

The Premier: Where did you get them?
 Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not think the Premier was very well acquainted with the facts right up to the time the strike occurred. I do not think he took the matter seriously.

The Premier: I did.

Hon. P. COLLIER: He was indifferent to the requests of the service for the appointment of a board for six or seven months.

The Premier: No. You appointed the board years ago, and dishd them. We did not appoint the board.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The hon. gentleman is most reckless in his statements. The board was appointed by a Government of which he was a member, in 1911.

The Premier: It was appointed in 1912.

Hon. P. COLLIER: No. It was appointed in 1911 by the Government of which the present Premier was a member.

The Premier: No. It was appointed by a statute of 1911.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I thought the hon. gentleman was referring to the reclassification board. I should like to know, too, what the Government propose to do. Apparently they have some policy which has been communicated to members of their party in caucus, and the terms of which are not yet known to the public. During the strike the member for Sussex (Mr. Pickering) wrote a letter to the "West Australian," in the course of which he said that the Government had given certain pledges or promises to the party which he, the member for Sussex, felt sure would be carried out. I think those pledges or promises ought to be made known. The hon. member's letter states—

I venture to think that the Country party, in arriving at its decision to support the Government in its maintenance of constitutional authority, did so mainly because it believes in governing the people through Parliament. Other reasons may have been because it believes that the Government will fulfil the promises it has made to the National party, promises which should result in a considerable reduction in the Public Service and an increase in the emoluments to the remaining, to represent in particular efficiency and the main factor for advancement and increased remuneration.

What are those promises? I do not think the Government are entitled to make promises to the National party as regards action they are going to take in dealing with the Public Service, especially in the settlement of a strike, without making those promises known. The letter of the member for Sussex continues—

I am convinced that the Country party will insist on the Government fulfilling its pledges. The methods by which this new system will be inaugurated will be, I think, entirely satisfactory to the general community.

Mr. Pickering: Hear, hear.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What are those pledges?

Mr. Pickering: They are known to the general public.

Hon. P. COLLIER: They are not known to me.

The Premier: All that was said was published in the Press.

Hon. P. COLLIER: All that was said at the meeting of the party was not published in the Press. The letter of the member for Sussex refers to the pledges made at the meeting of the National party, not to pledges given to the Public Service. The hon. member has said either too much or too little. I hope he will take the opportunity of elaborating later on, and of letting us know what those pledges were. He expresses the intention of keeping the Government up to its pledges. In any case it was rather a regrettable incident, and I hope it will not occur again. The fact remains that the lower paid ranks of the Public Service and the school teachers are entitled to generous consideration, having regard to the cost of commodities at the present time. To me it does not seem creditable that there should be something like 1,200 out of 1,400 school teachers on less than £200 a year. Two hundred pounds a year is not a living wage today; it is not a living wage more especially to those engaged in the responsible task of training the young people of this State. I have nothing more to say, except to express my thanks to hon. members for having listened to me with such patience.

On motion by the Premier debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 11th August, 1920.

	PAGE
Questions: Nationalist Workers' Compensation ...	49
Education, School books ...	50
Insurance agents' dispute ...	50
Rabbit-proof fence ...	50
Repatriation, Land settlement ...	50
Wheat Pool, Compensation for losses ...	50
Address-in-Reply, Amendment Single Chamber, third day ...	51

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

QUESTION—NATIONALIST WORKERS' COMPENSATION.

Hon. A. H. PANTON asked the Minister for Education. 1, What was the total cost

of the Royal Commission in connection with the nationalist workers' compensation? 2, The average amount paid to each nationalist worker? 3, Were the fees of the legal advisers of the men deducted from the compensation granted? 4, If so, what was the total amount paid to the legal advisers?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The total cost of the Royal Commission was £849. 2, The average amount paid to each nationalist worker was £83 7s. 9d. 3, No fees to legal advisers were deducted by the Government. 4, Answered by No. 3.

QUESTION—EDUCATION, SCHOOL BOOKS.

Hon. J. HICKEY asked the Minister for Education: 1, Do the Government realise the unfortunate position that parents are labouring under to-day in their endeavour to secure school books for their children? 2, If so, will the Government do something to alleviate the position? 3, In view of the answers given to my question last session, what action, if any, has been taken by the Government to arrange for the printing of school books in the State in order (a) to reduce the high cost of school books; (b) to create employment for workers in the printing trade in this State?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, The cost of books and paper has, unfortunately, risen all over the world. 2, The Government are considering buying wholesale stocks of all school books and stationery for distribution to schools at cost price. 3, A reading book has just been completed in this State, which can be sold at least as cheaply as a book of similar quality imported. In view of this, further books will be undertaken. The Government Printer has the first issue of the book now ready. I have handed the hon. member a copy of the book. I think our price for it will be 2s. 3d.

QUESTION—INSURANCE AGENTS' DISPUTE.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is the Minister aware that a dispute exists between the employees, known as insurance collectors, and the insurance companies? 2, Is the Minister aware that people were induced to take out policies with the various insurance companies on the distinct understanding that each week collectors would call and collect the premiums? 3, If so, are the Government prepared, in view of the decision of the courts of England during a similar dispute, to protect the interests of the public by endeavouring to secure an injunction restraining insurance companies from lapsing policies during the period of the dispute? 4, Are the Government prepared to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the operations of the insurance companies, with a view to establishing State control of fire and life insurance?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1 and 2, I have no official knowledge of this matter. 3, I have no reason to believe that policy holders are threatened with a lapse of their policies. 4, No.

QUESTION—RABBIT-PROOF FENCE.

Hon. A. H. PANTON asked the Honorary Minister: What is the total cost per annum for the maintenance of the rabbit-proof fence?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: The total cost for the maintenance of the rabbit-proof fence for the financial year ending 30th June, 1920, amounted to £12,488 10s. 2d.

QUESTION—REPATRIATION, LAND SETTLEMENT.

Hon. A. H. PANTON asked the Honorary Minister: 1, How many returned soldiers have been settled on the land? 2, How many on improved farms? 3, How many on virgin land? 4, What is the total amount paid for the purchase of improved farms? 5, Have any of the owners from whom the improved farms were purchased, since applied for land? 6, If so, how many?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, Number of returned soldiers settled on the land up to and including 31st July, 1920, 3,033. 2, Number settled on improved farms: (a) properties purchased, 1,756; (b) on own land, 669; (c) Agricultural Bank securities, 106; (d) repurchased estates, 332. 3, Number settled on virgin Crown land, 170. 4, The amount spent on purchase of improved farms, including stock, plant, crop, etc., is approximately £1,250,000. 5 and 6, The information desired in these questions could not be furnished even approximately without the compilation of an expensive return.

QUESTION—WHEAT POOL, COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY asked the Honorary Minister: 1, In view of the losses of wheat occasioned by mice, weevil, heavy rain, and other causes, did the British Government, after assessment, pay to the wheat pool any sum of money by way of compensation over and above the purchase price of such wheat? 2, If so, what amount did they pay? 3, What was done with the money? 4, Did Western Australia share in the division? 5, If not, why not? 6, Will the Minister make a statement regarding this matter?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, Yes. 2, £522,500. 3, Divided between the State pools of Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales. 4, No. 5, Because a fully attended meeting of the Australian Wheat Board, the W.A. Minister alone dissenting, decided that, although this payment was made to the general pool, Western Australia had already, by direct arrangement with the Royal Commission, which was considered by the

board as final, received an allowance of £34,609 8s. 5d. 6, if considered necessary. I might add that this information is not all that the hon. member desires and that it will take some considerable time to explain it to him. I shall take an opportunity at the next sitting of the House of giving him a full explanation and also of giving an explanation to Mr. Duffell on his question asked yesterday.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day.

Amendment—Single Chamber.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the Address-in-reply and the following amendment moved by the Hon. A. H. Panton:—"That the following words be added to the Address—'And we respectfully suggest to Your Excellency that the time has now arrived when the Government of the State can best be carried on by a single Chamber elected on an adult franchise.'"

Hon. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban) [4.37]: Before addressing myself to the amendment, I would like to express my congratulations to those hon. members who have been returned during the recent election. I sincerely hope they will prove good and useful members, and that the House will benefit as a result of their election. At the same time, without deprecating in any shape or form the result of the election, I wish to express my sincere regret that since last session we have lost an hon. member like Mr. Allen, who represented West Province. I feel sure we all sincerely regret that he was rejected considering that this House only a few months before had elected him to the position of Chairman of Committees. During the time that Mr. Allen occupied a seat in this Chamber he showed distinct ability, and I say without hesitation that the country is richer to-day for the ability displayed by him while he sat in this Chamber. The same applies to Mr. Millington. I have benefited very materially from time to time from the good advice and the able debates of Mr. Millington on the many and important occasions when there has been before the Chamber business on which we desired the best knowledge available from one particular section of the community—the particular section which Mr. Millington had the honour to represent. Mr. Carson, though of a somewhat reticent nature, assisted this House on many occasions by his ability as a debater. The absence of his intimate knowledge in regard to rural matters makes this House a loser as a result of the election. Regarding the amendment to the Address-in-reply, I would say at the outset that I give Mr. Panton and Mr. Moore credit for being very sincere in their efforts to bring about a state of economy at the present time in Western Australia. It is somewhat astonishing that the economy should have been suggested in that form, especially when we remember

some of the remarks made by Mr. Panton in the earlier part of his very able speech yesterday. He suggested the appointment of a joint select committee of both Houses in what could very well be called a second reading speech on a Bill forecasted in the Governor's Speech, clearly indicating that he did not at that period contemplate moving to the Address-in-reply an amendment of the nature we heard at the conclusion of his speech.

Hon. A. H. Panton: A sudden inspiration.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Mr. Panton has already given us reason to believe that he is very sincere in all the statements he makes. He is very tactful, as he justly claims to be in all his doings, especially in regard to those matters which are likely to have a very serious or beneficial bearing on the community generally. He is justified in taking to himself credit for being tactful on those matters. At the same time, I wish to direct my remarks briefly in opposition to the amendment I have just moved, because I realise that the bi-cameral system, as in vogue in Western Australia, is the soundest and undoubtedly the only system which will guarantee to the people that sound and mature judgment after the measures emanating from the other Chamber have been sent here for our review and deliberation. I am sure Mr. Panton deserves credit for being plucky enough to launch an amendment of this nature. Mr. Moore, who seconded the amendment, is to be congratulated on the very able manner in which he tackled a question which, to a fledgling in politics was, to say the least, a very big question indeed. It is unfortunate that Mr. Moore was not better versed in the arguments he brought forward. The ignorance he displayed when he referred to the qualifications for a vote for this Chamber was very regrettable. It is also somewhat significant that Mr. Moore was, on a previous occasion, elected to a seat in another place but he never availed himself of it and never took his seat in the Assembly. To put it charitably, it is strange that when, for the second time, Mr. Moore secures a seat in Parliament, he should, on taking his seat in this Chamber, launch out as he did yesterday in seconding the amendment. I am reminded that some of Mr. Moore's statements were not altogether in accordance with fact. He said that this Chamber is out to kill democracy and to block legislation. Although this House claims to be a non-party House, I think it can be verified that the Legislative Council has dealt more severely, during the six or seven years over which my membership extends, with the measures sent up by the Nationalist Government than with those sent to us by the Labour Government during the same period. This one fact clearly proves that we are no respecters of Governments. Governments come and Governments go, but the Legislative Council goes on for all time.

Hon. A. H. Panton: There will be a rude awakening some day.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: Another thought which occurs to my mind on this question is that only a few months ago the leader of the Opposition in another place found reason to exclaim most sincerely and most fervently, "Thank God we have a Legislative Council!" When these facts are taken into consideration, one cannot but express himself in favour of the retention of this Chamber. At the same time, while I have been a particularly strong advocate of a restricted franchise for this Chamber, I do realise that it should be elected by the people who have a stake in the country. I do not refer to bricks and mortar, but to real live people, people who are married and have homes, though they may be paying as little as 7s. 6d. per week rent. Heaven knows that in these times one cannot obtain much of a house for 7s. 6d. per week. Under these conditions it is clear that every person, other than those people whose hats cover their responsibilities, has a vote for the Legislative Council of Western Australia. If such a person has not a vote, it is his or her own fault. Certainly it is not the fault of the Electoral Department, who during the last two years have been most vigilant to see that every person entitled to be enrolled shall have an opportunity of enrolling. To that end the department have taken the trouble to visit the offices of municipal councils and road boards, and the Taxation Department, and every other Government department where information can be obtained as to persons entitled to be enrolled for the Legislative Council. Further, the Electoral Department have gone to the expense of posting claim cards to the householders whose names appear on the various municipal and road board registers. If the householder has failed to fill in and return the claim card as requested, it is not the fault of the Electoral Department. Therefore, if Mr. Moore is anxious for the people to whom he referred so eloquently yesterday afternoon to be on the roll of the Legislative Council, I say the door is open and the way is easy.

Hon. T. Moore: What about all the men living on mills in houses for which they pay 6s. per week?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I am not in a position to reply to that interjection, because I do not know anything about those men. All I can say is that if they are living in houses carrying rentals of less than 7s. 6d. per week, they are obtaining their houses very cheaply.

Hon. T. Moore: But their wages are low.

Hon. J. DUFFELL: I look upon this Chamber as the bulwark of the State.

Hon. T. Moore: And of democracy?

Hon. J. DUFFELL: If it is necessary to put those men on the roll, I would advise them to see to their enrolment straight away. I am prepared to go this far, that I would be willing for every returned soldier to have a vote for the Legislative Council. When we bear in mind the apathy of the people of this State during the last Legislative Council election, we must recognise that something

should be done to arouse greater interest among the people who have the privilege of voting for the Legislative Council. It is all very well for candidates seeking re-election, or seeking election for the first time, to go to great expense in providing committee rooms and all that kind of thing, and to be at the trouble of preparing addresses which would undoubtedly prove interesting if only the people would come along to hear them. But those candidates are extremely disappointed when they find a mere handful of people come to listen to them. I am prepared to alter my views regarding the franchise for this Chamber very considerably if it can be shown that by amendment of the franchise we can secure better attendances at election meetings and greater interest in elections. I sincerely hope that the majority of this Chamber will vote against Mr. Pantou's amendment. At the same time I give both Mr. Pantou and Mr. Moore credit for being in real earnest. Later on we shall be able to give our views as to economy and as to ways and means by which money can be saved to the State. In the circumstances I shall have no hesitation in voting against the amendment.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN (West) [4.55]: I appreciate the welcome which has been extended to me, and desire to endorse the complimentary references which have been made to Mr. J. F. Allen, lately a member of this Chamber. I re-echo the remarks which have been made regarding Mr. Allen. The contest in the West Province was fought on the most friendly terms. The majority of the electors having declared against Mr. Allen, I, too, think that this House has lost a very valuable member. I trust, however, that before six years have expired, remarks of the nature of those made to-day concerning Mr. Allen will be made regarding me. With reference to the duties of membership, I am here to do my very best in the interests of the State as a whole, and particularly in the interests of the province I represent. Whilst I am a member of this House I shall give to legislative duties every attention, and members will find that I shall do everything I can to forward the interests of the people. Coming now to the amendment, I may say that if I had had a hand in the framing of it, there would have been a straight out declaration for the abolition of the Legislative Council. The amendment does not ask for that, but says that in the opinion of this House the State can best be carried on by a single Chamber elected on an adult franchise. The amendment does not declare either that this House should be abolished or that the Legislative Assembly should be abolished, but merely that there should be only one House elected on an adult franchise. I support the amendment because I believe the time has arrived in the history of this State when the people desire only one Chamber to rule them. I am convinced, particularly so far as the electors of the West Province are concerned, that if a referendum

on the subject were taken to-morrow, a large majority of the people would declare in favour of a single Chamber. Twenty years ago, when the people of this continent were asked to vote for the establishment of a Federal Government, one of the strongest arguments used, and an argument that I feel sure influenced thousands of people to vote for Federation, was that there would, under Federation, be no need for Legislative Councils in the States, that the Federal Parliament taking over many large departments, at least one of the Chambers of the State Legislatures could be abolished, with a corresponding saving. I claim that the will of the people should at no time be vetoed by the vote of a House elected on a property qualification. What do we find in this State to-day? We have about 160,000 people voting at the Assembly election. At one period 160,000 of our people are asked to declare through the ballot box whom they wish to rule over them, what Government they desire to control the destinies of this State. That vote is taken, and the people declare who shall govern them. I say that is democracy. I say that when the adult people, both male and female, are allowed to voice their opinions through the ballot box, that is full and free democracy. But later, at another period, we find that a further vote is taken; but instead of 160,000 people being consulted, only 50,000 are consulted. Whilst I admit that there are about 60,000 people who are entitled to vote at Legislative Council elections, it has to be remembered that quite a number of these have votes in various provinces, and bearing that in mind we are safe in saying that not more than 50,000 people should be allowed to vote at province elections. If we are going to ask the representatives of all the people to frame certain legislation, and at the same time give the right to 50,000 people to elect another body of men to veto such legislation, then we are creating an anomaly, and one which should be wiped out. I am sorry that Sir Edward Wittenoom is not here, because during the debate yesterday afternoon he frequently desired to have pointed out to him what legislation had been blocked by this Chamber that was of a progressive nature. I have heard that cry pretty often, and again this afternoon from Mr. Duffell. Mr. Duffell said this is a non-party Chamber. That is only a plan to throw dust in the eyes of the people. This Chamber, ever since its constitution, has plainly demonstrated that it is a party House, and to say at this late hour that it is a non-party House, is to speak twaddle and endeavour to camouflage the position.

Hon. J. Duffell: It is only camouflage so far as your party is concerned.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: During the time the Labour Government were in office, 4½ years, this House was responsible for rejecting, or at all events mutilating, no fewer than 33 Bills sent up by that Government, and yet it is said we are a non-party House. Had these Bills been sent up by another Government they would have been passed by this Cham-

ber. Take the Prices Regulation Bill as an example of what I mean. The Labour Government sent up a Bill to provide for a Prices Regulation Commission to last for a period of 12 months, but this Chamber refused to pass it although it claims to be a non-party House. Last year when the present Government sent up a similar Bill it was passed by this Chamber. There is only one conclusion to be drawn from an attitude of this description. It seems very plain that many of those 33 Bills that were rejected by the Chamber were rejected for no other reason than that they were sent up by the Labour Government.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is a strong statement to make.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: It is just as well to be candid and to voice one's opinions and convictions. During the campaign in which I defeated the late member, Mr. Allen, I made it clear to the electors of the West Province that I desired them to vote for me, first of all because I was a Labour candidate, and secondly because I believed in the abolition of the Legislative Council. I was told by many people that I was losing votes, but my object was to come to this House with the assurance that I had the majority of Labour supporters behind me. Since I have told them plainly from every platform that I am in favour of the abolition of the Upper House, I can do nothing less than support the amendment which provides for a single Chamber.

Hon. J. Duffell: You will be sorry if it is carried.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: Not at all. I have never starved up to the present and I am not particular whether I get out of a job to-morrow or not. I can find another job, but the hon. member may not be able to do so. With further reference to the 33 Bills I have alluded to, I desire particularly to mention the Public Works Act Amendment Bill. This provided that land required to be resumed for public purposes might be compulsorily acquired at a price representing an advance of 10 per cent. on the valuation placed on such property by the owner for taxation purposes. That appeals to me as a reasonable kind of measure. The Government said that if they wanted to resume land for public purposes in the interests of the public, it should be resumed on that basis. There was not very much wrong about that particular Bill, and yet it was rejected by this Chamber. The Council could not allow that kind of legislation to go upon the statute book, and therefore refused to pass it. I have figures here to show how necessary it was for a Bill of that nature to be passed into law. There is one instance of an owner who valued his property for taxation purposes at £830, but as soon as the Government claimed the property for public purposes, he wanted £1,750. It was only worth £830 for taxation purposes, but this jump occurred as soon as the Government wanted it. The question was submitted to arbitration and the owner got £1,600 for the land. Another owner valued his property at £150

for taxation purposes, and demanded £1,400 when the Government wanted it for public utilities. Upon reference to arbitration the owner received £478. In another case the owner valued his property at £1,000 for taxation purposes, and demanded of the Government no less than £4,000. I have a list of many instances of that kind. If we are sent here to protect the interests of the public, to see that they are not robbed and exploited, then, when legislation of this nature comes before us, it should be passed. Some hon. members who voted against this particular Bill will no doubt be able to enlighten the House as to why they did so. Because of their instructions to defeat the Bill at that juncture the State lost thousands of pounds. There are many hon. members who are representing vested interests in this Chamber. They are sent here and have to deliver the goods. If they do not, they may lose their seats at the next election. If they are here simply representing a section of the community and vested interests only, the time has arrived when there should be a single Chamber, one elected on a broad adult franchise. I am pleased that Sir Edward Wittenoom has re-entered the Chamber and am ready to furnish him with a list of the 33 Bills I have referred to. I cannot believe that this is a non-party Chamber, but possibly when I am here a little longer I may—

Hon. J. Duffell: Know more about it.

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I may do so. But the more I know about it the more convinced shall I be that this House is useless and that the people do not require it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you examined the virtues of these Bills or the reasons for their rejection?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I have a good idea of most of them. I have been a fairly close student of all the Bills which have gone through this Chamber and I can name a good many of them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you got them?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I have them here. I have named one in particular. Possibly the hon. member may be able to tell me later why it was rejected, in company with the others I have mentioned, by this House. I was amused at Mr. Duffell's remark that merely those persons who only had a hat on their head were denied a vote for this particular Chamber. I should like to take him to Fremantle to see Princess Buildings, owned by Captain Biddles. There is a great scarcity of housing accommodation at the port, and later on I will ask this Chamber to do something to see that more accommodation is provided at Fremantle. Owing to this lack of accommodation people are compelled, very often against their wish, to live in rooms, either furnished or otherwise, and several families have to live in the one house. Over the Princess Theatre there are chambers known as Princess Buildings, and Captain Biddles lets rooms or flats there to people who have to pay from 15s. to £1 a week. These people have not the right to

vote. There are no means of getting them the vote because they pay their rent to Captain Biddles, and therefore cannot be placed on the roll. This happens all over Fremantle. There are hundreds of people to-day who have, I presume, as much at stake in this country as Mr. Duffell, and yet are denied a vote for this Chamber.

Hon. J. Duffell: You cannot name one.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: One has to consider what a stake in the country really is. Of course if bricks and mortar constitute a stake in the country, and if sheep and acres constitute a stake, then it is all right. Every man has to comply with the laws that this particular House enacts, and that being so I claim that every person should have the right to say who is going to represent him. There is nothing else for it. If we go on inflicting on the people of the State a certain amount of legislation and possibly punishment for crimes, those people have a perfect right to say who shall frame the laws.

Hon. J. Cornell: What will you do about those who break the laws?

Hon. F. A. BAGLIN: I suppose if our friend were punished for every law he broke he would not be here to-day. That would apply possibly to all members present. I am supporting the amendment principally because I believe the people of Western Australia are over-governed, and that the time is ripe for us to submit to the people of Western Australia the question whether they want the two Chamber system or not. I really believe that if a vote were taken to-morrow a large majority of the people of Western Australia would declare against the bi-cameral system. If the amendment is not carried I certainly think we should at least give the people an opportunity to say what they want. I leave the question to the good judgment of hon. members. So far as I am concerned I have a mandate from the electors of the West Province, and I would be failing in my duty and failing in that promise if I did not support the amendment. I am prepared to go even further and to vote for a straight-out resolution for the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) [5.19]: I am sure that all of us in the short life we have passed in this world appreciate a new sensation, and I can honestly admit having experienced one yesterday afternoon when I heard the speeches of the two hon. members who proposed and seconded the amendment to the Address-in-reply. I listened with the greatest attention to their remarks, and I brought to bear a fair amount of intelligence, at any rate as much intelligence as members on this side of the House are allowed to have, when listening to the hon. members' speeches. With regard to what Mr. Panton had to say, I am sorry to have to declare that his remarks did not carry conviction to me. He appeared to be exceedingly half-hearted in his advocacy of

the amendment, and it seemed to me that what he desired to say was, "I have to do this job, but I do not care very much about it." There was not that enthusiasm about it that one might have expected him to apply to his advocacy of the cause of poor down-trodden girls, say in the Cabin tea rooms, whose wages should be raised 6s. a week.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is my long suit.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. member, but I was not carried away by the enthusiasm he displayed. I may say, however, that I was lost in admiration, indeed I might also say envy, when I listened to the confidence with which the hon. member who seconded the amendment submitted his arguments and the eloquent method he adopted. I believe it was the hon. member's first speech in the House. He had experience of this Chamber extending over some 24 hours, and he gave forth his views as to what the Legislative Council was worth, what it had done, and what it had not done. He did all this with such confidence that he filled me not only with admiration, but, as I have already said, with envy. The hon. member was so confident in his remarks that I could not help but call to mind the quotation of Herbert Spencer that "the pride of knowledge is humble compared to the pride of ignorance." I do not say that altogether applies in a case like this, when a man comes before a gathering of this kind, of which he has been a member for so short a time, and tells us that it is no earthly good, that it has been doing harm and damage—but I consider that he is a plucky man who deserves to get on.

Hon. T. Moore: We have read all about it and the people know that it exists.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The two speeches delivered by the hon. members put me in mind of an experience of a great many years ago, when I was a member of Parliament, I think in 1884 or 1885, before the hon. members were born. In those days we had an enterprising member who was looked upon either as a Radical or a Liberal—we were all supposed to be Conservatives. We were a Crown colony in those days, and every year that member brought in a motion in favour of responsible government, and he prayed in his own heart that the motion would be defeated, as it always was for a great number of years. With regard to the amendment now before the House, I feel positive that if the hon. members who, shall I say, had the pluck to submit it, thought for a moment that it would be carried, they would have submitted it with the greatest hesitation.

Hon. T. Moore: Give us a chance.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I am certain that there is no organisation, let alone a Labour organisation, which is willing to do away with 30 positions each worth £400 a year. I am certain, however, that they would do away with the existing qualification. The arguments advanced in favour

of the abolition of this Chamber submitted by Mr. Moore were, firstly, that the Chamber had blocked useful legislation; secondly, I gathered that he claimed that hon. members of this House usually looked with hostility on measures introduced during the period of office of the Labour Government, but favoured those submitted by Liberal Governments when they were in power. The third argument was that there was a number of people who wished to vote for the election of members to this Chamber but who were denied the right to do so. The fourth argument was that the Legislative Council should be done away with because one House was sufficient, and that the remaining House should be elected on an adult franchise. The fifth was that the Legislative Council was out to kill democracy. I think I have set out the headings correctly. I have not had much time to go into the matter fully. We have not yet had the "Hansard" report of the speech delivered by Mr. Moore, but the report which appears in the newspaper this morning, concise as it is, conveys, I think, very well indeed the hon. member's ideas. Unfortunately, so far as I am concerned, on account of other duties I have had to attend to, I have not been able to give that reflection to the subject that it deserves.

Hon. J. Cornell: Tell us why you think this House should remain.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I will tell the hon. member if I can, but whether I shall convince him is another matter. Let me first deal with the charge that we are here to block useful legislation. I defy any member, past or present, to show that this House has ever blocked a single measure of useful legislation. In connection with the one suggested by Mr. Moore yesterday, the hon. member forgot to say that there were sound reasons for rejecting it. I am not going to hunt up "Hansard" to give those reasons for an unreflecting member who may come along; he must find out for himself, and by turning up "Hansard" he will see that the Bill was rejected for good and sound reasons. Every Bill brought forward that had for its object the advancement of the interests of the people or the development of the State always received the fullest consideration at the hands of this House, and was dealt with on its merits. We next come to the charge that the Legislative Council refused to favour measures submitted by the Labour Government and favoured those submitted by Liberal Governments. This House did nothing of the kind. The finances of the State would to-day be in a better position if the Legislative Council had declined to agree to all the proposals brought down during the five years of the Labour Government's administration, Bills for the extension of railways, for the expenditure of loan money in every direction—these were never interfered with by the Legislative Council. What is the result? At the present time we have the Commissioner of Railways telling us that we have spent more money on the construction of railways than we should have done, and

the consequence is that there are too many miles of railways, all because this Chamber never refused to agree to the proposals of the Labour Government. Those proposals were always treated in the most liberal manner. We helped that Government in every direction during the five years they were in office, and during which time they spent 35 millions of money from loan and revenue, without leaving behind a contented person or a thriving industry. What they did leave behind was a splendid deficit of about a million and a half. How, then, can it be said that the Legislative Council blocked the legislation which was introduced by the Labour Government? So far as that Government were concerned they had every encouragement given them at the hands of this Chamber, and they admitted it too. I am quite certain that on reflection the conscientious members of that Government will admit that they spent too much money, more money than they were justified in spending. The result is amongst other things, that to-day the railways cannot be made to pay. The next charge is that the people are prevented from voting for the election of members to this House. One would think, to hear hon. members talk, that those poor people never had a chance of voting, that they were actually prevented from doing so. Let us take the exact position of the people under the Constitution at the present time. Every adult person, man and woman, over the age of 21, has the right to vote.

Hon. T. Moore: For this House?

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: For the House that has command of the expenditure.

Hon. T. Moore: Oh, no!

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Oh, yes! When the hon. member has been here a little longer he will understand these things. All the people in the State have a right to do that. Members, and especially those who spoke yesterday, would be surprised if I asked whether they favoured representation without taxation. They would reply, "Certainly not; there should not be representation without taxation." Thousands of people in this country have a vote for the Assembly but have never paid one sixpence in taxes, and there are a great many such people to-day.

Hon. T. Moore: I wonder how they live on £100 a year and pay taxation.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: There are many people getting more than £100 a year who do not pay taxation, and until lately there were thousands who had £200 a year and did not pay taxation. I will explain it. Until quite recently the income tax exemption was £200 a year. A sum of £200 a year is practically £5 a week. If we allow for idle time and illness, a man would not get much more than £200 a year out of £5 a week. People receiving £200 a year were exempted from taxation and there are thousands of people, especially women, who do not get £5 a week. These women have the right to vote whether they get £200 a year or not.

There are thousands of women who do not get £200 a year or £100 a year. I have two daughters who have not a penny and they are entitled to vote. Yet they pay not a cent. to the revenue of this country.

Hon. J. Cornell: Their father does, though.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: There are hundreds of men and women who do not pay taxation. They pay no income tax, no land tax, no wheel tax, and they do not pay rates. They have nothing to pay in that way. Someone will ask—do not they pay customs duties? The answer is that they do pay customs duties, but who gets the customs duties. The Federal Government get the customs duties and what do we get back? A paltry 25s. for each person. There are thousands of people who have votes and who pay not one penny towards the direct taxation of this country. That cannot be contradicted; it is a fact. All that the Federal Government return to the State out of customs duties is 25s. per head. Let us look at what that means. Say there are, roughly, 350,000 people in the State. At 25s. per head our receipts from the Federal Government would amount to about £480,000 or £500,000. What a paltry amount that is will be realised when we consider what we pay in the way of interest and sinking fund. Our interest and sinking fund on loans comes to nearly two millions a year. Speaking from memory, the figure is about £1,750,000. Not one-fourth of that amount do we receive from the Federal Government. Looking at the matter quite seriously, there are thousands of people who voted when the exemption was £200 and there are plenty now that the exemption is £100 who have a vote through the other House for the taxation of people and who never pay a penny of taxation directly to the State.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Are not they an asset to the State?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not say they are not. They are entitled to a vote. I quite agree with that; everyone should have a vote. They should have a right to say under what Government and under what form of taxation they will live.

Hon. T. Moore: You will vote with us.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: But they also have a right, which I say they should not have, a right of dictating the taxation which other people shall pay while they pay none. Mr. Moore told us yesterday of some poor person who was earning a little over £100 a year and had to pay income tax. I would go further and say that everyone who has the right to vote should pay something towards the taxation of the country, and I would start with 10s. Every person should pay 10s.; then there would be some value attaching to the vote. We hear a lot about people having no vote for this House. Anyone would think people wanted a vote for this House. My hon. friend says that out of 18,000 voters, a very small proportion of them exercised their vote. Yet, according to the hon. members who spoke yesterday, everyone is

clamouring for a vote. I know many people who will not exercise their votes.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I said they were clamouring for the abolition of this House, not for votes.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I think the hon. member said it was a disgrace that they did not have the vote and that they were clamouring for it. Every person in this State of 21 years or over has a vote, and a vote for the powerful House, which deals with money matters—the direct, representative House. We are told that this Council should be done away with because many people have not a vote for it. Having given a vote to everybody, no matter whether educated or good or bad or industrious, having given every adult the vote for the powerful House, surely we should give some protection to those who are thrifty. Any system which would give to the idle and the intemperate and the lazy the same political privileges which it would give to the industrious, the thrifty and the good can never be satisfactory. Nobody with any reflection would say that the boy or girl out of a factory, a boy or girl who has just turned 21 years, has the same knowledge of affairs as Mr. Panton and Mr. Moore have. Therefore, if we are going to induce people to be thrifty, we must give them a certain amount of protection, and this House was put here for the purpose that, after giving the greatest freedom possible to every elector. This Council should exercise the right of revision in regard to Bills passed by another place before those measures passed into law, revision in such a way that those measures should not do harm to people developing the country.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Or good.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: This House was established to provide that protection. I am not a believer in a system of two Houses. I believe in one House, but for the reasons I have given, I do not believe in one House elected on an adult franchise. I do not think that the whole of the laws and liberties of the State should be placed in the hands of people whether they are educated or not. That would be an impossibility. I am a great believer in one House and I entirely concur with the two speakers that we are over-governed by Parliaments throughout Australia. We are a great deal over-governed. The ideal of Federation was that all the best men would be gathered in the Federal Parliament in a central part of Australia, and that the rest of the legislative work would be carried on by much smaller Houses in the different States. That was the ideal, and we have realised anything but that ideal. Instead of the best men of each State being sent to the Federal Parliament, it was very difficult for them to get there at all. And what about the Senate? It has represented one class from the outset for I do not know how many years. Time after time, the six members of the Senate representing this State were the elect of one class of the community only, and it was impossible for any one else to win a Senate seat.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: What is the position now?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not know.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: But what is the position now?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Perhaps the hon. member can tell us.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. members must not conduct conversations.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: No, Sir, but the inducements are so strong. If the tables are turned now, it proves my argument and shows what a mischievous Constitution we have when any one class can win the whole of the representation for the State.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The Senate should be abolished.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: It should be abolished, but we cannot abolish it. Every adult in this State has a vote for the powerful House of the State, the House that deals with money matters and with taxation. This House cannot tax anybody. This House cannot impose taxation or introduce or deal with money Bills, but the other House can, and for the other House every adult in the country is entitled to a vote.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: This House can stop taxation, though.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: This House cannot introduce taxation. I wish to make it perfectly clear that, though we hear so much objection to the fact that many people have not votes and are not represented such people are fully represented from the child of 21 upwards, whether they are qualified by education or otherwise. Every adult has a vote, which is quite the right thing, and he has a vote for the powerful House. This House is to some extent a protection for those people who are thrifty. We were told yesterday that this House was of no use, that it had never done any good and, so far as could be seen, it never would do any good. I can only say that the speakers who voiced those opinions were not taking a very liberal view of those members who have sat in this Chamber for some years. I cannot see why the brains of those who have been members of this Council for some years should be poorer or less capable of judging matters than those of members who have recently been elected. We are accused of being the House of "fat," or some such vulgar expression, which I suppose is intended to indicate men with means or money. If that is so, members cannot be accused of sitting here for the fees they receive. Therefore, they may be given credit in that they see a reason for being present instead of being told that they are here doing harm or, at any rate, not doing any good for the State. I am certain that if a referendum were taken on the question whether the Legislative Council should be abolished, it would meet with the same fate as did the Queensland referendum.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Will you give us the opportunity?

Hon. J. Duffell: You had that six years ago.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Another statement was that this House is out to kill democracy. What has this House ever done to kill democracy? I do not know that we have ever done anything except to help democracy in every way we possibly could. Where can we find a freer country than this? In what way has democracy been killed? I listened with some interest to learn how we have interfered with the freedom of the people which I take it is the meaning of democracy. This House has been established to revise the Bills which come from another place, and I can honestly say, from the experience of a good many years, that this Chamber has done a lot of good work in revising the measures sent up to us. I flatter myself that my opinion is worth something, not only because I happen to belong to the Legislative Council, but because I belong to a few other institutions about the city which one would scarcely be likely to belong to, if his opinion were not worth something. In the circumstances I have no hesitation whatever in flatly contradicting any statement that this House has ever done anything in the way of blocking legislation, or blocking democracy, as regards the development of the country and the well-being of the people. Any Bills that come before this Chamber are dealt with liberally and fairly, and I may say that I felt a little indignant yesterday when I heard young men—to judge by appearances—or at all events new members, with little experience, and having been here scarcely 24 hours, say that the place—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Wants cleaning up.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: I do not think I need argue the question any further, as I cannot believe the hon. members supporting the amendment are serious for a moment. I feel quite certain that if they thought the amendment was likely to be carried, they would have hesitated a long time before introducing it. I repeat emphatically that this House exists to do good, and has done good, and will continue to do good. On the other hand, I am in accord with those hon. members when they say that one House would be quite sufficient provided it was elected on a satisfactory basis to represent all parties in the community. No one part of the community wants to get the better of the others; not in the least. We are here not for the sake of a little bit of class legislation, but as statesmen to see that the country develops. The three speeches to which I have listened were, I am sorry to say, absolutely in favour of one class only. There was in them nothing of a broad nature showing how we could develop the country. Each member spoke for some particular class in which he is interested. That is all very well, but let us also have some broader views. I am opposed to the amendment as it stands, and shall vote against it.

Hon. H. STEWART (South-East) [5.48]: There is one point in which I am in accord with the proposer of the amendment. That is as to the desirableness of reducing the cost of government. But I am not at all satisfied that Mr. Panton is in earnest with this amendment. At all events, my method is not his method. I think this House could very well be reduced in numbers without impairment of its efficiency. I have previously expressed the opinion that the numbers of this House might be reduced by 38 per cent., and that the continuity desirable as regards this Chamber could be maintained by holding elections every three years instead of every two. The economy resulting would not be great, but it would amount to something. The desire expressed by the mover of the amendment to reduce the cost of government can hardly be sincere, because only at the end of last session the hon. gentleman was one of a party who voted for increasing the cost of government.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And he will go for it again this year if he gets the chance.

Hon. H. STEWART: I was pleased to hear Sir Edward Wittenoom mention that at the time of the Federation of the colonies it was anticipated that the cost of the State Parliaments would be reduced by a reduction of the number of their members. The fact shows that in those days it was considered, as a great many persons consider now, that there are too many members of Parliament in Australia. I do not propose to deal with the various issues that have been raised. For instance, there is the matter referred to by Mr. Baglin in regard to valuations of land for taxation and the claims put forward when the Government wanted to resume certain properties. I was not a member of the House at the time when that occurred, but it seems to me that quite a feasible explanation is that the valuation for taxation represented the unimproved value of the land, and that the claims for compensation, when the properties were resumed, included the value of the improvements. If my surmise is correct, the action of the owners was perfectly legitimate. I must oppose the amendment.

On motion by Hon. J. Cunningham, debate adjourned.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motions by the MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch) sessional committees were appointed as follows:—

Standing Orders: The President, the Chairman of Committees, Hon. A. Sanderson, and the mover.

Library: The President, Hon. A. Lovekin, and Hon. J. Nicholson.

Printing: The President, Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom, and Hon. A. H. Panton.

House: The President, Hon. J. Cornell, Hon. J. Duffell, Hon. J. Ewing, and Hon. J. W. Hickey.

House adjourned at 5.51 p.m.