown districts. No move has yet been made there. I believe some promise has been made, but I am not sure. The extension of the Bolgart line is just commenced. The Yillimining line, running eastward and northward according to the Advisory Board's suggestion, has been commenced, but has anything more been done? The Burswood-Belmont line, to complete the circle of the present branch system, the Wagin-Darakan line, are also in the policy, and the Busselton-Margaret River line has not been commenced, although it was promised. The broad gauge from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle and to the naval base, to which all Governments have been bound and committed for the past ten years, and which my friends opposite put in their Estimates and passed a Bill for some two years ago, has been abandoned. Fremantle harbour, additional wharf extension on the north side and grain sheds, grain storage accommodation, that por-

tion of it is fairly well in hand, but not yet completed, after three years. The Bunbury inner harbour, Albany harbour extension, Geraldton harbour extension and grain sheds, the jetties of the North-West, all these have never been touched by hon. members opposite. There is also the Carnarvon jetty extension, the Onslow jetty, Port Hedland extension, Broome extension, Derby, the Wyndham chilling and freezing works, and increased harbour accommodation. All these works were included in that policy which was to cost the country 10 millions of money. My friends have spent the 10 millions, and the country has got nothing for it. The only things my friends have done are the sanatorium, a section of the Yillimining railway, and the Pinjarra-Hotham railway extension. Otherwise the policy is non-existent.

Mr. Bolton: You would have had that policy for a quarter of a century.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: If my policy was for a quarter of a century and was to cost 10 millions of money. I have to point out that the present Government have spent nine millions of loan money in three years, and have next to nothing to show for it. What have they done with that nine millions? It has gone. I expect something to be shown on the face of things as the result of that expenditure. My friend should tell us where it has gone to.

Mr. Thomas: We have the State steamers.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We have, of course, the abandonment of the chilling and canning works at Wyndham, where—

The Premier: We just came in in time to save this country from the meat trust. If you had remained in, they would have been there before now, just as your Federal conferees have let them in at Port Darwin.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: But for the abandonment of those works at Wyndham, we would have had scores of small cattle-producers in the North-West—

The Premier: All in the hands of the meat trust.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: All depending on the freezing works, and protected against any trust. But, contrary to a policy of that description, which would have decreased the cost of living, we have the whole thing hung up; and hung up, forsooth, on the recommendation of the Minister for Works. Mr. Johnson goes up to the North, and he comes back again, and he reports that the freezing works at Wyndham are not required, and he advises the Government that the works should not be constructed. He says what the Government ought to do is to encourage the export of the cattle on the hoof to Java and Manila and other foreign countries. And that is the means that the Government are adopting to cheapen the food supply of the people in the congested areas down south. Did anyone ever hear of such a suicidal policy? And the Cabinet sat in its wisdom, and endorsed that report. To-day, notwithstanding the warnings repeatedly given, that if we did not seize our opportunity and make Wyndham what she is evidently intended to be, the outlet for the whole of the cattle of our northern territory and of the Northern Territory of South Australia, works would be established at Port Darwin, and we should gradually lose our trade in addition to that of the Northern Territory of South Australia, this is almost an accomplished fact. Here we have an agreement signed by the Federal authorities for the establishment of these very freezing works some three or four miles out of Port Darwin; and the result will be that the cattle of the Northern Territory of South Australia will go there, and that gradually our cattle from the northern portion of Western Australia will be drawn across the border to be treated at Port Darwin. I never heard of such a foolish policy, in all my days, to be adopted by what we hoped were commonsense Ministers. Then there was the projected new dam in the hills for the metropolitan water supply. That has never been touched. It is a large expenditure, and was sadly needed. As regards abattoirs at Midland Junction and North Fremantle we are

just hearing now, in the face of a general election, that these abattoirs are to be commenced.

Mr. Bolton: They are completed. They have been running nine months.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The settlement of the South-West by dairy farmers was also included.

Mr. Bolton: I hope that is recorded.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I will withdraw it. They are just completed. We started the sale yards, and the Government have just completed the abattoirs. The settlement of the South-West by dairy farmers, including the opening up by railway construction from Manjimup to Denmark and Nannup to Deep River, the place the hon. gentleman scorned, were also included, as recommended by the Advisory Board. Homes for the people were also included in the policy, and this is about the main and principal portion of that policy which the Government have attempted to carry out. It would be interesting, with regard to the workers' homes, to have the occupations and incomes of those who have received advances or have had homes built under the Act.

The Premier: You can get them to-morrow morning at my office, if you like, right up to date.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why not put them on the Table of the House? It is public information, and you might give it. You might also state the number that applied under the leasehold provision and the number under the freehold provision. Of course, the point that has to be driven home in connection with the whole of this *résumé* of policy and non-completion of same is that whereas had we spent the 10 millions, the country would have had these beneficent works, the money has been spent by my friends opposite, and squandered in doubtful undertakings mainly, and the country has not got the works. Our railways, of course, as sanctioned by Parliament prior to the present Government taking office, are gradually being brought to completion: but the cost to the country is enormously in excess of the previous cost. This matter has been de-

bated time after time, until it is hardly necessary for me to repeat the figures. We have the admission of the Minister for Works that his railways, constructed during the last three years, have cost this country something like £500 or £600 per mile more than an equal mileage of railways constructed under our administration.

Mr. Lander: Why do you not tell them the reason why it is so?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Because the Government have been squandering the money on expensive day labour without proper supervision. That is the reason.

Mr. George: Hear, hear.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: And the country, of course, is paying the piper. Just, for instance, look at these figures for a moment. Mr. Johnson, the Minister for Works, claimed that he is doing twice as well as we were when we left office.

Mr. Lander: Nobody shook any of his rails, at any rate. He looked out for that.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not know that anyone shook any of my rails.

Mr. Bolton: Yes, they did.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Lander: How did the rails get on at Noggerupp?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The cheapest line that that versatile gentleman has constructed during his term of office was the Quairading-Nannup line. I think, costing £2,000 per mile; and the cheapest lines that I constructed during my time cost £1,060, £1,153, and £1,196 per mile. Another good illustration, perhaps, is the Greenhills-Quairading line. In my time a section of that line was constructed by contract and cost £1,426 per mile. The present occupant of the Works Department built another section, to Nannup, and it cost £2,000 per mile. Six hundred pounds per mile more, and similar country and just exactly similar construction.

Mr. Gill: A fully equipped line.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Just exactly similar construction. When you also take into consideration that railways were much more cheaply and more expedi-

tiously constructed during our time, and that the working railways earned in 1911 £1,844,000 and showed a profit of £224,000 after paying the interest bill, whilst in 1913 with a revenue of £2,037,000 they showed a profit of only £25,000, you can see at once the marked difference between the administration of the Liberals and that of the Labour party.

The Premier: Tell us the number of new trucks and engines we have bought.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is said we starved the railways for rolling stock. Ninety locomotives have been purchased, and of these 60 were ordered in my time. That is the way I starved the railways for rolling stock.

The Premier: You never paid for a single locomotive. As a matter of fact, you did not buy a box of matches while you were there.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The management of the railways, the construction of the railways, and the mismanagement in regard to butchers' shops and steamers and other things are equalled only by the bungling of the Premier, more especially in connection with these sleeper contracts. Here again, I want to point out to him that, whilst he was so bitter against myself and others who had the temerity, last session, to point out that he could not possibly complete his contract in time—

The Premier: I did not say anything of the sort. That is absolutely incorrect. I never said I could not complete them.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I said you could not complete your contract, and you jeered at me.

The Premier: That is a different matter, then.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: To-day the Premier is in the unenviable position of having to admit that the very statement I then made has been absolutely proved.

The Premier: I do not admit anything of the sort.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Then let me just point it out to the Premier.

Mr. Foley: The Federal candidates will have to admit a lot when they go over.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Debating this matter in the Assembly on the 30th

July, 1913, I was criticising the State sawmills and their adaptability for carrying out this contract. After referring to the expenditure that would naturally be incurred, I pointed out that the capacity of the mills was not sufficient to carry out the terms of the contract which the Government had entered into. I used very pregnant words, very strong words, on that occasion, and wound up by saying that disaster was imminent, and that it was apparent the Government would never be able to carry out the terms of the contract, and that the country would suffer enormous loss in consequence. Later, I amplified that by saying that the Government, with a mill capacity at the outside of 54,000 loads per annum, were attempting to carry out a contract which meant an output of at least 80,000 loads per annum. And I went on to ask how we could expect anything but disaster to follow such maladministration. Of course I was hauled over the coals for this, and I was called unparliamentary names for having dared to criticise the undertaking and more especially the administration of my friends opposite. In fact the Minister for Lands was wrathful, and in a speech on the subsequent day he said—

This kind of criticism is characteristic of the leader of the Opposition, who poses as a great commercial genius. He has been telling my friend the Minister for Works how he ought to run his sawmills, and warning him about the pitfalls that are sure to befall him. He has been telling my friend the Premier how to buy steamers; in fact there is no subject under the sun on which the leader of the Opposition does not claim to be an authority.

That was all right, but the unkindness about the whole thing was the final paragraph—

and yet we all know that his path through life appears to have been strewn with failure.

It is unnecessary for me to admit that this sort of thing, these gibes and jeers, have to be put up with. Let us see how the Premier has come out with regard to

the sawmills. In his published interview the other day he said that the output of the mills day and night was 636,000 sleepers per annum.

The Premier: I do not think I said anything of the sort.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Oh yes, the Premier did. It is a little game of the Premier to interject that he did not say such a thing. The Premier declared that the full output day and night was 636,000 sleepers, equal to 40,000 loads, and he previously said at His Majesty's theatre in February last that the output was 72,000 sleepers per month, notwithstanding that his mill manager had told him that the capacity was 53,000 sleepers—

The Premier: That is absolutely incorrect.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: A capacity which just equals the figures I gave the House in July of last year, and although I was pointing out in the public interests the pitfalls Ministers were drifting into, I was jeered at and called a financial genius and other similar names for my pains. Now the Premier charges Sir John Forrest with weakness and blames that gentleman for his own blunders.

The Premier: And Gregory for being a traitor.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I wish the Premier would say that outside; he would get a warmer reception than he imagines.

The Premier: We have seen him under the table before.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is a nice thing to say. Senator Pearce also declared that the Premier would receive little assistance from Sir John Forrest. It is a marvellous thing that the Premier goes over East and spends two months in trying to adjust the contract, and then in two days two public officers fix up the whole matter. That again shows the Premier's marvellous business capacity. He proceeds to the Eastern States at big expense and spends a couple of months there and returns in a worse position, and then two officers determine the question almost immediately.

The Premier: It was on my suggestion that the officers should meet.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: In the arguments that the Premier used, he declared that 500,000 sleepers would make serious inroads on our jarrah forests. We have eight million acres of jarrah forests according to the present Minister for Lands. In a recent publication that Minister declared that the total wooded area of Western Australia was estimated at 98 million acres, and that the marketable timber was divided approximately as follows:—jarrah mainly, with blackbutt and red gum, 8,000,000 acres; karri, 1,200,000 acres; tuart, 200,000 acres; wandoo and white gum, 7,000,000 acres; York gum and others, 4,000,000 acres.

The Premier: That must have been your Minister.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: It is the publication of the present Minister for Lands, and yet we have the Premier putting forth the argument that 500,000 jarrah sleepers would make serious inroads in the jarrah forests. If the Premier had carried out his promise to construct the Margaret River railway he could have turned the hewers into that part of the State, and they could have cut four times the quantity of those jarrah sleepers out of country already cut over. Is there anything more disgraceful in connection with this unhappy business than the Minister for Lands' admission that the timber cutters' licenses were stopped to bring pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government. We know that is so, and that the Government were prepared to jeopardise the livelihood of many of the hewers because these novices in administration of business affairs wanted to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government, as the latter had cancelled the contract which the State Government had failed to carry out. What a suicidal policy to attempt to injure our own people in this way!

The Premier: What we were short in karri we promised to make up in jarrah.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: The Premier has admitted in public utterances that he over-estimated the capacity of his mills. He flouted the advice I gave him with regard to the capacity of those mills, and yet he says that if the Federal

Government had carried out their contract, that is, taken delivery when the Premier was able to deliver, there would have been no need to call for these tenders.

The Premier: We promised to make up any shortage in jarrah.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: I do not know about that promise. I do not think the Premier promised to do anything of the sort.

The Premier: Thank you very much; you are a gentleman, as you always are.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Just about equal with the Premier. In addition to the reprehensible conduct of the Minister for Lands in cancelling the timber cutters' licenses, we have the Ministers going round the Eastern States and blowing as to what they can do at the State mills. The Minister for Mines, although courteous in demeanour, speaking in New South Wales said that it did not matter a rap whether the Federal contract was cancelled or not, because the mills would be fully employed; then we have the astonishing behaviour of the Minister for Works who absolutely refuses, backed up by the Premier's department, to give any papers on the subject of these sawmills to the Powellising Commission.

The Premier: Not with the sort of chairman they had.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: That is a gentlemanly remark to make. The excuse the Minister for Works gave for refusing to produce those papers, was that they had his estimates of cost on them. Why, they did not even know how to calculate the capacity of their mills! What were their estimates of cost worth? Not the paper they were written on. Why did he not take those estimates off? Is anyone likely to take the Minister for Works' estimates of the cost of the production of sleepers? Was any competitor likely to base his costs on the estimates of the Minister? Were they not more likely to take their own experience of past years, of the actual cost of production, and base their tenders on those figures? The thing is too flimsy, it is too paltry altogether, and it shows con-

clusively that this matter has been mismanaged from beginning to end. Now our new contract provides—and, by the way, I presume it will be placed on the Table of the House—that \$5,000 sleepers—

The Premier: It has been published in extenso, is not that sufficient?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: We want the original document. The contract now is for 85,000 sleepers, 9ft., 10in. x 5in., equalling about 5,312 loads, and 415,000 8ft. 6in., 9in. x 5in., equalling 22,046 loads. This contract will keep the mills in full swing for the next ten months we were told, thus proving that the calculation I made here and which I gave the Premier the benefit of with regard to what he could do with these sawmills, was accurate, and that the figures I gave were such that he could safely work upon instead of flying into a tangent and getting into an unholy mess. I have seen the mill at Big Brook; it is hardly in going order yet. The mills, of course, are all right, as I said when speaking on the subject. The cost, I am bound to say, will be extravagant when we get the details of the establishment of the powellising works in connection with the mills. These are going to cost £30,000. The permanent structure, I think, is a mistake. The powellising works ought not to have been put in the karri forests, they ought to have been at some central port of distribution where supplies could be taken from all parts of the jarrah and karri country. To spend £30,000 on huge concrete tanks, which cannot be removed, is nothing short of folly.

The Premier: Did you say you had seen them: you said concrete tanks.

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Concrete foundations and channels. It is a mistake to spend £30,000 on permanent works of this description in the karri forest where, according to experience, it is estimated that the timber supply will last from 10 to 12 or 15 years. You are not going to make that scheme profitable, and I do not care what quantity of timber may be there to be treated;

the is sure to be an enormous loss when  
tho works have to be removed elsewhere.  
a Premier: Big Brook is going to be  
a centre.

I b. FRANK WILSON: Yes, but you  
are not going to carry your timber uphill  
wh you can take it down to a mill. The  
Pr pier has also stated that brickworks  
we part of my policy. There is no  
tru in that statement. It is two and  
a l f years since the Premier mentioned  
in speech that the Government were  
ob yning particulars with regard to a  
pr osal to establish State brickworks,  
an he then added that during the next  
fe months these works would be in full  
op ation and turning out bricks at half  
th then cost. I merely want to remind  
th Premier that that was some two and  
a l f years ago and his brickworks are  
nq turning out bricks at all for the  
m ket to-day, let alone at half the cost.  
Th s it is that we emphasise and instance  
th blunders which have been made by  
th Administration. And when we also  
ta into consideration that our immi-  
gr ion has fallen off enormously; that  
th five months ended 31st May saw only  
a leagre increase of some 579 persons;  
th the policy has evidently been  
dr pped; that the cheapening of our  
f l supplies, so often promised by the  
Pr mier and his colleagues, has resulted  
in a failure and a farce; that the land  
se lement which was so successfully car-  
ri out by my colleague the member for  
N tham, and the Administration with  
wh he was connected, and which  
br ight prosperity to this country, has  
be a practically killed; that the harbour  
fa ilities, which are essential to the pro-  
gr progress and advancement of this  
gr d country, are on paper only so far,  
at that the promises made to that port  
w, wh I have the honour to represent,  
B seton, for an extension of harbour  
fa ilities have been now discarded and  
re diated, notwithstanding that they  
w e made in good faith; that the burden  
of taxation has been increased; that  
m ey has been raised from the people  
wh was unnecessary in face of the  
en mous revenue being derived by the

Treasurer; that State money has been  
used to establish enterprises in competi-  
tion with the citizens themselves and the  
taxpayers; that we carry out a policy  
of exterminating our own people regard-  
less of the fact that the progress and  
prosperity of any country depends upon  
the individual effort rather than the  
efforts that may be put forth by any  
Administration; when we grasp the fact  
that at the present time there is un-  
doubted unrest, there is a lack of con-  
fidence strongly in evidence to the extent  
that private capital will not come freely  
to our country—and how can we expect  
it, seeing that if a man puts his capital  
into any industry in the State the very  
next day the Government are out after  
his blood, and want to establish from  
State funds something to compete with  
that man and exterminate him?—when  
we consider the tyranny of unionists,  
fostered and winked at by the Administra-  
tion and encouraged by hon. members  
opposite; when we think of the car-  
penters' strike and the Youanmi miners'  
strike, where 12 poor men engaged on  
contract work were hounded out of You-  
anmi, followed to Sandstone and hounded  
still further from Sandstone, because they  
had dared to sign a contract, notwith-  
standing that other parties were being  
engaged and had been for years past,  
on contract work under verbal agree-  
ment.—

The Premier: It is only an ex-parte  
statement; why not wait until it is  
proved?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Why not  
wait! Why do you not send the men back  
to Youanmi and protect them, so that  
they may get on with their work? Is  
the liberty of the subjects to be interfered  
with in that way?

Mr. Foley: Where are those men now?

Hon. FRANK WILSON: Some of  
them are down here in Perth. Is the  
liberty of the subject to be interfered  
with in that style, while, forsooth, we are  
to wait until the Government can make  
up their minds to move? When they do  
move it is too late, the men have gone.  
I have on many occasions had to com-

plain on the floor of the House of such treatment, treatment which I believe does not receive the support of many of my Labour friends opposite, although some of them are rabid enough to endorse it. I have pretty well concluded my task; I have pointed out where the Government have utterly failed financially, where the borrowing has been lavish and the expenditure extravagant; that as compared with its condition under the Liberal Administration this country is fast being run into debt up to its very ears, if I may use the term; that the policy of my friend opposite seems to be that the more money we can borrow the better off we are, and the bigger the overdraft we can get the more solvent are we. Such a system has always proved disastrous to the individual, and it will prove disastrous to the nation if the people see fit to permit our friends opposite to carry it on for another term.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned 9.37 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 7th July, 1914.*

	Page.
Papers presented .. .. .	124
Assent to Supply Bill .. .. .	124
Address-in-Reply, fourth day .. .. .	124

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

### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Colonial Secretary: 1, Workers' Homes Board—Reports of the Chairman for the years ended 30th June, 1912, and the 30th June, 1913. 2, Workers' Homes Act, 1911, and Work-

ers' Homes Act Amendment Act, 1912—Financial Statement and Report for the years ended 30th June, 1912, and the 30th June, 1913. 3, State Steamship Service—Audit Report and Balance Sheet for year ended 30th June, 1913. 4, Health Act, 1911—Leederville Municipal Council—Amendment of By-law 24.

### ASSENT TO SUPPLY BILL.

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

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 2nd July.

Hon. R. J. LYNN (West): Since last session, the biennial elections for the Council have been held, and while the House has benefited by the accession of new members, I desire to make reference to some of those gentlemen who are no longer amongst us. I wish to refer specially to my late colleague, Mr. Moss, who for many years held prominent positions in Ministries, and was not only a valuable member to the West province, but one who rendered great service to this State, a gentleman whose opinion, hon. members will agree, was valued in this Chamber. I think I should mention this in order to have an appreciation of his services recorded on the pages of *Hansard*. With reference to the Governor's Speech, with the exception of the re-appearance of many old familiar friends, there seems to be little other than a considerable amount of padding, together with a eulogy of the administration of the present Government. While congratulating the hon. Mr. Millington on his speech in moving the adoption of the Address-in-reply, and the hon. Mr. Cornell on his speech in seconding the motion, I agree with the hon. Mr. Colebatch when he said that the hon. Mr. Cornell's idea of mending this Chamber is somewhat different from the attitude adopted by that gentleman when he first took his seat in the House. Doubtless the environment of this Chamber has had some