

war very many of her people were thrown out of employment. No country can afford to let its poor people starve. In Western Australia we have a system of doles; and who would say that we should not give unfortunate people sufficient to maintain them?

The Premier: "Dole" is the term used in England.

Mr. LATHAM: I am not objecting to the term. What I am objecting to is the statement that people who received the dole at Home are unsatisfactory citizens here.

The Premier: That is not right. Some of the finest and most skilled tradesmen and mechanics in England have compulsorily been receiving relief for years.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And through no fault of their own.

The Premier: No fault whatever of their own. Some of the best people in England have been on the dole.

Mr. Teesdale: Yes; some excellent textile workers.

The Premier: Yes, and shipwrights and engineers.

Mr. LATHAM: Let us give these people an opportunity in Western Australia as the Premier has outlined. Let them have an opportunity to develop our lands. The South-West offers wonderful opportunities to these people. We want to give them a word of encouragement, and help them. For Heaven's sake, let us not tell these people that they have no earthly hope of making good, thus breaking their hearts when they come to the first trouble. These children of our forebears have not deteriorated. It is the duty of every true Western Australian to help the people who have come out here to settle on our lands and become good citizens of this State.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-reply adopted.

House adjourned at 10.21 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 25th August, 1925.

	PAGE
Questions: Railway, Esperance Northwards ...	444
Railway trucks ...	444
Address-in-reply, amendment ...	445

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY, ESPERANCE NORTHWARDS.

Taking-over by Commissioner.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Are the Government aware that the District Settlers' Associations in the Norseman-Esperance locality are keenly desirous of hastening the taking over by the Commissioner of Railways of the Esperance-Northwards railway, so as to relieve the community of the inconvenience caused by the erratic nature of the existing railway service between Esperance and Salmon Gums? 2, Can a more definite date than "within a month or two," as stated in the Governor's Speech, be given for the railway to be handed over for traffic?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes, although it is not admitted that the traffic has been run in an erratic manner. 2, It has already been arranged that the line will be taken over by the Railway Department on the 1st proximo.

QUESTION—RAILWAY TRUCKS.

Mileages loaded and empty.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (for Hon. H. Seddon) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What was the average truck mileage, (a) loaded and (b) empty, per day during each of the past five years? 2, What was the truck mileage per day for "Xa" trucks over the same period? 3, What was the truck mileage, (a) loaded and (b) empty, during the last wheat season for trucks used in that traffic?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The average truck mileage of both loaded and empty trucks per day for the past five years was:—1921, 20.56 miles; 1922, 20.04

miles; 1923, 20.20 miles; 1924, 21.51 miles; 1925, 22.63 miles. Loaded and empty movements of trucks are not recorded separately. 2, It is not possible to give the movement of any particular class of truck. 3, Loaded and empty daily mileage was:—January, 25.30 miles; February, 27.43 miles; March, 27.53 miles; April, 27.35 miles.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eleventh Day—Amendment.

Debate resumed from the 20th August.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.35]: The amendment moved by Mr. Duffell reads—

But this House expresses its regret that your Advisers have thought fit to sign a memorial addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies praying that State Governors in future should be Australians recommended by the Government for the time being of each State.

It is unusual for an amendment to the Address-in-reply to be moved in this House. It is one of the methods adopted in another place with a view to bringing about the defeat of the Ministry. Mr. Duffell undoubtedly regards the amendment as of supreme importance. It signifies that he would, if he could, guillotine the Government for their action in this matter. He implies that the Government have been on an Empire-breaking expedition or on an enterprise likely to do the Empire serious harm. He darkly hints that there is something underlying the proposal. He says dangers will confront us if the memorial meets with success. Instead of telling us what those dangers are, he refers us to a leader in the "West Australian." That is a peculiar attitude indeed for a member of this House to adopt. He asks a non-party House to be guided by the views of a partisan Press. Mr. Duffell took a grave step in moving the amendment to the Address-in-reply. One would have thought that before doing so he would have fortified himself with the facts of the case. It would have been very easy indeed for him to adopt a proper course in order to obtain accurate information. Why did he not ask questions in this House relating to the matter? He had ample opportunity to do so. It was not a matter of extreme urgency. Three or four questions would have elicited

the necessary information, and would have saved Mr. Duffell from the position into which he has fallen. He, however, was eager for the fray and he preferred to be guided by the political propagandists of the East who have used the "West Australian" as a means to their end. The amendment states that the Ministry have signed a memorial to the Secretary of State for the Colonies "praying that State Governors in future should be Australians recommended by the Government for the time being of each State." There is no such thing in the memorial, nor anything which inclines to that view. That is a gross misrepresentation of the actual position. After a recital of the events connected with the history of this movement, the request is contained in one sentence, which I shall read from a copy of the memorial. This is the only request made in the memorial—

On the expiration of the term of office of each of the distinguished gentlemen who now occupy the position of Governor in the respective Australian States, he may be succeeded by an Australian citizen appointed under a letters patent by His Majesty the King.

What is the request contained in the memorial? The appointment to be made from Australian citizens, not from Australians merely, as the amendment indicates. And by whom is the appointment to be made? It is to be made by His Majesty the King. The words contained in the amendment "on recommendation by the Government for the time being of each State" do not appear in the memorial, and are simply the product of the excited imagination of Mr. Duffell.

Hon. J. Duffell: On a point of order I beg to differ. I am accused of having made that statement on my own initiative. I simply quoted the words of the Premier as reported in the "West Australian."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I read the words of the Premier as reported in the "West Australian," and they do not in any way conflict with what I have stated. The next paragraph of the memorial sets out the position clearly. It reads—

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that our attitude in this matter is entirely consistent with the feeling of the greatest loyalty to His Majesty's Throne and Person, and a desire to promote to the utmost extent within our power the bonds of Empire unity. It is our firm and sincere belief that if His Majesty is graciously pleased to recognise in this distinctive and befitting manner the long, meritorious and faithful service in the public interest of some citizen of the Commonwealth, it would

strengthen the bonds of affection and kinship which unite us indissolubly to the Mother country.

The memorial asks that some citizen of the Commonwealth should be appointed. The question of the identity of the gentleman or of his qualifications is left to the Imperial authorities and to the King to decide. The custom now is that whenever the Imperial authorities propose to appoint a Governor, they notify the Government concerned. No doubt if the Government objected, another appointment would be made, but the appointment rests solely with the Imperial authorities. If there was provision for the appointment of Governors from amongst Australian citizens, the same course of procedure would no doubt be followed in every respect. The proposal that Australian Governors should be appointed from the ranks of Australian citizens is no new idea: it dates back for a quarter of a century. It was first discussed when Federation was in process of determination. Let us go back to 1898 when the third session of the Australian Convention was held on the Commonwealth of Australia Bill. Here is an extract from the speech of Sir John Forrest, taken from the official record of the debates on the Commonwealth of Australia Bill, the 1st March, 1898, Melbourne:—

Sir John Forrest (W.A.): I beg now to propose the insertion, after (Clause 102, of a new clause 102a, which is as follows:—"In each State of the Commonwealth there shall be a Governor, who shall be appointed by the Governor-General-in-Council, and shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor-General, but no longer than six years in any one State at any one time." Hon. members are aware that no mention is made in the Bill as to the mode of appointment of the Governor of a State. I believe the result of that omission will be that the Governors of the several States will be appointed by Her Majesty in the way in which they are now appointed. Hon. members will also recollect that, in 1891, a provision was placed in the Bill by which the States had power to legislate in regard to the office of Governor of a State. That provision was exercised in Adelaide, I think very wisely, and there is now no provision in the Bill for the appointment of a Governor of a State. We have provided that the Governor-General shall be appointed by Her Majesty, but we have said nothing whatever, as far as I can recollect, in regard to how the office of Governor of a State is to be filled. I hope that no one will think that I have any desire to weaken the bonds which unite us to the great Mother Country. Every one of us, I think, is agreed that the Federation we are trying to create—in fact, is it mentioned in plain words in the preamble—shall be a Federation under the

Crown of Great Britain. But it seems to me that if we are to have a real federation of these colonies, that federation will be very much weakened if we have each State with a Governor, appointed by Her Majesty, from Home My friend (Mr. Symon), in the early part of this session, while addressing himself to the constitution of the High Court, used these words, "I understand we are creating a nation which is to be self-contained, self-sufficing in every possible respect." If that applies to the constitution of the High Court, surely it should also apply to the appointment of the heads of the States, in the persons of the Governors I desire with my friend (Mr. Symon) that this federation should be self-contained. Speaking for myself, I desire that the very highest post of this great continent should be open to our own public men. That would give dignity to our public life. At the present time in our own small Governments we do not go out of our own colonies for officers to fill the highest posts in the land, leaving out the position of Governor If we are prepared to trust the Federal Government to appoint the judges of the High Court, and also other officers to carry on the business of the Government, why should we refuse the right to appoint our State Governors? At present we must remember our field of selection is very much restricted in appointing the Chief Justices, Puisne Judges and other high officers. But when we have the whole of Australia to select from, our area will be very much enlarged, with the result that better men may be appointed. In selecting a Lieutenant-Governor for a State the Government would not be restricted to the State in which that officer would have to perform his functions, but would have the whole of Australia to select from . . .

And much more in the same strain. However, I do not wish to weary hon. members by reading even the main portion of the speech. A request was also made to the Secretary of State for the Colonies by the Hon. Thomas Price, Premier of South Australia, in a despatch dated the 25th July, 1913. The Secretary of State was also approached on the question by Sir William McPherson, Treasurer of Victoria, in 1919, and by Mr. Theodore, Premier of Queensland, in 1920. The reply was that the Imperial authorities would not hesitate to give effect to the wishes of the Governments of Australian States should it be clearly demonstrated that there was a unanimous desire that in future the Governors of the States should be selected from the citizens of the Commonwealth. Here are expressions of opinion from men like Lord Forrest, Mr. Alfred Deakin—I do not know whether I mentioned his name before, but certainly Mr. Deakin was a supporter of the appointment of Governors

from among Australian citizens—Dr. J. A. Cockburn, Mr. B. R. Wise, Sir Alexander Peacock, and Sir Winthrop Hackett, the former proprietor of the "West Australian," that great and philanthropic journalist. Is it to be thought that those gentlemen would suggest anything inimical to the interests of the Empire? Now we have Mr. Duffell launching an attack on the Government with respect to something that is 27 years old, something that was in its infancy in 1898. Right through the intervening period the question has cropped up. It came prominently before the public of Western Australia, at any rate, in 1913, when Mr. Scaddan wrote to the Secretary of State for the Colonies urging that our Governors should be appointed from among Australian citizens. That was publicly announced at the time, and made the subject of speeches from different platforms. Mr. Scaddan received telegrams of congratulation. Now, Mr. Duffell was a member of this House at that time; but he never ventured to raise his voice in protest. But here, after a lapse of many years, he comes forward with an amendment to the Address-in-reply.

Hon. J. Duffell: We have learnt a lot since that period.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I wonder where Mr. Duffell has been during that long interval. According to his remarks, the hon. member is averse to Australians being appointed to the office of State Governor. He is strongly antagonistic to that principle. According to him, no Australian should be appointed to the position of State Governor. He says that men selected for such positions should be men of high and important position, having wide experience of Imperial affairs. That sentence, according to Mr. Duffell's idea, disqualifies Australians. Men like Mr. Deakin and Sir Edmund Barton, who helped to preserve the bonds between Australia and the Old Country, had no sense of Imperial responsibility, according to Mr. Duffell. I think it is a reflection on the proved ability and loyalty of Australian statesmen to exclude them from the Vice-Regal distinction. It is, in my opinion, a gross imputation on the honour of Australian citizens to say that while they are fit to become Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth and to have the affairs of the Commonwealth in their keeping, they are not fit to represent His Majesty the King as a Governor of one of our States. More than one instance could

be adduced in proof that the Imperial Government do not take this view. Chief Justice Madden, to whom I have referred, was acting Governor of Victoria for many years; and his impartiality was never questioned. To come nearer home, Sir Edward Stone filled the position of Lieut.-Governor of Western Australia for several years; and I think that everyone with a knowledge of Western Australian affairs will say that Sir Edward Stone adorned the office. He had been a politician, but he was a man of high character, and was respected by every section of the community. Sir Robert Mac-Millan is following in his footsteps. He is a gentleman of great intellect, and I think it will also be admitted, of unquestionable integrity. No one could raise even a murmur of protest if Sir Robert Mac-Millan were appointed Governor of this State, at the end of Sir William Champion's term of office. I could mention at least a dozen other names of Western Australian citizens who are qualified in every respect to fill the office. I might mention the name of Sir Edward Wittenoom, who has reached one of the highest positions in the gift of the Crown. He holds strong political views, but from my experience of him he can rise superior to prejudice, and is imbued with a fine sense of fairness. I feel certain Sir Edward Wittenoom would exercise semi-judicial functions to the satisfaction of the community. It is very harassing for me to have to make these remarks in the circumstances, but I feel justified in doing so in support of my case. Turning back to the past, we see men like Lord Forrest, Sir Edmund Barton, Mr. Andrew Fisher, and Mr. Alfred Deakin, and others whose names I have already mentioned, men whose work would have been properly recognised by their elevation to Vice-Regal rank. Under the present system, however, they would not be eligible to occupy Government House. The possibility of local bias could be safeguarded against by selecting the appointee from another State. He could be appointed from one of the Eastern States if a gentleman were required to fill the position in Western Australia. That would be in perfect accord with the prayer of the memorial. But, after all, it is a question purely for the Imperial authorities to decide. There is no suggestion even of a recommendation from the State Government. It would be left to His Majesty and His Majesty's Government to determine the sources from which they

would secure their information before making an appointment. Indeed, probably it would be hardly necessary for them to make any investigation. The man they would appoint would be a man of almost world-wide fame through his devotion to the Empire and through his exercise of statesmanship within the confines of Australia. The memorial signed by the present Government is quite different from that which was signed by Mr. Thomas Price in 1908. In proof of that I will quote the reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the letter sent by the Scaddan Government in 1913 in connection with the same question. The Secretary of State then wrote:—

It is true that the proposal made by the Premier of South Australia in 1908 was for the appointment of citizens of the State to the office of State Governor, whereas the present proposal is for the appointment of citizens of the Commonwealth. I recognise that this modification would considerably enlarge the field of His Majesty's choice, but it hardly appears to me to affect the desirability of treating the question from the general standpoint, for if the question were now decided on the desired lines, with sole reference to the case of Western Australia, citizens of other States would be marked out for appointment to the Governorship of Western Australia, but not for the Governorship of their own State.

Suppose a local man were appointed to the position and he showed bias and prejudice. Then there would be a remedy. There are men who have been appointed from Home to these positions and have not been guilty of prejudice or bias but have committed some slight error of judgment. That has resulted in their withdrawal. The same remedy could be applied in the instance under review. If a Governor appointed from Australian citizens did not give satisfaction, if he caused trouble or did not deal fairly in the exercise of his functions, he would be within the four corners of the Constitution Act and the British Government would without delay withdraw him from his position. The Agents General appointed by the various State Governments are drawn mainly from the ranks of politicians. Soon after the Daglish Government came into power, there was a vacancy in the Agency General, and it was offered to Sir Walter James. He had been the previous Premier, and he had been defeated by the Labour Party. But they considered that if he were appointed Agent General he would carry out the duties of the position conscientiously and without exercising any effort to hamper or defeat the

policy of the Labour Government. Sir Walter James was in the office of Agent General for nearly 12 months during the Daglish Ministry's term of office, and the Government of the day could not speak too highly of the manner in which Sir Walter performed his duties. Again, Sir Newton Moore had been Premier of the State, and was appointed Agent General by a Liberal Government of which he had been the head; but a long period of his term of office as Agent General was served under a Labour Government, the Scaddan Ministry. We received the greatest assistance from Sir Newton Moore. Last of all, Mr. Colebatch was a vigorous opponent of the Labour Party. I remember him in the olden days here as one of my strongest antagonists, one who gave me a great deal of trouble. But during his term of office as Agent General we have received every help from Mr. Colebatch in carrying out our policy on the London side. I contend that Mr. Duffell's action in moving the amendment is out of place, and that the amendment itself is out of place. He is taking belated action; he has delayed the move for 27 years. What the Government have done in this case is in perfect harmony with the views expressed by some of Australia's leading statesmen. They were not members of the Labour Party, except perhaps a small section of them; they were members of a party to which we are now opposed. The Legislative Council, of course, is entitled to express its opinion. But I submit, with all due respect, that a matter of this description should form the subject of a separate motion, and then, if carried, it could be transmitted to the Legislative Assembly for its concurrence. The Assembly is the House that carries weight with the British Government.

Hon. J. Duffell: Did not Mr. Panton, whilst a member of your party, move an amendment to the Address-in-reply in this Chamber

The Honorary Minister: No.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not talking about amendments in general; I am talking about this amendment, and expressing the opinion that it should have been submitted in the form of a separate motion, which motion, in the event of its being carried, could have been sent on to the Assembly. The Legislative Assembly is the House that makes and unmakes ministries, and if the Legislative Council is to attach an amend-

ment to the Address-in-reply, the effect will be to bring upon itself nothing but ridicule.

Hon. J. Duffell: Mr. Panton, in this Chamber, moved an amendment on the 10th August, 1920.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not aware that one of the Legislative Councils in the Eastern States has taken action similar to that adopted by Mr. Duffell here, but whatever course is followed, I contend that the House cannot accept the amendment. It is a misrepresentation of the position, and it is an attempt to place on record something that is not in accordance with fact. The memorial does not ask that the appointment of Governors be restricted to Australians, and it does not stipulate that they should be appointed on the recommendation of the Government for the time being. It says nothing of the kind. All that is pure invention, not on Mr. Duffell's part, but on the part of the enemies of the Labour movement. Mr. Duffell's amendment has been broadcasted far and wide, and I do not think a rebuttal will see much daylight. I suggest that an amendment to Mr. Duffell's amendment is the only course open to this House if it should desire to agree to something of the kind so as to make it more acceptable than it is at the present time.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is your opinion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I hope that whatever course the House takes, it will not stultify itself and cast a slur on the Australian people.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.7]: The Colonial Secretary has remarked that it is very unusual in this House to submit an amendment to the Address-in-reply. My reply to that is that the circumstances are very unusual, and I do not know that ever before have we had anything of a similar nature brought under notice where this House, and all that it stands for, and those whom we represent, have not been consulted. Seeing that the circumstances are unusual, I do not consider that there is any great fault to be found with the action taken by Mr. Duffell; in fact, I commend him for it because I feel quite differently from those whose opinions were quoted by the Colonial Secretary. Whenever the Government of this State lend money to any large institution, care is always taken to see that a representative of the Government is appointed to watch the Government's interest. We

borrow money from the Mother Land, and therefore it seems only right that the Mother Land should appoint its own representative to watch its interests in connection with the expenditure of that money.

Hon. T. Moore: I hope he is not sent along as a bailiff.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I presume he would be no more a bailiff than would be any person who was appointed by the State Government to see that the money it had advanced to a local institution was being wisely spent. If that money was not being spent to the best advantage, then perhaps the hon. member's idea might apply. I do think, however, it is only proper that, as Great Britain is directly concerned in the welfare of the people of Australia, it should have the right to send out its own representative. Have we not in London our own representative in the form of an Agent General? He is at the seat of Government to look after the interests of Western Australia and is in direct touch with the Home authorities. Other countries are represented by Consuls stationed in our community. I presume that the Consuls are appointed to look after the interests of the subjects of the nations they represent.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Is that what Amery is coming out for?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I understand he is coming out to look into a number of questions for himself. From time to time I presume that the British Government look to their representatives here to give them an unbiassed view of affairs which are constantly changing, affairs which directly concern the two countries.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: And they have the right of veto?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I presume so. I know that in days gone by it has been exercised and I imagine it would not be so readily exercised if we had a local appointee. We have only to recall what happened in Tasmania a little while ago when a local representative, who was the Acting Governor, went over the head of the Legislative Council and gave his assent to a measure that had been thrown out by the Council.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He showed good judgment.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Perhaps so in the view of some people. At the same time I presume that the members of the Tasmanian Upper House were entitled to their

judgment, and I would be inclined to think that that judgment, expressed by a majority, must have carried with it a good deal of public opinion. The judgment of the Acting Governor of Tasmania, it appears to me, was biassed, and that bias was due, more than not, to the fact that he at one time was associated with a Government that had been in power. I commend Mr. Duffell for bringing this matter forward, and I express surprise that the Premier should have signed the document without permitting Parliament to discuss the matter. Probably it was discussed in Cabinet, but it came as a thunder-clap to me after the utterances of the Premier, the outcome of the experience he gained in the course of his visit to the seat of Empire.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He had in mind the aspirations of the Australian people.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: An article appeared recently in the "Nacion," a newspaper published in the Argentine, and founded by some of South America's greatest patriots. The article dealt with the visit of the Prince of Wales and it touched a chord which should re-echo in our midst: "The Prince of Wales will be the Monarch of the greatest Empire the centuries have known." As he will be the head, so his representatives will be "the silken cord which binds the whole," or if one might refer to Rudyard Kipling's "Day's Work," "the little rivets which hold together the mighty structure of the ship." To-day there is nothing that binds us as well as the personal symbol of our allegiance to His Excellency the Governor. Here is a country gentleman with a fine home and splendid properties. And yet, at a period which was most critical and crucial to landed property owners and wealthy men, he left his country to become the Governor in this State. I would refer also to Sir Gerald Strickland.

The PRESIDENT: I do not know whether the hon. member is wise in referring to individual Governors by their names. This is a general question as to whether the Government were correct in agreeing to the appointment of State or Commonwealth citizens rather than retaining the existing system of appointment of British Governors.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I mentioned these names because they are in our minds. I wish to refer to Sir Gerald Strickland and Sir William Robinson. I do not know that it would do any harm to do so.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: It will not hurt Sir William Robinson.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have been in the State a good many years, and I can remember all these names.

The PRESIDENT: So long as the hon. member refers to them respectfully, there can be no objection.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I wanted to refer to the Governors we have had and to their callings, but can do so in another way. I will refer to one who enjoyed the distinction of sitting in two Parliaments, also on the Executive Council, and who at the same time was well versed in Parliamentary procedure and in diplomatic usage. I do not know that we could choose men of that calibre very easily if we were to choose our own representatives in Australia. It is very difficult to find non-political representatives here who would have the wide experience of these men.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Do you not think they have their political views?

Hon. G. Potter: The political view of Sir Francis Newdegate was that he consecrated so much of his estate to the honour of Australia, through the A.I.F.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: He did immense service, and is doing it to-day in the Old Country.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is where the greatest value lies.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: All our Governors have done that. It would be deplorable to change the present system. When these men return to the Mother Land they are great advocates for this country. They can speak from their wide experience and with non-political views. They are certainly not biassed. It would be very difficult to choose from those living in Australia whose whole life had not been wrapped up either in one political party or another. It would be impossible for them to throw off this garment, because they had been elected to the position of Governor.

Hon. T. Moore: Sir John Madden did it very effectually in Victoria.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The men I refer to have all played their part in Empire building. The salaries they receive would not in any way compensate them from the monetary point of view. They do the work because of the honour attached to it, and because they are about to gain a great experience of those countries which to go build up the Empire. They are thus able to be of

greater service at the heart of the Empire when they return to it. It is a particularly good thing for the nation that we have men who are willing to leave the Mother Land, and put in three or four years of service with that idea in view. When they return they are in a better position to help tighten the cords I have referred to, and the link we have with the Mother Land. If we appoint local representatives that tie will be considerably weakened. It would probably not be many years before the tie itself might be broken, and that would be deplorable. Where should we be without the protection afforded by the Mother Land and the British Navy? If we are protected in that way, as we have been in years past, the least we can expect is that Britain should appoint its own Governors to watch its interests, and be able to gauge the settlement in Australia much more readily than would be the case through a representative elected by ourselves. If we are going to have local appointments, where should we find gentlemen able adequately to fill the position without fear or favour, without inter-parochialism or party set or creed. The more one thinks the more one is persuaded of the hopelessness of trying to find such men. It is almost impossible to do so in our small community. Government House would quickly become the happy hunting ground of some particular clique or party. We can imagine some lady who has been left off the invitation list saying, "I am just as pleased; I knew the Governor's wife when she washed her stockings and nursed her own baby."

Hon. T. Moore: Do you think that is all Australians do? Are they not doing enough?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There would be other social distinctions.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Questions would be asked in Parliament as to why Mrs. So-and-so had not been invited.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Some important political sympathies might outweigh the better judgment of the occupant of the position. Is the post to be filled by nomination or by referendum? Who is to be appointed?

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: He is to be elected.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Just as the President of the United States is elected.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It might be done by election, or he might be appointed by the Premier.

Hon. T. Moore: How are Governors appointed now?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: By recommendation from the Home authorities.

Hon. T. Moore: On the recommendation of the Prime Minister of England. I hope that is all right.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. I am only raising a query as to how these appointments will be made. Would Parliament make them, or only a section of Parliament? Should we have any say in the matter?

Hon. J. R. Brown: Of course. We have a say in everything.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Would the matter be left to the Legislative Assembly, or would the appointment be made by whatever party was in power? It would not find favour with the community. There is another way in which it could be done.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That is to take selection ballots.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: We might have the Treasurer in charge of a depleted Treasury calling for tenders.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Or the contract system.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: And the highest tender could be accepted. If we adopt this new system, how is it to be worked?

The Colonial Secretary: The appointment would be made by His Majesty the King.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I can imagine the rush to deposit cheques.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you not think any Australian is fitted for the post?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There would be a rush for the job by our city fathers.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Do you not think there would be a few forfeited deposits?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Mrs. King's Park-road would be bidding a little higher than Mrs. Colin-street. A sweep could be run from Trades Hall on the final results.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Would you call that an even money chance?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Such a sweep would have a great deal of support, and a lot of money would be flying about.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You have not a very high opinion of Australian citizens.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: They are pretty shrewd. If they saw an opportunity like this occurring they would not lose it. They would take the opportunity of starting a fund going.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That shows their enterprise.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Elsewhere in the world very fine positions have been

bought. What will be the outcome if this proposed system is adopted. I pin my faith to the present system. I have great respect for the appointees who have held the post. A great error would be committed if we departed from the present system so long as we have Governors and separate Parliaments for each State. It is particularly unfortunate just now that so many of the States have signified their wish to change a system that has been in vogue for so many years. I very much regret the step, and that there should be a feeling abroad in favour of local appointees. This means that in a sense we should ignore the appointments from the Mother Land. Our Governors have been treated with the greatest respect and it seems to me essential we should continue along the present road, and have appointed by the Mother Land Governors who can furnish confidential and unbiassed reports as to what is happening in the States of Australia. I cordially support the action of Mr. Duffell in moving the amendment to the Address-in-reply. This Chamber sends its own address to His Excellency the Governor and members are entitled to give expression to their opinions. This proposal will fortify His Excellency in whom we recognise a man of wide experience, and whom we were pleased to welcome at the opening of Parliament. We are therefore justified in allaying any impression that may have been created in his mind by the action of the Premier in signing the memorial requesting that in future Australians rather than representatives from the Mother Land shall be appointed Governors of the State.

HON. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.32]: The memorial signed by the Premier and the amendment to the Address-in-reply moved by Mr. Duffell raise the very important question whether it is wise to make any change in the present system of selecting Governors for this State, or whether we should continue to have as in the past, gentlemen selected by the British Government, gentlemen who have filled prominent positions, many of them in the House of Commons, while others have held important positions in the Army, the Navy, the Diplomatic Service or in Commerce. They raise the question whether we should turn to a new system and have Governors selected from the citizens of Australia. There is a good deal to

be said in favour of the last mentioned course. I think that the advantages to be gained from having Governors selected from the Homeland outweigh the advantages we might have from having local appointees. I have no doubt whatever that once it is decided that the Governor shall be selected from the citizens of Australia he will naturally be a citizen of the particular State over which he is to be appointed the Governor. Such a course would be with good reason, too. To my mind, just as the King is the symbol of the unity of the British Empire, so is the Governor, selected as in the past, the sign of the Imperial connection, the tie that binds us to the Mother Land. Burke many years ago finely expressed the sentiment on a very memorable occasion in the House of Commons, when he said: "A tie, light as air but strong as a link of iron." That is the aspect of the question that will appeal to most of us who are emphatic in our declarations that it is better to continue the system that has prevailed in the past rather than turn to a new system. It has to be remembered that the great majority of the people of Australia have very little idea of the tie that binds us to the Mother Land other than is shown by the presence of His Excellency the Governor amongst us. If that tie is once lost I am afraid that the sentiment that binds us to the Mother Country will weaken in time.

Hon. J. Ewing: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Some of us have been fortunate in having been able to go to the Mother Country and spend a good number of years there. We have been able to realise the greatness of the British Empire and have become familiar with and learnt to estimate the value of the British people. There are others not so fortunate who have been on a visit, more or less extended, to the Mother Land and have been able to survey something of the country and its people. The great majority of our citizens, however, have never had that opportunity, and so it comes about that to them the only visible symbol of the tie with the Mother Land is the presence of His Excellency the Governor. It may be said that we shall retain the Governor-General still and that he will be the great connecting link between Australia and Great Britain. That is undoubtedly true, but we in Western Australia are

so remote from the seat of Government of Australia, that, unfortunately, His Excellency the Governor-General is only on infrequent occasions amongst us in this State, much as we would appreciate seeing more of him. It cannot be denied that former Governors who have come to Western Australia have indeed done us good service. During the last 20 years, owing to my profession, I have been fortunate in having a very intimate knowledge of a good number of the gentlemen who have been here and occupied the position of Governor. The thing that has struck me most about them has been the spirit of service that has animated each of the Governors. I recognised their desire to do the best for the Empire and also for Western Australia. They have essayed to do everything that would promote the happiness and prosperity of the people in Western Australia. Undoubtedly they have been considerably helped by their wives who have laboured indefatigably in the cause of charity and of the social advancement of the people. Reference has already been made to the assistance derived from Governors on their return to the Home Land. In England they have undoubtedly done Western Australia good service. I would quote Sir Arthur Lawley, who has maintained a very intense interest in Western Australia since his return to the Mother Land, although he was here for a very short period prior to returning Home to take up a responsible position at the conclusion of the South African war. Sir Arthur, in his great interest in Western Australian affairs, has done a good deal for the State and he is at present chairman of the Child Migration Scheme which is endeavouring to help the financing of the Fairbridge Farm School at Pinjarra. Then there is Sir Gerald Strickland, who is a member of the House of Commons. That gentleman never wearies in his desire to further the interests of this State. Then we have Sir Francis Newdegate, who, as hon. members are probably aware, recently wrote a very appreciative article in an important magazine in England whereby he has done a great service for Western Australia. Thus not only does the existing system do good in our midst, but it increases our reputation abroad. There is one aspect of the system of having governors appointed from the Old Country that should not be lost sight of. Such men, most of who have held important positions elsewhere, must undoubtedly, on occasions,

be in a position to give important advice, especially regarding events outside Australia, to the Government of this State. Although I do not appreciate the view that Mr. Hamersley has adopted regarding the functions of a Governor in connection with finance, I do think that His Excellency does represent what I might term a *liaison* officer between the Government of Western Australia and the Imperial authorities. He is able to judge the views of the Government here and place them before the Imperial Government, and he is able to present the views of the Home Government to State Ministers. From his detached position he is eminently suited to perform this great service to Western Australia. I have already alluded to the great assistance to charitable causes. There is never an appeal made to a Governor and his wife that does not receive their sympathy and their practical support. Governors from the Home Land have another advantage in that they have no local ties and are bound to no clique. With them there is no fear of family favouritism. They are not here to promote the interests of any family. I wish to entirely dissociate myself from the remarks regarding the unsuitability of the citizens of Australia for the position of Governor.

Hon. T. Moore: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Particularly does that apply to any reference to the position being regarded as one for worn-out politicians. I disagree entirely with the tendency that is indulged in in other parts of Australia as well as here, of throwing mud at those who serve their country politically. It does no good, because it lowers the prestige of members of Parliament and that reacts to the disadvantage of the State. I am quite sure that should this change be made, there will undoubtedly be quite a number of individuals in Australia generally, and in Western Australia who will be fitted to fill the position of Governor. Whether they will be chosen however, is another question.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Many will be called.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: We have many in our midst of quite as high an intellect, but perhaps not so cultured and not possessing the manners that characterise many of those from the Home Land, who would be capable of filling the State Governorship worthily. I would have preferred this question to be dealt with rather as a substantive motion than as an amendment to the Address-in-

reply. Holding the views that I do, however, in favour of retaining the present system of selecting our Governors I have pleasure in supporting the amendment moved by Mr. Duffell.

HON. J. W. KIRWAN (South) [5.43]. I do not intend to support the amendment. I congratulate the Leader of the House on the way he dealt with the proposal. The way in which he dealt with it was a considerable improvement on the references that were published in the Press as being made by the Premier relative to this matter. The Premier is reported in the "Daily News" as having referred to the question in an extremely flippant way. To me the question of the appointment of a representative of the King in this State is a matter that should not be dealt with flippantly, because I regard it as a serious question, and one of considerable importance to the people of this State. At the same time I do not think the Colonial Secretary correctly interpreted the motive actuating Mr. Duffell. I am satisfied that Mr. Duffell did not for a moment hold that there were not amongst the 5½ million people in Australia many men competent to fill the position of Governor, or, for that matter, any other position of responsibility. Furthermore, there is another aspect of the matter that I may refer to, because Mr. Duffell will not have a chance to reply. It is said that it would be better if a proposal of this kind had been put forward as a substantive motion. I take it the reason why the hon. member brought it forward as an amendment to the Address-in-reply was that, holding the views he does, and as the matter is one vitally concerning the Imperial relationship, he thought that, in the form in which he brought it forward it would reach the Governor and so reach directly the Imperial authorities, who would thus learn the opinion of the majority of the House.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is absolutely correct.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: However, I hope the hon. member will not persist with the amendment. If he does, I certainly will not vote for it, because, after the documents that have been read by the Colonial Secretary, the amendment is not a correct statement of the position. The Minister made it perfectly clear that the amendment states the Government did

something which, according to the documents read, the Government did not do. Therefore, even if I were in favour of the principle enunciated in the amendment, I would still consider that Mr. Duffell ought not to ask the House to vote upon it, at any rate not in that form; for if the amendment were carried it would place the House in a wrong position, inasmuch as the House would be saying that the Government had done something which, according to the Colonial Secretary, the Government have not done. Although it was perfectly competent in the Premier, on behalf of the Government, to sign the memorial, he would have been acting more courteously to Parliament had he consulted both Houses of Parliament as to whether or not the memorial should be signed. In a matter of such great importance, it is only right that the opinion of Parliament should be ascertained. As it is, the signing of the memorial expresses the opinion of Cabinet; but since it is so grave a matter, it would have been well if the views of both Houses of Parliament had first been obtained.

Hon. J. R. Brown: How long would it have taken to get that opinion?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Not very long. A motion might have been brought forward and been put through in a very short time, certainly not more than two days. If the Premier had expressed a desire that the matter should be dealt with immediately, it would not have taken more than a day in each House. The amendment introduces a very much larger question than the question directly involved in the appointment of State Governors. A feeling exists in various parts of the overseas dominions that the system of appointments to Imperial positions is not altogether satisfactory. The overseas portions of the Empire are growing up to the status of nations and, in order that the Empire should be consolidated, the overseas dominions should be made to feel they have an equal share in the responsibility of holding the Empire together. At present all the administrative positions overseas go to residents of the British Isles. I thoroughly endorse every word Dr. Saw has said regarding the estimable nature of those gentlemen who have been Governors of Australian States or Governor Generals of Australia. They have been men of outstanding qualifications for the positions. When one remembers the large numbers of

men appointed Governors of Australian States over considerably more than a century, it is amazing how few errors of judgment have been made by those gentlemen. One can look through the pages of Australian history and rarely point to mistakes made by Governors, mistakes few and very far between. It is astonishing the number of men who have been sent from the British Isles and who have done such excellent work, both when in Australia and also on their return to the British Isles. I have been in Canada on two occasions. There the provincial Governors are local men. I met most of them and I was very much impressed by their calibre. I heard nothing whatever of any objection raised to them. I did not hear that they were biased by party influences of any kind. Some of them had been in public life, some were business men, and all of them had occupied various positions in the life of the respective provinces of which they were Governors.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They are elected by the people, are they not?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: No, they are appointed by His Majesty on the advice of the Dominion Government.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Well, in America they are elected.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Yes, the Governors of American States are in an entirely different position from that of Governors of Canadian Provinces. When one goes through the list of prominent Australian statesmen and also considers the numbers of distinguished Australian judges and military men, one can find quite a number eminently qualified for the position of State Governor. One point regarding the signing of the memorial that struck me was this: The idea originally put forward by Mr. Price was that the individual to be appointed Governor of a State should be a citizen of that State. The memorial, as lately signed, contemplates that he should be a citizen of the Commonwealth. Personally I should be well satisfied if it were made plain to the Imperial authorities that, instead of our State Governors being drawn from amongst citizens of the British Isles, the selection should be widened to include citizens of the overseas dominions. In that way the overseas dominions would be given the feeling that they were assisting in the government of the British Empire and that for all

practical purposes they were even regarded as an extension of the British Isles. Without effort one can think of half-a-dozen men who have occupied prominent positions outside the British Isles and who would be quite competent to fill the highest positions in the British Empire. There is, for instance, the name of that very great Canadian, Sir Wilfred Laurier, a man who was respected throughout the length and breadth of Canada and also of the British Isles. Then there were also Lord Strathcona and Lord Mountstephen. Turning to South Africa, we find one of the greatest of Imperialists, Mr. Cecil Rhodes; and if we come to Australia we could mention some of those whose names were referred to by the Colonial Secretary. All of those great men should be just as well entitled to fill the positions of Governors throughout the Empire as the gentlemen, however estimable they may be, who have their homes in the British Isles.

Hon. A. Burvill: You would choose the State Governors from all over the Empire?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: That would be a much better system than to confine appointments to those resident in the British Isles. There is no reason why such appointments should not be made Imperial appointments rather than be confined to residents of the British Isles. If the amendment goes to a division, I shall be compelled to vote against it, although the memorial is not quite on the lines I would favour, but I trust that Mr. Duffell, having perhaps achieved his purpose, will not ask us to vote on this proposal, at any rate in its present form, for to carry it would be to put the House in a false position.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.59]: Mr. Kirwan has shown in a marked way the extent of the error made by the Government in not having referred the question of signing the memorial to both Houses of Parliament. The point raised by Mr. Kirwan as to the desirability of giving opportunity to a citizen not only of the British Isles or of the Commonwealth, but of the Empire seems to me to be a very important one indeed. The illustrious men to whom he has referred are such as we as a people might be proud to honour as Governors of the State. Like Dr. Saw I do not wish for one moment to associate myself with the idea that there are no persons within the State worthy and highly

fitted in every way to discharge the duties of Governor of the State. I quite believe there are many men in our State and in the Commonwealth well fitted to discharge the duties that fall to the lot of a State Governor. But the question is, are the Government, by subscribing to a memorial such as they have signed, departing from something that we might regard as highly constitutional? It is quite true, as Mr. Kirwan has said, that the signing of the memorial involves the consideration of the relationship between the Empire and the State, but it also involves a grave constitutional change. Ever since the inception of the State we have followed a certain method of appointing Governors. They are chosen by the Home authorities, no doubt after communication with the Government of the State. Certain suggestions are made, names are mentioned, and a Governor is appointed. If we are to make a constitutional change such as the memorial contemplates, the very least that could have been done by the Government was to refer the matter to both Houses of Parliament. If both Houses had been given an opportunity to discuss the matter—and it could have been done expeditiously—the Government would have had the expressed opinion of the people's representatives on this very important question. It would have been desirable in every way to obtain that expression of opinion. The memorial, however, was signed without reference to anyone. Mr. Dodd, in speaking on the Address-in-reply last week, showed very clearly the great responsibility devolving upon us and upon the Government in making constitutional changes. The office of Governor is one that should be held by a person free from local prejudices and possible political bias. It is an advantage to us to maintain this connecting link with the old land. By continuing the appointment of Governors in accordance with the existing practice, we secure for ourselves the services of a representative who maintains with the old land the connecting link which has been so fittingly referred to by other members. Only the other day we were reminded of the necessity for maintaining that connecting link as strong as possible by Sir George Buchanan, who pointed out the need for strengthening the relationship between the overseas dominions and the Old Country. He showed how far and how greatly we are dependent on the mother country, and it is

essential that we should seek to strengthen instead of weaken the ties that bind us to the old land. If, however, we adopt the proposal in the memorial, we shall weaken those ties. Such a step is to be deplored; it would be to our disadvantage in every way. Another point is that a representative appointed from the mother country is free from even the taint or suspicion of local prejudice and that is a very important consideration. It has been one of the outstanding features of past appointees that they have always held the scales of justice evenly between all parties. Knowing from experience that we have had the benefit of Governors who have shown absolute disinterestedness as regards party politics, and who have sought at all times to advance the interests of the State and strengthen the connecting link binding us to the old land, would it not be detrimental to alter that system? Undoubtedly it would be to our detriment to make any alteration to the present system. I take it that if the memorial were adopted, the appointment would be made on the recommendation of the Government for the time being.

The Colonial Secretary: It might be at the instance of the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, or the Commonwealth Government. Mr. Kirwan has pointed out the practice in Canada, but I do not favour it as compared with our present system. We have seen how well our system has worked and how it has operated to our advantage in many ways. We have had Governors who, after leaving our shores, have become ambassadors of Western Australia and have conveyed to the people of the Old Country seeking new homes in the dominions the story of the richness of this State and the possibilities of achieving success here. If we lose those ambassadors, we shall be losing something of great value indeed. If Governors were appointed on the nomination of the State Government or the Federal Government, I care not which, there would always be the risk that some nominee who was a supporter of the Government in power, Liberal, Labour or Country Party, would receive the nomination. That would not be wise, because it would import into an office which should be free from all political prejudices, the risk of political rancour and bitterness. There is only one way to avoid that, and I hope the Government will review and qualify what has been done by the signing of the memorial. Assuming that

in place of the appointment being made on the recommendation of the State or Federal Government, it were made by election, as obtains in the United States, we should consider the terrible upheaval it causes there. Look at the unfortunate party splits that take place.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: We get them occasionally even without the election of a Governor.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, but let us compare our present peaceful method with the rowdy method that prevails in America.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is not in order. This is a question not of election but of nomination.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: True, it is a question of nomination—

The PRESIDENT: It is a question of appointment by the British Government.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, but it is quite possible that in the course of time we may adopt the method of election, because the stage between nomination and election is very short indeed.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think you would be in order in discussing that.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I merely wished to point out the fact without discussing it. Having regard to the views I have advanced, I feel that Mr. Duffell was justified in bringing the matter before the House. Following the explanation made by the Colonial Secretary, it might have been better had the amendment been worded differently.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Then you can move to amend it.

The Honorary Minister: Do not give it that much importance.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Still, we have been afforded an opportunity to express our views on this question and bring before the Government the opinions held by members of this House. Therefore I shall support the amendment.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. W. H. KITSON (West) [7.32]: I oppose the amendment. From the remarks of some hon. members one might infer that the Premier's decision to sign the memorial was in the nature of a protest against the gentlemen who have occupied the position of Governor of this State during so long a term of years. I feel sure, however, that

the Premier's action was not intended to cast any such reflection.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Who suggested that?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I need only point to a few remarks passed as to the good qualities displayed by occupants of the position. One might be led to think that it is only gentlemen coming from the Old Country who possess such qualities. I agree that we have in this Commonwealth numerous men who have proved by their public services, extending over a number of years, that they are quite fit to occupy the position of Governor. I agree also that past Governors of this State have done all that could be expected of them in the interests of the State. I had the pleasure of meeting several of them, and they were most estimable gentlemen. At the same time I will say that in various parts of the Commonwealth I have met gentlemen who would fill the position of Governor with just as much honour to themselves and to the State. From expressions which have been used in the course of this debate, it might be thought that such gentlemen did not exist in Australia. In a progressive country such as ours citizens should be able to aspire to the very highest position. There ought to be no bar to any position in a democratic country. By long custom there has grown up an idea that the principle of appointing the representatives of the King from outside Australia should not on any account be violated. However, that principle does not square with the aspirations of Australians, particularly in view of the position occupied by Australia to-day in the Empire and in the world. Instead of such appointments as the memorial suggests weakening the bonds between the Old Country and Australia, they would tend to strengthen those bonds. We would be only too pleased to bestow on many members whom we know the honour of occupying the position of Governor. I do not for a moment wish to suggest that anyone appointed by the King, whether he came from the Old Country or from some other part of the Empire, would not do his best on behalf of the State; but I claim that we should give citizens of our own Commonwealth the right to attain to the position. What, after all, are the Imperial authorities asked to do? There seems to be a misconception on the point. During the tea adjournment I saw the memorial, and I wish to quote a few lines in order that

the House may have a proper understanding of its contents—

Our petition is to the effect that on the expiration of the term of office of each of the distinguished gentlemen who now occupy the position of Governor in the respective Australian States, he may be succeeded by an Australian citizen appointed under Letters Patent by His Majesty the King.

What is the difference between the present procedure and that suggested by the memorial? None whatever, except that we ask that Australian citizens shall have the right to occupy the position instead of its being reserved for citizens of Great Britain. I take it that the Government would be asked to recommend an appointment, and if the King were pleased to approve of the recommendation, the appointment would be made. A somewhat similar procedure, I understand, exists at present, in that what may be termed negotiations take place between the two authorities, and if no objection is raised the appointment is made. The memorial proceeds:—

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that our attitude in this matter is entirely consistent with the feeling of the greatest loyalty to His Majesty's Throne and Person, and a desire to promote to the utmost extent within our power the bonds of Empire unity. It is our firm and sincere belief that if His Majesty is graciously pleased to recognise in this distinctive and befitting manner the long, meritorious, and faithful service, in the public interest of some citizen of the Commonwealth, it would strengthen the bonds of affection and kinship which unite us indissolubly to the Mother Country.

Nobody can take exception to the terms of the memorial. The mover of the amendment should have withheld it until he knew the actual facts of the case.

Hon. F. F. S. Willmott: In that case we might never have seen the memorial.

Hon. T. Moore: You could have asked for it to be laid on the Table of the House.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Why was it not made public more freely?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not know that there has been any objection to its being made public. Certain questions were asked of the Premier by a Press representative, and he answered them. The paragraph which appeared in the Press is not, I understand, in accordance with the memorial.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Then it should have been corrected by the Government.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I do not know that the Premier would think it necessary to issue a correction. He replied to the questions which were asked him, and there, as far as he was concerned, the matter ended. An hon. member has suggested that what the memorial proposes would mean a great change in our Constitutional procedure. That is recognised by the memorial in the following words:—

To this prayer for an alteration in Constitutional practice to accord with the views of the Australian people, we add an expression of our lasting gratitude to His Majesty's Governments of the past and present for the exceedingly high standards they have invariably maintained in the unquestionable character, ability, and dignity of the gentlemen who have been appointed to administer the affairs of the Australian States, including those to whom we have the honour to act as advisers at the present time.

I think that paragraph shows that our Premier, and also the other signatories to the memorial, recognise the integrity of the gentlemen who have occupied and are occupying these positions. In carrying the amendment, the House would show that it hardly knew what it was doing. The Leader of the House put the matter well when he said that by carrying the amendment the House would be disagreeing with something which was not a fact, or, in other words, would be disagreeing with the Government for doing something which the Government had not done. I should say that the carrying of the amendment would lower the prestige and dignity of the House. If the amendment is carried, I do not know what people will think, but I know what they will be entitled to think. It would indicate that members of the Legislative Council are out of touch with the sentiment of the people of this continent. The Colonial Secretary gave a list of men who are honoured in this country, men who gave many years or a lifetime of service to this country, and whose appointment as Governors would have been perfectly justifiable. The sentiments of those men, were in accordance with those expressed in the memorial. The question has been under consideration for 27 years, and from time to time has been discussed by many public bodies. The suggestion of the memorial seems to be in accord with the great bulk of public sentiment in Australia to-day. It must be borne in mind, too, that the proposal refers only to State Govern-

ments, and does not touch the question of the Governor General of the Commonwealth. As has been pointed out by an hon. member, if it is necessary that we still retain a link between the Commonwealth and Great Britain by means of a Governorship, it can be achieved through the Governor General of the Commonwealth being nominated from the citizens of the Old Country. That would bring us into line with Canada. I was pleased to hear Mr. Kirwan refer to that great Dominion. Canada, like Australia, has produced some wonderfully fine public men. My reading has led me to the conclusion that it is the fact that Canada appoints her own provincial Governors in the same way as this memorial proposes we should appoint our State Governors, that has given such satisfaction to the Canadian people and led them to take so great an interest in the affairs of their country. If it is a fair thing for Canada, I cannot see any logical objection to applying it to Australia. I remind members that it is not so long since a motion was tabled in the Victorian Parliament not in favour of Governors of that State being citizens of Victoria but in favour of the abolition of the office of Governor. Even with a Conservative Government in power the latter motion was defeated by only two votes. By some of the prominent journals of the Commonwealth it has been unhesitatingly declared that in the opinion of the people of Australia there was no necessity for six Governors, and that if it was necessary to have State Governors at all, it would lead to a reduction in expenditure if local citizens were given the opportunity to fill the posts. It has been stated that if one desires to kill an existing practice, the quickest way to do so is by ridiculing it. I consider that at least one member to-day was endeavouring to do this by ridiculing the suggestion contained in the memorial. If we are to have Governors, there is no need to cast ridicule on a suggestion that may be put forward by representative men. If we are not to have Governors it is a different matter entirely. It is to be regretted that an inference should be drawn that there are no Australians worthy of occupying the post of Governor. That is wrong, and I go further and say that if it is fair to cast reflections on those people who may be considered eligible to occupy the high office of Governor, the same reflections might be cast

on quite a number of estimable gentlemen who have been nominated from the Old Country. Many of them have occupied political positions in Great Britain, and some have held influential posts in other directions. Is it to be thought that they are not likely to be biassed on a particular question affecting the whole of the people, just as those gentlemen whom we at this end might appoint? The argument is untenable. Surely after so many years of responsible government, any government that may be in power would see that a citizen appointed to the office of Governor was one for whom everybody in the State had the highest regard and would look to as being thoroughly capable of discharging the important duties with the important office. I trust the amendment will not be carried. I trust that the memorial will receive the whole-hearted support of the Chamber. I am sorry to think that there are one or two members who do not desire a change. In a country like this it is time we gave our citizens the opportunity to qualify for an important position, whether it be the Governorship or anything else.

HON. F. E. S. WILLMOTT (South-West [7.50]): Possibly this debate might not have occurred if the Press had been accurate in its statements.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: The hon. member who has just resumed his seat quoted the Press and told us what kind of notice we should take of it, and the views expressed. If views expressed by a newspaper are not accurate in connection with events such as this, then the views of the newspaper are not at any time worth much. I can quite understand Mr. Duffell regarding it as his duty to move as he did after having read what appeared in the daily Press. That shows what a good thing it would be for Western Australia if we had two morning newspapers instead of one. Both papers could then put their different views before the people and we could come to an unbiased conclusion. Unfortunately we are in the position that the members of the Legislative Council have had the privilege of hearing the vital portion of the memorial read to us. But whilst 30 of us have had that privilege, the remainder of the population have to be satisfied with what has appeared in the "West Australian." Thirty

of the best men in Western Australia—I will be modest—

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: You mean 29.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: No, I am including the hon. member—have had the privilege of hearing the memorial read and knowing the truth, whilst the remainder of the population know only through the "West Australian" what is inaccurate. There is one point I do not agree with and that is the question of expense. It has been said that we would do away with an enormous outlay if we did not have imported governors. If any member in this Chamber is fortunate enough to be offered the high and honourable position of Governor of Western Australia, and imagines that he can carry out the duties of the office and extend the hospitality associated with the Governorship of the State on the pittance set aside for the purpose, he is making a great mistake. He would file his schedule in the first 12 months. So far as expense is concerned, no man can possibly maintain Government House as it should be maintained, and entertain even in the most parsimonious manner, on the allowance voted annually.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Are there any three per cents attached to it?

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: I do not think there are. When Mr. Kirwan spoke, he spoke as a statesman of the British Empire, not as a politician. We are proud of the views he expressed. He opened a train of thought which I hope in the near future will cause something to be done on the lines indicated by him. I agree with him that it would be in the best interests of the Empire if there were an interchange of leading public men. There is no matter in connection with the appointment by His Majesty the King of Australian citizens that has come up in my mind, and it is as to whether there is any danger, under such a proposal, of the State losing its sovereignty. To-day we are a sovereign State. Would we remain one in the circumstances as set out in the memorial? I am one of those who want to see the sovereignty of the State maintained; I do not wish the State to be reduced to the level of a Canadian province. Hon. members have spoken about the difference between Australia and Canada as if it were trifling, and as if we were on a similar footing. The position is totally different; there are no sovereign States in Canada. There are certain provinces and there is a personage who corresponds to our Governor-Gen-

eral. Therefore, the simile that was drawn by one hon. member was not apt. I cannot vote for the amendment as it appears on the Notice Paper, but if someone will move an amendment to it and couches it in such terms as will make it agree with the words of the memorial, then I may be prepared to support it. I am sorry there has been such a long discussion, but it has been due entirely to a published inaccuracy. Really that is what the whole discussion has hung upon. I am sorry some Minister of the Crown did not think it of sufficient importance when he read it in the Press or when his clerk cut it out of the newspaper and put it before him—

Hon. T. Moore: Ministers are used to misrepresentation; they get it every day.

Hon. F. E. S. WILLMOTT: They may be used to it, but there is no need to misrepresent the Government in their actions. I have no doubt they do many things that are wrong; it would be a strange Government if they did not. Anyhow, I cannot vote for the amendment. I came from the Old Country, and have become a West Australian by adoption, having lived here nearly 40 years, I am proud of Western Australia. It has enabled me to make a living, and I look forward to the time when we shall have Australian citizens as Governors. I am not going into the question as to whether or not we have citizens in our midst capable of filling the position. We have men just as honourable and capable as any. That is not the point. It is a question of Western Australia being a sovereign State, and I hope nothing will be done to jeopardise that sovereignty by the appointment of Australian citizens as Governors in Western Australia.

HON. J. EWING (South-West) [8.0]: Mr. Willmott has thrown out an important suggestion. I realise that the Government are in the majority and have a perfect right to do what they like. They are a duly constituted Government placed in office by the people. They have done what they think is right. I am sorry that the newspaper report does not coincide with what was read out by the Leader of the House. He gave us a clear, honest and straightforward statement and I wish I could support him. For many years past different States have applied to the Imperial authorities to have Governors appointed from within their own State. This has been refused on the ground

that until all the States of the Commonwealth are unanimous, this cannot be done. We are very close to that now. Six of the States of the Commonwealth, with the exception of Victoria, have all signed the memorial, and this is to be sent on to the Imperial authorities as a suggestion of the wishes of the various State Governments. I understand that it was only by a majority of three in the Victorian Parliament that the question of the abolition of State Governors was defeated.

Hon. J. R. Brown: By two.

Hon. J. EWING: That seems to Mr. Kitson to be an argument for signing the memorial. The present Premier of Victoria has not seen fit to sign it; therefore it will not attain the end the promoters have in view. It will not be a unanimous requisition to the Imperial Government to appoint Australian Governors. That is an important point. Perhaps to-morrow or the next day pressure may be brought to bear upon the Premier of Victoria and he may sign the memorial, and then all the States will have done so. I should like Mr. Duffell to withdraw his amendment. I do not think it should have been moved as an amendment to the Address-in-reply, and I agree with the Leader of the House that it should have been moved as a substantive motion. We cannot expect the agreement of another place to the amendment. We could on a separate occasion express our views in regard to the appointment of Australian Governors. That would be just as effective as speaking about it on the Address-in-reply. Many members have suggested that Mr. Duffell should withdraw the amendment, but he has not seen fit to fall in with their views. He will force me, therefore, into the position of voting for it, when I do not want to do so in its present form. The Leader of the House will, I am sure, give members the opportunity to discuss this matter later.

The Colonial Secretary: Yes.

Hon. J. EWING: Mr. Duffell ought to fall into line with the suggestion of the Leader of the House. The fact that such an amendment would be sent on to another place is of no importance. We are constituted as representatives of a certain number of the people, and we may or may not be in accord with the wishes of the Government. Let us report by substantive motion our wishes in this direction, and

let that be sent to the Governor and be communicated to the Home authorities. Mr. Kitson suggested that there should be only a Governor General and not a Governor, not only on the score of expense but on the score of the attitude that is taken on the question by the Labour Party. Mr. Willmott has pointed to another danger, with regard to the sovereignty of the State. That is a very apparent one. We must preserve our sovereignty at all costs.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I do not see how this could affect the sovereignty of the State.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Of course it will.

Hon. J. EWING: It appeals to me as a danger, and I want to steer clear of all dangers. My reason for opposing the memorial as signed by the Premier is one of a lifetime. I have always adhered to the closest possible unity between the Old Country and the State. I could just as easily cut off my right hand as do anything to weaken that unity. If the memorial is despatched, especially if it is signed by all the States, it will do something to injure the tie at present existing.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: In what way?

Hon. J. EWING: I want to keep as closely in touch as possible with the Old Country and its ideals. At present a great proportion of the Commonwealth is seething with trouble and discontent.

Hon. J. R. Brown: What has that to do with the matter?

Hon. J. EWING: We do not want at any price to weaken the silken thread that ties us to the Old Country.

Hon. J. R. Brown: The Governor might be in China. It would not make any difference.

Hon. J. EWING: I am sure that there are many Australians good enough to hold the position of Governor, but if we depart from the present system we shall be doing something to weaken the bond between us and the Old Country. So long as I am a member of this House and a citizen of the British Empire, I shall do all I can to assist in binding closer the threads of kinship that now exist. It is suggested by Mr. Kirwan that an amendment on the amendment should be moved. Following upon that suggestion I move the following amendment on the amendment:—

That all the words after "That," in line six, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu:—"On the expiration of the term of office of each of the distinguished gentlemen

who now occupy the position of Governors in the respective Australian States he may be succeeded by an Australian citizen appointed under Letters Patent by His Majesty the King."

Hon. J. Nicholson: I second the amendment.

HON. J. DUFFELL (Metropolitan-Suburban—on amendment) [8.10]: When I moved the amendment on Thursday last I distinctly stated I had not seen the memorial. I only had the words of the Premier as reported in the "West Australian" on Wednesday. It must be borne in mind that several days have passed since that appeared and, although the Premier was waited on by a representative of one of the newspapers, he has not contradicted the statement upon which my amendment was drawn. I have now seen a copy of the memorial. I find in it a paragraph which may be taken as an index to the whole of the verbiage of the document. It is as follows:—

The extension of the scope of the Public Service to include the representation of His Majesty the King in the office of Governor of the State will be regarded by our citizens with gratification and pride, and could not fail to add to their devotion in the service of His Majesty.

Members will agree that what I hinted at on Thursday night was that something was underlying the efforts that were being made by certain Governments in Australia. This paragraph clearly shows that there is a something. If the memorial is issued in its present form it shows there is not that complete unity between His Majesty's subjects in this portion of his dominions, and that which prevails in the British Isles. That is a very important feature. My amendment would have been very fitting if this memorial had not come before us to-night. I still have my doubts, and they are stronger than they were before, that it opens the door for grave irregularities if we appoint, or suggest the appointment, of citizens of the Commonwealth to this important office. A member pointed vividly to the link with the Empire which we require to keep so strong as to bind us ever closely together. Anything that is done to weaken the strength of this link would be a retrograde step. Mr. Kirwan correctly stated my views when he said that it was not that I had any doubts as to there being citizens of the Commonwealth quite capable of filling the position. We have citizens in Australia who are capable of

holding any position in any portion of the British Dominions. I am quite prepared to admit that, but I emphasise the fact that experience has taught us to be cautious. When we view the outlook and trend of affairs through present-day spectacles, we should be more than ordinarily cautious regarding the steps we are asked to take in ratifying the action of the Premier in signing the memorial. In the circumstances, I regret I was not in my seat immediately after the tea adjournment. I had to introduce a deputation to the Premier and it was rather good of him to receive me in view of what the Leader of the House would infer was a diabolical action on my part. I accept the statement made by the Leader of the House as being uttered in the course of a fair debate, uttered with a view to putting his case as strongly as he could from the Government point of view. He inferred that an attempt was being made to establish an extraordinary precedent by moving an amendment to the Address-in-reply. When I stated that Mr. Panton had moved an amendment to the Address-in-reply in this Chamber on the 10th August, 1920, the Honorary Minister (Hon. J. W. Hickey) contradicted me. I have the reference in "Hansard," and what is reported there must be taken as a correct statement of what occurred. Another occasion was on the 10th July, 1912, when Mr. Moss, then a member of this Chamber, moved an amendment to the Address-in-reply, and it was agreed to. Thus there is nothing extraordinary in moving an amendment such as I propose. If anything transpires that, according to any hon. member's views, is contrary to the best interests of the Empire, it is his duty to take the most drastic step he deems necessary in the circumstances. The question was raised as to why I did not give notice of motion and deal with this matter when the Address-in-reply was concluded. I adopted my present course for the simple reason that occasions have arisen when, such a motion having been moved, the adjournment of the debate has been secured—I am not referring to actions by the present Leader of the House—and the motion has been placed at the bottom of the notice paper. I contend the proper way was to deal with this question without delay. If dealt with by way of notice of motion, consideration of it might have been delayed and then the memorial might have reached the Home authorities who, in the absence of any indication to the contrary,

might have concluded that the people of Western Australia were satisfied with that memorial. I believe that many thousands of people are behind me in my amendment. Rather than lose the amendment, however, and rather than let the Home Office consider that we had expressed ourselves in accord with the Premier's action, I, with the consent of my seconder, will accept Mr. Ewing's amendment to my amendment.

Amendment on amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	6
				—
Majority for	9
				—

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. J. W. Hickey
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. W. H. Kitson
	(Teller.)

AYES.

Hon. A. Burrill	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. J. Velland
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	(Teller.)

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [8.27]: The amendment in its present form practically embodies the wording of the memorial. Personally I take the view that that expressed in the memorial is not in accordance with the spirit which should exist in Western Australia as part of the Empire to which we owe allegiance. It appears to me that the Premier, in his desire to fall into line with the attitude adopted in other States, signed the memorial but possibly, had he given it more careful consideration, he would have agreed with the view suggested by Mr. Kirwan. We have this opportunity to lodge a protest for, had it not been for the amendment moved by Mr. Duffell, we would have been kept in ignorance as to the text of the memorial. It deals with the question of Imperial relationship in which so much is involved that it would have been better had Parliament been allowed to express an opinion on the principle before the memorial was signed. One cannot help regretting that a certain feeling has been introduced into the debate, a feeling possibly engendered by

the idea that it was an attempt on the part of Mr. Duffell to discriminate against Australian citizens. We can all endorse the view that nothing was further from the mind of the hon. member. Each one of us recognises that Australian citizens have no reason to fear, for they are in no sense inferior in capacity or citizenship to those of any other part of the British Empire. We all feel, and I think we are expressing the views of the Imperial Government when we say, they stand as co-equal in brotherhood of the great British Empire, which is founded on free citizenship and self-government. For that reason one would regret the importation of such a spirit as by certain speakers has been imputed to Mr. Duffell. When we approach the question from the standpoint of Imperial relationship, we have to recognise the fundamental principle upon which that relationship has been extended to the self-governing dominions, namely, the principle of affording to them more and more self-government and responsibility. The attitude has been rather that of a father who has seen his sons growing in capacity and has been only too proud to hand over to them the responsibility of carrying on the government of their own States. That principle has actuated the policy of the Imperial Government for many decades past, and I am convinced that when this matter is brought before the Imperial authorities they will not have the slightest hesitation in acceding to the request that Australian citizens should be appointed to the position of Governors of States of which they are the free-born sons. But the question we have to consider is whether it is desirable from standpoints other than that of recognising the full equality of our Australian citizens. The object of appointing a Governor is that he shall represent the King with all the impartiality and dignity of the head of a great nation. He is supposed to embody the ideals of the State and to stand as the representative of a people who have reason to be proud of themselves and the ideals on which they have built up their world-wide commonwealth of nations. Coming to the question of the appointment of a local governor, certain factors may possibly creep in that would interfere with the dignity and respect with which such a Governor should be regarded. The first point we have to recognise is that he should be a man in complete touch with all the Imperial questions that the British Parliament has to deal with.

He is supposed to be able to acquaint the members of his Cabinet with the Imperial viewpoint on such questions, and so there is unity of purpose and action between the various Parliaments and Governments of the British Empire. The appointment of a local Governor might result in the elevation of a man who is not as fully conversant with the latest developments of Imperial policy as would be a man brought up in the shadow of the British Parliament. The local man might not be fully acquainted with the Imperial and international relationships, and might be more out of touch with them than would be a man appointed by the Imperial Government. We all agree that our Imperial Parliament is this much ineffective, that it is not a Parliament consisting of representatives from every part of the British Empire qualified to inaugurate and embody an Imperial policy. However, members of the British Parliament are more closely in touch with international relationships than are we out here in Australia. The second point to be considered is the danger of appointing a party nominee. I do not mean to imply that a man would be appointed because he was a member of a political party, so much as that most public men in this and the other States have been identified with political movements at one time or another.

Members: So, too, in the Old Country.

Hon. H. SEDDON: But the local man would still be more or less associated with the party to which he had subscribed during his public career. It is said that the same thing obtains in the Old Country; but there is this point to be considered, that when a man comes out here as Governor, he comes out practically dissociated from his old party.

Hon. T. Moore: To what party does he lean when he comes out here? With what party does he associate? The aristocratic party.

Hon. H. SEDDON: When he comes to Australia he comes dissociated from the political party with which he was allied in the Imperial Parliament. He has to deal with local questions, and he can maintain a greater impartiality than would be his if he had remained in close touch with his old political faith. From that standpoint I contend a man taken from one of the other dominions and transferred to, say, Australia would be able to exhibit strict

impartiality and still be in close touch with questions of Empire. In conclusion I should like also to refer to this: As representatives of the people we are entitled to know what the communications are between the State Government and the Imperial Government. As a result of the amendment this memorial has been shown to members of the House, and to-morrow, I take it, it will become public property. So we all have a clearer idea of what the memorial contains, and we recognise the spirit behind the memorial, the spirit of equal citizenship. We sympathise with and support that ideal. I think we can support the amended amendment with a greater determination because of that spirit. Still, I ask members to remember that there is a general recognition on the part of citizens of Great Britain of the equality of Empire citizenship.

Hon. T. Moore: It has never been mentioned previously. We have to ask for these things.

Hon. H. SEDDON: It is only one of many questions that arise out of our more or less disorganised Empire. It is one of the questions that might well be dealt with by a truly Imperial Parliament. Such a Parliament would tend more than anything else to bind together the citizens of the Empire with a better mutual understanding than exists at present.

HON. G. POTTER (West) [8.40]: I do not think for a moment that in the action they have taken the Government were in any way disloyal to the person, the throne, and the Empire. But I say unquestionably their action was most ill advised, particularly at present, when the Empire is going through one of its greatest trials, one of the greatest throes of its existence, and when whatever action we take here will be looked upon as an example of what some other people would like to see happen. I have seen no evidence of a desire for a discontinuance of the present system of appointing State Governors. During the last general elections it was not in the forefront of the Labour Party's platform, nor did they have any mandate from the country to carry such a policy into effect. So we know where this agitation has emanated from. The Government were ill-advised to take the action they have taken without first referring it to the Parliament of Western Australia. When we consider

the wonderful service that has been given to Australia by successive Governors in the past, when we know that every retiring Governor has been an honorary and brilliant ambassador of Australia in the land to which he has returned, I feel that any money spent on the office of Governor has been wisely spent and with great profit. I hope the Government will not do anything to in any way disintegrate the Empire even in the smallest degree, and that we shall never approach from this end of the Empire the position that the great Pitt reached when he saw the American colonies drifting away and declared that the Empire was rendered to the condition that there were none so poor as did her reverence. If anything is done to destroy the stability and the interwoven influences at present operating in the Empire, we shall undoubtedly be doing something for which those who come after us will not bless us.

HON. T. MOORE (Central) [8.45]: Seeing that so many members who apparently have not the same feeling for Australian sentiment that I possess have spoken so rapidly and readily, it is about time that an Australian put his viewpoint. I am surprised that Mr. Potter should say the proposal contained in the memorial would have a disintegrating influence. What a wonderful thing to suggest, merely because an Australian Governor might be appointed, perhaps a pioneer who has been here 50 or 60 years and done much to build up this continent! Were not his remarks a reflection on such men? He suggests that they would not be fit to represent the King.

Hon. G. Potter: On a point of order, I refute that statement.

Hon. T. MOORE: I consider the hon. member is quite out of order. He has spoken of a disintegrating influence, and yet all that is proposed is that some Australian gentleman shall have the right to bask in the glory of the governorship. So far as I can judge a man sent out from the Old Country is supposed to sacrifice a lot in order to accept the position of Governor, so I suppose he must come for the glory of the office. Such a man, no doubt, has rendered service to the Empire, but who has rendered greater service than the man who has come here and shared the burden of building up this Commonwealth? Reference has been made to the silken threads that bind the Empire.

Within late years the Empire has been bound by something greater than silken threads, and I am surprised that so soon it should be necessary to advocate a connecting link in the shape of a Governor sent from the Old Country. I cannot appreciate that viewpoint at all. Members talk about the proposal having a disintegrating influence.

Hon. G. Potter: We do not want to disrupt the Empire.

Hon. T. MOORE: Why a disruption?

Hon. G. Potter: That is what we want to know.

Hon. T. MOORE: Then where the disruption? Where is the malign influence at work when the suggestion is purely what I have stated? I hope that some of the members hailing from the Old Country will try to get the Australian viewpoint that we consider ourselves just the equal of anyone else in this world.

Hon. G. Potter: That is not in question.

Hon. T. MOORE: No, but the very fact that we propose to give notable citizens an opportunity to be elevated to the position of Governor is questioned. We are told the influence is bad. Such statements will not go unchallenged so long as I occupy a seat in this House. It was a ridiculous statement to make.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: We all agree with you.

Hon. T. MOORE: There are plenty of Australians who are not only fitted to fill the position, but who should fill it, and they have been overlooked too long.

Amendment as amended put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	7

Majority for 5

AYES.

Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. Duffell	Hon. G. Potter
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	Hon. A. J. H. Saw
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. F. E. S. Willmott
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. W. Hickey	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	(Teller.)

Amendment as amended thus passed.

HON. J. R. BROWN (North-East) [8.52]: Let me preface my remarks by referring to what I consider was a breach of Parliamentary etiquette on the part of Mr. Glasheen. I congratulate him on his able speech, but I must take him to task for a reference that I consider was somewhat unseemly.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Is this Satan reproving sin?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Mr. Glasheen in the course of his remarks, said—

On the goldfields I was working underground, and my mate was M. J. McCarthy. That man stood for more selection ballots and contested more vacant seats, I think, than any other man in the State, and every time he stood he failed signally McCarthy never did anything himself. He believed in explaining the principle of work to others. I was in the unfortunate position of being his mate. Instead of working, my mate brought me a book on socialism I think I may claim to have one of the best libraries in the wheat areas Socialism would be an economic possibility were it not for human nature. Socialism is a beautiful dream, and every Christian ought to believe in it.

Evidently Mr. Glasheen is not a Christian. While listening to his speech, my first impression was that he was more accustomed to the pulpit or to the stage than to Parliamentary procedure. He has a great idea of socialism. It reminds me of the horse race on which people take tickets and those who lose collect the same as do those who win. That is the sort of socialism some members think we advocate. I happen to know M. J. McCarthy very well, and I can say that whatever he did was done in the interests of the workers without fee or favour. He attended to his duties and also worked in an honorary capacity in the interests of his fellows. He worked on the Golden Mile for 30 years and is still there battling along.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: He is a well-intentioned, genuine man.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Mr. Glasheen's references to a man who is not in a position to defend himself were uncalled for, and I hope he will not be guilty of that sort of thing again. I do not wish to speak long on the Address-in-reply. It is a waste of energy to debate what is only in the air.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Hot air.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Last session members on the Address-in-reply discussed a number of Bills that had not then taken form, and told us what attitude they were going to adopt. When the measures reached this Chamber, they were brutally murdered.

The Fair Rents Bill was sent to this House and was treated as a huge joke.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: It was.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Though people in this State are paying £2 for houses worth only 7s. 6d. or 10s., this Chamber turned the Bill down and refused to listen to it. The Closer Settlement Bill came to us from another place. That measure would have been the means of relieving a tremendous lot of unemployment if only it had been passed, but it was so mutilated that the Minister for Lands refused to accept it in the amended form. Then there was the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, one of the most important measures to the workers. The whole prospect of industrial peace is based on having a good Arbitration Act. Members here would not allow us to have an Arbitration Court comprised of a judge and two laymen; they cut out the laymen. I wanted to cut out the judge. Subsequently the judge jibbed and turned the job down.

Hon. T. Moore: Was it a strike or a lockout?

Hon. J. R. BROWN: The Government, however, overcame the difficulty by appointing Mr. Davies an acting judge and president of the Arbitration Court. I think someone apologised for his having been taken from another job. Still it was the best thing the Government could have done. I hope they keep him in the position because he is the best president we have had so far. When the amending Bill comes before the House this session, I trust that members will not table so many amendments as they did last year. Mr. Lovekin is not present this evening and I hope he will not be here when the Bill comes before us. The Jury Act Amendment Bill will be sent to us again this session. Last session the gag was put upon it; the Chairman was moved out of the Chair, and that was the end of the Bill. The Legal Practitioners' Bill was defeated in this Chamber, and the Main Roads Bill was laid aside with the usual "R.I.P." We cannot expect road boards to maintain the highways in good repair unless the Main Roads Bill be passed. We are extending the highways so far in the South-West and in the North-East that we hardly know where we are, and a main roads measure is essential and should receive the support of the House. Several other Bills introduced last session met with no better fate. According to the remarks of Mr. Glasheen, he was imbued with the same ideas as was I

when I entered this Chamber. I considered that this was a party House, but members informed me that it was a House of review. When Mr. Glasheen was speaking on this point, I interjected, "You will know when a division is taken." To-night he had an opportunity to see our lonely six on one side of the House against the mob on the other side. They soon converted him; but they have not converted me, and I still hold the opinion that this is a House of obstruction. We have read much recently about the need for a dry dock at Fremantle. If this House were shifted to Fremantle, judging by the number of dry speeches delivered during this debate, it would make an excellent dry dock. Hon. members spoke of sentiment and tradition. One said he was sorry that the guard of honour was cut out on this occasion. I think we ought to live for to-morrow, and not for the past. That kind of thing is unnecessary expense and of no use whatever. The money required for a guard of honour would be better spent on providing bread or employment for men out of work. There was once a racehorse called Tradition, which ran second in the Caulfield Cup to Chicago. When the Melbourne Cup was run I had £500 on Tradition, but he did not win. I suppose he had no pedigree. Of course the traditions here all have good pedigrees. Mr. Ewing spoke of migration, and said that we wanted the "hordes" who were living on doles in England. I interjected that we did not want migrants with doles but migrants with capital. Mr. Dodd said that that was against our principles, and that we should not stand for capital. However, it was not in that sense I made the interjection. I meant that we did not want migrants who lived on doles in England, but that we wanted the real working classes of England, who are never out of a job. The class of migrant we get here is a nuisance in the Old Country. That is the reason why he is sent out here.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: Question!

Hon. J. R. BROWN: A man goes up to a farmer and says, "Do you want a man?" The farmer answers, "Yes; if you see one about, tell him I want one." Another man goes up to a farmer for a job, and the farmer asks him, "Can you ride?" The man says, "No," and then the farmer says, "There is a colt over there that has never been ridden. Catch him, and you can both learn

together." We have enough legislation to fill this Chamber. If we had all the Acts we are bound by together, they would make a mountain. When Christ was on earth, 10 simple commandments sufficed Him. We are not like Abraham Lincoln, who legislated for to-day and not for to-morrow. Let to-morrow legislate for itself. We are governed by prosy, frowsy solicitors who drag out laws that were passed in the fourteenth century. It has been said that the present Government are not doing enough for the mines, but they are doing as much as they possibly can. Goldfields members know that some time ago a big deputation waited upon the then Premier, Sir James Mitchell, in Kalgoorlie, and begged and prayed him to grant a reduction in the price of water. It was a most representative gathering, and I happened to be there, and I said the time for praying and begging was past and the Government had to give cheap water. Mr. Hamilton, the manager of the Great Boulder Mine, said that 50 million pounds' worth of gold was lying there ready to mine if water could be got at 2s. 6d. He said that the mining of that gold would not perhaps be a payable proposition to the company, but that it would give a lot of work to the unemployed. But when the water was reduced to half-a-crown, the company put off men instead of putting men on. If anything in the shape of a bonus on gold were given, it would enable much ore to be mined which to-day is lying idle. That is not speculation, but a matter of ascertained fact, proved by developments. The ore goes 7 to 8 dwts.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: You want to spend five guineas in order to get £4 10s.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: Money makes money. If we get that gold bonus it will revert to the Commonwealth tenfold. Mr. Ewing was much upset about the report of Mr. Kingsley Thomas. Kingsley Thomas was the ablest man available for reporting on our mining industry. He came from South Africa, where there are larger mining areas than we have here, though the system of mining may be different as the lodes are different. He came here unbiassed, and gave his opinion. Certainly he did the right thing in starting at the top. An ordinary man would have started at the bottom and said, "The toiler is getting too much wages; he will have to come down and will have to work a bit longer." Kingsley Thomas began by

saying that the management was overdone. I have said here, by interjection, that men like Mr. Hamilton have outlived their usefulness. They ought to have been pensioned off long ago. If Mr. Hamilton dies to-morrow, the Great Boulder Mine would not know he was dead, but would go on just the same. If we could get amalgamation and increased efficiency of management, it would be a great thing for our goldfields. Most of the mine managers are being paid £5,000, £4,000, or £3,000 a year, whereas one man could look after all the mines if they were properly organised. I am pleased to see that the Government intend to go on with the Esperance railway, which has been promised for the last 25 years. The 60 miles northwards were built, but that length was useless unless continued to Norseman and thus connected with the railway system of Australia right through to Rockhampton in Queensland. The Governor's Speech does not refer to the sandalwood question, which has caused much uneasiness in my electorate. Residents in the North-East Province are very sore about that matter. However, we have the assurance of the Government that it will be rectified at the end of the year. Mr. Dodd said that one Government or House should not control the destinies of the State. If Mr. Dodd were here, I would remind him that when he was returned to this Chamber he was pledged by the Labour platform to work for its abolition.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I think what Mr. Dodd said that unless the initiative and referendum were introduced, he was not in favour of a single Chamber.

Hon. J. R. BROWN: The initiative and referendum are in the air. Mr. Burvill suggested that training camps in England would be suitable for the migrants. The migrants are trained in England for about three weeks I believe; but it is done in a camp in the town. There are no big trees to cut down and when these people come out they are not suitable for clearing work. If we get 50 per cent. of successes among the migrants, we shall be doing admirably well. It is an uphill game, and not too many Australians would take it on, although they are born and bred in the place and know the ups and downs of the game. I think the Address-in-reply debate is to some extent a waste of time. Two or three days ought to do it and members ought to confine themselves to about 20 minutes instead of trying

to put up records in the way of lengthy speeches.

On motion by Hon. W. H. Kitson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 25th August, 1925.

	PAGE
Temporary Chairman of Committees ...	468
Questions: Apprentices and Tradesmen (1) Railway Department (2) State Implement Works and Public Works ...	468
Traffic bus routes ...	469
Bills: Land Tax and Income Tax Act Amendment 2A., com., report ...	469
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Message 2A. ...	471
Group Settlers Advances, 2A. ...	474
Group Settlers Advances, 2A., continued com., report ...	494
Traffic Act Amendment, Message, 2A. ...	477
Resolution: Mining Industry, gold bonus ...	483

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

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to announce that I have nominated the member for Menzies (Mr. Panton), the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo), and the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) as temporary Chairmen of Committees during this session.

QUESTIONS (2)—APPRENTICES AND TRADESMEN.

Railway Department.

Mr. MANN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, How many journeymen tradesmen are employed at the Midland Junction workshops? 2, How many apprentices are being trained? 3, What is the number allowable? 4, How many journeymen are em-