

ter, nor, indeed, many others, took the slightest notice of him. However, the time will come during the next few weeks when, I hope, attention will be given to various matters to be introduced, such as the Licensing Bill, the redistribution of seats, and other measures foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech. I only desire to say I hope there will be no undue haste, even if the House has to sit long after Christmas to make up lost time, the time during which Ministers have been touring the country instead of meeting Parliament. I hope even if we have to make up this lost time we will give proper attention to the various measures, that we will criticise them, amend them, and make them more workable in the interests of the people of the State.

On motion by Mr. Carson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.7 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 10th August, 1910.

	PAGE
Papers presented	245
Questions: Land available, Victoria district	245
Railway Overhead Bridge, Fremantle	245
Secondary School Headmaster	245
Railway rolling stock hired	246
Blackboy industry	246
Railway Advisory Board, appointment	246
Liquor Revenue Returns	246
Leave of absence	246
Papers: Royal Commission, Collie	246
Bill: Geraldton Municipal Gas Supply, &c.	246
Address-in-Reply, sixth day	247

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Attorney General: Regulations made under Education Act.

By the Premier: 1. Reports of the Public Service Commissioners on Accounts and Stores. 2. By-laws under "The Met-

ropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act, 1909." 3. By-laws of the Wiluna Roads Board. 4. By-laws of the Municipality of Busselton. 5. Copies of Orders in Council under Section 35 of "The Audit Act." 6. Poundage Fees agreed to by the Cottesloe Beach Road Board.

QUESTION—LAND AVAILABLE, VICTORIA DISTRICT.

Mr. S. F. MOORE asked the Minister for Lands: When is it intended to throw open third-class lands in the Victoria district for selection under conditional purchase conditions?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Lands) replied: On the 16th instant, *vide* notice now appearing in the *Government Gazette*.

QUESTION—RAILWAY OVERHEAD BRIDGE, FREMANTLE.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Railways: When is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the erection of a bridge over the railway from Edward-street to the wharf at Fremantle?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The Commissioner advises that this bridge is not required for railway purposes, and he does not propose asking for authority for its erection.

QUESTION—SECONDARY SCHOOL HEADMASTER.

Mr. DAGLISH asked the Minister for Education: 1. Is it true that a person from outside the State has been appointed as headmaster of the Secondary School? 2. If so, has the appointee had any previous experience as a headmaster? 3. Is there no member of the staff of the Education Department or of any secondary school here qualified for the position? 4. In what were the local candidates inferior—scholarship or capacity to organise and control a new institution?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3 and 4, It was considered that the gentleman selected was the most suitable all-round candidate for the appointment.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ROLLING STOCK HIRED.

Mr. CARSON asked the Minister for Railways: What amount was paid by the Midland Railway Company for the use of Government rolling stock during last financial year?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The amount paid by the Midland Railway Company for the hire of railway stock and demurrage was £1,211 7s. 6d.

QUESTION—BLACKBOY INDUSTRY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (for Mr. O'Loughlen) asked the Premier: 1, Has any attempt been made to start the blackboy industry in this State? 2, Has the deposit of £1,000 lodged by a company last year been forfeited? 3, If not, why not?

The PREMIER replied: 1, An agreement was entered into with Dr. Black in November, 1908, giving him the right to remove blackboy from certain Crown lands on payment of a royalty of 6d. per ton. 2, No deposit was provided for in the agreement, but the agreement provided that Dr. Black was, within twelve months, to expend a sum of £1,000 in the provision within the State of a plant for treating the blackboy. The condition not having been fulfilled, the agreement was cancelled after due notice being given as provided in Clause 9 of the agreement. 3, Answered by No. 2.

QUESTION—RAILWAY ADVISORY BOARD, APPOINTMENT.

Mr. KEENAN asked the Minister for Mines: 1, On what date in March last was the expert advisory board for reporting on proposals to construct agricultural railways appointed? 2, Under what authority was such board appointed, and by whom? 3, What tenure of office

is assured to the members of the board? 4, Has the Minister any objection to laying on the Table of the House all papers in connection with the appointment of such board?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Works) replied: 1, On 26th March, 1910. 2, Cabinet. 3, No security as members of the board beyond that as members of the public service. 4, I do not anticipate any objection. I have not been able to obtain all the papers in connection with this matter.

QUESTION—LIQUOR REVENUE RETURNS.

Mr. MURPHY asked the Treasurer: 1, What is the amount of revenue derived annually from the issuing of licenses to manufacture or sell beer, wines, and spirituous liquors in the State? 2, What is the amount of revenue returned to the State by the Commonwealth since Federation, collected as customs duties, on the importation of beer, wines, and spirits from abroad?

The TREASURER replied: 1, £38,847. 2, This information can be supplied only by the Commonwealth Treasurer, and he will be communicated with if the hon. member so desires.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Gordon, leave of absence for one fortnight was granted to Mr. Hardwick (East Perth) on the ground of urgent private business.

PAPERS—ROYAL COMMISSION, COLLIE.

On motion by Mr. A. A. Wilson ordered, "That all papers in the Mines Department file before the Commission in connection with the Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund, etcetera, on April, 1910, be laid on the Table."

BILL—GERALDTON MUNICIPAL GAS SUPPLY.

Introduced by Mr. Carson, read a first time, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Sixth Day.

Resumed from the previous day.

Mr. CARSON (Geraldton): It is not my intention to criticise the Government, because I recognise that the Opposition will give enough criticism of the actions of the Government. In the first place I wish to congratulate the Premier on the energy and ability displayed by him in the old country on behalf of this State. I was surprised at the remarks of the member for Forrest when he referred to the Premier's visit. I feel sure that the great majority of people in Western Australia recognise that the Premier did great work in advertising this State and its vast resources and possibilities, and I am sure the visit will mean a considerable increase to our population, more particularly of those desirous of going on the land. However, I think it is a great mistake for this Parliament and the country to be tied up altogether to agricultural immigration. I am sure we could do in this country with more men of sound constitution and good character, because we have a huge State to develop with boundless resources, and it is impossible for the Government to carry out their policy of railway construction unless we have a considerable increase in population. It was only a few months ago that we had an unemployed difficulty, but through the developmental policy of the Moore Government what is the state of affairs to-day? Notwithstanding what members of the Opposition have said with regard to want of employment, in the districts where I have been there is need for labour of all descriptions, more especially in the agricultural centres.

Mr. Angwin: How long will it last?

Mr. CARSON: It will last for a considerable number of years; because we have a huge country and we have a vast amount of agricultural land which has to be cleared and cultivated.

Mr. Gill: Do they want the men on day work or piece work at this time of the year?

Mr. CARSON: They will take the men either way. I do not wish to see the policy of railway construction retarded,

because I recognise it is the only way of opening up this country and developing it as it should be developed; but there is one proposition which I would suggest to the Government. I think a much better proposition than that to construct the Wongan Hills-Mullewa railway and one more in the interests of the country would be to secure the Midland railway from the Midland Railway Company; and this can be done according to their agreement, a copy of which I have before me. This agreement says by giving 12 months' notice the Government can procure this property at a price, and failing an offer the price can be determined by arbitration. I thoroughly believe it would be in the best interests of the country if the Government secured that railway instead of constructing a line from Wongan Hills to Mullewa. It would be possible then to run out a line 45 miles from Minginew to Mullewa, for this would open up a vast extent of arable land and would allow coal seams to be worked which would prove a great boon to the mine owners in the Murchison and East Murchison district. With the opening up of the Victoria district and the increased population there the great bulk of the traffic will be by way of Geraldton and thence on to the Murchison. Under the present system of control by the Midland company considerable expense is caused to the Government in the way of book keeping. If the Government secured the Midland line it would be possible to build spur lines to suitable agricultural areas which are now intended to be tapped by the Wongan Hills-Mullewa line.

Mr. Angwin: Why were you against the purchase previously?

Mr. CARSON: I did not speak against it. Every member of the Labour party who spoke was against it. I am pleased the Government intend to introduce Bills for the extension of the Northampton and Upper Chapman railways. There is no district that would so well justify the expenditure of public money as the Victoria district will do and, in fact, has done in the past. To give some members an idea of the work that has taken place

there I may tell them that last season we exported from Geraldton 8,000 bags of wheat and this year 80,000 bags. There are in the Geraldton district three flour mills which supply the Murchison and the North-West with flour. That shows the progress being made in the district. All that wheat is grown within a radius of 40 miles of Geraldton and, notwithstanding that fact, within that small area there are about 200,000 acres held by a few people and used entirely for the raising of sheep. The member for Balkatta ridiculed the idea of the Government securing these large estates, which according to him, gave the owners an opportunity to "get in out of the wet." Whatever taxation proposals are made with regard to large estates does not matter much to the owners, who are able to bear any tax, for they keep a very fine class of sheep, and wool growing is more payable than wheat farming. It is in the interests of the country that large estates, when close to a port, should be secured. It costs the State nothing to obtain them and it means great revenue to the railways. I hope the Government will continue the policy of buying up large estates. Regarding immigration I agree with some members that it is necessary for the Government to have large areas ready for immigrants on their arrival. There will be objection raised to this scheme because some people say that its adoption will mean blocking out our own people, but in order that a successful immigration policy shall be carried out something of the sort must be done. No matter what care is taken, we are bound to get some undesirable immigrants, but it is very necessary that we should have an increased population. With regard to the legislation the Government propose to bring down this session, most of the Bills foreshadowed were before the House last year. I hope the measures will be passed, and particularly that the Licensing Bill will become law. We are not likely to be unanimous on the Government proposals and I cannot fall in with their views as to some of the clauses, but all agree that the people of the State

should have power to control the traffic. I hope the Bill will go through and give a measure of local option. We shall have ample time to discuss the other Bills when they come before us. While I do not desire to oppose the University Bill, I think it would be better if the Government were to do away with the secondary school and give to students of the primary schools scholarships which would take them on to the colleges in the State. The proposal for continuation classes is a very good one. Only last year I endeavoured to get the Government to establish something of the sort at Geraldton. I obtained the names of 30 pupils who were willing to pay a reasonable fee, and we also arranged for an instructor, but the Government could not afford the outlay. If they could not afford that, I do not see how they are going to establish a university. I hope every facility will be given to the selectors' children to get a primary education. I know it means a great expense to supply all the out-back places, but that should be the first consideration of the Government. I hope the Government will be able to carry out the policy foreshadowed, for if they do so it will be in the best interests of the country.

Mr. WALKER (Kanowna): It was not my intention to have spoken at this stage, but rather than that the Address-in-Reply should go by the board, I will step into the gap. In all my experience I have never read a Government programme put in the mouth of His Excellency so discursive, so verbose and so laudatory of the peunman, whoever it was, on the Government side of the House. It is really a re-hash of all we have had in Governor's Speeches in the last two Parliaments. There is absolutely nothing new; it is an old train upon the old line. Perhaps the only new feature introduced into the Speech is that for which the Government are in no wise responsible, and it adds a melancholy feature to it, that is the death of our late Sovereign, King Edward VII. We all of us feel grieved, as citizens of a great Empire, at the loss of a Sovereign distinguished among Sovereigns for his

common-sense, his manhood, his tact, and his non-interference with the active life of citizenship. The next feature of course is the accession of our new Sovereign; in no wise are the Government responsible for that. The next striking feature is the visit of our Premier to England. I do not know that the Government can particularly crow over that. It was for health, pleasure and business, doubtless connected with politics. I am not going to take from him any merit he justly deserves for services to the State while on that visit, but it adds nothing to the Government's policy or programme, it gives us nothing further, we are just where we were. What advantage, if we carry out this programme further than we have done hitherto, have we from the Government remaining in office? I know it is a cry throughout the country, wherever the Press on the Government side of the question is circulated, that we have a progressive Government, a developmental Government, a Government intending to build up the State. I want to know what the Government are doing that is new, original, or due to themselves. I cannot understand this everlasting crowing about this Government doing what any Government would have to do at the present stage of our national advancement. What Government in office would not build railways? Can we conceive it possible, as the population increases, as development is taken further and further from the old lines, that any Government in office would decline to build railways? Moreover, before ever the Government took office, the programme now carried out was mapped out for them.

The Premier: By whom?

Mr. WALKER: By the Labour party. The report of the Royal Commission appointed by the Labour Government contained proposals for the construction of agricultural railways. Under those circumstances I do not blame the Government for carrying out the policy. I give credit wherever it is due, but I do object to this perpetual cry that they are the authors of this policy. They are not the

authors of this policy. Moreover, if I might take, not credit but due common justice to myself, I might say that from the first—I think it was the first speech I made in this House—at all events I had not been long in the House, before I pointed out the necessity for these light railways, the opening up of agricultural districts, schemes of settlement, and improvements in the treatment of immigrants. What has been done beyond that? Is there one single original feature that is new from start to finish in the Government's administration? There is not one. I would not object but for this reason. They carried on this policy, which I say is our policy, and I say it is the rightful policy, and we are thankful for it, but when it is used as a contrast, when at every political election the platform is made the resonant board for proclaiming to the country the contrast as between the Government on the one hand and the Opposition on the other, when they say we have done all this, we authorised all that, and the other side are the very side that did not want it, and would not give it, and could not get it; that kind of thing is an unjust contrast, it is unfair. The progressive party is the Labour party.

Mr. Troy: It always has been.

Mr. WALKER: In every instance the Labour party by its creed, if I may say it, has advocated the extending of the avenues of labour from the coast to the furthest bush hamlet, and beyond it into the wilds. This is the party that rightfully advocated that policy: this is the party that has planned that policy, that has mapped it out, and to the other side only belongs the reward for having done it: this is the party that properly deserves the honour. These are the features that are justly objectionable. Now we are only going ahead progressively, because the country is in that state that in spite of any Government, progress cannot be prevented. As settlement proceeds the country must become more prosperous, and as the avenues are opened up, and as employment follows there must be an appearance of prosperity for the

time being, and the credit is due to the seasons and the blessings of Providence. This, however, the Government take to themselves as if they had done it all. As a matter of fact they have done nothing. Look behind the scenes and see what the Government are doing in the real sphere of Government, that of administration; that is the real test. What are they doing to better the Government of this country? Is it not true that a few sessions ago we heard from the Government benches nothing but wholesale condemnation of Mr. Jull? Do we hear anything of that now? Is there the same opposition now that there was to the Public Service Act at that time? Is there the same condemnation of Mr. Jull and the administration of the Act? No. Why? Because now Mr. Jull is utilised, if I may so express it, as a convenient tool of the Government in their manipulation of the public service. But is it not true that the whole public service is in a cauldron of seething discontent because of the injustice in the supervision of that service, and in the pay, and the classification, and the treatment of the members of that service? Is it not a fact that the Government have again and again broken their solemn contracts with members of the civil service? The Government are not keeping their pledged word, they have failed to do what the Act requires, and failed to keep the assurances given from the Treasury bench. Is not that a fact? Is there not discontent not only among the heads but in all the ranks of the public service? Have not the classifications, which should have the force of law, been absolutely ignored by the Government; no notice taken of them? What shall we say of the commercial honour of the Government, so to speak, when they ignore not only Acts of Parliament but promises made solemnly in this very Chamber? We cannot say the Government are doing good, or that they are fulfilling their mission, or that they are acting as a Government at all in that respect. They are simply allowing things to drift, and not troubling themselves as to the adjustment required right throughout the civil service. Take another feature, take the line of least resistance. In almost every de-

partment presided over by a Minister, we find that the chief or the several heads of that department are the kings who are governing us. If you want to propose anything that is for the general welfare of the public, the Minister refers the matter to the heads of the department, and often their reports decide his course of conduct. It is not only in that respect that the Ministers are under the thumb of the heads of departments and controlled by them, but between the various departments themselves there is almost civil war at times. Whenever the departments come into conflict there is a lot of correspondence between them. They set their backs up, as it were, and fight against each other, and a lot of time is wasted until the dispute is arbitrated upon, perhaps by some officers outside the department altogether. Let us take as an instance the case of the man Berteaux in which the Minister for Mines is concerned. We had an assurance given us here that steps would be taken to bring the wrongdoers to justice. How has the matter been settled? It was referred to an officer in the Crown Law Department, kept for over 12 months, and now the whole thing is to be abandoned. We are now governed not by the Minister, who has his honour to protect, nor by his department, but we are governed by an outside officer who lays every arm useless by the utterance of his opinion. I will not labour that point, but simply give it as an instance of how we are governed, not by the Minister, whose duty it is to clear his department in a court of law, but by an officer of a department. Even if the Minister goes under and if the other man wins, no matter, it is a clearing of the atmosphere and makes us capable of judging clearly whether right is being done. I give this as an instance simply to show that we are governed by those who are in the civil service and not by the Government. Where is credit due to the Government, I would like to ask, in the administration of this State? Whenever a difficult question of any kind arises what is done? They appoint a board. If there is a difficulty as to where railways are to run, or what part of the

country is or is not entitled to a railway the Ministry appoint a board, which is absolutely irresponsible.

The Premier: That is what we have been criticised for.

Mr. WALKER: What for?

The Premier: Not having previously appointed a board.

Mr. WALKER: If you appointed a board that was responsible, or if the board were appointed by this House, I would be with you. That would be an entirely different thing; but this board has been appointed ministerially. I have every respect for the members of that board and I have no desire to belittle their character, or question their integrity, but I am just speaking of the matter as an instance of government. Supposing that a Government absolutely corrupt were to get into power and were at liberty to appoint its own boards whenever it wanted them——

The Attorney General: Who appointed the Royal Commission to which you have referred?

Mr. WALKER: I presume the Government did.

Mr. Scaddan: The Labour Government appointed it.

Mr. WALKER: I do not know that that is always wise. I have lifted my voice in this House against Royal Commissions again and again for similar purposes, and I admit a good many of them have been farces, and a vast amount of public funds of the State has been spent, and responsibilities have been shifted, and facts have been screened by the appointment of these Royal Commissions. It is the same with regard to boards. In this case I may give an instance of what could be done. A corrupt Government could appoint a board and get a verdict, or decision, or opinion from that board to carry out what the Government wanted, and the Government could shield itself behind the board. I would advocate the appointment of a board similar to that in New South Wales where the House takes the responsibility upon itself. That, however, is quite a different matter from appointing boards which may be, I do

not say are, but which may be partisan boards.

Mr. Jacoby: This is not.

Mr. WALKER: The hon. member knows the people and knows that they are trustworthy, but he does not see the principle that is involved and the danger there is in this kind of government. I say it is not government at all; it is shifting the government into departments and provinces where the people and the people's representatives have no voice. We cannot discuss these matters in the same way when we have these irresponsible bodies telling us what we should do. Let me mention an instance of what may happen. The other day I was at a deputation which waited upon the Acting Premier. It was in regard to the goldfields water supply regulations, and at that meeting the head of the Water Supply Department in Perth was present. And, would you believe it Sir, that officer, a servant of the people, took the words out of the Minister's mouth; and not only did he take the words out of the Minister's mouth, but, in order to join in the conversation and the opinions being expressed, he walked to the Minister's table and, not rudely, but as one who knew more than the Minister himself, took a document out of the Minister's hand and read the parts he wanted read to the deputation, as though he had charge of the deputation, as though the deputation were interviewing him, while the Minister was but second fiddle.

Mr. Troy: That officer has had charge during all the recess.

Mr. Taylor: There have been no Ministers to look to the business, for they have all been away.

Mr. WALKER: Probably so, but the point is in the matter of the government of affairs. Are we going to allow the government to be in the hands of the heads of the branches of the various departments of the State, or are we to have Responsible Government with Ministers themselves taking all responsibility, and dealing with things, as indeed they ought to do, on the basis of their own knowledge? I am objecting to this method of delegation to people who are irrespon-

sible. I say we are practically giving away all the privileges of a deliberative and legislative body; that we have government by figurehead and not by actual initiative when our Cabinet is no more than the mouth-piece of the heads of departments—when they are not actually governing but are themselves being governed. I am objecting also to these perpetual appointments of boards for all matters that are troublesome. Everything intricate or troublesome, or upon which there can be two opinions expressed, commends itself to the Government as something that a board should deal with; and so we have boards for everything. It is bureaucratic government over again; it is the Russian form of Government here in Western Australia. It is this that has cursed Russia, and will curse this country in the fulness of time.

Mr. Jacoby: It is a common practice all over the world.

Mr. WALKER: It may be so. It is getting more common because Ministers, I regret to say, are constantly shirking their responsibilities. If they are not qualified or not sufficiently numerous to carry them out, let us appoint more Ministers; but let us have Responsible Government.

Mr. Jacoby: It seems to act all right in the United States.

Mr. WALKER: The hon. member desires as an illustration to take us back to a Government that adopts this practice. I tell him the Government of the United States is, in point of responsibility to the people, almost second to Russia herself. America has killed democracy by virtue of that form of government.

Mr. Scaddan: That is what they want to do here.

Mr. WALKER: Undoubtedly. It is in America that we have had the first direful examples of the evils of trust and combines—examples which, I regret to say, are being followed in this country, and possibly under this system of government, where boards of irresponsible people can recommend a thing to the Government, and the Government can excuse themselves with, "Well, we have adopted the recommendation of the board." In

America there is no liberty for the working classes.

Mr. Jacoby: The Government are responsible to the people.

Mr. WALKER: In what way are they responsible to the people? The people cannot reach them. It is these boards that stand between them and the people. America, by her boards and system of Government has, I say, killed the social growth of that great people, and absolutely reduced them to a stage of wage slavery where there seems very little hope of betterment. It is in America where, for every cry for betterment of their lot, they are either hanged on the gallows, as in Chicago, or the militia is sent to shoot them down like so many dogs. That is the position in America, and I hope the hon member, if ever his turn comes, will not take the American Government as an example to be followed in this State.

Mr. Jacoby: Take the United Kingdom as an example.

Mr. Taylor: What is wrong with delegating Parliament to a board?

Mr. WALKER: Precisely so. What is there even here which we are not doing by a board? Every day we are whittling away our responsibilities, until ultimately this will be a Chamber for nothing else but talk without any work. The interests and welfare of the people are already delegated to this board and to that. to this commission and to that Judge until there is really nothing for this House to do. I mention this because there has been a good deal said of the apparent aggression of the Federal Parliament. Is it not likely that aggression will increase when we ourselves are unprepared, or unfit, to carry out the responsibility imposed upon us by the electors? We are asked to represent the people, and be trustees for them for the time being, and we are sent here to do work on their behalf. But the work is delegated all round to boards, and to heads of departments, while the Government themselves do really nothing in the matter of governing. Now, whilst that state of affairs exists, can we wonder that this Parliament should become unpopular? Can we wonder that there are people crying out that we are unneces-

sary, that we are not carrying out our duties? Can we marvel, in short, that there should be a cry for Unification? My object in speaking as I am doing is not so much to hit Ministers, as it is to vindicate our right to exist, to get an improvement, to secure a betterment in the state of affairs of this country. I say, looked at coldly and as a matter of fact, our Government are doing absolutely nothing to earn the reputation that is bestowed upon them by a sycophantic Press; and I say it is time the country gave a trial to some who will do more than merely build railways. That is all the stock of the present Government; they have nothing else. Cut up lands and build railways to them. When you have said that, you have said practically all that the Government are doing. We want something more than that at the present juncture. If the Government were a live Government, and felt keenly for the people's welfare and interest would they not, ere this, have taken some action in respect to this tramway strike? Here we have upon the statute-book an Act admitted to be imperfect, and which will not meet this case. We have an Act of Parliament which, interpreted by the Judges, produces a deadlock. I have no hesitation in saying it is the Act of Parliament itself which produces the dead-lock. Yet there is not a single effort being made by the Government to save the people from inconvenience under the present trying trouble to the workmen in the tramway employ. Would not the Government, if they were really alive to the welfare of the people, have stepped in long ago? Is there nothing the Attorney General can think of to bring to their senses any unreasonable party concerned in this strike? I want to know if there is not something the Minister could think of in this respect, which would enable the Government to interfere? Is not this city part of the estate, so to speak, for which the Ministry are trustees for the time being? Are not the people of the city part of their care and concern? And yet with all this inconvenience, all this property wastefully

lying useless at the present juncture, the Government have not the nerve to step in and do anything. Instead of that, they are waiting calmly by to see how things will eventuate. I cannot think that, under these circumstances, the Government are worthy of the reputation of being either progressive or democratic. They are simply indolent in the face of danger or difficulty. Now, I want to know in what department we have had any special advantage from the Government? Where have we received any advancement through the Government? We have had what I have already objected to, namely repeated crowing. Take, for instance, this talk about building the Trans-Australian railway. What is that but crowing? Playing to the gods as it were. Is there any sense or reason in putting that in the Governor's Speech? What definite proposal is there here? Let us again look at the language in that portion of the Speech—

Feeling that the delay—
Observe this from a dignified Government—

Feeling that the delay in beginning the construction of the Trans-Australian railway is fraught, not only with grave injury to the interests of Western Australia, but is also a menace to the safety of the Commonwealth as a whole, my advisers are of opinion that, rather than incur a further indefinite postponement, the project should be undertaken by the two States through whose territory the line will pass.

Can any member find anything definite in that? "Should be undertaken." By whom? By the two States concerned. Has there been any communication with the other States? Is this not one man speaking altogether without his partner; how do we know that this other State concerned will be any more willing, nay, will be so willing as the Commonwealth to undertake a national work of such gigantic proportions? How do we know it; has there been any preliminary correspondence on the matter; has the Premier of South Australia been communicated with in any form; has he ever been written to or telegraphed to on the matter?

Yet here is an ostensible partnership, a presumable agreement and understanding as if it had been definitely raised that if the other party did not come in, and in good time, they would show him that they would start it, these two themselves. Yet the other partner does not know anything about it: it is done without any communication or understanding of any kind. Does not this show the character of whoever penned this Governor's Speech? It is mere high falutin. And yet it is put before a solemn, deliberative assembly as if it were part of a programme. There was no necessity for it. I take it that when we are called upon to listen to His Excellency as to the course our legislation should take, we are not going to be played with, we are not going to be amused, we are not going to be befooled, but we are going to be told what is in progress and what is the intention of the Government on a solid issue or basis, no mere playing either with the people or with the people's representatives. Yet can this paragraph be described but as playing with the people? There is no intention, there has been no resolve, I guarantee to say there has been no Cabinet meeting on the subject to decide that it would be done or to see if it could be done.

The Attorney General: Your powers of second-sight are small.

Mr. WALKER: Are they?

The Attorney General: Very much.

Mr. WALKER: I guarantee to say, then, if something has been done, that this has been done, and this only, "That we will put in a paragraph of this kind, it will take, we will get kudos by it, it is a useful bit of frill to the rest of the matter."

The Attorney General: You are absolutely wrong.

Mr. WALKER: I am not absolutely wrong. Will the Attorney General assure this Chamber now that they corresponded with the other partner over an enterprise of this kind?

The Attorney General: I can deal with it later—certainly.

Mr. WALKER: Assure me now. Do not put me on a wrong track by empty denial. Let me know if there was cor-

respondence with the other States before this partnership transaction was put in the Governor's Speech.

Mr. George: Why do you not move for the papers?

Mr. WALKER: Are there plans? They naturally keep them secret. Now the Minister is silent on it.

The Attorney General: You must not assume that silence is consent to your charges. It is nothing of the kind.

Mr. WALKER: Then what is it; do you contradict it?

The Attorney General: I will speak later.

Mr. WALKER: That is not fair. The hon. member may be shifty in a good many things, but surely he should not shift here where there is responsibility.

The Attorney General: I am not shifting.

Mr. WALKER: The House has a right to be taken into the hon. member's confidence, and the hon. member should not allow me to finish in error if he can correct me while I am speaking. I ask to be corrected. Has there been any correspondence with the other State?

The Attorney General: I say generally you are in error as to the intentions of the Government.

Mr. WALKER: Generally! Has there been any correspondence with the other partner on a matter of this kind?

The Attorney General: What I said is sufficiently explicit until my opportunity for speaking comes.

Mr. WALKER: Then I take it the Attorney General will not, because he cannot.

The Attorney General: Because he can.

Mr. WALKER: Then am I to take it as an assurance that there has been correspondence?

The Attorney General: You may take it for what you like.

Mr. WALKER: That is the impertinence, that is the style in which Ministers treat members of the House. This sneering, this autocratic, this "bounding" species of contempt for those who wish to know the truth, if the Ministry have truth

to tell, is not an insult to me; it is an insult to a member of this House and, through him, an insult to the whole House, and it is wholly to be expected from the hon. member. I take it the hon. member is intending to follow me, and I wish it to be known when he does follow me that if he allows me to proceed in error when he has an opportunity of removing it, he is only doing it for a few more fireworks, it is a little more standing in the limelight, a little more of an appeal to be advertised all over the country as having squelched a member of the Labour party—tricks of debate, not honest dealing with the differences that are bound to arise when two sides of the House confront each other. I say as this paragraph stands it bears on its face the fact of mere playing in the limelight; it has insincerity marked in almost every line; there has been no—I repeat—no consideration of the ways and means for a proposal of this kind; and it is put here for no specific purpose. His Excellency does not tell us that we shall be asked to take into consideration a Bill having for its object the carrying out of this proposal, or that resolutions will be submitted to us asking our opinions. No. It tells us simply that Ministers think so-and-so and so-and-so, and His Excellency is made to voice these opinions so airily expressed and with such slight foundations to this Assembly. Let me say that in itself is a reflection upon this Chamber. A proposal of such gigantic importance ought to be first of all considered in this and another place. A matter that would apparently pledge this State to a certain course in an international or interstate question ought not to be so lightly expressed as this. The Ministers should have taken the House first of all into their confidence. A communication should have been made first to us, and we should have been allowed to consider it. Ministers do not know that the House is in favour of such a proposal; they do not know that the majority sitting behind them is in favour of any such proposal; certain it is that they do not know that the other Parliament in South Australia is in favour of it; yet here the opportunity is taken in the Governor's

Speech either to pledge the State—for if it does not pledge the State it means nothing—or to merely do a little spread-eagling. If the paragraph is in earnest then the Ministry have striven to pledge the State to a certain course without asking the Houses of Parliament what they think of it—they are governing autocratically in that respect—if the paragraph is not in earnest then it is bombast, and it ought not to be in the Governor's Speech; it is undignified, it is befuddling Parliament and belittling the purpose for which Parliament exists. We are promised in the Governor's Speech a resurrection of old items. We are promised again the lowering of the franchise of the Upper House. Are the Government in earnest this time; are they really anxious for the reform of that Chamber; are they as democratic as they would have the public believe them to be? If so, why have they not the courage at once to say that the Upper House is entirely unnecessary in the legislative machinery of this State under existing circumstances; why have they not the consistency? But are they really in earnest in this any more than they are in earnest over this paragraph I have quoted? Are they not again playing in the limelight, is it not a limelight Government we are following? When they have had the opportunity of really fighting the Upper House when the Upper House has thrown out their measures and sent them back upon us time and time again, have we not had the Government caving in at the last moment, yielding to the Upper House? When real fighting was possible with the chance of vindicating the liberties and privileges of this Chamber, did not the Government back down again and again? Now, are they in earnest in the matter? If they are in earnest, why stop at the franchise they proposed last session? If they are really as democratic a Government as they would have the people of the State imagine them, why do not they go in for manhood suffrage for the Upper House as well as for this? If the people of the State, the men and the women, can be trusted to vote for you, Mr. Speaker, and Ministers, and every member of this Chamber, why cannot they be trusted to

vote for members of the other Chamber? It requires, I think, as much intelligence to pick out a good member for this Chamber as it does for the Legislative Council, and if we are going to be democratic let us be so, let both qualifications be equal and let us have adult suffrage for both Chambers. The Government dare not do that; they are afraid of it; they are not really desirous of helping the democracy at all as long as they keep a portion of the franchise there; because if they lower it they still preserve the evil; by touching it at all they declare the evil; by keeping it there at all they continue it. These are the horns of the dilemma on which the Government are placed. But I take it they are not in earnest in this measure. It is a stop-gap. It will be introduced for the purpose of long debates in this Chamber; and then when it passes out of this Chamber, they expect it, in the same manner as before, to be massacred; but they get the credit of having tried to reform, when all the time they have the satisfaction of knowing that the reform was either never intended or would have been regretfully received if it had been afforded. Similarly with the Licensing Bill. Are the Government in earnest about it? I say that if we had had a real sense of Responsible Government in this State the Government would not be sitting on the Treasury bench now. In that very Bill, the Licensing Bill, we took out of the hands of the Government their power so to speak. We took the business out of their hands. We changed the entire policy. The Attorney General had charge of that measure. With all his backbone he bent and absolutely receded from his own measure, contented with the complete mutilation of the Bill he so prided himself on; a measure which he introduced with a wonderful sweetness of tone. His speech was magnificent from an oratorical standpoint.

Mr. Johnson: It would have been the same against the Bill.

Mr. WALKER: A measure of sentences, from all kinds of orators from Gladstone downwards, modified more or less

by his own eccentricities of utterance, flooded this Chamber until the very roof scintillated with delight at the music of his voice, and one would think that by such an effort he was desperately in earnest, and meant every line of his Bill. No sooner was he confronted with amendments that absolutely demolished the fundamental principles of the measure he had presented, than he quietly backed down, adopted everything, embodied everything. Are the Government to be held responsible for the measure they introduced? Are they still to stand to their posts? That is the question. When are we going to have sensitive Ministers of the Crown, men who will resent the slightest stain upon their escutcheon; men who will stand by their measures? Have we examples of them now? No. We are not governed by a responsible Government but by convenience, and the member who had charge of the Bill is an illustration of that. Only a few sessions ago that gentleman sat in a chair on the cross-benches. He fought the Government on every possible chance. He expressed views which he has swallowed up in his own inner-conscienceness, and has gone backward. He fought the Government until he became a nuisance, and the reward of being such a political nuisance was to put him into the chair he now sits in.

Mr. George: He forms a target for you.

Mr. WALKER: A target for me. I know he is preparing an onslaught on me. I am to be the target for him, and it is fair therefore if I give him gentle taps on his iron skin, for he will try and jump on me with his hob-nailed boots. That is his usual course. There is no mercy in the Attorney General, but that is the way we are governed. That is how we have the present member in the chair, for how otherwise could he declare himself fitted for the position he is filling?

The Attorney General: I am modest.

Mr. WALKER: There is no modesty in taking a position like that over the heads of men better by experience and training than he who, right from school,

goes to where he may become a Judge upon the Bench. That looks a little suspicious. Has any merit, long service to the State, or qualifications in his particular calling lifted him up to the exalted position he occupies? It all had the appearance of a political move to shift him to where he is, and it is against that I am entering my protest now. Let us have a straight-forward honesty in government and when the Government cannot put through measures they bring forward for our discussion, and when they cannot obtain the vote of this Chamber, let them do what other Governments in other parts of the world do, resign.

Mr. George: They are resigned, I think.

Mr. WALKER: They are too much so in a sense. It is something like the hon. member's resignation from a thousand a year. It is not the resignation I could compliment either party upon. Last session the Government were defeated on the Licensing Bill.

Mr. Gordon: It was agreed to be a non-party measure.

Mr. WALKER: Undoubtedly. Whenever a thing gets awkward, whenever it is a matter upon which the Government may be defeated they say, "Do not stand to your guns, let us all run together."

Mr. Gordon: You ran too.

Mr. WALKER: No, I fought against the Government. The opportunity presented itself to do this when the amendments were proposed. Whenever a measure is likely to be awkward or to challenge the existence of the Government, or the rights of members on the Government side of the House, it is at once declared a non-party question. Is that standing to one's guns? No, that is abandoning them; that is leaving the sphere of battle; that is agreeing to anything, and it must have been your experience, Mr. Speaker, from your observations from the seat you occupy, that the Government in all instances have followed the will of the Assembly. They have never led it, never directed it, never commanded it, never challenged it; but in every instance have gone with the times, have swum with the tide so to speak. That is not the Government I want to see, for there should

be a Government who would bring down a measure and say, "This is our measure; if you don't like it we are not fit to occupy the seats we are in and we are going out and will leave the responsibility to someone else." The Government do not go out. Mention a measure that has been brought down where the Government were likely to be defeated in a division where they said "This is ours, and we are going to protect it with our emoluments and all we enjoy by virtue of our position?"

Mr. Taylor: There was the Sewerage Bill also.

Mr. WALKER: That is another illustration of the same kind. Is there a measure at all debatable, where the vote is likely to alter the balance of the two sides, that the Government will stand by? What chance have any Opposition or any Parliament of ousting a Government from office if they adopt those principles. Are those the principles by which a country should be governed? What chance is there of ever beating them? One fights against them, outvotes them, the majority decide they are wrong, and yet they say "This is not a party measure. We are going to continue, boys, just the same."

Mr. Taylor: That does not show too much dignity.

Mr. WALKER: The way the Government dealt with the liquor law reform was nothing more nor less than an absolute sacrifice of dignity. Again and again the Government were absolutely defeated. A sensitive Government would have said, "You cannot trust us to draw up your measures, you do not affirm our principles, you have shown no confidence in us, and we will leave it to someone else to take our places"; but the Government are determined to stick there, let come what may. They are glued to their seats, do what one may to them, and although they are bobbed under, still the next minute they bob up again. I cannot commend that kind of Government. What is the cause of it? Ask those who support them and they will tell you they are afraid of a Labour Government coming into office. There have been occasions when the dissatisfied of the cross-benches would have voted with the Opposition

only they said "We cannot vote for Labour." There is the stronghold of the Government. There is the security the Attorney General enjoys. It is not because they trust him or his Government, but because they do not want what they think is the humiliation of having this State dominated by the Labour party. There is something that is objectionable to their fine feelings in having a Labour Government. The people of the Commonwealth are not so thinking. If the Ministerial supporters nurse that class pride, for it is class pride, let them no longer talk of being democrats while they nourish those feelings. That class pride that keeps them from voting for the Labour Party is not in the minds of the people. The great body of the people are commencing to see that the real test of merit is manhood; that it is neither the advantages of fortune as bestowed by wealth accrued from industry or speculation that makes manhood valuable or sorry, but it is what nature has given to man, that honesty of purpose and that love of his fellows that makes him feel on all occasions that he is a servant of humanity, not its exploiter. That is what labour means throughout the State. In the Parliament of South Australia the crown has been given to Labour, and through the States in the Federal Parliament the crown has been given to Labour; and surely it is not the despicable thing in this State that either the cross-benches or the Government would like to make it out. What superiority is there on that side of the House? Where does it come in?

Mr. Johnson: Brains.

Mr. WALKER: I am not going to disparage the mental qualifications of Ministers, because I admit that some of them have exceedingly good and enviable educations. They are a few. They are not united amongst themselves even in the enjoyment of this great privilege, for which many of them themselves deserve no credit. Otherwise I see nothing to distinguish that body from this body. Is there anything that can make one say they are better men, more honest men, more honourable men, more true to their

fellow men; is there any qualification of that kind to distinguish them? There are just as honest men on this side of the House, just as intelligent, just as faithful in the service of the public. Why vote for the Government for the one object of keeping out this party, the people's party? I say that is an unsound element in the government of the country at this moment. It is not voting for or against measures; measures are not considered, and that is how those upon the cross-benches vote to support the Government, not because the measures of the Government are to their approval but because if they voted against these measures they vote for the Labour party. Rather than vote for the Labour party, they vote for measures they themselves condemn. Is that healthy government? It takes hold of the weaknesses of humanity in order to secure its own strength. That is the matter that I am condemning. In addition to the possible entertainment that the public are to have again on the Liquor Bill, we are promised a measure for the redistribution of seats. Upon what basis we are not deliberately told. Was there ever an electoral system or a distribution of seats without anomalies? Are we to have an Act of Parliament to remove every little anomaly that occurs? Is this Parliament to be kept passing Redistribution of Seats Bills? Is that the purpose of it? Now, is it not time and should not this House have been taken into the confidence of the Government on this matter? Should we not have been told of the alterations it is proposed to make? I am informed that the Government have been tinkering with that measure for a long time and am not quite sure that it has reached the stage of political accuracy owing to the state of the political barometer at the present moment; but last session that Redistribution of Seats Bill was in the possession of the Government and the Government considered it. I believe the Attorney General had charge of it and that he knows all about it. He spent some time going through the country or a portion of it during the last elections and more particularly during the election that occurred

in Forrest, but did he take the public into his confidence? He surely knows what the Bill is. Has he given the public any chance of making up their minds upon it? Has he taken this Chamber into his confidence? Are we to have a surprise some night by the Bill being thrown upon the Table, the second reading moved, and possibly the Standing Orders suspended at the far end of the session in order to get the Bill through the House?

Mr. Taylor: Some of the Ministers will be suspended before that Bill goes through.

Mr. WALKER: Possibly, but we do not know what has been done or what is to be done. I have been so long in this House that I know that in the early portion of the session we are kept talking about unimportant measures that could be thrown into the waste-paper basket without anyone being injured and then at the end of the session, in the hot month of December, we are asked not only to pass sums involving millions, but to pass measures, with far reaching ramifications, into law. Is that the way to treat the House? Should we not have had some indication of that measure foreboded during the discussion that has taken place since the direct pledging of it in the Governor's Speech? Absolute silence. It is a matter they are holding up their sleeves, to use a vulgarism; it is a weapon to destroy the strength of the Opposition. Can the Attorney General deny that the object of that measure is to lessen the strength of the Labour party? He takes a note but does not answer. The object of it is to diminish the representation of the goldfields. Is that not so? The object of the measure is to get representation for snug country constituencies at the expense of the goldfields. At the present time an election is being fought in the Beverley district wherein the pet of the Government, Sir Walter James, declared that the goldfields are shrinking and that representation should be given to centralisation.

Mr. Hudson: Concentration.

Mr. Taylor: Harper is their pet.

Mr. WALKER: Harper is not their pet. I do not know what kind of billets

there are in store for someone and what a shuffle of cards will take place when that election is over. It seems to mean that the Government think they can afford to neglect the goldfields. They seem to say, "We have had all the benefit we can get from the goldfields; now turn them aside and develop only the political strength of the party on the coast and in the agricultural areas." I wonder if Sir Walter James was inspired by the Government when he uttered sentiments of that kind. These sentiments, too, are becoming more or less general. What is the object of them?

Mr. Hudson: The Acting Premier said something similar.

Mr. WALKER: Yes, I believe the sentiment is not new. They have been going about the country—both Mr. Harper and Sir Walter James, the Government pets, and the Government supporters, declaring that the goldfields are shrinking, that they are played out, that they are negligible and that it is necessary to concentrate down here in the agricultural districts. That is the policy spoken for by the Government, and we have heard none of it contradicted, no reply to that from a single Minister of the Crown, not one word of reproof even. What then must be concluded? They are not unconscious, no Government could be unconscious of the value of the gold mining industry. They know what this industry has done in building up the State in the past. There can be no question about it. Whilst I am as ardent a believer in the agricultural possibilities as any member of the other side of the House, yet I know that had it not been for the gold mining industry, the agricultural lands that are now under crop would have been bush still and labelled still as desert. It was the wealth created by the gold that attracted population; it was through the goldfields that the coast got its first go-ahead; it is because the goldfields have progressed that the agricultural industry is flourishing; because the goldfields have provided a market for the farmers.

Mr. Gordon: Who put the gold there?

Mr. WALKER: That is a senseless interjection.

Mr. Gordon: I thought it would meet the case.

Mr. WALKER: It meets no case. The gold is placed there by the bounty of nature just as the fertility in the soil is placed there by the bounty of nature. You might as well say you cannot boast of the progress the country is making in cultivation and farming generally, because if it had been a sandy desert there would not have been soil there. The soil being there the people have taken advantage of it, the gold being in gold-bearing districts the people have taken advantage of it, and they have flocked there from all parts of the world and made our population what it is. They have given the State its first move in nationhood so to speak, and yet there seems now to be an utter forgetfulness of the services rendered, and the goldfields are to be denied not only the material privileges existing on the coast but political rights which are due to the people there as simple citizens. That is the proposal of the Government. The goldfields are to be shorn of political power by a redistribution of seats. Is that honest government? Is it not government for the maintenance of political monopoly, a monopoly of power for the other side of the House? Is it really done in the best interests of the State? Is it not done only so that the Government may continue in office and that those upon this side of the House might be prevented from putting their own ideals and the ideals of the people into material operation? That appears to me to be the only object of the measure, the lessening of political influence. There are anomalies it is true, but they exist as much in Perth as they exist upon the goldfields; they exist in the agricultural districts and in the far North-West, and no Bill merely having the power of redistribution and containing no further element or principle can prevent anomalies. If we were to adjust matters to-day, to-morrow they would be lost in some part or another. Therefore better let well alone. No injustice is done to any section of the community: there is no injustice towards any class which has representation in this Chamber at present. All interests then

being represented, all views being capable of utterance in this Chamber now, why the necessity for alteration? There seems to be a want of honour in the Government, a selfish clinging to power, and the whole geographical position so far as the electoral divisions of the State are concerned must be altered in order that they may continue in office. Passing from that point I share the view taken by the leader of the Opposition that we should have had something said about the Agency General, but not one word has been spoken. There was the opportunity in the Governor's Speech to tell us something about it.

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

Mr. WALKER: I was complaining of having received no information as to the future of the Agent General's office in London. The Premier went Home particularly to rearrange that office, to take observations as to what was necessary in regard to its future. He has returned, and one would expect that after a trip of that character, with such a specific end in view, the first thing we should have learned would have been something concerning the future of the Agent General's establishment in London. We have not heard a word. What is the reason of the delay? Are we awaiting the result of the Beverley election? Is that to be a factor in deciding the fate of that office in London; or is there any uncertainty since the Premier's return as to which Minister he shall dispense with?

The Premier: I have not seen you yet.

Mr. WALKER: No, that is quite true, but I am not an aspirant for the honour. I want to know why the House has not been taken into confidence. It is the feature I object to all the way through, namely that the House is treated with, may I say, disrespect. Things are done behind the back of Parliament, and we are called together to approve, to endorse, to ratify; not to take any part in the government of the country, but simply to condone what has been done. That is not my idea of the purpose for which we are gathered here. We surely should have an

active and real part in the government of the country.

Mr. George: What are we getting?

Mr. WALKER: We are getting or becoming a useless body of men. We could do without this Parliament altogether, in view of the way things are being run. You could dispense with the Government and let the heads of departments do the work; and you could dispense with Parliament, because all it has to do is to endorse what has been already done behind its back. That is the position we are now in. And I have further to complain of another feature of partisanship in the government of the country.

Mr. Hudson: Before you leave the question of the Agent-Generalship—I presume we will be told who is to be the Agent General.

Mr. WALKER: We are entitled to know, and we have asked for it, but the information is not yet forthcoming.

The Premier: You will not have to wait long.

Mr. WALKER: I am pleased to hear that. Another feature of partisanship in the machinery on the Government side is the appointment of magistrates, the justices of peace. It is a remarkable feature that, in the majority of instances, members on this side of the House nominating magistrates get very little respect paid to their nominations.

The Premier: I wish somebody else had the job of making the appointments.

Mr. WALKER: No doubt it is an unsatisfactory task, but at the same time it is a just cause of complaint that nominations from members on this side of the House—and the nominations really come from the people of the district, who know best the qualities of the nominees—are practically ignored.

The Premier: I do not think you should say that.

Mr. WALKER: They are so far ignored that to the extent of only something like one out of twenty are such nominations honoured, while members on the other side of the House can always get their nominees appointed. I had an instance in my own electorate the other day, when there was made a justice of the peace a gentleman who, at the time

of his appointment, was leaving the district. He was not nominated by myself, nor did I know anything of his nomination. He was not recommended by myself, nor by the municipal council. Where the nomination came from I do not know; but he was made a justice of the peace, and at the time his commission went down he was on the railway train bound for another part of the State where he has taken up his permanent residence. Nominations made by the municipal councils were not considered until recently; indeed I question whether any of them has as yet been accepted. Nominations I have made of members of the Labour party—that is to say, of those who were well known to be labourites—have been ignored altogether. I have not been able to get a single avowed labour man appointed a justice of the peace in my district; yet there are there labour men as good in every respect as those appointed—men of honour, men of intelligence, men respected in the community. Yet they are passed over, while men who are opposed to the views entertained on this side of the House have, from somewhere, been nominated, and have been selected. Perhaps there may be some secret key to this in the way magistrates are made in the Greenough district. The Attorney General, perhaps, could throw a flood of light on some of the recent appointments of justices of the peace in the Greenough district. I believe all the old hands have been practically swept away—opponents, possible rivals of the hon. member; while supporters of the hon. member have been created justices of the peace. I do not know the exact number, but I believe it is fairly large, and amongst them a relative of the hon. member. So his supporters are put upon the roll and are made justices of the peace in an extraordinary number, in a whole flood of them, simultaneously with the disappearance from the list of the hon. member's political opponents. Now that is not fair administration of the powers reposed in the Government in that respect. There should be no partiality, no distinction of party in appointing men to that honourable and trustworthy position. All sides

should have fair play in a matter of that importance; whereas this side of the House is absolutely ignored, or if not absolutely ignored its treatment is sufficiently near to that condition to render the expression justifiable. Well, now, when we see all these evidences of maintaining power by this species of political bribery—what name can you call it but political bribery? Keeping sweet with the people by conferring these honours upon them—what can we say of a Government that reign by these means: that reign, not by intellectual superiority, not by energetic superiority, not by superiority of principle, but that reign simply by the applying of these principles borrowed from Walpole of old—this keeping sweet with the people by giving them all they ask for? I submit it is time the country had a change of Government; for, as I said at the commencement of my speech, the whole of government does not lie in simple, easy-going administration; it does not lie in allowing things to drift; it does not lie in merely allowing events to go in their natural course. There is something more to be done. An ideal is impressed on the whole of the people of the State which aims at the betterment of the people generally—betterment in mind, betterment in body and betterment in the good things of life. What are the Government doing in that direction? What ideals have they? In the very word “progression” they take their shelter. Progressive legislation, progressive development—these phrases are charms, and the supporters of the Government conjure by them. They mean absolutely nothing. Events have naturally shaped themselves, and the Government have followed on their heels. In respect to the real difficulties of government, the adjustment between the citizens of their rights, the Government have done nothing. As has been pointed out they have done nothing to amend the Arbitration Act that is paralysing this city this very night whilst I speak. They have done nothing towards bettering the condition of the workers under the Workers’ Compensation Act, or giving a substitute for that imperfect measure dealing with the lives and happiness of the toilers of the State. They

have done nothing to bring the reward which is justly due to labour, they have done nothing to cut the claws of the exploiters in the land. They have encouraged the combines and syndicates and organised commercial rotters, but the people they have not considered. They have allowed them to drift their weary way along, and fight and suffer and fall and fail in the struggle. That is not government. Surely it is time a Government came into office who would be in line with the march of the ideals of the people, The Government cannot be blind to that great force which is stirring the whole world to its foundation, not here in this State alone, but in every part of the civilised world. I have seen letters from America, arrived by the last mail from there, speaking of the stirring pulse of the people in the hope of the betterment of the toiling masses who have been so long the victims of that juggernaut called the trusts. In England we know what this great force has done. I am mentioning these peoples, and these nations to show that this movement represented by 22 of the chosen of the people in this Chamber is not an isolated phenomenon, is not merely peculiar to the Western State of Australia, is not a movement of an hour, but is part of a great movement that is sweeping round the whole world and touching nations that seemed even to be buried in their barbarism and ignorance only a few years ago. Right over the great areas of the Russian dominions, all that sluggish empire where tyranny and despotism have been enshrined, over that vast area of darkness and sloth and suffering, this wave of ours is passing and stirring up the multitudes until the poorest toiler of the land begins to feel the dignity of manhood. We know what this force has accomplished in the Federal Parliament. It is not individuals alone who have made these great victories for a cause that is sacred; it is not the individual advocate. Take most of us; we are ordinary citizens of the State, not specially fashioned for great, or high, or lofty things, some of us fresh from the plough, or the mine, or the anvil, or the carpenter’s bench,

toiling and struggling through all difficulties to obtain a modicum of education in youth, gifted only with that fire and spirit of hope and companionship and comradeship with our fellow men. With these disadvantages, with no wealth at our disposal, no privileges, no golden opportunities, but only by the sanctity of a cause which is felt to be true, and that moved like a spirit among all—by that only these great triumphs have been obtained, triumphs in view of which our forefathers would stand aghast. Think of that great historical House, the House of Commons, where the sons of lords and lords themselves have been proud to enter; think of that great institution where landlordism and wealth of conservatism have been kept sheltered from the common herds and multitudes for centuries—men have entered that sacred place with hands that were black by the work they had done, their very toil having ingrained itself into the pores of their skin, their hands hardened and broadened and forced out of shape in growth by the toil, the physical toil for poor wages that they had undergone from boyhood; among those coronated men, among those with the wealth of Cræsus, these hard-handed men have gone upon terms of equality—realise that phenomenon—and some of them have risen until, in the Cabinet of the Empire, they are taking place in the counsels of the greatest. It is a phenomenon that is not accounted for by individual quality or individual merit. It is a triumph that can only be explained by the fact that in the march of ages onward the force behind events has lifted up the lowly people to take place with the high and mighty. That is the phenomenon. And on this side of the House the children of that cause are represented. It is here that we bodily express that growing spirit. It is here, no matter how feebly and humbly we may do it, we champion that great movement; and whoever stands in the way of it, or turns back from the track, as the Attorney General has done, leaving those principles when he first felt their breath in his breast years ago and claimed to be a democrat, going backwards now to stand as a barrier to the march of

these principles—whoever stands, in the way stands abreast of the rising tide and must be swept aside. Let the Government go on in their dull, slow, slipshod style, following the chariot of progress, and crowing all the time that they are dragging it whilst they are being dragged with it. In a little time the country will give the penalty. They will be swept from the path of this great cause which is the cause of the people and which is going to make the humblest, the poorest, and the weakest in the land feel a member of the human family entitled to all the rights and privileges and dignities that belong to the human family. This cause must sweep aside these parrots, praters of democracy, who are champions only of that which the word “prater” will express.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. J. L. Nanson): I have listened with a considerable amount of pleasure to the speech of the member for Kanowna, artistic pleasure rather than political pleasure. The hon. member has such a command of language, he has such a copious vocabulary, he has so many sounding phrases, he has so much of invective at his disposal that one would indeed be dull, would indeed be lacking in that generous admiration which should be part, I think, of every man in public life, if we on this side of the House did not congratulate members opposite on their great political orator. But like other great political orators the hon. member suffers from the defects of his virtues. He could not be so eloquent, he could not be so fervent if he were to stick solely to the truth; if he were to deal only with facts his utterances would be relatively tame. But because he is the fortunate possessor of a perfervid imagination, because things unimportant to the ordinary observer assume before his telescopic vision a magnitude out of all real proportion, we in this Chamber are delighted, if not convinced by his oratorical displays. My task this evening is much humbler: I shall not even try to emulate the hon. member; I feel I am not gifted with his command of language; but, even if I were, I fear it would be a dangerous gift, that it might lead me

away from the path of fact I have to take this evening rather than to wander in those realms of imagination which the hon. member has traversed.

Mr. Troy: Nature has given you compensations.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am glad to hear that nature has not bestowed on the other side of the House all the advantages in political warfare. However, I do not wish to deal so much with the language of generality as to take up the various points the hon. member has touched upon and so far as I am able, to reply to them seriatim. The hon. member began by belittling the effect and purpose of the visit of the Premier to the old country, and he asked the House to believe that the Premier's visit, whatever good it may have done, has added nothing to the policy or the programme of the Government. Possibly that may be true. For my own part, I believe that policy and that programme to be so admirable, so perfect, that there needs little indeed to be added to it. But, I will say this, that, although the visit of the Premier may have added nothing to the policy or the programme of the Government, it has had this good effect—and will continue to have it—that it will make that policy and that programme more readily possible of being carried out, it will help to make that programme and policy a reality. It will show to the people outside the bounds of Western Australia, the people in the great mother country, the teeming population to be found there, that here in Western Australia, no matter what the "croakers" on the Opposition benches may say about the difficulty of obtaining a living in this country, there is an opportunity for every man sound in wind and limb and ready to work, an opportunity second to none in any other country in the world. Although for more than a week now we have listened on this side of the House to speeches all impregnated with the suggestion that Western Australia is a country in a position of very great danger so far as her material progress is concerned, although we have been told it is a country in which the people who come here may find themselves

travelling the streets in search of work and unable to find it, yet facts are stronger than words, and the facts which the Premier was able to put before the people of England are to-day bearing fruit in a steady stream of immigration to this country, a stream that will become larger as time goes on, as the people who first come here find that the account the Premier was able to give to this country is in no sense exaggerated and in no sense conveys a view that is not warranted by facts. Then the member for Kanowna had sneer at their policy of development on which the Moore Government particularly pride themselves; and he asked what the Government were doing new in that policy of development. He seemed to imagine that other Governments that had gone before had done everything that we were doing, or at any rate had conceived the policy that we were carrying out. While that may or may not be a fact, I do not think that any member whose recollection carries him back to the period anterior to the assumption of office, first by the Rason Government and then by the Moore Government, can forget that the Government preceding the Rason Government, which for a period of twelve months reigned in Western Australia, had in all sincerity of purpose or conviction come to the view that Western Australia had for the time being gone far enough in regard to development, that we should rest for a time, that we should get our wind so to speak, and that we should not push forward with a vigorous policy of public works.

Mr. Troy: Who said that?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was generally accepted as the policy of the Labour Government that was in office for eleven or twelve months prior to the advent of the Rason Government to power. I do not suppose anyone had the slightest doubt whatever that, but for the fact of that being regarded as the policy of the Government, that Government might be in office to-day. Had they displayed the same political perspicuity, the same political courage that has been displayed by the Moore Government, had they

launched out upon a bold policy of public works, had they shown the people that they had confidence in the country, the people would have shown confidence in them. If there is one kind of Government this country and the people demand it is a Government having confidence in the country; confidence in the power of the country to go on progressing, not merely at a slow rate of progress, but at a rate that would enable one in the short span of a lifetime to see marvellous and complete changes in the material condition of the State. It has been said that everything the Government have done in regard to building railways was proposed by the Royal Commission appointed by the Labour Government. Do the members opposite take credit to themselves for appointing a Royal Commission? They are not by any means the first Government to appoint a Royal Commission, and even though members opposite have not had any very lengthy experience of office, they at any rate have had sufficient political experience to know that the device of a Government unable to make up their minds, who shirk responsibility, and wish to get someone else to do their thinking for them, is to appoint a Royal Commission. The Government who preceded the Moore Government did not act, they simply appointed a Royal Commission to get other people to advise them. That commission was not composed wholly or of a majority of labour members, or members of the Labour party, it was a commission of which more than half the members belonged in no sense of the term to the Labour party. The outstanding contrast between the two Governments and the two parties is manifest. The Labour Government when in power had the opportunity of doing, the opportunity of acting, and how did they avail themselves of it? They appointed a Royal Commission. The Moore Government came into power and how did they avail themselves of their opportunity? They acted, they brought in their programme of railway Bills, and they carried those Bills through the House, with the result that to-day Western Australia is more prosperous than it has been for very many years. When the Moore

Government first came into office we were threatened with a large exodus to the Eastern States. People had come over here to take part in the mining boom; that boom had begun to expend its force, and we had to call some other industry into existence to make up for the sagging of the mining industry. If we had then a Government contenting themselves merely with appointing Royal Commissions, who delayed taking definite action, prompt, courageous, and immediate action such as was then required, there would never have been stopped that drift to the Eastern States, and the result would have been that all the good we had obtained from the gold discoveries would have been lost, or, at all events, a very large portion of it. Unfortunately, we did lose a large number of those who had come here attracted by the gold discoveries.

Mr. Troy: Have you stopped the drift?

Mr. Bath: Population was coming here in greater numbers than under the present Government.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I say unhesitatingly that we have stopped the drift and that during the past three years Western Australia has been improving her position. Last year she turned the corner, and to-day she is unmistakably on the upgrade. The member for Kanowna may utilise all the persuasive eloquence at his command, but he cannot argue away the fact that by the administration of the Moore Government, whether administered by the heads of departments, as he says, or by Ministers who are responsible, the revenue has been increased and the expenditure diminished, and that we closed the last financial year with the substantial balance of something over £200,000. Those are facts that will be remembered when the eloquence of the member is forgotten; those are facts with which we may go before the country with every confidence, because we know that they spell prosperity to Western Australia, that they have achieved prosperity in the present and spell prosperity for the future.

Mr. Taylor: When you paid the June bills in July you were in a nice fix,

£40,000 on the light side; why did not you pay up in June?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Will the member for Mount Margaret endeavour to control his excitement. It has been said that the Government in their railway policy derived their ideas from this Royal Commission, but I shall bring forward the report of the Royal Commission as evidence of the fact that not a single word is to be found recommending any particular line of railway. The commission contented themselves with pointing out what, I think, may be regarded almost as an obvious truth, namely, that in a country like Western Australia if there is to be development there must be a bold and progressive railway policy. The Moore Government take no sort of credit for the discovery of that political truth, it was discovered long before they came into office; but we take credit for the fact that, believing in that truth, we had the courage to apply it at a time when many people in the State were depressed and, to use a familiar phrase, "had their tail down," and thought that ruin or something approaching ruin stared Western Australia in the face. In that report there was not a single line of railway advocated specifically; all that was urged was that it was a sound policy to go in for an energetic programme of constructing agricultural railways. If one looks through the evidence given before the Commission it will be found that the members of it had considerable difficulty in persuading some of the witnesses, one in particular, a Mr. Thomas H. Bath, who, I believe is identical—I have not heard the fact contradicted—with an hon. member who sits in this House and not many days ago was leader of the party opposite, that such a policy was necessary. The chairman of the commission pointed out that the commission was not advocating any line, only the principle of opening up the country with railways.

Mr. Taylor: Who was the chairman?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Mr. Charles Harper, a gentleman who did not belong at that time, and does not now, unless there has been a recent conversion, to the party opposite. I do not suppose the Labour party take credit for his

views. He belonged to our party, and we are very proud of him.

Mr. Taylor: What complaint have you?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Members may interject, but they will not take me away from the trend of my argument. Contrast the buoyant tone, the strong faith of the Premier and his colleagues in their policy of railway construction, with the tone adopted by the recent leader of the Opposition, assuming of course that the gentleman referred to in the report of the commission, Mr. T. H. Bath, is the same gentleman who sits in this House for one of the goldfields constituencies. That gentleman was called as a witness on behalf of the Trades and Labour Council of the Eastern Goldfields, and he was invited to give a statement as to the views of those he represented. This is what he said, "They also," that is the Trades and Labour Council, for I assume their views were his, and the views of members opposite—

Mr. Bath: I want the Attorney General to be absolutely fair, and not take anything out of that statement which is contrary to the context. The views were written to me by the Trades and Labour Council, and I was desired to express them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. Johnson: You knew that perfectly well before you heard it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I will now proceed to read the statement.

Mr. Bath: The member should be fair and read the whole of it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is rather lengthy.

Mr. Bath: If you want to be true read the whole of it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not aware of any sentence in this statement in which the hon. member pointed out that the views he expressed there were not his own views; but if he can guide me to such a sentence I shall be very glad to read it.

Mr. Bath: If the Attorney General had read all the evidence he would have found it, for it is contained in the statement.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have read the whole of the statement, but not the whole of the evidence, and that remark may have been elicited from him in cross-examination. I have only read the opening statement.

Mr. Bath: I read it two days ago.

Mr. Holman: You read a bit of Gladstone one time.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I wish the member would read a little more of him.

Mr. Holman: I would not use it like you did, anyhow.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Judging from the interjections, perhaps members do not wish me to read this statement.

Mr. Bath: If you read it read it all through, so that members will know the truth.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I will not read it all.

Mr. Bath: The Attorney General wants to do what the Premier did, read a little without the context and so convey an entirely wrong impression.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not want to do anything of that kind. If the member intimates to me where the passage is, in which he told the commission the views he expressed were not his own views, and that he held contrary views, then in justice to him I shall be very glad to read it. Nothing could be fairer than that.

Mr. Johnson: You read what you want and we will read out what we want.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member said—

They also (that is the Trades and Labour Council of the Eastern Goldfields) believe that at the present time much of the land, or the greater part of the land along the existing lines of railways, has already been alienated, and that those who would be brought here under an immigration scheme will have to go considerable distances from the railway system in this State, and that to provide them with facilities for settling on the land it would be necessary to build new lines of railways, branch lines, in order to provide them with carrying facilities to get their

produce to market (there is no objection there). At the present time they recognise that many of the existing agricultural lines are not paying, and that to add to them other agricultural lines which could not be expected to pay for a considerable time to come would be likely to involve the State in financial embarrassment, and the Goldfields Trades and Labour Council thinks that it would be better for the State and better for the settlers if we could devise some means by which much of the unoccupied and uncultivated land along the existing lines of railway could be made available for those who are brought here.

You see, sir, that hon. members cry out before they are hurt. I read this extract and instead of hurting their feelings it has given them the utmost pleasure. Yet we have all this trouble and fuss with the hon. member for Brown Hill as though I were going to do something unfair. The hon. member went on to say—

It would mean there would be additional traffic on those lines, with the probable result that they would be brought to be payable propositions and that it would not be necessary to involve ourselves in the additional expense of building other unpayable lines in order to find land for the settlement of those few persons.

I am going to stop there. The hon. member went on to advocate taxation on unimproved values. It is not necessary for me to quote that in support of my line of argument. I wish merely to indicate that there you have a distinct line of cleavage between the policy of the present Government and the policy of the Opposition, and if I may judge by the applause that has greeted the reading of that extract about the policy outlined by the member for Brown Hill then it is the policy of the Opposition to-day. If members opposite came into power they would still hold back from building additional agricultural railways and they would go on the lines that the land open along the routes of the existing railways, should be

cultivated, and every inch of it cultivated before the construction of other lines was taken in hand. Is that their policy or not?

Mr. Bath: If you had read further down you would have found that the evidence given was that the resources opened up would be such as to enable us to build additional lines.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member was severely heckled for suggesting that the agricultural railways at that time were not paying and he was very completely bowled over and it was shown that the lines even then were paying. At any rate the hon. member and those who think with him had an honest conviction no doubt that the agricultural railways were not paying and they held it so strongly that they said, "We refuse to build additional railways until the lines already in existence are paying their way." That was their line of argument and granting that the premises were true and that the lines were not paying, I am free to admit that there would have been something to have been said for the policy of the Labour party. But the Moore Government took a different view altogether. While there were many people prepared to throw cold water on the scheme of building railways and were prepared like some hon. members opposite to say that the lines would not even pay for axle grease, there were men belonging to our party outside the House who thought the Moore Government were mad to embark upon this policy and who thought we were embarking upon a policy of boom and bust. But I say without fear of the statement being effectively challenged that that policy of building these spur lines has been a magnificent success and that it has exceeded even the expectations of the Government responsible for it, and it gives us every reason to persevere with that policy at an accelerated speed. Now that the success of that policy has been proved beyond the possibilities of cavil, we have members opposite coming in and claiming the credit for it and referring to their stupendous achievement in appointing a Royal Commission

on Immigration. Hon. members opposite are the undying foes of immigration. You have only to listen to their speeches made with their tongues in their cheeks and hear them talk of wishing to have immigrants brought here, but always with the qualification that the men must be of the right sort. They claim that the men and women who come here are not of the right sort and even go so far as the member for Albany did, to libel those new arrivals.

Mr. Scaddan: Do you not say they should be of the right sort?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I say that the great bulk of men who have been brought here by the Moore Government are of a fine stamp. Although they are new to Australian conditions, although they find much here which they have never seen before, although the methods of farming employed in Australia are different from those employed on smaller farms in England where labour is much cheaper, yet within a few months when these men become accustomed to Australian conditions they will prove a great source of strength to this community and we have no reason to be discouraged. The policy has been so successful that we might well redouble our efforts. Hon. members may point to a few failures. Of course some will be failures. What sort of competitive examination do members expect that we should impose upon every applicant who wishes to come to Western Australia? We admit this is a great country which offers fine opportunities to industry, energy and enterprise, but it would be a negation of all in which we believe if we on this side, while uttering pious opinions and generalities as to the virtues of immigration, were to impose such severe tests upon the people as to make it a virtual impossibility for anyone to come into the country. That is what members opposite would like us to do. Hon. members are always afraid of someone coming into competition with the worker. I have a better opinion of the Australian worker than hon. members. He is not the craven hound that members opposite would ask

us to believe. The best class of Australian worker is well able to hold his own. There are members opposite who are never tired of proclaiming their hostility to rings and trusts. We have heard about a meat ring, a fruit ring and all sorts of rings, and yet they are endeavouring to use the political machine at their disposal to create the greatest ring possible, a labour ring, which would make every man in the country who earned his living by manual labour the slave and the master of the union. There can be no objection to the trades unions rightly used; they have done great work in improving the condition of the worker and in increasing wages, but if they are to be used to stifle competition, to educate the workers of Australia into the belief that in this great country we are to be afraid of a few hundred or a few thousand additional workers, and that starvation awaits the workers already here, if unionism is to be used for that it will be an evil day for Australia and the workers in it because it will mean that we are not raising a race of self-reliant men but that we are teaching those who are growing up among us to be cowards, instead of not being afraid to face the fair and reasonable competition of life. Yet we are asked to believe by the member for Kanowna that the progressive party is this Labour party opposite. Why sir, the tactics of the official exponents of the Labour party instead of being progressive are the tactics of the most retrograde and stagnant country in the world, the tactics of China, a country that would like to keep people out and shut its gates against civilisation. Nothing except genuine action will persuade me to believe that members opposite are sincerely in favour of immigration, because as I say their general praise of it is surrounded by qualifications, and when immigrants dare to show their faces in Australia there is so much criticism—as for example the remarks of the member for Albany the other night—that their true object, the preventing of immigration, is made abundantly clear. If a verbatim report of that member's speech were sent to the old country

and were circulated widely there, it would undo much of the good done by the Premier, not because the people there would believe there were not openings for them in this new world but because they would believe they were going to a country where they would not be welcomed amongst people and would not be regarded by them as brothers. I say anyone who gives expression to such beliefs either by direct words or by implication is libelling this country and its people.

Mr. Bath: Does the hon. member think that sweating these people here is giving them a brotherly welcome?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not believe there is anything of the kind here.

Mr. Bath: The Government is sweating them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Government is doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. Bath: The facts are in the report of the Select Committee.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member will have an opportunity of substantiating his statement, but it has become such a habit for members opposite to make these statements that they become reckless and we on our side get tired of knocking them out. To go on with the points raised by the member for Kanowna. We are told that there is discontent in the civil service. I suppose in no civil service in Australia or in any country of the world is it possible to find absolute contentment. I admit that in the poor years which this State passed through, two or three years ago, the civil service in common with the rest of the community, felt the pinch of the bad times and it became necessary for the Government to withhold those increments to which the civil servants were looking forward. They had to suffer with the rest of the community, but whatever may be said as to the past and the painful necessity there was to refuse the increases, now, at least, it can be said that every member of the classified civil service is obtaining the minimum salary of the class to which he belongs, and therefore the intention and the letter of the Pub-

lie Service Act are being alike carried out. The Government hope that this year it will be possible to deal with a greater degree of liberality with the public service but although the finances are once more on the up grade, one cannot hope to give everyone exactly what he wishes, because the opinions of people as to their value are not always the opinions of others. Yet we hope we shall be able during the current financial year to vote a considerable sum of money to provide increments to the public servants. A most singular complaint against the Government was that it was absolutely under the domination of the permanent heads of the different departments. And we were told that these permanent heads who had this amazing power, who were really governing the country instead of the Ministry governing it—we were told that these gentlemen were discontented. Now the hon. member who made that statement tried to prove too much. It is scarcely likely, if this country were being run by the permanent heads, if those gentlemen could do as they pleased and not as the Government and Parliament pleased—it is scarcely likely they would be discontented. They at any rate, having this vast uncontrolled power, would be satisfied. But, further on, the same hon. member pointed out that the Government had taken far too much responsibility upon their shoulders. Now which are we to believe? That we have a Government controlled by the permanent heads, the political heads doing nothing in regard to administration, or, as the hon. member said a few sentences later, that the Government have taken too much responsibility on their shoulders? The hon. member clearly destroyed the effect of a very fine forensic speech by introducing these antagonistic arguments. Listening to him one might have been inclined to believe that the Government were wanting in some respects; but one would refuse to believe that the Government, being on the one hand in the control of the permanent officers and afraid to take responsibility, were at the same time going far beyond the legitimate limit of Government.

Mr. Walker: The two things can be distinct and both true—and they are.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Now we come to the Berteaux case. A great deal of fuss was made about this matter. I can well understand what would have been said if members of the Government—if I myself as Attorney General and also a politician had dealt with this matter. If I had felt it my duty to advise the Government that there was no crime for prosecution, or that a prosecution could not be successful, or that there was not sufficient grounds for a civil action, it would at once have been said that I was simply actuated by political motives; that my law was altogether at fault and that I was endeavouring to screen a colleague. But, recognising the accusations which would be levelled against them if they accepted advice which might be regarded as political on this matter—recognising that, what was the attitude of the Government? The papers were sent along to the Crown Law officers, non-political officers, with instructions that a thorough investigation should be made. And the Government were prepared to take such action as might be advised by their legal advisers. There are, I am told, lawyers, who when they are asked to advise make a point of first ascertaining what their client wishes them to say; and, when they ascertain the wishes of their client they advise accordingly. That no doubt explains why, time after time, there come before the courts, actions which should never come into court, and which land unfortunate litigants in heavy costs. But, fortunately, the permanent officers in the Crown Law Department are not of that description; and even if they were they had no sort of inkling as to the wishes of the Government in this case. No single member of the Government looking at the matter from a personal standpoint cares one straw as to what may be done in regard to Berteaux, whether he is prosecuted civilly or criminally, or be let go altogether. Our view is simply this: let justice be done if it can be done, utterly regardless of consequences.

Mr. Taylor: That is all fudge.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member measures my corn by his own bushel. It is not fudge at all, it is simply a very commonsense way of dealing with the case. We consult solicitors of vast experience—the Crown Solicitor who has a unique experience in this State of criminal matters. We had an exhaustive investigation made and we would, indeed, be foolish if, having got a very definite opinion we were to fly in the face of that opinion. Why obtain advice if we do not intend to follow it? I say unhesitatingly, no matter what the advice might have been, the Government would have followed it. If the effect of the expert report had been that Berteaux should be placed in the dock, in the dock he would have gone; if it had been that a civil action should be brought, such civil action would, undoubtedly, have been brought; if it had been that the evidence was not such as would permit of remedy in the law courts, well, we would not throw good money after bad in unavailing litigation. The report is available to hon. members. We have nothing to conceal; indeed, if we wished to conceal we could not do it. Our actions are open to the fullest inspection.

Mr. Seaddan: When did you get the report?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That has nothing to do with the question, and I absolutely refuse to be drawn away from my argument by irrelevant inquiries. The hon. member can have the report as soon as he likes, and no doubt he can find the date upon it.

Mr. Seaddan: It was the day before the House met.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I do not mind if it was. Why is the hon. member so peurile in his interjections? The point surely is, are the contents of that report, is the reasoning contained therein, convincing? If the report is dated only the day before Parliament met, of what is that evidence? Is it not evidence that very careful consideration was given the case before the report was finally drawn up? These are not matters to be decided off-hand. Persons are not

to be condemned unheard. Why should the Crown go to heavy expense by indulging in a legal wild goose chase?

Mr. Seaddan: The Crown Solicitor gave an opinion on the case in two hours without seeing the file.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Not the Crown Solicitor, but the Solicitor-General. That was necessarily a hasty opinion. In order that there might be no doubt on the subject, when the matter was brought before the Crown Law officers there was first a very careful investigation made by the Criminal Investigation Department; and in a later investigation, Mr. Sayer, who had previously given an opinion, was not called in at all. The matter was placed in the hands of the Crown Solicitor; and after going into it with very great care and attention to detail his conclusion coincided with the more hasty conclusion previously arrived at by the Solicitor-General. And I do not suppose that even if members sitting opposite are prepared to say that these two legal gentlemen, men of their standing in the profession, are content to take their orders from whatever Ministers for the time being happen to occupy the Treasury bench. The member for Kanowna suggests we should put the man on his trial, not because we can hope to obtain a conviction, but in order to clear the air. Could anyone expect to hear more ridiculous, more absurd reasoning? Men are to be placed in the dock in order to clear the air, to satisfy the hon. member's ideas of what is right. If the hon. member himself comes, in the fullness of time, to occupy the position of Attorney General he will not, I am sure, be prepared to institute criminal prosecutions simply on those grounds. If there is need to clear the air, if there are lurking in the background facts which should be brought to light, the proper method of investigation is either by a select committee or a Royal Commission. But I say we have nothing to conceal in this matter. All the papers are open to hon. members. Of my own knowledge of the case, I am free to admit there may have been—indeed, there is very little doubt that

there was—some amount of carelessness on the part of an officer of the department. But it is absolutely ridiculous to turn round and try to translate that carelessness by a subordinate officer of the department into a charge reflecting on the Minister for Mines. Only hon. members whose minds are poisoned with political animosity would dream of adopting so unfair a course. As I say, we challenge the fullest investigation. The papers are there for the inspection of hon. members, who can look through them and try to discover the damaging facts, if they are in existence. (Mr. Taylor interjected.) The hon. member is drawing an absolutely unwarrantable inference. It does not follow that because a man happens to be a supporter of the Minister for Mines or myself, if that man commits an offence against the laws of the State we will not put him on his trial. Does the hon. member suggest that if a member of the party to which I belong commits an indictable offence I will not return a true bill against him? Does the hon. member intend to make a charge of that sort against the Minister for Mines?

Mr. Heitmann: Yes.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, I am ashamed that politics should have sunk so low on that side of the House.

Mr. Heitmann: I have seen the files faked before to-day.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member knows so much about faking files that if he interjects much more in similar strain I shall begin to think he is a past master in the art. Now we have also been criticised for appointing a board of advisers in regard to the construction of agricultural railways. The argument on that matter directed against the Government furnishes another instance of how one man may steal a horse and another get hanged for looking over the fence. It was a most meritorious action when the Labour Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the question of immigration, and incidentally, the building of agricultural railways. But when the present Government are prepared to go one better and build those

railways, or ask Parliament to provide the money for building them; and in order that we may inform ourselves and have the fullest information for the House we appoint a board of experts, consisting of three or four members of the public service, whose duty it is merely to collect information and place their views before the Government—views available for the guidance of the House; then, judging by the opinion of members opposite, we have committed a political enormity. I do not care twopence for the indignation that is vamped up on an action of that sort. The country at large will support the Government for the ordinary common sense expedient of getting information before deciding what lines shall be built. It has been said that we are inconsistent because, when last session it was proposed that a public works committee, composed of members of the House, should be appointed to settle what lines should be built, the Government refused to fall in with the suggestion. But is it not a somewhat singular thing that the Government who are said to be afraid to shoulder responsibility should be blamed because in that respect they did not shoulder responsibility? The objection to this political board was that it would remove responsibility from the shoulders of the Government and would enable a weak Government to say, "We have no opinions in regard to this or that public work; we throw from our shoulders that function and give it to a committee." I say we have done very much better by appointing a non-political board, because we have secured a board which will supply the information and a board of such standing that it cannot be suggested that political pressure was brought to bear; but nevertheless the Government have to shoulder the responsibility. Certainly when a proposal is brought to the House the Government will feel strengthened by the support the board will give to any project, and it is questionable whether a railway condemned by that board would secure a majority in this House if the Government introduced it against the advice of the majority of those experts. At any rate the Govern-

ment have no wish to escape from their responsibility, and it is precisely because we realise that it is the duty of the Government to be responsible for their policy and to frame it and not to leave the task to others to do, that we have contented ourselves with appointing this non-political board of experts rather than a political board composed of members of this Chamber. Then we were asked whether the time had not come when the Government should do something more than build railways. If we ask 99 people out of 100 in the State whether they are satisfied as to how the country could go on prospering, they would say, "By all means go on building these railways seeing how admirably that policy has already answered." The hon. member condemned us by declaring that the Government contented themselves merely with building railways and did not enter into the domain of progressive legislation and had not advanced the community as a whole in something more than a material sense. We are accused of having taken no action in regard to the tramway strike. Hon. members who take that view must not suppose that because the Government do not trumpet abroad their intentions, these matters like the tramway strike are not engaging their attention. Anyone who will look at a matter of this sort calmly and dispassionately—and it is well to do so when it is a matter of a trade dispute—will realise that it may be better to have some delay rather than excite feeling, and that the Government should hesitate to do anything that will make a settlement less possible. In this matter we were faced with the position that apparently the great bulk of public opinion, practically the whole body of public opinion in Perth, was in favour of the tramway men. Members opposite may now be inclined to say that immediately the award was disobeyed we should have instituted proceedings against the tramway company or the men, whoever we thought guilty of an act in the nature of a strike or a lock-out under Section 98 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Up to the present we have not brought proceedings, but some days before the recent

judgment of the Full Court was delivered by Mr. Justice McMillan and Mr. Justice Rooth, the matter had been engaging the attention of the Government, and a definite instruction was given to the registrar under the Act that in all cases where he had reason to believe that an act in the nature of a strike or lock-out had been committed, he was to consult the Crown Law officers, the non-political law officers, and if the facts were such against any individual that the Crown Law officers were of opinion that a conviction could be obtained in a court he could take proceedings. And I may say that this matter of the tramway strike has throughout the day been engaging the attention of the Solicitor General, and not only the matter of this strike but also another industrial dispute. But what the Government refuse to do is to do anything in the nature of taking sides in a dispute. It is not for the Government to say whether the men are wrong or right in the action they have taken although individual members of the Government may have their views; that is for a court to decide; but the Government take this view that Section 98 being in the statute book, and it being the intention of Parliament when the Act was passed that the awards of a court should be obeyed, the section should be enforced if the Crown Law officers are of opinion that there is a case to go before a court, and a reasonable chance of securing a conviction. I do not profess to be very sanguine that even if we do obtain a conviction in this matter very much good will be done so far as industrial peace is concerned, which I take it is what we all aim at. The most I fear we can hope for if a conviction is obtained is that the inutility of the section will be proved, and then it will be a question whether we are to have the prosecutions or whether this section of the Act is to be repealed. There is now a certain amount of unfairness if the position is that no proceedings are to be taken against the employees but are to be taken against the employer. I believe it has been the practice in the past where a party to a dispute thought that Section 98 had been infringed to allow the registrar to become the nominal complainant, the actual

proceedings being taken by the party aggrieved. In the present case, without expressing an opinion on the dispute one way or the other, the registrar has full power to take proceedings on his own initiative subject to the advice of his legal advisers; and I think that is the proper attitude for the Government to adopt. At any rate it completely disposes of the argument or the assertion of the member for Kanowna that in this matter the Government have been idle or inactive. Simply because we are not in evidence, because members do not see every morning a statement by the Attorney General or the Premier when they do see statements by Mr. Johnson, it does not follow that the Government have been inactive. Personally I have no particular wish to be in the limelight. More harm than good is very often done by premature speech.

Mr. Collier: The reference to the tramway strike was only to prove the need for amending the Act.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It may show something more than that. At any rate it completely disposes of the accusation that in this case the Government have not had the nerve to do anything. Like so many accusations of members opposite, when examined it is found to have no substratum of truth. Exception has also been taken to the attitude of the Government in regard to the construction of the Trans-Australian railway. I do not know whether the member for Kanowna is an artist in the game of poker, or an exponent of the art of bluff; but one would almost imagine that he was, because he could see nothing in this proposal but some ingenious attempt on the part of the Government simply to persuade the Commonwealth Government and the people of Australia that we were ready to do something we would be sorry to undertake if we had the opportunity. That offer was a perfectly bona fide offer. Communications did pass between the Acting Premier and the Premier of South Australia. The Acting Premier took no action in the matter until it had been fully discussed in Cabinet, and it was a step taken with all due deliberation. Of course it is a perfectly legitimate line of

argument for members opposite to say that we took a wrong view, or that we adopted a wrong policy. My own view and that of my colleagues is that we adopted the very best policy in the circumstances; and I only wish for my own part that we had an opportunity of building that line. Nothing can be more certain than that within a very few years from the time that line is constructed it will be a magnificent asset for whatever State owns it, whether the State or the Commonwealth.

Mr. Walker: Will you lay the correspondence on the Table?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Hon. members opposite think we have something to conceal when we are the most candid people possible. Hon. members should get out of that habit, that evil habit of measuring our corn by their own bushel. I can assure the hon. member there is nothing to conceal. It is a plain businesslike proposition. My recollection carries me back to the time when it was indeed a daring thing to construct railways in Western Australia, and when for years after they were constructed they hung like a millstone round the neck of the State. Those were the days before the gold discoveries. But when we consider the vast possibilities of Western Australia, when we consider her history during the past 15 years, the State has no reason to be afraid of building that line itself; and it would be an undoubted gain in the future if we owned all the railways in Western Australia instead of having dual control, one great trunk line owned by the Commonwealth and the rest of the lines owned by the State. I firmly believe, without labouring the point, that there was ample justification for this offer, and that if it had been accepted by South Australia and we had gone ahead with the work, it would be looked upon by those who come after us as a brilliant piece of statesmanship equal in its foresight, say, to the purchase of the Suez Canal shares by Lord Beaconsfield, a step which was condemned by the then Opposition, but which resulted in enormous profit to the country. But we have to remember that this action in pledging the Govern-

ment to the construction of this line if South Australia would consent was taken by a Government "afraid of responsibility," a Government "governed by the permanent heads of department," according to the member for Kanowna, a Government that never did anything that subjected it to the least risk. We were prepared to stake our political existence on that proposal. I do not, however, claim any particular credit for that, because I do not think there is any doubt at all that we would have had the bulk of the country behind us. At any rate it disposes of the suggestion of the hon. member that when great occasions arise we are afraid to take responsibility. The reason why the Government have remained in office so long, and why the Government that preceded us had so short a lease of life is that we are not afraid of taking responsibility while they were. What was the gigantic blunder of the last Administration—the first and last Labour Government? While in office an offer came to them for the purchase of the Midland Railway.

Mr. Troy: And you opposed it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I did not; I was seriously ill for months and I paired with Dr. Ellis, the then member for Coolgardie. I did not oppose it, I was strongly in favour of it. Not only that but the paper I then owned was doing everything in its power to secure the purchase. Had the Government of that time had the courage of their convictions, and given the House a straight lead on the subject, and said, "We are prepared to stand or fall by it" the purchase would have been made. There is no one to-day who will say that if the line had been purchased at that figure we would not have made a splendid bargain for Western Australia. There is the difference between the Moore Government and members opposite: we are prepared to take responsibility.

Mr. Collier: The Minister for Mines said there was something behind the deal.

The Minister for Mines: I demand the withdrawal of that statement.

Mr. Collier: You said it in the back country.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member must withdraw.

Mr. Collier: I will withdraw it for the time being, but will take an opportunity of proving it later on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member must withdraw unconditionally; he must not make conditions to this House. I must order compliance with the rules of the House; he must withdraw without condition.

Mr. Collier: I will withdraw with a condition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member must comply with the rule, which is not of my making but of his own. He must withdraw unconditionally.

Mr. Collier: Well, I will withdraw.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I have no doubt that a note has been taken of the hon. member's words and he will have an opportunity of proving the statement. The cry of "wolf" has been so often raised, however, that he must excuse us if we are somewhat incredulous.

Mr. Collier: I am too reliable for your side.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is amusing to hear member's bark away as they are doing, but it would be more to the point if they took the trouble to get facts together, and instead of saying things actually prove them. It is all very well to say these things.

Mr. Underwood: Did we not prove that Berteaux was a thief?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Members opposite have shown themselves lamentable failures in proving things.

Mr. Underwood: You are frightened to bring these cases before the court.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am not frightened; you amuse me, you do not frighten me.

Mr. Underwood: We proved him to be a thief.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the hon. member thinks I am a thief he is at liberty to try and prove me to be one.

Mr. Heitmann: He did not say you were a thief, but that Berteaux was.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, I do not mind even if he accuses me of

being one. Such things do not affect me; I make allowance for his ignorance.

Mr. Collier: There is a fair amount of ignorance behind yourself.

Mr. George: That is a sad reflection on the member for Fremantle.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Among other charges laid at the door of the Government is that of insincerity. After all, one more charge does not do much damage. In proof of that charge there was advanced the attitude of the Government in regard to the reduction of the Legislative Council franchise. Last year when it was announced by the Government that they intended to introduce that Bill members opposite expressed the utmost incredulity; they did not hesitate to imply, even if they did not actually say it, that they did not believe a word they were told, and that there was "Buckley's chance" of the Bill ever being introduced. However the Bill was introduced and I can only say that it will be introduced again this session. I believe there is better hope now of its becoming law. There is this fact, however, which we cannot altogether shut our eyes to, that the recent elections for the Legislative Council, which took place between last and this session, showed that without exception every member, I believe it was without exception, who opposed the reduction of the franchise was returned at the head of the poll.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Only 13 per cent. of the electors voted.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: That shows what little interest there was in the question, for the people would not turn up to vote. Last year the measure was thrown out by the Upper House. Can members suggest for one moment that when the Bill was thrown out in another place there was any agitation out side, any tremendous outburst of popular indignation at the action of that House? Was a single meeting held in Western Australia to condemn the Legislative Council for their action in throwing the Bill out, was there any evidence at all of a strong public opinion on this subject? My own belief is that the great

mass of people regard the question with comparative indifference, and certainly the great mass of electors of the Legislative Council did so as is shown by the small minority of electors who took the trouble to vote at the elections. If there were a strong body of public opinion outside supporting the Government, in this matter our hands would be strengthened. However, despite the indifference we are doing everything in our power to make the Bill law. Perhaps members opposite may suggest what other steps we could take. That Bill will be introduced this session, and will be dealt with if members opposite give time for it, and if time is not wasted in discussing matters of less importance. There is no reason to suppose that the undertaking given by the Government that the Bill will be produced this session will not be carried out. Now as to the Licensing Bill. That Bill also will be introduced. It has been said that the Government have abandoned the principle of the measure. That is absolutely untrue, absolutely without warrant. What are the facts in regard to that Bill? Last session a very great deal of time was taken up, unfortunately, in discussing points of order; several days of the session were occupied by members opposite moving the adjournment of the House in order to call attention to matters certainly not of the first importance, with the result that legislation was very much delayed. The Licensing Bill got no further, practically, than the second reading stage. It just reached Committee, and the first controversial point dealt with was with regard to the constitution of the licensing court, and an amendment was carried against the Government providing that licensing benches should not be nominated by the Government but should be elected by the people.

Mr. Taylor: That was a bit of a knock out.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I quite agree with the hon. member that it was a very inadvisable thing to do. However, the Licensing Bill will be reintroduced this session. I utterly fail to see

how it can be said that the Government have abandoned the principle of the Bill simply because that detail, important detail perhaps, went against them. When moving the second reading I said the Government did not regard the Bill as a party measure, nor as a measure conceived in party spirit, and that we had no desire that it should be received or considered from a party point of view. We recognised that a question like that of the control of the liquor traffic was not one that could very well be discussed from a party point of view. On this side of the House we have not got our members under the whip; they do not belong to a party that has cast-iron discipline; they are free and independent, and no Government from this side of the House would ever dream of dragooning members into supporting every principle contained in the clauses of the Licensing Bill. The main principle of the measure is local option, and I venture to hope that this principle will be in the Bill when, as I trust, it leaves this Chamber for another place this session.

Mr. Taylor: The member for Murray does not like it.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then doubtless he will vote against it. I would say this in regard to the Bill, that if members opposite are really sincere in their desire to get the Bill passed, as sincere as we on this side are, there will be a spirit of compromise displayed. I can assure members that the Bill will be brought down very shortly. I do not propose myself to take up any time in delivering another second reading speech, for I cannot see that any good would be achieved by so doing, or by there being any lengthy second reading debate, for it is practically the same Bill that was introduced last session. We should read it a first and a second time *pro forma*, and lose no time in getting into Committee. When in Committee we should deal with it in a businesslike spirit, in a spirit of compromise, and try and frame a measure which, while not being all we may want, will be an improvement on the existing condition of things. Some

of us may hold extreme views on this question from the temperance side, some of us perhaps hold extreme views from the publican's side, and some perhaps do not care one jot one way or another. But whatever our views are we must recognise that there are many matters needing improvement, and if we are temperance advocates we should recognise that if we demand too much we shall be playing into the hands of the drink traffic and the people who are making money out of it. If there is need for reform it is better to get half a loaf than no bread. Members opposite who believe with me in the principle of State ownership of hotels should, if only for the reason that State hotels shall be established in new centres, welcome that principle in the Bill becoming law even though in other respects the measure does not give all they would like to have. Then I come to one matter which is evidently of considerable interest, and particularly so to the member for Kanowna—redistribution of seats. I can assure that hon. member that I share his curiosity with regard to the Bill. I may mention, however, that I have no wish to keep him in the dark longer than is necessary, nor do I wish him to suffer any sleepless nights if he should be feeling anxiety as to the form the Bill may take. The measure, however, is not one to be decided upon hurriedly; it needs a great deal of consideration. It is now on the stocks, but it is certainly not completed, and it is, therefore only possible at this stage to give a very general indication of what it will be. It will certainly do this. It will remove some very glaring anomalies.

Mr. Walker: What are they?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The member can find them out for himself.

Mr. Walker: That is rude, and you the Minister for Education.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I had no intention of being rude when I said the hon. member could find them out for himself. I merely wish to indicate that if he would study the various constituencies as at present existing, and compare the number of electors in each, he would see

there are some very glaring anomalies. It will be the endeavour of the Government in presenting the Bill to remove, at any rate, some of these anomalies. The Bill will also be framed with the idea of bringing into this Chamber 50 men who will really adequately represent Western Australia, that is represent Western Australia in every aspect, not merely the wage earner, not merely the employer, it will be a Bill that will give a fair degree of representation to every class in the community. The ideal Parliament is one which is a microcosm of the community at large, and the Government are attempting to bring forward a measure that will permit of the general life and the general aspirations of Western Australia being represented. If we can succeed in doing that, although we may violate some of the strict principles of doctrinaire politics, yet we are practical people and I do not doubt that we shall obtain the support of public opinion to a Bill which will correspond to the practical work-a-day needs of the State. There is one more point to which I wish to refer before I sit down and it is a somewhat unpleasant matter, because it is in the nature of a personal accusation. I have heard so many accusations hurled at me across the floor of this Chamber that I have become somewhat case hardened. The member for Kanowna made some accusations against the Government for disregarding the nominations of the Opposition side as to the appointment of justices of the peace. He went on to say, in order to give point to his observation, that appointments had been made in the Greenough district and that old hands had been swept away, while a large number, an extraordinary number of justices had been appointed there. That a relative of my own had also been appointed, and the hon. member waxing warm said that a whole flood of justices had been appointed.

Mr. Walker: I never used the word.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I made a note of it.

Mr. Walker: Then you are as bad a reporter as you are a Minister.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member can have it his way; I will not bandy contradictions with him. Let the hon. member ask for a return of the number of justices of the peace who have been appointed in the Greenough constituency since I came into office. I do not care a scrap about these charges, but I would like the hon. member to follow them up.

Mr. Troy: I will call for a return although I did not make the charges.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member will still further oblige me if he will ascertain the name of the relative.

Mr. Troy: I will obtain it, but not to oblige you.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It has been necessary for me to deal at some length and with some detail with the various accusations made against the Government. I have often sat in this Chamber silent when I have heard accusations made, and it has been a common practice on this side, wishing as we do to get to business, not to waste time in continually answering baseless charges. But occasionally it may serve a good purpose if we do confront our accusers and challenge them to bring forward chapter and verse of what they say, and that is why I have just asked the member for Kanowna to follow up his charge against myself. It is well that the country should have the opportunity of seeing the tactics that are employed on that side of the House. There has been too much in the past of that hateful practice of impugning the personal and political honour of opponents. I yield to no man in respect for honourable members opposite as long as they act in a way that entitles them to respect, but when they make charges without taking the trouble to satisfy themselves of their truth, then I say any hon. member, no matter to what side of the House he belongs, stands condemned in the opinion of every honest man, no matter what the opinions of that man may be on political questions. I say unhesitatingly if you take the policy of the Government as a whole, that while the members of the Government being human,

they must necessarily make mistakes, yet their policy has brought Western Australia from a condition of insecurity and depression to one of a very high degree of prosperity. The member for Brown Hill when speaking early in this debate advanced the argument that although the country had gone ahead the working man had not participated in the general prosperity, but still earlier in the debate the member for Fremantle brought forward unmistakable evidence in the figures of the Savings Bank deposits which showed that the deposits per head had very largely increased. One has also only to go into the city and see the large number of places of amusement which are being supported, and one has only to get the evidence of business men to obtain unmistakable proof that the great body of the people are prospering. I do not say that we should merely look towards accumulating wealth but it is a great satisfaction indeed to feel that the community are doing well because I very much doubt if you can have any very great social uplifting of the people if you have not a fair degree of material prosperity upon which to build. It has been said that the policy of the Government deals only with public works and the building of railways; it goes further. In the past year or two, owing to the financial difficulties we have not been able to spend on education as much as we would like, but this year with brighter conditions, the vote for primary education probably will show an increase of not less than £15,000. In the proposals of the Government with regard to education, are proposals for continuation classes, which will allow children after reaching the age of fourteen years to continue their education in the day time if they wish, up to the age of sixteen years and classes will be provided in the evening for those who prefer evening instruction. The Government are taking the first step towards extending the period of education for the youth of the community, because they believe that a highly educated community makes an even better investment for Western Australia than a large policy of public works, necessary as the latter is. I am sanguine enough

to believe if we have here a highly educated class emerging from school we will have fewer exhibitions of the crude theories which often emanate from the opposite side of the House, and we will have a juster view of the relations of the individual to the State and society. We on this side of the House are not afraid of education; we believe in education, and we believe the more intelligent a community the greater will be the support for the party to which we belong. Therefore I say the two main lines in our policy are the material development of the wealth of the country and the development of the intelligence of the community, and giving it every possible opportunity to benefit by the great advantages this country offers. While we may make mistakes in detail, if we can carry out that policy, if the general effect is as I have stated, to help forward the material prosperity and social uplifting of the people, then I believe that if the facts are only adequately put before the electors, this Government will not fail to obtain a continuing lease of power.

On motion by Mr. Keenan, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.27 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 11th August, 1910.

	PAGE.
Questions: Agricultural Department, Rabbit-proof fence employees	279
Abattoirs, Kalgoorlie	280
Lambs for export	280
Agricultural Bank, Advances on machinery	280
Address-in-Reply, seventh day	281

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

QUESTION — AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT, RABBIT-PROOF FENCE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. COLLIER (for Mr. Price) asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has a